



Mid-Coast Water Planning Partnership

COORDINATING COMMITTEE

Meeting Notes

May 18, 2018, 9 am – noon
Newport City Hall, Conf. Room A

NEXT STEPS / ACTION ITEMS

- Jackie Mikalonis will ask Jason Miner to meet w/the 4 pilots to discuss policy issues and funding processes to support these planning efforts.
- GSI will list conservation as an issue – we should identify the problem like leaky pipes, waste water, etc.
- IGS/GSI will work on logistics to bring the working groups together in June, including a doodle poll to identify best time for the WG collective meeting.
- Outreach to Georgia Pacific – co-conveners will plan a strategy to reach out to GP.

Brought FWD from April Meeting Action items -

ODFW Representation -

- Jackie Mikalonis and Wayne Hoffman will discuss how to get a representative from ODFW to fill Jitesh Pattni’s role.

Funding -

- Jackie Mikalonis and Tim Gross will have a follow-up discussion to see if there are monies from regional infrastructure funds available to support this effort.

Upcoming Meetings –

- **Partnership:** May 30, 4 – 8 pm, Newport Best Western. Project Team to outline the agenda.

Participants:

- Tim Gross, Co-Convener, City of Newport
- Alan Fujishin, Co-Convener, Gibson Farms
- Adam Denlinger, Co-Convener Seal Rock Water District
- Wayne Hoffman, MidCoast Watersheds Council
- Caroline Bauman, Economic Development Alliance of Lincoln Co.
- Jackie Mikalonis, Governor’s Office, Regional Solutions Team
- Jim Tooke, City of Yachats

Work Group Spokespersons:

- Audrey Sweet, LSWCD
- Joyce Sherman, Resident

Unable to Attend:

- Matt Thomas, OR Dept. of Forestry
- Harmony Burrig, Co-Convener, OWRD
- Terry Thompson, Lincoln County Commissioner
- Stan VandeWetering, Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians
- Charlie Plybon, Newport Surfrider Foundation
- Amber Nickerson, OSU Student

Project Team in Attendance:

- Ronan Igloria, and Ingria Jones, GSI Water Solutions
- Shirlene Warnock and Jeanne Nyquist, Innovative Growth Solutions

Objectives:

- Report on progress of Work Groups
- Prepare for Partnership meeting 5/30/18
- Communication and Outreach status report
- Funding status report

Water Planning Workshop in Bend:

- Caroline reported that we had a good delegation from Lincoln Co. We exhibited leadership. Ford Family Foundation was there.
- Tim Gross reported there was discussion of developing a Learning Partnership so we can share knowledge and information amongst the four pilot groups. Format would be to visit each other's planning groups and then gather in Salem during Legislative session to communicate to the legislators with a more unified voice. The PBP process is much more expensive than anticipated. Tim emphasized that the state needs to provide funding if they want these planning processes to continue.
- Alan Fujishin also emphasized the need for funding for implementation so that the plans don't just sit on the shelf after they have been completed.
- Wayne Hoffman explained that Harney Co. has come to the conclusion that they could manage their water better if they weren't restricted by water rights that allocate water based on senior/junior water rights. Harney may create a plan that is not in line with existing water rights laws.
- Joyce Sherman commented that this process started 30-40 years too late. All rivers are over-appropriated.
- Ingria Jones – The pilots are all unique, but the funding and communication issues are common amongst the pilots. Continuing to build support and bringing new members into the Partnership is important for the longevity of the plan.
- Caroline Bauman – Given the gap in state funding, people are looking to philanthropy for funding. The 4 pilots are competing with one another. We discussed working together to pursue grant funding collectively.
- Wayne Hoffman – Implementation plans in each pilot are going to be very different. This will be a complicated thing for the legislature to deal with. We need to strategize about how to present this to the legislature. Funding will need to come from different sources.
- Jackie Mikalonis suggested that the funding strategy needs to be developed with participation from the Governor's office so that they can help to coordinate the funding requests going through different committees. We need to get Policy Advisor for Natural Resources plugged in early.
- Adam Denlinger – Business Oregon recognizes that the system is not working. They would like to provide more funding to qualified applicants, but they are constrained by their own boundaries and processes.
- Ingria Jones – We need to do public outreach as well as outreach for funding.

- Tim Gross emphasized that the Learning Partnership might be able to communicate as a whole that we need more water funding and streamlined processes for funding. We would carry more weight if we could communicate common issues/solutions.
- Jackie Mikalonis reiterated that we need to get the policy people to the table early so that they can help us figure out the best approach. Jackie will ask Jason Miner to meet w/the 4 pilots to discuss policy issues and funding processes to support these planning efforts.

