



# Mid-Coast Water Planning Partnership

## COORDINATING COMMITTEE

### Draft Meeting Notes v2

March 10, 2017, 9:00 am – 12:00 pm

Newport Recreation Center

## NEXT STEPS

- Charter: Alan Fujishin and Harmony Burrighrigh will edit the Charter by 3/17/17 and send to: [jeanne@innovativegrowthsolutions.com](mailto:jeanne@innovativegrowthsolutions.com)
- OSU –
  - Harmony will connect with Jim Adler, Deb Wilkins and Leah Tai, to communicate the CC's discussion to pause this effort.
  - Tim Gross will call the OSU professor to inform him of the CC's discussion and will follow up with a letter.
- Communication and Outreach – Harmony Burrighrigh will send an update via email to the CC.
- GSI to update Work Plan and connect with project team next week indicating time needed on 3/29 Partnership meeting agenda.
- Next Planning Partnership Meeting: March 29, 2017
  - IGS to draft an agenda and secure venue.
  - Jitesh will host 'New Partner Welcome' 30 minutes prior to the meeting start.

## Participants:

- Alan Fujishin, Gibson Farms
- Wayne Hoffman, MidCoast Watersheds Council
- Stan VandeWetering, Siletz Tribal Council
- Tim Gross, Co-Convener, City of Newport
- Harmony Burrighrigh, Co-Convener OWRD
- Jackie Mikalonis, Governor's Office, Regional Solutions Team
- Jitesh Pattni, ODFW
- Caroline Bauman, Economic Development Alliance of Lincoln Co.

## Unable to Attend:

- James Adler, Yachats Valley resident
- Adam Denlinger, Seal Rock Water District
- John Stevenson, OSU, Oregon Sea Grant
- Terry Thompson, Lincoln County Commissioner
- Deborah Wilkins, USFS, Hebo Ranger Dist.

## Project Team in Attendance:

- Shirlene Warnock, Innovative Growth Solutions

## Discussion Notes: March 10, 2017

### Welcome/Announcements

#### Announcements:

- Wayne has two articles on recent research of 'forest plantation management on stream flows' to share with the CC. He will send the links.
- Alan has two new healthy calves – congratulations, Alan!
- Harmony reminded the CC of the purpose for the group – the CC works on behalf of the entire partnership – the CC represents the larger body, not individual interests.
- Jackie reminded the CC that she is happy to do what she can to keep things aligned throughout state.
- Caroline expressed that she is a source of information about the economy (framed by the 'triple bottom line').

#### ***Clarification on Coordinating Committee representation:***

In the interest of openness and transparency, Wayne Hoffman was asked to address a comment made at the February 10, 2017, Coordinating Committee meeting by another member. During that meeting (February 10) the member indicated that he was being paid by the Watersheds Council. Wayne clarified that an anonymous party that represents conservation interests made a donation to the MidCoast Watersheds Council. The Watersheds Council administers these funds that help to support participation in the Mid-Coast Water Planning Partnership.

The Coordinating Committee would like to seek clarity about whether or not this financial arrangement affects who the member is representing. Since the member was not present, this topic was tabled.

**Action:** Topic to be discussed at a future meeting.

#### **Charter:**

*The CC formed into three small groups to edit the Charter.*

*The group was also supplied with two additional supporting draft documents, 'Decision-making Matrix' and 'Coordinating Committee Overview' as historical reference. The group suggested*

that these documents could be developed into appendices to the Charter (draft documents attached).

Small group detailed edits have been scanned and are attached to the notes.

