



Mid-Coast Water Planning Partnership

COORDINATING COMMITTEE

DRAFT Meeting Notes

December 15, 2017, 9:00 pm – 12:15 pm
Newport Recreation Center, Room 105

NEXT STEPS / ACTION ITEMS

Step 3:

- GSI will take CC comments into consideration and present revised scope to the CC, to include further discussion on how to form the working groups.
- Tim to forward USACE scope of work to Coordinating Committee.

Communication & Outreach

- Harmony to share the CC's suggestions with the CO Committee.
- CO to provide briefing at next Partnership meeting (January 24).
 - Include guidance for Partners on how to deal with media – refer them back to the Charter language.
 - Include protocols and tools on how to handle media contact.
- CO to develop regular updates to the media on Partnership activities.
- Include info about Partnership accomplishments in future press releases.
- Harmony will edit the flyer and send to CC for a 'red flag' review.
- Harmony will update CC as plans are developed for Field Tours and Panel Discussions.

Funding

- Adam D. will get further information on River Network funding opportunities and he and Tim will make contact.
- Tim, Maryanne, Caroline, and Charlie will meet to continue developing criteria for the OCF grant.
- Adam D. will contact Paul Berg to explore his availability to speak at a future Partnership meeting or event.

Participants:

- Tim Gross, Co-Convener, City of Newport
- Harmony Burright, Co-Convener, OWRD
- Wayne Hoffman, MidCoast Watersheds Council
- Caroline Bauman, Economic Development Alliance of Lincoln Co.
- Jackie Mikalonis, Governor's Office, Regional Solutions Team
- Alan Fujishin, Gibson Farms
- Adam Denlinger, Seal Rock Water District
- Charlie Plybon, Newport Surfrider Foundation
- Jim Tooke, City of Yachats
- Amber Nickerson, OSU Students

Unable to Attend:

- Jitesh Pattni, ODFW
- Deborah Wilkins, USFS, Hebo Ranger Dist.
- Stan VandeWetering, Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians
- Terry Thompson, Lincoln County Commissioner

Project Team in Attendance:

- Adam Sussman and Ronan Igloria, GSI Water Solutions
- Shirlene Warnock and Jeanne Nyquist, Innovative Growth Solutions

Introductions

The Committee welcomed new participants –

- Amber Nickerson, OSU student, is attending to learn about the Committee’s work. She may be interested in filling the resident/student/academic slot on the Coordinating Committee.
- Ronan Igloria, GSI Water Solutions, will be working with the technical team on Step 3.
- Member Jim Tooke explained that he will be attending regularly to represent the Yachats area and Yachats City Council.

Debrief of Planning Step 2

- Synopsis of Issues - Jeanne Nyquist presented a draft synopsis of water issues and vulnerabilities discussed by the Partnership during Step 2. The Committee provided the following feedback on this document.
 - Alan observed that it helps to have a summary of the issues discussed by the Partnership.
 - Wayne suggested that threats to water quantity need to be included as a vulnerability, including land use, urban, stormwater, and agricultural systems.
 - Caroline noted that there is insufficient political will to address the needs identified by the Partnership. We need education to let people know about the vulnerabilities.
 - Wayne observed that Newport and Seal Rock Water District have a vision of their infrastructure needs. However, some smaller water providers patch leaks when they have them and don’t have a plan for infrastructure replacement.
 - Tim commented that he has funding available through a very successful grant program. Newport’s limitation is inability to find the skilled staff needed. Lack of qualified technical staff should be added to the summary of vulnerabilities.
- Workforce Training – Identification of Newport’s difficulty in finding skilled staff generated a good discussion on the need for workforce training and workforce housing. Jackie suggested that the Workforce Investment Board may be able to help bring investments to the region to work with the local community college to develop technical training for water and wastewater staff. The Committee is interested in keeping this issue in the ‘parking lot’ for further exploration at future meetings.
- **Debrief of Step 2** - The Committee provided comments on Step 2 of the process.

What went well?

