Consortium Board Chair Russ Axelrod called the meeting of the Executive Committee (EC) to order at 5:35 p.m. Introductions were made. Executive Committee members present at the meeting included Councilor Kirk French from the City of Gresham, Commissioner Nancy Gibson from Oak Lodge Water Services, Mayor Russ Axelrod from South Fork Water Board, Commissioner Ernie Platt from Sunrise Water Authority, Councilor Tom Anderson from the City of Tigard, and Commissioner Jim Duggan from Tualatin Valley Water District.

Others in attendance included Andrew Degner from the City of Gresham, Brian Stahl from Rockwood Water PUD, and John Goodrich from the City of Tigard.

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

**Approval of the April 5, 2017 Meeting Summary:** Commissioner Ernie Platt made a motion to approved the April 5, 2017 Executive Committee meeting summary. Commissioner Nancy Gibson seconded the motion. The April 5, 2017 Executive Committee meeting summary was unanimously approved as presented. (6:0:0)

**Project Manager Report:** Rebecca Geisen, Consortium Project Manager pointed out that included in the meeting materials packet was a detailed one-page Project Manager Report handout for EC member to read at their leisure. Ms. Geisen 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.

**Regional Interconnections Study:** Ms. Geisen reported that consultant Murraysmith (formerly Murray Smith and Associates) continues their work on the Regional Interconnections Study. Murraysmith has updated the geodatabase with changes from water providers. Over 180 interconnections were identified and of those, 20-30 were ranked using criteria developed in conjunction with the Consortium Technical Committee (CTC). Ms. Geisen advised that key interties were identified and next steps outlined. She noted that Murraysmith also demonstrated how the geodatabase could be used to help identify staging and distribution locations for the mobile water treatment and distribution systems. Murraysmith gave a brief presentation to the CTC at their meeting this afternoon and provided two technical memorandums for review. Ms.
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Geisen advised that planning is underway for a tabletop exercise that is scheduled for Tuesday, October 24, 2017 at Tualatin Valley Water District. Ms. Geisen 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, and Thursday, October 10, 11 and 12, 2017 at Rockwood Water PUD, Murraysmith and webinar, and Tualatin Valley Water District respectively.

**Intergovernmental Agreement with Clackamas River Water:** Ms. Geisen reminded EC 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. Ms. Geisen advised that because the Board only meets tri-annually it can be difficult to get timely maintenance and equipment needs done. Ms. Geisen 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.

Ms. Geisen advised that the CTC concurred with her recommendation at their meeting this afternoon and directed her to get Executive Committee approval at this meeting.

EC members discussed the IGA amendment request and dollar thresholds for repairs that the CTC could approve.

Commissioner Jim Duggan made a motion to amend the IGA with Clackamas River Water to transfer from the Consortium Board to the Consortium Technical Committee the approval of Consortium funds for the purpose of repairing or replacing major equipment and parts in excess of $100 and up to $2,000. Commissioner Nancy Gibson seconded the motion. The Executive Committee unanimously approved the motion to amend the IGA with Clackamas River Water to transfer from the Consortium Board to the Consortium Technical Committee the approval of Consortium funds for the purpose of repairing or replacing major equipment and parts in excess of $100 and up to $2,000. (6:0:0)

**Meeting Location:** Ms. Geisen reminded EC members that she recently sent them an e-mail poll seeking approval for changing the Executive Committee meetings to the second Wednesday of the months in which they meet. She noted that no one seemed to object or have conflicts with the change so beginning in January 2018 the EC will meet on the second Wednesday in January, April, September and December. Ms. Geisen advised that if the EC meets in December, often this meeting is cancelled, the December 2017 meeting will remain on December 6, the first Wednesday since it has already been scheduled. It was decided that the December EC meeting would be held in the Consortium staff’s new building at 400 SW 6th Avenue.

**Source Water Protection Plan:** Ms. Geisen mentioned that Consortium staff completed the Consortium’s Updated Source Water Protection (SWP) Plan. She noted that the source water protection chapter from the Regional Water Supply Plan served as the basis for the updated plan. The SWP Plan includes specific actions the Consortium will undertake to promote source water protection. The Consortium will continue to advocate for source water protection in the region,
state and nationally. Actions taken will be reflected in the Consortium triannual and annual reports. Ms. Geisen said the SWP Plan is on the Consortium website.

**Conservation and Emergency Preparedness Program Update:** Bonny Cushman, Program Coordinator 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.

Ms. Cushman 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.

Ms. Cushman 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. She noted that twenty-four TriMet busses are traversing the tri-county area with the Consortium’s three emergency preparedness ads. The three-month campaign began in August and will run through October.

Chair Axelrod mentioned that the City of West Linn is having an emergency preparedness event on September 21. He noted that he will connect with Ms. Cushman about possible materials the Consortium may have that can be distributed at the event.

