



Mid-Coast Water Planning Partnership

COORDINATING COMMITTEE

Meeting Notes

August 23, 2017, 1:00 pm – 4:45 pm
Newport City Hall

ACTION ITEMS

- Ecology – Invasive Species spreadsheet – add column for species of interest – Wayne
- Chamber of Commerce info re tourist volume – Tim to send to Suzanne
- Outreach to small water districts
 - Plan to visit board meetings - Project Team & Adam D.
 - Get intern to assist – Project Team
- Outreach strategy to statewide groups – Communication & Outreach Subcommittee
- Partnership funding and support – develop strategy with Coordinating Committee
- Designate group to recommend funding distribution from grants – Coordinating Committee
- Write letter of support for MMT grant – Jackie
- Funding – breakdown of costs – share with Coordinating Committee at future meeting – Tim
- Meet with CoG 8/28 @12:30 to discuss funding – Caroline and Jackie
- Define outcomes thus far – Project Team & Coord. Comm.
- Edit Responding to Opportunities doc – Harmony
- Contact universities/colleges to see if they have resources we could tap – OSU/UO Tim; OCCC Shirlene
- Filling Coordinating Committee vacancies –
 - Forestry – Harmony to call Leah Tai/Deb Wilkins
 - Academic – Shirlene to call Maryanne Bozza and OCCC

Participants:

- Tim Gross, Co-Convener, City of Newport
- Harmony Burreight, Co-Convener, OWRD
- Wayne Hoffman, MidCoast Watersheds Council
- Adam Denlinger, Seal Rock Water District
- Caroline Bauman, Economic Development Alliance of Lincoln Co.
- Stan van de Wetering, Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians
- Jackie Mikalonis, Governor's Office, Regional Solutions Team
- Terry Thompson, Lincoln County Commissioner

Unable to Attend:

- Jitesh Pattni, ODFW
- Charlie Plybon, Newport Surfrider Foundation
- Rick McClung, Jim Tooke, City of Yachats
- Deborah Wilkins, USFS, Hebo Ranger Dist.
- Alan Fujishin, Gibson Farms
- John Stevenson, OSU, Oregon Sea Grant

Project Team in Attendance:

- Suzanne de Szoeki, GSI Water Solutions
- Shirlene Warnock, Innovative Growth Solutions
- Jeanne Nyquist, Innovative Growth Solutions

Discussion Notes

Welcome

The facilitators welcomed participants and reviewed agenda and meeting guidelines.

Update on development of Technical Memos

Suzanne de Szoeki, GSI Water Solutions, joined the meeting by phone to provide an update on development of Technical Memos.

Water Quantity

Status Report – Suzanne de Szoeki

- Obtained USGS gage data for some sites (6).
- Decided to use estimated natural stream flow information for streams without gages..
- Collected water availability information (OWRD) – gives sense of availability for new water rights and storage.
- Also looking at data on Drift Creek and Schooner Creek from Lincoln City and data from City of Yachats.
- Groundwater – Obtained good info from Michael Thoma at OWRD.
- In the process of defining data gaps.
- Analyzing stream flow restoration – have obtained tables from ODFW and OWRD. These two agencies have different priorities. We are working to reconcile the data.
- We are in the process of seeking funding information.

Discussion:

Wayne – I've been hearing about ground water and wells in Salmon River area and have been told these wells are producing quite a bit of water. Wondering if it makes sense to review these well logs? Panther Creek indicated that one of the small districts uses primarily well water.

Tim - Lots of small water districts (serving 5 – 10 houses) pull from wells. Wells are not feasible source of water for municipalities, but smaller wells may be the answer for limited number of houses. Salmon River wells may be worthwhile to keep on line for flood periods when stormy and muddy. Carmel Knoll is another small water district that uses wells.

Jackie – If some people are on wells now, and it is a feasible source, that's fine; but we need to make sure we are doing comprehensive planning to address potential growth in these areas. We don't have a mechanism in place to address growth. The small systems usually don't have a way to collect enough funds to cover costs of maintenance and upgrades, much less to respond to growth demands.

Suzanne – Michael Thoma, OWRD, produced a great map with average well yield by section. It has red for no water – ranging to green where there is plenty of water. You can have some sections that have high yield compared to neighboring sections where there is hardly any yield.

Tim clarified that these wells are probably pulling from springs, not groundwater. Spring water can change course, which will dramatically affect the volume of water produced.

