



## **REGIONAL WATER PROVIDERS CONSORTIUM BOARD MEETING Minutes of October 5, 2011**

Consortium Board Chair Jody Carson called the Regional Water Providers Consortium Board Meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. The meeting was held in the Metro Council Chambers.

Elected representatives from fourteen Consortium member agencies were present at the meeting (which is a quorum), including City of Beaverton, City of Forest Grove, City of Gladstone, City of Gresham, City of Hillsboro, Metro, Raleigh Water District, Rockwood Water PUD, City of Sherwood, South Fork Water Board, Sunrise Water Authority, City of Tigard, City of Tualatin, and Tualatin Valley Water District.

Consortium member agencies not represented by elected officials at this meeting included Clackamas River Water, City of Fairview, City of Lake Oswego, City of Milwaukie, Oak Lodge Water District, City of Portland, City of Sandy, West Slope Water District, and City of Wilsonville.

**Introductions:** Introductions were made. Those in attendance included Councilor Forrest Soth and David Winship from the City of Beaverton; Councilor Victoria Lowe and Rob Foster from the City of Forest Grove; Councilor Ray Jaren from the City of Gladstone, Councilor John Kilian and Brian Stahl from the City of Gresham; Commissioner John Rosenberger from the City of Hillsboro; Guy Graham from the City of Lake Oswego; Councilor Shirley Craddick from Metro; David Shaff from the City of Portland; Councilor Aaron O'Donnell from Raleigh Water District; Commissioner Larry Dixon and Harvey Barnes from Rockwood Water PUD; Councilor Dave Grant and Craig Sheldon from the City of Sherwood; Councilor Jody Carson from South Fork Water Board; Commissioner Ernie Platt and Wade Hathhorn from Sunrise Water Authority; Councilor Nick Wilson from the City of Tigard; Councilor Ed Truax, Kaaren Hofmann and Alice Rouyer from the City of Tualatin; Commissioner Jim Duggan, Todd Heidgerken and Cheryl Welch from Tualatin Valley Water District; and Lorna Stickel, Rebecca Geisen, Lindsey Berman, and Patty Burk from the City of Portland/Consortium Staff.

Chair Jody Carson presented Councilor Forrest Soth with a recognition award and gift from the Consortium Board and Staff for service as the Consortium Board Chair for the past two years as well as his contributions to the Consortium since its inception.

Councilor Soth thanked the Consortium Board and member staffs. He announced that tonight's meeting will be his final Consortium meeting.

**Approval of Consortium Board Minutes for June 1, 2011:** Councilor Victoria Lowe made a motion to approve the Consortium Board minutes for June 1, 2011 as presented. Councilor Forrest Soth seconded the motion. The Consortium Board unanimously approved the June 1, 2011 Consortium Board minutes as presented. (14:0:0)

**Public Comment:** None.

**Executive Committee Membership:** Lorna Stickel explained that with the election of Councilor Carson to the Consortium Board Chair position, a vacancy has been created on the Executive Committee. The at-large EC position that Chair Carson represented prior to her appointment to Board Chair is now vacant. Ms. Stickel reminded Board members that the Executive Committee is made up of the Board Chair and six members appointed by the Board with geographic representation from throughout the region encouraged and at least one member from each of the three metropolitan counties (Multnomah, Clackamas, and Washington) is required unless no participants will volunteer from a County. In addition, memberships from municipalities, districts, and other types of entities are to be encouraged. Ms. Stickel noted that although the at-large positions are not county specific, equal county representation is encouraged and therefore, if possible the vacant position should be filled by a member from Clackamas County. Ms. Stickel advised that Councilor Carl Exner from the City of Sandy, which is in Clackamas County, has expressed interest in the Executive Committee vacancy.

