



Mid-Coast Water Planning Partnership

COORDINATING COMMITTEE

Meeting Notes

November 18, 2016, 1 – 4 pm
Newport Recreation Center

NEXT STEPS

- Review meeting notes, draft charter, agenda for Nov. 30 Partnership meeting. Send your edits by Nov. 25 to:
jeanne@innovativegrowthsolutions.com
- Review the draft work plan and send your comments and questions to Adam at
ASussman@gsiws.com
- Draft agenda and materials for November 30 Partnership meeting – Project Team
- Meeting schedule – Harmony
- Next Planning Partnership Meeting:
November 30, 4 – 7 pm, Health Education Center, Samaritan Pacific Hospital, 740 SW 9th Street, Newport

Participants:

- Jitesh Pattni, ODFW
- John Stevenson, OSU, Oregon Sea Grant
- Alan Fujishan, Gibson Farms
- Wayne Hoffman, MidCoast Watersheds Council
- James Adler, Yachats Valley resident
- Adam Denlinger, Seal Rock Water District
- C. J. Drake, Georgia Pacific
- Stan VandeWetering, Siletz Tribal Council
- Tim Gross, Co-Convener, City of Newport
- Harmony Burright, Co-Convener OWRD

Unable to Attend:

- Rick McClung, City of Yachats
- Charlie Plybon, Newport Surfrider Foundation
- Jackie Mikalonis, Governor's Office, Regional Solutions Team
- Terry Thompson, Lincoln County Commissioner
- Deborah Wilkins, USFS, Hebo Ranger Dist.

Project Team:

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

Discussion Notes: November 18, 2016

Meeting Objectives:

- Review / revise work accomplished at Meeting A 11-4-16.
- Continue to develop Charter.
- Refine issue identification and identify information to begin the educational process.
- Outline scope of work plan.
- Plan for the November 30 meeting of the Partnership.

Meeting Guidelines:

- Future focused
- Spirit of togetherness
- All viewpoints matter
- Strive to understand
- Practice patience
- Seek win-win
- Identify yourself
- Help us stay on track
- Be present

Introductions:

- Committee members introduced themselves and welcomed Stan VandeWetering, Siletz Tribal Council

Review of Meeting Notes:

- Wayne is pleased that results from 'Guiding Principles' activity were recorded without ranking.
- Edits to notes:
 - Guiding Principles – describe the process used to develop the guiding principles.
 - Grant funding – clarify that work is funded jointly by OWRD and City of Newport.
 - Facilitators will make suggested edits and send revised notes out to Committee members.
- Grant is meant to support planning process – not all about meeting deliverables – it is about understanding and meeting water needs. Don't want grant to limit or stall process.
- Wayne – Does not see a 1:1 relationship between guiding principles as listed in notes and those that appear in draft charter. Facilitators explained that they developed the notes into draft guiding principles for the Charter – to be discussed and revised by Committee in today's meeting.
- The Committee accepted the notes with edits discussed. The Committee determined that they like the format of the notes, especially with the next steps summarized on first page. The Committee agreed that they want summarized notes rather than formal minutes. Notes will be reviewed by the Committee at each meeting, but a 'vote' to approve notes is not necessary.

Charter Development:

- Mission statement –
 - Overall statement is good. Needs language to indicate that actions will result from the process. 'Promote and pursue strategies' was added to the mission statement to reflect this intent.

- We don't want this to just be a plan that sits on the shelf. Ideally, both information and solutions will be a result of the planning process. We also need a clear implementation plan.
- Goals –
 - The Committee discussed that the goal statements need to be shorter, more succinct.
 - The Committee developed a number of edits to the goals (see version 1.2 of draft Charter).
- Guiding Principles –
 - The Committee adopted a new guiding principle suggested by Jim Adler:
 - **Clarity.** We commit to expressing all of our findings in the simplest and most easily comprehensible form possible.
 - In the spirit of 'clarity', the Committee revised wording on guiding principles (see version 1.2 of draft Charter).
- Decision-making process – The Committee agreed that they want to use a consensus decision making process. Definition of 'consensus' was discussed. The Committee agreed that the spirit of consensus is to engage all viewpoints. The facilitators presented a draft description of consensus decision-making. Key points of discussion:
 - Wayne pointed out that the group will not be making decisions that bind any agency or provide funding to build infrastructure. The plan will contain recommended strategies that will help us advocate for funding to implement them.
 - Wayne suggested removing language in the draft that defines consensus as 'meaning that one or two may dissent, while the rest of the group supports the decision or can live with it.'
 - The Committee discussed that they would like to achieve consensus, but recognized that we need to have plan for situations in which not everyone agrees. The Committee reviewed the draft language specifying that if consensus is not reached, the item would continue to be discussed in the meeting (if time permits), or an ad-hoc group could be formed to continue to discuss and resolve the areas of disagreement in an effort to get full consensus. If, in the end, there is a dissenting opinion, then a 'majority report' and 'minority report' will be included in the plan. If a 'minority report' is needed, then the people who support the minority position should be involved in writing it.
 - The Committee also considered making alternate recommendations, but instead prefer to use the 'majority – minority report' approach to ensure that all viewpoints are represented.
 - The final report may show a number of recommendations that are supported by full consensus, and then a few items that we could not achieve consensus on, with a description of the majority and minority opinions.
 - The overall goal is to represent all interests and provide a transparent description of the discussion. We want to document the initial proposal and capture the discussion. The discussion should be recorded in meeting notes and we should post a summary on the Partnership website so interested parties can understand the discussion and track the path to a final decision.

