**Meeting Notes**

**Date:** December 15th, 2021, 11:00am -12:34pm

**Location:** Virtual

**Participants:** see list of participants on our website [www.midcoastwaterpartners.com](http://www.midcoastwaterpartners.com)

**Convener:** Adam Denlinger, General Manager, Seal Rock Water District

**Project Team:** Alexandria Scott, Partnership Planning Coordinator

**Next Steps**

* **Partnership Coordinator will be submitting the 12/15/21 draft plan for the state agency review by December 22nd, 2021.**
* **30-day public review of the 12/15/21 draft plan will begin on January 8th, 2022, and close on February 7th, 2022.**
* The Partnership’s Planning Coordinator will send a press release to local news, media, the County and to partners to inform the public of this opportunity
* Partners will be asked to share the press release with their organizations & networks
* **Please share the Oregon’s Kitchen Table Survey link with your networks** - **Survey closes January 7th!**
* Survey asks members of the community what matters to them about the plan & how they see themselves taking action to help make sure we have enough quality water to meet our collective needs (English & Spanish versions available): <https://consultations.oregonskitchentable.org/mid-coast-water-plan>
* The results of this survey will help inform the Partnership of where the priorities are for the larger community & how they could be involved in the implementation of different actions
* For a printable copy of the survey in English or Spanish, you can email the Partnership’s Planning Coordinator at alexandria@midcoastwaterpartners.com
* The final report from Oregon’s Kitchen Table will be shared with Partnership through our email list, posted on our website, and shared on the Oregon’s Kitchen Table website
* **Partnership Meetings & Events:** Mark your calendar -
* Partnership Meeting - to discuss preparing for implementation: expected in early February 2021 (TBD)
* Partnership Meeting - to review the results of the 30-day public review & state agency review of the draft plan: expected in mid-March 2022 (TBD)
* **If you have any partner updates, job or internship opportunities, or funding opportunities you wish to share with the Partnership**, please email them alexandria@midcoastwaterpartners.com to so we can include them in our monthly email blasts

**Discussion Notes**

**Meeting Objectives:** Review the outcomes of the Charter Signatory vote to submit the 11-18-21 draft of the Mid-Coast Water Action Plan for a 30-day public review process & 60-day state agency review. Both processes are part of the place-based planning pilot program that the Mid-Coast Water Planning Partnership is a part of. Once the outcomes of the processes have been reviewed by the Partnership and incorporated into the plan, the final plan will be submitted to the Oregon Water Resource Commission for official state recognition.

**Welcome & Reminder of the Purpose of this Vote**

**Alexandria Scott**, **Partnership Planning Coordinator** welcomed the Partnership’s Charter Signatories and went over the objectives for the meeting. She reminded the group that eligible Charter Signatories were given 3-weeks (11/18/21-12/10/21) to review the draft Water Action Plan, now that the consulting team hired to help produce it completed all the appendices and their contract.

Eligible Charter Signatories were given the following parameters for this consensus vote using the green, yellow, red card system in the Mid-Coast Water Planning Partnership Charter:

* + *Green card -- indicates agreement with the plan moving forward to state recognition.*
	+ *Yellow card -- indicates some hesitation or caution about the plan moving forward to state recognition and a desire to discuss (be specific).*
	+ *Red card -- indicates disagreement with a specific item in the plan moving forward to state recognition and propose a productive alternative. These need to be things that you cannot support moving forward in the plan.*

The Charter Signatories were also reminded of the criteria from the Partnership’s Charter that is used to determine eligibility, which is:

* Anyone may participate in meetings and deliberations of the Partnership, only persons signing the Charter may participate in Partnership decision making.
* Partnership members (and/or their alternates) must have attended at least two of the last four meetings to formally participate in making decisions.

With so much turnover since 2016, the Partnership did outreach encouraging partners to sign the Charter, or to re-sign if they did in the past in late 2020 and early 2021. The partners that made the commitment to sign or re-sign during that time are considered the current Charter Signatories. With that said, moving forward partners may sign the Charter at any time. The Partnership recognizes that time and capacity are an issue for everyone, for this vote, meeting attendance at Partnership webinars and Charter Signatory meetings were considered for eligibility. For organizations with more than one member participating, it is stated in the Charter that each entity represented in the Partnership has one ‘voice’. It is up to those entities to decide who will represent them in the voting process.

**Eligible Charter Signatories & Results of Voting**

**Alexandria Scott**, **Partnership Planning Coordinator** provided an overview of the eligible Charter Signatories and the votes that they submitted prior to the meeting.

