***Mid-Coast Water Planning Partnership***

***Coordinating Committee Meeting Notes***

May 14th, 2020

9:00 am – 10:25 am

1. **Welcome & Partner Updates**

**Attendance:**

**Adam Denlinger** - Seal Rock Water District

**Ann Mooney** - Oregon Climate Change Research Institute

**Harmony Burright** - Oregon Water Resources Dept.

**Alan Fujishin –** Gibson Farms

**Alexandria Scott** - Local Planning Coordinator

**Penelope Kaczmarek** - Resident At Large

**Tim Gross** - City of Newport

**Kaety Jacobson** - Lincoln County

\*No Partner Updates

1. **Update on Facilitation and Plan Writing RFP**

Five interested individuals have reached out so far about the optional virtual conference on May 19th. Friendly reminder proposals are due to Alexandria via email or delivered to the Seal Rock Water District by June 1st. Today the project team is looking for a volunteer from the CC to be on the review panel for the RFP process.

Discussion:

* Adam, Harmony & Alexandria will be joined by Kaety Jacobson on the review panel
* Ann Mooney was asked to be on the review panel, she cannot make the meeting on May 19th, but Alexandria will fill her in on the details and she will be on the review panel with the project team.
1. **Convener/Fiscal Agent Transition and Continuing to Build Consensus**

Alexandria sent over the DRAFT version of the convener and fiscal agent transition to the committee for them to review. There will be personal messages from Kaety, Tim and Alan as stating their vision for the Partnership and why they are stepping into or out of the convener role that will go along with the overview. We are hoping to get this message out to the Partnership by the end of May to hopefully reach consensus on bringing in the county as a convener by the end of June.

Speaking of building consensus over the next month Alexandria will be sending out some materials and messaging around consensus to prime the Partnership for the convener decision. This will include a video about consensus-based decision making and a write-up about it (put together by Harmony, Alexandria and Sarah Means using feedback from the Partnership).

Discussion:

* Penelope: The document looks good
* Kaety: Has not had the chance to look over the document yet
* **Action Item**: Alexandria will send the document out to the rest of the committee again for a consensus check within the committee about the county becoming a convener
* Penelope: What are theories and metrics behind consensus? Is there language in Charter clearly stating what we mean and the process itself?
* Harmony: Our process uses full consensus versus partial consensus. There is a lot of language in the Charter describing the process and ground rules. It is one thing to have it on paper, but it is another to actually practice it.
* Penelope: So far in the problem/issue statements I haven’t seen anything that I heavily object to so I don’t imagine we will have difficulty reaching consensus on them. Moving forward however how do we find a metric for what we want to achieve? What about the difficult topics?
* Harmony: We are hoping that we can work to shape the metrics with the consultant when they come on.
* Alan: In the past we did a round of discussions and then did a consensus check which spurred another round of discussion and another check. For the decision to bring on the county as a convener we are going to have to do things differently this time around due to COVID-19. We are going to have to do an email consensus check which is going to be a little awkward, but we will work through it.
* Kaety: The problem is you really need someone who is skilled at getting you to not only reach consensus on items you want to reach consensus on but also keeps you accountable to the hard topics and decisions as well. That is what I am hoping for in the consultant. Someone who can push the uncomfortable conversations forward so that we have meaty substance to our plan.
* Alan: Consensus-based decision making in the Charter was really to encourage participation at the Coordinating Committee level not as much the partnership level because that is difficult to track. Things like field tours and work group meetings might be something to consider as far as participation.
* Alexandria: Part of my job is to maintain the integrity of the process and to analyze things with a fine-tooth comb to minimize tension and confusion. I find that the current language in Charter regarding consensus-based decision making needs to be further clarified and potentially revised as we move into this new chapter of the Partnership. I am not asking that we make a revision right now, but rather when the consultant comes on. That way we will have an idea of what the process is going to look like for the rest of the project.

