

PCW Meeting Notes – 21st March 2017

Attendees: M. Vander Heyden, C. Claire, D. Ivy, B. Yednock, A. Farrell Matthews, J. Schmitt, D. Sutherland (UO – by phone), M. Howard (UO), J. Peterson (UO student), P. Karr (UO student), R. Hiller (UO student), S. Gibbs, K. Marenger, D. Erler, L. Galli-Noble, C. Hood, H. Schrager, C. Cornu, T. Slater, C. Schnabel, A. Dibble, M. Spangler

Action Items:

- If no comments received by Friday, one pager will be finalized. Schmitt will send final one-pager to Erler and rest of PCW.
 - Schmitt and Ivy will draft and send a letter to Souder regarding completion of Data Source socio-economic chapters.
 - Schmitt will ask Souder for outline of “Jobs” chapter that the group can work off of to provide feedback.
 - Schmitt will give Gibbs info on Data Source website and coordinate work with Gibbs to write grant to support new website
 - Schmitt will provide single-beam sonar data to Sutherland
 - Erler will provide slide hazard and flood hazard data to Schmitt and the CSC team
 - Howard will send the bio for their recommended facilitator to Rolfe and Schmitt to distribute
 - Howard will have proposed revised timing for workshops by next meeting
 - Howard will have example of Land Use Inventory output by next meeting
 - Howard will ask that Bob Parker and their recommended facilitator show the PCW an outline of similar workshops at next meeting
- » **Next meeting set for April 11th, 2017**

Main Discussion:

Data Source update

- Schmitt – Jon Souder’s Population and Housing chapter is being wrapped up although the chapter “Jobs” needs some help/suggestion from members - suggests searching for insight that can lend a socioeconomic look into historic records of employment across current labor statistics.
 - Cornu responds that the PCW may want to entertain the idea of locating a sociologist familiar with the area who can compile this dataset with the addition of extrapolating labor and jobs trends.
 - PCW agrees with an additional idea; look into local universities sociology depts. for graduate students who may take this task on, especially under the guidance of Jon if he is unable to complete in time.
 - Cornu suggests including a historical context as well as job conditions and employers in the area for the “Jobs” chapter. He also wonders if there could be a forecasting element included.
 - Schmitt and Ivy are to meet after the session to write/brainstorm a letter to Jon about solidifying his commitment/timeframe to the project.
- Schmitt asked Gibbs if SCDC could still partner with PCW to write grant and support website development to house the Data Source
- Gibbs gave tentative “yes” and asked to follow up with Schmitt more information

Coos estuary circulation model

- Sutherland demonstrated his remote sensing work in the greater Coos Bay area to follow up on his progress in synthesizing and compiling bathymetry data. Noted some errors in the 10m DEM from NOAA. USACE LIDAR 2014 has good main channel definition, Peter Ruggiero’s (OSU) transect data of entire bay is to be updated in April where needed. 2017 ODFW data is good as is and will be used in final dataset.
- Sutherland heard that David Evans and Associates is collecting multiband data soon and wondered

if PCW could get it?(TBD)

CBEMP Audit & Assessment

- CSC group members are working on updating some "best methods" techniques for the plan in order to streamline and clarify the navigability and search-ability of the policies/goals/evaluations criteria.
- This is to be completed by the end of the month to provide guidance on how to increase user friendliness and efficacy.

Coos estuary land use analysis

- CSC team demonstrates the project boundaries (aggregating the XXL tsunami inundation zone with the official CBEMP boundary) and their Map Atlas concept. Map Atlas is a 10-tile schema each tile at 1:15,000 scale to 1:10,000 scales depending on area (e.g., zoomed in along N. Bend and Coos Bay waterfront areas where tax lots are much smaller). Zoning aggregation is to be done by generalizing categories based on Coos County Development Code Section 4.1.100 and covers constraints in the generalized zoning aggregation, such as flooding.
- Erler offered to provide slide hazard area data and flood hazard areas

