

## Enhancing Interregional Coordination (EIC) Committee Meeting Minutes

August 6, 2020, 10:00 a.m. held via GoToWebinar

**Committee Members present (3 of 5):** Gail Peek, Chair; Jim Thompson; Ray Buck. Scott Reinert and Patrick Brzozowski were absent.

**Senators/Representatives/Other VIPs in Attendance:** N/A

**TWDB Board Members and Staff:** Participants: Temple McKinnon, Ron Ellis, and Suzanne Schwartz.

**MEETING GENERAL:** Ron Ellis (TWDB) checked roll and determined that a quorum was present.

### AGENDA ITEMS

- 1. Call to Order and Welcome** – Chair Gail Peek called the meeting to order and welcomed the committee members.
- 2. Public Comment** – None.
- 3. Consider Minutes for July 15, 2020 Meeting** – Ms. Peek noted that she had requested a clarifying change to the original draft minutes, which was reflected in the draft in the meeting materials. ***Jim Thompson made a motion to approve the minutes as amended, and Ray Buck seconded. The motion was approved.***
- 4. Committee Member feedback and discussion of Committee Charges** – Ms. Peek noted that the committee's charges had been expanded at the July 29<sup>th</sup> council meeting to include interregional conflict. She introduced changes to the committee problem statement and goal statement for the committee to discuss. Ray Buck asked about the pros and cons of the EIC Committee taking on the additional charge. Ms. Peek related that the pro is that EIC is looking at nuts and bolts of a related issue, while other committees are looking with a broader perspective which made it fit logically with EIC. She stated that in considering Chairman Larson's letter, the charge of dealing with interregional conflict fit with the EIC Committee in a logical way. The con is more work for the EIC Committee. Jim Thompson asked where the new language had come from and Ms. Peek indicated that she had drafted it for committee consideration. Mr. Thompson asked about the meaning of the reference to the timing requirements of TWDB. Ms. Peek indicated that the intent is to recognize that planning follows a schedule. Temple McKinnon proposed revising the language to reference the planning process administrative timing requirements to clarify that it's referring to statutory and rule constraints that must be met. The committee members agreed.

Mr. Thompson then suggested changing the draft Goal Statement language to refer to WMS that impact more than one region, instead of WMS that are in more than one region. The committee members agreed, and Ms. McKinnon made the change.

***Mr. Thompson made a motion to adopt the revised Problem Statement and Goal Statement. Mr. Buck seconded, and the motion passed.***

5. **Discussion and Action, as appropriate – Committee Action Plan** – Ms. Peek discussed the action plan as a roadmap to follow when developing observations and recommendations. She recognized that the BMP Committee has developed an action plan and recommended that the EIC follow its model. Ms. McKinnon displayed the action plan template, and Mr. Buck commented that it is an excellent model. Ms. Peek recognized that they have buy-in on the action plan, then she noted that they should play it by ear concerning member roles and assigning tasks since the committee is so small. The committee members agreed.
  
6. **Discussion and Action, as appropriate - Enhancing Interregional Coordination; Enhancing TWDB Coordination** – Ms. Peek asked Ms. McKinnon to display the draft sixth planning cycle timeline document. Ms. McKinnon oriented the committee to the document and emphasized that it's very draft and intended to help them see where coordination could potentially begin. Ms. Peek emphasized that the committee should consider coordination and collaboration and identify how planning groups can collaborate earlier rather than later. She also acknowledged that each planning group has a different way to identify WMSs and they need to find a way to get that done and shared earlier. She noted that the planning groups need to coordinate and collaborate as early as possible to avoid interregional conflict, for which TWDB already has a resolution process, which was covered in the first committee meeting. Ms. McKinnon noted that the collaboration and coordination bar in the timeline should extend to the beginning of the planning cycle.

Ms. McKinnon displayed the draft estimated sixth cycle scope of work and showed the draft task language under Task 4B that would require coordination before the mid-point of the planning cycle. Mr. Buck asked how it relates to the timeline discussed previously. Ms. McKinnon indicated that it would occur before the technical memorandum during the period indicated by the yellow bar labeled coordination on regional projects on the timeline. Ms. Peek asked that the draft language be reversed to put opportunities before conflicts, and the committee members worked out new language. The committee members agreed the new language was OK.

Suzanne Schwartz asked if the Interregional Conflict Workgroup members thought that assessing strategy opportunities and issues to discuss in the technical memorandum would be early enough. Ms. McKinnon displayed the planning cycle timeline and indicated that the technical memorandum is due 2.5 years into the planning cycle and the IPPs are due about a year later. Mr. Thompson raised a concern regarding the five-year cycle of planning, specifically that the final decisions on WMSs are not made until late in the cycle, which is not conducive to identifying and solving conflicts. He emphasized that the timing will always be the issue because so many planning tasks have to be completed early in the process, so issues will come late in the process. Ms. McKinnon acknowledged that the timing is tricky but asked if an issue has already been identified during one planning cycle, could the resolution process begin immediately at the beginning of the following cycle. Mr. Thompson responded yes, that if a WMS is likely to be recommended, then discussion could begin early, if the parties were willing or required to do so.

