



Mid-Coast Water Planning Partnership

COORDINATING COMMITTEE

Meeting Notes

May 19, 2017, 9:00 am – 12:00 pm
Newport Recreation Center

NEXT STEPS

Communication and Outreach Plan

- Present draft for review by Partnership at 5/31 meeting - Harmony
- Plan field trips. See notes for suggestions. Project Team.
- Add CO Working Group meetings to master schedule - Jeanne

Technical Work Plan

- Email 'bibliography' to Coordination Committee members for their review and input prior to Partnership meeting – Adam
- Post Work Plan on Partnership Website prior to 5/31 meeting – stamp 'Draft' – Adam

Coordinating Committee (CC)

- Poll members of the CC to determine week of month that works best – Jeanne
- Provide CC access to master list of Partnership stakeholders – Harmony
- Include 'grant update' as standing agenda item on CC meetings – Jeanne
- Tim and/or Tia to stay in touch with MidCoast Watersheds Council to support Coho Business Plan efforts
- CC Members to develop brief biography to post on Partnership website

Participants:

- Tim Gross, Co-Convener, City of Newport
- Wayne Hoffman, MidCoast Watersheds Council
- Jitesh Pattni, ODFW
- Adam Denlinger, Seal Rock Water District
- Caroline Bauman, Economic Development Alliance of Lincoln County
- Stan VandeWetering, Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians

Unable to Attend:

- Harmony Burrignt, Co-Convener, OWRD
- Charlie Plybon, Newport Surfrider Foundation
- Rick McClung, City of Yachats
- Deborah Wilkins, USFS, Hebo Ranger Dist.
- Jackie Mikalonis, Governor's Office, Regional Solutions Team Alan Fujishin, Gibson Farms
- John Stevenson, OSU, Oregon Sea Grant
- Terry Thompson, Lincoln County Commissioner

Project Team in Attendance:

- Adam Sussman, GSI Water Solutions
- Shirlene Warnock, Innovative Growth Solutions
- Jeanne Nyquist, Innovative Growth Solutions
- Olaf Sweetman, City of Newport

Meeting Objectives:

- Review Communication, Education, Outreach Plan
- Review plan to present Technical Work Plan to Partnership
- Review Partnership Meeting agenda and materials for May 31, 2017

Discussion Notes

Welcome, Guidelines

- Facilitator reviewed meeting guidelines and guiding principles/values established in the Charter.

Communication and Outreach (CO) Plan

- A Communication and Outreach (CO) working group has been formed – includes 16 members from the Partnership representing a variety of groups.
- August-December 2016 – Initial communication tools and activities were developed:
 - Initial Partners database created
 - Invitation letters and emails sent
 - One-on-one outreach
 - Mailing list created (145 people have subscribed)
 - Website created
- January – May 2017
 - Working Group formed
 - Draft Communication and Outreach (CO) Plan developed with input from Working Group
 - January-March – Draft Plan developed – sent to Working Group for review
 - May – Plan to be reviewed with Coordinating Committee and presented to Partnership for approval on 5-31-17

Communication Outreach Plan Overview

- The CO Plan captures where we are at – it is meant to evolve over time as our communication and outreach needs change.
- Distributed leadership model. Different members of the CO group will be encouraged to lead as their time and abilities allow – OWRD will help with coordination.
- Goal based strategy. Tools and activities will be identified to achieve certain goals – documented in a worksheet. Initial goals identified, though worksheets have not yet been developed for each goal.
- Materials will be maintained and updated online to allow for sections of the plan to change and grow. Living web-based document that will reflect the CO members.

Field Trips:

- Field trips are being planned to educate the Partnership and other interested parties about the water resources in the mid-Coast. During Step 2, three field trips will be offered from June – November, 2017:

1. July: Watershed Processes from uplands to estuaries – Salmon Creek Watershed. Potential co-organizers – USFS, The Wetlands Conservancy, Water District.
2. September: Watershed quantity and supply, highlighting reservoirs, Siletz River streamflows, intake stations and geology. Potential co-organizers – OWRD, City of Newport, City of Toledo, Georgia Pacific, CTSI, DEQ.
3. November – Built infrastructure – source watersheds, water capture/storage/treatment in Waldport/Yachats. Potential co-organizers: Cities of Waldport and Yachats, DEQ.

Next Steps

- Ongoing – Sustain current communication tools and activities with assistance from CO members and CC members.
- Ongoing – CO will work with Project Team and CC to identify future educational opportunities at Partnership meetings.
- May-November – CO members will help to coordinate complementary field trips (see proposed plan below).
- May-November – CO Working Group will do a deeper dive to develop goals, key messages, key audiences, communication tools.

