



Mid-Coast Water Planning Partnership

COORDINATING COMMITTEE

Meeting Notes

April 14, 2017, 9:00 am – 12:00 pm
Newport Recreation Center

NEXT STEPS

- Technical Work Plan: Adam Sussman (GSI) will make edits to the Technical Work Plan and prepare it to be sent to the Partnership for review prior to their May 31, 2017 meeting.
- Collaborative Water Planning Conference: Harmony Burrignt will forward names of delegates recommended by the Coordinating Committee.
- Scheduling: Jeanne Nyquist (IGS) will poll members of the Coordinating Committee to determine a meeting day of the week to resolve scheduling conflicts.
- Next Meetings:
 - Next Coordinating Committee Meeting May 19, 9:00 am – noon, Newport Recreation Center
 - Next Partnership Meeting May 31, 4 – 7 pm, Samaritan Pacific Health Education Center

Participants:

- Tim Gross, Co-Convener, City of Newport
- Harmony Burrignt, Co-Convener, OWRD
- Wayne Hoffman, MidCoast Watersheds Council
- Jitesh Pattni, ODFW
- Alan Fujishin, Gibson Farms
- John Stevenson, OSU, Oregon Sea Grant
- Terry Thompson, Lincoln County Commissioner
- Adam Denlinger, Seal Rock Water District

Unable to Attend:

- Charlie Plybon, Newport Surfrider Foundation
- Stan VandeWetering, Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians
- Rick McClung, City of Yachats
- Deborah Wilkins, USFS, Hebo Ranger Dist.
- Caroline Bauman, Economic Development Alliance of Lincoln Co.
- Jackie Mikalonis, Governor's Office, Regional Solutions Team

Project Team in Attendance:

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

Discussion Notes

Technical Work Plan

Adam Sussman presented the updated draft of the Technical Work Plan for review and discussion. Adam explained that there will be three study groups formed within the Partnership to assist with:

- 2.2 Water Quantity
- 2.3 Built Systems
- 2.4 Water Quality

Ecosystem/Ecology is an important aspect of the study. This is an overarching topic that will be discussed in each of the study groups listed above.

Discussion:

- Wayne: To support future decisions, it would be helpful to have good estimates of water availability in streams – ways to calculate water availability in different places up and down stream. It would be really nice to have some modeling tools that would let us work with different scenarios and see what the consequences are of moving intakes upstream or downstream (for instance).
- Adam: Water quantity – we are going to describe water supply/availability based on current information. The WARS model has different points to estimate the availability.
- Wayne: Is there a capability to run different climate change scenarios and depict consequences?
- Adam: We will need to identify this as a data gap and estimate the level of effort needed to run climate change scenarios. The Army Corps of Engineers has a couple of modeling tools - Modsim model and RiverWare model – that could help us look at different strategies and make a recommendation.
- John reported that he has a proposal in to look at climate change effects of stream flow.
- Harmony indicated that it is important to highlight limitations of current tools.
- Wayne: Modeling will be easier for our watersheds than other basins because of lack of groundwater recharge. Our region has a direct relationship between precipitation and flows.

Adam provided an overview of the Work Plan, highlighting the following:

- This version of the Work Plan uses the same structure as prior versions, but we have fine-tuned it quite a bit.
- There is an engagement strategy that incorporates information sharing and collaboration.
- We have included some description of the kinds of data that we would be looking for. We want to emphasize to the Partners that Step 2 is intended to characterize our current water resources so that we can establish a baseline understanding to start everyone on a level playing field of knowledge. We will ask the Partners to help us understand available information and define data gaps.

- Our approach will be to rely on existing documents, expertise from the Partnership, and study groups. For instance, before we kick off the water quality effort we are going to convene a small study group and look at the information we have, how will it be approached, identify other available information, and define our collective expectations. This will be done collaboratively with input.

Discussion of how to deal with data gaps: Who identifies data gaps, prioritizes them, and identifies ways to fill them?

- Tim: We need to identify data gaps, develop criteria for evaluating them, and then prioritize.
- Wayne: We need to understand the consequences of not developing the information, which would include determining the big uncertainties and what information we need to support those decisions.
- Tim: We need to develop a methodology for conducting a data gap analysis for prioritizing data gaps. This needs to be consistent with our approach.
- Wayne: This is an iterative process – our technical goals are going to evolve. We will identify opportunities and pursue them collectively. This may potentially change the way we manage the process.
- Tim: Having the data collected and in one place might be helpful for individual partner efforts.

