

PCW Meeting Notes – January 10, 2017

Attendees: M. Vander Heyden, C. Claire, C. Hood, J. Barton, E. Hughes, C. Stopher, J. Rolfe, E. Day, M. Spangler, G. Cooper, D. Ivy, B. Yednock, A. Farrell Matthews, J. Schmitt

Action items:

- All PCW members: review the CBEMP audit draft findings. Comments to Jill by end of day Friday.
- All PCW members: review Population and Housing draft chapter. Comments to Jenni by 1/20/17
- C. Cornu: Draft and send an outline of an outreach plan to the group.
- C. Cornu: Draft a one-pager of talking points (what the project is and is not) and send to group for comment.
- J. Schmitt: Incorporate PCW feedback into UO Scope of work and Deliverables. Discuss changes with Michael Howard (UO).

Main discussion points:

CBEMP audit and assessment:

- Rolfe: She'll be looking to make sure they addressed the legal section comments that she and Matt had provided. Matt, and would like the group to look at the priorities [recommendations] section to see if we got what we wanted out of the project. Get comments back by end of day Friday (1/13/17)
- Spangler: First reaction is with more detail in recommendations, especially how to remedy some of the problems, but said it provides a good foundation
- Rolfe: It's a small contract and offering solutions to the problems may be beyond scope of what they can do under current contract.
- Ivy: Suggested we ask that the report include specific examples of issues they've identified.
- Ivy: Who receives the report when done?
- Rolfe: Will post on County website, copies to commissioners, etc. Will be useful when applying for future grants.
- Schmitt: Should we think about applying for new Technical Assistance (TA) grant to further define the solutions to their recommendations?
- Rolfe: yes
- Spangler: DLCD may have some TA money if budget goes through. Even w/o money, they can offer technical assistance for that aspect of the project.

Data Source

- Schmitt: Souder would like feedback from anyone who can provide it. Any feedback to Schmitt by end of next week (1/20/17)
- Schmitt: Will email electronic copies of the chapter to group
- Schmitt: Still missing the workforce/employment chapter.

- Day: City of Coos Bay did a demographics assessment this past fall. Will send a copy to Schmitt to share with Souder.
- Vander Heyden: How and when are we planning on updating the Data Source? Especially as we collect new data to fill already identified gaps, how can we incorporate that in?

Agenda item at the next meeting: how to make sure the Data Source is a living document

Website Strategy

- Schmitt: SCDC is interested in applying for \$5K grant to Pacific Connector Gas Pipeline to make a Weebly-based website. It would pay for developing the new site (making it more user-friendly) and moving the existing content, plus two years of maintaining the site. Website cost is \$480 for two years. The grant application is due April 1st, SCDC will be the applicant.

Circulation model

- Schmitt: Gave general project overview and progress to date, including some questions the model can answer. The three year project will expand the capabilities of the existing model and fill in data gaps (sediment size, bathymetry, movement of sediment)
- Schmitt: End users include Coos County (erosion hotspots and sediment movement), ODFW (where oyster and clam larvae move), DEQ (help advise bacteria TMDLs and contaminant movement).
- Schmitt: PCW role will be to help prioritize questions for the model to answer and provide feedback to the PI (D. Sutherland) on data gaps it should fill and what the products should look like. Sutherland will be attending the PCW meeting in February to discuss the project.
- Claire: Other questions to answer: 1) Where is major sediment deposition occurring? Is it evenly distributed or focused in certain areas? Important implications for managing eelgrass beds. Product could include GIS shapefiles showing gradated areas of sedimentation. 2) What do summer temperature patterns look like and where are cooler spots. Implication being cooler waters are refuge locations for fish and areas where they might be holding (important for protecting those habitats).
- Hughes: Another question could be "How does tidegate function affect sediment input into the estuary?"
- Ivy: May want to include industry end users (e.g. oyster culture, ACE (dredging)). Roblan and McKeown would be interested in results of this (OR Shellfish Taskforce).