Discussion:

- Grant: A letter of interest for a grant to fund communication, education, outreach activities has been submitted to Meyer Memorial Trust (MMT). The letter of interest was developed by Chase Park Grants with input from members of the CO Working Group. We expect to hear from MMT by late June if we will be invited to submit a formal grant application. If the invitation is extended, Chase Park Grants will take the lead in preparing the grant proposal, with support from the CO Working Group.
- CO Working Group Membership:
 - It was observed that several of the participants in the CO Working Group are representatives of state agencies. The Coordinating Committee (CC) discussed this and concluded that it is good to have a variety of state agencies involved in Partnership working groups to build understanding and support of Partnership activities. It was observed that the CO Working Group is fairly large – will there be opportunities for others to join? The CC suggested that the CO Working Group remain open to new members.
- Audiences – Suggestion was made to include outreach to potential providers of technical assistance.
- Field Trips – comments from CC:
 - Great value in field trips – example Water Resource Commission tour was a great success!
 - The topics proposed appear to be appropriate for the first 3 field trips.

- Suggestion to video field trips to post on Partnership website. Check the local high schools, Tribal Govt., OSU to see if they can provide assistance.
- Length of time – 4 hrs. on site is plenty, but may need more time to travel. Some field trips may take longer. The Salmon River trip may need 6 hrs. with a lunch break.
- Use the Water Resources Commission tour as a model – Tim has the model for this.
- Include the small water providers to help build understanding of what they are up against.
- Consider a visit to Olalla Reservoir – It would be illustrative to go from river to reservoir to see what the challenges are and understand the differences between industrial vs. public use of water.
- Be sure to connect the dots on the field trips.
- Field trip 2 – have a presentation at the Tribal office to provide information as part of the tour, especially for areas that are difficult to access.

Technical Work Plan

Adam Sussman, GSI Water Resources, provided an overview of the technical work plan. Adam emphasized the following:

- The purpose of Step 2 is to characterize our water resources. This will be a high level review and description, primarily based on currently available data and information. We will also identify ‘data gaps’ and determine which ones we need to fill. We will delve into more detail on these topics in later steps of the planning process.
- Three Study Groups will be formed to assist GSI in collecting, reviewing and developing the information. The three study groups will be organized around Water Quality, Water Quantity and Built Systems. Ecology is an overarching topic that will be discussed in all study groups. Funding will be addressed through outreach to specific stakeholders.
- We will need the CCs help to develop the information so that at the end of Step 2, the members of the Partnership will have a consistent level of knowledge to enable them to evaluate potential solutions.
- Adam presented a list of informational resources that GSI has collected to date. Adam will email the list to Coordinating Committee members and asked that they review and suggest additional information resources including data, studies, reports and people.

Discussion:

- Wayne suggested that it would be good to talk about the study groups and how they will be organized and also to have a follow-up process for people to provide data to Adam.
- Caroline asked if it would be possible to table the discussion of funding and economy to a later date as many of the people interested in this topic will be attending another meeting the same night as the Partnership meeting. Adam responded that funding will be discussed with an interest group or individuals at another time.

- Wayne commented that this process needs to identify critical information gaps. He pointed out that some of the gaps can be answered with existing data, but some may require funding to develop new data. Adam responded that we will be developing a list of data gaps, as Wayne suggested.
- The facilitators explained the process for discussing this topic at the Partnership meeting. Adam will provide an overview of the work plan, followed by 2 rounds of table group discussions led by table hosts. Table group discussions will include a review of the 'bibliography' (i.e. list of informational resources) and a discussion to identify additional information resources and data gaps. Table groups will be asked to identify what information should be focused on.
- CC suggested that the Work Plan be posted on the Partnership website in advance of the meeting. Work Plan should include all 5 steps, highlighting that Step 2 will be the focus of the May 31 Partnership meeting. Adam will stamp 'draft for future discussion' on Steps 3-5 of the Work Plan.
- Tim reviewed the 'bibliography' and observed that electronic links are often out of date. He suggested that we download reports and data and save to a Partnership repository to preserve the data.
- Workflow and Scheduling for Step 2: June – November. CC suggested: CC meetings – Wednesdays or Fridays work best for CC members; however, there is not a consistent day of the week in which everyone can attend. It was suggested to poll the Committee to identify week of month that works the best for everyone.
- Caroline commented that CO Working Group meetings need to be added to the master schedule.
- Wayne commented that he expected more than 2 meetings for the Study Groups. Adam explained that although 2 meetings are planned for the groups during Step 2, we will be reaching out to individuals or subsets of the groups to help develop and analyze information. Adam reiterated that the purpose of Step 2 is to develop a high level characterization of water resources. More in-depth study and analysis will occur in the future during Steps 2 and 3.
- CC members commented that July 12 is not a good date for Coordinating Committee meeting. Facilitators will poll the Committee for a more satisfactory date.
- It was suggested that Steps 3 and 4 of the planning process be discussed at the July Coordinating Committee meeting.
- Facilitators reviewed agenda for 5/31 Partnership meeting. Jitesh volunteered to be a greeter and orient first timers.
- The Committee expressed interest in the listing of all stakeholders. The stakeholder spreadsheet will be provided to CC members.