Commissioner Ernie Platt from Sunrise Water Authority made a motion to appoint Carl Exner from the City of Sandy to the Regional Water Providers Consortium Executive Committee. Councilor Victoria Lowe from the City of Forest Grove seconded the motion. The Consortium Board unanimously approved the motion to appoint Carl Exner from the City of Sandy to the Regional Water Providers Consortium Executive Committee. (14:0:0)

**Emergency Planning Committee Report:** Rebecca Geisen pointed out that a detailed report of the Emergency Planning Committee (EPC) activities was included in the meeting materials packet. Ms. Geisen reminded Board members that in May 2011 the Emergency Planning Committee conducted a tabletop exercise to test the capabilities of the new regional interconnections geodatabase. Ms. Geisen reported that the exercise scenario focused on the Clackamas River and was geared toward Clackamas River water users, however, many of the regional water providers were impacted or had the ability to assist in some way. She said the objectives of the exercise were to test the capabilities of the regional geodatabase, test linear systems and supplies from multiple sources, identify gaps in data, infrastructure, policy, and operations, identify off-load risks, and test how quickly water providers can react and provide water where needed. Ms. Geisen advised that the EPC completed the After Action Report from the exercise. The report summarizes the exercise design, scenario, how well objectives were met, and lessons learned and evaluations. The report was included in the October Board meeting materials packet.

Ms. Geisen advised that in August an additional Urban Area Security Initiative grant was secured from 2008 reprogramming money. This is money that was unspent in the 2008 grant cycle and made available for projects approved under that grant year. The Regional Interconnections Map and Evaluation Project was funded in 2008, so the Consortium was eligible to apply for additional money for this project. A \$100,000 grant was given to Portland (on behalf of the Consortium) to complete additional work on this project. A scope of work was developed by Murray Smith and Associates (MSA) based on input received during the May table top exercise and is summarized below into four tasks:

- Water Providers Staff Training
- Resolve Identified Additional Overlapping Facilities and Map Corrections
- Enhance Data Contained in the Geodatabase
- Develop Preliminary Regional Hydraulic Model

Ms. Geisen noted that the reprogramming money must be used by October 31, 2011. The scope of work for this project was included in the Board meeting materials.

Ms. Geisen reported that the Emergency Planning Committee met recently to discuss the update of the Consortium 5-Year Strategic Plan and to propose action items or necessary updates to the Emergency Preparedness key strategic goal in the Plan. Ms. Geisen concluded that some of the ideas proposed by the EPC for the Strategic Plan Update included improving communication with the public on the importance of storing drinking water for emergencies, improving communications between water providers and public works agencies by standardizing communication tools. i.e. radios etc., improving coordination between water providers and the State Office of Emergency Management and the Oregon Health Authority, and developing an orphan workers program which in an emergency would allow workers from a utility to report to work at a utility near where they live etc. as they likely may not be able to get to their own workplace.

Councilor Forrest Soth commented that an option for improving communications with the public could include partnering with the 911 system to utilize their reverse telephone tree.

Councilor Victoria Lowe noted that she supports the idea of improving coordination between emergency management entities statewide. She commented that many organizations at the local and state level are doing great work with emergency preparedness but that it seems like those efforts could be better coordinated.

Councilor John Kilian commented that with more and more people relying solely on their cell phones and giving up their telephone land lines, technology associated with cell phones needs to come along as well so they can be used for emergency alerts.

Ms. Geisen noted that social media has begun to play a huge role in emergency response and notification.

**Conservation Committee Report:** Lindsey Berman pointed out that included in the Board meeting materials packet was an extensive Conservation Program End of the Year Report that highlights the work and accomplishments of the Consortium Conservation Program.

Ms. Berman acknowledged that the work of the Consortium Conservation Program could not be done without the collaboration and dedication of the individual Consortium member staffs. Ms. Berman thanked Consortium Board members for allowing their staff to contribute their time and expertise to make the Consortium's Conservation Program so successful.

Ms. Berman reviewed a few of the highlights from this year's media campaign. She advised that during this campaign year they've done 19 news stories, 6 indoor water conservation stories and 13 outdoor water conservation stories. All stories can be viewed on the Consortium's website.

