

PCW Meeting Notes – 4/17/2017

Attendees: L. Galli-Noble, C. Claire, T. Dixon, J. Rolfe, T. Slater, K. Marenger, C. Cornu, D. Ivy, B. Yednock, A. Farrell Matthews, J. Schmitt, On Phone: M. Howard (UO), J. Peterson (UO student), P. Karr (UO student), R. Hiller (UO student), P. Hoobyar (recommended facilitator)

Action Items:

- **Ivy** will draft a letter to Souder relieving him from the PCW
- **Ivy** will get Slater working title for WBC presentation by end of week
- **Howard** will narrow down and identify more specific workshop structure and content.
- **Schmitt** will draft dates/times schedule for workshops and email to group (alternately doodle poll)
- **Schmitt** will email April PCW meeting powerpoint to group
- **Schmitt** will solicit list of potential workshop members from PCW
- **Howard** will provide an outline at the next meeting for what the Coos atlas will entail (i.e., table of contents)

Next PCW Meeting Scheduled for May 23rd.

Main Discussion:

Data Source Update

- Discussion opens with conversation following up on last month's Ch. 5 (socioeconomic) jobs and economics chapter from that is still overdue from J. Souder.
- It is proposed to "relieve" Souder of his verbal contract to finalize the socioeconomic chapters
- Ivy suggests this data can be obtained by other means namely Chamber of Commerce, SCDC, Oregon Spatial etc.
- Rolfe wants to at least try to get the remaining pieces of the 95% complete Demographics chapter from his
- Cornu suggests instead of relieving him of his commitment, we should try a strategy that parallels with the following; peruse and hold Souder accountable whilst seeking out data / grad students to complete the chapter as previously discussed. Possibly informing his supervisor, past groups / colleagues about his lack of obligation – use it as a sort of social, professional lever noting the faltering in responsibility.
- Cornu thinks PCW should compel Souder to move this up his list of priorities. We were promised a product, which he was paid to do, and never received it. Therefore he is in breach of contract. Something his superiors should know about.

- Yednock cites potential for a possible verbiage that states obligatory synergy by PCW and OSU in initial grant writing.
 - Claire suggests (someone) writing Souder a letter with firm dates, firm expectations and possible repercussions of neglecting his obligation, which could include informing his superiors, also could inform his current higher ups to free his schedule up to follow through with prior commitments
 - Galli-Noble: Souder in is breach of contract** if he cites OSU giving him too much work, it comes back around to OSU and back to Souder's accountability
 - Ivy: this has been going on for over a year, still to be determined. Ivy will draft a letter for the group to review
 - Claire: What's Plan B?
 - Schmitt: suggests reaching out to PSU sociology dept.
 - Farrell Matthews: SWOCC also has programs and resources that may be able to help with the analysis
-

PCW Website

- Schmitt: Website has not been revamped for +2 years at this point and plans to update in the following weeks including a new page for the current Coos Estuary land Use Project
 - Schmitt is working with SCDC dev. Director S. Gibbs to host a dedicated site for the Data Source using a \$5,000 grant SCDC will apply for
 - Possible for them to host dedicated server
-

Outreach Schedules

- Ivy has been presenting with Schmitt and Rolfe as support (3 times so far), seems to be received positively
- Slater: Bay Area Chamber of Commerce Luncheon to take place 4/26/2017, Ivy suggest being involved as it is a broad, relevant audience approx. 40-100 people present depending on topic and location. Many business people attend; non-technical group, majority of people would need to understand the basics of the project and the PCW. They would be interested in knowing why this is of value to the community or how it affects their future.
- Ivy, Schmitt will work to create the presentation: what to present and how to frame it; Further look into audience, resolve what they will find relevant to themselves, how to capture their attention.
- Galli-Noble - It would be advisable to include sample inventories from Lower Makenzie inventory, which really helped clarify for her the end product.
- It is suggested to follow up with S. Gibbs (SCDC) in order to get a better picture.

- April BioBreakfast: PCW group will be present, opportunity to give a 5 min. talk on what it is, why it's important and how to be involved. ***Ivy: make sure to ask about having a solid spot for the July BioBreakfast.

