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

***Coordinating Committee Meeting Notes***

December 12, 2019

1. **Welcome: Attendance (no partner updates)**

**Adam Denlinger** – Seal Rock Water District

**Alan Fujishin** – Gibson Farms

**Tim Gross** – City of Newport

**Alexandria Scott** – Local Planning Coordinator

**Penelope Kaczmarek** – Resident of Siletz

**Jim Tooke** – City of Yachats

**Matt Thomas** – Oregon Department of Forestry

1. **Working group updates**

Adam Denlinger (Muni/Special Districts):

The group is has completed one PIGS on water quantity and they have a working draft on water quality. They are going to continue to meet every other Tuesday wrap up the working group hopefully by mid-January. The group still plans to do PIGS on infrastructure, financing and collaboration.

Alexandria Scott (Instream/Ecology):

The group will have a “pre-instream summit” on January 7th at the normal meeting time so that the working group has a chance to come together and work on their individual statements and refine them before the Instream Summit. Stay tuned for more information on the Instream summit but as of now the target time is sometime in the first 2 weeks of February.

Alexandria (Self-Supplied):

The group had their last working group meeting yesterday where they took one last vote on their final PIGS and decided on the rough draft of the January Partnership meeting agenda. In today’s meeting we will be reviewing their PIGS and hopefully getting feedback to the group as soon as possible.

1. **Introduction of the “Instream Summit” and Step 3 timeline amendment proposal**

Alexandria: Like I mentioned we are aiming for the first two weeks of February to maximize time not only for the IEWG but also our state agency partners. I will be sending out an email soon to the IEWG asking them who they want to invite and a doodle poll to set a date. The summit will be 4 hours long as we anticipate it will take that long to really go over the PIGS being presented. By adding the Instream Summit, it does push things a little bit for the Step 3 timeline, so we are going to go over that and I am looking for approval from the CC.

* CC supports the Instream Summit
* The CC approved the proposed timeline amendment (please see the Mid-Coast Schedule until Spring 2020 Doc attached to the meeting recap email)
1. **Review and feedback for the first round of Problem/Issue Statements**

Alexandria: The group did a consensus check on all 4 PIGS produced by the SSWG “as written”. Alan did not vote since he was the working group leader for the PIGS. Alexandria did not vote as project support and leader of this exercise.

Results: All of the PIGS reached consensus within the CC.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Water Quality | Infrastructure | Water Quantity  | Conservation |
| 4 | 4 | 5 | 4 |
| 4 | 3 | 3 | 5 |
| 4 | 3 | 3 | 5 |
| 5 | 3 | 4.5 | 5 |
| 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 |

For one of the PIGS that scored low ask them what they found problematic about it? What feedback can we give to the author/group? What “criteria” or “ground rules” are we using to determine consensus?

What would constitute a problematic statement?

* If it is in distinct conflict with another working groups goals statement(s)
* If it written hostility it must be rephrased to find some sort or common ground, or it does align with our Charter and will likely not reach consensus
* If it is alienating the actions or occupation of a particular partner
* If it is too site specific and does not have regional significance

For one of the PIGS that scored high ask them what they liked about it? What feedback can we give to the author/group? What “criteria” or “ground rules” are we using to determine consensus?

What would constitute a problem statement that is likely to reach consensus? What did the highly rated PIGS have in them to get a high ranking?

* Bridging across working groups (they can be thought about from multiple lenses)
* Less site-specific overarching issues are more likely to achieve consensus
* Solutions that benefit or keep in mind the broader partnership rather than one entity
* Feasibility of the solutions section (especially when we are talking about laws and regulations). It doesn’t mean we lose sight of them and make recommendations but what are we able to do?

Feedback on the four PIGS from the Self Supplied Working Group: Ran out of time

1. **Review the January Partnership meeting agenda**
* CC approved the proposed January Partnership Meeting Agenda
1. **Action items**
* **ALL CC members:** before Jan 1st, 2020 please send your feedback on the four PIGS from the Self Supplied Working Group
* **ALL CC members:** I am going to be starting to do the “mini campaigns” in the monthly email blast to introduce the CC to the broader partnership. Please send me one photo and answers to the following questions by Dec 23rd
* Briefly state your current position and what you do.
* What does water mean to you? (value of water)
* What attracted you to our cause? Our organization?
* What’s something quirky about you or that you want partners to know about you?
* What inspires you? (friends, family, quote etc.)