

MidCoast Watersheds Council
Meeting notes January 7 09

Introductions: 19 folks

Recorder's report: There were no official actions taken at the December Meeting

Treasurer's report: \$43,469 in bank at end of December. Administrative committee approved financial report. No issues to report.

Technical Team Report: John Spangler gave the report. He noted 6 items and gave a summary or update on each:

1. Lint Slough. ODOT is going to repair the bridge instead of replacing it as anticipated.
2. There is an EPA sponsored Western Estuaries Initiative Grant available. Deadline is Feb 19th. It is to deal with watershed and growth and climate change. LIDAR work and water quality work were discussed by the group for this source of funding.
3. The Green Infrastructure Projects letter was reviewed and suggestions were made for changes.
4. There is a need to increase the capacity of the watershed council Hiring another project manager is desirable. There are several opportunities to get grant funding ,e .g. from foundations for seed money.
5. Developing a Community Vision for Yaquina Bay. The technical team discussed the benefits of having a vision for the bay and if the watershed council should do this or potentially others, e.g. Lincoln County Economic Development Department.
6. Mill Creek, Siletz restoration, monitoring. Mill Creek is part of ODFW's life cycle monitoring project. There have been 10 years of data already gathered. Would there be an opportunity to do restoration here and continue monitoring this area through the life cycle monitoring protocols to help determine restoration project effectiveness. Wayne will discuss with Chris Lorian who now does program for ODFW (replaced Steve Johnson).

It was moved and seconded that the letter re green infrastructure be send as drafted to Congressional and State representatives and the Obama administration. This letter advocates that watershed restoration work be considered as green infrastructure worthy of funding for jobs and the environment.

Basin Planning Team Reports:

Siletz—the December meeting was cancelled due to weather. The next meeting is January 20th and Jeff Light will discuss the new Alsea Watershed Study and Forestry in Siletz Basin and learn about what a forest industry biologist does.

Yaquina—Debra Spoelstra reported that phone calls were made to folks who went on the field trip to see spawning salmon and to other potential group members and preparations are being made for more field trips and other events in the spring.

Salmon Drift Watershed Council – Corrina Chase reported that the group had received a small grant for work at the Pixieland restoration site (on Hwy 18 west of Otis). In partnership with forest service and with the help of the fisher crew they do invasive plant removal and native species replanting. The SDWC Board had approved the hiring of someone to work with Corrina

on administrative matters. They will hold board elections next month. Upcoming meetings speaker (and subsequent field trip) will be about lichens, especially the lichens used for air quality monitoring. There are only a few sightings of fish in the streams here—a few steelhead were seen in N. Fork Schooner, but no coho yet. (But the high water volumes that we've recently had will help. There were about 8 coho seen after the rains in Crowley Creek. A written activities report was provided

Nominations for Officers and At Large Positions: Nominations were made for public at large and officer positions. People are asked to recruit persons to fill open board position roles. Rennie reported that Mark McConnell will fill the local government position. Ballots to go out at least 10 days before the Feb 5th election. It was suggested that Board member information packets be prepared for new board members and be made available to welcome others to the group. Among other things the process of the group and information about its committees should be shared.

Administrative Committee Report: Jan Christensen gave the report. The group approved the financial report, approved a revised administrative budget, and made a policy regarding contractors showing that car auto insurance was current. They also finished work on the proposed hiring/contracting policy and reiterated the need for staff members transporting volunteers to have signed liability waivers in hand to minimize risk. This info will be circulated to current staff and contractors and others. The Admin group reviewed the Green Infrastructure letter and discussed who should get copies. The Admin group spent time on reviewing the draft Council support application which will also have sections for Salmon Drift and Alsea Watershed Council support requests. Finally it reviewed the Coordinator's activity report and noted the meeting about Beaver Creek (Ona Beach) planning for the new natural area acquired by State Parks (Keady property) and that the Regional Review team visited Bummer Creek and NF Beaver, two sites for projects that have been generated by the completed limiting factor analyses.

It was moved and seconded that the Council authorize the Administrative Committee to finalize the Council support grant and get it submitted to OWEB (Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board).

Education Committee Report: Virginia Tardaewether, the Council's education coordinator, was unable to attend the meeting, so provided a written report of activities. Virginia spent a lot of time this past month serving on OWEB's education and Outreach Grants review committee. After reviewing 35 applications she has a good understanding of other programs around the state and how large our program is in comparison. The report also outlined plans for establishing and sustaining a county-wide outdoor schools program.

Council Self Evaluation

Instead of the usual educational presentation, the Council members performed a self-evaluation. This evaluation used the OWEB form modified slightly by Jan Christensen to allow a wider range of responses. 16 persons participated in the evaluation. The Council members thought that staff management, project management, fiscal accounting, and contracting procedures were being done well as were evaluating watershed priorities and limiting factors and undertaking strategic projects. The following page (back and front) are places where scores were below 4 (the highest grade is a 5) and where we need to focus our energies at improvement. Lowest scores are presented first.

Lowest Scores. I list here, in order of average scores, the questions with the lowest scores (scores below 4.0). These are the ones we might want to examine to identify issues we need to address.

16) Community members understand our organization's purpose. How well do we succeed?	2.63
13) The council reports progress and results to our county governing body. How well do we succeed?	2.89
14) The council reports progress and results to all stakeholders. How well do we succeed?	2.91
12) Our group actively involves key people and community leaders in projects and/or activities. How well do we succeed?	2.93
Our group and its projects are actively supported by:	
23) landowners	3.07
22) community groups	3.08
17) Community members feel our council is successful and effective. How well do we succeed?	3.11
Our group and its projects are actively supported by:	
19) local people	3.17
15) Community members know how to contact our group. How well do we succeed?	3.23
11) Members are aware of and involved in projects and/or activities. How well do we succeed?	3.27
Our group and its projects are actively supported by:	
20) local government	3.38
21) industry and business	3.38
6) Members advocate for the group vision. How well do we succeed?	3.43
29) Members are aware of the council's contractual commitments and understand their responsibility. How well do we succeed	3.43
1) MCWC tries to have a broad, diverse membership which represents all interests in the watershed. How well do we succeed?	3.47
40) Projects implemented by the council are monitored for their effectiveness. How well do we succeed?	3.58

- 18) Our council works to increase citizen understanding of watershed conditions and concerns.
How well do we succeed? 3.60
- 38) Our group actively involves stakeholders in watershed level planning and project development. How well do we succeed? 3.64
- 2) Council members understand their responsibilities and roles.
How well do we succeed? 3.67
- 4) Our group members share a common vision and purpose.
How well do we succeed? 3.85
- 30) Council members are aware of recordkeeping procedures and have access to records. How well do we succeed? 3.93
- 36) Our group identifies and evaluates the major restoration priorities in our watershed (action plans). How well do we succeed? 3.93
- 39) Our group annually evaluates its priorities and plans.
How well do we succeed? 3.93