Following are the reports from each of the small group discussions:

**Group 1: Wayne, Stan and Jackie (recorder-see attached):**

- Membership – pg. 3
  - Need to clarify who is represented and what that means? Suggest – **“associated with, but not formally representing”**
  - Qualify list – make it flexible and not as definite. The group is not finite – want diverse representation – suggest **“Including but not limited to”**
  - Use only Siletz vs. Tribes – be careful to suggest someone is included when they are not. **“Seeking to include tribes”** (see additional edits submitted by Stan – attached).
- **Page 4 Coordinating Committee:**
  - Fix typos (see attached).
  - Last paragraph – strike last sentence *“The committee may invite guests to participate in Committee discussions to provide information or perspectives necessary to gain a full understanding of the issues”*. We assume we are smart enough to do that. (See additional note submitted by Wayne – attached).
- **Page 5 Decision-Making:**
  - Second sentence, eliminate ‘arrive at’ and replace with **‘strive for’**.
  - Third bullet edit to read: **‘I can live with the decision and won’t stand in the way of implementation’**
- **Page 5 Consensus Decision Making Process**
  - Third bullet – **allow time (parking lot) to retreat and research.**
- **Page 8 – News Media**
  - Question news release [only]? Need clarification.

**Group 2: Jitesh and Harmony (recorder – see attached):**

- **Discussion Topics:**
  - **Page 7: Meeting Protocol:**
    - Refrain from making negative comments about decisions that were reached by consensus.
    - Specify role of co-conveners – what do we mean by convener?

- **Modifications:**
  - Page 4: Change highlighted text: “The project Team also recommends Partners to serve on the Coordinating Committee to represent a cross-section of the Partnership” [some did not like the term ‘cross-section’]
  - Page 7: Remove/replace text: Remove text about meeting schedule and replace with a link
  - Page 8: Communication: Point to Comm/Outreach Plan
  - Page 8: News Media – Reframe/Rephrase

**Group 3: Tim, Alan and Caroline (recorder – see attached):**

- **Front Page:** The Charter should not be a ‘living document’
  - The modifications process is clarified on last page.
  - The intent is for the front page to be replaced with a cover page that describes the background/scope of project.
- **Page 4: Sub-Groups:**
  - Edit to read “*Topic- specific sub-groups may be designated **by Coordinating Committee** as needed...*”
- **Page 5: Consensus Decision – Making**
  - Second bullet point – Not clear - see edits in attached notes.
- **Page 8: News Media**
  - First bullet point replace word “regarding” with “**representing**”

***Charter: Parking Lot issues that need further discussion:***

- Full Disclosure (Membership)
- Coordinating Committee pg. 4 – initial membership
- News media language clarification
- Define role of conveners?
- Proposals – how do we respond to opportunities – (include in Charter)?

***Action:***

- **Alan and Harmony will work together to edit Charter based on today’s discussion.**
- **Edits will be complete by 3/17/17.**

## OSU Opportunity:

- Harmony has been trying to connect with Jim, Deb, Leah, to gain further clarification on the project, but was not able to connect.
- Also, Jim, Deb and Leah were not in attendance for the CC to gain further clarification.
- The Committee felt it was important to discuss the topic as there is confusion and concerns around the project, and time is of the essence.

### *Discussion:*

- Tim – it is too soon – the Work Plan is not ready – regionalization sends the wrong message. I would be all for it if it was part of the Work Plan.
- Alan spoke to Jim – they want to start now.
- Harmony – what message does this send when we do not even have a Charter?
- Stan agrees with the concerns and the Tribal Council agrees. If a report comes out ahead of us by OSU it may not be the right message for the Partnership. It is a great project for students, we won't lose the opportunity completely - we can revisit this in the future.
- Jitesh – It seems we are putting the cart before the horse and this could blow up. We need to finish the Charter and Work Plan first.
- Tim – Right now, the concept is open ended and I don't think it will give the Partnership what we are looking for – we need parameters. We need the Work Plan first - there are going to be questions coming out of the Work Plan that can give guidance to the students. I am also concerned about credibility of the process. Convener must be neutral – this needs to be useful information and we must follow the process.
- Wayne – This was not directed to be a regional system. The original concept was – what would be the ideal way to deliver water to population of the study area in 50 years?