Land Use Inventory: Focus Group Workshop

- Introduced P. Hoobyar, recommended facilitator; (go to www.watersheds.com for more information)
- Howard went over workshop strategy and general timeline. In general, Pre-workshop, followed by two ½ day workshops for each of the three focus groups. They recommend 1-3 weeks between pre-workshop and the ½ day workshop to acquire all necessary material.
- Yednock is concern that 3 weeks between the pre and normal workshops will be too great of time and people will forget what they're supposed to be doing.
- Dixon said if requests such as old land use cases were made to City of Coos Bay, it would probably take 2-3 weeks to honor those requests.
- Claire suggested as a group we could brainstorm data that the workshop members might need
- Cornu asked how the workshop would be run, specifically how would the data be presented or made accessible to participants
- Rolfe added that workshop members will need very specific guidelines
- Claire agreed and suggested that tat the pre-meeting ask groups to consider goal x, y, z when making decisions
- Howard said they will narrow down and identify workshop structure and content.
- Claire said we also need to decide how to assemble all the data so it is usable for the workshops
- Ivy declared that the PCW needs to decide and commit to firm dates, times, locations.
- Ivy said following that, we need to focus on the mechanics of the workshop and the UO team needs to focus on workhp content and how to organize workshop participants.
- Howard said they will use summer to crunch the data, and develop how & what will be discussed in the pre meeting
- When asked about the necessity of a pre-workshop, Hoobyar responded that not everyone takes time to look at materials prior to a workshop. A pre-workshop will get everyone on the same page, clarify goals and objectives. It gets the ball rolling and the wheels turning for participants which gives us better shot at getting good results
- Ivy said PCW needs to get a firm list of individuals for the workshop by next meeting.
- Schmitt will solicit lists of individuals from PCW members by email and compile for next meeting's discussion.
- Ivy did not think two half/day workshops were better than one full day.
- Hoobyar responded that 1 day workshops are an option but could be a stretch. It would be technical heavy, difficult for people to do. Says the scope of what will be possible is dependent on what data will be available.
- Howard suggested pre-workshop happens (same week) as the September PCW meeting; e.g., 9/12 PCW meeting; 9/14 pre workshop; 9/25 1st half day workshop happens

- Ivy asked how long a pre-workshop would be. Hoobyar responded that 3 groups w/ 10-15 people = ~45 people = 4-5 hours needed for pre-workshop.
- Ivy ended agenda item by saying we need to nail down the member list and have firm dates for each workshop meeting by next PCW meeting. WE need to solidify, time, place, and location in order to make this happen. [Perhaps a living google doc people submit their availability.]
- Schmitt will email out drafted list of groups and individuals. At next meeting, PCW will attempt to narrow down the compiled list of people and groups. PCW members will then be asked to reach out to professionals and colleagues in order to participate.
- Schmitt to email out workshop timeframes

Land Use Inventory: Land Use Analysis “Atlas”

- Howard went over list of data still needed.
- Rolfe, Claire, Cornu agree there is no local wetland inventory. Most people use NWI and now CMECS
- Rolfe, Claire, Schmitt don't think there is a stream bank erosion dataset. May be one for Coquille. Rolfe said possible there is one for Coos.
- PCW added some ideas for what else should be included (and that there is existing data for):
 - o Oyster lease data request (ODA might have, or Scott Groth/ Steve Rumrill from ODFW)
 - o Deep Draft and shipping lanes layer vs. channels and wharfs (possibly get from Kate Groth USACE)
 - o Tidegates and levees (conditions included) – can get from SSNERR or OCM
 - o Tideland ownership
 - o Buildings of historical significance
- Howard reviewed the McKenzie map atlas as an example of what the end product will be similar to. He expected the Coos atlas will include over 100 maps with accompanying analysis and tables
- Howard will provide an outline at the next meeting for what the Coos atlas will entail (i.e., table of contents) and garner PCW feedback on the completeness of the lists.

Next PCW Meeting Scheduled for May 23rd

Meeting adjourned