

PCW Meeting Notes – 5/23/2017

Attendees: J. Barton, L. Galli-Noble, C. Claire, C. Hood, J. Caruso, T. Dixon, J. Rolfe, K. Marenger, C. Cornu, D. Ivy, B. Yednock, A. Farrell-Matthews, S. Gibbs, M. Vander Heyden, M. Spangler, J. Hitt, C. Schnabel, J. Schmitt, M. Howard (UO), J. Peterson (UO student), P. Karr (UO student), R. Hiller (UO student)

Action Items:

- **Schmitt** will follow up with **Ivy and Rolfe** on project outreach at the OR Coast Economic Summit
- **Schmitt** will follow up with **Anne Farrell-Matthews** on fall State of the Coast Conference
- **Ivy** will draft an article (press release) by next meeting
- **Schmitt** will send **Barton** draft Demographics chapter
- **Howard** will follow up on feedback pertaining to Land Use Analysis and workshop development (see below for details)
- **Schmitt** will send example maps and list of maps to PCW for feedback on other maps that should be included
- **Schmitt** will re-work workshop timing and send it out to PCW for comment after UO and facilitator OK it
- **Schmitt** will work with select PCW members to do initial approach to workshop participants including overarching information they can use
- **Ivy** will draft letter to Souder to formally release him from PCW business
- **Schmitt** will work on Plan B for outstanding socio-economic chapters

Next PCW Meeting Scheduled for June 13th

Main Discussion:

Coos estuary land use analysis project: *Outreach*

- Schmitt presents outreach efforts update and provides page view analytics from PCW website, seeing an increase in page views over this time last year, possibly due to the outreach efforts.
- Schmitt reviews upcoming outreach audiences: confirms with Caruso that PCW can be on their June Port Commission agenda; Ivy states that presentation to both tribes' cultural resource and executive management staff will take place sometime in July
- Schmitt asks if anyone is attending or can attend OR Coast Economic Summit in July to present project to that audience: Ivy is already going, Jill can email Commissioner Cribbins, who is on agenda to see if that is a possible outlet. Schmitt will follow up with Ivy and Rolfe.
- Schmitt asks if anyone is attending State of the Coast Conference this fall. Farrell-Matthews can look into when and where this might be happening (e.g., has connections with J. Doyle, who organizes). Schmitt will follow up with Farrell-Matthews.

- Schmitt asks if there are other audiences we should be reaching out to: Farrell-Matthews suggests SWOCC school board as possible outreach or possibly people associated with natural resources or forestry programs; Vander Heyden suggests "Patty's replacement" from BLM since they are a major landowner on the shoreline, which prompted people to add US Forest Service; Galli-Noble suggests Coos Soil and Water Conservation District (specifically "Kaylie", who Rolfe, Galli-Noble and Claire all know).
- Schmitt asks what next steps should be – for example a press release?: group discusses option of taking an "ad" out in The World to inform public of the PCW's efforts – "ad" vs. article – possibility of reporter bias if it is run as an article. Farrell-Matthews also warns that if submit a press release, contact person should be ready to be contacted by media outlets and possibly interviewed. Barton suggests getting down our list of outreach audiences before doing a press release so that nobody is blind-sided by this project by seeing it in the media first.
- Ivy will draft an article (press release) by next meeting, using .PPT material created for the Wednesday business connection
- Farrell-Matthews can eventually follow up with "media list" used at SWOCC (i.e., her communication network for sharing information to public)

