

Mid-Coast Water Planning Partnership Prioritization Project Workgroup Meeting

Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2023, 9:00 am – 11:00 am

Location: Virtual

Conveners: Adam Denlinger (Seal Rock Water District)

Facilitators: Suzanne de Szoeki and Mikaela Clarke (GSI Water Solutions, Inc.)

Online Participants:

Suzanne de Szoeki – GSI Water Solutions

Mikaela Clarke – GSI Water Solutions

Billie Jo Smith – Toledo and Lincoln County Water Systems Alliance

Caylin Barter – Wild Salmon Center

Paul Engelmeyer – MidCoast Watersheds Council

Christine Clapp – ODFW

Mike Broili – MidCoast Watersheds Council

Brad Wynn – Seal Rock Water District

Fran Recht – Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission

<p><u>Questions/Comments To Address</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<p><u>Decisions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None other than scoring sheet decisions
<p><u>GSI Action Items</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Send Scoring decisions and meeting notes to the group • Keep MCWPP home page up to date with water news • Send out information about the full Partnership meeting on November 16 	<p><u>Partnership Action Items</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review materials and send comments and questions to Suzanne • Share information about the upcoming Partnership meeting (social media, etc.)

Next full Partnership meeting: Nov. 16

Meeting Agenda:

- Introductions, review of agenda
- Review October 10 meeting minutes
- Review input and scoring together
 - Remaining imperatives
- Updates on past action items
- Review meeting questions, decisions, and action items

Scoring discussion

(Note: The scoring table filled out during the meeting reflects decisions made about scores for the actions. The following captures comments/questions from the scoring discussion, at times identifying the person who commented.)

Imperative 1: Public Awareness and Support

Action 1f: Identify or develop curriculum and materials/information for students and the public (community education) about their water sources, water management, and water conservation.

- Paul: curriculum about source water protection would be valuable for the community and industrial landowners
- Christine: Paul, could you please send out the curriculum to the group
- Billie Jo: this doesn't directly affect water quality and quantity unless people actually act on the information received in the outreach
- Fran: combining student and public education makes scoring difficult
- Mike: there may not be an immediate effect, but looking at the future, outreach is important for getting people to understand water issues
- Caylin: not sure how much impact outreach actually has on stakeholder behavior as opposed to understanding
- In general, the team wanted to rank stakeholder understanding high but were mixed on the effects on water quality and quantity

Action 1i: working with partners to reduce pesticide use

- Mike: this action is aimed at pesticides, but we should also include herbicides – this is a big issue at Beaver Creek right now
- Caylin: herbicides can be considered a type of pesticide and included under this action
- Suzanne: in the work plan, we can consider it broadly and include herbicides; several communities have included this goal in their plans
- Fran: OSU Extension may not promote reductions in pesticide use unless they have an Integrated Pest Management program now – they provide information about safe application, but don't generally discourage pesticide use in general

Action 1j: source water education

- Similar to the previous education and outreach action, and the group generally agreed on similar scoring
- Communities with Drinking Water Protection Plans are actively working on this

Action 1k: connect landowners with resources about best practices to protect water quality and quantity

- Similar to the previous education and outreach action, and the group generally agreed on similar scoring
- Readiness may be revisited from medium to high – Lincoln SWCD may have programs
- Fran: there are more outreach programs related to water quality than water quantity

Action 2: 50-year county-wide water supply plan

- Fran: it's related to water supply, so it focuses more on quantity than quality
- Billie Jo: the action doesn't specify this, but the goal of the proponents of the 50-year plan is to be a water supply plan that stipulates it must improve water quality too and benefit the environment
- Billie Jo can send the description of the plan and goals for use in the description when we are making the work plans – goal is to reduce pressure on over-used streams and benefit both quality and quantity

Action 3: Mid-Coast Water Conservation Consortium and Lincoln County Water Systems Alliance to facilitate prioritization and funding of projects

