

NCUWC Goals

Advocate [NCUWC] - ideas listed by members

- Support & monitor county efforts to follow Natural Step principles
- Stop environmental degradation & establish effective protection
- Build capacity by developing effective partnerships & coalitions

Improve [NCUWC] - ideas listed by members

- Restore native fish runs & native riparian vegetation
- Maintain, preserve & enhance urban tree canopy, connectivity and open spaces
- Improve surface water quality & flow while eliminating litter.

Educate [NCUWC] - ideas listed by members

- Educate Watershed Council members
- Communicate the socio-economic benefits of thriving watersheds
- Encourage stewardship through stream-side property owner & watershed-wide neighborhood outreach
- Provide a public forum for discussion about our watershed issues
- Insert NCUWC into the seams between relevant agencies to facilitate & enhance communication

Kellogg/Mt Scott Creek Watershed Council Discussion Notes

Date: Jan 21st, 2009

Time: 6:30pm

Location: Milwaukie City Hall

Welcome/Introduction, JoAnn Herrigel

- Overview of her position with City of Mil. and role in *Kellogg-for-Coho Initiative*
- Motivation for City's Involvement in formation of Watershed Council is bringing stakeholders together, giving body of knowledge/energy in the watershed community a home. City also has interest in energizing advocacy for the Kellogg Watershed and is well positioned given recent energy dedicated to the Kellogg dam removal project.
- Particularly relevant in light of the County's anticipated Watershed Action Plan
- Bureaucrats come and go, but residents stay
- Gives overview of the Agenda/flow for the evening
- Asks for our help in self monitoring/talking stick approach
- Call for additions to the proposed agenda

Group Introductions

JoAnn Herrigel (City of Milwaukie)

Wendy Hudson (OWEB)

Nicole West (City of Milwaukie)

Dave Green (Riverfront Board)

Phil Marchant (Milwaukie High)

Tonia Burns (No Clack Parks District)

Pat Russell (No Clack Citizens Assn)

Dion Shepard (Historic Milwaukie NDA)

Eric Shawn (Frnds of No Clack Parks)

Alex Campbell (City of Milwaukie)

Ron Rasch (Homeowner near Lake)

Ed Zumwalt (Historic Milwaukie NDA)

Shirley Stageberg (Presbyterian Church)

Chris Runyard (Tsunami Crew etc)

Steve Berliner (Frnds of Mt Scott/Kell Crks)

Dick Shook (Frnds of Mt Scott/Kell Crks)

Sally Shook (Frnds of Mt Scott/Kell Crks)

Susan Shawn (Frnds of No Clack Parks)

John Nagy (Clack Co, WES)

Brief Presentation, Wendy Hudson OWEB

- Raise of hands, who knows of the Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board?
- Voters authorized Measure 66 which dedicated 7.5% of lottery funds to be dedicated to fish and wildlife
- Typically, lottery funds yield \$60m per biennium (2 year cycle)
- Current economic climate has meant uncharacteristic downturn in lottery activity, subsequently 7.5% will be smaller in the 2009-2011 biennium
- OWEB decided best expenditure of lottery funds is to support creation of a system of voluntary organizations state-wide and allocate \$\$ there
- There are currently 90 councils in Oregon (she passed out maps indicating represented watersheds in Oregon)
- 60/90 councils statewide receive direct support from OWEB for their administrative functioning through the "Council Support Grant Program"
- The first recommended step toward becoming a watershed council is to gain recognition/official sanction from the County Commission

- OWEB distributes about \$5m per biennium between 60 supported councils, breaks down to about \$83,000 per council
- This \$83,000 typically spent on salary of council coordinator/office operations
- Wendy asserts that, largely due to the smaller scale of our potential council, it is highly unlikely that OWEB would award a Kellogg/Mt Scott Creek Council with a "Council Support Grant"
- Urges we consider joining forces with neighboring council (i.e. Johnson Creek or Clackamas River Basin Council)
- Gives the example of River Keeper organizations (i.e. Willamette River Keepers and Mollala River Keepers) non-profits that essentially function like a watershed council but do not receive OWEB council support

Question/Answer w/OWEB Rep

-Susan Shawn: Tried talking to Johnson Creek and Clackamas River Councils about potential merger a year-and-a-half ago, met with disinterest from both.