Agenda item for next meeting: D. Sutherland will talk about the model and what it can and cannot answer

Land Use Analysis Project

Project Outline/Message and Outreach Priorities

- Schmitt provided and went over a document summarizing the timeline of the project

- Cornu: With regards to #7 on the outline document, what's the best way to inform Planning Commission?
- Rolfe: Two ways: 1) Provide details at a board meeting (short time) 2) do a work session, which is probably better since will get more discussion time and feedback
- Ivy: Need to do this sooner than later. Concerned crucial end user entities that we need to talk to (such as the Planning commission) will hear about it from others (possibly with wrong information) before they hear about it from us.
- Cornu: Agree. Will organize outreach plan through email to more quickly understand how the outreach will unfold.
- Rolfe: Have a subcontract for this project that will need to be presented to the commission. Meeting January 17th but wants to wait until they've been formally "reminded" of the project, so it's not out of the blue.
- Rolfe: Board of Commission work sessions can be called more than once a month. Rolfe can call a work session when we're ready to review the project.
- Ivy: Getting ahead of detractors should be an immediate concern
- Stopher: Agree. Stopher came to the group very skeptically but once she learned what it was about, she fully supported the efforts.
- Cornu: Reviewed who still need to recruit and who to message to (new recruits include Ag. Interests; oyster industry). List of audiences for outreach on the project outline is only a partial list.
- Barton: Chamber should be included; could present at Wednesday business connect.
- Stopher: Need to get on the calendar early for Wednesday Business Connect
- Cornu: What's our strategy for messaging? One-to-one conversations? Or presenting to large group
- Barton: For the Chamber, a large group since no one person is in charge
- Hood: Focus on the end-users identifies (Cities, County, Port) and have one-to-one conversations with those entities. Then presentations to other groups.
- Cornu: Need to focus on what the project is and is not. E.g. the project provides scenarios only and is not the only information the county will be using. The project is not a visioning effort. Cornu will update the one-pager to make sure these concepts are clear.
- Schmitt: Suggested bullets to emphasize what the project is and what it isn't.

UO Subcontract

- Ivy: Would prefer a facilitator with local knowledge over someone from outside the community
- Barton: The scope seemed clear. As they develop the land use inventory, they should include info on what lands are being used for currently, including partial uses.
- Ivy: Could they also include projects that are just beginning (e.g., in the planning phase) even though lands aren't currently being use?
- Hood: Concerned the scope is too vague, especially the land use analysis piece, which Hood thinks is the single most important thing we get out of this

- Hood: The more we know about the properties, the more valuable the land inventory will be. E.g., include ownership and specifics on what exactly is on it; include what neighboring land uses are zoned/used for
- Rolfe: The idea is to identify controversial or sensitive areas; we need a base of what's there to know what to plan for
- Cornu: Seems people are hung up on the word "deducting". Don't use that word. Maybe call it "further classifying" instead.
- Spangler: The way scope is written is a garden variety buildable lands survey. Spangler thinks we need a more nuanced analysis. E.g., identify constrained lands, don't "deduct" them.
- Spangler: Don't want a strictly quantitative buildable lands inventory, we want some more qualitative and analytical. Include categories for ownership, constraints, and adjacent uses.
- Cornu: Can we use information from the socio-economic chapters to partially inform this analysis?
- Stopher: It really would be helpful to know adjacent uses, especially conflicting ones
- Day: What is their definition of "industrial"? There are many uses for that classification.
- Stopher: Has an example of analysis done where they deduced significance of properties. Stopher could share this.
- Unidentified: what does "estimating land holding capacity in terms of uses allowed under existing land classifications" mean? Is this referring to state law size limits?
- Ivy: Is there money to make ensure a good land use inventory product
- Schmitt: There is some flexibility built into the budget, but will talk with UO group to make sure. UO group will come to the meeting in February.
- Schmitt: UO group will come to the meeting in February to discuss project.
- General consensus: Needs to be more than just a buildable lands inventory. If can add specificity and description of land use inventory tasks (i.e., ownership, adjacent uses, especially conflicting uses, and state of occupied use) and include more verbiage ensuring flexibility in schedule, tasks (based on PCW feedback), and budget (e.g. more money may need to go to inventory piece to make sure that is done well), then group is good to go ahead with subcontract.

Agenda items for next meeting: Socio-cultural what do we mean by this (ran out of time to discuss this); Continue discussing land analysis inventory; Continue discussing focus workshops and how that will work

Next meeting date was set for Feb 14th.