CO-CONVENERS: Mark Labhart

CO-CONVENER ABSENT: Senator Betsy Johnson

PROJECT TEAM PRESENT: Mark Gervasi, Paul Levesque, Tom Manning, Denny Pastega, Don Hurd, Joy Friebaum, Cathy Tortorici, Rick Klumph, Dale Buck, Rudy Fenk, Bob McPheeters, Dick Townsend, Mark Labhart, Dale Blanton, Geoff Roach, Ross Halloway, Bub Boquist, Jon Carnahan, Doug Clarke, Wendell Hesseltine, Larry McKinley, Ken Bierly, Art Riedel, Shawn Reiersgaard, Mark Trenholm, Bruce Apple and Chad Allen.

PROJECT TEAM ABSENT: Robert Anderson, Deborah Boone, Mark Ellsworth, Vickie Goodman, Rob Rees and Laren Wooley.

GUESTS: Sandy Bell, Tom Jayred, Ken O'Toole, Doug Henson, Greg Beaman, Carolyn Decker, Orella Chadwick, Margaret Page, Tracy Johnson, Jim Goble, Jack Thayer, Bud Gienger, Frank Didier, Kathleen Didier, Gus Meyer, David Martin Tilda Jones, Janet Stringer, Fritz Graham, Jennifer Wagner and Richard Krikava. Ben Hathaway said that he is all for reducing the flooding but has to leave due to a bad back.

ITEM NO. 1: WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS: Convener Labhart called the meeting to order at 1:34 p.m. Convener Labhart said that Convener Johnson was to fly in at 1:00 today. The Senate is done but the House is not. She is unable to attend and extends her apologies.

Everyone introduced themselves.

Convener Labhart said he was pleased, that from the first meeting there have been three (3) sub-committees formed. All three (3) groups have met and are doing yeoman's work. They hit the ground running. The Project Team will be coming together in a few months with projects to implement for flooding in Tillamook Basin. The sub-committees are doing the behind the scenes work and will bring findings back to the full committee to see which way to proceed.

ITEM NO. 2: REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Convener Labhart said that everyone had received and hopefully reviewed the Minutes from the first meeting and asked if there were any additions or corrections to be made. Hearing none, a motion was made by Dale Buck to approve and sign the Minutes. The motion was seconded by Bub Boquist. The motion carried unanimously. The Conveners will sign the Minutes.

Dick Townsend said that together with the Minutes there is a list of the Project Team and a list of the work group members. He asked everyone to look at their information and see that it is correct. He said he is also passing around a sign up sheet for the Project Team and guests to sign.

ITEM NO. 3: WHAT IS OUR COLLECTIVE VISION: a) WHAT ARE YOUR EXPECTATIONS/DESIRES FOR THIS PROJECT? b) WHAT CAN YOU OFFER, OR BRING TO THE TABLE TO MAKE THIS COLLABORATIVE PROCESS A SUCCESS?

Convener Labhart said that he had heard several of the members say they were disappointed that there was no discussion on addressing the issues at hand, at the last meeting. He said that everyone needs to see the big picture and wanted to take a few minutes to process what our vision is for this group. Convener Labhart wanted to go around room and have each member answer two (2) questions: What are your expectations or desires for this project, and most important, what can you offer or bring to the table to make this collaborative process a success?

Shawn Reiersgaard said that he expects a means in which the community and agencies can come together to work towards a common goal in unison. Mr. Reiersgaard said this is the third time he has been an Oregon Solutions Project Member. He is also able to work with the Tillamook County Creamery Association Board towards eventual solutions to issues.

Mark Gervasi said he hopes that all come to the table with an open mind about short and long term projects to be addressed. He said the City can't offer anything but he can go back to the City Council to help make things happen.

Paul Levesque said he has been with the County and local government for thirty (30) years, from beginning working to launch flood insurance, working with the Port on studies. He was the Project Manager for the Feasibility Study and has had the good fortune to be linked to the community for over thirty-three (33) years. He said he understands the community issues and needs and has been on the technical side of regulatory requirements. He said his expectation is that a series of institutional problems or issues that cut across a number of proposed projects or have been work-in-progress over the past decades are addressed in sub-groups through those institutional issues and part of identifying ground projects to move forward.

