



Mid-Coast Water Planning Partnership

COORDINATING COMMITTEE

Meeting Notes

February 10, 2017, 9:00 am – 12:00 pm
Newport Recreation Center

NEXT STEPS

- Communication and Outreach: Charlie Plybon will consult with John Stevenson to develop communication and outreach scope to present to the Coordinating Committee March 10.
- Collaborative Water Planning Conference: Send your thoughts about program design to Harmony Burrignt by February 27.
- Technical Work Plan:
 - Harmony Burrignt to email Committee for input on key questions to be addressed by the Technical Work Plan.
 - Harmony will summarize data she has collected re 2.8.
 - Adam Sussman will reorganize the Technical Work Plan to incorporate input from today's meeting.
 - Next Coordinating Committee meeting - March 10 .
- Proposed OSU Capstone Project: Jim, Deb and Leah to:
 - Work with OSU to further define the Capstone project proposal, paying careful attention to messaging.
 - Develop an outline to share with the Coordinating Committee to ensure that it fits our needs and conforms to our goals.
- Next Meetings:
 - Coordinating Committee Conference Call, February 24, 9:00 – 10:00 am to discuss Charter. Please review discussion topics (attached). Call in number will be forthcoming.
 - Next Coordinating Committee Meeting March 10, 9:00 am – noon, Newport Recreation Center
 - Next Partnership Meeting March 29, 4 – 7 pm, location TBD

Participants:

- Tim Gross, Co-Convener, City of Newport
- Harmony Burrignt, Co-Convener, OWRD
- Wayne Hoffman, MidCoast Watersheds Council
- Jitesh Pattni, ODFW
- Alan Fujishan, Gibson Farms
- James Adler, Yachats Valley resident
- Charlie Plybon, Newport Surfrider Foundation
- John Stevenson, OSU, Oregon Sea Grant
- Stan VandeWetering, Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians
- Leah Tai attending for Deborah Wilkins, USFS, Hebo Ranger Dist.
- Caroline Bauman, Economic Development Alliance of Lincoln Co.

Unable to Attend:

- Jackie Mikalonis, Governor's Office, Regional Solutions Team
- Rick McClung, City of Yachats
- Terry Thompson, Lincoln County Commissioner

Project Team in Attendance:

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

Welcome and Introductions

Members introduced themselves and welcomed new members:

- Caroline Bauman, Economic Development Alliance of Lincoln County, representing business interests and taking CJ Drake's position on the Coordinating Committee.
- Olaf Sweetman, City of Newport Public Works Department, providing support for the process and attending for Tim Gross.

Communication and Outreach Update

- Harmony Burrig reported that 12-14 people volunteered to assist on the Communication, Education and Outreach Subgroup.
- Charlie Plybon reported on the need to develop a communication and outreach strategy to identify audiences beyond the Coordinating Committee and Partnership meetings. There may be an opportunity for funding from the Meyer Foundation to support additional outreach efforts. He asked for feedback from the Committee to help identify the audiences and their values:
 - Tim Gross – It is important to keep citizens, visitors, and anyone interested in water informed through press releases, etc.
 - Wayne Hoffman – We need to ask ourselves –
 - What do we want people to learn?
 - What behaviors do we want people to adopt, and what messages do we need to develop (such as water conservation, need for infrastructure investment, understanding how watershed health affects them)?
 - Alan Fujishan – We need to help people understand how water planning impacts them. The average citizen might not think there is a place for them at the table. People are attending for a variety of reasons – some want information, others have committed to be partners, and some have a greater commitment to serve on the Coordinating Committee.
 - Jim Adler – Can we invite people who are interested?
 - Harmony – Communication and Outreach. We are doing the bare bones to ensure an open, transparent process (public notices, making information available on the website). We need to develop strategic messages about how we are reaching out to a broad, diverse group of stakeholders.
 - Wayne Hoffman – Our audiences are in two primary categories: 1) Partners – people we need to reach out to and involve in this process, and 2) Audiences that we need to reach with messages.
 - John Stevenson – We need to think broadly about outreach and also about our leadership role on the coast. OSU has the ability to assist us with outreach.
 - Caroline Bauman suggested using the business community as a prime example of people who are users of water. She is willing to help identify key audiences.
 - Wayne Hoffman – We need to make sure the Partnership meetings are worthwhile and address substantive topics. We should be prepared to deal with potential issues. When asking community to make investments in resilience, particularly related to climate

change, we will have people in the community who do not believe in climate change. We need to be prepared for this and provide education.

