

Mid-Coast Water Planning Partnership Prioritization and Early Implementation Work Group Meeting

Date: Tuesday, December 12, 2023, 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.)

In Person Participants:

Suzanne de Szoeki – GSI Water Solutions, Inc.

Leah Cogan – GSI Water Solutions, Inc.

Mike Broili – MidCoast Watersheds Council

Bradley Winn – Seal Rock Water District

Tyler Clouse – Lincoln Soil and Water Conservation District

Alexandria Scott – Lincoln County Resident

Bill Montgomery -- MidCoast Watersheds Council Board Member and certified water treatment plant operator

Online Participants:

Mikaela Clarke – GSI Water Solutions

Billie Jo Smith – Lincoln County Water Systems Alliance

Caylin Barter – Wild Salmon Center

Paul Engelmeyer – MidCoast Watersheds Council

Fran Recht – Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission

Andrea Sumerau – Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians

Evan Hayduk – MidCoast Watersheds Council

Tatyana Isupov – DEQ

Mark River – Weyerhaeuser

Alyssa Mucken – OWRD

Steve Parrett – DEQ

<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"> • Imperatives 1 and 2 groupings
<p><u>GSI Action Items</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update the prioritization groupings and send out 	<p><u>Partnership Action Items</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to think about groupings and work plans, • Send any comments and ideas, think about how the work plans will be done and who will be involved

Next meeting: Tuesday, January 9 Virtual Only

DRAFT

Finishing Scoring

Action 42: Additional sources of water for the region

- Paul: regional plans – have we addressed the TMDL on the horizon, and making that a priority? And have we talked about regional plans linked to endangered species and habitats?
 - Leah: appendix D mentions a species plan not TMDL
 - Paul: and are plans for minimum instream flows on the list?
 - Suzanne: we have OWEB endangered species plans, natural hazards mitigation, ODFW plan, etc.
 - Leah: we have put a yes if it helps implement State Integrated Water Strategy, we can add TMDLs etc. once available
- Fran: the word development is loaded – it looks like supporting development rather than development of alternative sources of water to take pressure off over appropriated areas. Maybe rephrase to something that better reflects the desired outcome.
 - Billie Jo: The studies David showed us, looking at water systems for the whole county show there is not enough water currently to serve future populations so they have to come up with other storage options. Either storage or something like desalination if we don't have sources and meet instream flows.
 - Mike: I agree with Fran. Conservation should be at the top of the list as well, as desalination doesn't solve flow minimums etc.
 - Leah: other actions are focused on instream flows.
 - Fran: conservation to 'create' more water. Moratoriums on development are other solutions. We don't have instream flows established on many streams so that is a big hole.
 - Bill: Maybe we should start with what options we have for a second choice and identify that.
 - Alyssa: This is the description of Action 42 in the plan. Check out the objectives: Develop a sustainable water supply for consumptive uses that also protects the environment, supports healthy watersheds, and is resilient to climate change stressors and natural hazards.
 - Billie Jo: the action plan is to develop a 50 year plan, phase 1 is a professional study which includes looking at all the conservation plans and identifying sources
- Quality
 - Fran: storage often decreases water quality – increases temp, decreases O2
 - Andrea: if we were looking at storage, there's tradeoffs but often you have to look at covered storage if you're not going to lose so much from other processes, and that's really expensive.
 - Tyler: I don't want to say the solution to pollution is dilution because of the quantity so I would go medium for quality.
 - Billie Jo: I think it should be high because we are talking about drinking water, and it should improve it
 - Bradley: drinking water quality would be medium, but streams quality would be high. - Storage would have regulatory actions taken but it would still be treated.
 - Leah: the action is just that additional sources are identified for development.
- Regional plan

- Caylin: in the appendix, the Rocky Creek assessment seems to be a regional plan, right?
 - Its never made it past just the talking stage.
 - Caylin: is it just looking for a yes/no for a regional plan (not whether the plan is actionable)?
 - Fran: it's whether the action implements a plan.
 - Mike: with technology, if you do have to go to desalination that would be a regional issue.
 - Billie Jo: this will be covered in the 50 year plan which will be a regional plan but it doesn't exist yet.
 - Leah: if you're implementing this additional plan, there could be funding available and that's why we originally included it in the scoring criteria.