- New people continue to come to meetings.
- The format of the November 14 meeting was great, and the event was a good wrap up of Step 2.
- We are making most of opportunities. Charlie reached out to Otter Rock WD and Tim met with Pacific Shrimp. When we see problems and opportunities, we need to continue to reach out to provide assistance.
- The Step 2 technical reports are good and reflect the input of the study groups.

Suggestions for future steps in the planning process –

- Get more of the community involved – especially those without knowledge of water issues.
- The Partnership will eventually complete this planning process, but our work will never be done. We are building relationships and a way of working together that we want to continue into the future.
- We need to be clear about who the audience is when we communicate about the Partnership.
- We need to be intentional about engagement and help people understand the urgency of this planning process.
- We need to get more water district leadership to the planning meetings.
- The big challenge is to focus our messages to specific audiences – what is realistic to get them engaged in this process?
- We need to give direction to the Communication and Outreach Committee to define audiences and messages so that they can create messages that resonate.
- We need a campaign to educate and engage, and we need to tailor messages around a campaign target.
- People don't respond to anything unless they have a stake in it. People need to understand that this planning process can benefit them. Messaging is important.
- We will be identifying a large range of solutions from water conservation all the way to big infrastructure projects. The Step 2 reports looked at issues from a regulatory perspective. It is helpful to understand existing regulatory framework. A potential liability as we begin to identify solutions is that the regulatory issues may be perceived as barriers. We need to think outside the box and not constrain our thinking by focusing on regulatory issues.

Plan for Step 3 – Define Current and Future Needs

Overview of Step 3 – The Committee was reminded of the Step 3 concept that was presented at the October Coordinating Committee meeting.

- Steps 3 and 4 will be combined into Step 3 – both current and future needs will be addressed.
- Partnership will set overall strategic direction for the work.
- Coordinating Committee will coordinate the work and frame topics for Partnership discussion.
- Topic-specific Working Groups will work with GSI to develop technical information. They will check back with Coordinating Committee periodically.
- Communication and Outreach Committee will develop key messages, education and outreach. They will check back with Coordinating Committee periodically.

Technical Work Plan – Ronan Igloria, GSI Water Solutions

Ronan provided a draft scope of work for Step 3 –

- Baseline work completed in Steps 1 and 2 will help us understand our needs and begin to identify solutions.

- Step 3 will give us the opportunity to build technical information and develop the messages to engage the various audiences.
- Deliverables will be in a format that meets technical needs. Messages will need to be packaged for consumptions by different audiences.
- Step 3 will focus on the following categories –
 - Out of stream needs in two groups:
 - Municipal and district supplied water
 - Self-supplied water (i.e. irrigation, commercial/industrial, domestic)
 - In stream needs
- Working groups will be created for each category. Working group leads will be identified to help create an effective communication loop with the groups.
- The US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) has been brought on board to work on climate change analysis that will be incorporated into the technical analysis.
- Ronan explained that GSI will develop a Mid Coast conceptual model so that the working groups can frame the issues and communicate effectively. This can be updated as information is developed and needs are identified. We will also develop a matrix that describes the needs and tracks conceptual solutions so we can use this information to formulate solutions in Step 4.
- Overview of process for Step 3 -
 - Coordinating Committee will meet January 19 to help scope and define the working groups.
 - GSI will develop scoping documents that further define the work of the working groups.
 - Preliminary findings developed by the working groups will be reviewed with the Coordinating Committee, then the Partnership.
 - Input from the Partnership will be incorporated into a final report.
 - Then refined to incorporate input from the partnership.

Input from Committee on Step 3 Plan –

Organization of Working Groups -

- We need effective communication and focused direction to avoid scope creep so we can do more with resources available.
- We need to think through how we form the working groups and have a formal mechanism for this to happen. The working groups may also want to designate small ad hoc groups to study particular issues and report back.
- Working groups need to regularly bring their analysis back to Partnership for discussion and consideration.
- We need to meet with the working groups to ensure that they understand their charge and the process.

Climate Change -

- GSI and USACE will pull together the information on climate change. It is important to document this need to support funding for solutions.
- The Oregon Climate Change Research Institute and other organizations also have usable data.

