

Mid-Coast Water Planning Partnership Coordinating Committee Meeting Notes

Date: Tuesday, May 14, 2024, 9:00-10:30 AM

Location: Zoom

Coordinating Committee Meeting Attendees

Coordinating Committee Members Present:

Adam Denlinger – Seal Rock Water District

Steve Parrett – Oregon Department of Environmental Quality

Billie Jo Smith – Lincoln County Water Systems Alliance

Alan Fujishin – Gibson Farms

Alyssa Mucken – Oregon Water Resources Department

Henry Pitts – Oregon State University student

Coordinating Committee Members Absent:

David Rupp – Oregon State University

Mike Broili – MidCoast Watersheds Council

Facilitators:

Suzanne de Szoeko – GSI Water Solutions, Inc.

Leah Cogan – GSI Water Solutions, Inc.

Meeting Agenda

- Partnership meeting planning
- Financial report
- Partnership capacity funding
- June 11 Work Group meeting agenda

Summary of Major Points of Discussion

- The committee discussed the agenda for the full Partnership meeting and tour
 - Materials to be sent out to the Partnership ahead of the meeting include the agendas, consensus decision making primer, proposed charter updates, Partner reimbursement form, and list of reasons to participate
 - There will be signature pages for the charter available at the meeting for people to sign if their organizations do not have a representative in the Partnership
 - Alyssa recommended clarifying that the original charter will be used for the consensus decision about the prioritization, not the proposed revised charter
- The committee discussed the consensus decision making primer
 - This primer is based on the 2018 version of the charter
 - Alyssa suggested including the original charter language for transparency
 - Alan recommended walking through the decision-making process at the meeting prior to deliberations

- Billie Jo suggested using the primer during the meeting because it provides a concise summary
- Henry suggested including both the primer and the original charter for those who want to see it
- Steve suggested moving the page about the specific decision to be made to the front of the document, before the process description
- The committee discussed eligibility for participating in consensus decisions
 - The charter requires attendance at two of the last four meetings, but this is ambiguous in practice since the full Partnership has only met twice during the ARPA grant-funded period but there have been other types of meetings
 - Alan expressed interest in making the process as inclusive as possible to bring a better cross-section of perspectives to important decisions
 - The committee agreed to focus on Partnership meeting attendance because it is not realistic to expect everyone to have participated in the one Work Group currently meeting
 - **Decision:** For the prioritization decision at the May 29 Partnership meeting, all charter signatories would qualify under the Partnership meeting attendance requirements, so they are all eligible to participate in decision making (no requirement to have attended any Working Group meetings)
 - Proposed changes to the charter will make this process less confusing in the future
 - Organizations each have one “voice” in decisions, regardless of the number of representatives attending
 - Suzanne noted that she is a charter signatory but will not be eligible to vote as a consultant, so she will add a note to the signatory list
 - Steve noted that DEQ has decided to participate in an advisory role and will join the discussion but not participate in the decision making
 - Alyssa noted that OWRD intends to continue participating in decision making, and that Kim Fritz-Ogren (current OWRD signatory) will designate Alyssa as OWRD’s alternate
- The committee discussed the explanation of proposed changes to the charter
 - The redline (tracked changes) document and a clean version will be sent out to the Partnership, along with a summary of changes and a description of the process for updating the charter
 - Steve noted that the explanation of the proposed changes was helpful but asked if the decision making section delegated more authority to the Coordinating Committee than was intended
 - If consensus is not reached, the Partnership may refer a matter to the Coordinating Committee, and the committee reports back with a recommendation. The proposed revisions suggested that if consensus was still not reached, a decision could be made by the Coordinating Committee. Committee members recommended that this type of decision be made by the Partnership instead, and the draft language was revised

- **Decision:** Propose that a decision may still be made if extensive efforts have not achieved consensus, and that such a decision would require support of 75 percent of the Partnership (instead of a simple majority)
- **Decision:** Add language about special meetings being called virtually rather than requiring in-person meetings
- The committee discussed the May 29 Partnership meeting
 - Alan volunteered to facilitate the discussion of the proposed charter updates
 - Alyssa suggested that a Coordinating Committee member should present information about the consensus process and recommended that it not be done by state agency staff if possible
 - Alan and Suzanne agreed to coordinate on the presentation, with Alan taking the lead on describing the consensus process
 - The committee consider whether it would be possible to allow a decision about the charter changes to be made if everyone at the meeting happened to agree on them, but determined that it was proposed as a discussion item so participants might need more time to reflect and discuss the changes with their constituents or boards
 - Billie Jo is looking into the possibility of having a videographer accompany the tour
 - The committee wants to be sure the Partnership is aware that the ARPA funding will expire in December, and make sure to include the formation of a Funding Committee during the funding agenda item
 - Committee members support having the state/OWRD sustain some level of funding for place-based planning groups and expressed displeasure at the expected gap in funding continuity due to the planned rulemaking
 - At the last place-based planning meeting, many expressed this concern but OWRD has not yet provided suggestions for bridging the gap in funding
- Suzanne provided an update on the grant budget
 - It will be important for budget planning purposes to understand how many Partners intend to request participation support reimbursement under the grant
- The committee discussed the June 11 Working Group meeting agenda
 - The primary focus will be on looking at implementation gaps and determining how to develop implementation support work plans
 - Clear implementation plans can be used to support future grant applications
 - GSI will present an update on the Smartsheet project tracking tool
- Billie Jo described the Puget Sound Partnership as a potential model to learn from for the Partnership and suggested inviting them to speak at a Working Group meeting this summer
- Billie Jo told the committee about a potential upcoming One Water model project that would help communities understand and plan for future water needs in the context of climate change; funding announcement is expected in early July