John Goodrich from the City of Tigard called the meeting of the Consortium Technical Committee (CTC) to order at 1:00 p.m. Other CTC members in attendance included David Winship from the City of Beaverton, Todd Heidgerken from Clackamas River Water, Rich Blackmun from the City of Forest Grove, Andrew Degner from the City of Gresham, Niki Iverson from City of Hillsboro, Joel Komarek from the City of Lake Oswego, Don Simenson from the City of Milwaukie, Brian Stahl from Rockwood Water PUD, David Janusz from the City of Sherwood, Elizabeth Edgar from Sunrise Water Authority, Jeff Fuchs from the City of Tualatin, Carrie Pak from Tualatin Valley Water District, and Mike Grimm from West Slope Water District.

Others in attendance included Brian Ginter and Mike McKillip from Murraysmith and Christine Wallace Caldwell from Catalysis LLC.

Consortium Staff included Rebecca Geisen, Bonny Cushman, Katy Asher, and Patty Burk.

**Approval of June 21, 2017 Meeting Minutes:** Mike Grimm made a motion to approve the June 21, 2017 meeting minutes as presented. Brian Stahl seconded the motion. The Consortium Technical Committee unanimously approved the June 21, 2017 meeting minutes as presented. (14:0:0)

**Election of Officers:** Nominations for Consortium Technical Committee Chair were opened. A motion was made and seconded to nominate John Goodrich from the City of Tigard for CTC Chair. There were no other nominations. The CTC unanimously approved John Goodrich as CTC Chair. (14:0:0)

Nominations for Consortium Technical Committee Vice-Chair were open. Mike Grimm nominated Andrew Degner. Brian Stahl seconded the motion. There were no other nominations. The CTC unanimously approved Andrew Degner as CTC Vice-Chair. (14:0:0)

**Project Manager and Conservation Program Updates:** Rebecca Geisen, Consortium Project Manager pointed out that included in the meeting materials packet was a detailed one-page Project Manager Report handout for CTC member to read at their leisure. Rebecca advised that she had just a couple of items she briefly wanted to mention so that maximum time could be spent on the Strategic Plan update discussion.
Intergovernmental Agreement with Clackamas River Water: Rebecca reminded CTC members that the Consortium has an Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) with Clackamas River Water (CRW) to maintain and house the Consortium-owned Emergency Water Distribution System. She advised that in the IGA there is a section that outlines maintenance costs and responsibilities which states that for maintenance repairs or equipment needs over $100 CRW may make a request to the Consortium Board for that purpose. Rebecca advised that because the Board only meets tri-annually it can be difficult to get timely maintenance and equipment needs done. Rebecca said she would like to amend the IGA to delegate that approval to the Consortium Technical Committee to allow for more timely responses to CRW fund requests.

The CTC concurred with Rebecca’s recommendation and directed her to get Executive Committee approval at their meeting later in the evening.

Water Communicators Network: Rebecca mentioned that the Consortium Communications Network’s September meeting included a media panel with Jim Redden from the Portland Tribune and Bruce Williams from KGW, Channel 8. She noted that committee members had an informative, frank discussion with the media representatives; what they are looking for in a story, how and when to pitch stories, and the importance of building relationships with media partners. Through this exchange, it was mentioned that there could be a bill introduced related to how rate payer funds are spent resulting in media inquiries about how ratepayer funds are spent, and what authority or restrictions our jurisdictions have on spending ratepayer funds.

Consortium Conservation Committee: Bonny mentioned that at next week’s meeting, the Consortium Conservation Committee (CCC) will participate in a half-day workshop/planning meeting to discuss where they would like to see the program go in the future, what’s working, changes that may be needed, and how that all fits into the Consortium’s Strategic Plan update. She noted that she asked CCC members to connect with their managers about project priorities and direction so that they can confidently speak on behalf of their organization.

Bonny advised that the summer water conservation marketing campaign has concluded. She noted that she would send out story links and campaign statistics as soon as they have been collated. Bonny reported that the emergency preparedness media campaign with KGW, Channel 8 kicked off at the beginning of September with a news story and promotion of the #14Gallons Challenge.

Regional Interconnections Study: Mike McKillip and Brian Ginter from Murraysmith joined the CTC meeting to give an update on the Regional Interconnection Study and the tabletop training exercise. Mr. McKillip gave a brief history of the project and outlined the current efforts of the update including an update of the geodatabase; ranking of the regional interconnections; identification of the emergency treatment staging locations; and a planning exercise using the database. Two technical memorandums were distributed at the meeting that detailed the evaluation of regional interties and the staging of the emergency water treatment and distribution systems around the region.