Ms. Berman advised that 2,667 radio ads were played that reached 1.9 million listeners as well as three radio interviews. The Consortium launched a TriMet bus signage campaign. A total of 24 Tri-met busses ran throughout Multnomah, Washington and Clackamas counties this summer, showcasing 3 different water conservation ads and the Consortium website.

Ms. Berman noted that the Consortium distributed 800 water savings kits through two promotions in tandem with the indoor and outdoor campaigns.

Ms. Berman said that the Consortium's overall media campaign investment was \$155,780. The total in-kind received from the campaign was \$420,545. The total campaign value generated was \$576,325.

Ms. Berman concluded that the Consortium participated in 21 community events reaching 29,000 community members and provided 23 school programs reaching 5,000 school kids.

Ms. Berman showed an example of one of the news stories from this year's campaign.

**FY 2012/13 Consortium Budget Concepts Discussion:** Lorna Stickel pointed out that included in the meeting materials packet was a FY 2012/13 budget concepts memorandum prepared by Consortium staff based on discussions of the Consortium Technical Committee (CTC) and Executive Committee at their September 7 meetings. Ms. Stickel reminded Board members that they will be discussing budget concepts at this meeting and providing direction for Consortium and member staffs for the formulation of the actual FY 2012/13 Work Plan and Budget documents for Board action at their February 2012 meeting. Ms. Stickel reviewed the memorandum.

Ms. Stickel noted that in the memorandum, a pie chart was provided to illustrate budget activities proportions. In FY 2011/12, the conservation program subsumed approximately 56% of the total Consortium budget, logistical support 16%, overhead 14%, regional coordination including emergency preparedness 13%, and contingency 1%.

Current Consortium work activities include:

A. Basic Logistical Support and Charges

1. There is an overhead charge by the City of Portland attached to each personnel hour to cover overhead charges for housing and supporting the staff with other aspects of municipal government such as payroll, human services, etc. The charge for the last

couple of years has been 29.5% for personnel time only (or 14% of the current FY budget).

2. There are separate materials and services costs that are regular logistical Consortium activities such as meeting room costs including recording equipment at each Board meeting, newspaper notices, postage, equipment repair costs, etc.
3. Staff costs attributable to basic business administration and public involvement are required each year as part of the logistical support category; however, the amount has been reduced in recent years due to lower meeting frequencies.
4. Staff hourly costs are increased each year to account for any cost of living increase as well as any merit step increases approved based on performance evaluations and increases in city-wide benefits costs. These costs are assigned by the City of Portland under terms and conditions that apply city wide.
5. The contingency amount has been \$10,000 in most years; however, the Board has also approved budgets with \$5,000 of contingency.

B. Conservation Program – this program takes up 56% of the total budget (close to half for staff time and half for professional services). This program is geared towards education and outreach focused on summer peak season water demands. There is a small element of resources spent on an indoor conservation message (see the attached chart). The conservation budget also provides for the maintenance and update of the Consortium’s webpage. Over the last few years the conservation program has actually increased in output due to staff and member commitments to doing as much as possible with the same dollar commitment. We are approaching a point where it will become staff hour limited to engage in higher programmatic levels and activities, but at this point the existing program is maintained with two full time positions.

C. Regional Coordination & Emergency Preparedness – this program has also grown over recent years, and as of this year takes up 13% of the total expenditures, not including significant USAI grants that have been awarded to Consortium members for the regional interconnections study and geodatabase, and emergency water distribution and treatment systems. In addition two sinking funds were established in the current year for update of the geodatabase in 2013 and to replace the six-quart food grade bags included with the portable emergency water distribution system, once their shelf life has been reached. This program, similar to the conservation programs, is approaching the limit of what is possible with the existing number of staff hours assigned. A modest amount of staff time has been assigned to other coordination activities such as climate change, the Oregon IWRS, source protection programs, legislation and rules development.

