

Mid-Coast Water Planning Partnership Early Implementation Work Group Meeting

Date: Tuesday, February 13, 2024, 9:00 am – 10:30 am

Location: Seal Rock Water District office and virtual

Conveners: Adam Denlinger (Seal Rock Water District)

Facilitators: Suzanne de Szoeki and Leah Cogan (GSI Water Solutions, Inc.)

Participants:

- Adam Denlinger – Seal Rock Water District (SRWD)
- Alyssa Mucken – Oregon Water Resources Department (OWRD)
- Andrea Sumerau – Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians
- Billie Jo Smith – Lincoln County Water Systems Alliance
- Bradley Winn – SRWD
- Caylin Barter – Wild Salmon Center
- Evan Hayduk – MidCoast Watersheds Council
- Henry Pitts – Water Policy Grad Student at OSU
- Janna Stevens – Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW)
- Jennifer Beathe – Starker Forests
- Leah Cogan – GSI Water Solutions, Inc.
- Mark River – Weyerhaeuser
- Mikaela Clarke – GSI Water Solutions, Inc.
- Steve Parrett – Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ)
- Sue Birge – Interested Local Resident
- Suzanne de Szoeki – GSI Water Solutions, Inc.

<p><u>Questions/Comments To Address</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None 	<p><u>Decisions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The group likes the new workplan approach. • Add terminology related to synergies and multi-benefits to the flowchart and the implementation guide. • Find out what people are working on and interested in working on. • Bundle actions that are high priority. • Add more links to resources to the Partnership website. • Recommendation from the Work Group that funding and resources be set aside for building a database with Smart Sheets. This recommendation will be brought to the Coordinating Committee.
<p><u>GSI Action Items</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All of the decision items. 	<p><u>Partnership Action Items</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide comments on any documents that GSI shares before the next meeting. • Suggest resources/studies to add to the Partnership website resources page.

Next meeting: Tuesday, March 12, 2024, at 9:00 am

Work Plan Approach & Partnership Support Tools Discussion

- Billie Jo: It should be clear that the Partnership solicits projects from organizations in the workplan and flowchart.
- Caylin: Emphasize opportunities to synergize projects across focal areas. E.g., If SWCD brings a project to the committee, can that also help other projects for other organizations meet their goals?
 - Billie Jo: that's one of the most important roles of the committees
- Alyssa: Want to see more of a regional approach. Groups in California didn't get integrated on a regional level. We don't want to lose the collaborative base to bring in support on projects that could have bigger integrated benefits.
 - Suzanne: we could add that to the list of Partnership support, or could add it to the flowchart.
- Steve: Top of flowchart could be added: Pathways to Implement Plan Actions (or something similar)
- Billie Jo: Another way to bring in the synergy is to show other organizations that might be working on the same action on the leads and participants table.

Implementation Guide Discussion

- Billie Jo: I could see this being used later in the Action Plan. I think the first step is to send actions to our potential leader group and see what they are working on and what they are interested in working on. Then we can see what's missing, and at that point we can use this process. To develop these, I would think this would be a work group session that could bring possible leaders into the session to develop these steps. I don't see us working on this now, but this is a good model for high priority actions that aren't being picked up.
- Steve likes bundling similar or related ACTIONS into logical, coherent PROJECTS/programs/campaigns
- Alyssa: Billie Jo's approach is good. I was surprised to see OWRD and DEQ identified as a lead for so many actions. I'm concerned about the fact that we have 33 actions that are considered high priority out of 59. It would be difficult to communicate what we're focused on as a partnership without bundling a lot of actions.
 - Suzanne: a lot of the Imperative 8 actions that are a high priority are very complementary to each other, so that's a good example of where to bundle actions. We can think of other ways to bundle.
 - Alyssa: maybe one of the committees or groups can help the Partnership figure out how to communicate that info effectively. Spreadsheets aren't comfortable for everyone, so we need a key document or material that shows what our key focus areas are.
- Billie Jo: I understand the concern about the bundling, but I think that's going to happen naturally. Organizations will automatically bundle actions as they look through actions and what they want to do. Very few actions are a whole project.

Monitoring Database Discussion

- Leah: many of the performance metrics were surveys, so we could work with an organization like Oregon Kitchen Table who does lots of community engagement work, this way we aren't sending out survey after survey. People collect and store data in different ways, so it might not be convenient to have data all in one database, but we could track things like what the data format

is, what has been accomplished, what the goals are, etc. there could be more than one tracking/monitoring tool. We can see what might apply to different organizations.