- The discussion and decision-making process should recognize that individuals may need to check back with groups or organizations they are representing. We need to allow time for this in the discussion/decision making process.
- The Committee concurred that the draft approach is acceptable and directed the facilitators to make the following edits for clarity:
 - Remove the language that refers to consensus as ‘meaning that one or two may dissent, while the rest of the group support the decision or can live with it’.
 - Include a point that indicates that ‘once agreement has been reached, the parties will support it’
 - Indicate that the report will indicate:
 - Items on which we achieved full consensus
 - Items on which there is a ‘majority report’ and a ‘minority report’
 - Items on which there are mixed opinions and we could not come to a satisfactory conclusion
 - Provide a description of the ‘spirit of consensus’ – i.e. It is the intent of the Partnership to engage all viewpoints.

Work Plan:

- Adam Sussman and Harmony Burright presented a first draft of the work plan. The group will need to eventually decide what the study will focus on and how the study will be funded to completion.
- Adam emphasized that during Step One of the planning process, we will define the ‘scope of work’ that will then guide our work through the remaining phases of the process.
- Throughout the process we will be identifying and documenting issues and developing solutions. Adam encouraged everyone not to look at options or strategies in isolation, but rather as a package in which the combined strategies support the overall goals.
- Prioritization - The Committee agreed that we may want to prioritize some of the solutions and should develop rating criteria to help us with prioritization.
- Data - We will need to determine what information we have, as well as identify data gaps and how we will fill those gaps. Data gaps will always exist. We need to track and quantify our data gaps and determine which ones we are able to fill. We need to reach out to Partners and create an inventory of existing information, as well as data needs (do this in January meeting of Partnership).
- Budgeting – Once the work plan is developed, we will need to identify potential costs and revenue sources. Some of the work will be supported by the grant, and we may need to find additional funding sources to support other work. For instance – ‘characterize water resources’ – we need to develop foundational information. Is that effort funded by grant money or is there another source for the information (i.e. Can agencies develop the information?) We need to be realistic about what we can do, who is going to do it and cost.

- Implementation – Ultimately the work plan needs to include a column that indicates who is going to do the work that has been identified. It may not always be about budget/funding.
- Monitoring – We will need to track and monitor progress on work and cost as we work through the plan.
- Technical Expertise –
 - There is considerable technical expertise within the Partnership. If partners provide technical assistance, we need to keep track of that as ‘in kind contribution’ to the process.
 - We may need to bring in technical experts to address the Partnership, such as hydrology related to specific nature of our area.
 - We may want to form technical work groups, depending on issues we identify.
 - This will be driven by what we choose to focus on.
- Regional view – A lot of information is available. We need to collect the information and assimilate it into a regional view so that we can understand our water resources as an integrated system.
- Outreach – We need to continue to reach out to potential partners and bring them into the process. This is an open partnership. New partners can join throughout the process.
- Adam clarified approach to creating the work plan:
 - In Step One – we are creating the work PLAN – not doing the work.
 - We will approach the broader Partnership to find out what information they have available and what their needs are.
 - We will need to define technical work groups and this may be added to the Charter.
 - Committee members are encouraged to send comments regarding the work plan to Adam.
- It was suggested that we review timeline and deliverables at next meeting of the full Partnership to help remind people where we are in the process and emphasize that Step One is to create the work plan. Implementing the work plan comes in subsequent steps.
- Stan commented that the biggest challenge is defining the granularity of the information we need/want to support decision-making. He cited water quality as an example – we could get very tied up in looking at details or we could take a broader look at trends. We may want to bring in a technical expert early on and decide how we will approach this. We need to consider this holistically and not get bogged down by examining temperature in each water body. DEQ is addressing this in their TMDL process and we need to be careful not to duplicate that effort.

Meeting Schedules:

- Partnership survey indicates Wednesday afternoons are best for meetings of the full Partnership.
- Coordinating Committee agrees that Friday mornings are best for them, but Friday afternoons are also workable.

Next Partnership Meeting – November 30:

- Agenda to include:
 - Charter: Report on status of Charter, share and get input on sections that have been drafted and ask the Partnership to contribute their thoughts on development of a vision statement.
 - Work Plan: Report on status of Work Plan and get input from Partnership.
 - Data and Education: Poll the Partnership to find out what information they may have available to support the process and to determine what educational topics they would like to have information provided on.

Next Steps:

- Review meeting notes, draft charter, agenda for Nov. 30 Partnership meeting. Send your edits by Nov. 25 to: jeanne@innovativegrowtholutions.com
- Review the draft work plan and send your comments and questions to Adam at ASussman@gsiws.com
- Draft agenda and materials for November 30 Partnership meeting – Project Team
- Meeting schedule – Harmony
- Next Planning Partnership Meeting: November 30, 4 – 7 pm, Health Education Center, Samaritan Pacific Hospital, 740 SW 9th Street, Newport