Mr. McKillip advised that the tabletop exercise is scheduled for Tuesday, October 24, 2017 at Tualatin Valley Water District. He noted that junior staff, engineers, planners, operators, and database tool users would benefit from the tabletop exercise. Mr. McKillip said prior to the tabletop exercise three training sessions on what is in the geodatabase and how to use it have been scheduled for Tuesday, Wednesday,
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and Thursday, October 10, 11 and 12, 2017 at Rockwood Water PUD, Murraysmith and webinar, and Tualatin Valley Water District respectively.

Rebecca asked that if CTC members have comments/feedback on the two technical memos from Murraysmith to please send them to her by Friday, September 15. She advised that a poll and Outlook invites will be sent out for the three training sessions and asked that CTC members pass it on to staff that would benefit and be interested in the training.

Rebecca concluded that one item that came out of the 2010 Interconnections tabletop exercise was how members access the geodatabase. Currently, the geodatabase is housed on a secured City of Portland server and a request for the geodatabase is made to Rebecca as the project manager for the Consortium. She noted that except for the City of Gladstone, all Consortium members have signed a data sharing agreement but since the development of the geodatabase only two entities have requested it. Rebecca commented that it seems the geodatabase is underutilized. Rebecca asked if anyone had concerns with giving members a copy of the geodatabase in hopes that the tool would then be more fully utilized especially since members have signed the data sharing agreement and there are clear protocols in the agreement on how information can be shared. Rebecca said decisions about the sharing of the geodatabase do not need to be made at today’s meeting but it is something she would like CTC members to think about.

FY 2018/19 Budget and Work Plan Concepts Discussion: Rebecca reminded CTC members that the Consortium Board will discuss program priorities for the FY2018/19 budget and work plan at their October 4th meeting. She advised that CTC guidance is needed to determine what projects and program priorities to bring forward to the Board for their consideration. Rebecca noted that this is a bit of an unusual year as the carry-over for FY 2018/19 is significant ($188,643) due to being under-staffed for a significant portion of FY 16/17. Approximately $163,000 of the carryover is in personnel services ($126,000) and overhead ($37,000) due to a prolonged vacancy, and approximately $15,500 was under-expended in materials and services. None of the $10,000 contingency was spent. Rebecca commented that it is important to note that the Consortium is now fully staffed and staff is getting better at more accurately budgeting for materials and services. She advised that this will result in a much smaller carry-over in future years to off-set dues.

Rebecca said this larger carry-over presents an opportunity to do one of three things:
- significantly reduce dues for one year with minimal program changes by maintaining a flat budget (with inflation); or
- maintain a flat dues budget and fund one-time projects, expand our outreach program, and update our collateral material; or
- do something in between.

Included in the meeting materials was a budget memorandum that outlined new programs and one-time and on-going costs for consideration and discussion. Rebecca reviewed the programs. Rebecca said the expansion of the Spanish language outreach program was deemed important by the Conservation Committee and Communicators Network who have been asking for more translated materials and outreach tools for the Hispanic community. One-time projects focus on starting to update and reprint our conservation materials which have not been updated in over 10 years; replenishing conservation devices; developing and printing new emergency preparedness materials; producing new radio spots; increasing
sinking funds; and buying more emergency water storage bags. Rebecca mentioned that the Consortium Conservation and Emergency Planning Committees will be meeting in September and may have additional feedback and ideas.

CTC members discussed the budget options presented. There was support for using the carry-over funds to fund some one-time and on-going projects but with a mindfulness to what future dues might look like. CTC members directed Consortium staff to research costs for the Spanish language outreach program and to do approximate calculations on what dues in out-years would be if on-going programs were funded with the idea that a much smaller carry-over will be realized in the current fiscal year that would be applied to the FY 2019/20 budget. It was suggested that even more funds could be put into the contingency line item to cushion dues increase for the outlying years. The CTC was supportive of continuing work with Portland State University (PSU) for the population and household estimate work. Members were comfortable with using the map updates from the drinking water advisory tool for the PSU work so the larger first year cost for PSU to develop a map would not be needed for the new contract.

Rebecca advised that the Executive Committee will discuss and provide direction for FY 2018/19 budget and work plan concepts as well at their meeting this evening.

**Strategic Plan Update:** Rebecca introduced Christine Wallace Caldwell from Catalysis LLC who will be assisting the Consortium with the development of the five-year Strategic Plan Update. Christine introduced herself and provide a brief history of her work and clientele. Most recently, Christine is working with the City of Portland, Bureau of Environmental Services on an update of their ten-year Strategic Plan.