Doug Clarke said he has a similar view to Mr. Reiersgaard and Mr. Levesque in that it is worked through in a collaborative process. He said he brings background with Oregon Solutions as a Project Manager three (3) times with details of study and good knowledge of Corps authority.

Bub Boquist said his expectation is that we do something now rather than have too many meetings. What he brings to the table is that he has lived on the farm on the river his whole life, has seen the best and worst of agency people. He has been working nine (9) years on the gravel project.

Tom Manning said he expects a collaborative effort to see a disaster resistant community come out with solutions to reduce flood impacts. He brings State hazard and Federal hazard mitigation. He is the State and local Emergency Operations Manager and understands the FEMA process.

Art Riedel said he brings forty (40) years experience in dredging heavy marine construction all over the world.

Denny Pastega said he expects to be part of something that creates results and he brings business experience and the economic impact of flooding.

Don Hurd said he wants to find a way to have agencies and citizens not remain frozen in time on a solutions project. He said he wants salmon flood relief. We need to think outside the box. Mr. Hurd moved to Tillamook in 1959 and realizes the aggravation of driving back and forth in flood waters. He served as Mayor for eight (8) years. He said we should have recognized these problems long ago.

Joy Friebaum said she has similar expectations with different perspectives. She said it will take time to evaluate and implement projects. She brings guidance from the Department of State Lands and the resources they have.

Cathy Tortorici said she developed a vision based on a watershed approach for rural area flood control. With a watershed and ecological context she brings regulatory understanding of the Endangered Species Act. She anticipates putting in time on this labor intensive part of a longer vision.

Dale Blanton, with DEQ's State Coastal Program said his perception is the same as Ms. Tortorici. He said we need the support of an Oregon Solutions environmental mediator and secondly, specific State interests. Whatever projects come out of this process should demonstrate flood reduction benefits and a project that can meet State and Federal land use and an environmentally strong foundation. He brings strong land use and environmental backgrounds to provide guidance to process the likelihood of project success.

Geoff Roach said he has Trust for Public Lands involvement and is an outside resource. He said there are no magical fixes. There are decades worth of work to undo. Work a set of problems for clear clarification and direction of the community and agencies to come together with a road map for long term investment. There needs to be a short and cohesive set of actions. The Trust for Public Lands brings best practices for what is working, time and expertise and limited financial resources. How do you leverage resources? Work on the incentive based side not the regulatory side. He said thinking of problems in a slightly differently way would help.

Ross Holloway represents the forests where water originates and causes problems. He expects to be able to identify the extent to which the forest land is managed. He said he brings technical expertise, hydrologists helping with direct control of management practices on State forest lands, identify problems with forest related resources, staff, money, public education, resources and can communicate to the public through the Forest Center.

Wendell Hesseltine said that small groups over the years have had little support and resources. He feels we need to stay focused to come up with solutions and put them into action, not to just talk about it. He brings staying focused and moving ahead, no more years to just talk.

Rick Klumph said he finds solutions with multiple values, broad based support and a win/win attitude. He brings background in permitting, help in crafting projects and moving forward.

Ken Bierly said he comes with money to the table, with strings attached. He also brings a deep level of cynicism. He feels it is important to recognize the community. He has done a great deal to address this situation because of choices we have made. Be candid about what will and what will not work and to address those situations. Don't hide it in obtuse language. There should be an expectation that we won't solve the problem of two hundred (200") inches of rain a year, but we can figure out how to reduce the impacts, not affect the economy and support healthy rivers.

Mark Trenholm said he desires to craft long term solutions with concerns to do what is politically expedient to demonstrate results. Go after the right fix, not the easy fix. Recognize what has already been done. He hopes everyone is dedicated to the process. Don't tear apart after the fact in sub-committees, go back, communicate and articulate. He hopes that the Board and City of Tillamook develop a long term solution. He said he is a good sounding board to further conversations and is part of a national program, influence, leverage, permits and institutional memory.

Larry McKinley expects to engage in post solutions impact or change in infrastructure. What are fatal flaws? Give a solution and impact to provide economic stimulants in communities to meet needs. He feels we need to tailor future projects to the community.