Water Quality

Status Report – Suzanne de Szoeki

- We are collecting information on water quality monitoring – where it is happening, what they are monitoring. We are also getting some information from DEQ, and we sent out an email asking who is collecting information.
- We are putting together a table to present this information.
- We have DEQ 303D listing throughout mid-coast – still working on getting 303D listing for beaches.
- Sifting through BLM documents that have pertinent information.
- Collecting information on watershed restoration projects – many of these will improve water quality.
- Also have information about environmental cleanup efforts in the area.
- Are there other sources of information about water quality improvement projects that we should be aware of?

Discussion:

Tim – DEQ funds a lot of these projects.

Wayne – NRCS does quite a bit of work on projects with agricultural landowners in category of manure management. Not sure if they are captured in the OWRI data base. It might be worthwhile contacting them. They have some rules about disclosure that could keep the information out of the OWRI data base, but they could probably share it with you.

Suzanne – We started working on spread sheet that Ingria Jones, GSI, sent out about expenditures. This will show what we have been spending in the past. I'm wondering if we should also ask what it would cost if we were doing it right – i.e. identify the funding gap. We are still developing the following information:

- Funding
- Groundwater quality.
- Wastewater discharge overflow events and information – getting from NPEDS permit. This information is dated, so will be reaching out to cities to get information on more recent events.

Ecology

Status Report – Suzanne de Szoeki

- We are developing information on different habitats. We have quite a bit of information on aquatic habitats.
- In process of developing information on lakes, wetlands, and estuaries.
- If anyone has documents they recommend, please send to GSI. We will also ask the Study Groups.
- Species of concern – lots of information on salmonids; some information on invasive species.
- We have reached out to some of our partners, particularly Wayne Hoffman, to seek additional information on other species of interest.

Discussion:

Wayne – It would make sense to send that request to Stan van de Wetering and Jitesh Pattni as well. On Ingria’s spreadsheet on invasives, suggest adding a column titled ‘status’ so we can note what is currently a problem, as well as what we are concerned may be a future problem.

Suzanne asked Wayne to add the column re status of invasives. She also provided the following status information:

- We have a nice list of restoration projects.
- We are working with OWRI to get more targeted maps by watershed to identify where restoration projects are occurring.

Built Systems (Infrastructure)

Status Report – Suzanne de Szoeko

- We have collected master plans to understand potable water.
- We are using NPDES permit information for wastewater.
- DEQ also has wastewater plans.

Discussion:

Tim clarified that there are facility plans on file at DEQ associated with wastewater treatment plants. These would be called wastewater facility plans. Then there are wastewater system master plans that deal with wastewater collection systems. These are used differently than facilities plans. Tim explained that cities will have different levels of information. It would be helpful to know if we have a data gap here.

Wayne – if we can identify dwellings that are not served by municipal systems, then we would have a data base of individual systems – i.e. septic. That will be useful for understanding risks.

Tim agreed that if you identify who is served by a municipal system, then you can assume that everyone else uses septic for wastewater.

Tim and Terry - The County has a data base on septic, but the information is difficult to access and is only available back to the 1960s.

Suzanne reported that she has reached out to small water districts twice by email. Second time sent some tables that could be filled in. Have heard back from 3. Kernville, Bev Beach, Bay Hills. Sent out 12 requests, got back 3 responses.

Tim commented that the request is asking for lots of detail. We may need to pare the request down to only the critical information we need to quantify the problem.

Terry – There are a lot of small districts. Many of them are staffed by volunteers. If you hand them the form, they won’t fill it out. You may need to contact them and ask a few simple, basic questions.

Tim - some of this information is available through OHA, annual water quality reports. We can get this data through the back door. We can’t get some of it through the front door because no one is there.

Harmony – Suggestion to figure out what we need in all the steps and then contact them once to get all of the information. It will also be good to go to the board meetings of small water districts to tell them about the Partnership and to gather information.

Terry - One of the problems you're going to have is that these people don't trust you because they see the government as the bad guys.

Caroline suggested using a constituent. For instance, she lives near one of the water districts and could talk with them to obtain the information. She offered to provide a list of all water districts.

Tim – We can make a plan to visit water districts at their board meetings.

Committee - Information may also be available from:

- Loan and grant applications to DEQ, USDA, OHA, or OWRD.
- Rate studies.
- System inventories.
- Rate studies
- Annual water quality reports
- Master Plans
- OHA (Oregon Health Authority)
- Growth projections – look at city and county comprehensive land use plans

Adam D. – Need to separate small water districts. Small districts (like Panther Creek) are not going to have master planning documents. Larger water districts, like South Lincoln County Water Dist., will have master planning documents and will have already adopted a growth projection based on that master planning effort. Growth in last 2 years has been more than in last 10 years combined. We are constantly concerned about water demand in the future. Water districts the size of Seal Rock (serving 8,000 customers) are operating much like a municipality. Only way to get info from small water districts would be to visit them. Adam volunteered to assist in this effort.