Report on Progress of Work Groups (WGs)

Ronan Igloria provided an overview of the work plan. He reported that we are on track with the work plan. (See attached flow chart)

- WGs survey constituents and prioritize issues - spring
- WGs work on issues – summer
- Needs assessment – fall

To help expedite the process, we will present a preliminary draft of focus areas to the Partnership on May 30. This will support the work done in steps 1 and 2. After the May 30 meeting, we will meet with the WGs to finalize these issues, and then we will begin to work on the focus issues.

Ronan clarified that the surveys were focused on WGs. We are now elevating the discussion to the basin scale. Each WG should be able to recognize how their issue fits into the overall picture.

Tim Gross commented that some of these issues will conflict. The purpose of our planning process is to figure out how the strategies work together and to describe the intersection of the issues, such as – we know we need more water for municipal use and we need more water for instream. We need to be able to articulate this.

Ronan emphasized that we will need to identify the high priority issues so that we can focus limited resources on studying high priority issues.

Joyce Sherman - At this point do we need to identify that we are not going to be able to deal with some of the issues we have identified; i.e. we identified the need to restore natural systems. We are not going to be able to remove Hwy. 101 to restore the estuaries.

Tim Gross – Any kind of large scale water improvement will require mitigation. If we need to develop water resources and this impacts fish passage, then we need to develop mitigation strategies and determine how these actions all intersect.

Wayne Hoffman – There are ways to simplify by setting priorities. For instream work that is relevant to this planning process, we need to prioritize by use and potential use as a public water source. For instance, Drift Creek/Alsea is a beautiful stream. No one is contemplating this as a water source. So we should not make this stream a priority for our study.

Tim Gross commented (and several agreed) that the plan needs to address current issues as well as anticipate future issues.

Wayne Hoffman – We need to identify how much water we need as well as ask if we are effectively utilizing the water we are already taking out of streams (i.e. fixing leaky pipes, low flow toilets, other conservation measures).

Alan Fujishin – We need to catalog and record all of the issues. Many of these issues will overlap – these are the ones we need to focus on as priorities.

Caroline Bauman – We will have quite a few Partnership members at the May 30 meeting. We need to ask them what they think. There are multiple constituencies in business. Businesses are interested in conservation measures. Tourists also want to conserve water.

Ingria Jones – This is a framing process. We need to identify the core issues and continue to get input from the Partnership. The WGs can continue to reach out to get specific information. The survey is a living tool that can still be used to gather information.

Alan Fujishin – Even though we draw a line around what we can achieve given our resources, we still need to continue to capture and communicate issues as we go forward.

Tim – All of these issues fall under major categories of policy, funding, politics, structure etc. We are a resource poor region. The number one issue is communication and coordination with one another regarding water. We need to talk about these core things.

Self-Supplied Work Group Report - Audrey Sweet

What came up in the survey is what we already knew. See attached summary of major issues.

- We did not get information on how much water the self-suppliers use by category or how water is distributed across basins.
- The WG did not get all of the information we wanted/expected from the survey. The format was not very approachable. For people outside our process, the survey was not easy to fill out. A survey monkey format would've been easier for people to access. Some of the issues did not fit the survey, so people did not fill them out.
- We identified data gaps and are planning ways to collect this information.

Wayne Hoffman explained that Audrey's job with LCSWCD is to help rural landowners better manage resources. There is distrust from rural property owners about govt. intervention. Landowners will see a benefit to the kinds of things that Audrey and the Partnership can bring to the table. This will help build trust and communication.

Alan Fujishin commented that about half of our WGs responses came from interviewing individual landowners. We had few responses from Lincoln City. No responses from Alsea and N. Lincoln Co.

Instream WG – Joyce Sherman

- Problems we are looking at are not readily solved, and it takes a long time to find the right solutions.
- There was frustration with the magnitude of the problems and difficulty fitting this information into the survey.
- In-stream is addressing undefined, larger problems.
- Water quality issues are due in a large part to lack of water quantity. Our rain patterns have changed. We no longer have significant rain in the summer. And, there is less dew throughout the year.

- Tim Gross commented that it is important to list issues, even if they seem insurmountable.

Muni/WD – Jim Tooke

- No response from Depoe Bay and Waldport.
- Regional planning efforts are always a struggle.
- Individual cities cannot solve the water problems themselves. We need regional cooperation, not regional competition.
- This is an issue that is not going to go away. The best solution is a regional solution – it won't happen city by city.
- People typically don't respond unless it impacts their pocketbook.
- Yachats has very limited funding for infrastructure work. It's important to continue to communicate about water issues and keep people involved in the process.