Dale Buck said there were no ecosystem benefits that came out of the feasibility study. The government says to reduce future impacts. The feasibility study rules out the Tillamook River, the Trask and the Kilchis. Seventeen (17) years has gone by, we can't wait any longer to get some drainage, we need to start now with the mouths of the rivers. He brings a vast knowledge of the flood plain.

Rudy Fenk said he has been fighting for thirty (30) years to get all agencies to work together on a common goal. He is now eighty (80) years old and only sees a three to four (3-4) year expectation to live. He wants to see something done before then.

Jon Carnahan said there needs to be some outcome and some results. He feels he brings a new set of eyes and ears and relationship skills to work as a team.

Bob McPheeters said he wants to absorb as much information as he can and relay it to City Council to unify the efforts of citizens to support whatever this group wants to do. He brings consensus and collaboration, a chance to endorse action, research and then fine tune ideas.

Convener Labhart asked those who had just arrived to introduce themselves. Margaret Page, Carolyn Decker and Chad Allen did so.

Chad Allen said he expects insight from different groups and no hang-ups in the permitting process. We all need to move together at the same speed. Long term solutions, long term work. We are not going to solve in the problems in six to eight (6-8) months. We need to continue to address the situations as time goes on and be open to what changes there may be in years to come. As a dairy farmer in the flood plain he deals with water on a daily basis. He is committed to looking at all the pros and cons to all projects, to benefit reduction of flooding and restoration of damaged areas.

Convener Labhart then summarized what he felt he had just heard. He said that his vision is to improve livability of this community, but how do we get there?

Mr. Townsend observed that this is a powerful group. What he heard is that folks are hoping for broad based support and a collaborative approach. Other Team observations included: We are very correct to not go for the quick fix. There is a lot of history here. We need to go for something that will sustain in the future. On the other hand, let's do something now, which is also accurate; don't be afraid to look at projects

that would mitigate flooding. Short term fixes are ok too, but we can't fix everything short term. We need to reduce the impact of flooding and protect the economy. A watershed approach in an environmental context to reduce impact, is good.

Mr. Hurd said it is possible to do a short term project as part of a larger project. Mr. Hesseltine left the meeting. Mr. Hurd said cleaning brush or fixing tidegates is something to get to a bigger solution.

Convener Labhart said we need to improve community livability.

ITEM NO. 4: DISCUSSION OF PROJECT TEAM GOAL: Convener Labhart said that you should have a copy of the Goal Statement. He read the statement: "Reduction of unacceptable flooding impacts in the Tillamook Basin that reduces the economic impact of flooding while recognizing environmental, social and human values in the short term and in some cases, the long term." Convener Labhart said he had asked for additional input, which he had received and which is reflected on the sheet.

He said that Gus Meyer's suggestions reflected the following statement: "Reduction of repetitive nuisance level flooding impacts in the Tillamook Basin while recognizing environmental, social, economic and human values in the short run and in come cases, the long term." Mr. Meyer is the former Feasibility Study Vice-Chair.

Another rendition submitted by Kirk Jarvie, Economic Revitalization Liaison for the Department of State Lands was: "Reduce the adverse public health, welfare and economic impacts of flooding while recognizing the environmental and social benefits provided by wetlands and waterways in the Basin."

A third suggestion from Don Hurd, Project Team member was: "Reduction of unacceptable flooding levels in the Tillamook Basin that adversely impacts the economic, social and human values while protecting the environment."

Convener Labhart asked for further comments. Mr. Bierly asked if repetitive use levels are specific enough? Mr. Meyer said the intent was to say that this team won't be able to provide assistance for the fifty (50) and the one hundred (100) year floods.

Mr. Boquist asked Convener Labhart to clarify what he wanted. Convener Labhart said he wants a goal statement discussion around the suggested amendments. Mr. Boquist said the goal is to get rivers into shape and to carry water out again. Convener Labhart asked Mr. Boquist if he wanted to propose another rendition that reflected his goal. Mr. Boquist did not.

Mr. Trenholm said he likes Mr. Meyer's changes to protect this community. Nuisance floods are an important question and it informs us of what our solutions are going to be. Big floods or nuisance?

