

Mid-Coast Water Planning Partnership Coordinating Committee Meeting Notes

Date: Wednesday, March 13, 2024, 9:00-10:30 AM

Location: Zoom

Coordinating Committee Meeting Attendees

Coordinating Committee Members Present:

Adam Denlinger – Seal Rock Water District

Alan Fujishin – Gibson Farms

Alyssa Mucken – Oregon Water Resources Department

David Rupp – Oregon State University

Billie Jo Smith – Lincoln County Water Systems Alliance

Coordinating Committee Members Absent:

Steve Parrett – Oregon Department of Environmental Quality

Mike Broili (MidCoast Watersheds Council)

Henry Pitts – Oregon State University student

Facilitators:

Suzanne de Szoeko – GSI Water Solutions, Inc.

Leah Cogan – GSI Water Solutions, Inc.

Meeting Agenda

- Proposed charter revisions
- Next Coordinating Committee meeting agenda

Summary of Major Points of Discussion

- The committee discussed proposed provisions to the charter
 - Some discussion items had been tabled at the previous meeting to allow discussion when Adam (convener and current fiscal agent for the ARPA grant) could attend
- Role of the Coordinating Committee
 - Billie Jo expressed support for more involvement of the Coordinating Committee in reviewing and proving recommendations on an annual fiscal plan for the Partnership and overseeing fiscal decisions
 - Adam described the fiscal accountability measures taken by Seal Rock Water District as the ARPA grantee and agreed that grant documentation (grant budget, invoices, quarterly financial reports, etc.) would be provided to the Coordinating Committee, but pointed out that the Partnership is not a stand-alone organization with its own governing body, budget, and bank account
 - The committee expressed support for transparency, accountability, and engagement of more entities in developing scopes and funding applications that directly affect what activities the Partnership can undertake

- Alan noted that the Partnership had run short on funding in the past, and Billie Jo advocated for a more detailed budget or fiscal plan to understand whether the Partnership's intended activities have sufficient funding and guide future grant applications as needed
- The committee discussed the necessity of having the Coordinating Committee review and approve budgetary changes greater than \$5,000 and agreed that all activities should be in compliance with relevant grant requirements and any changes to the scope should be discussed with the Coordinating Committee
- The committee discussed ways to share responsibility for developing and reviewing grant budgets and fiscal plans that would provide transparency, allow for more involvement in developing scopes that affect the Partnership's direction and activities, not create significant additional administrative burden, and avoid placing all responsibility for the Partnership's fiscal planning on a very limited group of people
- The committee determined that the Project Team should develop an annual fiscal plan, and the Coordinating Committee would review it and provide recommendations; in the future, a budget committee may be formed depending on funding sources and interest
- The Coordinating Committee would also be involved in developing and/or reviewing grant funding proposals and providing strategic direction on scopes
- Role of the Project Team
 - The committee tentatively added "Partnership Coordinator" as an additional member of the Project Team, which includes the Conveners and technical consultants, and will consider describing this role further at a future meeting
 - The committee included preparation and maintenance of an annual fiscal plan in the Project Team's responsibilities
- Role of the Convener
 - The description of the role is consistent with the position description developed for the search for another Convener
 - Alyssa noted that the description of the Convener being "impartial to any particular outcomes," which had been proposed for deletion, came from the state's place-based planning guidelines, and the committee agreed to include it in the description
- Decision Making Process
 - The committee discussed the meeting attendance requirements for members to participate in consensus decisions, particularly because full Partnership meetings are less frequent than during the planning phase, and not all members are on the Coordinating Committee or another sub-group
 - Alan noted that the original concern was that someone could attend one meeting, sign the charter, and then obstruct all consensus decisions at that meeting, but that this had not happened in the past
 - Billie Jo suggested that the attendance requirement could discourage attendance because people who missed several meetings would not see a reason to re-engage if they could not be part of consensus decisions

- The committee discussed the agenda for the next Coordinating Committee meeting
 - The committee will give an update on the search for another Convener, discuss agendas for the Prioritization Work Group and full Partnership meeting, and discuss outreach materials about the value of participating in the Partnership
 - GSI will provide a quarterly financial report, and the committee will discuss fiscal planning and Partnership capacity funding (administration, meeting facilitation, Coordinator position, etc.)
 - The committee decided to add time to the agenda to continue working on proposed changes to the Charter

DRAFT