



# Mid-Coast Water Planning Partnership

## Partnership Meeting Notes - DRAFT

November 30, 2016

### Next Steps

- Coordinating Committee to further refine Charter and Work Plan. Next Coordinating Committee Meeting December 16, 2016, 1 – 4 pm, Location to be determined
- Form Communication and Outreach Subgroup.
- **Next meeting of Partnership January 25, 2017, from 4 -7 pm. Location to be determined. Please be prepared to discuss:**
  - What water-related information do you have and use in your work?
  - What water-related information do you wish you had that would make your job easier, better, more effective?

### Discussion Notes

**Date:** November 30, 2016, 4:00 – 7:00 pm

**Location:** Center for Health Education at Pacific Samaritan Hospital, 740 SW 9<sup>th</sup> St., Newport, OR

**Participants:** Approximately 41 people representing a broad range of water-related interests (see page 19-21 for list of participants)

**Conveners:** Timothy Gross, Public Works Director and City Engineer, City of Newport  
Harmony Burrigh, Planning Coordinator, Oregon Water Resources Department

**Project Team:** Jeanne Nyquist and Shirlene Warnock, Facilitators – Innovative Growth Solutions  
Adam Sussman, Consultant – GSI Water Solutions

### Meeting Objectives:

- Present progress on the rough draft Charter for discussion and input.
- Forecast scope of work plan and describe how it will be developed.
- Identify information resources and needs and define educational needs.

*The following notes summarize the Partnership discussion. For additional detail, please see handouts and presentation for Partnership Meeting 2, November 30, 2016 (on the website listed below) - Including slides from presentations by the following:*

- *Seal Rock Water District – Adam Denlinger*
- *Mid-Coast Watersheds Council – Wayne Hoffman*
- *Gibson Farms – Alan Fujishin*

[www.midcoastwaterpartners.com](http://www.midcoastwaterpartners.com)



## Welcome – Overview of Planning Process

Co-Conveners, Harmony Burrig, Oregon Water Resources Department (OWRD) and Timothy Gross, City of Newport Public Works Director and City Engineer, welcomed participants to the kickoff meeting for the Mid-Coast Water Planning Partnership.

- Harmony provided background on the state’s Integrated Water Resources Strategy (IWRS) and explained that the Mid-Coast Region is one of four regions in the state that received grant funding to undertake a regional water planning exercise (also referred to as “place-based planning”), which will result in an integrated water plan for the region. City of Newport is providing matching funding.
- Harmony provided an overview of the steps in the planning process. She explained that the planning process will entail 5 steps. The first 2 steps are funded, and we are seeking funding to support steps 3 – 5.
  - Step 1: Build a collaborative and integrated process
  - Step 2: Characterize water resources
  - Step 3: Quantify current and future needs
  - Step 4: Identify integrated solutions to meet needs
  - Step 5: Develop an integrated water resources plan
- Harmony reviewed the Partnership Structure that was discussed at the Partnership’s first meeting on September 29, 2016. She explained that a Coordinating Committee has been formed, consisting of the Conveners and 13 representative members of the Partnership. The role of the Coordinating Committee is to gather information and frame issues for discussion by the Partnership, communicate with stakeholders, and advocate for a planning process that balances interests. See handouts from November 30, 2016, meeting for more detail on the Partnership Structure and roles.

- Tim Gross summarized the expected outcomes for this process, including:
  - Build relationships and develop a partnership
  - Share knowledge and information
  - Understand and characterize our water resources
  - Identify future water supply needs
  - Strategize how to make the most of limited resources
  - Work together to develop and prioritize our options
  - Develop a long-term action plan to address water challenges

### Charter (Governance Agreement)

The facilitator explained that a Charter (sometimes called an ‘Operating Agreement’ or ‘Governance Agreement’) is a document that defines the purpose of the Partnership and memorializes how we agree to work together. The Partnership provided input on the Charter at its September 29, 2016 meeting. The Coordinating Committee subsequently met twice to begin drafting the Charter.

- Tonight, the Partnership:
  - Reviewed and identified suggested changes to: Mission, Goals, and Guiding Principles by discussing each of these sections in table groups.
  - Brainstormed concepts for the Vision section by identifying potential ‘newspaper headlines’ in 2021 reporting on the success of the Partnership.
  - Reviewed and provided feedback on Structure and Decision Making sections by discussing each of these sections in table groups.
- The Draft Charter is included in the notes as Appendix A. The Draft presents the proposed language, followed by a *summary* of the comments from discussion by the Partnership. Following the last page of the Charter are detailed notes from each of the table group discussions.
- Next Steps:
  - The Coordinating Committee will meet to incorporate input from tonight’s meeting and continue to develop the remaining sections of the Charter.
  - The next draft of the Charter will be shared with the Partnership for review and comment at the January 25, 2017 meeting.

## Work Plan

Adam Sussman, GSI Water Solutions:

- What is a work plan?
  - Work plan defines what we are going to do together.
  - Clear articulation of the tasks we are going to undertake to develop implementable strategies for meeting water needs.
  - This is a logical step in the process – Collect, analyze information to understand problems and help develop consensus-based solutions.
  - Why? We don't want to be rudderless as we go through this process. A Work Plan will help us to be more focused, effective, and efficient.
- We are operating under a grant from State of Oregon and we need to do a good job of defining a scope of work.
- The Partnership is ultimately responsible to develop the work plan. GSI will help you deliver the work plan.
- We have already started building the work plan with the assistance of Coordinating Committee.
- We need to gather information about supply, demand, and shortfall to help quantify the problems and provide data so that we can develop solutions that work for the Mid-Coast.
- The Charter we are developing together will help us when it comes to prioritizing actions and recommendations, realizing that we will need to develop recommendations even when we have differing opinions.
- In developing the work plan, we need to understand what information we have available and where we have information gaps that we need to fill.
- By spring of 2017 we will have a well-defined work plan with task, budget, and deliverables.

### Work Plan Discussion:

Comment: Concern that this process won't lead to anything meaningful. For example, 10 years ago ODFW developed Elk Management Plan. Every area had its own team involving diverse interests that reached consensus on management actions. We got done, took it to wildlife commission, they didn't like it and developed their

own plan and disregarded the work that was done at the grassroots level. How is this process going to be any different?

Response: This is a unique process – not like ones of the past. This process is non-traditional. You are going to talk about what you want to do in your region. You can make recommendations to State agencies. Ideally this plan will identify things that cities, landowners, water providers are going to do, identify beneficial partnerships. (Harmony Burrigh)

We don't want this plan to be something that sits on the bookshelf. This is not a plan for state agencies. This is a plan that WE together are implementing. We may ask for some assistance from state agencies to help us out as partners, but WE are defining the actions that we will take. We will come up with strategies that we will implement. This process will help us to move forward in managing our water resources as a region and will help to support us as we apply for grants or request other resources from state agencies. Ultimately we are responsible for implementing our own plan – we may ask for help from others, but it is our responsibility to create this plan and implement it so that it works for our communities and our regions. (Tim Gross)

Comment: We need some kind of assurance from the state agencies that our recommendations will be supported.