Mr. Allen's goal is to not pinpoint nuisance floods but reduce the severity of big floods. How long the water is up determines the economic damage.

Convener Labhart asked Mr. Allen if adding "and severity of flooding impacts" would be better. Mr. Allen replied affirmatively.

Mr. Reiersgaard said that he felt Mr. Jarvie's statement was cleaner and more elegant. The goal should be to have as many qualifiers, be more to the point and achieves what we want to have happen.

Mr. McKinley said Mr. Meyer's statement has pigeon holes. The second leaves us open. We need to look at the whole picture.

Mr. Holloway said both have good ideas but get rid of "unacceptable". He said he likes Mr. Jarvie's description but also likes Mr. Meyer's closing better. It recognizes different values based on a discussion of "in some cases" or "short term and long term".

Mr. Pastega said he isn't sure that the statement addresses the big picture. Convener Labhart said that it is the goal of this committee and a statement that we can live with, to guide this project. Mr. Pastega asked to have "nuisance" defined.

Ms. Friebaum agrees. She likes Mr. Jarvie's but add "waterways provide social and economic values".

Mr. Levesque said use Mr. Meyer's statement of issue. Take the first part of Mr. Jarvie's and the last part of Mr. Meyer's with the other change that Mr. Holloway recommended. Convener asked for clarification. Mr. Holloway said "reduce the adverse ..."

Ms. Tortorici said she would like the mention of wetlands and waterways. She asked how the group is defining the basis of geographic extent, is it described somewhere?

Mr. Gervasi asked what's the definable area? The Land Use Group came up with, from the Wilson River to the Port of Tillamook Bay and the Trask River drainage.

Mr. Levesque said to include the term "environmental wetlands and waterways" to understand it by implication. Ms. Friebaum asked about the use of "values and benefits". Ms. Tortorici said "social and environmental benefits". Ms. Friebaum said

leave "wetlands and waterways" in and add "environmental and social benefits". Mr. Allen said it was important to recognize environmental impact, also recognize the word "environment" and "public health". Flooding causes a lot of environmental damage itself to public health and welfare.

Mr. Blanton said there is a part in the feasibility study that includes watersheds, which narrowed the project locations. Convener Labhart said there are two (2) issues. What is geographic scope and the other is vision.

Mr. Hurd said we do not want to reduce; he wants to eliminate the impacts. Mr. McKinley asked about the social and economic values.

Mr. Bierly said the important question is infrastructure. It is a given. Mr. Roach agrees. Going back to the statement of removing people from harms way, there are two (2) implications: change environment or move people out of the environment. Mr. Carnahan said the conclusion of Land Use Committee was a combination of both. We are not going to stop flooding. It will take a combination of reducing the impact and land use decisions to get a fine balance. Mr. Hurd said "reduce flooding and the adverse". Mr. Clarke said take that out.

Convener Labhart said we are now at "Reduce flooding and the adverse impacts of flooding while recognizing the environmental, social, economic and human values in the short and the long term."

Mr. Townsend said Mr. Jarvie did a good job but we could add a footnote to this that says "environmental includes wetlands and waterways" and a similar footnote about the Basin.

Mr. Reiersgaard said the last phrase doesn't make sense. "Social economic and human values" of what? He suggested putting back in "wetlands and waterways". Mr. Hurd said you can't stop the water and not damage what is there now. We won't get permission to do that. We need to increase our values in economic areas. What's there now, is not enough. Mr. Buck said the Governor says "Create consensus. Flat reduction dredging while considering habitat". Mr. Pastega asked about geographic boundaries. Mr. Trenholm said the word "recognize" doesn't mean that we did anything. A stronger word to incorporate values is needed. Incorporate is a better word.

Now we are at "Reduce flooding and the adverse impacts of flooding while incorporating environmental, social & economic values in the development of the short and long term solutions."

Convener clarified that Tillamook Basin includes the waterways that flow into the Bay. The Land Use Committee is proposing a different area, at least for their projects. Waterways and watershed is the Tillamook Bay Drainage Basin. It includes all five (5) rivers.

