

**Willamette Headwaters Region Water Resource  
Inventory and Protection  
Kick-Off Meeting  
October 26, 2009 9:30 AM-12:00 PM**

**AGENDA**

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Alan Henning (EPA), Ginger Griffith (Scio), Cathy Martin (Scio), Ryan Taylor (Scio, Mill City), Denise Walters (Creswell), Jim Manard (Monroe), Janet Morlan (DSL), Jarerd Rubin (DEQ), Amanda Punton (DLCD), Bryce Cleeton (Harrisburg), Pamela Wright (DEQ), Chuck Spies (Lowell), Steve Amraen (Lowell), Peter Ryan (DSL), Amanda Ferguson (Cottage Grove), Drew Foster (Adair Village),

**1. Introductions 9:30 – 9:40 AM**

**2. Project Overview and Timelines 9:40 – 10:00 AM**

- Project objectives
- An overview of long-term and short term project components

Harrisburg curious about opportunities for working outside of the overall project timeline, since they are eager to expand UGB ASAP. Denise suggested that our overall timeline does not need to be followed, but Amanda noted that certain elements of the process need to be far enough along to fold into the expansion process seamlessly.

Denise noted the financial commitment that is the Cities (\$5,000) paid in one lump sum, or over two or three year period.

**3. Community and Public Official Outreach 10:00 – 10:25 AM**

Individual meetings—one meeting per each jurisdiction--- meetings should be light. Broad consensus on this issue.

Concern was expressed by Lowell and Monroe about the ability to gain property access permission. Many are just afraid to make known what may or may not be on their property.

Local initial meetings are a good opportunity to let property owners know about benefits to allowing property access, and disadvantages to not allowing access. (Access provides ACCURATE detail of what is on site rather than assumptions made from aerial photos and more distant observations. The sites absence form the LWI will not ensure that the wetland does not become a problem for the landowner in the future.

Lowell: Do we let them provide access permission after the fact (after they see what the consultant identifies on their property)?. Janet noted that consultants are often flexible in working with property owners.

Impacted property owners invited. Meetings staffed by local reps (generally accepted). LCOG and State folks are available to help with both public and public official meetings. We will create materials for the meetings:

LCOG will create meeting briefing materials—keep short -- to two pages, include a timeline, whole project scope (they will need a reminder of what this is, benefits etc.

Initial meetings may be most ideally held in each community, but maybe the follow up meetings can be combined in central locations, once real stakeholders and concerned citizens have been identified.

Letters should be on City letterhead and mailed from the City. LCOG's can create outreach letter template, but Cities should incorporate local insights, issues, other customization.

Materials/reports for City Councils should emphasize Riparian aspect. Most know about wetland issues but may be less familiar with riparian.

LCOG can/will create Flyers and other outreach resources.

Focus on benefits of Wetland inventories. Reduced impacts of flooding.

It was suggested that cities could hold outreach meetings before or during PC or CC meetings. Then at least the decision bodies are aware.

Utilize the Watershed Council newsletters for outreach on the matter.

#### **4. Data Collection and Base Map Development 10:25 – 10:50 AM**

No concerns or issues with the groupings of the cities for two consultants.

Most jurisdictions interested in looking at areas outside of the UGB. Bill gathering (being sent) that info as soon as possible, because we need it for RFQ going out to consultants immediately. We cannot do a buffer around each city. We have to temper the desire to do areas outside of the UGB with the capacity and budget to do so. Each area checking in with Bill to identify areas outside of UGB.

Bill's county contacts will likely be the best data for each jurisdictions. Cities will be available to double check identified lots and resources.

Mill City in two counties (including Marion)

Scio has Veg mapping along Thomas Creek which would be very helpful to have.

Data used and areas covered

- Identification of potential growth areas
- Local GIS layers that can be contributed—Not many data links identified.

#### **5. Wetland and Riparian Area Inventory and Assessment 10:50 – 11:15 AM**

- Introduction to process and methodologies
- Consultant selection and interest in being on selection panel:

Jim Manard willing to participate on selection process, also DLCD local rep, DSL rep (Peter)

Cities generally willing to make contact with critical property owners (although they make no promises)

Cities should make efforts to coordinate with counties. Courtesy check-in if nothing else.

Community Rating System.

Question from DLCD about wetland banking

#### **6. Water Resource Policy Phase of Project 11:15 - 11:30 AM**

-Land Use Action Kit

Sounds good---Not much feedback.--

-Public official and community involvement – most present noted that their decision bodies are largely conservative, but see the issue as a pressing matter that needs to be addressed.

General interest shown in the visualization exercise.

**7. Steering Team Composition, Meeting Frequency, and Location 11:30 AM – 11:45 AM**

-Are the right players at the table?

We need to look at Brownsville's contact info and make sure they know about the meetings.

-Are quarterly meetings about right?

Yes

-Meeting location and time

Eugene not too inconvenient, try for Harrisburg next time. January next meeting—discuss some public outreach meeting ideas, discuss LWI in great detail. Consultant will be on board.

**8. Wrap-up 11:45 – 12:00**

- Any particular needs or issues not covered?