Coos estuary land use analysis project: *Land Use Analysis*

- Howard and his team presented detail on what will be included in the final land use analysis: Report will include an Executive Summary, detailed Methodology, Study Area Overview, and Tabular Analysis; the Atlas will be divided into 5 major sections: zoning, constraints/hazards, improvement status, environmental features, and other
- Each map topic will have one main overview map of the entire project area, then zoomed in detail on 10 tiles. Can also do finer scale to focus on cities of Coos Bay and North Bend
- Zoning section will contain: generalized zoning (within and outside UGB, and by jurisdiction), conflicting zoning designations, underutilization, obsolescence, development status, improvement value ratios
- Hood inquired about describing difference between zoning type rather than lumping everything into "Employment" category; wonders if there are plans to break category into sub category i.e. light commercial, heavy industrial etc.
- Howard asked if they should separate out airport so it is on its own.
- Rolfe states the instead of breaking the airport into its zoning and management units, the county has an "airport overlay" GIS data layer versus "operations overlay", asks which would be more suitable for this project
- Howard says they will separate out airport then and differentiate the "employment" category by zoning
- City and county have different management unit classifications (e.g., Natural, conservation, development)
- Howard takes note of this and verifies he will look into it.

- Claire asks if more specificity can be provided in report; conversation follows for more vs. less detail in maps (i.e., how far categories are broken down).
 - Schnabel comments that higher specificity might date the maps more quickly
 - Howard states that a solution could be that the cities will need a more specific map, perhaps less generalized.
 - Spangler states that aquatic areas classification should also be included
 - Howard will follow up on this as well.
 - Ivy asked about how the group came up with the \$10k threshold for the unimproved vs improved status.
 - Howard explained it had precedent and was considered somewhat of an agency standard. He added that the report will include detailed methods citing how they chose different thresholds.
 - Question arises around definition of lands that are considered improved and how this figure is being calculated – whether it's based on RMV or otherwise.
 - Rolfe confirms that it is based on assessor's data
 - Claire wonders about a "large parcel with relative neglect since 1850 that contains a tiny structure that's been improved" which now makes the entire parcel appear to be "improved"
 - Yednock inquires why nearly 50% of South Slough Reserve is not being depicted on map. <
 - Howard confirms that this is due to the XXL tsunami boundary; they only included any parcel with more that [10%] inside project boundary. It is likely South Slough Reserve contains lands outside project area. They will confirm this.
 - UO team gave example of data tables that will be included based on generalized zoning maps.
 - Some discrepancies exist between county versus cities around how they use the "mixed use" classification
 - Constraints/Hazards section will contain: XL tsunami inundation, sea level rise, wetlands, slope, floodplain, floodways, landslide susceptibility)
 - Rolfe asked for a map with all five tsunami zone boundaries in once map, along with original CBEMP boundary
 - Rolfe asked for clarification on what sea level rise scenario was used (e.g., xx amount of feet by xx year)
 - Question is posed to have individual maps or one aggregate map of all hazards/constraints (to more easily see lands that are not constrained by anything). Group decides that having both would be the best case scenario, including tabular data.
 - Environmental Features will include: snowy plover, eelgrass, clam recreational areas, oyster leases, habitat (CMECS), deep draft estuary
 - Other maps will include: recreation sites (boat ramps, parks, etc), employers location, common ownership
 - Howard and team ask if anticipated list of maps to be incorporated into the report looks complete.
 - In the interest of time, Howard will provide example maps and lists of maps to Schmitt, who will send out to group for feedback.
-