- We want to bring these resources to the table so we can incorporate this information into the discussion.

Resiliency -

- Analysis of resiliency will help us explain to rate payers why water rates need to keep pace with needs.
- The Seal Rock Water Dist. Board is focused on resiliency issues, and City of Newport recently hired a new emergency management coordinator. We need to link these constituents into the process.
- We need to include in the resiliency discussion seasonal variation (summers longer & drier), bigger storm events, sea level rise and related impacts on infrastructure.
- Include tide gates in the resiliency discussion. Prior discussion about tide gates has been focused on maintenance, repair, and replacement of infrastructure. We need to broaden the discussion to include improving fish passage, public investments to help landowners maintain and repair tide gates, etc.

How to organize the working groups -

- Domestic self-supplied water users – one meeting may be the limit of resources we can devote to this use.
- Where do rural landowners with wells fit? They could fit with a commercial / agricultural focus group.
- Where do agency partners fit? For example, Oregon Department of Agriculture – out of stream. Forestry – in stream. Where does recreation fit?

Education -

- We could provide more education around overarching issues that affect the Partnership, such as climate change, in stream needs, built systems needs. Step 2 reports would be a good source of information for this. (Wayne)
- At some point in time we need to talk about Rocky Creek. (Tim)
- We need to balance getting the work done and having meetings. We spend a lot of time preparing and following up on meetings. Some of the education will be provided in panels and other forms of education. (Harmony)
- We should also take the opportunity to bring in information on funding needs. We could ask funders to present information on what they can provide to support to small organizations. (Adam Denlinger)
- We also need to explain to Partners why there is a funding gap. (Tim)

Next Steps:

- GSI will take the above comments into consideration and will present the revised scope to the Coordinating Committee, to include further discussion on how to form the working groups.
- Tim to forward USACE scope of work to Coordinating Committee.

Communication & Outreach Subcommittee – Harmony Burrigh

Harmony reported that -

- The Communication and Outreach (CO) committee has met 4 times. All committee members are volunteers – there are no dedicated staff. Everyone is busy, so we need to focus our limited resources.
- Maryanne Bozza (Hatfield Marine Science Ctr.), Brianna Goodwin (Surfrider Foundation), and Harmony Burrigh (OWRD) share the facilitation role. Harmony is coordinating the group.
- We need to balance vetting of ideas with the need to be nimble.
- Harmony presented a flow chart depicting when the CO will check in with the Coordinating Committee and when they will engage the full Partnership.

Discussion:

- Feedback on flow chart – Organize in these 3 categories
 - Developed
 - Solicited
 - Invited
- Tim commented that the flow chart needs to identify who speaks to the media re the Partnership.
- Alan – Charter spells this out, but we did not emphasize this clearly to members of Partnership. We need to reiterate this.
- Adam – We need to be careful with limiting response to the media. We need to establish a Public Information Officer (PIO) for this process. We need to explain this to the Partnership.
- Charlie suggested that we issue periodic press releases. This helps the media. They get accustomed to hearing from the same people. You build a relationship with the media so they know who to come to. We can give guidance, but we don't want to muzzle freedom of speech.
- Wayne reported that he was giving an update to the Siletz Watershed Council at an open meeting. There was a reporter in the room, so an article was generated. This was unintentional.
- Harmony clarified that we don't want to prevent Partners from answering a call and expressing their opinions and thoughts about the Partnership.
- The Committee discussed that it would be helpful for the CO to develop a press kit with tools to give Partners guidance on how to respond appropriately to media contacts. For instance – if a Partner is questioned by the media about an issue that the Partnership has not made a decision on, an appropriate response is, 'I am not aware if the Partnership has taken an official position'.
- Charlie emphasized that messaging is important. He suggested –
 - Focus on content and message, not so much on design and the way it looks. Does it say what it needs to say?
 - Develop tool kits that local people can tailor to their audiences. This will result in consistency of messages while allowing people to speak to their constituents.
 - Send press releases periodically to report on the Partnership's work.
 - Partners should be able to speak to the media about their own opinions, but only the co-conveners should speak on behalf of the Partnership.

