

MINUTES

McKenzie Watershed Council
Thurston Grange – Springfield, Oregon

October 22, 2005
9:00 a.m. – 2:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Megan Finnessy, Facilitator; Mary Allison, United States Forest Service, Diane Albino (Mohawk Watershed Partnership), Pat Gripp (McKenzie Residents Association), Allen Olander (Hynix Semiconductor), Bob Bumstead (McKenzie Flyfishers), Kurt Cox (McKenzie School District), Gene Highfill (McKenzie River Guides Association), Douglas Moser (At-Large Stakeholder), Erik Petersen (Army Corps of Engineers), Ralph Perkins (East Lane Soil Conservation District), Emily Rice (Bureau of Land Management), Jeff Ziller, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, Council Partners; Kate Ferschweiler, Juan Welsh, Council staff;

ABSENT: Chris Pryor (City of Eugene), John Lily (Division of State Lands), Joe Moll (McKenzie River Trust), Joe Pishioneri (City of Springfield), John Simpson (Eugene Water & Electric Board), Michael Kerrick (At-Large Stakeholder), Mike McDowell (Weyerhaeuser), Charlene Phipps (McKenzie Residents Association), Faye Stewart (Lane County), Council Partners.

I. REVIEW AGENDA AND INTRODUCTIONS

Ms. Finnessy convened the meeting at 9:00 a.m.

Those present introduced themselves.

Ms. Finnessy noted that she was now the Executive Director for the McKenzie Watershed Alliance. She said her job would still mainly comprise of coordinating the McKenzie Watershed Council and her duties had not been changed in that regard. She noted that another employee had been hired to help her run the Watershed Alliance.

II. Further Discussion of and Approval of Decisions Made At the Last Meeting

There was general consensus to approve the September meeting minutes. All members showed threes.

Ms. Finnessy said she had attended a joint elected officials meeting in early October to discuss the request of the City of Coburg to hook up to the metro waste water facility. She said a number of amendments to local plans would be required to be passed before such an action took place and noted that the fastest hook up timeline was five years, assuming no litigation. She said the elected officials present felt they did not have enough information to vote and the City of Eugene did not have a quorum. The decisions were sent back to each of the governing bodies for future decisions. The City of Coburg had responded that a ‘protracted maybe’ resulted in a no vote since it had a number of strict timelines established by the State. She said the governing bodies would have to make decisions before the end of the year or Coburg would have to seek another option. She noted Coburg would have to move forward, in any case, before the end of the year.

In response to a question from Mr. Bumstead regarding whether the MWC could affect the State decision, Ms. Finnessy said the Mayor of Coburg had made it clear that attaining a discharge permit for the McKenzie River would be an uphill battle. She said a lot of concerns had been raised with the Coburg plan. She said a big issue was cost and added that Coburg had said they would pay their fair share for the needed work but noted that many felt that Coburg's share was 100 percent. She added that the Metro Wastewater Facility did not have staff on hand to deal with the issue and would have to contract out staff work.

Mr. Highfill acknowledged the problems the City of Coburg and Monaco Corporation faced but said Coburg wanted to discharge 350 gallons of effluent per minute into the McKenzie River according to his figures and expressed a hope that no one would be allowed to discharge into the McKenzie River at the level being proposed.

Ms. Finnessy said Coburg would have to meet State DEQ standards for discharge.

Ms. Finnessy said the majority of the County Commissioners had expressed strong support for Coburg but commented that the timeline for action could not be met. She said she would check with Lane Council of Governments and the City of Coburg to get an update on State timelines and how/if the watershed Council could get involved.

III. MWC Achievements

Ms. Finnessy said, in the previous few weeks she had attended a number of conferences and had found it encouraging that watershed Council work was being seen and heard at the State and Federal levels. She said watershed Councils were an integral part of the national work being done on the ground level.