Charter Signatories Eligible to Participate in Consensus Based Decision Making:

* Jennifer Beathe, Starker Forests, Inc (Green)
* Jay Macpherson, Oregon Health Authority (Green)
* Paul Robertson, Robertson Environmental LLC
* Leo Williamson & Matt Thomas, Oregon Department of Forestry (Green)
* Geoffrey Wilkie, Interested Citizen
* Caylin Barter, Wild Salmon Center
* Jeanne Anstine, Newport Community Gardens
* David Bayus, Johnson Creek Water Services (Green)
* Tim Gross, Civil West Engineering Services Inc.
* Alan Fujishin, Gibson Farms (Yellow)
* Clare Paul, City of Newport
* Billie Jo Smith, Interested Citizen (Green)
* Penelope Kaczmarek, Interested Citizen (Green)
* Mike Broili, MidCoast Watersheds Council (Green)
* Don Andre, Oregon Coast Community Forest Association
* Suzanne de Szoeke, GSI Water Solutions, Inc.
* Mark Saelens, Saelwood LLC (Green)
* Jen Hayduk, Lincoln Soil and Water Conservation District
* Evan Hayduk, MidCoast Watersheds Council
* David Waltz, Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (Green)
* Lisa Phipps, Department of Land Conservation and Development (Green)
* Adam Denlinger, Seal Rock Water District (Green)
* Bill Montgomery, Interested Citizen (Green)
* Stan Van De Wetering, Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians
* Joe Moll, McKenzie River Trust (Green)
* Jerry Anderson, Manulife Investment Management (Green)
* Stephanie Reid, City of Lincoln City (Green)
* Cyndi Karp, Ecosystem Advocate (Green)
* Steve Parrett, Oregon Water Resources Department (Yellow – still submit for state recognition)

The Partnership has 29 current Charter Signatories listed above and 18 submitted votes. For partners that like statistics, the Partnership Coordinator calculated that out of the 18 participants that voted, 16 voted green (89%) and 2 voted yellow (11%).

**Green Card & Yellow Card Feedback Discussion to Reach Consensus on Submitting the Draft Plan for 30-Day Public Review & 60-Day State Agency Review**

**Alexandria Scott**, **Partnership Planning Coordinator** went through the yellow card feedback submitted and the Charter Signatories talked through potential solutions.

Lisa Phipps - Department of Land Conservation and Development

* Submitted a green card but would really like a statement in the introductory piece that says that these actions have not been reviewed under the lens of the statewide planning goals and local land use ordinances. As a result, as actions are initiated, they may either be allowed, modified, or prohibited based upon land use reviews.
* After some discussion, the Charter Signatories agreed that a positive statement could be made to highlight this, and that it could be put on page 54 before the implementation table starts. It was suggested that many of the water and land use related actions may have several regulatory steps that have to be followed to be implemented, so broadening the language could be beneficial for partners looking at this document.
* ***Alan Fujishin, Joe Moll and Lisa Phipps volunteered to work together to craft this statement.***

Steve Parrett - Oregon Water Resources Department

The Department reviewed the draft plan with the state-recognition review criteria in mind. Below is a list of some things that concerned them or needed clarification. They wanted to note upfront that even with these concerns they recommend the plan be submitted for state agency review**.** They think these concerns can be addressed following the agency plan review process and should not hold up moving forward. Their yellow card concerns include the following:

* The plan identifies some user groups such as industrial self-supplied, farmers, and community water systems who are important, but were not able to adequately participate in the planning process. The plan should include an explanation about efforts taken to reach those people, challenges you faced, and how you will try to engage them during future work. This will help the agency review team understand that the plan was developed with a balanced representation of interests, to the extent possible, and that you made a good-faith effort to reach them.
* ***The Partnership’s Planning Coordinator can put together a few sentences about the outreach that has been done in the past and how the Partnership intends to continue to do outreach to resolve this concern.***
* Action 52: Is not quite clear, whether it is legal under existing law for OWRD to limit appropriation in the way described, so that action will need more review and discussion.
* The Charter Signatories discussed the language for action 52 and action 54 to clarify what the original intentions of these actions were with Steve Parrett (OWRD).
	+ - ***The Charter Signatories came to an agreement that the following additions could be added to the 11-18-21 draft plan to help clarify for readers what the existing rules and programs are related to these actions to help with implementation.***