Mr. Buck said the Governor says the entire County. Mr. Bierly said the issues are in the Tillamook Basin. He said that Senator Johnson would clearly state Tillamook Basin not the entire County. The letter talks about the Basin.

Ms. Tortorici said the scale of the issue is overwhelming. In talking about this committee, the members selected were representatives from the Basin area. Nobody was interviewed from Nestucca or Nehalem. This was done to take a smaller look at a more focal area and then expand up and down the entire coast.

Mr. Levesque asked do we want to add to the Goal Statement "Tillamook Bay Basin" as a foot note? Mr. Manning said another definition of long term "Tillamook Bay Drainage Basin" as a footnote. Mr. Townsend said the drainage basin is the same as watershed.

The guests from the Nehalem area walked out.

There was consensus that the area was Tillamook Basin including the five (5) water systems.

Convener Labhart adjourned the meeting at 3:10 p.m. and reconvened it at 3:19 p.m.

Convener Labhart summarized the goal statement. "Reduce flooding and the adverse impacts of flooding while incorporating environmental, social and economic values in the development of short and long term solutions". Footnote 1: While the geographic area for the project is the Tillamook Bay Drainage Basin, this project will hopefully create a template and process to address flooding in other coastal basins (watersheds). Footnote 2: Long term definition: Ten (10) years or more and Footnote 3: Environmental considerations may include: freshwater wetlands, estuarine areas, associated side channels, streams and rivers, forest lands and associated habitats and species.

<u>ITEM NO. 5: WORK GROUP REPORTS & TEAM DISCUSSIONS:</u> Convener Labhart offered thanks to Mr. Carnahan, Mr. Buck and Mr. Klumph for representing the work groups.

<u>a) LAND USE WORK GROUP:</u> Mr. Carnahan said that the differences that we can make are in the policy and long term impact. He said he is encouraged. The group met on June 21st. One discussion was on defining of geographical boundaries of land use.

Mr. Gervasi said the Drainage Basin is from the Wilson River, the Creamery and the Port to the South. Mr. Carnahan said that Mr. Gervasi did a nice job of setting the baseline with the City of Tillamook. There is a mitigation plan that all members will receive. They did good work developing a plan but can't carry it out now because of financial reasons. The group will read the report and then discuss how it can be applied County-wide, then they will prioritize the projects identified. He said there are a number of issues which they will put into categories: 1 – Identify the City of Tillamook flood mitigation resources; 2 – FEMA review that might take place for elevating and relocating, a combination of reducing flooding and good land use choices; 3 - Engaging in a community discussion on a long term project to enhance the community. They will explore all options and 4 – Improvements on the roads, especially Hwy 101.

Mr. McKinley added one future project would be an environmental assessment to be done in six (6) months addressing Hwy 101 work. Mr. Levesque said that Tillamook County also has a flood hazard mitigation plan that will encompass the rest of the Basin outside of the City limits. Ms. Tortorici asked if one of objects is to list options? Mr. Carnahan said that Tilda Jones was at the meeting today and handed out a letter of short term impact of the flood season.

b) USACE FEASIBILITY STUDY WORK GROUP: Mr. Buck said the group met. There was a list of ideas that Mr. Levesque presented. They studied the Hall Slough Swale project. There are reservoirs in the Upper Wilson and Trask Rivers where fish can't get. They also did a gravel mediation agreement and an in-stream corridor plan. They talked about spillways but farmed that over to the In-stream Group. Next meeting they will have Doug Clarke attend to assist with the Swale project and also to see which projects have been sufficiently modeled or if more studies are needed.

There is concern over the set back levies in the wetlands on County-owned property. They also want to get the water flowing toward the Bay. There was concern about farming the areas between the current levies and the setbacks.

Mr. Clarke apologized for not making the meeting. He said that the studies the Corps does have, have economic justification for Federal interests. The benefits are bigger than the costs but they could not justify the work because of a nationally balanced ecosystem. The benefits and providing flood damage reduction concepts are about reducing flooding. He will review them in context of local needs and try to make some sense of them.

Ms. Tortorici said she was encouraged by the conversation and getting back to the watershed concept. There is an environmental benefit or action in moving forward. The State Agriculture Department has some flexibility. There is also a NRCS Krup Program about the purchase of land for a set aside. Mr. Reiersgaard said we should not go there

yet. Fish & Wildlife has wetlands funding also. He said that US Fish & Wildlife should be included for grant programs.