Christine gave a brief overview of the strategic planning process and lead the CTC through a facilitated discussion that included a review of the mission statement and goals – what resonates? what might be missing?; an accelerated SWOT (strengths, weakness, opportunities and threats) analysis; and a look at challenges and opportunities. CTC members were asked to consider several questions to help facilitate the discussion including what does success look like for the Consortium five years from now; what prevents the Consortium from being successful; and what information is needed from the Board, members and stakeholder to develop an informed and effective strategic plan?

Notes from the Strategic Plan Update facilitated discussion are attached to this meeting summary.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:30 p.m. The next meeting of the Consortium Technical Committee is November 1, 2017 at 1:30 p.m. in the Portland City Hall, Pettygrove Room.

Submitted by Patty Burk, Consortium Staff
Regional Water Providers Consortium
Combined Notes from Consortium Technical Committee and Executive Committee Meetings on 9/6/17 (updated 10/16/17)

On September 6, 2017, both the Consortium Technical Committee and the Executive committee devoted a portion of their regular meeting to discussing the upcoming strategic plan renewal. To start the process, the groups spent some time considering their hopes and concerns for an updated 5-year strategic plan. These notes are summarized as follows:

HOPES/CONCERNS FOR AN UPDATED STRATEGIC PLAN

Consortium Technical Committee (CTC)
- Continues collaborative spirit
- Clear, measurable, goals and objectives
- What we can do, what we don’t
- Clear message, especially for members (justification and value of the Consortium)
- Creates confidence in what we’re doing
- Plan that can change and be expanded
- Fire protection critical and overlooked in materials/messaging
- Plan provides unifying focus for diverse members
- Public health as central
- Economies of scale
- Common, regional voice/message
- Influence policy
- Address concern of Metro dropping out (they did not see value)

Executive Committee (EC)
- Realistic/actionable
- Greater public understanding (Emergency Preparedness)
- Serving our members: value added is effectively communicated
- Stronger at end
- Building relationships (RDPO, Burnside Bridge)
- Leverage our success and expertise
- Need to better share among members (innovation, knowledge, success)
- Proactive participation with policy/legislature
  - Use members
  - Cohesively leverage expertise
  - Subcommittee of elected?
- Staff succession planning
- Board succession planning and onboarding
- Have conservation down – need to build regional Emergency Preparedness
- Public awareness of infrastructure/region
- Empowering people/public to be prepared
- Increase engagement with landscape community and homeowners
- Promote technology that improves protection and emergency prep
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Consortium Conservation Committee (CCC)
- Equity – ensuring diverse audiences have access to our information in a culturally appropriate manner
- Maintaining and fostering relationship with landscape industry which has waned over the years
- Having the ability to retain a provider’s own branding while delivering a regional message – (there are some providers who take regionally developed material and re-brand it which somewhat defeats the purpose of having/developing regional materials) - perhaps co-branding?
- Program evaluation – ensuring our outreach efforts are effective, relevant and measureable

Emergency Planning Committee (EPC)
- Expand our inventory of grant funded regional equipment
- General population all has an emergency supply of water
- Public is educated about importance of preparedness and we can move onto more sophisticated messaging
- Tie talking points about emergency preparedness into value of water
- Continue to see value in having emergency preparedness outreach material available to the public via TV, radio, trimet, print, social media, videos, etc.
- Continue regional exercises – Table Top every other year and large scale (with equipment) every 3-5 years
- Get value from access to RWPC information and resources
- Excellent forum for sharing information and technical expertise between providers
- Help drive or develop resources for employee preparedness (which will help utility be more responsive when even occurs)
- Broaden outreach beyond typical homeowner – e.g. multi-family, non-English speaking, etc.
- Consider a community (regionally) owned materials yard for staging critical materials for repairing water system in addition to fuel
- We have a stranded worker agreement in place
- Speak with united voice – e.g. we all communicate need for 14 day supply of water for an emergency
The participants of both the CTC and EC went through a process of mapping the internal and external landscape of RWPC. This included identifying strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats (SWOT). The CTC meeting provided a preliminary assessment, and the EC reviewed and added their input.