***Action 52: add parenthetical – “(OAR Chapter 690, Division 500)”***

***Action 54: add parenthetical – “(OAR Chapter 690, Division 77)”***

* Some sources of information in the draft plan are not cited, so it is hard to know the validity of that information or if it was the writer’s opinion, etc. Additional citations should be made in a number of places.
* ***The Partnership’s Planning Coordinator has asked the Department during the state agency review to track change where they see this in the document. The convener of the Partnership, Adam Denlinger and the Partnership’s Planning Coordinator will be following up with the consulting team that helped produce the draft plan to get clarification and address this concern******before the plan is finalized.***
* The plan should recognize the state’s role and authority for water management.
* ***Oregon Water Resources can provide example language for this***.
* Timeline, 3 phases within a 10-year period involving 59 actions seems unrealistic. OWRD encourages the collaborative to think about implementation over a longer timeline, considering both the priority and sequencing of actions and the funding needed. It’s important to set realistic expectations about implementation, so people don’t feel plan implementation is failing to meet their expectations.
* ***Due to time constraints the Charter Signatories did not get the chance to discuss this topic but will be discussing it before the plan is finalized.***

Alan Fujishin - Gibson Farms

* Concerned that the budget estimates presented do not consider the full range of potential strategies and projects that might be pursued by Partners, or accurately reflect the specified objectives if pursued by either a likely subset or the full range of partners from their respective positions. The imposed "sticker shock" of these estimates as presented may lead readers to dismiss collaborative water action as prohibitively expensive offhand rather than motivate readers to consider how they might cooperate toward addressing achievable portions of the Plan within their means and capacities.
* There was a robust conversation weighing the pros and cons of keeping the budget figures in the plan and where they should be if they were kept.
	+ - There was agreement amongst the Signatories that the budget numbers are not citable and may be economically skewed over time. It was agreed upon by the Signatories to pull the budget breakdown from the executive summary but providing an estimated range of the total budget in the executive summary will be helpful for funders and partners to reference.
		- A balancing statement in the executive summary that acknowledges that there is a wide range of potential costs associated with implementing any of these actions, because they are not specked out at the individual project level in this plan was supported. It was also suggested to include something in this statement about the benefits of investing in ecosystem services, not just as out of pocket costs. This statement should also highlight that although this will be a heavy lift the investment will result in tremendous benefit to the coast and its residents and visitors.
		- Alan was supportive of keeping the budget numbers in the implementation table, if the name was changed from budget to initial estimates of need.
* ***David Waltz and Mike Broili volunteered to help craft the balancing statement to include in the executive summary with the Partnership Planning Coordinator.***
* Alan submitted suggested edits for the Step 3 summaries (pages 30-46) of the draft plan. Was disappointed with how these were summarized in several cases. Edits submitted range from stylistic ones to correcting some factual inaccuracies presented regarding how water is administered in OR and the Planning Area.
* ***The proposed edits were not submitted in enough time for the other Charter Signatories to review them before the meeting. The Charter Signatories requested that the Partnership’s Planning Coordinator send them the suggested edits for them to consider before the plan is finalized, but that the plan could go forward for state agency review.***
* Appendix A. Definitions - Several terms need minor changes to account for all water uses across the Planning Area or could be attributed differently to match specific definitions used by Oregon agencies, definitions that we relied upon when discussing these issues as a Partnership.
* ***Alan is okay with submitting the plan for state agency review given our timeline for state recognition, with the understanding that if there is an opportunity to help work on some of those in the future before the plan is finalized, he is happy to help with that.***
* Appendix G. Issues Identified but Not Carried Forward - Could be revised to be more respectful as to why those issues are while maintaining the integrity of our prioritization and consensus process, all the while explaining adequately to our reviewers why these were not fully developed in our Implementation Table.
* ***Alan is okay with submitting the plan for state agency review given our timeline for state recognition, with the understanding that if there is an opportunity to help work on some of those in the future before the plan is finalized, he is happy to help with that.***

**Meeting Wrap Up & Conclusions**

The Charter Signatories by majority (either in by attending the meeting or submitting a green card before the meeting) reached consensus on submitting for state agency review the week of December 20th – 24th and a 30-day public review (option 1 on the projected timeline in the meeting PowerPoint). When submitting the plan for the state agency review, the Partnership will recognize that 2 yellow cards were submitted, but that those participants were okay with the plan moving for to state recognition knowing that the Charter Signatories intend to address their concerns before the plan is finalized. By waiting to do the 30-day public review until January 8th, 2022, the Partnership will be able to more effectively do outreach around the draft plan than trying to do it over the holidays and New Year. If partners have any questions about the state agency review or public review process, please reach out to the Partnership’s Planning Coordinator, Alexandria Scott at alexandria@midcoastwaterpartners.com and she will work with the Seal Rock Water District and the Oregon Water Resources Department to help answer them.