DBWC Planning Team vs. Executive Committee – options for consideration

7/4/21

At the June 4 DBWC Planning Team meeting, staff raised the question of whether or not the DBWC still needs a Planning Team, or whether to eliminate the group in light of the functions that each of the subcommittees is now performing – the subcommittees are now empowered with bringing concepts forward to the Working Group. We did not reach consensus on this question, and the Planning Team requested that staff generate two options for Planning Team consideration:

1) Disband the Planning Team and replace it with a smaller Executive Committee.
2) Keep the Planning Team and reduce the length and scope of meetings.

Here is the existing PT + the two options and some interpretation of each, for discussion at the Planning Team meeting on August 6, 2021.

Options	Composition	Functions	Staff notes
Existing Planning Team	31 members + staff, representing interests, geographies, etc.	"The Planning Team will deliberate on issues and develop recommendations, help set the agendas for Deschutes Basin Working Group meetings, and steer the effort." (Charter) 2-hour meetings	Pros: - Broadly representative group - Existing PT helped build the DBWC, so has that knowledge and context - Concept of vetting draft strategies/proposals is sound Cons: - The subcommittees are now essentially charged with creating recommendations - Large group that can be hard to corral - Meetings are somewhat redundant to WG meetings
Planning Team 2.0	Same as current – 31 members	No more Committee reports 1-hour meetings Focus would be WG agendas, funding, and staffing questions	Pros: - Simpler meetings - Still broadly representative - Still able to vet concepts Cons: - If we have a large, representative WG, do we need a large, representative PT?

Options	Composition	Functions	Staff notes
			- If no committee reports, how does the PT guide WG meeting agendas?
Executive Committee	Co-Chairs or Chair 1 rep each from agriculture, communities, and instream	Small leadership group with a process orientation – adjustments, funding, staffing, etc. Available as a "speakers' bureau" or other external engagement functions.	Pros: - Smaller group; easier to staff, make decisions, request Ex. Comm. action. - Easier to discuss and refine potentially controversial ideas privately before forwarding for consideration Cons: - May be difficult to ID the 3 reps and ensure that each interest feels engaged in DBWC leadership. - Less voices in general