

Columbia Basin Sustainable Water Coalition

Grant Scope of Work Work Session

Tuesday, November 9, 2021

Recording: Topic: <https://wastatecommerce.zoom.us/rec/share/gUo-yZZV6T7Zdh0U1FnNEAK0nRy1jo2a6g9uwui4MLZqJduy82HgnWWtaQKYw1ul.-wCz83NXNo8TaFVK>

Access Passcode: 9x=5Ex.K

Purpose

To provide Elsa feedback and finalize Scope of Work tasks and timeframes

Agenda

- Review Scope of Work (see attached)
- Discuss individual tasks and determine time frames
- Identify task needs and develop list of needs to present to larger group

Notes

- May have contract by new year – this process should be quicker since it's a planning grant, not construction
- LCCD got sub-award with WSU
- Elsa received comments from Ben
- Sara shared questions
 - Why are we committing ourselves to such specificity like one page information flyer, page limitations on report
 - Ben supplied those suggestions and wanted to manage expectations. Set a simple work plan from the beginning so there isn't a situation where the group commits to something the Bureau understands to be more expansive. Can always do more than what we agreed to, but this limits our deliverables
 - Are 4-6 well sites enough?
 - 4-6 was in the grant proposal so we used the same number. This will piggy back on the WSU monitoring work too. Good to have set numbers to potentially contractors to get bang for our buck.
 - Maybe use language like "anticipated" or "at least one"
 - Can we establish a group that meets the Title IX requirements, do we have the ability to focus so narrowly on Title IX. Concern that we would be able to recruit such a focused group of stakeholders.
 - We have a good array of stakeholders and stated goal is to expand that group
 - Need to cover all the bases meaning we invite everyone we can, can't force people to join or support
 - Build outreach plan around the list of stakeholders in Title IX.
 - Any value in highlighting collaborative effort between work being done under this grant and OGWRP group or will they see those two efforts as separate.

- Elsa and Claire met with OGWRP group – Harold felt these are 2 separate groups because our targets and goals are different.
 - Our group more discovery, looking more into issues of water availability OGWR is construction on the ground.
 - Commissioner Stedman wants to bring as many folks to the table to create a bigger voice, not more voices. This Coalition could be that group that creates the large voice.
 - Discussed our proposed deliverables with Harold and he will let us know if he thinks PL566 process would be available to this group for watershed restoration funding when we need implementation money.
 - Unity is the issue – too important a topic to let others on the side not be involved or be seen as competing.
- What other groups should we reach out to or include?
 - Potato Commission report on groundwater availability. Matt Harris, Sara will send his contact information.
 - Franklin county GWMA material
- Start dates taken from proposal and then extended. Not schedule we have to abide by exactly but guidelines.
- First is by-monthly meetings – Claire will continue to organize meetings, after 12/14 meeting we will shoot to meet late January and go bi-monthly after that.
 - Bi-monthly meetings will take place through the life of the grant.
- Ben wonders if January 1 is too soon.
 - Elsa will be able to adjust dates before contract is signed so she will adjust accordingly.
- Contract project facilitator – can't afford facilitator for 2 years – what specific things do we need a facilitator for so we can make a more specific task list/budget for what we need a facilitator for.
 - Facilitator would coordinate meetings, recruit others, create educational material, push project forward.
 - \$30,000 for facilitator over 2 years – is that enough to get us foundational documents? What does \$30,000 get us?
 - Not much. Needs to be targeted. Hard to get invested feedback on documents from larger group so key role of facilitator would be getting documents drafted and feedback.
 - Curious about conservation districts capacity to produce materials like flyers – this may not be best use of facilitators time.
 - Create RFP/RSQ? Do we need to create a job description? Yes.
 - This assumes the group wants to be an independent group.
 - Assuming the group wants to be it's own entity, we may need a facilitator to help decide what the group wants to be.
 - Conservation District willing to put together outreach material and conservation districts can disperse material.
- Need to clearly define role of conservation district and commerce
- Claire can do meeting coordination, documentation, reports.
- Legal services not necessary for organizational documents.
- Does this group have the political will and ability to pick this up and run independently.

- If this group is not ready to formalize, what are other options? What are existing groups we can join?
 - Columbia Basin Development League is obvious choice for an entity this group could join – what would that look like?
 - Comes back to unity – is there an organization that's driving the bus for sustainable water in the basin?
 - If this group teamed up with the Development League, how would the two mix?
 - Can the Bureau agree these two would work well together?
 - Sara doesn't see the League taking on the Coalition, but filling facilitation piece. Examples of trade associations participating in facilitation of industry committees/coalitions. Coalition isn't under umbrella of association but taking advantage of the associations to advance industry efforts.
- Push back timing of foundational documents to 9 months out.
- What can \$30,000 get you in facilitation – would it cover facilitation of foundational documents and watershed plan?
 - Depends on how many meetings are necessary, how many drafts of the documents will be necessary.
 - Sara not certain on the watershed plan, if the CBDL could do that for \$30,000
- Watershed plan will outline what the activities will be, these funds will not be used for implementation.
- Move contracting of a facilitator to June so we have time to decide what this group wants to be and have conversations with CBDL to see if it's possible to join/team up.
- Allow more time to create RFP if needed.
- Michele notes there are a lot of groups out there we can coordinate with, don't want to miss out on information that will serve us.
- Formation documents set for 12/2022
- Establish Board will be 10/2022
- Contract facilitator 6/2022
- Bi monthly meetings start late January
- Outreach and educational material 4/2022
- Review data in 12/2022
- Contract groundwater monitoring consultant 10/2022
- Select monitoring wells 1/2023
- Produce map of monitoring wells – 2/2023
 - Want to include Potato Commission, OGWRP, GWMA data
 - Bureau is doing monitoring that Michele knows of – these should be included in data set.
 - WSU data will be involved too
- Select and prioritize projects 6/2023
- Develop preliminary watershed management plan 10/2023
- Federal funding – do we need to put out RFP? Protect ourselves individually and as a group.
- Anything over \$5,000 LCCD has to go to bid.
- Follow up:
 - Sara to send Matt Harris contact information
 - Claire to follow up with Elsa to get GWMA materials

- Conversation with CBDL – should we meet again to discuss how the League and Coalition can join/work together? Sara suggests drafting a scope of work or job description for facilitator to begin the conversation.
- Outreach – Claire will start list of other groups we want to coordinate with, can be beginning of outreach plan.