

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

**Date:** Wednesday, November 29, 2023, 12:30-2:00 PM

**Location:** Zoom

### Coordinating Committee Meeting Attendees

Adam Denlinger – Seal Rock Water District

Billie Jo Smith – Lincoln County Water Systems Alliance

David Rupp – Oregon State University

Steve Parrett – Oregon Department of Environmental Quality

Suzanne de Szoeka – GSI Water Solutions, Inc.

Leah Cogan – GSI Water Solutions, Inc.

### Meeting Agenda

- Partnership meeting reflections and future approach
- December Prioritization Work Group planning
- January Work Group planning
- Co-convener search update
- Coordinating Committee seat openings
- Financial report

### Summary of Major Points of Discussion

- No comments on minutes from last meeting. Minutes from last meeting will be emailed to the Committee to review and comment on next meeting
- The committee reflected on the November full Partnership meeting
  - Committee members enjoyed the presentations but expressed the need to keep the meeting running on time and keep the speakers on time
  - Important discussions or decisions should not be left to the end of the meeting
  - Billie Jo suggested starting future meetings with a business meeting before having the presentations
  - Steve suggested there were too many items on the agenda, and that 2-3 presentations might have been better; the model of tour-lunch-learning-work seemed like a good fit; circular tables would have been better for discussions; introductions are important and time should be made for them in the agenda; technical issues were unfortunate, but they happen, and harsh criticism felt unwarranted
  - Committee members had hoped for better turnout at the meeting and want to find ways to get more people to attend; if people help develop the work plans during the next phase, they would be more invested in implementing them

- During work plan development, the Work Group may directly reach out to specific Partner organizations that are likely stakeholders for the particular imperative under discussion
- The committee discussed the approach for future full Partnership meetings
  - Steve suggested having presentations on relevant funding opportunities (e.g., OWRD, OWEB, and DEQ grants)
  - Another potential theme could be updates on local actions and data sharing
  - David noted that there has been some interest in holding meetings in the early evening in case some individuals are not able to take time off work to attend meetings during the day; it might be good to try evening meetings in the spring or summer
  - Billie Jo described successful hybrid meetings and noted that it requires coordination but is possible; it may work best with smaller groups; allowing for full participation including online participants is important; small breakout groups might have to be in separate rooms on separate Zoom meetings so it would be complicated
  - Steve suggested that if breakout groups were set up in the room, Zoom participants could be sent 3-4 questions to consider and respond to individually rather than relying on technology to work correctly for virtual breakouts
  - One presenter did not want their PowerPoint presentation shared after the meeting because it could be reused or taken out of context; the committee members agreed that it would be preferable if presentations can be shared but it's not necessary to require it; meetings are recorded anyway
  - The next Partnership meeting location has not yet been selected, but GSI has been communicating with the MidCoast Watersheds Council and Lincoln Soil and Water Conservation District about potential tours in the southern part of the county
- The committee discussed the Partnership contact list
  - Partnership members have expressed interest in a contact list and want to know who is part of the Work Group, Coordinating Committee, etc.
  - Suzanne noted that the list has been available on request for the last few months, but no one has actually requested it
  - Steve suggested emailing out a list of names and affiliations, without contact information
  - Billie Jo suggested adding the names and affiliations of charter signatories and committee members on the website, without contact information
  - **Action Item:** GSI will post an updated name and affiliation list to the website without contact information (the contact information list will still be available upon request, and its availability will continue to be announced at meetings)
- The committee discussed planning for the December Prioritization Work Group meeting
  - There is one action left to score, and then members will have time to give feedback on the A/B/C groupings
  - Next agenda item will be to look at the draft work plan template and prepare refinements for the January meeting

- Suzanne has recorded a video describing the work plan concept, and it has been posted on the Partnership website and a link emailed out to the full Partnership mailing list
- There will probably be 1-2 work plans created per imperative
- The goal of the December meeting is to get approval of the top priorities and general agreement of the outline for the work plans
- Billie Jo suggested creating project-specific work plans instead of work plans by imperative; groups planning to implement projects could create their own work plans and format them more like project proposals or grant proposals
- Steve observed that some actions are more Partnership-oriented and some are specific member projects, and suggested there could be two types of work plans
- Billie Jo suggested seeing which of the high-priority actions are not being implemented by Partners and then determining what the Partnership could do to support them
- Steve noted that some actions line up well with agency priorities; for example, DEQ staff could help write the work plan related to water reuse and include agency commitments toward supporting implementation
- Committee members would like to see and discuss several possible styles or examples of work plans before making a decision on the format
- David suggested having several concrete examples rather than abstract templates; work plan ideas could be introduced at the December meeting and then the main work could start in January
- Billie Jo recommended that the December meeting should focus on work plans rather than lingering over the prioritization process
- David agreed that Work Group members will have had time to look at the A/B/C groupings so that discussion can be short and then the meeting can focus on work plans
- Steve recommended getting an affirmative answer from each member of the Work Group on the A/B/C groupings rather than only asking if anyone disagrees
- The committee discussed planning for the January 9 Work Group meeting
  - The January meeting will be virtual (Zoom) only
  - Agenda setting will be flexible based on the outcome of the December Work Group meeting – this will be discussed at the January 3 Coordinating Committee meeting
- The committee discussed the convener search
  - Billie Jo has contacted Stan van de Wetering with the Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians, and he has expressed interest, but she is waiting to hear more from him; if he does not have time, he may be able to recommend someone else
  - Adam will be discussing the convener position with County Commissioner Casey Miller; they had to reschedule a previous meeting, so they have not met yet
  - David will be contacting students from the Water Resources graduate program at Oregon State University to send descriptions of their interest in being a student representative on the Coordinating Committee by December 13
- GSI presented an update on the financial information for the ARPA grant

- The budget categories are very general (task-based) per the grant agreement
- The project is on schedule and on budget, ready to move into Phase 2
- There may be potential continuing funding from OWRD when the ARPA grant ends, but it is uncertain; the Partnership may want to apply to the Drinking Water Providers Partnership or other sources
- Steve noted that OWRD received \$2 million in the last legislative session to support place-based planning, and suggested advocating for implementation funding and continued support for coordination and collaboration; some of this funding could be used as a match to secure additional funding; there is concern that OWRD rulemaking to decide how to use the funding could take a long time
- Adam supported seeking additional OWRD funding for implementation
- Billie Jo suggesting developing some talking points or a proposal for DEQ to advocate for how to spend the place-based planning funding
- Steve noted that existing conveners will likely be asked to be part of the Rules Advisory Committee, so Adam (and future convener(s) may have a role)

DRAFT