Coos estuary land use analysis project: *Focus Group Workshops*

- CSC team reviews memo written by Hoobyar relating to focus group workshops
- Ivy requests “environmental” category be changed to “natural resource protection and restoration” to be consistent throughout all presentations and outreach efforts.
- Pre-meeting: short informational presentations; breakout discussion groups at expert-run stations, reconvene
- Dixon warned that it should be made clear to participants process of zoning change (e.g., initiated by private landowner or legislatively)
- It was also requested that a clearer definition of workshops purpose is made as to not present false hopes or false expectations/understanding about the purpose of the workshops.
- Howard agreed and confirms he will work with Paul to establish a clearer set of guidelines.
- Claire suggests a short presentation using ArcGIS to show what attribute tables contain and what info is included in Map Atlas
- Claire suggests someone explain laws, processes and framework at pre-meeting
- Schmitt suggested Spangler be one of the presenters to provide that info and background on estuarine management from the state’s perspective (Goal 16)
- Howard will work with Schmitt and Rolfe on ideas for the short presentations
- Cornu asks what focus of breakout sessions will be, what specific questions we’ll be asking the participants to answer or work on or talk about
- It was asked if breakout groups is the wrong term and stations would be more appropriate (e.g., a station to further digest map atlas data, etc)
- Howard will work with Hoobyar to further define breakout sessions and to define objectives and structure for what these groups will be working towards and how they will get there.
- Howard expressed one goal may be to get feedback on the map atlas
- Howard explained the breakout groups would consist of 5-7 individuals with mixed representation (i.e., from economic development, natural resource protection, socio cultural interests)
- Vander Heyden asked if mixing the representatives from the various focus groups is the best method, maybe the members within a certain focus group could begin to work together in this pre-meeting
- Cornu suggests that mixture of specializations within the groups is beneficial as to let individuals share their expertise.
- Howard explained reasoning behind mixing the groups up was to gain an understanding on different perspectives and greater span of issues
- Rolfe follows up that this is important because some people have legal or otherwise professional knowledge that others may not have – this may help groups stay on workshop tasks.
- Barton asked what the deliverable for the pre-meeting was
- Dixon stated that may need to let things evolve on their own a bit and that we can’t plan every detail of the pre-meeting, things will adjust on their own to some extent
- Ivy requests that we “dial in” a place and times for the workshops

- Discussion evolved on when the best time to have the workshops will be; general consensus seemed to be to move pre-meeting and workshops to month of October as September is our last nice month here and many people still have field work and make time for vacation.
- Schmitt will re-work workshop timing and send it out to PCW for comment after UO and facilitator OK it. Schmitt will give deadline for people to respond as to whether dates work so we can confirm workshop dates
- Once dates are confirmed, Schmitt will work towards securing a venue (for the pre-meeting in particular since it will be the largest)
- Farrell-Matthews suggests the Lakeview room at SWOCC as an appropriate venue
- Rolfe also gave the county's conference room in Coquille as an option
- Howard stated it was preferable to have lunch brought in or a catering option for the pre-meeting
- Schmitt presents narrowed down list of participants for workshops with methodology and ideas behind selections
- Schmitt also presented an approach strategy where select PCW members provide initial ice-breaker/approach to each member – in person or over the phone – to catch them up on the project and state that Schmitt/Hoobyar/Howard will follow up with details if they're interested in being involved.
- Claire suggests Schmitt email PCW members specific verbiage for each group to be designed for the initial contact to individuals.
- Galli-Noble agreed and added that Schmitt should line out the expected time commitment, general schedule, one-pager, goal of activity and brief info on workshops, and a deadline to respond by.
- Farrell-Matthews agreed we need a deadline for participants to either confirm or decline that they will be able to participate in workshops so we can move on to other options.
- Galli-Noble asked if participants can't make it are they allowed to appoint someone
- Schmitt responded that if they are qualified and meet the criteria, then yes. Otherwise we'll move on to a randomly selected person off the remainder of the list.

Data Source Update

- Schmitt reported no more content has been received from J. Souder in the past two months or more on Data Source socio-economic chapters and stated that the Demographics chapter is 90% complete and the Jobs and Employment chapter has not been started (i.e., 0% complete)
- The group agreed with the official decision to relieve Souder from his obligations to this project and Ivy agreed to draft a letter stating as such. He will work with Schmitt and Cornu to that effect.
- Specifics on Plan B for completing this chapter is still being worked out, including the idea of finding a graduate student to complete the analyses and writing.

- Barton was interested in viewing the 95% complete chapter and would be able to possibly complete, or at least look at it.

Wrap Up

Topics and goals for June meeting

1. Initial approach to participants on workshop invite list to be completed
2. Workshop dates to be confirmed
3. Map Atlas draft will be presented
4. Location for workshop (especially pre-meeting) confirmed
5. Invite Paul Hoobyar, more details on workshop plan

Next meeting is set for June 13th, 2017

Meeting adjourned