Adam explained next steps:

- GSI has been collecting information already.
- We will engage the Partnership to help us identify additional information.
- Once we have gathered the information for each sub-task, we will synthesize the information and develop a technical memo on each topic.
- We are attempting to characterize water resources in the major watersheds. This will be a broad characterization (i.e. mile wide – foot deep). We will not be delving deeply into specific topics during Step 2. The purpose of Step 2 is to help everyone develop a consistent set of knowledge and set ourselves up to get to the next step of the process.
- GSI will be in charge of this effort, but we will engage the Partners as contributors.
- There isn't a bright line between Steps 2 and follow-on steps. Information collected during Step 2 will be valuable for the follow-on steps. GSI will begin work on Step 2 in April. The Partnership will kick off Step 2 together at the May 31 meeting. We will work to flesh out Steps 3 and 4 by the August Partnership meeting. All of these things will happen somewhat concurrently.

Discussion on organization of Study Groups: How will the Study Groups be formed, what is the schedule, how will the information be gathered and organized?

- GSI will take the lead on forming the Study Groups and will be supported by IGS.
- The plan is to form 3 Study Groups on:
 - Task 2.2 Water Quantity
 - Task 2.3 Built Systems

- Task 2.4 Water Quality
- The Study Groups will be formed during the next Partnership Meeting May 31. During this meeting, the Partnership will provide input on existing information, and Partners will be invited to indicate their interest in serving on a Study Group.
- It is anticipated that the Study groups will meet twice this summer. Some participants may be able to dedicate only a small amount of time, which others may be able to do research to assist GSI. A synopsis of the schedule follows:
 - June: Initial meeting to establish expectations, parameters, and identify informational resources. GSI will work with individuals on the Study Groups to collect and analyze the information.
 - July: Coordinating Committee will meet to review progress of Study Groups.
 - August: Partnership meeting to review progress of Study Groups.
 - August: Study Groups meet for second time to review and refine the analysis developed by GSI.
 - September/October: Coordinating Committee will meet to review the draft analysis.
 - November: Partnership meets to review Step 2 Report and kick off Step 3.

Input on Step 2 Work Plan:

- Terry and Tim: This plan should deal with freshwater. The word ‘ocean’ is too broad. We need to stay focused on fresh water and estuaries. Need to specify that beach/ocean outfalls are included, but not the entire ocean.
- Wayne: Habitat needs deals with water temperature, substrate, and flow regimes – at what point do we capture additional detail?
- Adam: Study Groups will be important in helping us to define this.
- Tim: Data gap analysis will be important. We need to do intermediate check-ins on this.
- John: Let’s not just think about future needs – also need to think about future resources. We can’t assume that we will have the same resources in the future.
- Adam: As we are working on Step 2, we will be capturing information that will help us in subsequent steps.
- Terry: Biggest issue is maintaining habitat for salmon – temperature.
- Comments on specific tasks:
 - 2.1 Context:
 - Include ‘overview of climate and weather’ (move from 2.2)
 - Add Contributors: USFS, Lincoln County Planning Dept., Economic Development Alliance, Oregon Water Resources Dept. (OWRD), Tribe
 - 2.3 Built Systems:
 - Discharge locations and **overflow history**

- Water operators will have master plans, but probably at varying levels of information
 - Water conservation master plans will have quite a bit of detail (Depoe Bay, Lincoln City, Newport, Waldport, Seal Rock, Toledo)
- 2.4 Water Quality:
 - Contributors: Include USFS and Tribe
- 2.5 Ecology
 - Contributors: Include USFS and Lincoln County
 - Add: Species of concern and importance

Field Trips: Jeanne explained that field trips will also be planned to give Partners and interested public an opportunity to learn about the water cycle. The intent is to develop a common base of shared knowledge so that the Partners are able to make well informed decisions. The Field Trips will be orchestrated by the Communication, Education and Outreach Committee. The Committee brainstormed ideas for Field Trips:

- September: Water Master tour of intakes and Big Creek Dam. Schedule in Sept. to illustrate impact of low water.
- Shrimp fisheries – go when they are in production - Whiting plant and Hake Plant. Check with Tim or Terry on timing.
- Water use in hotel season.
- Mill Creek, Siletz (on Weyerhaeuser property) there is a big wood placement and extensive study on how the material changes the flow dynamics. There is a lot to be learned about potential of managing streams.
- Sport fishing industry – Get 2 or 3 bigger sport boats to take a tour through estuaries with discussion about what happens in the estuaries.
- Beach outfalls.
- Also think about who else we could target to bring in people - advertise a little more publicly to get more people involved beyond the Partnership.

