

Mid-Coast Water Planning Partnership Coordinating Committee Meeting Notes

Date: Wednesday, November 8, 2023, 12:30-2:00 PM

Location: Zoom

Coordinating Committee Meeting Attendees

Billie Jo Smith – Lincoln County Water Systems Alliance

David Rupp – Oregon State University

Steve Parrett – Oregon Department of Environmental Quality

Alan Fujishin – Lincoln Soil and Water Conservation District

Mike Broili – MidCoast Watersheds Council

Suzanne de Szoeka – GSI Water Solutions, Inc.

Leah Cogan – GSI Water Solutions, Inc.

Meeting Agenda

- Co-convenor search update
- Charter updates
- Work plan approach
- OSU project website content
- Partnership meeting planning
- Financial update

Summary of Major Points of Discussion

- No comments on minutes from last meeting
- The committee discussed the convenor search
 - Billie Jo has contacted Stan van de Wetering with the Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians, and he has expressed interest
 - Adam will be contacting County Commissioner Casey Miller
 - The proposed charter revisions do not limit the number of convenors
 - The process will involve potential convenors providing a letter describing their background and interest in being a convenor, then meeting with the Coordinating Committee, then the full Partnership
- The committee discussed proposed updates to the Partnership's charter
 - Members discussed the proposed changes to the decision-making process
 - Consensus is important to the group, but can be difficult to achieve in practice and can delay or prevent some decisions from being made
 - Discussion and deliberation are important for sharing ideas and perspectives
 - The original charter language allowed for decisions to be reached by majority vote only after a lengthy process and only in cases where time is of the essence; otherwise continued deliberation toward consensus is

required (in practice, the Coordinating Committee has never actually had to refer any question to the full Partnership for a vote as opposed to consensus)

- The place-based planning guidelines require a consensus process rather than voting, and the ARPA grant requires compliance with the guidelines, so the decision-making process cannot be shifted to a voting-only system
- Steve shared that other place-based planning groups' definitions of consensus were more flexible, such as consensus minus 2 participants or consensus minus 10% of participants
- The committee agreed that there should be some description of a quorum for decision-making, while retaining the idea that a spectrum of interests should be represented when decisions are made
- In cases where a decision must be made quickly (e.g., a funding application deadline is approaching) and consensus has not been reached, committee members wanted the option of calling a vote but with a high threshold for agreement rather than a simple majority
- **Committee decision:** require a quorum for decision-making, change the definition of consensus from 100% agreement to consensus minus 2 participants, and in the event of lack of consensus when a decision must be made immediately, allow for a vote requiring a three-fourths majority to pass
- **Action item:** GSI will make edits based on today's discussion and will present the proposed changes at the Partnership meeting on November 16
- GSI presented examples of the work plan format for the next phase of the prioritization project
 - The proposed format will be presented at the Partnership meeting, and development of the actual plans will begin in December
 - Work plans will be organized by imperative from the Water Action Plan
 - Imperatives are not competing against each other
 - Within each imperative, actions will be placed in priority groups based on the prioritization project results
 - Similar actions that could be implemented together will be grouped into themes
 - Work plans will describe foundational actions (e.g., studies and data collection) and project-based actions
 - Where projects have been identified, these will be included in the plan with descriptions of tasks needed to support implementation
 - The request for project information will be reiterated at the Partnership meeting
 - ARPA funding will not last forever, and the Partnership needs to think about long-term funding sources for collaboration and funding sources for projects
 - The process for obtaining project support will be included in the work plans
- The committee reviewed new pages to be added to the Partnership website on the OSU climate and water study

- The main page shows information about water providers and their drinking water source areas, population served, and water demand
- Subpages for each large water provider show projected impacts of climate change on their demand and on streamflows for their water source
- Detailed methods and data are available on a subpage for those wanting more information
- **Action item:** The new pages will go live the day before the Partnership meeting
- The committee discussed the upcoming Partnership meeting
 - The agenda has been updated; Rick McClung is no longer available for the presentation about Yachats' Drinking Water Protection Plan
 - Adam Denlinger will make opening remarks as the current convener
 - The proposed revisions to the charter will be presented with tracked changes
 - Tour information will be sent out to registered participants, including the meeting location
 - Upcoming funding opportunities will be described
 - **Action item:** post outreach about the meeting on social media
 - **Action item:** GSI will send out the list of funding opportunities for committee members to add any others they are aware of
- GSI presented the most recent quarterly financial information on the ARPA grant
 - Phase 1 (prioritization) is almost complete, and then the project will move into Phase 2 (work plans and early implementation steps)
 - The project is within budget, and amendments can be made once early implementation steps are defined to include implementation of eligible projects