Response: Through this process we will think through the requirements and potential obstacles. The alternative is for everyone to continue working on their own without a shared strategy. This should not – and will not – be a waste of time. (Tim Gross)

This is an important conversation that we should continue as partners to ensure that the process results in meaningful outcomes. (Harmony Burrigh)

## Partnership Presentations

As we develop a work plan, it's important for us to think about what information is already available to us (data, investigations, plans, etc), and what information we need to support better decision-making. In order to help the partners thinking about the information they have and what information they need/want, three Coordinating Committee members each delivered a presentation exploring this topic. The first presentation was by Adam Denlinger the General Manager of the Seal Rock Water District, Wayne Hoffman of the Mid-Coast Watersheds Council, and Alan Fujishin of Gibson Farms. The presentations can be accessed online at:

When the partners come back in January, we will be asking . . .

- What water-related information do I have and use?

What water-related information do you wish you had that would make your job easier and better? This will help us to identify gaps in information.

### **Mid Coast Water – Fun Facts:** Adam Sussman, GSI Water Resources

- 63 storage water rights in the planning area.
- Largest storage right is 1420 acre-feet from Olalla Creek.
- 93 instream water rights in the planning area, covering 42 different bodies of water.
- City of Newport holds the oldest water right in the planning area - May 10, 1909 for the use of water from Big Creek.
- 14 surface water claims in the planning area.
- The oldest surface water claim is November 6, 1876.

### **Education and Outreach Working Group – Harmony Burrig, OWRD**

- Harmony sought volunteers for a working group that will:
  - Coordinate the educational component of the Partnership meetings;
  - Develop a communication and outreach strategy to ensure an open and transparent process and to engage the broader community;
  - Develop communication materials for the Partnership and for external audiences to increase awareness and foster engagement in the planning process. .
- Harmony asked everyone to contribute the following information, which will help the group plan educational presentations:
  - What is one water-related topic that you think everyone in this room should know about?
  - What topic would you like to know more about?
  - What topic would you be willing and able to present on?

### **Next Steps**

- Coordinating Committee meets to incorporate your (Partnership) input and further develop Charter and Work Plan
- Next Planning Partnership Meeting:

- January 25, 2017, 4 – 7 PM
  - Review Draft Charter
  - Develop Work Plan
  - Education and Outreach Progress Report
  - Discuss the Benefits of Partnership



## Mid-Coast Water Planning Partnership

### DRAFT CHARTER

A **Charter** (sometimes called an ‘Operating Agreement’ or ‘Governance Agreement’) is a document that defines the purpose of the Partnership and memorializes how we agree to work together. The draft Charter will be developed by the Coordinating Committee (CC) to be presented to and tested with the Partnership.

#### FOR PARTNERSHIP REVIEW AND COMMENT

Includes Coordinating Committee input –  
November 4, 2016

Edits submitted 11/4 – 17

Coordinating Committee discussion 11/18/16

Coordinating Committee edits submitted through 11/25/16

*Partnership input on 11/30/16 in italic below dashed line*



## Mid-Coast Water Planning Partnership Draft Charter

- Round 1: (BLUE) with *summary of Partnership input at 11/30/16 meeting*
- Round 2: (GREEN) with *summary of Partnership input at 11/30/16 meeting*
- Round 3: (YELLOW) with *summary of Partnership input at 11/30/16 meeting.*
- Future: (WHITE) will be developed by Coordinating Committee to share and test with Partnership in early 2017.

| <b>DISCUSSION ROUND 1</b>   |   |
|---|---|
| <p><b>Mission / Purpose</b><br/> <i>Defines the overall mission or purpose of the Partnership.</i><br/> <i>Answers the question: Why do we exist?</i></p> | <p><b>The mission of the Mid-Coast Water Planning Partnership is to collaboratively develop a shared vision for our region’s water future and identify, promote and pursue strategies to sustain our ecosystem, our economy, and our community.</b></p> <hr style="border-top: 1px dashed black;"/> <p><u>Large group comments:</u> none</p> <p><u>Table group comments:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Makes sense – should be open-ended – not too specific. (4)</i></li> <li>• <i>All should be plural – ecosystems, economies, communities</i></li> <li>• <i>What does ‘water future’, ‘community’ mean – unclear</i></li> <li>• <i>Ecosystem – is there another word that is better? Natural systems?</i></li> <li>• <i>More emphasis on natural, ecosystems</i></li> <li>• <i>Do we aim to <u>sustain</u> our ecosystem or to sustain ecosystem services?</i></li> <li>• <i>Economy / jobs</i></li> <li>• <i>‘Sustain’ +</i></li> <li>• <i>We want to ‘thrive’ rather than ‘sustain’</i></li> <li>• <i>Missing ‘balance of needs’ – ‘community needs’</i></li> <li>• <i>Outreach education for all future generations for all species</i></li> <li>• <i>One earth, one watershed, one ocean, one ecosystem</i></li> <li>• <i>Water together for all users</i></li> <li>• <i>Short on natural / ecosystems</i></li> <li>• <i>Define the region – maps that show the region.</i></li> <li>• <i>‘Our’ possessive approach(?)</i></li> <li>• <i>Mission is planning not implementation.</i></li> </ul> <p><u>Questions:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>What is plan for implementation?</i></li> <li>• <i>Is outreach part of mission? Should outreach be part of the mission?</i></li> <li>• <i>Have we identified all key stakeholders – what is that process? Timing- when will all stakeholders be here? Need involvement now.</i></li> </ul> |

## Goals

*Defines the primary goals that will guide the work of the Partnership.  
Answers the question: What do we hope to accomplish?*

### The primary goals are:

- **Bring together diverse water interests to share information, knowledge and resources.**
- **Gather and analyze available information to better understand our water resources and systems to strategically inform future decision making.**
- **Develop a comprehensive vision and strategies for balancing competing water needs in the future.**
- **Create enduring partnerships that yield benefits for the economy, the environment, and our communities.**
- **Set the stage to implement strategies that achieve the vision.**

---

### Large group comments:

- *Not clear that education is part of our goals – need to be explicit*
- *Need to emphasize that resources are needed, including grant funding*

### Table group comments:

*Goal 1: First step is to bring people together*

*Goal 2 Data can be skewed to fit, tough to get objective view*

*Goal 3: Generic – we know this is made of several pieces – others may not*

*Goal 4: Create enduring and evolving partnerships*

*Goal 5:*

- ***This goal is redundant – dump it (2)***
- *Develop strategies that achieve the vision*
- *Could be unclear whether this means strategies that are in place and ready to go at the end of the process. Where will these strategies exist? Will it be in the plan or some other product?*
- *Edit: to develop action. Ready, set to work.*
- *We don't have a vision. Maybe we will later. . .*

*Suggested alternate language - The goal is to:*

- *Develop an integrated water resources plan with a high priority on:*
  - *Protecting the environment (has everyone agreed?)*
  - *Sustaining ecosystems, economies and communities**The second 2 are redundant*

