

**Multi City/County Water Resource Assessment Project (MC-WRAP) Meeting
March 16, 2011 - 2:00-4:00**

Meeting Place:

City of Harrisburg Justice Center - 354 Smith Street,

ATTENDANCE

Jacob Callister (LCOG), Fraser MacDonald (LCOG), Denise Kalakay (LCOG), Denise Walters (Creswell), Amanada Ferguson (Cottage Grove), Dave Kinney (Scio & Mill City), Cathy Martin (Scio), Drew Foster (Adair Village), Jim Minard (Monroe), Bruce Cleeton (Harrisburg), Chuck Spies (Lowell), Janet Morlan (DSL), Peter Ryan (DSL), Lynne Mcallister (DSL), Pamela Wright (DEQ), Chris Bayham (DEQ), Amanda Punton (DLCD)

- 1. Greeting/Introductions (5 minutes)**
- 2. Local Wetland Inventory Reports (15 minutes)**

- General update
- General comments or questions related to the reports?
- Requirements for report process (reviews, adoption, approval)

Adair Village still working on comments. Cottage Grove provided comments to Denise.

Questions about sequencing of reviews: DSL clarified that ideally their review can be concurrent with public review –adding public input as a follow adjustment (final review must come from DSL).

Question about the conclusions of the LWI generally. Does this mean that areas without mapped wetlands have an assurance of no wetlands? DSL clarified that the LWI provides wetland determinations that do not make a conclusive judgement of wetland boundaries (just an estimate). It is not impossible that wetland features will be found on other properties (by various means). The LWI is sufficient for land use reviews from the City’s perspective (barring instances with clear reason for concern otherwise). This was in reference to a question about Hydric Soils being a sufficient concern (DSL suggested that with the new LWI they would not).

- 3. Water Resource Policy (20 minutes)**

- Overview of policy within overall project context/scope
- Overview of regulatory options
- Discussion, questions, clarifications

Denise presented a shortened list of policy alternatives based on more of a “what do you want” perspective. No one was certain of which policy route to take. There was much discussion about the need to take the matter to council. There was also a clear sentiment among several cities that the “minimum” would likely be the preferred alternative with their decision bodies and public.

Denise asserted that although LCOG has some limitations, it was dedicated to providing some assistance in moving forward with the policy process in order to see it through. This would include training on how jurisdictions can use the maps, wetland data, etc. in a typical application.

Jurisdictions wondered if LCOG could provide a FINDINGS template and some example policy language. Some jurisdictions wanted something real boiled down to present to their councils.

- 4. Water Resource “Action Kit” (options for water resource protection) (35 minutes)**

- Action kit walk through
- Discuss initial impressions/concerns/questions
- Discuss potential needs and improvements (city and agency feedback)

Suggestions included:

Making those documents that would likely be used for cutting and pasting in WORD format, others in PDF format.

Include FINDINGS template and more specific ordinance or standards examples in the Action Kit

There was a question about where the model codes in the Action Kit came from. Denise explained that it was generally from the State Water Quality Model Code (and Wetland Planning Guidebook). However there some additions to additions that were included. There were questions about whether it had the state's blessing. DLCD noted that they had given up on a model Goal 5 wetlands code, because they were so many site specific nuances. DLCD noted that the existing model code may work if your willing to go with a strict and rigid approach. For example, safe harbor does not account for roads utilities in the model code. It can be a very code-by-code sensitive thing. The language needs to be CLEAR and OBJECTIVE. Buffers pose a challenge (how are they treated differently, where do they start or end? DSL noted that it is perhaps it's a good starting place.

5. Process Considerations/Timeline (30 minutes)

- Process for developing/proceeding with policy strategy (What needs to happen)
 - Policy Recommendations/Alternatives development (how, with who, and when do you want to develop policy?)
 - How can LCOG help?
- Development of timeline for process (collective and/or individual)

One jurisdiction noted that perhaps presenting the varying components (riparian and wetlands) as more of a general theme (Water Quality) could be more helpful to decision bodies and the public (emphasize the common goals). Someone else felt that this may confuse the public (keep it simple: they live next to a river, they are in the riparian zone, need a riparian application.)

One jurisdiction noted that their Council will not have an answer to a "What should we do?" question. They will want the options boiled down and spelled out clearly. We have to put something like a draft ordinance in front of them.

DLCD wondered if draft "standards" would suffice, since these would be easier to assemble.

DSL suggested that perhaps LCOG could assemble some suggestions based on basic wetland themes (private ownership, public ownership, infrastructure, etc.) This could help the cities limit alternatives further.

DLCD raised the issue of Flood Insurance Program that many communities may depend on. This could further limit policy choices. DLCD also noted that the "Minimum" approach is a nuanced thing. Are we talking about minimum protection? Minimum process? The distinctions need to be made clear.

LCOG noted that Fish Bearing streams is not a comprehensive gauge for waterways that could use protection for water quality purposes. TMDLs may not be achieved with this approached.

DLCD wondered if it wouldn't be helpful to approach it from a "what is the motivator?" perspective. Is it meeting the minimal requirements, is it protecting water quality, is it protecting other wetland values?

6. Public Meetings (likely needing to happen in April) (25 minutes)

- Notice
- Content
- Scheduling

Mailing protocol was reviewed. Meeting content was discussed. Combination of approaches to be determined individually. Many jurisdictions looking to combine public officials meetings with public meetings. It was noted that there wasn't a lot of time to assemble policy to present to the public. It may have to be presented generally with a sensitive treatment of the array of options.

7. WRAP-up/ Next meeting

- Any particular needs or issues not covered?