Reviewing Prioritization of Imperatives & Actions

- H,M,L were converted to 1, 2, or 3 points, Y/N was 1 or 0 points

Imperative 1

- Fran: it's really difficult looking at these without a prioritization within the existing priorities. It's difficult already to get the public's attention already but maybe there are too many high priority actions.
 - Suzanne: in the work plans as we identify different tasks maybe we can address a way to figure this out.
- Leah: in some cases, within an imperative, sometimes a 12 was an A, sometimes it was a B, they're not competing, we just are developing some first
- Billie Jo: I understand that these will be our priority actions, but when we get down to it, it will be different agencies and orgs that will decide their projects and which of our actions they will be working towards.
- Tyler: Especially with public awareness, there's a lot of orgs doing this, and when we do workplans it would be good to group them by category – e.g. agriculture, infrastructure, conservation, beavers, etc. which group is doing which.
 - Alexandria: we did some of that work initially to identify stakeholders. Looking at the list already created will be important to think about during the work plan phase.
 - Leah: we can use the projects spreadsheet that people filled out too.
- Fran: Yes, everybody will be working in their arena, but if there is conflicting instead of consistent messaging, that detracts from progress we can all make as a group. There should be consistent messaging from all groups using similar language.
 - Suzanne: we can specify that as a goal of the Partnership in the work plan. There's room for that within these groupings.
 - Caylin: Sounds like an outreach/ communications committee
 - Billie Jo: any time a group has a project they want our support on, that's where our meetings could go. There could be a group in our meetings where ideas are presented and reviewed by others in Partnership.
 - Bill: doesn't this go back to the Partnership vision? It will be tough to come up with a unified statement, other than our vision.
 - Mike: the organizations that speak to groups' interests should be listed on the website and/or other platforms.

- Caylin: 1. There will be an ad-hoc mission that each group has, 2. An opportunity for Partnership to speak, 3. Can we agree on general talking points when we get to implementation that each organization can elaborate on but to have consistency from the Partnership?
- Suzanne: We will stay open to discussion if anyone feels the groupings should change

Imperative 2

- Bill: Is Billie Jo involved with the 50 year county water supply plan?
 - Leah: I'm not sure if it's in progress yet, but it did get a high readiness score
 - There's a water systems alliance or something as well
- Mike: if this is being addressed, it hasn't hit the municipal level yet (no discussion in Newport)
 - Leah: they were seeking funding so may not have actually started it yet
- Fran: difference between a 13 and a 14 is arbitrary sometimes. For action 10, there's a lot of emergency planning going on, so strategically thinking about the resources right now, this one could be moved up to an A, just knowing how much money there is now for hazard resiliency.
 - Suzanne: we can move things around if we agree it should be somewhere else
 - Tyler: I think it scored low because of water quality impact and readiness maybe
 - Toledo, Yachats, Lincoln City have done ERPs or are in process
 - Suzanne: we scored it as a 2 for readiness, but maybe it should be a three based on comments
 - Mike: it doesn't really benefit quality/quantity generally
 - Suzanne: The group ranked it for quantity as a high, and quality as a medium.
 - (group agreed to move Action 10 to an A)
- Alyssa: I'm surprised that the two actions about Drinking Water Protection Plans (DWPPs) (12 and 13) aren't in group A because it seems over the last 8 or 9 months that source protection seems to be a high priority for different communities in the midcoast.
 - Suzanne: both of those were under quantity as a medium, and stakeholder understanding was medium-high (those categories keep it from being an A)
 - (Caylin and Fran agree to elevate 12 and 13)
 - Mike: Community Forest Plans are happening in Newport and other communities, and those would affect quantity & quality, and would be part of the protection plan.
 - Fran: Depoe Bay is also exploring watershed protection in our N Depoe Bay watershed-- including acquisition an easement (Yachats too)
 - Caylin: using easements & acquisitions to protect downstream water quantity and quality is being used by McKenzie River Trust and North Coast Land Conservancy. If their voices were in the room I hope they would agree.
 - Leah: Lincoln City has acquired part of their watershed.
 - (group agreed to elevate Actions 12 and 13 to an A)
 - Steve: IF the group elevates to A, DEQ/OHA may have staff and resources to help with writing work plan and funding