D. Contingency – the current fiscal year contingency is \$10,000.

Ms. Stickel advised that the CTC, EC and Consortium staff is recommending the following budget concept recommendations:

- A. *Logistical support & Overhead charges* – maintain the existing proportion of funds allocated to logistical materials and services, personnel hours and overhead in the current year.
- B. *Contingency* – set the level for the contingency at \$10,000.

C. *Conservation Program* – maintain approximately the same level of effort in materials and services (approximately \$245,000) and personnel hours (2 FTE) as in the current year. Continue the emphasis on the summer marketing campaign, youth education, regional resource materials, website, trade ally and regional events, and design. Recommend that the indoor conservation program continue for the next fiscal year at the same level of effort as the current year. Utilize the 5-Year Strategic planning process to determine if this program should be incorporated into the basic conservation program of the Consortium.

D. *Emergency Preparedness and Coordination Program* – Maintain the same program level as the current fiscal year (approximately 700 hours) with a small dedicated amount for materials and services/travel & training. Maintain the two sinking funds for updating the regional interconnections study and geodatabase (\$6,000) and for the replacement of the bags for the Portable Emergency Water Distribution System (\$5,000). Utilize the 5-Year Strategic planning process to determine if any shifts in this overall program are desired. Recommend retaining a small number of hours for intergovernmental coordination (280 hours or thereabouts).

Ms. Stickel concluded that there are few other considerations for the formulation of the FY 2012\13 Budget & Work Program including:

1. Adoption & Implementation of 5-Year Strategic Plan – based on the process being developed by the CTC and the Strategic Planning Subcommittee the schedule for adoption of the 5-Year Strategic Plan Update is at the May (or June) Board meeting, after the FY 2012/13 Budget and Work Plan have been adopted by the Board in February. This means that the next fiscal year may not fully represent the new Strategic Plan. However, within any adopted budget and work plan it is possible for the Board to reallocate funds or to redirect program activities.
2. Replacement of the Program Manager – the current Program Manager, Lorna Stickel, will retire as of July 2012 so the replacement of this position will be done according to the requirements of the Consortium Staffing IGA and City of Portland personnel procedures. A new project manager could result in some budgetary savings in personnel costs for FY 2012/13.
3. Carryover – The current fiscal year's dues collection amount was reduced by a \$65,000 carryover from FY 2009-10. This is a larger amount of carryover than has been common over the last several years. At this point the staff does not anticipate that the carryover amount for FY 2010/11 will be as large, so dues will likely increase even if no additional funds were allocated for new program activities.

Commissioner John Rosenberger asked if the contingency portion of the budget is always expended.

Ms. Stickel advised that the contingency budget has been utilized in the past but often it is not spent and is then included in the carryover for the next fiscal year.

Commissioner Rosenberger asked for clarification PARC radio.

Ms. Berman explained that PARC radio is the Portland Area Radio Council.

Councilor Forrest Soth commented that the budget presented is a steady state budget and behooves the Consortium to stay at a steady state budget until the economy improves.

Councilor Shirley Craddick asked if the revision of the Strategic Plan will influence the budget and work plan.

Ms. Stickel advised that the Strategic Plan revision could have some influence on the budget and work plan but not likely for the FY 2012/13 budget. The Strategic Plan revision is scheduled to be completed by June 2012 and any changes would likely be included and reflected in the FY 2013/14 budget and work plan.

**State and Local Updates:** Ms. Stickel pointed out that included in the meeting materials packet was a memorandum from Brenda Bateman with the Oregon Water Resources Department to the Water Resources Commission that outlined updates and discussion for the Integrated Water Resource Strategy. She noted that it is the intent of the Water Resources Commission to adopt the Integrated Water Resources Strategy in June 2012. A draft Strategy is slated to be available at the end of 2011. Ms. Stickel noted that overall she has been impressed with the development process.