### What is missing?

- *Water needs are discussed but storage and conservation are absent.*
- *Missing 'going out for \$\$\$\$'*
- *Identify gap between resources and demand*
- *Include: Education: Educate Partners*
- *Need education emphasis (use utility bill)*
- *Idea and concept of 'resiliency' – perhaps in #4 or #3?*

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>There is more to ‘environment’ than what has been captured here</i></li> <li>• <i>Add goal dealing with ‘respect’</i></li> </ul> <p><u>Overall comments:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Nothing lacking, goals look good (2)</b></li> <li>• <i>Goals are more process than outcomes – need to be more concrete.</i></li> <li>• <i>How might we compare the strategies to what we are used to seeing under a set of objectives?</i></li> <li>• <i>Cooperation through collaboration and common goals</i></li> <li>• <i>Collaboration through communities for clean water, air and soil.</i></li> <li>• <i>Comprehensive water quality testing</i></li> <li>• <i>Outreach – are all the critical stakeholders at the table or being represented in the process? And, at what stage?</i></li> <li>• <i>Facts vs. theories or perception – how to vet?</i></li> <li>• <i>Info gaps – how will data gaps be identified?</i></li> <li>• <i>Ensure info is good, factual and based on real data.</i></li> <li>• <i>Weakness – need to identify gap between resources and demand.</i></li> <li>• <i>Identify specific tasks to implement goals.</i></li> <li>• <i>Go over mission and goals at each meeting to keep us grounded.</i></li> <li>• <i>Environmental considerations need to be balanced with land owner needs.</i></li> </ul> <p><u>Questions:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>How will land owner water rights be affected?</i></li> <li>• <i>What will be the enforcement mechanism when an implementation plan is reached?</i></li> <li>• <i>Will this be a long-term, “living’ partnership with document, etc.? If so, will there be periodic opportunity to update to keep it all relevant, incorporate lessons-learned; new knowledge?</i></li> </ul> |
| <p><b>Guiding Principles</b><br/> <i>Identifies the key principles or values that will guide how the work together as a Partnership. Answers the question: How will we work together and treat one another?</i></p> | <p><b>The following principles guide how we will work together.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Partnership.</b> We recognize all interests and seek common ground to develop strategies that meet our collective needs.</li> <li>• <b>Transparency.</b> We create an inclusive process that openly shares information and interests, invites curiosity and encourages dialogue.</li> <li>• <b>Innovation.</b> We bring our best ideas and information to the table and explore innovative, out-of-the box solutions.</li> <li>• <b>Commitment.</b> We act in good faith to support the success of the Partnership in developing strategies that are in the best interest of the region.</li> <li>• <b>Flexibility.</b> We are open to new ideas and approaches and will adapt our process or approach to fit the needs of the partners.</li> </ul>  |

- **Action.** We seek practical near-term actions as well as longer term strategies.
- **Clarity.** We commit to expressing all of our findings in the simplest and clearest ~~most easily comprehensible~~ form possible.

In developing the integrated water resources plan, we place a high priority on:

- Protecting the environment and ensuring a healthy, resilient watershed.
- Sustaining the ecosystem, the economy, and our communities.
- Creating systems that are resilient to climate change and natural disaster.
- Stewarding the natural and built environments.

---

Large group comments:

- Last 4 points under guiding principles... are more like goals but are not specific enough, so remove them. Some felt these are good statements and should be moved to the 'goals' section.
- Add 'negotiate and compromise'.

Table group comments:

Wording:

- **Last section – Aren't these actually the goals? Points seem to overlap. Some felt these should be removed or put elsewhere. (7)**
- First section - Get rid of these – they're only values.
- Partnership: Wordsmith 'needs'
- 'Built environments' vague
- Transparency. 'We create an inclusive process that openly shares' . . .  
Comment: process doesn't 'share'
- Add: negotiation and compromise
- Partnership. We recognize all interests and seek common ~~ground~~ goals
- Transparency. 'Keep people'
- Last point: Stewardship of our water resources and human infrastructure.
- Commitment: 'We all agree to an oath to water'
- Commitment: Define Region – provide better definition.
- Create protection of our natural environment.

Comments:

- Stuff on how we are going to operate looks good.
- We can agree to disagree
- The larger the group, the more defined the principles should be.
- How do guiding principles help us achieve goals? These need to be in conversation.
- Sustaining the ecosystems, the economy, and our communities. Unpack. Elaborate at coordinating committee meeting. Process vs. outcomes.
- Actual / Factual
- Acknowledge uncertainty

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Include all stakeholders</i></li> <li>• <i>Transparency – decisions are made by stakeholder group and not steering committees</i></li> <li>• <i>Education as a goal.</i></li> <li>• <i>Resources (grant \$\$)</i></li> <li>• <i>Having systems that are resilient to natural disaster is clearly scope creep. While it is a consideration, it should not be a ‘high priority’</i></li> </ul> |
|--|--|

**DISCUSSION ROUND 2**

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <p><b>Vision</b><br/> <i>Defines the aspirational future that the Partnership hopes to accomplish. Answers the question: What is the future we hope to create?</i></p> | <p><b>Discussion: Fast forward 3 – 5 years. The media is touting the success of the Partnership. What will the ‘headlines’ say? The following feedback from the partnership will be combined with the issues and outcomes feedback from the Partnership on 9-29-16 (see notes posted on website), to create a first draft vision to share and test with the Partnership on 1-25-16.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Water consensus achieved . . . bond passes.</i></li> <li>• <i>Earthquake ready – Mid-Coast Rocky Creek Dam completed. Ribbon Cutting January 20, 2020. Economic, shovel ready through collaboration together.</i></li> <li>• <i>Lincoln County finds a sustainable water supply that does not kill a single fish.</i></li> <li>• <i>Water for fish and families</i></li> <li>• <i>Mid-Coast region begins implement of Mid-Coast water resources plan.</i></li> <li>• <i>Diverse group of water interests avoids water crises on Mid-Coast.</i></li> <li>• <i>Funding wave solves coastal water issues.</i></li> <li>• <i>Coastal County balances competing need for water demand with no drama.</i></li> <li>• <i>New regional partnership raises millions of dollars to secure water future on Mid Coast.</i></li> <li>• <i>Mid Coast water systems survive through Planning Partnership efforts.</i></li> <li>• <i>Mid Coast water planning partnership receives award for innovation.</i></li> <li>• <i>3-year study produces a process.</i></li> </ul> <p><u>Common words / concepts:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Water</i></li> <li>• <i>\$</i></li> <li>• <i>Projects</i></li> <li>• <i>Collaboration</i></li> <li>• <i>Cooperation</i></li> <li>• <i>Balance</i></li> <li>• <i>Resiliency</i></li> <li>• <i>Success</i></li> <li>• <i>Respect</i></li> <li>• <i>Clean water</i></li> </ul> |
|--|--|