There was thanks to Mr. Bierly for being in this group. He has money and wants to be directly involved in these projects. Ms. Friebaum from the Department of State Lands also has money available through permit process payments.

c) IN-STREAM WORK GROUP: Mr. Klumph said there were thirteen (13) participants. They patterned similarly to the feasibility study workgroup. Mr. Levesque gave some background. Mr. Manning said there has been eleven (11) years of activity in Tillamook, 1996 to 2007. He is impressed with all of the work that has been accomplished to date. The group went ahead and identified in-stream issues within stream beds and stream banks. They got into some concepts of projects. This group punted Hall Slough and setback levies to Mr. Buck's group.

General areas for follow up are projects that the members have thus far identified. 1 – Gated spillways; 2 – Mediated agreement for a Stream Corridor Management Plan; 3 – Log jams; 4 – Gravel extraction from rivers and the Bay; 5 – Flood Plan reconnection and restoration; 6 – Trask channel hook culvert.

Ms. Tortorici asked how do they envision modeling or assessment interacting with each other? Mr. Levesque said modeling is crucial. The Corps study identified thirty-five (35) cells that spill over into each other. There are studies on both lists that have already been modeled and filtered through. The feasibility flood control would have to get a Zero Rise Certificate as a permitting process and that can only occur if the project is modeled then, where money will come from for an overall benefit. The Corps is a big project funder. Mr. Bierly said almost all State and Federal money has matching fund requirements and we are already indebted because of the study.

Mr. Boquist said we are talking about millions before we are done, way more than what we have. When SWE stopped taking gravel out of the rivers they built up again but not every river dumping into the basin. Putting in spillways would just be a band aid fix. The rivers need to be opened up to gravel maintenance. Take out as much as they can.

Mr. Townsend said the Committee talked about modeling. The Corps did it on a few. When was that done and is it still sufficient? Is there another type of "modeling" that would be sufficient for application purposes that is not as expensive?

ITEM NO. 6: Discussion of Evaluation Criteria for Projects: Convener Labhart asked if there was anyone that could not live with the Criteria as set forth? Ms. Tortorici said it does not talk about project monitoring or capability. To do that we need to

include some statement to incorporate design and cost. Mr. Reiersgaard asked how can the success of a project be measured, particularly the long term affects? Mr. Townsend said the criterion is used to assist and should not be used to reject a project outright. The criteria will be refined over time. Mr. Reiersgaard said that how the project success can be measured should be in the criteria.

Mr. Blanton said that projects need to be economically and environmentally sustainable. When you evaluate projects check to see if they are sustainable. Can the project be easily implemented and is the project consistent with land use ordinances. It is important to add this, based on the framework of how they reduce flooding impacts. Item #8 takes care of that.

Ms. Tortorici said there needs to be a regulatory roadmap to see if the project is worth it and if it will pass and be approved. Mr. Klumph said there were some interesting conversations about specific projects from different agencies and who has problems with some of the projects. This team will decide on what gets done.

Mr. Boquist asked how many people know what the environment was like before 1950? There were only two (2).

Convener Labhart said that this is the Criteria that sub-committees will use. Mr. Trenholm asked for an explanation of #3. Mr. Townsend said it might show a sense of urgency to the project.

ITEM NO. 7: OTHER BUSINESS: There was none.

Convener Labhart thanked Mr. Graham from Senator	Wyden's office for being here all
day as well as Richard Krikava and Jennifer Wagner.	Also thanks to Su for taking notes
again.	

/	/	/	/	/	
/	/	/	/	/	
/	/	/	/	/	

ITEM NO. 8: NEXT MEETING DATES: The next meeting, after the July meeting, was set for August 23rd so that Representative Hooley can attend. It is a Thursday, not a Wednesday. Unfortunately Mr. Clarke will not be able to attend but will send a substitute.

There being no further business, Convene	er Labhart adjourned the me	eting at 4:12 p.m.
RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this	day of	_, 2007.
APPROVED BY:		
Senator Betsy Johnson	Mark Labhart	