- **ACTION:** The Coordinating Committee concluded their discussion by agreeing that the Technical Work Plan is ready to present to the Partnership Meeting on May 31. Adam Sussman will include the suggested edits and prepare the Work Plan to be sent to the Partnership for review prior to the May 31 meeting.

Communication, Education and Outreach (CEO) Subcommittee:

Harmony reported that the CEO Subcommittee is working to raise interest in the Partnership. Coordinating Committee suggested the following:

- Assess the Partnership roster to identify who is missing and invite them to participate.
- Small water districts are interested but do not have the staffing to participate. We need to keep them updated and encourage them to visit the website and think of other ways to engage this particular group.
- We need to make the benefits of Partnership apparent.

PBP Workshop – Bend

Harmony reported that Sustainability NW has provided funding to organize a Place Based Planning (PBP) Workshop in Bend on May 24 and 25, 2017. Purpose of the workshop is to involve local leaders, state agencies, and PBP participants in understanding how to build collaborative community based solutions. Each PBP pilot group is invited to send up to 5 people. Expenses will be paid. Harmony provided an overview of the workshop:

- Exchange about what is occurring in the pilots
 - Panel from other collective collaborations (Yakima, forest collaborative, VA, Deschutes) to share what it has taken to do this type of work successfully
 - Breakout sessions – skill building
 - Demand forecasting
 - Collaboration training
 - Communication workshop
 - Convener training
- **ACTION:** The Committee nominated the following to attend to represent the Mid-Coast Water Planning Partnership. Harmony will follow up with registration.
- Wayne Hoffman
 - Caroline Bauman
 - Tim Gross
 - Stan VandeWetering
 - Charlie Plybon
 - Adam Denlinger
 - John Stevenson would be interested in attending as an expert resource

Scheduling

- Coordinating Committee Meetings: At least two of the Coordinating Committee members have a conflict with meetings on Fridays. Jeanne sent out a Doodle Poll to determine if there is a better day.
 - Partnership Meetings have been held on last Wednesday of the month. The business community has an important standing meeting at the same time. As we move into Step 2, the meeting schedule will change. Partnership meeting will be held on the 2nd Tuesday of August and November from 4 – 7 pm.
- **ACTION:** Jeanne will complete poll of Coordinating Committee members to determine best day of week for meetings.

Discussion of Parking Lot Items from 3/10 Coordinating Committee Meeting

- Coordinating Committee initial membership: It was suggested that we need to provide a written description of how the Coordinating Committee was initially created.
 - Action: A description was developed and will be included in the record.
 - Status: Completed.

- News media language clarification: Will the news media be allowed to attend both the Partnership and Coordinating Committee meetings.
 - Action: The Charter was revised to clarify that the media will be allowed to attend the Partnership meetings, but not the Coordinating Committee meetings.
 - Status: Completed
- Define role of conveners. It was suggested that the role of conveners need to be more clearly defined in the Charter.
 - Action: Edits to the Charter were made to clarify role of conveners.
 - Status: Completed
- Full Disclosure (Membership). A question was raised at an earlier meeting regarding members' responsibility for full disclosure. The Committee discussed this topic:
 - Harmony reported that she conducted research on this matter:
 - The Partnership is not formally required to follow public meeting law, but the law should inform our conduct and should be a minimum standard.
 - The group is responsible for developing its own process consistent with its guiding principles captured in the Charter.
 - The Partnership is NOT exempt from public records requests. Everything that is transmitted to and from public employees is publicly available.
 - How we decide to record our meetings is important because it helps partners keep track of our progress and also is a key communication tool for individuals and organizations that do not attend meetings.
 - The Committee discussed meeting process and confirmed the desire to have an open and transparent process. The Committee recognized that it may, at times, need to discuss matters that are sensitive. The Committee determined that, in the event of sensitive discussions:
 - The Committee will flag the issue as sensitive.
 - The facilitator will take summary notes to fulfill the requirement for transparency, but will not include sensitive details of the discussion.
 - The Committee reviewed draft meeting notes from its March 10 meeting and suggested revised language. The facilitator will make the edits for review by the co-conveners. Once the review is completed, the notes will be posted.
 - Status: The Committee ran out of time to complete its discussion on this topic, so it will remain in the Parking Lot for further discussion at a subsequent meeting.
- Proposals – how do we respond to opportunities that may be presented to the Partnership?
 - Action: Harmony developed proposed criterion for considering opportunities.
 - Status: The Committee will review the proposed criteria at a future meeting.
- In addition to the above items, the Parking Lot will include the following items for further discussion:
 - Membership of Coordinating Committee – filling vacancies
 - Meeting Notes