**Strengths and Weaknesses**

The first part of the SWOT analysis involved the identification of the current strengths and weaknesses of the organization. Strengths and weaknesses are typically internally focused and highlight the inherent qualities of an organization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRENGTHS</th>
<th>WEAKNESSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Varying priorities (Member, political, special districts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcommittee expertise</td>
<td>Interconnections recommendations to be implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Messaging not from single entity/broad support</td>
<td>--Difficult inter-governmental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More effective, economy of scale</td>
<td>--How to facilitate implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to share information (ex. RFP’s, seismic, etc.)</td>
<td>Challenge of articulating what we do (3 things?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits to mutual partners</td>
<td>Old messaging/strategy on conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional mindset</td>
<td>Homogeneous nature of membership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leveraging funds</td>
<td>Missing Ag, land use planning, storm/wastewater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network of peers</td>
<td>Challenge in getting quorum/participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand created</td>
<td>Need member input on what provides value, talking points, selling points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding if one of us fails, we all fail</td>
<td>Some turf issues on conservation materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination of staff and political leadership</td>
<td>Poor marketing to our members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suite of outreach materials conservation messaging (some Emergency Prep)</td>
<td>Appropriate messages to specific audiences City councils/boards critical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective knowledge and expertise</td>
<td>Articulating $$ value back to Boards/City councils</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Opportunities and Threats

Following an analysis of internal strengths and weaknesses, the group shifted its focus to external opportunities and threats. These are external factors that may either offer new possibilities, or present threats to the success of RWPC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPPORTUNITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conveying collaborative coordinated message</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tell story</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate distribution systems “show and tell”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased focus on emergency preparedness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple channels/way to be timely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop talking points ready to use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential to get grants?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthen public connection to local water provider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected officials networking opportunity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THREATS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metro disconnect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban growth boundaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-- Education between planning entities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water rights regulatory pressures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not staying relevant to decision-makers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues tend to make us all look bad (ex. lead)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual entities maintaining regional thought</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited water supply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-- Understand systems thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural disaster preparedness and resiliency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competing regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding challenges</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mission and Goals

The EC was asked to consider prior to the meeting their thought on the current mission and goals. They were asked to describe what resonates, and what might be missing. A brief discussion identified a few areas that continue to resonate, but there was a sense that the mission and goals could be brought in better alignment with the Consortium’s current activities.

Mission Statement
The Regional Water Providers Consortium serves as a collaborative and coordinating organization to improve the planning and management of municipal water supplies in the Portland metropolitan region.

Goals

- We provide a forum for study and discussion of water supply issues and opportunities of mutual interest and we communicate the value of municipal water supplies as well as adopted policy and strategies to the public, agencies, and stakeholder groups.
- We promote cost-efficient use of our water resources through a regional water conservation program and wise stewardship and protection of water resources to meet the values of our collective members and the needs of future generations.
- We assist in improving regional emergency preparedness among water providers so that our customers are better served during emergencies.
- We take ownership of and coordinate the implementation and revision of the Regional Water Supply Plan as the agencies directly responsible for providing water supplies to customers.

Discussion from Executive Committee on the mission and goals:

- “Collaborative” still resonates
- Missing “Education” in the mission
- Missing serving as a “technical resource”
- Missing “emergency preparedness” in goals
- “Stewards” of the regions water supply is an important concept
- We “support regional stewardship”
- Just tweaks needed to the goals: include “and infrastructure” in first goal and add “and prepared” in third goal
- How understandable is mission statement?
- Remove Regional Water Providers Consortium from mission statement, begin with “We serve or To serve”
- The Consortium is more than just a collaborating and coordinating organization
• Begin mission statement with “As stewards of... i.e., As resource stewards, we protect regional water supplies through education and collaboration.
• Missing what we do in mission statement; i.e., do not mention conservation or emergency preparedness
• Missing same ideas in mission statement as are in the goals; goals are not really goals they are more HOW we do our work.
• Goals should be more outcome based, measurable
• Strategic Plan has not kept up with changes and evolution of the organization; the move from planning to more hard programs
• The Consortium supports the work of the individual members as well as being regional stewards

Board Engagement with Strategic Planning Process

Finally, the EC discussed how to engage the Board in the strategic planning process.

Recommendations included:

• Present highlights of discussions from recent committee meetings; summarize elements of all groups discussions for the Board.
• Massage mission statement and present options to the Board.
• Get Board to begin thinking about future direction of the Consortium. What do we want to do over the next five years?
• Extend the Strategic Planning discussion time at the October Board meeting to an hour and a half.
• Send summaries of committee discussion and draft mission statement options out to Board in advance.
• Conduct breakout sessions where groups have both newer members and EC members mixed in; if breakout sessions are done, must allow enough time for report back.
• Compared updated SWOT analysis with SWOT from 2012; compare/contrast/discuss.
• Send Strategic Plan PowerPoint and Strategic Plan given at the June meeting out again as reminder.
• Important to remember to not to get caught in the weeds; not trying to reinvent the whole wheel.