### *The CC individually voiced where they were at with this opportunity:*

- Wayne – I look at the project and what will come out of it and there are preliminary steps that we can use in the short term. E.g. how much water and where in study area? What are current and projected flow rates, etc.? Maybe Adam [GSI] can do some of this, but the students are capable – this would be valuable to us.
- Stan – We need to look at the broad process, THEN tell students what we need. It is too early in the process. It could get picked up in the media and misunderstood.
- Alan – We voiced support at the last meeting to further explore this opportunity – I thought it was theoretical, and we were not bound to it. I thought it would not impact us, and it would be beneficial to students. We have valid concerns at this point. I care

about process – should we put the brakes on it? Is it premature? We said go ahead and explore the opportunity, but should we slow it down?

- Harmony – I am in full support of engaging OSU, but the timing is not right – people don't know where we are – we need to get on the same page. Maybe we need to do a regroup? We need more discussion. Also we are still in the formative stages of our structure and still determining a framework for how we process opportunities like this. A proposal of a framework (with criteria was sent to the CC prior to this meeting - attached).
- Jackie – Agrees with Harmony. We are here to talk about structure and process. This discussion belongs in a topic specific sub-group (maybe education?). This is the wrong committee. I suggest this be tabled.
- Caroline – I agree it should be tabled. Not rejecting it all together - leave the door open to work with students in the future.
- Tim – We need the development of the Work Plan first. It is a good opportunity, but the timing is not right. We need to respect the process.
- Jitesh – We need to focus on our process. The opportunity is attractive, but it could de-rail what we are doing. We need to pump the brakes.

The CC took a consensus check, using the green-yellow-red cards, based on the following question: Should we slow down this process?

- There were seven green cards and one red card.
- Further discussion transpired.
- The CC member who showed the red card, changed to yellow, and said he would support the group and not stand in the way.
- Consensus was reached – the process will be slowed down.

***Action: As conveners, Harmony and Tim will take the following action:***

- Harmony will connect with Jim, Deb, and Leah to update them on the CC's discussion.
- Harmony will locate the OSU professor's contact information and pass it on to Tim who will reach out to the OSU professors (call and letter) to update them.

## **Technical Work Plan**

- Harmony explained that GSI is in the process of incorporating the feedback from the CC and the Partnership into the Work Plan.

- The next meeting of the CC will be focused on the Work Plan.
- Tim talked to Adam from GSI, and he is laying out specific scopes to define what we need, how it will work, and what is most important.

### **Next Partnership Meeting March 29:**

- Agenda topic discussion:
  - **Education:** Harmony suggested that part of the agenda have an education component: Water 101 – from the Partners’ perspective.
    - Some felt that there is not enough time to have this component – the Charter and updates on the Work Plan should take priority.
    - Harmony reminded the CC that people appreciate the education piece.
  - **Charter:** Most felt that the Charter should be the main focus for the meeting
    - It was noted that if we focus completely on the Charter it would be a difficult meeting.
  - **Work plan:** GSI could give an update on the Work Plan and how they plan to move forward at the next meeting, but an updated document should not be given to the Partnership until it has been vetted by the CC.
    - We need to be very structured and deliberate about the Work Plan – we need to be thoughtful and ready before it is presented to the Partnership.
    - The March meeting should focus on the Charter and the May meeting could be focused on the Work Plan.
  - **Communication and Outreach:** there should be some time set aside on the agenda to update Communication and Outreach.
- **Time on agenda to inform new attendees**
  - Too much time was spent at the last Partnership meeting catching up new attendees. Solutions:
    - Facilitators will create notebooks for new attendees.
    - 30 minutes prior to the meeting will be set aside for new attendees.
      - Jitesh volunteered to host this portion of the meeting on 3/29.

### **Action:**

- The focus of the meeting will be on finalizing the Charter.

- The edits to the Charter made by the CC today will be shared with the CC via email.
- A conference call on 3/24 will be held with the CC to do a consensus check on the Charter prior to the 3/29 Partnership meeting.
- There will be brief updates on the status of the Work Plan and Communication/Outreach plan at the Partnership meeting.
- If there is any time remaining, an education component will be considered.

### **Communication and Outreach Plan**

- Harmony will send an up-date via email.

**Next Steps – see page 1.**