

Mid-Coast Water Planning Partnership Coordinating Committee Meeting Notes

Date: Monday, July 24, 2023, 10 AM-11:30 AM

Location: Zoom

Coordinating Committee Meeting Attendees

Adam Denlinger – Seal Rock Water District

Alyssa Mucken – Oregon Water Resources Department

Mike Broili – MidCoast Watersheds Council

David Rupp – Oregon State University

Suzanne de Szoeki – GSI Water Solutions, Inc.

Leah Cogan – GSI Water Solutions, Inc.

Meeting Agenda

- Partner funding requests
- Co-convener search
- Charter updates
- August Prioritization Work Group agenda
- Partnership meeting planning

Summary of Major Points of Discussion

- The committee discussed the funding request from five Partner organizations
 - GSI contacted Adair Muth, the Grant Coordinator at OWRD, about the request – following OWRD’s internal discussions, Adair said that OWRD would accept the current requested \$60/hour hourly rate, and OWRD is trying to develop a standardized reimbursement rate for place-based planning groups in the future
 - Adair (OWRD) stated that a description of grant-related activities and hours spent (and/or travel mileage) must be provided with the reimbursement request to meet federal grant reporting requirements; funding can be distributed from a total set-aside amount to any group requesting reimbursement, or set up as individual stipends to specific groups
 - Suzanne showed how the groups’ requests would affect the grant budget (\$5,760 requested per group x 5 groups = \$28,800 total)
 - Adam explained that under previous grant funding for the Partnership, stipends were provided with minimal documentation, but that more documentation will be needed now to meet municipal audit requirements and federal reporting requirements
 - Alyssa suggested considering the tradeoff of providing stipends on accomplishing other activities under the grant

- Suzanne shared a template for reimbursement requests based on a form used by the Lower John Day place-based planning group
- Committee members generally agreed that participation in the Partnership is intended to be a voluntary process, but that if participation creates a burden on very small organizations or an attendee would be financially impacted by missing their day job to attend a meeting, compensation would be appropriate; some considered the pending request to be on the high side of the number of hours per month someone would participate
- Committee members agreed on setting aside a \$20,000 portion of the grant budget as a starting point for Partner funding requests and setting not-to-exceed limits of \$3,000 per group, which can be adjusted later if needed and as funding allows
- Committee members agreed to re-advertise the availability of stipend funding to make sure it is accessible to any groups that need it to participate
- **Action Item:** GSI will reach out to the organizations that requested funding to provide an update on the committee's proposed strategy, and it will be an agenda item for discussion at the next Work Group meeting
- The committee reviewed and discussed the co-convenor position description
 - Alyssa provided suggestions for an introductory paragraph about the Partnership's efforts and a more thorough description of the convenor's role from the Place-Based Planning Guidelines
 - Other clarifications suggested: this is not primarily an administrative position; the convenor should demonstrate leadership in the community to help get people to the table; it will likely not be feasible for the convenor to attend every meeting or be on every committee; we should list all convenors considered (even if they were not interested) so we have a record of how the convenor was selected
 - Mike suggested that it would be beneficial to have County and Tribal representation
 - David suggested having the position description explain the support available to fulfill the convenor role
 - Administrative support from GSI through the grant
 - Volunteer position, but funds available to support activities through the same Partner hardship funding set-aside if needed
 - **Action Item:** GSI will update the convenor description based on feedback received and send it back out to the committee
- The committee discussed proposed updates to the Partnership's Charter
 - Suzanne described comments compiled from committee members, including broadening the vision of the Partnership now that it is past the planning phase,

and including better descriptions of the project team and coordinating committee

- Alyssa suggested clarifying the decision-making processes for the Work Group, Coordinating Committee, and Partnership as a whole
- There has been turnover among Partner organizations, and the next full Partnership meeting (October or November) would be a good time to get more current participants to sign the charter
- **Action Item:** GSI will develop and send out draft language about the decision-making processes and will incorporate feedback into the proposed charter updates
- The committee discussed the agenda for the next Work Group meeting
 - The plan for the prioritization process is to hold three 2-hour meetings, with individuals providing draft scoring sheets prior to each meeting to be discussed and finalized at the Work Group meeting
 - Each meeting will cover 1-2 imperatives plus related actions from Imperatives 1 and 2 (cross-cutting imperatives)
 - The Prioritization Work Group will meet Tuesday, August 8 from 9 AM-11 AM
 - August meeting will focus on Imperatives 6 and 8 (source water protection and ecosystem restoration)
 - September meeting will focus on Imperatives 4 and 5 (water conservation/reuse and resilient water infrastructure)
 - October meeting (depending on timing of Partnership meeting) will focus on Imperative 3 (monitoring) and miscellaneous actions not yet covered
 - If the Work Group can't cover all actions in three meetings, a fourth meeting may be scheduled
 - The Work Group will discuss the proposed scoring criteria and process at the first meeting
 - The scoring sheet has a column where participants can self-assess their expertise related to each action
 - Non-experts are welcome to contribute their perspectives
 - Knowledge gaps will be identified
 - Scores will not be weighted, and can be changed after discussion when the Work Group meets