## DISCUSSION ROUND 3

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <p><b>Membership</b><br/><i>Lists the organizations and individuals that have officially joined the Partnership</i></p>   | <p>The Partnership welcomes all stakeholders and actively seeks diverse perspectives, needs and expertise. Committed Partners as of 9/29/16 are listed in your packet of handouts.</p> <hr style="border-top: 1px dashed black;"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The Partnership welcomes all stakeholders and actively seeks diverse perspectives <del>needs</del>-(replace with ‘interests’) and expertise.</i></li> <li>• <i>Open door situation – anyone can participate. How are we ensuring balance?</i></li> <li>• <i>Use the word ‘citizen’ or ‘public’; not ‘stakeholder’</i></li> </ul>  |
| <p><b>Structure and Function</b><br/><i>Defines structure of Partnership. The structure and roles were discussed by the Partnership at the kickoff meeting on September 29.</i></p> | <p><b>Planning Partnership:</b> Broad group of stakeholders that commit to work collaboratively to identify current and future water challenges and plan together to meet future instream and out-of-stream water needs. The Planning Partnership provides direction to the Coordinating Committee and makes decisions about the contents of the final plan.</p> <p><b>Coordinating Committee:</b> Diverse group representing a range of Partnership interests. The Coordinating Committee is made up of Partners who get together between meetings of the Planning Partnership to provide advice to ensure that diverse interests are included, identify potential issues, gather information and frame issues for discussion by the Partnership, and advocate for a planning process that balances interests. The Coordinating Committee will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Frame issues and prepare information for discussion by the Planning Partnership.</li> <li>• Solicit diverse perspectives, listen to ideas that are not their own, and represent a broad range of perspectives.</li> <li>• Work to build community and statewide awareness and support.</li> </ul> <p><b>Sub-groups:</b> Topic-specific sub-groups may be designated as needed to work on specific aspects of the plan and/or assist in communication.</p> <p><b>Project Team (PT):</b> The Project Team plans meetings, prepares materials and meeting minutes to support the work of the Partnership. The Project Team Includes Co-conveners Oregon Water Resources Department and City of Newport, as well as technical consultants, GSI Water Solutions and Facilitators, Innovative Growth Solutions.</p> <hr style="border-top: 1px dashed black;"/> <p><u>Comments:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Coordinating Committee needs to include:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Fishing industry</i></li> <li>○ <i>Brewery</i></li> <li>○ <i>Cedar Creek Quarries</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>• <i>Membership should be a priority for all sub-committees</i></li> <li>• <i>Outreach model and alternate outreach strategies may be needed to include all key stakeholders.</i></li> </ul> |

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Precise identification of key stakeholders is necessary early in this process.</i></li> <li>• <i>Learn from evidence – based practices.</i></li> <li>• <i>What are the incentives to being involved – for those who might not gravitate to being involved. Shared resources.</i></li> <li>• <i>We need the Partnership to contribute; bring something to the table.</i></li> </ul>  |
| <p><b>Decision Making</b><br/> <i>Identifies the decision making protocol to be used. Also addresses how lack of agreement will be handled.</i></p> | <p>It is the intent of the Partnership to provide a forum for inclusive, transparent discussion to identify opportunities and resolve issues in the collective interests of the Partnership. Decisions will be made in the spirit of consensus using a collaborative process that engages all viewpoints.</p> <p><b>Definition: Consensus</b> is a group decision-making process in which group members develop and agree to support a decision in the best interest of the whole. A practical definition for consensus is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The parties have had an opportunity to share and understand all viewpoints.</li> <li>• The parties have reached a ‘meeting of the minds’ sufficient to make a decision and carry it out.</li> <li>• Once agreement has been reached, the Partners are committed to supporting the decision.</li> </ul> <p><b>Consensus Decision Making Process</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Each group represented in the Partnership has one ‘voice’. If there are multiple individuals representing an entity, they must select one person amongst them to speak on behalf of the entity.</li> <li>• Depending on complexity of the issue, appropriate process tools will be used to test for consensus, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Red, Yellow, Green cards</li> <li>• Thumbs up, thumbs down, neutral</li> <li>• Ranking on a scale of 1 – 5</li> <li>• Priority ranking</li> <li>• Show of hands (can be done with eyes closed or open)</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>If Consensus is NOT reached</b>, the following process will be used to resolve the issue:</p> <p><b>A. If time is available: Continue to process the issue using one of the following:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continue to discuss during the meeting – revisit previous steps in the process.</li> <li>• Refer issue to a sub-group for further study and discussion; then report back to Partnership at a subsequent meeting and re-test for consensus.</li> </ul> |

**B. If time is NOT available (i.e. if goals of project would be compromised)**

- Refer to Coordinating Committee to determine how to handle the issue.
- Coordinating Committee may table, study further, narrow options, or select a preferred option.
- Coordinating Committee reports determination back to Partnership and a further attempt is made to reach consensus.
- If consensus is still not reached, a decision may be reached by majority vote.

**Recording Decisions**

The meeting notes and final report will reflect:

- Items on which the decision was reached by consensus of the Partnership.
- Items on which consensus was not reached, in which case a 'majority report' and a 'minority report' will be presented.
- Items on which there are mixed opinions and the Partnership could not come to a satisfactory conclusion.

---

Large group discussion:

- *Concern about one individual stymying the consensus process and how we will handle that*
- *Our group thought the process not really clear*
- *There may be some decision making processes for procedural thing and some for more complex decision making*
- *Doesn't really give an opportunity if you aren't on same page but can live with it – this needs more fleshing out. . . 'I don't support it, but I won't stand in the way of it'*
- *Make it clear who speaks for each group*

Table group comments:

- *Pretty clear definitions – makes sense.*
- *No objections, but minority report is important*
- *Consensus – What are we going to making decisions on? Simple vs. complex?*
- *When will decisions occur and how will that affect a minority position entity? As is, it appears as though decisions/votes will occur at the full group meetings. Can this occur through email or an on-line process?*
- *Explain who voting members are. Not just the entity but the individual. How will we deal with 'turnover' of member entities?*
- *Consensus*
- *Level of support noted in decisions*
- *Ensure time to talk about it as long as it takes*
- *Separate conversation with individuals or partners outside of large partnership meeting*



Disagreement on:

- *If consensus is still not reached, a decision may be reached by majority vote.*

Decision Making:

- *Definition provided is perfectly acceptable. Georgia Pacific calls it 'alignment' – similar to consensus.*
- *Present all the options and information, let the group come to a decision.*
- *Always consider the no action alternative – what happens if we don't reach a decision?*
- *Specify different types of decisions – procedure vs. substance (3)*
- *Specify decision making for each group (i.e. Coordinating Committee; Partnership)*
- *Specify who gets to vote – Participation is tied to voting rights. If you sign the charter, you need to play an active role.*
- *We're not here to reach consensus, we're here to do the right thing.*
- *Bring everyone along.*
- *The smaller the group, the greater the need for consensus.*
- *Open door (anyone can join the Partnership at any time) – how does that fit with consensus?*
- *Finish in email*
- *Just because consensus fails does not mean we quit*
- *Are there other models of consensus to look at?*
- *How do you define 'group'?*
- *A. 'Time' – When? During meeting? What does this mean? Needs clarification.*
- *B. 'Coordinating Committee' – is this the right group to refer to? What about "Oregon Consensus"?*
- *B. 'majority Vote' – who is voting?*
- *Not clear on flow.*
- *No option for 'not standing in 'the way'.*
- *Transparency – decisions are made by stakeholder group and not steering committees. Clarify this in charter.*
- *How to keep one individual / organization from stymying consensus*
- *Periodic opportunities for growth and evolution of decisions – Revisit and determine if revision, enhancements, additions or subtractions to the time, conditions, knowledge, etc.*
- *Majority/Minority Report – similar to the Supreme Court*