Good of the Order:

Announcements

- **Bend PBP Workshop**
 - Mid Coast Partnership will send up to 7 participants.

- **Coho Business Plan Update – Wayne Hoffman**
 - MidCoast Watersheds Council (MCWC) is preparing to submit a Coho Business Plan application – due by the end of next week.
 - OWRD will participate if the application is selected.
 - The work will focus on the Siletz Basin. There are opportunities for synergy with the Mid Coast Water Planning Partnership.
 - Timing – If the MCWC application is approved, there will be 1 – 2 years of work beginning in July or August 2017.
 - Program will involve NOAA, Wild Salmon Center, Oregon Dept. of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW), Tribes, and Nature Conservancy.
 - The plan will study opportunities on in stream flows and management of watershed, including looking at how restoration upstream impacts downstream intakes.
 - Stan commented that the Business Plan will result in a strategic action plan that will identify basin restoration and needs for additional data. The Plan may lead to future funding.
 - Wayne commented that one of the products of the Plan will be an updated list of potential restoration projects, backed up by tools not used before. The process will identify data gaps, and there may be synergy with the Partnership in developing data that will be useful to both processes. The development of data and a strategic action plan may increase opportunities for funding.
 - The Committee observed that there is opportunity for beneficial overlap between the Coho Business Plan and the work of the Partnership.

- **Update on grant pursuits**

Tim presented an update on grant pursuits to support the work of the Partnership over next 3 years. Tia Cavender, Chase Park Grants, was not in attendance at the meeting; however, she has provided additional information in the notes below:

 - We currently have only 1/3 of the needed funding secured.
 - This report includes a lot of assumptions and is based on grants that we currently have as well as ones that we are pursuing.
 - Army Corps of Engineers (CoE) is included as ‘value added’ but does not provide dollars to pay for Partnership expenses.
 - We need to keep updating this report as the situation will change month to month.

Discussion:

- Stan asked if we have funding from Bureau of Reclamation (BoR). Tim responded – not at this time, but this funding could be pursued a couple years down the road.
- Caroline asked if the Meyer Memorial Trust (MMT) grant pursuit is to support the CO committee. Tim responded he believes this is correct, but needs to verify. Tia has since confirmed that the grant will be used to help:
 - Pay consultants to conduct the work outlined in the pilot grant, and
 - Implement the Communication and Outreach Plan (including providing funding to pay for staff time).
- Caroline commented that the CO committee would like to secure staff time. Tim indicated the grant request will include hard costs and scholarships to fund time. Tia provided clarification that the goal is to secure funding for staff time; however, this funding objective is secondary to the primary objective to conduct the work outlined in the OWRD grant, specifically to convene the Partnership and develop the Integrated Water Resources Plan (IWRP).
- Caroline asked - who is writing the grant? Tim explained that Chase Park developed the initial letter of interest with input from Charlie Plybon. The MMT will review the letters of interest that have been submitted and will hopefully invite us to submit a formal grant application. City of Newport is the applicant and needs to be administrator of the grant funds. Charlie Plybon sent a letter of support.
- Tim explained that City of Newport, working with Chase Park Grants, uses a strategic grant process. They evaluate grant opportunities and look for ones that align with our mission and goals. Tim emphasized it is important to look for partners with whom we can focus investments. We need to be careful not to pursue opportunities that are not aligned with our charter and work plan. For example, we have had some discussions with Ford Family Foundation. This may be an opportunity for funding – IF the goals of the Foundation align with our Charter and work plan.
- Tim emphasized that we will pursue funding opportunities as they arise, but they must align with our Charter and work plan.
- Caroline commented that we will need to consider as part of the strategy who can be a funding partner. She explained that some grantors will not provide funding to municipalities. In this case, other members of the Partnership may need to be the grant applicant.
- Wayne asked if the grant pursuits will fund infrastructure items. Tim explained that we are currently focused on seeking funds to support the planning process. He further explained that there are many more sources to fund infrastructure items, and it can be easier to obtain funding for the more concrete infrastructure projects. Down the road, when we need to raise funding for infrastructure, the OWEB Circuit Riders may provide assistance.
- Caroline commented that she has had discussions with Congressman Schraeder recalling the Declaration of Salmon disaster. The Partnership should stay in touch with the Congressman on this issue. Tia has since responded that we will add this item to the City of Newport's