Ms. Finnessy said community interface during events was one of her favorite parts of working for the Council. She noted that over 50 people had participated in the annual river clean up and commended Gene Highfill for his efforts on the annual event. She remarked that it would be continually more important to build connections with the communities along the McKenzie River.

Ms. Rice expressed her desire to participate at the next annual river cleanup.

Mr. Highfill said the event will now take place on the second Saturday after the Fourth of July.

Mr. Highfill said he had enjoyed participating in the work that had been done at Cougar Reservoir. He added that the river cleanup event was a lot of work but remarked that it was rewarding to see so many people participating. He invited all members to participate in the next year.

Regarding a new Boat Landing near Leaburg Lake, Mr. Highfill said he and Ms. Finnessy had attended a meeting with Marty Douglas from EWEB. He said EWEB was putting together a community group to study the issue but felt that there might be no need to do any work at the boat landing. He remarked that many nearby residents wanted to see something done with the boat landing and were concerned about safety issues. Mr. Highfill commented that the landing was a dangerous place to take boats to the river.

Ms. Finnessy said EWEB was required to assess the possibility of a new boat landing under its FERC re-licensing agreement. Ms. Finnessy said boat landing safety was on the work plan for the coming year. She said she would provide updates on the situation as things moved forward.

Ms. Rice said it was encouraging to see work being done at the confluence of the McGowan Creek and Mohawk River. She expressed a hope that the nearby habitat could be improved.

Ms. Rice also expressed her pleasure about the nonprofit agency being formed and congratulated Ms. Finnessy for helping that to happen.

Mr. Welsh said he was proud of the way the Council had worked with BLM and the Forest Service. He stressed the importance of having a diversified funding base and noted that the Council's funding had been diversified significantly in the previous year.

Mr. Bumstead said another thing to be proud of in the previous year was the work on the confluence process. He said Wildish's decision to pull out of the stream side channel was a disappointment but there was still a possibility that something else could be done. He noted that the Confluence Committee would not meet until Wildish had finalized its plans.

Ms. Finnessy said John Runyon was working on getting the Confluence Committee together with all of the agency representatives and were setting meeting dates. She said the group would work to decide on a different process for the future.

Mr. Cox stressed that the projects that the Council participated in would have positive impacts far into the future.

Ms. Finnessy distributed note cards to the members present and asked them to write comments regarding about the Council that could be used during the following year.

IV. Business Plan and Conservation Strategy Benchmarks

Ms. Finnessy provided a presentation on the MWC Business Plan. She said the MWC had been discussing diversifying funding for the Council since 2003 and said one idea was to use a more business minded approach. She said Council representatives would visit community organizations and businesses to solicit funding but stressed the need to develop a business plan to show potential funding sources. She said business planning would:

- Set strategic direction
- Leverage Resources
- Blend expectations about multiple factors
- Measure outcomes
- Identify and evaluate risks and opportunities
- Ultimate Goal; help build capacity to meet goals and objectives.

Ms. Finnessy said she had consulted with Commissioner Ron Farmer of Eugene Water Electric Board who had made comments on the Business Plan. She outlined how the plan was constructed and noted that there were changes in the Conservation Strategy Benchmarks. She noted that some of the goals were not likely to be achieved and needed to be reset so there could be a better measure of success. She added that there were now more general timelines for Benchmark measurements of success.

Mr. Olander suggested that everything should be quantified in number of hours or numbers of people reached. He reiterated that everything should be quantified in the number of hours spent. (Volunteer working hours, education hours, etc.)

Ms. Finnessy noted that there was limited staff to track and quantify everything that was done so she had decided to track activities through 'Education' and "Outreach' categories.

Mr. Olander stressed that the Council Coordinator might know how many people were influenced by that method but potential funders would not. He reiterated the importance of quantifying activities in numbers of hours so there would be visible numbers shown as results in any report that was shown.