- Charlie Plybon – This is why we need to identify audiences and their values so we can engage, inform, and educate them.

➤ **ACTION – Charlie Plybon will consult with John Stevenson and develop a communication and outreach scope to present to the Coordinating Committee at next meeting March 10**

Collaborative Water Planning in Oregon

- Harmony Burrig reported that the Oregon Community Foundation has funded an event in May (being planned for either May 17,18 or May 24, 25) in Bend to bring together representatives from the four PBP Pilots, as well as agencies that initially applied for the grants, to network and share information. We need to identify up to 5 representatives from our Partnership to attend. John Stevenson, Caroline Bauman, Stan VandeWetering, Wayne Hoffman, and Adam Sussman expressed an interest.
- Harmony Burrig reported that this is an opportunity to connect with other community leaders so that we can better inform and influence the state’s approach to place-based planning. Initial thoughts offered by the Coordinating Committee include:
 - Offer a webinar so more people can participate.
 - Provide opportunities to learn from groups similar to Mid Coast – i.e. locations where water does not come from snow melt.
 - Learn from Tribes in Washington – John Stevenson can follow up on this.

➤ **ACTION: By February 27, send your thoughts about program design to Harmony Burrig. Harmony and/or Charlie will follow-up with those that expressed interest.**

Develop Technical Work Plan

Adam Sussman presented an update of the Technical Work Plan, explaining that we are preparing ourselves to understand the water system and our needs. The Technical Work Plan will help us understand:

- What is our water supply?
- What are today’s demands?
- What are the future projected demands on the water supply?
- Where are there imbalances in the system - both in-stream out-of-stream?
- What are the potential solutions? How will we address the imbalances?

The Technical Work Plan will result in a scope of work that identifies where we need to further develop technical information so that we can quantify and better understand our imbalances to inform the solutions that we are selecting.

- GSI scope of work –
 - Develop technical work plan
 - Identify existing information

- Review and analyze it
 - Summarize existing information
 - Analyze data gaps
- We will start by developing a common understanding of the existing system.
- GSI will do work on the overall context and then create working groups to work on specific subject matter areas.
- What we want to accomplish at today's meeting:
 - Review input from the Partnership – red text indicates input from the Partnership.
 - Is this everything?
 - Can we do all of this? Are some items more important for us to focus on? What are the items we 'need to do' vs. 'nice to do'?
- Task 2: Characterize Existing Water Resources
 - Data Gaps –
 - 2.8 Harmony Burright has been collecting input on data gap and will consolidate key themes.
 - 2.7 Need to include both Revenue and Expenses
 - Add: socio-economic data, understand needs of existing industry
- Task 3: Examine Current and Future Water Needs
 - Wayne Hoffman expressed concern about protecting in-stream flows. The state's system for processing water rights is not working.
 - John Stevenson emphasized the need to prioritize data needs.
- **Next Steps:**
 - Identify the key questions we need to answer at each stage of the Technical Work Plan
 - What is the supply?
 - What is the demand?
 - What are the imbalances?
 - How can we solve the imbalances?

Harmony Burright presented a proposed list of key categories that have emerged from Partnership meetings in relation to the work plan (see attached). She asked for feedback from the Coordinating Committee in regard to how these categories are addressed in the work plan, and how/when subgroups should be engaged in the work.

The Coordinating Committee discussed different options in how to best involve subgroups in addressing the key categories. It was determined that more work needed to be done on identifying the key questions that would be asked around each category before sub-groups are formed.

The facilitator offered that the Technical Work Plan addresses:

- Current State - including characterizing our current water resources and identifying current challenges
- Future State – including identifying future demand and challenges

- Gaps between our current state and future needs
- Potential solutions

➤ **ACTION:**

- **Harmony Burrigh will send an email to Coordinating Committee members to get their input on key categories and key questions to be addressed by the Technical Work Plan categories.**
- **Harmony will summarize data she has collected re Task 2.8.**
- **Adam Sussman will reorganize the Technical Work Plan to incorporate input from today's meeting, including common understanding of 'base case'. This update of the Technical Work Plan will be discussed at the next Coordinating Committee Meeting March 10, 2017.**

Proposed OSU Capstone Project

Jim Adler and Leah Tai reported on discussions with Oregon State University's Civil Engineering Department to engage students in undertaking a senior class 'capstone' project beginning next winter to define a sustainable, long-term water supply. See attached 'Concept Proposal II'

Jim and Leah explained that the role of the Coordinating Committee would be to:

- Define the framework for this project.
- Identify questions we would like to have answered.
- Identify the deliverables we would expect to see from the students' work.