Tim and Terry commented that we need to be careful of population projections because many of those projections are based on residents only and do not include tourism.

Tim – Interesting information is available from Chambers of Commerce – visitation information for Central OR coast covers vacation rentals, hotels, etc. This would be good way to characterize population to include tourism. Tim will send these reports to Suzanne.

Committee discussion about strategy for small water districts. What do we need to know?

- How many residents they serve
- How many developable lots
- Current and future needs
- How much water they produce
- How much water they use
- Current infrastructure Inventory
- Geographically where they exist in future network
- Annual operating & maintenance O&M budget
- How many service connections
- Population of service area

- Water right and well capacity
- Seasonal issues
- What would make your operation sustainable over the long term?

If we can obtain this information, then we can develop broad brush estimates.

Next steps

- Refine questions
- Develop outreach strategy. Harmony volunteered to work with Suzanne on this.
- Consider using an intern to help with interfacing with small districts. (i.e. RARE intern). We could train them what to look for. RARE schedule starts in Sept., ends in July. The application process is in spring. Meaghan Smith and Bob Parker at U of O are good contacts for RARE program.

Planning Steps 3 and 4 – Current and Future Needs

Suzanne commented that we will be doing a ‘deeper dive’ in developing information as we work to define current and future needs in planning steps 3 and 4. We will be integrating water quality and quantity data. As a result, that will mean more outreach and interaction with partners will be required. We will still use the study group concept – but the groups will be called by other names (see work plan), and we will be meeting with them more often to produce information on these categories. The outcome of Steps 3 / 4 will be a report. Structure of these reports to be determined.

Communication and Outreach Subcommittee – Harmony Burrig

- Harmony reported that she and Tim Gross met with Water Resources Commission last week. The meeting went very well. Tim, the conveners from Harney County, and a representative from North Powder who is interested in place based planning, also attended. Harmony will be putting the Commission report on line. The Commission discussed:
 - Lessons learned
 - Challenges
 - Outcomes from programmatic level
 - Tim discussed budget needs for the PBP effort. OWRD provided a grant of \$135K and the City of Newport matched the grant, but it is not nearly enough to fund the planning process.
- Tim commented that it is time to discuss funding with the Partnership to see if we can generate interest and support for funding within the Partnership community.
- Wayne suggested that folks need to talk with Governor’s staff about funding needs.
- Harmony explained that the Integrated Water Resources Strategy Policy Advisory Group for the state did not arrive at consensus on funding PBP. They want to see some tangible results from current planning processes, but it is hard to get results if we don’t have funding.
- Tim encourages us to be more proactive with legislature regarding funding needs. We also need to reach out to our own stakeholder groups to seek financial support. There is strong need for

funding, and a big risk if we don't get funding. Adam D. reported that he has been making connections with SDAO (Special District Association of Oregon).

- Tim further explained that Harney and Mid Coast are very similar in that the need is for \$140K annually for about 4 years – we are only partially funded.
- Harmony is currently working on 2018 and 2019 budget package proposals for place-based planning and will keep us updated. These packages will first be vetted internally by OWRD leadership and also by key statewide stakeholders. OWRD's proposed budget will go to the Governor for consideration. If it ends up in the Governor's recommended budget then it still needs to make it through the legislative process. In short, there is an extensive process and no guarantees for funding.
- Stan asked if they are expecting to see results from our efforts now, given that we only received partial funding.
- Harmony explained that we need to define metrics of success so that we can report to different audiences. The group should be able to articulate the value of the funding and what they have been able to accomplish with the funding. It is also important to show local investments in the planning process, both cash and in-kind. Caroline suggested that process success implies future success.
- Harmony indicated that we need a strategy to reach out to a number of groups that are important to water discussions at the state level – LOC, AOC, Farm Bureau, SDAO, OCA, Water Watch, others. OWRD does outreach to statewide groups every 6 months and it would be good to coordinate efforts to the extent possible.
- Tim said he testified at the Legislature, but was only allowed 60 seconds. It is hard to tell a compelling story in one minute. We need to get our message out through other ways, such as through the OWRD commissioners. We need to get to the legislature before they are in session.
- Jackie and Wayne suggested that we need to get on agenda for Coastal Caucus. Jackie also suggested that we need support from Arnie Roblan's and David Gomberg's offices before meeting w/Coastal Caucus.
- Harmony said that while our work is important, there are so many priorities that our message has the potential to get lost.
- Tim emphasized that we need a strategy that repeats the message. We can't expect to get results from one meeting.