Ms. McKinnon asked if a process like coordination discussions initiated by TWDB with Regions C and D during the 5<sup>th</sup> cycle of planning would be effective, if earlier. Mr. Thompson said if stakeholders could get together earlier, the problem may not get resolved, but each side would know where the other stands. He also offered the example of the facilitated phone all of this Council's Interregional Conflict Workgroup (Jim Thompson and Kevin Ward) as a model of what could be done early in the planning cycle. Ms. McKinnon then asked how a process could be genericized to fit issues not yet

identified. She then asked if RWPGs should identify issues for the next cycle – WMS that need to be collaborated on. Mr. Buck asked how they would work on opportunities in such a process. Ms. McKinnon suggested that an opportunities and issue list be established at the end of each planning cycle to be addressed as a workplan for the RWPGs during the beginning of the following cycle. She indicated that she would draft that for the next meeting, and Ms. Peek and Mr. Buck agreed.

Ms. McKinnon asked if there is any other information TWDB could bring to the process that would help identify opportunities and issues early. Mr. Buck indicated that the RWPG consultants would need more money to do anything. Ms. Peek asked if there is a way to list each RWPGs WMSs from the IPP. Ms. McKinnon responded that TWDB can combine existing reports to provide that data to the RWPGs. Mr. Thompson reiterated that the earlier in the process they can get the information, the better. Ms. McKinnon indicated that TWDB could have data ready so RWPGs could use it in the first year of the planning cycle and that TWDB will also consider what other tools we can use to support a new collaboration scope of work item. Ms. Schwartz asked if there are opportunities to build in places where RWPGs automatically engage in conversations. Ms. McKinnon indicated that each RWPG is required to hold a pre-planning public meeting and discussion of identifying opportunities and issues at that meeting could be required by the scope of work.

Ms. Peek pointed out that the discussion is relevant to the third bullet and last bullet in Chairman Larson's letter. Mr. Thompson indicated that Chairman Larson also identified interregional conflict as one of his priorities in the letter.

Ms. McKinnon indicated that she would revise the planning cycle timeline document and the draft scope of work document to reflect the discussion.

- 7. Consideration and Action, as appropriate – Committee recommendations to the Interregional Planning Council regarding Enhancing Interregional Coordination** – Ms. Peek initiated discussion on recommendations by noting that the committee has a great deal of work to do in a short time. She observed that they may produce observations and/or recommendations, potentially more observations than recommendations. She emphasized that the committee should be mindful of Chairman Larson's letter. The letter was provided in the meeting materials and also posted on the Council's web page.

Ms. McKinnon reminded the committee that the committee recommendation document needs to be submitted by 8/10 for the full meeting of the Council on 8/12. She told the committee that she will update the problem statement and goal statement and asked if the committee wanted anything else from the meeting captured in recommendations. Ms. Peek asked her to capture coordination opportunities and activities that might impact other RWPGs. Ms. McKinnon indicated that TWDB staff will draft recommendations and recommendations under review and make sure they align with Rep. Larson's letter and provide them to the committee for review. Ms. Peek asked the committee members to continue to think about future issues for the committee to consider.

- 8. Discuss future steps – (a) methods to move forward including scheduling of Committee meetings, (b) background materials needed for future meetings, (c) coordination with or discussion and steps that can be accomplished before future meetings** – Ms. Peek noted that the Council will meet next on August 12. She indicated that she wants the committee to meet two more times to develop recommendations. Ms. McKinnon noted that the following IPC meeting is September 15 and that

Chair Scott had requested committee recommendations by then. Ms. Peek asked Ms. McKinnon to poll the members for availability for two meetings in two-hour blocks in morning and afternoon. Ms. Peek asked the committee members to let us know if they wish to see any materials for future meetings. She noted that the committee needs to know who in each planning group works on WMSs. Ms. McKinnon indicated that TWDB staff will generate a list of the committee structure and functions within each planning group.

**9. Discussion of agenda for future meetings** –Ms. Peek indicated that the agenda for the next two meetings will focus on observations and recommendations.

**10. Report and Possible Action on Report from Chair** – Ms. Peek reiterated to the committee that they need to think about how recommendations will be consistent with Chairman Larson’s letter. She thanked the committee members for their effort and input. She also stated a concern that the committee needs to stay focused on deliverables and doables and to focus concepts like “opportunities” to be more concrete in their recommendations to the council.

**11. Public Comment** – None.

**12. Adjourned** – Mr. Thompson motioned adjournment; Mr. Buck seconded. Adjourned at 11:20 a.m.