**Breakout Sessions on the Consortium Five-Year Strategic Plan Update:** Lorna Stickel explained that the Consortium adopted its first 5-Year Strategic Plan (Plan) in September 2000, and updated the Plan in 2004 and again in 2008. She advised that the Plan has been utilized to help formulate annual work plans and budgets. The 5-Year Strategic Plan process has involved the CTC, EC, and Board usually over a several month process to prepare an Update. The Plan contains a mission statement, goals, values, a future vision, and SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats) analysis. Three key strategic challenges found in the Plan address how to facilitate the provision of adequate water supplies as a region; how to deal with emergencies on a regional basis; and how to build the Consortium into a valued organization that help water providers meet water needs and meet emergencies.

Ms. Stickel advised that CTC has established a Strategic Planning Sub-Committee of the CTC to work on proposing a process for updating and reviewing the 5-year Strategic Plan and to work with the CTC to develop a recommended update for the Executive Committee and the Board. The Sub-Committee is involved in generating materials as well as providing comments/drafting as needed to the CTC for their discussion and approval. The CTC will then recommend a 5-Year Strategic Plan Draft Update to the Executive Committee of the Board. The objective would be to update the 5-Year Strategic Plan by June 2012. This time line fits very well with the need to identify a new Consortium Project Manager by July 1, 2012. The update of the 5-Year Strategic Plan is an independent process from the development of Budget concepts for FY 2012-13.

Ms. Stickel noted that recently an electronic survey (paper copies were mailed to those Board members without e-mail) was sent out to the Board and CTC regarding the update of the Consortium's 5-Year Strategic Plan. Ms. Stickel advised that the Consortium staff collated the responses to the survey and the results were distributed at the meeting. Ms. Stickel noted that she was pleased with the response rate to the survey. Survey responses were received by 14 CTC and 11 Board members. Ms. Stickel briefly reviewed the results.

Ms. Stickel advised that included in the meeting materials packet were the 2008 5-Year Strategic Plan, results from the survey, a 5-Year Strategic Plan Update timeline, and memorandum that outlined the proposed Plan Update process, potential topics to consider in the 2012 5-Year Strategic Plan Update, and a summary with action items since the last update of the Plan in 2008.

Following Ms. Stickel's update and review of the Consortium's current 5-Year Strategic Plan and background information, the Consortium Board divided into three breakout session groups to discuss the Strategic Plan. During these sessions a set of questions was posed that elicited a discussion of the external threats and opportunities that impact the Consortium and its members, and the internal strengths and weaknesses of the Consortium. (This is called a SWOT analysis.) Each group discussed how these observations might lead to changes in the strategic challenges of the Consortium and the activities that the Consortium might want to include in a revision of the Strategic Plan. Each group had a recorder and a facilitator. Attached are the chart pack notes from the three breakout sessions.

The Regional Water Providers Consortium Board meeting was adjourned at 9:00 p.m. The next meeting of the Regional Water Providers Consortium Board is February 1, 2012 at 7:00 p.m. in the Metro Council Chambers.

Submitted by Patty Burk, Consortium Staff

**5-Year Strategic Plan Update  
Breakout Session #1  
Chart Pack Notes  
October 5, 2011**

**Attendees:** Ed Truax – City of Tualatin, John Rosenberger – City of Hillsboro, Nick Wilson - City of Tigard, Shirley Craddick – Metro, Jody Carson – South Fork Water Board, Alice Rouyer – City of Tualatin, Harvey Barnes – Rockwood Water PUD, Wade Hathhorn – Sunrise Water Authority, Rob Foster – City of Forest Grove, Cheryl Welch – Tualatin Valley Water District (Facilitator), Kaaren Hofmann – City of Tualatin (Recorder).

**Question 1**

**External Threats**

- ◆ Adequate water supply as growth occurs.
- ◆ Other seven (7) still valid.
- ◆ Confidence in public expectations.
- ◆ Not trusting water quality.
- ◆ Take out “Consortium”.
- ◆ Rate capacity to deal with increased regulations (Doesn’t think this (rates) is part of the mission.
- ◆ Initiative Process.
- ◆ Robustness of Members.

**Opportunities**

- ◆ Not much homeland security.
- ◆ Water demand not increasing.
- ◆ Discussion of regional rate models.