Work Plan Discussion

- Mike: the Partnership has identified areas that need action – is there an opportunity or place where someone could find how they could fit into this and create a project around an action (online for example)?
 - Leah: there's the projects spreadsheet, but that's also a reason we're putting together the different imperatives and list of organizations
- Mike: for high priority ones, are we going to reach out and find out who has a project or idea, and how do we gain public response?
 - Suzanne: could happen through outreach of the partnership and then people could come to us and we could support them. Another way is that someone just comes cold and offers an opportunity for a project.
 - Bill: are we going to provide the money for projects through the partnership?
 - Suzanne: probably to be determined. Partnership will support people with getting grants and knowing what money is available
 - Mike: Could also work if Partnership knows where money is available and can get word out. Partnership can create opportunities and momentum for people to be able to come up with projects based on our actions.
- Billie Jo: I found what you developed for the work plan not very useful. I think the work plan should what we are going to get to implement projects, not just developing proposals we understand that already. We should be putting out a request for projects and proposals from entities and make sure we send requests to entities we already listed. Then our role would be to give them a proposal outline that describes the project, needs, general grant proposal stuff, which action is it addressing and how. Next step in our plan would be that we would have work groups that contain all of the people that would be helpful on that proposal with those who put it together, and that's where we can help them improve it and offer our expertise. Then we can make recommendations for grants etc. I'd like us to turn this around and focus it on our process and our work. This is rehashing what we've already done.
 - Steve: I think the work plan template is fine to get us started thinking, talking, and writing about how to get an action started. This discussion today seems to be more about the future vision of the Partnership and its role, which is also a good discussion to have.
 - Alyssa: in the executive summary of the existing plan, the partnership said its number 1 priority is a dedicated Partnership Coordinator position who can coordinate etc. this speaks to what Billie Jo is hoping to achieve etc.
 - From the executive summary:
Following state recognition process, the Water Action Plan will move into the Implementation phase. The highest priority is continued funding for a dedicated Partnership coordinator position to perform critical duties associated with partner agreements, partner onboarding, identifying the first round of projects (including any already initiated), monitoring and recording implementation progress, seeking funding sources and supporting the work of the Water Action Teams and individuals.
 - Alexandria: there's some future agenda items that could be helpful to plan for. There's a question about the future fiscal capacity of the partnership. There's one current convenor, and it's a big ask to ask for them to be a fiscal agent for the partnership and

additional projects. Reporting requirements are huge. It could be helpful to think about what does the Partnership look like in the future from a fiscal position. Each planning group has approached implementation differently. In the Harney Basin, their watershed council has started implementation, and when they write a grant proposal they submit it to a review committee that's a small subset of the collaborative. They've been able to make some progress implementing the plan recognizing the conveners didn't have capacity to fiscally go after things. Sounds like a future agenda item to work through and not for today.

- Paul: placeholder on an issue we need to figure out how to incorporate climate adaptation strategies and partners. There's a document related to Siuslaw forest and we should incorporate it as an example and it included a flow analysis.

Next Steps and Follow-up discussion

- Bill: confused about coordinating committee
 - Suzanne: the coordinating committee checks in on agendas
 - Bill: we used to have smaller groups and it seems like we don't have those again
 - Suzanne: someone from the coordinating committee in the future can discuss what their role is
- Alyssa: it's important to acknowledge that the charter was an agenda item today and we decided to table it. In addition, I want to acknowledge the confusion and frustration that the changes to the Charter made. I know it's important and you all worked hard on it, so any changes to it should be inclusive. The coordinating committee heard your concerns so we will go back to that and rethink what we want to do.
- Suzanne: next meeting we will follow up on prioritization and work on work plans. Next meeting is virtual only.