

Neskowin Coastal Hazards Committee

Minutes of Meeting February 8, 2011

Members Present: Chair, Mark Labhart. Residents: Charlie Walker, David Kraybill, Guy Sievert, Alex Sifford, Pete Owston, Gale Ousele, Larry Glickman. Support: Jon Allan, Laren Woolley, Kristen Maze, Tony Stein, Pat Corcoran. Guests: Neil Marquis, Bridget Brown, Heather Baron.

Welcome and approval of minutes: Approved, and sent to Christi for posting at NHA website.

<http://neskowincommunity.org/>

Old Business: Membership. It was noted that a couple of the members of the NCHC have not been attending the meetings. Those folks were contacted and expressed continued interest but are often away from Neskowin for extended periods of time. No action taken.

Recent developments on the beach: The north side of Proposal Rock has seen significant erosion over past few weeks. Waves are running right through. Repair work is ongoing. Hawk Creek has shifted back toward the point area where it has been in the past. This is likely attributable to the fact that wind and waves from recent storms coming from the northwest have a different impact on the shore than the typical storms which come from the southwest. (Photos of log removal from Hawk Ck. on Basecamp) New riprap is being placed in the Neskowin north area. Erosion is particularly bad at the south end of North Neskowin, near Winema where it is carving into the dunes. Homeowners received an emergency permit to riprap in January. Property owners can use riprap to preserve existing beach but cannot reclaim areas already lost to erosion. A concern is that erosion will continue over time and ultimately properties will become riprapped peninsulas sticking out onto the beach. This is already occurring in Rockaway Beach. Another concern is how the County owned parcels (which cannot be riprapped) will affect erosion patterns on adjacent properties and vice-versa.

Heather Baron (OSU) reported on the SARP work incorporating future uncertainties in a quasi-probabilistic erosion hazards model. That is, estimating how high the 100 year flood event will be in the future based on trends in wave heights, direction, and sea level rise. In Neskowin, and most of Oregon, the impacts are less from sea level rise or even storminess, but more influenced by local morphological features such as slope of the beach, sand grain size, and angle of wave approach. It was clear from the maps that if the riprap is removed the village will be affected. Heather noted that most coastal areas are eroding and that only a few locations are prograding (getting more sand).

Active Protection Sub-Committee: The committee met with six representatives of the US Army Corp of Engineers (USACE) at their offices in Portland. It was an excellent meeting and they provided a great deal of useful information. Kevin Monahan is the head of the regulatory division and was a knowledgeable advocate. It was mentioned in the meeting that a member of the USACE had previously inspected the riprap at Neskowin, and had reported that the riprap was as good "as any on the Oregon coast." They felt that offshore structures do not perform well in Oregon's wave conditions, and gave some engineering advice on design and maintenance of riprap revetments. Part of the conversation addressed the need to engineer structures not only for the wave heights of today, but with an eye toward increasing wave heights and sea levels in the future. The details of the meeting are summarized in the committee's report on Basecamp. Discussion ensued about the "dynamic revetment" used at Cape Lookout and possibilities for use in Neskowin. In terms of permitting, this type of revetment is considered somewhat "softer" and an exception to Goal 18 was approved for the Cape Lookout project. Similar exceptions would need to be applied for in Neskowin. It was noted that for any type of structure, feasibility studies would need to be conducted to determine the probabilities of effectiveness and at

what cost. Next, the committee expressed disappointment with finding of the report by Sally Hacker (OSU) which indicated that strategies to build the dunes through fencing and planting are not likely to replenish the dune. The key issue is that there isn't enough sand in the system to build dunes with. The dunes are already well vegetated, so planting isn't a solution either. An alternative is to bring in sand (from say, Sand Lake), but this is very expensive and would require many heavy trucks that would impact the local roads. Members of the NCHC went on a tour to see the sites in question. (Photos from Laren are posted on Basecamp) These are mature, well vegetated dunes that are simply eroding back due to increased coastal erosion. (Hacker report on Basecamp) The subcommittee noted that it was disappointed that it has been unable to date to find an effective active protection strategy that protects the beach; but they are continuing to look at unconventional alternatives.

Land Use Sub-Committee: The committee met and reviewed the draft County Adaptation Framework Plan. Chapters are being developed on policy, implementation, and funding. This draft will be reviewed by the broader group by March 8th meeting. Subsequent comments to Mitch are due by March 22. Mitch transmits draft of the Neskowin Sub-Plan to LRLU by March 29. LRLU meets April 5th to review and transmit revised draft to NCHC. The NCHC meets April 12 to revise draft Neskowin Sub-Plan.

At the community meeting, Gale will present talking points and clarify the relationship between the County plan and the sub-plan. Discussion emphasized the need for articulating Neskowin-specific land use options. It was also desired that the Land Use presentation be similar to that of the AP committee. The suggestion was to cluster similar land use strategies and list some "pros and cons" for each cluster. No recommendations would be offered at this point. There was discussion about how to handle the "abandonment" strategy since it is a land use option, but it is not part of the mission to "maintain the beach and protect property." Gale has also produced a poster announcing the meeting and is working with others to post them in the area. Everyone is urged to talk to neighbors to boost attendance.

Implementation Sub-Committee: The Community Meeting is part of the communication function of the Implementation committee. It will be March 26 from 1-3 pm at the Neskowin Valley School. The agenda begins with a Welcome by Alex and an introduction by Mark Labhart via video. This is followed by Bill Busch giving a background on the science. After Bill's presentation Pat will entertain a few questions for Bill and then move on to the next presentation. Pat is next summarizing the local response and the progress to date by the NCHC. Tony follows with comments on the riprap survey and repairs. David presents the AP options before we break. After the break, Kristen will begin with an overview of the County Framework, and Gale will address the Neskowin sub-plan options. Charlie will conclude the presentations with a "roadmap for implementation." Q&A will continue until folks are satisfied. Maps and materials will be available for people to look at and ask questions about afterwards. Format: Pat will serve as moderator moving us through the agenda and trying to keep questions during presentations to a minimum and facilitating Q&A and broader discussion at the end. It was agreed that this is not a forum to answer questions about individual properties. Handouts of PowerPoint presentations will be available at the meeting, and presentations will be uploaded to the Neskowin Community Association website. Fliers have been developed and will be distributed in the community. Members were encouraged to make personal contacts with friends and neighbors to get people to the meeting.

Meeting Adjourned

Next NCHC Meeting: March 8, 2011. 9am-11:30am. Neskowin Fire Hall