| <b>TO BE DISCUSSED AT FUTURE MEETINGS</b> |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Member Responsibilities</b>            | <p><i>Identifies the responsibilities that the members commit to (such as attending meetings, working collaboratively, supporting decisions, etc.)</i></p> <p><b><i>To be discussed at future meetings.</i></b></p>   |
| <b>Meeting Protocol</b>                   | <p><i>Defines how the meetings of the Partnership will be conducted, including:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Schedule and timeline</i></li> <li>• <i>Meeting Ground Rules</i></li> <li>• <i>Meeting Facilitation and Minutes</i></li> </ul> <p><b><i>To be discussed at future meetings.</i></b></p> |
| <b>Communication</b>                      | <p><i>Identifies the basic communication protocols to be used by the Partnership. A separate, more detailed Communication and Outreach Plan will be developed by subcommittee that will plan for communication, outreach and education.</i></p> <p><b><i>To be discussed at future meetings.</i></b></p>                    |
| <b>Charter Modifications</b>              | <p><i>Defines the process and authority for making modifications to the Charter. To be discussed at future Coordinating Committee meeting.</i></p> <p><b><i>To be discussed at future meetings.</i></b></p>   |
| <b>Other?</b>                             |   |

## Attendance:

| <b>Org Type</b>                      | <b>Org Name</b>   | <b>Name, Position</b>                                    | <b>Email</b>   |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| <b>Special District - Water Dist</b> | Seal Rock Water District                                      | Adam Denlinger, Director                                 | <a href="mailto:adenlinger@srwd.org">adenlinger@srwd.org</a>                               |
| <b>Project Support</b>               | GSI Water Solutions   | Adam Sussman, Principal Water Resources Consultant       | <a href="mailto:ASussman@gsiws.com">ASussman@gsiws.com</a>                                 |
| <b>Landowner</b>                     | Landowner (OFB)   | Alan Fujishin  | <a href="mailto:alan.gibsonfarms@gmail.com">alan.gibsonfarms@gmail.com</a>                 |
| <b>Public</b>                        | Interested Member of the Public                               | Andrea Scharf  | <a href="mailto:dreams@peak.org">dreams@peak.org</a>                                       |
| <b>City Govt.</b>                    | City of Toledo  | Billie Jo Smith  | <a href="mailto:billiejo.smith@cityoftoledo.org">billiejo.smith@cityoftoledo.org</a>       |
| <b>Conservation</b>                  | Newport Surfrider   | Charlie Plybon, Oregon Policy Manager                    | <a href="mailto:cplybon@surfrider.org">cplybon@surfrider.org</a>                           |
| <b>Industry</b>                      | Georgia Pacific   | CJ Drake, Communications and Public Affairs Manager      | <a href="mailto:cjdrake@gapac.com">cjdrake@gapac.com</a>                                   |
| <b>Farming</b>                       | Oregon Cattlemen's Association                                | Craig J. Herman, Chairman of the Private Lands Committee | <a href="mailto:cjherman@gmail.com">cjherman@gmail.com</a>                                 |
| <b>Local Government</b>              | City of Toledo  | Craig Martin, City Manager                               | <a href="mailto:manager@cityoftoledo.org">manager@cityoftoledo.org</a>                     |
| <b>Coastal Resident</b>              | Resident, Watershed Advocate                                  | Cyndi Karp   | <a href="mailto:cyndikarp@peak.org">cyndikarp@peak.org</a>                                 |
| <b>State Agency</b>                  | Department of Environmental Quality                           | David Waltz, Mid-Coast Basin Coordinator                 | <a href="mailto:Waltz.David@deq.state.or.us">Waltz.David@deq.state.or.us</a>               |
| <b>Special District - Water Dist</b> | Kozy Acres Water System                                       | Doug Edgmon  | <a href="mailto:dledgmon@peak.org">dledgmon@peak.org</a>                                   |
| <b>Community-Based Organization</b>  | Mid-Coast Watersheds Council                                  | Evan Hayduk, Restoration Specialist                      | <a href="mailto:evan@midcoastwatershedcouncil.org">evan@midcoastwatershedcouncil.org</a>   |
| <b>Project Support</b>               | Oregon Water Resources Department                             | Harmony Burright, Planning Coordinator                   | <a href="mailto:Harmony.S.Burright@wrd.state.or.us">Harmony.S.Burright@wrd.state.or.us</a> |
| <b>State Agency</b>                  | Office of Governor Kate Brown, Regional Solutions Coordinator | Jackie Mikalonis   | <a href="mailto:Jackiemikalonis@oregon.gov">Jackiemikalonis@oregon.gov</a>                 |

|                         |  |   |  |
|-------------------------|--|---|--|
| <b>State Agency</b>     | Oregon Department of Environmental Quality | Jacque Fern, Drinking Water Protection Specialist | <a href="mailto:Fern.Jacqueline@deq.state.or.us">Fern.Jacqueline@deq.state.or.us</a>           |
| <b>Project Support</b>  | Innovative Growth Solutions                | Jeanne Nyquist, Senior Consultant                 | <a href="mailto:jeanne@innovativegrowthsolutions.com">jeanne@innovativegrowthsolutions.com</a> |
| <b>Federal Agency</b>   | NOAA/NMFS                                  | Jennie Franks                                     | <a href="mailto:jennie.franks@noaa.gov">jennie.franks@noaa.gov</a>                             |
| <b>Forestry</b>         | Starker Forests, Inc.                      | Jennifer Beathe                                   | <a href="mailto:jennifer@starkerforests.com">jennifer@starkerforests.com</a>                   |
| <b>Forestry</b>         | Hancock Forest Management                  | Jerry Anderson                                    | <a href="mailto:janderson@hnr.com">janderson@hnr.com</a>                                       |
| <b>Coastal Resident</b> | Resident, Watershed Advocate               | Jim Adler   | <a href="mailto:jladler@peak.org">jladler@peak.org</a>   |
| <b>State Agency</b>     | Oregon Department Fish and Wildlife        | Jitesh Pattni                                     | <a href="mailto:jitesh.a.pattni@state.or.us">jitesh.a.pattni@state.or.us</a>                   |
| <b>Public</b>           | Interested Member of the Public            | John Clark  | <a href="mailto:bassman354@att.net">bassman354@att.net</a>                                     |
| <b>State Agency</b>     | Oregon Department Fish and Wildlife        | John Spangler, District                           | <a href="mailto:John.i.spangler@state.or.us">John.i.spangler@state.or.us</a>                   |
| <b>State Agency</b>     | Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board         | Katie Duzik, Regional Coordinator                 | <a href="mailto:katie.a.duzik@state.or.us">katie.a.duzik@state.or.us</a>                       |
| <b>Federal Agency</b>   | US Forest Service-Siuslaw                  | Leah Tai  | <a href="mailto:ltai@fs.fed.us">ltai@fs.fed.us</a>   |
| <b>Local Government</b> | City of Lincoln City                       | Lila Bradley, Public Works Director               | <a href="mailto:Lilab@lincolncity.org">Lilab@lincolncity.org</a>                               |
| <b>State Agency</b>     | Oregon Department of Agriculture           | Margaret Matter                                   | <a href="mailto:mmatter@oda.state.or.us">mmatter@oda.state.or.us</a>                           |
| <b>Forestry</b>         | Starker Forests, Inc.                      | Mark Gourly                                       | <a href="mailto:mark@starkerforests.com">mark@starkerforests.com</a>                           |
| <b>Local Government</b> | City of Newport                            | Mark Saelens                                      | <a href="mailto:m.saelens@newportoregon.gov">m.saelens@newportoregon.gov</a>                   |
| <b>State Agency</b>     | Oregon Department of Environmental Quality | Mary Camarata                                     | <a href="mailto:camarata.mary@deq.state.or.us">camarata.mary@deq.state.or.us</a>               |