- This relates to the current prioritization process
- Billie Jo: this is to help organizations get going to get funding to do projects, it's more about procedures but the end goal is to benefit water quality and quantity
- "Projects" referenced in the action can be interpreted broadly to include water system projects, outreach, habitat restoration, instream flow protection, etc.
- Suzanne: the Consortium is looking to apply for funding for a water-efficient appliance rebate program in the spring
- Steve: the action is more indirect, supporting procedures rather than directly impacting quantity or quality

Action 4: Mid-Coast Water Conservation Consortium to enhance water conservation efforts and pool resources of water providers

- Steve: the consortium's work is beneficial but "strengthen and support" is vague – how will the Partnership do this?
- Suzanne: the Partnership could provide a venue for distributing information, use its website to enhance coordination, and promote it at meetings
- Billie Jo: the value of the Partnership is sharing knowledge and expertise among members

Action 5: support planning and development that minimizes impacts to floodplains and riparian areas, and promotes Green Infrastructure and Low Impact Development

- Suzanne: this could include education of staff and council members for the cities and County
- Mike: this is needed across the board, rethinking the way we develop
- Caylin: this is not just education, but the Partnership taking a position to advocate for GI/LID, so the scores should be high for quality and quantity – we need a more robust forum for the Partnership to be able to take a public position to support and advocate for it – if the Partnership was functioning as a coordinating forum and had procedures, this could be a high for readiness
- Billie Jo: it would be useful to go through the plan and identify the actions for the Partnership itself to move forward, as opposed to the actions that will be implemented by individual partner organizations
- Steve: DEQ has a LID program that helps communities with this – add resources for technical assistance, in addition to the Partnership taking a policy stance

Action 6: develop Water Management and Conservation Plans for water systems

- Suzanne: these plans describe water rights and historical water use, conservation measures and benchmarks, curtailment plans, and future water needs
- Fran: not a fan, municipalities hire consultants to write plans and they sit on the shelf with no implementation
- Steve: WMCPs allow expanded use of a permit if conditions are met
- Suzanne: some communities do use conservation measures from a WMCP as a tool to show City Councils that investment is needed; they can also be used to think about changes needed for water rights
- Mike: in Newport, WMCP is past its expiration and nothing has been done to update it – it could still be a valuable tool but some kind of enforcement is needed to keep plans current and implement them
- Suzanne: not every municipality is required to have a WMCP – they would be required to have one if they needed an extension for a permit, or get a new permit, but some communities don't have the condition on their water rights – it can be integrated into a Water Master Plan, but it would be voluntary if their water rights don't require it
- Mikaela – we could put together an inventory of which municipalities are required to have WMCPs – the larger water providers in this area are required, but there is a mix among small and medium suppliers
- Caylin – if a municipality is not complying with its requirement, what is the consequence?
 - Steve: no access to additional water under a permit
 - Suzanne: OWRD can hold entities accountable by losing access to additional water, or require them to check in with OWRD if their water loss is high
 - Mike: Newport's plan is 8 years behind on updating and they are behind on implementation, but they were still able to expand water use, so not much enforcement appears to be happening
- Billie Jo: these plans should be well done and up-to-date and implemented, which would be high for water quantity, but since they aren't being developed and used the way they should be, it should be a medium

Action 7: coordinate water curtailment plans among water providers

- Billie Jo: this would definitely affect water quantity; if we didn't curtail, water shortages could occur
- Paul: this should be part of each municipality's WMCP, and revisiting the plan would be the next step
- Caylin: are curtailment plans and WMCPs different plans?
 - Suzanne: curtailment plans are a component of WMCPs, but some communities without WMCPs would have Emergency Response Plans that may include some information
 - Caylin: it sounds like the goal of this action is more to coordinate among water providers, rather than just having each one create their own curtailment plan
- Billie Jo: water quality benefits are lower than water quantity; coordinating for providers with the same water source is important (e.g., Seal Rock has interconnections with Newport and Toledo)

- Steve: there are no stream temperature triggers for curtailment, it's more about streamflow
 - Caylin: having a stream temperature trigger could help with meeting TMDLs and water quality standards for aquatic life
 - Paul: the TMDL process has been taking a long time, especially for the Yaquina – this should be a priority
 - Suzanne: we can see if there is an action directly related to that and include that in the work plans