- It was agreed that Harmony will continue to update the Coordinating Committee and Partnership on activities of the CO Committee. If approval is needed on a time-sensitive issue, Harmony will send the information to the Coordinating Committee by email, stating in the subject line 'Red Flag Review' to indicate importance / timeliness of the topic.

Next Steps:

- Harmony to share the Coordinating Committee's suggestions with the CO Committee.
- CO to provide briefing at next Partnership meeting (January 24).
 - Include guidance for Partners on how to deal with media – refer them back to the Charter language.
 - Include protocols and tools on how to handle media contact.
- CO to develop regular updates to the media on Partnership activities.
- Tim asked for the press release announcing the Partnership meetings to include some information about Partnership accomplishments thus far.

Panels – Harmony reported that the CO committee is sponsoring educational panels on behalf of the Partnership during Step 3 of the planning process. Surfrider and Hatfield have offered to be co-sponsors. She explained that,

- The CO committee will develop a template for the panel discussions.
- The Coordinating Committee will review and approve the template,
- The sponsoring Partner will organize the event.
- The Communication and Outreach Committee will promote the event.

Field Tours – Harmony reported that the CO committee will develop field tours focused on different areas of interest.

Flyer – Harmony shared a draft Partnership flyer developed by the CO committee. She asked for comments from the Coordinating Committee:

- Too much language.
- Use wording that local residents will understand.
- Share at next Partnership meeting and also include on website.

Next Step: Harmony will edit the flyer and send to Coordinating Committee for a 'red flag' review.

Funding

- Tim reported that Ford Family Foundation will attend next Partnership meeting January 24.
- Adam Denlinger reported that River Network is offering funding opportunity in conjunction with OR Environmental Council. SRWD has taken advantage of this to fund major capital improvements. Business Oregon IFA has also provided funding. River Network's guiding principles match the Partnership's guiding principles.
 - Action: Adam will get further information on River Network funding opportunities and he and Tim will make contact.

- Adam Denlinger reported that Paul Berg, CH2M/Hill, is passionate speaker about water issues. He recently gave presentation to Corvallis City Club about emergency disaster in home water treatment. This highlights need for self-sufficiency during a disaster. Paul would be a good speaker for the Partnership.
 - Action: Adam will contact Paul Berg to explore his availability to speak at a future Partnership meeting or event.
- Caroline Bauman reported that she and Maryanne Bozza met to discuss ideas on how to allocate the Oregon Community Foundation grant of \$20,000.
 - Action: Tim, Maryanne, Caroline, and Charlie will meet to continue developing criteria for the OCF grant.

Parking Lot – for discussion at future meeting(s):

- How to form ad hoc committees.
- Public Survey via Oregon Kitchen Table
- Continued discussion on distribution of grant funds.
- Workforce development to provide qualified staff for water and wastewater operations.

Mid Coast Water Planning Partnership

DRAFT Synopsis of Steps 1 & 2

For discussion with Coordinating Committee 12-15-17

Partnership Mission

The purpose of the Mid-Coast Water Planning Partnership is to . . .

Develop an inclusive community forum
which examines water use in the region,
identifies current and potential water challenges,
and creates a unified plan to balance water needs.

Planning process and schedule



Partnership Structure



What did we do in Steps 1 and 2?

Who's been involved?

- Partnership – 280 on list, 120 active
- Partners – 50+ signed Charter
- 7 Partnership meetings – average attendance 50 ea
- 8 Study Group meetings – average attendance 12 ea
- 3 Field Tours – avg. 35-40 ea
- 4 C/O Meetings – avg. 10 ea
- 15 Coordinating Committee Meeting – avg. attendance 10 ea.

What did we accomplish?

- Governance structure – Charter, MVV
- Communication & Outreach Plan
- Technical reports – Quantity, Quality, Ecology, Built Systems, Context
- Common baseline understanding of water resources in Mid Coast
- Collaborative relationships
- Shared technical info., resources, assistance amongst Partners
- Secured grant funding
- Established web page to keep everyone informed

Summary of Partnership Discussions

Summary of outcomes, issues, needs, vulnerabilities, identified at Partnership meetings. Results are listed in order of *frequency mentioned by table groups*. Note that this is a compilation of table group summary reports and does not represent an accurate count of individual statements.