|  |  |   |  |
|--|--|---|--|
| <b>Academic</b>                              | OSU Hatfield<br>Marine Science<br>Center                     | Maryann Bozza   | <a href="mailto:maryann.bozza@oregonstate.edu">maryann.bozza@oregonstate.edu</a>                   |
| <b>State Agency</b>                          | Oregon<br>Department of<br>Forestry                          | Matt Thomas   | <a href="mailto:Matt.thomas@oregon.gov">Matt.thomas@oregon.gov</a>                                 |
| <b>Local<br/>Government</b>                  | City of Toledo   | Mike Adams, City<br>Attorney and Planning               | <a href="mailto:attorney@cityoftoledo.org">attorney@cityoftoledo.org</a>                           |
| <b>Tribes</b>                                | Confederate<br>Tribes of Siletz<br>Indians                   | Pam Lind  | <a href="mailto:pamelal@ctsi.nsn.us">pamelal@ctsi.nsn.us</a>                                       |
| <b>Conservation</b>                          | The Wetlands<br>Conservancy                                  | Paul Englemeyer,<br>Central Coast Preserve<br>Manager   | <a href="mailto:pengelmeyer@peak.org">pengelmeyer@peak.org</a>                                     |
| <b>Local<br/>Government</b>                  | City of Yachats  | Rick McClung  | <a href="mailto:Rick@mailyachatsoregon.org">Rick@mailyachatsoregon.org</a>                         |
| <b>Local<br/>Government</b>                  | City of<br>Waldport  | Scott Andry   | <a href="mailto:scott.andry@waldportworks.org">scott.andry@waldportworks.org</a>                   |
| <b>Project<br/>Support</b>                   | Innovative<br>Growth<br>Solutions                            | Shirlene Warnock,<br>Owner                              | <a href="mailto:shirlene@innovativegrowthsolutions.com">shirlene@innovativegrowthsolutions.com</a> |
| <b>Tribes</b>                                | Confederate<br>Tribes of Siletz<br>Indians Tribal<br>Council | Stan VandeWetering,<br>Aquatics Program<br>Manager      | <a href="mailto:stanvandewetering@yahoo.com">stanvandewetering@yahoo.com</a>                       |
| <b>Local<br/>Government</b>                  | City of Lincoln<br>City                                      | Stephanie Reid, City<br>Engineer                        | <a href="mailto:stephanier@lincolncity.org">stephanier@lincolncity.org</a>                         |
| <b>Local<br/>Government</b>                  | Lincoln County   | Terry Thompson, County<br>Commissioner                  | <a href="mailto:tthompson@co.lincoln.or.us">tthompson@co.lincoln.or.us</a>                         |
| <b>Local<br/>Government</b>                  | City of<br>Newport   | Tim Gross, Director of<br>Public Works/City<br>Engineer | <a href="mailto:t.gross@newportoregon.gov">t.gross@newportoregon.gov</a>                           |
| <b>Community-<br/>Based<br/>Organization</b> | Mid-Coast<br>Watersheds<br>Council                           | Wayne Hoffman, Policy<br>Director                       | <a href="mailto:mcwc@midcoastwatershedcouncil.org">mcwc@midcoastwatershedcouncil.org</a>           |

## TABLE DISCUSSION NOTES - Recorded By Table Group

### Table 1: Host: Jim Adler

**Participants:** Jennie Franks, Rick McClung, Andrea Schaff, Billie Jo Smith, Mike Adams

#### Mission/Purpose:

- All should be plural: ecosystems, economies, communities

#### Goals:

- #5. Develop strategies that achieve the vision

#### Comment:

- More process than outcomes – needs more concrete goals. Difficult to differentiate from mission/purpose.
- Will the charter include objectives for each goal? Objectives that are quantifiable and have an established timeline? (Jennie Franks)
- The goal is to: Develop an integrated water resources plan with a high priority on:
  - Protecting the environment (has everyone agreed?)
  - Sustaining ecosystems, economies and communitiesThe second 2 are redundant

#### Guiding Principles:

- First section - Get rid of these – they're only values.
- Last section – Aren't these actually the goals?

#### Vision:

- Water for fish and families
- Alternate: 3-year study produces a process

**Decision Making:** No objections, but minority report is important

### Table 2: Host: Stan van de Wetering

**Participants:** Mark Saelens, Carlie Plybon, John Clark

**Mission:** What does 'water future' mean – unclear

#### Goals:

- Water needs are discussed but storage and conservation are absent.
- Goal 3: Seems very generic. We know this is made of several pieces but someone else may not.
- Goal 5: Could be unclear whether this means strategies that are in place and ready to go at the end of the process. Where will these strategies exist? Will it be in the plan or some other product?
- How might we compare the strategies to what we are used to seeing under a set of objectives?

**Guiding Principles:** Stuff on how we are going to operate looks good.

**Vision:**

- No good ideas – should include fact that we are composed of a diverse set of interests and by the end of the process will have hopefully developed set of strategies to support all our needs.
- Vision statement: Diverse group of water interests avoid water crises on central coast!

**Decision Making:**

- Consensus – What are we going to making decisions on? Simple vs. complex?
- When will decisions occur and how will that affect a minority position entity? As is, it appears as though decisions/votes will occur at the full group meetings. Can this occur through email or an on-line process?
- Explain who voting members are. Not just the entity but the individual. How will we deal with ‘turnover’ of member entities?

**Table 3:** Host: Alan Fujishan

**Participants:** Mary Camorota, Tia Cavender, Jenifer Beathi

**Mission/Purpose:**

- Economy / jobs
- Ecosystem – is there another word that is better?
- ‘Sustain’ +
- Alternative – ‘natural systems’
- What does ‘community’ mean?
- We want to ‘thrive’ rather than ‘sustain’
- Missing ‘balance of needs’ – ‘community needs’

**Goals:**

- Missing ‘going out for \$\$\$\$
- Education emphasis
- Idea for education: Utility bill notice

**Guiding Principles:**

- ‘Built environments’ vague
- ‘We can agree to disagree
- 4 not priority – points seem to overlap

**Vision:**

- Regional partnership breaks ground on major water project
- Conserved the most water
- Community plants trees to restore watershed.
- Communities support new water dam.
- Mid Coast meets water conservation goals.
- Forest company and watershed committee protect river.
- New Regional Partnership raises millions to secure water future for mid coast.