Government Relations Plan and will look for opportunities to engage Congressman Schraeder in Partnership activities.

- The Committee concluded that Tim or Tia should be part of Coho Business Plan discussions to coordinate approach on application to OWEB/FIP to avoid competition between the Coho Business Plan and work of the Partnership. Tia has responded that it will be important to make sure that funding pursuits are coordinated and avoid 'competition' within the Partnership. The City of Newport will continue to update the Partnership about grant pursuits and will rely on Partners to share their pursuits so that we can coordinate efforts.
- The Committee would like to have a funding/grant update at every CC meeting. Tia will prepare an update for every CC meeting.

Parking Lot Items

- **Full Disclosure of Representation** – The Committee continued its discussion from the 3/10/17 and 4/14/17 Coordinating Committee meetings to clarify the expectations of Coordinating Committee members in disclosing which entities they represent.
 - The facilitators began the discussion by illustrating that each member of the CC 'wears different hats' representing different perspectives. Each Committee member needs to speak on behalf of the entities they represent, and they also need to be prepared to 'put on the Partnership hat' to act in the best interest of the Partnership as a whole.
 - Wayne commented that it has been generally acknowledged that members often represent multiple interests and receive funding from multiple resources. Wayne believes that the Coordinating Committee does not need to know the details of funding resources for individual members.
 - Caroline commented that we each fulfill the role of representing an interest on the CC and we should state which interests we represent.
 - Jitesh commented that, for purposes of the CC, we are at a current understanding about which entities members of the Committee represent. However, if there is a change in representation, this should be disclosed to the group.
 - Wayne commented that part of our role is to provide our perspective to the discussion, but a whole lot of our work is being in service to the Partnership, which calls us to transcend our individual perspectives.
 - Tim commented that all of the work we do is influenced by the lenses we look through, and the diversity of our perspectives is important to the discussion.
 - Jitesh observed that we gain credibility and buy in from the Partnership because of the diversity of the membership of the CC.
 - The Committee discussed and agreed on the following:
 - When discussing an issue, we will all clarify the perspective we are coming from.

- If a change occurs and we represent a different interest, we will share this information with the Committee. Each of us should be self-aware and let the CC know if our role changes.
 - We appreciate the diversity of the Committee. All voices need to be represented and heard.
 - When we approach the Partnership, we need to stand behind the collective efforts of the Coordinating Committee and remember that the Coordinating Committee represents the Partnership.
- Stan suggested that the Coordinating Committee members each provide a brief biography that we could post on the Partnership website. This would help the Partnership know more about the CC, understand the diversity of perspectives, and demonstrate transparency. The Committee agreed that each member would develop a brief biography.
- **Committee Notes:** This item was brought forward from discussion at the 3/10/17 meeting. It was agreed that the facilitators will:
 - Attribute discussion comments when practical.
 - Identify sensitive discussion topics and review key points for the notes prior to concluding the discussion.
 - Send draft notes from CC meetings out to the CC members for their review and comment for one week prior to posting the notes on the Partnership website.
- **Other:**
 - Agenda Development – The CC agenda is sent out prior to the CC meeting. If a member of the CC wants an item on the agenda, they are welcome to let the Conveners and/or facilitators know ahead of time.
 - Project Team (PT) agenda/notes – Wayne asked if the PT notes/action items should be shared in the interest of transparency. Currently, Project Team meeting notes consist of a list of action items to support Coordinating Committee and Partnership meetings. There was not sufficient time to discuss this item, so it was placed in the parking lot.

Parking Lot

The following items remain in the Parking Lot for discussion at a future meeting.

- Opportunities – table until next meeting
- OSU’s participation - table until next meeting
- CC membership – table until next meeting
- Project Team meeting notes