Desired Outcomes

Identified at 9/29/16 Partnership meeting.

- Increased awareness about regional needs (8)
- Sustainable supply for consumptive uses that also protects ecology (6)
Integrated strategies to improve water quantity and quality (4)
- Incentivize conservation (4)
- Resources to implement solutions (4)
- Cross boundary solutions (3)
- Improve resilience (3)
- A collaborative, future-focused process (3)
- Manage flows (2)
- Funding and financing (2)
- Water rights that benefit all (1)
- Understanding of regulatory context (1)

Key Water Issues on Mid Coast

Summary of issues identified at 9/29/16 and 1/25/16 Partnership meetings.

- Water quality (21)
- Water quantity – limited supply to meet current and future demands (20)
- Aging infrastructure; lack of funding (15)
- Watershed health – (13)
 - Impact of upland activities on watershed health
 - Land use impact (forestry, industry, agriculture, residential) on watershed health
- Climate change and natural forces (11)
- Changing regulations (11)
- Balance in-stream and out-of-stream needs to support the water cycle (10)
- Lack of funding to address problems (9)
- Lack of sufficient water storage capacity – not able to capture and store water when it is abundant (7)
- Need for greater water conservation (6)
- Seasonal flows – demand is high when flow is low (5)
- Need for education about water issues (5)
- Lack coordination of drinking water systems (4)
- Challenges are unique to the region (1)

Needs¹ and Vulnerabilities²

| <i>In-Stream Needs</i> | <i>Out-of-Stream Needs</i> |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better quantify current and future needs (9) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Data to make accurate projections ○ More gages to better measure flows ○ Quantify in-stream and out-of-stream needs • Decline in in-stream flow impacts fish and ecological systems (6) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ ISWR not being met ○ Insufficient flows for fish & ecology • Water quality is critical, complex, sensitive for both in-stream and out-of-stream (5) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Quality is impaired by temperature, D/O turbidity, contamination ○ Lack comprehensive water quality testing to understand this issue • Restore natural systems (4) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Estuaries ○ Riparian areas • High dependence on Siletz withdrawals (4) • Impact of reservoirs on water quality/fish (1) • Healthy water for all species (1) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insufficient year-round supply (15) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Seasonal population variability ○ Need for consistent water supply ○ Future needs from increase in resident and tourist population ○ Increased need for water places too much pressure on available resources ○ Tidal influence limits withdrawals • Industry needs for water – forestry, agriculture, irrigation, fishing, tourism, marijuana (7) • Growth and development of region increases need for infrastructure (6) • Need for increased conservation (4) • Cost of supplied water – potential rate increases (3) • Lack of information on groundwater supply and utilization (3) • Estuary development plans (1) • Unforeseen water use (i.e. forest fires) (1) |
| Vulnerabilities | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aging infrastructure (20) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Aging/failing groundwater wells, leaking septic systems, water loss ○ Big Creek Dam – immediate, high risk ○ Lack of qualified water, wastewater operators • Threats to water quality (17) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Invasive species ○ Increased algal blooms ○ Contamination from bio-solids applications ○ Agriculture and forestry practices ○ Saltwater intrusion ○ Lack of comprehensive water quality testing to understand complex systems • Threats to water quantity (land use, urban, septic, stormwater, agricultural systems) • Impacts of climate change (12) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Drought ○ Higher water temperatures, lower flows, impact on consumptive uses and ecology • Lack of sufficient funding to address issues (9) • Impacts of natural disaster (landslides, earthquake, tsunami, storms, floods) (7) • Lack of secure water source and water security (5) • Lack of qualified staff for operation of water and wastewater systems • Water systems not designed for resiliency (1) | |

¹ Needs identified at 1/25/17, 8/8/17, and 11/14/17 Partnership meetings.

² Vulnerabilities identified at 8/8/17 Partnership meeting

