

## **PCW Meeting Notes – February 14, 2017**

**Attendees:** M. Vander Heyden, C. Claire, C. Stopher, J. Rolfe, E. Day, G. Cooper, D. Ivy, B. Yednock, A. Farrell Matthews, J. Schmitt, D. Sutherland (UO), M. Howard (UO), J. Peterson (UO student), R. Parker (UO, on phone), P. Karr (UO student), R. Hiller (UO student)

### **Action items:**

- Stopher will provide an introductory email between Schmitt and Shaun Gibbs.
- Rolfe will look at Comp Plan for guidance on how they dealt with socio-cultural interests.
- Howard will send out Data Request list to Rolfe and Schmitt to forward to appropriate parties.
- Howard will draft project area map based on feedback from this PCW meeting.
- Schmitt will make suggested changes to outreach plan and one pager and resend out to group for final comment
- Rolfe, Ivy, and Schmitt will present the project to the Coos County Board of Commissioners on February 15<sup>th</sup>.
- Rolfe will get us on the agenda to present at the next Planning Commission meeting.

### **Main discussion points:**

#### CBEMP audit and assessment:

- Howard: Final draft of audit and assessment nearly complete. Will give a 15 minute review of findings in March meeting.

Agenda item at the next meeting: final report out

#### Data Source

- Schmitt: Community Demographics chapter nearly complete (Jon Souder still needs to provide a table and do a final read through).
- Schmitt: Souder asked if any other members were interested in Employment Chapter. Many heads vigorously nodded to this question and Rolfe and Ivy stated a firm “yes”.
- Stopher: Souder can contact her anytime in the next two weeks for outline ideas. Her last day at SCDC is February 28<sup>th</sup>.

#### Website Strategy

- Schmitt: Is SCDC still interested and willing to write grant and take on that project?
- Stopher: Shaun Gibbs is up to speed on the website development and is the one who helped develop SCDC’s website. He could definitely help out on the website grant and work. He could also attend meetings until a new executive director is hired. The interim director, John Hitt starts February 21<sup>st</sup>, but will only be part-time and wouldn’t attend PCW meetings.

#### Circulation model

- Sutherland: Described the model and gave general review of inputs to the model (i.e., data to inform it). Inputs included Temperature/salinity; bathymetry, wind, tide, discharge, water velocity, sediment. He also gave outputs: circulation and sediment discharge (i.e., change in sediment). He gave several examples of how it could be used (e.g., how far saline (salty) water goes up the bay if the channel is deepened or widened).
- Several group members asked questions or made comments on how they saw the model being used.
- Vander Heyden: We should eventually incorporate model outputs into the Data Source
- Sutherland: Goal of end of summer having a working circulation model, after which will begin to incorporate the sediment model.
- Sutherland: Plans to give PCW minimum quarterly updates.

### Land Use Analysis Project

#### *Land Use Analysis memo*

- Karr: Gave brief overview of project goals and general timeline
- Parker: went over powerpoint by phone of how they will create the land use analysis (.ppt available)
- Day: what assumptions are you using for FEMA BioOP? FEMA is behind on their product, not sure it would be usable for this.
- Howard: May be able to give initial considerations using what's available to inform EMP's in the future.
- Parker: the County has the option eventually of modifying management units.
- Howard: Next steps will be to send a data request out to Rolfe and Schmitt who can then forward it on to the appropriate people.
- Howard: Defining the study area. Presented options of current CBEMP boundary, 50% exceedance boundary, XXL Tsunami Inundation Zone, ¼ mile buffer beyond the current CBEMP boundary, ½ mile beyond the current CBEMP boundary.
- Schmitt: Should we use the 50% exceedance boundary to match the CMECS classification work being done by DLCD?
- Howard: There are some areas where CBEMP extends beyond the 50% exceedance
- Howard: They often use the ¼ mile buffer line for projects like this.
- Schmitt: thinking about climate change and sea level rise, it might make sense to include the greater of the two between the 50% exceedance and the CBEMP boundary.
- Ivey: The tsunami inundation zone will show where high water is likely to be, I imagine sea level rise will follow that same path
- Rolfe: I agree, we should do the greater of the two between CEBEMP boundary and tsunami inundation.
- Howard: Team will come up with the project area map combining CBEMP boundary and tsunami inundation boundaries. Will then send to group to make sure all target areas are included (e.g., Stopher mentioned Bunker Hill areas).

### *Outreach Subcommittee Update*

- Schmitt: Went over the draft outreach plan and asked for feedback.
- Rolfe: Include the Coos County Planning Commission as an “Urgent” priority organization to talk to.
- Schmitt: Went over draft one pager, which is a list of talking points to talk about the project and the PCW.
- Rolfe: Had a few things to change.
- Schmitt: Will make changes and resend out to group for final approval.
- Rolfe discussed what she thought the BOC would expect at the February 15<sup>th</sup> presentation of the project.
- Rolfe: BOC are aware of the PCW and what our mission is. We should explain where we’re at with the project (they should be at least loosely familiar with it already). And talk about next steps, including continued search for funding. We should talk about the funding strategy for the project, including that Rolfe will be partially compensated for her work on it.
- Ivy: We should pester Jon Barton and Chris Hood to be there if possible.
- Rolfe: The Planning Commission meets the 1<sup>st</sup> Thursday of each month and will get this on their next agenda.

### *Socio-Cultural group (split vs. lump)*

- Schmitt: The Outreach Subcommittee has been struggling to define what “socio-cultural” means in the context of this project and finding the right person to be part of the PCW and head up that focus group. Craig Cornu suggested weaving the socio-cultural group into the economic development and natural resource protection groups. Schmitt asked people opinions.
- Rolfe: Will the grantors be ok if we remove that focus group?
- Schmitt: They are very responsive to end users molding the process, so if we give them a case for why it isn’t a good fit, I imagine they’ll be fine with that.
- Stopher: I think the Economic Development focus group will be more focused on strictly economics and cultural aspects may get diluted.
- Stopher: I think it’s ok that there isn’t one perfect definition or person to fill socio-cultural, because it means so many things. We don’t want it to be homogenous when it really is diverse and sometimes undefinable.
- Yednock: I agree, I don’t think we should get rid of the socio-cultural focus group.
- Claire: I agree, it would be myopic for economic development to also be expected to include socio-cultural interests.
- Farrell Matthews: If we did drop to two groups, would people we’ve already identified as being a good fit for that category (e.g., Florence Portall Stevens) be part of both focus groups?

- Ivy: We want to link to the larger landscape (e.g., those that support festivals and events) not get someone from every group out there. Thinks we can identify the socio-cultural landscape within the other two focus groups.
- Stopher: Thinks aspects of socio-cultural would be missed if it was melded into two groups. For example, homeless people's uses of public spaces (zero economic incentive to think about that interest group).
- Ivy: Remember the project boundaries are the CBEMP boundaries.
- Day: Groups like Connect the Boardwalk are fairly well represented on current economic development teams.
- Rolfe: Will look at comprehensive plan to see if there is any guidance there on the socio-cultural question (e.g., how did they deal with that the first time around, if they did).

Agenda items for next meeting: Report out on how Board of Commissioners presentation went; Continue discussing Socio-cultural question; Continue discussing land analysis inventory; Continue discussing focus workshops and how that will work

**Next meeting date was set for March 21<sup>st</sup> .**