Action 8: *stormwater management plans, GI/LID practices technical assistance*

- Fran: this is similar to Action 5 about GI/LID
- Mike: support encouraging municipalities to embrace these strategies, not sure how this is different
- Billie Jo: this one emphasizes stormwater management rather than water supply or wastewater
- Suzanne: this action seems to focus more on stormwater management in municipalities rather than up in the watershed
- Mike: water quality benefits should be high since it would prevent stormwater pollution
- Fran: GI could create swales, rain gardens, and open space – reductions in paved surfaces are good for the watershed

Action 9: *Emergency Response Plans, address vulnerabilities, regional interconnections*

- Billie Jo: this will benefit water systems through interconnections, but would not have an impact on water quality
- Fran: depending on what they are doing, reducing pressure on one source could benefit water quality through stream temperatures

Action 10: *collaborate with emergency planners to identify highest priority water needs, look for opportunities for emergency interconnections*

- Fran: is this for actions to be taken after earthquakes or wildfires?
 - Suzanne: yes, it is related to emergencies such as natural disasters, chemical contamination, etc.

Action 11: *communication trees to respond to emergencies, communication alternatives*

- Suzanne: this information would likely be in water providers' emergency response plans
- Fran: it's good that this action is framed as the Partnership supporting these entities rather than leading implementation

Action 12: *regionally integrated Drinking Water Protection Plans, and advocate for funding for plans and implementation*

- Billie Jo: do these plans already exist?
 - Suzanne: water providers develop their own individual plans; Yachats and Toledo have plans and Newport and Lincoln City will have them soon
- Fran: what is an example of an implementation action from a DWPP?

- Suzanne: if there is high turbidity coming from an eroding streambank, the action might be a riparian planting project. Another example might be identifying critical areas for land acquisition.
- Fran: what is the benefit of regional integration?
- Suzanne: there could be opportunities to work together where providers share a water source; for those with different sources, there could be benefits in aligning planned responses to wildfire or other natural disasters
- Fran: the responses are still site-specific; learning from each other is good but doesn't necessarily mean integration
- Suzanne: DWPP development involves stakeholder engagement through public meetings and local teams
 - Steve: stakeholder understanding benefits could be medium or high depending on how it's done, since the focus here is on regional integration
- Fran: there are so many types of plans (DWPPs, WMCPs, curtailment plans, etc.) and the actions keep focusing on advocating for funding for long planning processes – concern about the amount of planning and lack of action
- Steve: many water providers may bundle recommendations from plans into larger projects
- Billie Jo: many of these projects could be included in the 50-year water supply plan for the County – if cities are developing these now, they could be funneled into that plan

Action 13: *create one or more Source Water Protection Plans and advocate for funding for development and implementation of plans*

- Fran: this seems very similar to Action 12
 - Suzanne: they are the same type of plan, but Action 12 focuses on regional integration and Action 13 is more about creating the plans
- They are very similar and can be grouped together in the work plan
- Steve: check with Laura Johnson about whether there is any difference between DWPPs and SWPPs – it may just have been a mistake in wording

Next Steps and Follow-up discussion

- Still working on proposed Charter updates and convener search
- Coordinating Committee meeting November 8
- Reimbursement is still available
- Full Partnership meeting will be November 16 and will include a tour of Lincoln City's intake, a land acquisition project, and a sediment reduction project
 - Agenda and registration have been sent out
 - Meeting includes lunch and is in the afternoon after the tour
- Decisions in scoresheets will be shared out
- Outreach for the Partnership meeting has been sent out
 - Steve: has there been outreach other than emails to the mailing list?
 - Suzanne: there has been outreach to DWPP teams, and phone calls are planned
- Differentiating into Priority Groups A, B, and C will be a discussion with the group – Coordinating Committee and then come to agreement about work plan approach at December 12 meeting
 - Billie Jo: distinguish Partnership activities from other groups' activities