Harmony will work with the Communication and Outreach subcommittee to identify key audiences and help the Partnership develop strategies to reach those audiences.

Grant Update – Tim Gross

OCF:

- It looks promising for receiving Oregon Community Foundation (OCF) grant for \$20K. (Note: since the 8/23 meeting, we received word that this grant was awarded to the Partnership) This funding will allow us to support some of our partners to fund them to participate in the process.

- We will need to designate a group within the Partnership to recommend distribution of funding, should we receive this grant.
- OCF has funding partners they work with. This gives us an entry into OCF, which may open up additional opportunities in the future.

MMT

- We met with MMT (Meyer Memorial Trust) on August 9. The meeting went well. MMT grant is specifically to fund consultants to keep us moving down the planning path. MMT asked about one value added item that we had cut out – OR Kitchen Table. They may have additional funding, and they encouraged us to add this item back into the budget.
- Jackie offered to write a letter of support for the MMT grant.
- Jackie explained that OR Kitchen Table is part of Oregon Consensus – it is a methodology for community outreach. Harmony further explained that OR Kitchen Table would do design and outreach work to general public that may not come to meetings. They provide expertise in design and execution of surveys.
- Tim emphasized that MMT is interested in everyone’s voices being heard. We have a large Hispanic population that works in fishing and hospitality. We want to reach out to these groups.
- Tim reported that our chances look good to receive the MMT grant. We should hear in October.
- ACTION – Tim to send Jackie contact info and she will write letter of support for MMT.

Ford Foundation

- Tim reported that Harney County is meeting with Ford Foundation, and we will join in the conversation.

Overall Funding Strategy

- Tim has breakdown of cost he is willing to share. Coordinating Committee is interested in seeing this.
- Caroline may know of some funding sources.
- Jackie will schedule to meet with Phil Warnock at the CoG. Caroline offered that Seth from CoG is coming to her office on Monday and this may be an opportunity to speak with him about funding.
- Tim said that we need to ask partners to plan support funds in their budget. We need to avoid a funding gap that would slow the process down.
- Wayne suggested that if we think about what we’ve accomplished, we can put together a list of things that came up that was not anticipated in the original grant application. He suggested Outcomes we have achieved thus far:
 - Potential solutions
 - Identification of Infrastructure problems
 - Ways of enhancing minimum summer flows by enhancing upper watersheds
 - We know more about relationship between forestry practices and watershed yields

- What was a surprise? Need to articulate added value beyond what was promised in the OWRD grant application.
- Tim likes Wayne’s idea of describing where we’ve come from, what we’ve accomplished, and what we’ve learned. People are taking responsibility, moving forward, building trust so people can have conversations. The atmosphere is great. This takes time to grow. For instance, forestry has recently joined in and become much more engaged. This is one example of a positive outcome.
- Wayne offered that engagement is a good part of story – such as our inclusion of smaller water districts.
- Stan asked about Legislature. We can expect questions from our constituents about why the legislature only funded part of the process.
- Harmony explained that the rationale was to provide funds to catalyze the process. Full funding is one model; partial funding is another model. We will get this question and need to be prepared to respond to it.
- Jackie commented that we can demonstrate that there are other funding sources that are investing in this.
- Harmony – We need to make the argument that we are leveraging OWRD, community, and private funds.
- Tim explained that our funding model needs to be:
 - OWRD 1/3
 - Fundraising through grants, in-kind contributions 1/3
 - Partner contributions 1/3
- If cities and the county could all contribute, then we could fund the 1/3 Partner contributions. It is the principle that we want people to partner with funding as well as participation in the process. This fall we need to cast that vision and talk about what we would hope different organizations would contribute based on size and type. We need to discuss this at next Partnership meeting.

ACTION – Caroline is meeting with CoG on Aug 28 12:30 at City Hall. Jackie will join the meeting.

Parking Lot Items

The Committee worked through a number parking lot items noted below.

Responding to Opportunities

- Harmony explained the 3 tiers:
 - Tier 1: Letter of support for partners to pursue funding opportunity within their realm to boost their own capacity.
 - Tier 2: Commitment in Partnership to integrate efforts or work product. Will be vetted with Coordinating Committee and Partnership is briefed. Example – Corps of Engineer technical assistance.

- Tier 3: Partnership is pursuing specific initiative. Goes to full Partnership for consensus decision after going through the appropriate committee.
- This does not apply to grant applications that sustain the process because we need to meet stringent deadlines.
- Wayne – likes overall structure. We may want to think about building a structure that helps us to look for opportunities rather than just reacting to opportunities.
- The Committee approved of the overall structure and agreed that it should be written to be more proactive. Harmony volunteered to make the suggested edits.
- The Committee also discussed and agreed that they would like to see regular updates provided at every stakeholder meeting and in email blasts. We should also provide time at meetings for Partner announcements. This will help to build a culture of inclusiveness, which may also build support for funding.