Mr. Ziller agreed and remarked that hours were very quantifiable and stressed that a number of volunteer hours should be shown. He noted that potential funders would have an idea of what volunteer hours were worth and that number could be used as an indicator of the effort the Council was expending.

Ms. Finnessy stressed the importance of maintaining awareness of what staff could accomplish. She raised concern over a large and unmanageable database in an attempt to track large amounts of data. She outlined the goals and Benchmarks as presented in the business plan.

In response to a question from Mr. Highfill regarding how a stakeholder was defined in the Plan, Ms. Finnessy said it would be anyone with a vested interest in property or business in the watershed area. She noted that the plan contained a definition of stake holder.

Ms. Finnessy called for feedback from the members on the structure of the Business Plan.

Appendix B.

Members reviewed the goals outlined in the appendix of the Business Plan. Ms. Finnessy said she had changed timelines on Benchmarks to make goals more achievable.

Regarding the logging of hours as suggested by Mr. Olander, Mr. Ziller suggested categories of staff, volunteers, and education for each goal so the number of hours spent for each category could be easily seen. He said the number of people attending educational meetings and Council meetings, presentations, workshops should be shown and translated into hours spent for education and volunteer time.

Mr. Cox noted that there was a benefit cost for every business metric and stressed the importance of keeping tracked data simple, measurable and meaningful.

There was general discussion of how to track or categorize hours. Mr. Ziller said an indicator of hours spent could be Council meeting attendance.

Ms. Ferschweiler said she could do a broad category of education but noted that there was scrutiny over what kind of educational material was offered. She suggested keeping track of the kinds of materials that were used for education.

Mr. Olander said guys at the top did not get to that level of detail when looking at a business plan but suggested keeping the information in case of an audit or further questions from potential funders.

Ms. Rice suggested that Council Partners could keep track of their own hours and report to the Coordinator on a regular basis so the hours could be tracked.

Goal 1: Promote Community Understanding and Stewardship through Outreach and Education

Members suggested that hours could be tracked under the following categories:

- Educational Events
- Council Meetings
- Projects (restoration, water quality, annual events)
- Workshops/outreach

There was general consensus to have annual Council events listed and tracked for hours under goal one.

In response to a comment from Mr. Moser regarding how to measure the quality of the material in outreach and education, Ms. Finnessy acknowledged the difficulty of measuring quality of educational material presented. She said this was where the text of the Plan would be useful in going beyond simply presenting numbers.

Goal 2: Promote Partnerships to Support Local Stewardship Actions

Goal 3: Protect and Restore Key Fish and Wildlife Habitats

The following suggestions were made:

- Define ‘completed project’
- In title transfer; change wording to ‘aid and facilitate’
- Define ‘lower watershed’
- Remove numbers from Benchmarks
- Subset of habitats added to the report

Goal 4 : Protect and Restore Water Quality and Quantity

- Indicators 5 and 6 were removed from the list.

Goal 5: Council Accounts for and Provides Investments in the Watershed

- Account for investments in local economy

There was general consensus to have members send in corrections/suggestions by e-mail and then approve the plan at the November or December meeting.

V. Recreation Action Plan

Ms. Finnessy said the Action Plan goals were included in the work plan in an opportunistic fashion. She noted that the Action Plan goals had been prioritized at the May MWC meeting. The Recreation Action Plan Attachment would provide the next layer of prioritization for future incorporation into annual Work Plans.

There was general consensus to approve the Recreation Action Plan. All members showed thumbs up.

VI. Human Habitat Action Plan

Members broke into small groups for approximately 30 minutes to discuss the goals of the Action Plan.

Mr. Bumstead recommended a general discussion on priority goals and objectives. He commented that

some of the items in the Plan were also in the recreation plan and suggested that if an item was already being worked on in another plan it should not be highlighted in the Human Habitat Work Plan.

Goal 1: Manage Growth and Development within the Watershed

Mr. Ziller recommended making home builder/owner videos for both western and eastern Oregon.