**This portion of the Consensus Decision Making Process Section of the MC-WPP Charter that would probably need to be adjusted:**

* While anyone may participate in meetings and deliberations of the Partnership or any working groups that have been established, only persons signing the Charter may participate in Partnership decision making.
* Partnership members are encouraged to attend meetings in person. If this is not possible, members may designate an alternate to attend a meeting and contribute to discussions on their behalf. Alternates must sign the Charter and the name of the alternate should be conveyed to the Project Team prior to the meeting*.*
* Partnership members (and/or their alternates) must have attended at least two of the last four meetings to formally participate in making decisions.
* Adam: I agree when the consultant comes on and we see the process design is moving forward we may need to revisit the Charter language around consensus-based decision making.
* Alexandria: With regards to my email consensus check if we follow the rules of the Charter very liberally only 22 of our 197 partners would be eligible to vote to bring Kaety on as a convener. This is a very small subset and I fear it is not a diverse enough sample of the Partnership. Do you have suggestions of how to move forward?
* Harmony: How about we have everyone who has signed the Charter?
* Alan: Better to be broad and inclusive when it comes to a decision like this. 22 is not wholly representative of the Partnership.
* Ann: Better to air on the side of caution of being inclusive then not in my experience. Maybe do a two-step process of having everyone vote and then have the 22 people have the final say. Might be a lot more work for you though Alexandria.
* **Action Item**: Come to the next CC meeting with a proposal of how to do the email consensus check and then the CC will give feedback on it
1. **Further Questions on the RFP Process**
* Ann: If people have questions on the RFP are you going to be posting the questions and answers on the website? Other processes she has been a part of they did it to make things fair for all of the proposers.
* Alexandria: I would imagine we would post them on the website, where to post it I am not sure. I will have to follow up with Adam this afternoon if he has time.
* Penelope: I would be curious to look at the proposals is the CC going to get to see all of them or just the top candidate?
* Alexandria: I am not sure it depends probably on how many proposals we receive and if CC members have the time to review them.
* Harmony: CC input makes sense. Alexandria could send them to the CC and say you have 5 days to weigh in? For the RFP review process, we need to check with Adam if the SRWD board needs to be involved or not. We need to check with Adam to see how SRWD usually conducts their RFP process to ensure that we are following their guidelines. We would like to make sure Kaety has a role in reviewing and selecting the consultant given her experience in facilitation and process design. The committee members present agreed that it makes sense.
1. **Coordinating Committee Composition and Ideas for Open Chairs**

Over time the composition of the CC has changed, and we want to be sure that we have a diverse representative subset of our Partnership. Right we have four chairs open and Alexandria is looking for guidance and support infilling them. A couple months back the CC tasked Alexandria with looking for a Student/ Young Professional chair and she has found someone that she feels would be a great fit. Makayla Estill is a passionate and driven master’s student at the University of Oregon. She is studying Nonprofit Management with a concentration in conservation land-use planning. Her undergrad was in environmental sustainability and geography with a concentration in in geomorphology/ hydrology. She recently started an internship with the OWRD in Eugene and is eager to be involved in the Partnership at a higher level. She is willing to commute for CC meetings when needed, as her family owns a house near Yachats/Florence area, and she enjoys spending time at the coast. Alexandria is looking to reach consensus with the CC to bring Makayla on board as the Student/Young Professional chair.

Discussion:

* Alexandria: I did run this Leo Williamson before this meeting, and he voted yes
* Ann and Penelope voted yes
* Harmony, Alan, Tim and Adam approved of this earlier in the week on our convener call
* **Action item**: Alexandria will send an email to missing CC members to get their vote and explain that everyone that was present was in agreement, but we just want to follow up and make sure there are no objections.
* **Action Item**: Alexandria send a copy of the CC roles, responsibilities and composition document to the CC. CC members please look over this document when considering suggestions for the open chairs on the CC. Please send your ideas of potential candidates for the open chairs on the CC before the next CC meeting June 11th if possible. It would be nice to discuss candidates at that meeting.