OSU Participation

- Jeanne provided a brief recap - the Committee determined in March not to pursue the OSU proposal because we did not have a Charter or work plan and it was unclear how the proposal met the Partnership's goals.
- Caroline commented that we need to be proactive and develop a strategy for how we can tap talent or resources of U of O and OSU.
- Jackie suggested that we check in with institutions to see if there are opportunities.
- Wayne suggested that if we identify particular needs, then we locate the people who would be interested.
- Stan concurred that we should go to them with something specific.
- Tim offered to make a few phone calls to OSU / U of O to identify who we can reach out to.
- Shirlene reported that Maryann Bozza has offered to connect us with scientists at Hatfield Marine Science Ctr. to provide info or help fill data gaps. Wayne responded that he thinks the expertise we need is more in Corvallis (OSU) than Newport.
- Shirlene will connect with Oregon Coast Community College to see if there are opportunities.

Coordinating Committee Membership

- Jeanne and Shirlene reviewed Coordinating Committee membership vacancies.
 - Resident vacancy -
 - Cyndi Karp expressed an interest in filling this vacancy; however that would mean two representatives from MidCoast Watersheds Council. The initial parameters set for the Coordinating Committee valued broad representation. The Committee agreed that Cyndi has a lot to offer, particularly in the area of technical expertise. She has been making great contributions at Partnership, Study Groups, and is also on the Communication and Outreach committee. The Coord. Committee observed that we will have increasing need for technical

expertise as we delve into Steps 3, 4, 5 of the process, and Cyndi's skills will be a better match for the technical challenges, rather than the more process-focused work of the Coordinating Committee. Shirlene will call Cyndi.

- It was decided to fill the resident vacancy with a student. Shirlene will reach out to Maryanne Bozza at Hatfield and also to the President of Oregon Coast Community College.
 - Forestry – Deb Wilkins has not been able to attend. It was discussed and agreed that Harmony will invite Leah Tai from the USFS Hebo Ranger Dist. to fill the forestry vacancy. If Leah is not available, Kami Ellingson from Siuslaw HQ or Michelle Jones from Waldport would be good representatives from USFS.
 - Academic - John Stevenson, OSU Climate Change, recently resigned as he is leaving to pursue his PhD. John will be sorely missed. Shirlene will connect with Maryann Bozza to see if she is interested in filling John's spot.

Project Team meeting notes –

A question was raised at an earlier Coordinating Committee meeting if we should be posting Project Team meeting notes on the Partnership website in the spirit of transparency.

- Jeanne distributed examples of Project Team meeting notes and explained that the Team is transitioning to using BaseCamp – a project management software. The Project Team notes consist of logistical notes and 'to do' lists.
- The Committee discussed and agreed that, while transparency is important, it is not worth the effort to create formal meeting notes and post them on the Partnership website. It is unlikely that anyone will be interested in logistical details and 'to do' lists.
- Wayne suggested that the Project Team keep on file a list of the topic items discussed at each meeting. Jeanne said this would be easy to do, as she already sends an email to the Team with a list of discussion topics. She will maintain a file by date in case anyone requests the topics of discussion.
- This discussion highlighted the importance of trust in the Partnership. The Committee observed that some Partners were initially suspicious of the process, but people are getting more comfortable that everyone is approaching this process with positive intent and trust is being built. This led into a discussion of the following item.

Sustainability of the Partnership – new Parking Lot item

The Committee discussed the long-term sustainability of the Partnership.

- Partners need to support the Partnership at a higher level. Members need to be more heavily invested as we move into steps 3, 4 and 5. They can contribute by contacting legislators, providing funding, and taking the lead on some of the work efforts.
- We need to think more about how to engage other entities, particularly the county and the Tribe, potentially in a convening role.

- We need to develop a summary of accomplishments to date so we can demonstrate the value of the Partnership. As we think about legislative strategy, it might be time to think about broader group of conveners to generate broader support. We also need to think about how to manage this process for the long term. Once we have completed the planning process, it will still be beneficial for the Partnership to continue in some form so that we do not lose the cooperation and collaboration that has been built.
- Given that we were already past meeting end time, this topic was placed in parking lot for further discussion at a future meeting.

Good of the Order

Newport is a good location for Partnership meetings. However, it was noted that we had a good turnout from north County when we meet in Gleneden Beach. The Committee concurred that Newport is a good, central location, but we should move the Partnership to north and south locations periodically.