Adam Denlinger commented that conservation needs to be included in the study. How we plan for water will impact all of us. We need to continue to collaborate, share information, and tell the story. Adam confirmed that this WG outreached to water districts and municipalities - not to individual customers. The WG was disappointed that we did not receive level of anticipated response to survey. Some people just did not have the capacity to complete the survey. We should be grateful for the responses we received. As we continue to get information and input, we need to listen. For instance, we need to be open to hearing about issues – like the water shortage in Yachats – and we need to include these issues in our planning process.

Wayne Hoffman said it is disappointing that water conservation is low on the list. Ingria Jones responded that every group mentioned conservation – it was listed under solutions. Wayne suggested that conservation be listed as an issue – we should identify the problem like leaky pipes, waste water, etc.

Tim Gross – Conservation is complex – it involves detailed analysis of rate. We need to focus on conservation, but the effort compared to measureable results will be minor. It will be a tough thing to implement.

Wayne Hoffman – We may need to identify some new tools. Expertise that is not available in the county could be helpful in calculating different rate structures that encourage conservation.

Work Group next steps

Audrey Sweet commented that the survey being planned by Oregon Kitchen Table (OKT) needs to help us gather specific information that the WGs need.

Wayne Hoffman suggested a meeting in June to bring all of the WGs together to discuss the intersection of the issues. Ronan Igloria clarified that the WG huddle at the Partnership meeting would be an opportunity to discuss the results of the prioritization; then the WGs meet individually in June to vet the results. At least one of the WGs is already planning to meet June 20. It might work out to have all of the WGs meet the same day to share information and develop next steps. IGS/GSI will work on these logistics, including a doodle poll to identify best time for the WG collective meeting.

Planning for Partnership Meeting, May 30

Jeanne Nyquist reviewed the plan to facilitate discussion / prioritization of WG issues:

- GSI will provide an overview of the needs assessment process and remind participants how the WG surveys and prioritization fits into the overall needs assessment process.
- WGs will each provide a 10 minute briefing of completed activities and survey responses.
- GSI will propose a 'straw dog' in two formats:
 - Listing of priority issues for study
 - Map depicting how these issues show up on the geography of the region
- Prioritization exercise will be conducted –
 - Issues identified by the WGs will be posted on the wall
 - Each participant gets sticky dots to post on their highest priority issues
 - A 'graffiti chart' will also be posted on the wall so participants can respond to 2 questions:
 - Did we miss anything?
 - Are there synergistic opportunities we haven't yet recognized?
- After a break, the results of the prioritization exercise will be discussed. Then, participants will be given one more sticky dot for an opportunity to identify additional priority issues that may emerge as a result of the discussion.
- Following the prioritization exercise, the USACE will give a report on climate change. The USACE representative will not be able to be present, so the information will be presented in a webinar type format.

Communication and Outreach – Caroline Bauman

- Grant stipend – Has been announced. We have received 2 requests for funding. Selection Committee is Caroline Bauman, Patti Ferry, and Mark Farley.
- Oregon Kitchen Table – Survey to be done later in the summer – September, when water levels are lower and there is more interest in water.
- Panels – Peer based panel is being scheduled for June 14.
- Field Tour – Harmony is working with Wayne to plan a field tour for later this summer.
- Outreach to Georgia Pacific – co-conveners will plan a strategy to reach out to GP.
- Caroline emphasized that the goal of Communication and Outreach Committee is to get people to the table.

Funding

Jeanne Nyquist reported that funding contributions pledged this spring toward the OWRD matching grant include:

Cash Contributions:

❖ Lincoln City	\$2,000
❖ Lincoln Co.	\$1,500
❖ Seal Rock WD	\$5,000
❖ Lincoln Co Farm Bureau	\$ 300
❖ Gibson Farms	\$ 200
❖ OWRD Matching Grant	\$7,500 15,000
Total	\$16,500 24,000

In-Kind Contributions:

City of Yachats has offered to host the August 28 Partnership meeting.

Caroline Bauman will ask Newport Chamber for a contribution.

Tim will deliver a presentation to the Confederated Tribes of Siletz at their June meeting.

Ford Family Foundation will likely contribute \$10,000 to the Partnership as a part of the Learning Partnership. This has not yet been secured.

Alan Fujishin will present the funding update information at the May 30 Partnership meeting.

Parking Lot –

- Conservation and efficiency will be an issue for all of the groups
- Workforce development idea
- Coordinating Committee bios, Partner Directory & bios
- Charter signatures – all Coordinating Committee members must sign the charter
- River Network grant opportunity was removed from parking lot