- Adam: is that something we could put together with something like survey monkey or is that not as comprehensive?
 - Suzanne: it's up to the Partnership what level they want to take this tool/ how comprehensive it should be.
- Suzanne: is the group interested in us developing this tool out further, or just keep it as another tool that could be developed at some point?
- Billie Jo: I've found the references and links available on our website and in the Action Plan useful already. I can see us getting more links to more research and data that's been developed. Having those links available through our website would let those developing projects find data needed to back up their goals. This is an important tool, and I see it being more than a google doc but rather a research-based database with links to helpful data etc.
 - Leah: I think it's a good idea to have all these resources in one place. Then when groups apply for funding, they use the same data. Having it on the website is something we can work towards.
- Suzanne: at this point, is it just a matter of adding links to the website and re-organizing it? Or should we find out more about available data that's being collected to get a sense of data gaps, or just get a tool to track those metrics? Or are other things a higher priority than this now?
- Jennifer: I think it would be a good use of time to find out if data is available. ODF has GIS stream layers etc.
- Alyssa: I think we have a lot of work ahead of us that could be a higher priority than this specific monitoring database. We need to figure out the future role of the Partnership, what kind of funding streams are going to keep this work moving forward, fully fleshing out the three-pronged approach presented earlier, there's lots of work in the next year while we still have ARPA funding, I would worry about having two different databases and trying to build those, and not getting to the work we set out to accomplish. But it's not a bad idea, we just have limited resources.
- Billie Jo: I think a part of what we consistently do should be compiling data that's out there already, not making a database. Links to research and data could be important for our partners when doing projects. I'm curious what Evan for example thinks would be useful to the watershed council as you're trying to develop a project?

Options for Project Tracking Tools Discussion

- Billie Jo: Can we wait until Caylin can be here to discuss the project tracking database, because she had specific ideas about it?
- Adam: Is this programming (for the project tracking database) something everyone will be comfortable with? We want more participation, and I don't want to restrict anyone from being able to participate.
 - Suzanne: Smart Sheets has a form you can fill out instead of working in the spreadsheet, or they could ask the manager of the spreadsheet to update it. We can keep thinking of other ideas.
- Options include Google Docs (simpler, less functionality), Smart Sheets (more functionality, includes forms), ProjectFirma software (more robust system, has a map included, website, etc.)

- Caylin: I appreciate GSI looking into these tools. I think Steve originally suggested seeing how OWEB does its FIPs, so thank you Steve. I would really advocate for not describing this as a database. This is a project management tool for the Partnership to maximize synergy and accountability. I also want to highlight that \$12K is a lot of money, but somehow the John Day Partnership got the money to do this tool, so I would encourage this group to think big. If that funding came from OWEB through a FIP, that would help do amazing things, let's really consider that.
- Billie Jo: the Smart Sheet looked useful and is more reasonable, but as Caylin said, how will this be used? For us, it's to show what's happening within our region. I could see us building the actions into the Smart Sheet which would be useful. I see either one of these more as a way for the Partnership to show what we are accomplishing, rather than it being used to cause new things to happen in our region. We would see gaps from it of course, but I see Smart Sheets being used effectively, and I'd rather have the rest of those thousands of dollars be put into actual projects.
- Caylin: I agree with everything Billie Jo said. Wild Salmon Center is certainly a fan of Smart Sheets; my point was only let's look at all the options. I think it will agree internal & external transparency and accountability. We can set up Smart Sheets with the actions, and with a press of a button we can run a report to identify what the Partnership is doing to move any of the actions forward (for each action).
- Suzanne: What is the best next step related to this tool?
- Caylin: question for the group: would building a SmartSheet out be a good next step, and would this be a valuable use of funding that is supporting the early implementation process?
- Suzanne: as we move along, we want everyone to think about what other products we want out of this effort. When we think about the work plan in the coming months, what will help us get to our desired outcomes?
- Adam: I think this provides the partnership an opportunity to start developing smart sheets and data, plus is a way to be accountable and transparent. I'm in favor of that. Caylin made a good case; this would be a great first step in the right direction if everyone is interested.
- Suzanne: questions for the group: 1. Should we develop a database? 2. Is Smart Sheets the best way forward?
- Alyssa: I think starting with something like Smart Sheet now is great, and use that as momentum to think big and allow more time for developing that vision of the partnership.
- Billie Jo: We should try to gather info for that database from members who are already doing projects in the region.
- Next step to implement this recommendation: take it to the coordinating committee, the committee would approve the purchase, then we would purchase the subscription, then add existing projects and build out the functionality. Once the group is happy with the functionality, we will open it up for external viewing.
- Caylin: once we open it up to the external viewing, it will help make it snowball in a good way.

General comments

- Alyssa: OWRD is releasing the first draft of the Integrated Water Resources Strategy (IWRS) in early March, and there will be an opportunity for public comments.

- Caylin: we should weigh in on the IWRS, which is basically the foundation for Place Based Planning.

DRAFT