Headline: Regional partnership raises millions of dollars to implement new IWR plan.

**Decision Making:**

- Consensus
- Level of support noted in decisions
- Ensure time to talk about it as long as it takes
- Separate conversation with individuals or partners outside of large partnership meeting

**Yellow Card Comments:**

- I think it's just as important for partners to share successes about how collaborative groups have worked well in the past to help balance out the comments about how 'it will never work.' We are already combatting people's previous perceptions about their previous experiences.
- Make time for people to air grievances. For example: 'Had Elk plan that ODFW killed'. 'Why do I call ODFW for a dam leak?'
- Perhaps state agencies can present our structure and regulations.
- Perhaps state agencies can explain how we approve projects.

**Table 4: Host: Wayne Hoffman**

**Participants:** Terry Thompson, Mark Gourley, Evan Hayduck

**Mission:** Group is ok with mission.

**Goals:** #5 Edit: to develop action. Ready, set to work.

**Guiding Principles:**

- Last point: Stewardship of our water resources and human infrastructure.
- Create protection of our natural environment.

**Vision:**

1. Lincoln County finds a sustainable water supply that does not kill a single fish.
2. Lincoln County develops a Central Coast water supply that survives a 9.0 earthquake.
3. Water quality in Lincoln County is the best in the Pacific NW.
4. Property owners input results in award for best managed watershed. (? This one difficult to read?)

Selected vision: Lincoln County finds a sustainable water supply that does not kill a single fish.

**Decision Making:** Disagreement on:

- If consensus is still not reached, a decision may be reached by majority vote.

**Table 5: Host:** Harmony Burrigh,

**Participants:** Douglas Edgeman, CJ Drake



**Mission/Purpose:**

- Makes sense – should be open-ended – not too specific. Spot on – goals should be specific, not mission.

**Goals:**

1. First step is to bring people together.
5. This goal is redundant.
  - Slow is good
  - Nothing lacking
  - Include: Education: Educate Partners

**Guiding Principles:**

- The larger the group, the more defined the principles should be.
- How do guiding principles help us achieve goals? These need to be in conversation.
- Transparency. ‘We create an inclusive process that openly shares’ . . . Comment: process doesn’t ‘share’
- Innovation: Later connected – recognize.
- Add: negotiation and compromise
- Last section does not appear to be guiding principles. Different sub-heading, where does this go?
- Sustaining the ecosystems, the economy, and our communities. Unpack. Elaborate at next coordinating committee meeting. Process vs. outcomes.

**Membership:**

- The Partnership welcomes all stakeholders and actively seeks diverse perspectives ~~needs~~ (replace with ‘interests’) and expertise.
- Open door situation – anyone can participate. How are we ensuring balance?

**Vision:**

- No need for a headline because we were successful
- Water plan created – no drama
- Coastal county balances competing needs for water demand with no drama/dirt
- Mid-Coast Water Partners . . . develops a water supply that meets the needs of cities, industry and fish

**Structure and Function:**

- Shared resources. We need the Partnership to contribute; bring something to the table.
- Pretty clear definitions – makes sense.

**Decision Making:**

- Procedure vs. substance.
- If you sign the charter, you need to play an active role.

- Definition provided is perfectly acceptable. Georgia Pacific calls it ‘alignment’ – similar to consensus.
- We’re not here to reach consensus, we’re here to do the right thing.
- Specify decision making for each group.
- Bring everyone along.
- The smaller the group, the greater the need for consensus.
- Lots of experience with collaboration. Present all the options and information, let the group come to a decision.
- Always consider the no action alternative – what happens if we don’t reach a decision
- Open door (anyone can join the Partnership at any time) – how does that fit with consensus
- Specify who gets to vote – Participation is tied to voting rights

**Comment on Work Plan:**

- Where does problem definition fit?

**Table 6: Cyndi Karp**

Title should be: Mid-Coast Water Planning Collaboration

**Mission / Purpose:**

- Outreach education for all future generations for all species
- One earth, one watershed, one ecosystem
- One ocean – getting healthy
- Water together for all users

**Goals:**

- Cooperation through collaboration and common goals.
- Comprehensive water quality testing for chemicals, pharms, biological, mineral, salinity. All species need clean water. Take charge, get it done.
- Real time well testing for water and geology.
- Long-term planning for the next 150 years for all species.
- Collaboration through communities for clean water, air and soil

**Guiding Principles:**

- Partnership. We recognize all interests and seek common ~~ground~~ goals
- Transparency. ‘Keep people’
- Commitment – ‘We all agree to an oath to water’
- Last section: Find a home for this . . . maybe move it to ‘goals’ section

**Vision:**

- The Mid Coast Place Based Planning process has produced a new earthquake ready Rocky Creek Dam – completion and ribbon cutting January 1, 2020. Economic, shovel ready through collaboration tougher

**Membership:** Use the word ‘citizens’ or ‘public’, not ‘stakeholder’

**Structure and Function:**

- Do we need to review / enhance. Absolutely. Does it work?
- More meetings. Get it done January 1<sup>st</sup>, 2017. Concept deadline for submission. Base OWRD ODOT Highway 101.

**Decision Making:**

- Finish in email
- Consensus Decision Making Process: Use blue card for yes (blue for water)
- Just because consensus fails does not mean we quit

**Comments (Yellow Cards)**

- Tim Gross? Does Newport plan on including more cities in Partnership?
- Regional Governor’s Office, legislators, collaboration – State Agency, Federal, County City, NGO’s – by including legislators and governor (both sides) makes for effective tools – letter, campaign for support
- Wish List – Mid Coast Water 2 – 5 minutes speaker life history, funny stories, fish stories, bear stories, water stories
- Once a year testing of well water is not real time data – should your family’s water have a higher priority?
- 3<sup>rd</sup> speaker – would real time water data help? Yes.
- 3<sup>rd</sup> speaker – Siletz Farmer – Do they do comprehensive water quality testing for pesticides, chemicals, pharms, biologicals, drinking water on annual basis?
- Are there any other water sources available for emergency water sources in an area?
- Collect down flow energy for pump back up the hill. Can it be done?
- Power point available with definition of anagram – use 2<sup>nd</sup> speaker.
- Earthquake shut off values for all water storage units in states per emergency self-recognition systems.
- Comprehensive water quality testing base and mobile testing units – economic benefits for many government agencies, NGO’s, citizens al collaborations together for common goals.
- ODFW on the ground – scientists commonly ignore on the ground, scientist example – pulling logs.
- What do you do when one person holds up the whole process? Or property owner?
- Example of ODFW: I called into Lincoln County Dispatch about Thissel Pond on Alsea Fall creek ½ way to Oregon Hatchery Resource Center was leaking – called ODFW. Why would I call a Fish Biologist for a leaking dam?

