

## Mid-Coast Water Planning Partnership Coordinating Committee Meeting Notes

**Date:** Wednesday, January 3, 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

Steve Parrett – Oregon Department of Environmental Quality

Alyssa Mucken – Oregon Water Resources Department

David Rupp – Oregon State University

Billie Jo Smith – Lincoln County Water Systems Alliance

*Coordinating Committee Members Absent:*

Mike Broili (MidCoast Watersheds Council)

*Facilitators:*

Suzanne de Szoeki – GSI Water Solutions, Inc.

Leah Cogan – GSI Water Solutions, Inc.

### Meeting Agenda

- Co-convenor search update and Coordinating Committee seat openings
- Charter: feedback on proposed changes and next steps
- Coordinating Committee overview for Work Group meeting
- Next Partnership meeting planning
- Financial report

### Summary of Major Points of Discussion

- No comments on minutes from last meeting
- Committee members suggested additional topics for discussion at this meeting that were not on the agenda, but ran out of time for discussion
  - Alyssa suggested adding a discussion of the Partnership email list and participation list
  - **Action Item:** GSI will send the participation list to the Coordinating Committee
  - Billie Jo suggested adding a discussion of the work plan approach and format, and expressed concerns about the agenda for the next Prioritization Work Group meeting; in response, additional options may be presented by Billie Jo or other members of the Project Team
- There were no updates on the Convenor search over the holidays
- The committee discussed the applicant letters of interest for a student to participate on the Coordinating Committee

- Committee members agreed that both were good candidates and would bring value and different perspectives to the committee as well as gaining a learning experience themselves
- Committee members discussed the applicants' level of experience, background and interests described in their letters of interest, and involvement in collaborative processes
- Committee members discussed whether to invite one or both students (potentially alternating) and determined that Coordinating Committee membership should represent the spectrum of interests and perspectives without being weighted toward any particular perspective, so only one student should be on the committee
- Alan noted that previous student participants were undergrads, but graduate students like the applicants could be well-aligned; the committee had also expressed interest in local community college students
- The committee discussed feedback on the charter that suggested having Coordinating Committee members be appointed by the full Partnership but determined that the invitations are intentional by the committee and that the full Partnership does not need to ratify them
- The next Prioritization Work Group meeting has an agenda item to discuss the role of the Coordinating Committee and solicit participation
- **Decision:** GSI will invite one student to the next Coordinating Committee meeting and will invite the second student to participate in the Work Group and full Partnership meetings
- The committee discussed the proposed changes to the charter and next steps
  - Committee members noted that the charter changes were on the agenda for the full Partnership meeting but ran out of time; proposed changes were sent out to the full Partnership by email but didn't have enough context so it caused some anxiety among Partners
  - Alan noted that the Prioritization Work Group has a specific function and is not a proxy for the full Partnership, and it would be helpful to keep their role distinct
  - Steve noted that the Coordinating Committee is designated in the charter as being responsible for reviewing the charter and proposing changes to the Partnership, so it was reasonable to review and propose changes on the entire document, even though that could have been communicated more clearly
  - Alan noted that the redline document was somewhat overwhelming and it would be helpful to see a simplified or side-by-side version to understand the changes; the document should also be internally consistent so a change in one area may require changes in other areas
  - Adam noted that the charter was last revised in 2018 so a review after 5 years was reasonable, and suggested putting a DRAFT watermark with a date on future versions for clarity
  - Alyssa suggested minimizing edits and focusing on essential changes rather than personal text preferences or changes to key collaboration elements (e.g., mission, goals, objectives, etc.)

- Billie Jo suggested holding a Coordinating Committee specifically dedicated to doing through the charter and making final recommended changes to be presented to the full Partnership, and other committee members agreed
- Billie Jo described some research on consensus suggesting it may not always achieve the best outcomes; it can promote “least common denominator” decisions and pressure on individuals to go along with the group, but it is the method in the charter and the Place-Based Planning guidelines
- **Decision:** the Coordinating Committee will hold a second meeting in February dedicated to the proposed charter changes
- The committee discussed the next full Partnership meeting
  - Suzanne will be discussing potential tours and availability with Evan Hayduk (Midcoast Watersheds Council) and Tyler Clouse (Lincoln Soil and Water Conservation District)
  - Proposed timing is late April or May
  - Proposed topics include the charter, prioritization, and work plans
  - Committee members noted that there have been fewer tours and participation opportunities in the southern part of the county
  - Adam suggested touring a project on South Beaver Creek that has recently been completed
  - Billie Jo suggested making a stronger connection between the tours and the Water Action Plan
  - Committee members discussed the process for approval of the prioritization
  - **Decision:** the Work Group will present their prioritization recommendations to the Coordinating Committee when ready, and the Coordinating Committee will review and present recommendations to the full Partnership