**Question 2**

**Internal Weaknesses**

- ◆ Lack of influence at Metro.
- ◆ Struggle for control between Consortium & Metro.
- ◆ Not engaged in UGB discussions.

**Strengths**

- ◆ More history.
- ◆ Conservation!
- ◆ Emergency Preparedness efforts.

**Questions 3 & 4**

**Mission/Vision/Values**

- ◆ Add conservation to mission/goals
- ◆ Too many values

**Question 5 and 6 - Key Strategic Challenges**

- ◆ Good with the three approaches
- ◆ Regional supply issues difficult to discuss
- ◆ Not successful – remove (B).
- ◆ Remove (C).
- ◆ (D) – Take out “new look” verbiage
- ◆ Need to be part of the UGB discussion (case in point – Damascus).
- ◆ Conservation focus on “peak” (one week) not summer or indoor
- ◆ Reducing peak need would reduce need to expand capacity.
- ◆ Engage Board in exercises
- ◆ Need to add Metro to process
- ◆ Take off 1<sup>st</sup> sentence in (B)
- ◆ Annual State of the Region (Adam Davis).

**5-Year Strategic Plan Update  
Breakout Session #2  
Chart Pack Notes  
October 5, 2011**

**Attendees:** Forrest Soth – City of Beaverton, David Grant – City of Sherwood, Ray Jaren – City of Gladstone, Kami Kehoe – Clackamas River Water, Guy Graham- City of Lake Oswego, Edward Campbell – City of Portland, Victoria Lowe – City of Forest Grove, Craig Sheldon – City of Sherwood, Brian Stahl – City of Gresham (Facilitator), and Patty Burk – Consortium Staff (Recorder).

**Question 1**

**External Threats/Challenges**

- ◆ Public awareness – Do we value this or the outcomes of our efforts?
- ◆ Public awareness of the Consortium is important to justify public \$ (dollars).
- ◆ Collaboration and cooperation – valuable component. Public needs to know about Consortium to ensure \$ resources are being used appropriately.
- ◆ Public awareness = opportunity
- ◆ Consensus of group is that current threats/challenges still relevant.
- ◆ Consumer public confidence about system and how it runs. – to be added.
- ◆ Water quality expectations/requirements. – to be added.
- ◆ In Strategic Plan Update include narrative that frames the broader key challenges/threats to ensure more clarity.

**Question 2**

**Internal Weaknesses**

- ◆ Need to better communicate Consortium Board actions and discussions to individual entities Boards/Commissions.
- ◆ Not necessarily weakness – simply fact!
- ◆ Need to develop “resume” of the Consortium (who we are, what we do) and make it available to new members.
- ◆ Need to develop new member packets! (goal to address weakness)
- ◆ Annual Consortium updates by Consortium staff at individual members’ Board meetings.

**Strengths**

- ◆ Add – interconnectivity (equipment sharing, water movement, known threats to system, etc.) – important internal strength.
- ◆ Reduction in “silos”.

### **Questions 3**

#### **Mission**

- ◆ Is the RWSP still a valuable regional resource? Is it still relevant?
- ◆ Consider policy statements about climate change... Should the Consortium forward policy issues/recommendations to individual Boards/Commissions to forward on to Legislators?
- ◆ Include in the mission statement the “value of water”.
- ◆ Include in mission statement a good stewardship statement. Water does not belong to companies/corporations. It is part of the commons owned by no one.

#### **Question 4 – Vision/Values**

- ◆ Greater public awareness of Consortium activities is valuable.
- ◆ Public should see the Consortium as the “experts”.
- ◆ Public Ownership vs. Local Control = Value.
- ◆ Add attention to good stewardship to # 4 & 5 to add clarity.
- ◆ Public education should include – the Consortium should take some ownership of the cost of water, develop a fact page or source for members to reference regarding cost of water compared to other utilities; or how water rates compare nationally.
- ◆ Is there a connection between the supply side and end use? Is there a role for the Consortium in wastewater reuse?
- ◆ Maximizing water as a renewable resource.