**FY 2018/19 Budget and Work Plan Concepts Discussion:** Ms. Geisen reminded EC members that the Consortium Board will discuss program priorities for the FY 2018/19 budget and work plan at their October 4th meeting. She advised that EC guidance is needed to determine what projects and program priorities to bring forward to the Board for their consideration. Ms. Geisen noted that this is a bit of an unusual year as the carryover for FY 2018/19 is significant ($188,643) due to being under-staffed for a significant portion of FY 2016/17. 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.

Ms. Geisen 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 carryover in future years to offset dues.

Ms. Geisen said the larger carryover 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. Ms. Geisen reviewed the programs. Ms. Geisen 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. Ms. Geisen mentioned that the Consortium Conservation and Emergency Planning Committees will be meeting later in September and may have additional feedback and ideas.

Ms. Geisen advised that CTC members met earlier this afternoon to discuss budget and work plan concepts as well. She noted that the CTC was generally in favor of using the carryover funds to fund some one-time and on-going projects but with a mindfulness to what future dues might look like. Ms. Geisen advised that the CTC 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 carryover will be realized in the current fiscal year that would be applied to the FY 2019/20 budget. She noted there was some thought that even more funds could be put into the contingency line item to cushion dues increase for the outlying years and that the CTC was supportive of continuing work with Portland State University (PSU) for the population and household estimate work.

Councilor Kirk commented that he is in favor of utilizing the larger carryover funds to complete the one-time projects that were proposed.

Commissioner Platt suggested that more funds could be put into the contingency line item.

Commissioner Gibson concurred with the idea of adding more to the contingency and was supportive of the expansion of a Spanish outreach program.

The Executive Committee supported the proposed one-time and on-going new programs, and adding more to the contingency line item. They also supported the CTC recommendation to have Consortium staff research costs for the Spanish language outreach program and providing a picture of what future budgets/dues may look like assuming a smaller carryover in outlying years.

Ms. Geisen advised that staffing costs from the City of Portland will be available in early December at which time she will be able to solidify those costs and have a better idea of actual budget numbers.

**Strategic Plan Update:** Ms. Geisen introduced Christine Wallace Caldwell from Catalysis LLC who will be assisting the Consortium with the development of the five-year Strategic Plan Update. Ms. Wallace Caldwell introduced herself and provide a brief history of her work and clientele. Most recently, Ms. Wallace Caldwell is working with the City of Portland, Bureau of Environmental Services on an update of their ten-year Strategic Plan.
Ms. Wallace Caldwell gave a brief overview of the strategic planning process and shared the preliminary finding from the CTC accelerated SWOT (strengths, weakness, opportunities and threats) analysis that took place earlier in the afternoon. The EC reviewed the current Regional Water Providers Consortium mission statement and goals and discussed what resonated and what might be missing. EC 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.

**October Consortium Board Meeting Draft Agenda:** Ms. Geisen pointed out that included in the meeting materials was the October Consortium Board meeting draft agenda. Agenda items include approval of Board meeting minutes, Project Manager and committee reports, the FY 2018/19 budget and work plan concepts discussion, and a facilitated discussion on the update of the Strategic Plan. The Executive Committee approved the draft agenda as presented.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:30 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee is December 6, 2017 in Chinook Conference Room, 400 Building, 400 SW 6th Avenue, Portland.

Submitted by Patty Burk, Consortium Staff
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 measurable

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.

**STRENGTHS**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcommittee expertise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Messaging not from single entity/broad support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More effective, economy of scale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to share information (ex. RFP’s, seismic, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits to mutual partners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional mindset</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leveraging funds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network of peers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand created</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding if one of us fails, we all fail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination of staff and political leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suite of outreach materials conservation messaging (some Emergency Prep)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective knowledge and expertise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WEAKNESSES**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Varying priorities (Member, political, special districts)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interconnections recommendations to be implemented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--Difficult inter-governmental</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--How to facilitate implementation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge of articulating what we do (3 things?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old messaging/strategy on conservation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homogeneous nature of membership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Ag, land use planning, storm/wastewater</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge in getting quorum/participation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need member input on what provides value, talking points, selling points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some turf issues on conservation materials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor marketing to our members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate messages to specific audiences ➔ City councils/boards critical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articulating $$ value back to Boards/City councils</td>
<td></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>
<th>THREATS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conveying collaborative coordinated message</td>
<td>Metro disconnect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tell story</td>
<td>Urban growth boundaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate distribution systems “show and tell”</td>
<td>Education between planning entities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased focus on emergency preparedness</td>
<td>Water rights regulatory pressures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple channels/way to be timely</td>
<td>Not staying relevant to decision-makers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop talking points ready to use</td>
<td>Issues tend to make us all look bad (ex. lead)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential to get grants?</td>
<td>Individual entities maintaining regional thought</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthen public connection to local water provider</td>
<td>Limited water supply -- Understand systems thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected officials networking opportunity</td>
<td>Natural disaster preparedness and resiliency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Competing regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<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 region’s 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.