

Neskowin Coastal Hazards Committee

Minutes of Meeting July 12, 2011

Members Present: Chair, Mark Labhart. Residents: David Kraybill, Guy Sievert, Bill Busch, Robert Wulf, Charlie Walker, Pete Owston. Support: Laren Woolley, Matt Spangler.

Welcome and approval of minutes: Minutes approved, with two changes.

Review of the Mission Statement: Guy suggested that we review the NCHC mission statement, focusing on two points: 1) how are we defining “community”; and 2) what do we mean by maintaining the beach? It was generally agreed that we didn’t really define “community” when we first put it into the mission statement. As a starting point, it was suggested we define “community” as “property”; perhaps even replacing “community” with “property” in the mission statement. Charlie suggested that “property” was too narrow; that the community was both property and people. Laren proposed that community should be defined more as a geographical area. After discussion, it was agreed that the definition of “community” was “the geographical area, and everything in it, as defined in the County’s comprehensive plan.” It was also the consensus that the mission statement remain as it is.

With respect to maintaining the beach, the question was: what did we mean by that? The condition of the beach in 1997? As of this year? Pete recommended, and the group concurred, that maintaining the beach meant the beach should be maintained as a place for continued public use and recreation.

Developments on the Beach: At a previous meeting, the issue of public safety had been raised, in response to concerns about recent deaths on the beach and log rolling incidents. After a conversation with Mark, Tony Stein has agreed that State Parks will make, pay for, and place warning signs at all public entrances to the beach. However, since State Parks is doing the signs, the signs will have to comply with the standards of State Parks.

Active Protection Sub-Committee: Bill Busch reported on his communications with engineering firms and with Jonathan Allan. One engineering firm will participate in a preliminary meeting with us for \$3,000. Another engineering firm will meet with us for \$3,900, after reviewing our documents and aerial maps for another \$4,300. Jonathan Allan, after reviewing the second proposal, commented to Bill that nothing reliable could be gleaned from the analysis of historical changes due to a variety of factors including the paucity of data, errors with the data, and the fact that shoreline undergoes enormous seasonal/interannual variability, making it difficult to reliably interpret long-term patterns and trends. Further, Jonathan said that the dominant shoreline signal on the Oregon Coast is the individual storm event-based response.

Bill reported that what the subcommittee is seeking is guidance on the best shoreline protection options, including new options not previously considered, and also means of improving the design/construction of the riprap. Laren had agreed to prepare a scope of work, which he circulated to the subcommittee members for review and comment. The draft scope of work is composed of 3 tasks:

- The first task is a literature and science review. The coastal engineering firm is not expected to research and develop additional information related to potential future coastal erosion risk. There is significant and adequate information existing for this purpose for the Neskowin area.
- The second task is the analysis of existing and potential shoreline protective structures and other options for the Neskowin area considering Task 1 review. The analysis will be in four

parts. The first part will be to analyze options and the viability of continued maintenance of the riprap revetment. As part of this analysis the consultant shall review the potential of mass wasting events and the frequency of repair of existing structures. The second part will be to analyze options to increase height and uniformity of riprap revetment. This includes looking at options not associated, but in combination, with existing riprap. The third task will be to analyze options for better shoreline protective structure design to potentially help to better preserve the "beach" while protecting the beachfront development. The fourth task will be to investigate and provide information on other innovative structures, and other innovative options generally, that could potentially meet the needs of the village of Neskowin and the charge of the NCHC. The consultants will provide a draft technical memorandum of all Task 2 subtasks for review by the AP sub committee. Consultants will respond to sub committee comments and provide a final memorandum.

- The third task will be to prepare a final report, with key concepts, recommendations, and preliminary costs

Bill will send out the invitation to bid with the scope of work. The committee also discussed who should get an invitation to bid. It was agreed that Bill will also contact OSU and USACE to gain their input on prospective bidders and their own interest in the work.

Laren reported that he had checked around for government funding sources. He reported that although there are other possibilities, a minimum of a 50-50 match will be required. He should know by the end of July what sources might be available.

Charlie reported on his actions to date on raising matching money locally. After much discussion, we agreed that Charlie will draft a letter for Mark's signature that will be given to potential sources of funds. We also discussed future actions to be taken by Charlie, Guy, and other members of the committee to raise matching funds.

Land Use Sub-Committee: Mark reported that the draft Adaptation Plan had been submitted to the County. He told the committee that the County is required to prepare an All Hazards Mitigation Plan every five years, and that the Adaptation Plan will be included in it. The Mitigation Plan has to be reviewed countywide and adopted by October 23. Laren reported that Mitch will have the draft Neskowin subplan to the Land Use Subcommittee by mid-August. Also, in response to comments made after the last public meeting (see the June meeting minutes), the Land Use subcommittee will discuss the land use implications of riprap.

Implementation Sub-Committee: Mark reported that the County is waiting for a letter and a cost estimate from USACE. The key issue will be trying to get into the queue for federal funding.

Labor Day Meeting: After some discussion, it was decided that we would ask Christi Clark if we could have the NCHC meeting immediately following the NCA meeting (Christi has subsequently agreed to this proposal). The committee agreed that we would plan for a one hour duration for the Labor Day meeting. The meeting would be comprised of five elements: 1) a report on the Adaptation plan and other relevant land use issues; 2) a report of the status of obtaining an engineering consultant; 3) a report on the Hawk Creek bridge; 4) a report on activities with respect to obtaining funding; and 5) time for community questions and comments.

Other: Mark reported on the good news/ bad news with respect to the Tsunami trail. The good news is that the project nominally qualifies for FEMA funding. However, the bad news is that FEMA cannot fund

projects on federally owned projects. The Neskowin marsh is owned by US Fish and Wildlife, and thus any part of the trail that is on their property would not be eligible for FEMA funding. Mark will continue to pursue this project with Fish and Wildlife to see if they would be willing to build an Interpretive/Tsunami Trail.

The Oregon Shores Conservation Coalition, a special interest group working in Lincoln County, has expressed an interest in what we are doing, and has asked us provide them with information. The committee agreed that they should be told to contact Laren, who will give them access to our public information.

Meeting Adjourned

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