- Wayne Hoffman – are upland streams going to be protected by riparian coverage for temperature reduction? How is water temperature not part of the OWRS? All affects contributes warm water uplands cause water warmer.
- Make available an email address of collaboration members.

**Table 7: Host: Jitesh Pattni**

**Participants:** Matt Thomas, John Spangle, Leah Tai

**Mission:**

- Short on natural / ecosystems
- Define the region – maps that show the region.
- ‘Our’ possessive approach(?)
- Collaborate.

**Goals:**

Goal 2

- Data can be skewed to fit E.... (?)
- Tough to get an objective view.
- Sufficient info not biased.

Goal 5

- Disconnect. We don’t have a vision. Maybe we will later or it could be wordsmithed to say mission
- Dump #5 if #4 is there, no need for #5.

**Guiding Principles:**

- Commitment: Define Region to something more definite.
- Partnership: Wordsmith ‘needs’

**Headlines:**

- Mid-Coast Region Begins Implementation of Integrated Water Resources Plan.

**Yellow Cards:**

- Dessert (sugar) for break would be nice.
- Sugar after 5:30 pm – Apple pie would be nice.
- P.S. Jitesh wants us to say he is a great table host!

**Table 8: Host: Jackie Mikalonis**

**Participants:** Katie Duzik, Mary Ann Bozza, David Waltz, Paul Engelmeyer

**Mission:**

- Mission is planning not implementation.
- So, what is the plan for implementation? – seems ambiguous about this.
- Is outreach part of mission? Should that be part of the mission?
- Have we identified all key stakeholders – what is that process? Timing- when will all stakeholders be here? Need involvement now.

**Goals:**

- Outreach – are all the critical stakeholders at the table or being represented in the process? And, at what stage?
- Facts vs. theories or perception – how to vet?
- Info gaps – how will data gaps be identified?
- Ensure info is good, factual and based on real data.
- Need to include idea and concept of 'resiliency' – perhaps in #4 or #3?
- There is more to 'environment' than what has been captured here.

**Guiding Principles:**

- Actual / Factual
- Acknowledge uncertainty
- Include all stakeholders
- Bottom four bullet points - Sounds good.

**Headlines:**

- **Coastal water issues solved with wave of funding!**
- Water plan makes a big splash!
- Central coast collaborative rides wave to funding.

**Structure and Function:**

- Membership should be a priority for all sub-committees
- Outreach model and alternate outreach strategies may be needed to include all key stakeholders.
- Precise identification of key stakeholders is necessary early in this process.
- Learn from evidence – based practices.
- What are the incentives to being involved – for those who might not gravitate to being included?

**Decision-Making:**

- Are there other models of consensus to look at?
- How do you define 'group'?
- A. 'Time' – When? During meeting? What does this mean? Needs clarification.
- B. 'Coordinating Committee' – is this the right group to refer to? What about "Oregon Consensus"?
- B. 'majority Vote' – who is voting?
- Not clear on flow.
- No option for 'not standing in 'the way'.

**Yellow card:**

- P4 – Decision-making
  - Need better defined pathways – define/categorize types of issues
  - Administrative or 'process' issues, or
  - Substantive Technical, Econ., or other issues

### **Yellow Cards General:**

- Water quality info needs better info. On base flows on tributaries (CTD's, staff gage, periodic (?) measurements)
- People with Ax to Grind. Venting about (i.e. ODFW & Elk Mgt.), etc. This is an off ramp to productive discussion. Need to clearly ID where in planning process that potential barriers to implementation may occur and have a strategy.
- Tasks and Activities:
  - We should identify info gaps well before Nov. 27
  - Diverse participation – we need to reach out to the big users – fish plants /Rogue B – they need to know about this effort

### **Table 9: Host: Tim Gross**

**Participants:** Jacque Fern, Scott Andry, Pam Lind, Jerry Anderson

**Mission:** Like it. Region language is inclusive.

#### **Goals:**

- Weakness – need to identify gap between resources and demand.
  - Including identifying timeframe – specific to goal 5.
- Identify specific tasks to implement goals. i.e. what do you need to do to complete goal #2. Work plan?
- May be helpful to go over mission and goals at each meeting to keep us grounded.

#### **Guiding Principles:**

- Last 4 seem to be nebulous and unspecific to be included in guiding principles.
  - They are really goals
  - Redundant and confusing
  - It doesn't fit should be removed
- Transparency – decisions are made by stakeholder group and not steering committees
  - In Charter?

#### **Vision - Headlines:**

- **Water Consensus Achieved! Bond passes.**
- Mid-coast takes unprecedented steps
- Paving the path and making milestones

#### **Membership/Decision-making**

- Coordinating Committee
  - Fishing industry
  - Brewery
  - Cedar creek Quarries
- Decision-making - How to keep one individual / organization from stymying consensus

## **Table 10: Host: Margaret Matter**

### **Mission:**

- Do we aim to sustain our ecosystem or to sustain ecosystem services?
- I ask because our climate is changing, thus our present ecosystem characteristics will change (evolve) in response. Is it to our best interest to ensure the ecosystem services are preserved regardless of the species doing the work, or to preserve the ecosystem as it is at a point in time?

### **Goals:**

- Evolving (a living document and partnership and vision (?)).
- 4. Create enduring 'and evolving' partnerships...
- Add. 6 – Respect
- Will this be a long-term, "living' partnership with document, etc.? If so, will there be periodic opportunity to update to keep it all relevant, incorporate lessons-learned; new knowledge?

### **Guiding Principles:**

- Bottom 4 – Tim suggests that points are goals, and should be moved out somewhere.
- Education as a goal.
- Resources (grant \$\$)

### **Headlines (Vision):**

- Mid-Coast Water Planning Partnership Receives Award for Innovation

### **Decision-Making:**

- Suggestions from the whole group:
  - Clarify groups
  - 2 processes to address different levels of complexity in decision-making
- Periodic opportunities for growth and evolution of decisions – Revisit and determine if revision, enhancements, additions or subtractions to the time, conditions, knowledge, etc.
- Majority/Minority Report – similar to the Supreme Court

## **Table 11: Host: Adam Denlinger**

**Participants:** Craig Herman, Lila Bradley, Stephanie Reed

**Mission:** Could be more detailed, but would complicate the mission/purpose.

### **Guiding Principles:**

- Last four bullet points are not very flexible.
- Yellow Card (Craig Herman) – having systems that are resilient to natural disaster is clearly scope creep. While it is a consideration, it should not be a 'high priority'

### **Headlines (Vision):**

- Mid-coast Water Systems Survive Through Partnership Planning efforts.

### **Yellow Cards:** (Craig Herman)

- How will land owner water rights be affected?
- What will be the enforcement mechanism when an implementation plan is reached?

#### Yellow Card Comments

- I think it's just as important for partners to share successes about how collaborative groups have worked well in the past to help balance out the comments about how 'it will never work.' We are already combatting people's previous perceptions about their previous experiences.
- Make time for people to air grievances. For example: 'Had Elk plan that ODFW killed'. 'Why do I call ODFW for a dam leak?'
- Perhaps state agencies can present our structure and regulations.
- Perhaps state agencies can explain how we approve projects.