Ms. Finnessy said she would make a recommendation to the network producing the video.

Regarding the riparian tax incentive recommendation listed on page three, Mr. Zimmer said the riparian tax incentive through the State of Oregon was already in existence. He noted that, as of 2001, it was also available to areas inside urban growth boundaries. He noted that, so far, the cities of Eugene and Springfield had not signed up for the program. He suggested taking some action to bring those cities on board.

Ms. Finnessy suggested having a Council meeting topic on the issue in an effort to educate the Cities of Eugene and Springfield.

Goal 2: Maintain the Rural Character within the Watershed

Regarding item A(2) on page five involving the establishment of an advisory group work with county policies and decisions, Mr. Ziller said the entire Council should be involved any time a county policy was being created to help encourage desired outcomes.

Goal 3: Maintain the Ecological Function within the Watershed

Mr. Bumstead commented that everything under goal 3(a) on page ten should be highlighted.

Ms. Finnessy questioned whether the entire area should be highlighted since there were items listed that it would be difficult for the Council to take the lead in accomplishing. She cited the revision of the riparian ordinance as an example.

Goal 4: Increase Safety within the Watershed

Members prioritized Action Plan items by the use of 8 dots per person. The resulting top six priorities would be incorporated into an Action Plan Attachment that would be reviewed for adoption by the Council in December.

VII. 2005 – 2006 Work Plan and Budget

Ms. Finnessy said the Work Plan was based on the amount of funding that was available. She noted that there were five elements in the Work Plan:

1. Identify and Address the Priority, Protection, Restoration, and Enhancement Needs of the McKenzie Watershed.
2. Monitor and Evaluate McKenzie Watershed Conditions and Functions
3. Encourage and Track Public Participation in McKenzie Watershed Projects and Activities
4. Teachers, Students, and non formal Educators Have Tools and Training to Implement Education Watershed Related Activities
5. Build Partnerships, Organizational Capacity and Council Effectiveness

Ms. Finnessy noted that any changes made to the elements of the Work Plan would require contract amendments since the funding had already been allocated.

Members reviewed the elements listed in the plan.

In response to a question from Mr. Ziller regarding whether there were any items in the plan she felt could not be accomplished, Ms. Finnessy said the volunteer coordinator piece was the one that would probably not be accomplished. She noted that hiring a volunteer coordinator had been on the work plan for a number of years and said the item might get attached to the water quality goal so the person hired would be a part time water quality coordinator/volunteer coordinator.

Regarding Element 5.1, Ms. Finnessy reported that the Bonneville Power Administration had provided funding to hold a one day conference on upper Willamette restoration efforts.

There was general consensus to approve the work plan for the upcoming year. Members showed a mix of twos and threes.

Moving on to the budget document, Ms. Finnessy outlined the budget tables shown. She noted that the Executive Committee had already reviewed and approved the budget document.

There was consensus to approve the draft budget document for FY06. All members showed threes.

Administrative Update

Ms. Finnessy said a representative from EWEB would conduct a tour of the Walterville Hydroelectric Project for interested members after the day's meeting. Seeing no one wishing to take the tour that day she suggested setting up a tour for a following meeting.

Ms. Finnessy noted that the Watershed Alliance had hired Amanda Wilson to be the new Administrative/Financial Bookkeeper. She said Ms. Wilson would be present at the next Council meeting.

Ms. Finnessy noted that there were minutes of the Water Quality Committee included in the meeting packet. She said the Ambient Water Quality Program started out as a Partnership between DEQ and a number of organizations. She said August marked the end of the funding agreement which had been solely funded by EWEB. She said the Water Quality Committee had decided to pull away from DEQ and use a more local approach. She said the Committee was in the process of reviewing a draft Monitoring Plan which she would bring to the next Council meeting. She stressed that there would still be a high level of quality monitoring and reporting.

The meeting adjourned at 2:15 pm.
(Recorded by Joe Sams)