Discussion:

- Wayne Hoffman asked if the purpose is to look at the ideal way of supplying water in 2050?
Answer: Yes.
- Olaf Sweetman questioned the term 'regional water system', and suggested it should be plural 'system(s)'. He cautioned that one regional system would be huge, and we should not pre-judge the answer before completing our study.
- John Stevenson recognized this as an opportunity and offered the following questions:
 - How do we integrate this Capstone project with our current process?
 - Will an ideal system really influence our process given the existing realities?
 - How can we improve the existing infrastructure?
- Jim Adler responded that this project is theory in its entirety. This is imagining something else.
- Stan VandeWetering posed the question, 'How bad is our current infrastructure compared to an ideal'?
- Leah Tai explained that the OSU Capstone project would help to create a point of comparison of a potential future system against what we currently have in place.
- Olaf Sweetman observed that defining the ideal system may not be that useful to us because we are somewhat confined by the system that we currently have.
- Wayne Hoffman observed that the Capstone would help us better define what might make sense for us to work toward in the future.

- Stan VandeWetering questioned if the students can ask for feedback from us as they work through the Capstone project. Members of the Committee felt this would be helpful.
- Adam Sussman commented that the Capstone proposal is an interesting idea. It will be important to very clearly define the criteria for the ideal – cost, pressure, vulnerability to natural hazards, etc.
- Jim Adler explained that this is an opportunity for students to work with engineers. We should get a project from this. We can't just go straight to building a dam. Jim further explained that the Professor, Shane Brown, has experienced engineers available to work with and mentor the students.
- Stan VandeWetering suggested it would be good if some of the engineers and students are from the Mid Coast area.
- Alan Fujishan expressed that this is a great way to expand the Partnership by including students, engineers and OSU. Question – what information and support does OSU need?
- Jim Adler suggested that we need to define the relationship between the students and the Partnership. Students need some time to present to the public. The Partnership can be engaged in the process. Jim questioned if Adam Sussman can be available for phone calls from the students/professor. Adam responded that his office is nearby and he is willing to collaborate around developing information.
- Caroline Bauman expressed that she does not see any down sides and the proposal looks very worthwhile.
- John Stevenson offered a caution that the OSU effort should support the Partnership, not define the outcome independent of this process. The Partnership needs to operate in a transparent way, and we need to send the right message about OSU's participation. Facilitator – We need to be careful about how we describe this project. Describing it as developing a 'regional system' may seem like we have reached a foregone conclusion. A 'regional system' in the future may be very different from our current understanding of a 'regional system'. The possibility of 'regionalization' may be exciting to some, and may strike fear in others.
- The Committee acknowledged that messaging the intent of OSU's class project is critical: The Committee explored the following:
 - This is a study of long term implications, asking the question, 'What might be a concept that serves the needs of the region in the long-term?'
 - Capstone Project is an alternatives analysis.
 - The value of the study is a 50 year look, but is not intended to provide a solution.
 - Capstone Project is an exercise – opportunity to work with data on a real problem, to come up with best analysis – it does not obligate the Partnership to use the product in any way.

- **ACTION: The Coordinating Committee members present agreed that Leah, Jim and Deb will:**
 - **Work with OSU to further define the Capstone project proposal. They emphasized that naming and defining the intent of the project is very important.**
 - **Develop an outline to share with the Coordinating Committee to ensure that it fits our needs and conforms to our goals.**

Next steps

- Harmony Burrigh will schedule a follow up conference call with Coordinating Committee on February 24 at 9 am to continue discussion on the Charter.
- All CC member to review discussion topics posed regarding the Charter (see attachment).

Attachments:

- Technical Work Plan
- Subject Matter Groups
- OSU Capstone Project: Concept Proposal II
- Draft Charter and discussion questions submitted by Committee members
- Updated Coordinating Committee roster