Mid-Coast Water Planning Partnership Early Implementation Work Group Meeting

Date: Tuesday, June 11, 2024, 9:00 am – 10:30 am
Location: Virtual (Zoom)
Conveners: Adam Denlinger (Seal Rock Water District)
Facilitators: Suzanne de Szoeke, Leah Cogan, and Mikaela Clarke (GSI Water Solutions, Inc.)

Participants:

Adam Denlinger – Seal Rock Water District (SRWD)
Andrea Sumerau – Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians (CTSI)
Billie Jo Smith – Lincoln County Water Systems Alliance (LCWSA)
Brad Wynn – SRWD
Caylin Barter – Wild Salmon Center
Christine Clapp – Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW)
Janna Stevens – ODFW
Leah Cogan – GSI Water Solutions, Inc. (GSI)
Mark River – Weyerhaeuser
Matt Thomas – Oregon Department of Forestry (ODF)
Mikaela Clarke – GSI
Steve Parrett – Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ)
Suzanne de Szoeke – GSI
Tyler Clouse – Lincoln Soil and Water Conservation District (SWCD)

Questions/Comments To Address	Decisions
None	- Remove duplicated projects from the Smartsheet and streamline its organization - Add a How-to Guide for future convenor/coordinator as a grant deliverable - Describe the Partnership future implementation model further in the Implementation Support Work Plan
GSI Action Items - Send Implementation Gap Big Picture Notes document - Send ARPA Funding Products document - Continue developing products for the ARPA grant	**Partnership Action Items** - Send GSI a list of the tracking metrics your organization uses that would be helpful for the Smartsheet - Review documents and offer comments and ideas

Next Work Group meeting: July 9 at 9 am

Smartsheet discussion

- Caylin had several ideas for the Smartsheet
    - Type of funding – e.g., OWEB for riparian restoration. Ideally, people could see other people's work and consider bundling projects/applying for grants
        - Tyler mentioned that for restoration it might be helpful to put what watershed it's in (broad level, e.g., just Siletz)
        - Caylin advocated for identifying the HUC (Hydrologic Unit Codes, delineated by United States Geological Survey (USGS)) level watershed so that we can create summary statistics and show projects happening on different levels
        - Suzanne suggested including both the broad watershed and the HUC
    - The overall project cost or funding amount would be good data to include
    - More automation across the top. For example, # of grants submitted, info about the grants, # of successful grants. At a glance you'll be able to tell where things are going. This tool will be powerful for funding.
- Suzanne proposed including more metrics such as number of trees planted etc. for specific types of projects
- Tyler wondered if we could track different metrics depending on the bundle – most orgs already have their own tracking tools. He suggested we enter the data but that each bundle would have their own reporting column
    - Suzanne mentioned that when entering data people can skip over metrics that don't apply to them
    - Caylin said some Smartsheet spreadsheets are set up as decision trees, where one type of project opens a suite of other entries (so types of projects could open up different tracking metrics). She also asked how information will be entered into the sheet.
        - Information can be entered in two ways: entering directly in the spreadsheet, or submitting a form. The form would make more sense for adding a new project.
- Leah added that the metrics orgs already track may or may not align with the performance metrics in the Action Plan. It would be great if we could line those up and show them on the Smartsheet.
- Suzanne told the group to send GSI the metrics their org uses so that GSI can start populating the Smartsheet with those.
    - Leah added the goal is not to add extra work or repetitive tracking

Discussion questions: what does the group envision the Smartsheet being used for/when should it be used, what should be tracked, etc.?

- Caylin proposed including work that has been done since the Action Plan was adopted (and wanted a reminder of when it was adopted) as a starting point to tell the Partnership's story of the work it's done. The priority would be starting with projects that are currently moving but need support, and working our way back to the date of the Plan's adoption.
- Mikaela added that feedback on the organization of the Smartsheet would be helpful. The projects with multiple actions have to be duplicated to sort by individual action, which creates several issues.

Leah posed the questions: how important is it to sort by individual action? Is it important to anyone to see if an individual action is being implemented, or would sorting by bundle be important?

- Caylin commented she hopes there are ways to collapse columns and information, and she doesn't think partners should have to enter information twice
- Billie Jo said it would make sense to have the actions all in the same cell, and if you need to find an action just look for it, or have a separate table that shows that but not have the redundancy.

The group agreed to remove duplicated projects from the Smartsheet to streamline it.

<u>Implementation gaps and bundles discussion</u>

- Leah went over the updated action bundles and the implementation gaps big picture next steps.
- When discussing Action 59 (spatial analysis to prioritize restoration projects), Mark suggested separating by HUC watershed or area to focus and prioritize the spatial analyses to make it easier to start implementing
- Tyler let the group know that the SWCD is implementing Action 1i, pesticide outreach through outreach workshops and in the Living on the Land series
- Steve said he can get DEQ's water data portal experts to present to the group in the fall and have a discussion about how it can/will be useful to local groups
- GSI can share the Implementation Gaps big picture notes that Leah made. This can turn into essentially a work plan for the Partnership.

Discussion question: The notes mention potential committees/work groups, including a Funding Committee, Project Support Committee, and Monitoring Committee. Are there other committees or work groups people are interested in starting?

- Tyler mentioned he likes the idea of a Monitoring Committee and asked Steve to help the group learn more about the Oregon Water Data Portal and how data is submitted
- Steve will be on the Funding Committee, not on but he can help gather DEQ people to present on monitoring and be a part of the monitoring committee
- Suzanne discussed how the committees could work: projects can be moved to different committees who can figure out what support would be needed
- Steve mentioned that Pat Heines (DEQ) is producing a report for the legislature about improving expanding the Water Reuse Program throughout the state. The group could talk about how to implement those findings on the mid-coast.

<u>ARPA Grant products discussion</u>

- The Partnership will produce a document describing the prioritization process as part of what it said it would accomplish for the grant
- The Partnership will produce several early implementation support products. Can develop the narrative based on Leah's notes further about activities the Partnership could do to address gaps, using committees, etc.
- An updated Charter is another product of the Grant.
- Not envisioning doing a monitoring database as a Grant product but that could be done further down the line.
- Comments on the ARPA Funding Products are welcome

- Tyler mentioned that we need to discuss the handoff to the next convenor/coordinator. Some kind of how-to guide would be helpful to make sure the Partnership has the kind of support it needs from that position.
- Billie Jo expressed that these are all good tools, but for the Partnership to continue, we need a clear Implementation Plan that includes some of these tools, that we can use to request future funding. A new grant proposal needs to show the model for how the Partnership will implement the grant.
  - Leah: what components to the Implementation Support Work Plan could be added to support this idea?
  - Billie Jo: We need the model/framework for how the group will continue. The overall picture of the implementation plan and how the group will be organized to think about applying for funding.
- Suzanne suggested the group look at grant applications and see what they are looking for, and how to make the implementation support tools help the group prepare for grant application funding
- Leah suggested looking at other place-based planning groups and learning how they transitioned from the planning to the implementation phase
  - Steve will propose that topic to Lili at OWRD for the next quarterly meeting of the place-based planning groups
- Tyler asked if there has been any interest in a new convenor
  - Suzanne said Coordinating Committee members have been doing outreach, some have responded they don't have capacity and it's still up in the air
  - Adam added they reached out to Lincoln County commissioner Miller, but he doesn't seem to have the capacity to take on the leadership role as a convenor. Other pilot groups have had county commissioners become convenors. This needs to be at the forefront of the conversations within the Partnership as we move forward.

Next steps

- See if there are comments on the documents by the next workgroup meeting
- Share comments or ideas on upcoming meetings and tours