Focus group workshops

- CSC seeks PCW assistance in stakeholder workshop discussion. "Three workshops targeting field experts and focusing on anomalous properties identified in land inventory". Workshops are currently divided into three groups: Natural Resource Protection, Economic Development, Sociocultural interests
- Cornu enumerates on the question of narrowing to two groups (natural resource and economic) and dissolving the socio-cultural group into both. He states that if each group has 11 experts what are the implications on zoning? Does this introduce bias or skew the intended results?
- Ivy points out that the Sociocultural interests group was "suggested by the grant reviewers" initially. He asks who are the users of the estuaries and what is the value of the estuary to the community at large.
- Cornu thinks it might include access to the estuary and public space issues
- Hood thinks it also includes tourism and recreation
- Cornu says that if those are the overarching qualities, it probably fits well within the economic development group
- Hood says we need to have a larger conversation on how we use the bay in our daily lives
- Claire says there is intrinsic value to the bay and a visual appeal that doesn't necessarily have an economic value. He adds that we need to define what socio-cultural means if we decide to keep it as a separate group. We don't want it to get lost by placing it inside another group.
- Ivy says that the museum we're sitting in now fits into both the socio-cultural and economic development categories depending on how we look at it. As another example, how do we characterize the position of a boat ramp when it can be considered an economic development tool, a natural resource and a sociocultural interest?
- Yednock thinks the public meeting part of the proposal would bolster citizen involvement to help provide that aspect and feels the natural resource group would be a good merge with the socio-cultural.
- Schrager stated that different people would be included in a natural resource group vs. a socio-cultural group and therefore provide a different perspective. She believes we

need to make sure each group is well-defined and everyone in each group should be clear what their focus (i.e., lens) should be.

- Cornu thinks it would be ok to think of socio-cultural as its own group as long as we're very clear on what it is
- Hood thinks it should be its own entity so down the road we have a clear place to point at the socio-cultural inputs that went into the end product
- Claire says that things like open space gets lost in the natural resource or economic groups. He says that we are good at compartmentalizing into economic or natural resource but don't have practice compartmentalizing socio-cultural. If we tackle that we may not do it well but at least we'll have attempted it and can learn from it in the future.
- Farrell Matthews thinks a local historian would provide good context for the waterfront and feels like if we dropped that as its own group we'd be missing an opportunity to include some of the more intangible aspects.
- Schnabel agrees that a historian would be a good person to include and thinks that keeping socio-cultural as its own group would be valuable.
 - » Overall people were generally agreeing that all three focus groups should remain separate
- Ivy ends the conversation by saying that we should wait to decide until we figure out specific 3-4 key questions we want these groups to answer.
- Schrager offered to take a stab at defining each of the three groups – i.e., what they are and what we want out of them
- Howard said that Bob Parker and their recommended facilitator could show the PCW an outline next time of similar workshops done (e.g., questions answered)
- Cornu thinks each workshop should give rationale behind their recommendations
- Hood asked what we meant by “anamolous” lands.
- Howard responded that it is existing zoning that is problematic. He continued that a pre-workshop where all participants get together to discuss the final land analysis and what's expected of them (i.e., questions to answer and outcomes expected) would be ideal.
- Erler offered that the City of Coos Bay had a redevelopment grant to look at front street, including several public meetings. They could share public input from those meetings in case it is relevant.
- Ivy said we need to make sure focus groups are not confusing the CBEMP boundary and issues with those of the cities
- Howard said he might have a draft land analysis inventory by May
- Ivy asked if they could extract some examples before then to have as part of our workshop discussion (i.e., something tangible to talk over)
- Schrager offered to start drafting lists of people that might fit into the three focus groups.
- Howard said they could have a proposal of amended project timing by the next meeting, with the idea that summer might not be the best time to have the workshops. He also said they would begin to develop methodology for workshops

Outreach update

- Schmitt asked for any final input on one-pager by Friday then would make any changes and send out to group
- Schmitt went over current outreach scheduling
- Dibble mentioned Coos County Planning Commission upcoming meeting dates
- Galli-Noble put the PCW on the agenda for the May CoosWA board meeting
- Slater said that there was a possibility of getting PCW on the Wednesday business connection agenda in June and would work with Ivy to do so.

- Gibbs said PCW might want to wait until new director of SCDC was on board before presenting to their board (i.e., likely August at the earliest)
- Ivy said end of May both tribal councils will be together and PCW could present then; he would set it up.
- PCW agreed that the May Port Commission meeting would be better than double-scheduling on an April date.