#### **Question 5 - Key Strategic Challenges**

- ◆ Stated pretty well.
- ◆ Anticipate the future, be open as information changes.
- ◆ What is the definition of adequate water supply? Suggestion language – adequate, sustainable for a long –term planning horizon.

#### **Question 6 – Strategic Goals/Approaches**

- ◆ Provide forum for review – Add policy recommendation to higher realm. Political action to higher Boards and Commissions...but as prerogative of individual agencies.
- ◆ Add to #5 – current water issues.

**5-Year Strategic Plan Update  
Breakout Session #3  
Chart Pack Notes  
October 5, 2011**

**Attendees:** Aaron O'Donnell – Raleigh Water District, Todd Heidgerken – Tualatin Valley Water District, David Shaff – City of Portland, John Kilian – City of Gresham, Ernie Platt – Sunrise Water Authority, Jim Duggan- Tualatin Valley Water District, David Winship – City of Beaverton (Facilitator), and Rebecca Geisen – Consortium Staff (Recorder).

**Question 1**

**External Threats & Opportunities**

- ◆ Still relevant
- ◆ Could refocus some based on our experience
  - Still low public awareness
  - Poor economy
  - Climate Change
  - Lower demand than expected post few years - weather effects
- ◆ Should we remove “growth” bullet since not much growth is anticipated (this could also be a challenge), not much added demand
- ◆ Decline in water demand and per capita use
- ◆ Lack of growth – not as anticipated, makes it a challenge to plan – economic challenge, planning challenge
- ◆ Low public awareness of water infrastructure – unless problem- not as concerned about lack of awareness of RWPC
- ◆ Rate concerns & “rate shock”
- ◆ Water rights still an issue for some – resolving slowly
- ◆ Under External Threats – add “and policies” to first bullet to read “Low public awareness of the Consortium or of public water infrastructure and *policies* in general.
- ◆ Add “uncertain” to 3<sup>rd</sup> bullet to read “*Uncertain* growth without adequate thought and planning...”

**Question 2**

**Internal Weaknesses & Strengths**

- ◆ Not sure of difference between “different interests” & “lack of shared expectations”
- ◆ Internal weaknesses have decreased over time
- ◆ Remove two bullets that deal with “different interests” and “lack of shared expectations and replace with “*Different interests, expectations, and governance structures between providers.*”
- ◆ Change in membership not really a weakness – need knowledge transfer to new members/representatives.
- ◆ Communication has improved.
- ◆ Bullet #3 not really relevant anymore. Meetings have improved.
- ◆ “*Cumbersome size creates difficulties in logistics and administration*” – replace bullet #3 with this new language.

- ◆ Strengths – Last bullet - Implementation of regional programs – don't make specific to conservation.

### **Questions 3**

#### **Mission/Vision**

Goals – Still relevant

2<sup>nd</sup> bullet adds...water supply issues & “*opportunities*” of mutual interest...

Vision -

- ◆ More sub-regional efforts currently. Add...are met now “*and coordinated*” into the future.
- ◆ More focus on resiliency & interconnections vs. large regional entity & regional supply
- ◆ Facilitative
- ◆ Vision is weak
- ◆ Potential language: “RWPC has a vital role in ensuring that the water resource/supply needs of the region are met now and into the future.”
- ◆ Change “supply” to more encompassing word, e.g., resource

### **Question 4**

Value –

- ◆ Still fits
- ◆ Communicating and promoting the value of investing in water and preserving value of system (new value)
- ◆ Planning for replacement of aging infrastructure (also a challenge)

### **Question 5 and 6 - Key Strategic Challenges**

- ◆ # 1 and 3 not really appropriate anymore – revise 1 and eliminate 3 – we've moved past that
- ◆ Add protection of public health and safety as a strategic challenge
- ◆ Bring into synch with survey results – top 4.
- ◆ Fire Protection – add to?
- ◆ Resiliency – in all aspects of water delivery
- ◆ Redundancy.