***Mid-Coast Water Planning Partnership***

***Coordinating Committee Meeting Notes***

February 19th, 2020

1. **Welcome**

Alexandria Scott called to order the coordinating committee at 9:15 am on February 19th, 2020. She stated the objectives for this meeting were to hear about the progress of the work groups, how to prepare for the inter-working group meeting and to go over the consensus criteria survey results.

**Attendance:**

**Adam Denlinger** – Seal Rock Water District

**Sarah Means** - Office of Governor Kate Brown

**Harmony Burright** – Oregon Water Resources Dept.

**Alexandria Scott** – Local Planning Coordinator

**Emily-Bell Dinan** – Lincoln Soil and Water Conservation District

**Jim Tooke** – City of Yachats

**Leo Williamson** – Oregon Dept. of Forestry

**On the phone:**

**Alan Fujishin** – Gibson Farms

**Stan Van de Wetering** – Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians

1. **Working group updates**

**Self-supplied work group (Alan):**

The work group submitted four problem/issue statements to the CC for review. The CC was given two months to review and submit feedback on these documents to Alexandria. Alan said the feedback was fairly general and positive.

**Path forward for this group:** Harmony provided some detailed feedback on the PIGS that Alan intends to incorporate into these documents. The CC approved these documents (even with some redrafting) to go on to the inter-working group meeting.

**Instream/ecology work group (Emily-Bell):**

The work group had the instream summit on February 10th. She felt like Summit was functional and successful at moving things forward but there may be a longer list of topics to incorporate into this process. Emily said there were some high and lows of the meeting. When people come in and out of the work group meetings it makes the group dynamics complex and sometimes difficult. It is also difficult when problem/issue statements are submitted from folks who may not have the qualifications to fully understand the problem they are trying to address or there isn’t fact-based science to back it up. The instructions for Step 3 could have been a bit clearer and more explicit to help guide us in the work groups.

Stan: Brought up the idea of first tier problems/issues versus secondary tiers. What is appropriate for us to try to tackle? Are other agencies addressing these issues? We shouldn’t limit ourselves by any means, but we should keep in mind time and resources as we look at the things we want to approach. If there are say 42 things that everyone can agree on, then move forward with those and then make a laundry list of things that are important to certain partners but are not within the budget/time/capabilities of the partnership.

Leo: Thinks we have an oversaturation of information, but it is difficult to reach consensus of what we can/can’t do. Is it at a community-based planning level? Is it a legislative level? It’s a matter of setting a direction.

Alan: the planning partnership is not bounded by a single agency scope. We have had a lot turnover in the partnership and the instream work group so folks may not have been around for some of the earlier conversations. Revisiting our guiding principles could be useful for everyone to remind us of why we are all here. We want variety and diverse perspectives in a regional water plan.

Jim: At the end of this process we have to have a deliverable. There are some things that we can do and that we can’t do.

Harmony: After the Summit we have a lot of feedback and material to sift through. Keep in mind during this that you want community buy in on your plan, state recognition will elevate it, but community is really where it is important. Place-based planning is not traditional.

**Path forward for the group**: Leo and Emily volunteered to carve out some time to work with Alexandria on the problem/issue statements from the Instream Summit to distill them down further. After working on these they will circle back with the attendees from the Summit before our next CC meeting to get them to sign off.

**Municipalities/ special districts work group:**

The work group wrote five problem/issue statements on the topics they see as their highest priorities to address. These documents have been sent electronically to the CC and physical copies were handed out at the CC meeting.

**Path forward for this group:** The CC has two weeks to review these documents and submit feedback to Alexandria. Alexandria will hand this feedback on to Adam, who will incorporate it into the documents and present new drafts at our next meeting.

1. **Discussion about prepping for the inter-working group meeting**

Harmony posed the question to the group - What is in scope? Out of scope?

Adam: This process can get difficult when folks are very attached to their position, we need to come up with a way to recognize everyone’s position. How we do that he isn’t sure.

Alan: Is expansive about what is on the table and what it isn’t. He had hoped the problem/issue statements would be more convergent on what is more important and what is low tier. He also hopes to see what solutions pop up that are achievable.

Emily-Bell: When thinking about scope we need to think about defining at each step. What is the scope of the work groups? What is the scope of the all three work groups combined? For instream the scope for step 3 has been really difficult, we need an interdisciplinary way to define it.

Sarah: New to this and not familiar with the work groups but she is coming at it from a CC point of view. What is the scope of the CC and how we shape this?

Alexandria: The CC was designed to set the strategic direction of the Partnership and to give me guidance as well. This is your process, so I need to hear from you guys on how to move forward.

The next CC meeting will be 4 hours long. At that meeting we will be addressing overlap between problem issue statements and coming up with a plan for moving forward. Harmony is going to bring a proposal on how to structure the inter-working group meeting.

1. **Go over the consensus criteria survey results (Harmony)**

The survey results show there is a lack of understanding around consensus and we have a ways to go before we can get there. We have things that are in direct conflict with each other, what do we do? What is the best way to communicate?

Adam: Suggests Alexandria and Harmony make a short video (1.5 mins) summing this up that we send out before interworking group meeting. We could talk to Peter Vince if we have the funding for it.

Leo: Suggests if we make a video that we show it at every meeting from now on.

Alexandria: If there are willing CC members might be nice to have them be a part of it instead of it coming from just Harmony and I.

Emily-Bell: Agrees that a video is good. But if we are going to bring this document forward, we should make sure that CC members are following the principles laid out. We could do without tensions do exist portion of the final document. Emily-Bell offered to help distill some of these ideas down if Harmony needs help.

**Sarah**: The results need to be more concise, so folks don’t just gloss over them. Sarah agreed to help Harmony distill some of these ideas down further.

**Harmony:** Said she will look into how to make the video and will work on written document that will come from the CC that will lay out this is what we mean by consensus building.

1. **Partner updates & good of the order**
* Alexandria will send out a doodle poll for the 3rd and last week of March because a CC meeting on the 12th doesn’t work for a few folks.
* Harmony is going to bring a proposal on how to structure the inter-working group meeting next meeting
* Alan is going to send out some Gibson farms updates via email
* Alexandria announced that the Devils Lake Water Improvement District will be hosting a fishing derby on May 2nd and they are looking for sponsors and anyone that would be willing to have an information booth related to water conservation of fish/wildlife. Emily-Bell suggested that Alexandria talk to Ari Blatt at MCWC, Salmon-Drift Creek Watershed Council
* Emily-bell is leaving the LSWCD March 13th but plans to help try wrap up Step 3 items for the Instream/Ecology Work Group before she goes.
* Alexandria let everyone know that Charlie Plybon has resigned from his position on the CC and we should start thinking about filling that position on the committee.