Neskowin Coastal Hazards Committee

Draft Minutes of Meeting January 10, 2012

Members Present: Commissioner Mark Labhart, Chair, David Kraybill, Guy Sievert, Alex Sifford, Charlie Walker, Bill Busch, Pete Owston, Gale Ousele, Randall Koch, Leslie Gordon, Neil Marquis. Support: Valerie Soilihi, (Tillamook Co. Planning Director), Laren Woolley (DLCD), Pat Corcoran (Sea Grant).

Welcome and approval of minutes: Minutes for December were approved with changes.

Old Business: Laren updated the group on the status of Matt Spangler, who is taking a new position within DLCD as soon as the hiring freeze thaws. Recruiting to replace the north coast regional representative will also happen after the freeze.

Developments on the Beach: This summer brought a good supply of sand back to the beach, according to Jonathans' data posted on www.nanoos.org This fall, Neskowin was lucky to have low tides during the two big storms. Discussion occurred around the properties that were in the unknown or gray area in terms of their ability to be rip rapped. The County will review these with Tony and make a determination of eligibility.

Active Protection Sub-Committee: Donations for engineering study up to $36k. Mark re-iterated how much local support in dollars and effort the residents of Neskowin have contributed to this cause. Paul Levesque is the contracts officer with the County is working on the contract language. NCHC moved and approved to authorize the AP sub-committee to make the choice about which firm to hire. Any residual money from this contract will remain with the County account for use by NCHC.

Land Use Sub-Committee: Gale noted how this draft document from Mitch represents a tremendous amount of work that NCHC does not have to do, and expressed her gratitude for that. A question to Valerie and Laren was whether this Sub-Plan would pass legal muster. The reply was that there is nothing obviously a concern (e.g. no takings issues), and that this framework allows for changing specifics down the road. Most of the rest of the meeting comprised both general discussion and specific comments on the Sub-Plan document. Highlights included how and where to bring in the "history" piece, in particular the pre-1998 conditions on the beach. Thoughts were either early in the text, or in a separate white paper.

There was also extended conversation about the relationship of the Active Protection Sub-Committee and their effort to get an engineer to assess the rip rap system, and the Land Use Sub-Committee drafting language to accommodate potential land use planning approaches. The engineering and rip rap system is not a land use issue per se, and is therefore are not considered part of the CPAC realm. There was concern that the AP efforts might get subsumed in the CPAC/Sub-Plan process. Laren felt that the Land Use Sub-Plan can and should be broader than just land use strategies, and is a good place to document and "house" the AP work. The Sub-Plan will ultimately (if approved, etc.) reside in the "Communities" section of the Tillamook County Comprehensive Plan. In practice, the CPAC can address the land use pieces of the Sub-Plan without regard to the active protection pieces, and the AP can refer to the Sub-Plan in their parallel conversations and contracts, etc. So, the Sub-Plan can be the common place for all of the NCHC strategies to reside, with CPAC dealing with (only) the land use issues and the

AP Sub-Committee dealing with the active protection issues. Ideas included putting the AP work in an appendix of the Sub-Plan, but introduce the distinction between active protection and land use in the introduction. Charlie asked if combining the two elements will impede the decision making process of the CPAC; and wondered whether AP actions would need to go through CPAC. Alex felt that non-land use decisions do not have to go through CPAC. (I don't have in my notes a clear answer to the role of CPAC, if any, regarding the potential engineering activities.)

Several other observations were made including: some maps are hard to read, the main objectives of the NCHC were buried and might be put at the beginning of the document, the definition of "success" in the first paragraph of the conclusion should be "Neskowin is more resilient" not "policies have been changed," need clarity on whether riprap should be considered a "solution" or not which brings in the notion of what timescale are we talking about, if AP strategies are to be part of the Sub-Plan then they need more verbiage describing them commensurate with the land use HAT's, add a glossary of terms, there are lots of unspoken assumptions in the language, no reference in the document about the consequences of "doing nothing," a reminder that the DOGAMI maps do not consider riprap in determining the hazard zones, the contingency HAT's section needs work in defining the long term land use issues, and a concern that the Sub-Plan process might be getting ahead of the Framework Plan process.

Next Steps: Gale will take the lead on the Sub-Plan revisions. Drafts will be posted on Basecamp for an attempt at collaborative editing. Get comments in by January 31. The revised draft will be the center of discussion at the February 14th NCHC meeting. The longer timeframe is to present to the community the Sub-Plan draft at the Memorial Day community meeting (post on NCA website, and announce in Newsletter). The Labor Day community meeting is anticipated to be about the results of the engineering study.

Meeting Adjourned

Next NCHC Meeting: February 14, 2012. 9am-11:30am. Neskowin Fire Hall