-Wendy: Recently called both councils to discuss issue. Johnson creek is not thrilled, but not completely closed to idea. Clackamas River Basin was slightly more accepting

-Erik Shawn: Do all councils need paid employees?

-Wendy: Not necessarily but councils do need a "fiscal agent". Aside from "Council Support Grants" OWEB offers other funding opportunities. Cycles run twice annually. More information at: <http://www.oweb.state.or.us/OWEB/GRANTS/index.shtml>

-Susan: What are the steps of Council formation? Is there a handbook?

-Wendy: All councils are different in size and nature. There is no handbook.

- First recommended steps are a) **County Recognition**, and b) **Creating a Watershed Assessment that identifies the limiting factors, prioritizes solutions, and establishes a road map for work in the watershed**
- Highly recommended, as with any formal group, to develop bylaws and articles that pay particular attention to: how the group will arrive at decisions and how to remove and replace members
- OWEB has small dam removal guide (could be helpful for culvert removal): <http://www.oweb.state.or.us/OWEB/docs/pubs/SmallDamRemovalGuide.pdf>

-John Nagy (WES): Describes Watershed Action Plan process as using existing information to put out a state of the watershed report. Notes that most of what goes into the storm drains goes straight to the creeks and rivers

-Pat Russell: Questions Wendy, Is the Oregon Fish Recovery Plan working? What can we expect in light of changes in federal Administration?

-Wendy: Given economic climate, don't expect big changes from federal agencies. "The Oregon Plan for Salmon and Watersheds 2007-2009 Biennial Report" is a reference for statewide successes. Also, what does "fish recovery" mean? How do we measure success? Where is the "end of recovery"?

-Pat: Questions OWEB prioritization for allocation of OWEB funds

-Wendy: Projects are evaluated based on merit by volunteer review board. Project proposals are diverse and not only fish related. Education/outreach projects are also funded among others. Reinforces importance of seeking support (even if symbolic) from the county and references OWEB "Small Grant Program"

-Shirley Stageberg: What is the role of Soil and Water Conservation Districts?

-Wendy: These Districts began forming in the 1930s along county lines and their focus was to help farmers and ranchers preserve soil.

-Chris Runyard: Highlights importance of a body that can monitor pollution. References plastics and parking lot flooding pumped directly into creek.

-Dave: When Councils are recognized, info comes to you. It's not about only money or authority but about being recognized as **the** major player in the watershed.

-Tonia: Emphasizes the goal of bringing together partners and stakeholders under common vision of conservation.

-Tonia/JoAnn: Clarify the function of "Stewardship Partners": A body that can be called on for (written) partner support. More strength = more partners = more success.

-John: Points out importance of administrative role/project management

-Pat: Reiterates importance that potential council is the leading agency for fish recovery. If not, we jeopardize ability to raise funds and be successful

What other organizations/bodies need to be in this conversation?

-Susan: Chamber of Commerce, Neighborhood Associations, CPOs, Cities: Gladstone, Happy Valley, Milwaukie

-Pat: CCSD1, Soil and Water Conservation Districts, NCPRP

-Chris: Suggests now may not be the time for drawing in CPOs and neighborhoods. Could be too many uninformed folks, leading to complications

-Pat: CPOs are excellent method for outreach, need to be included at some point

-Erik: What is the tipping point for too many stakeholders?

-John: Group can be formed, reevaluated continuously. References Johnson Creek

-Steve: Johnson Creek/Clackamas River Basin Councils should be present at next meeting to discuss charters, by-laws, board. To learn from their experience.

-Susan: Suggests Walt

-Pat: Suggests Tryon Creek, thinks Clackamas is too rural and does not represent a similar urban watershed.

-Chris: Suggests Rick Roon of SWCD

-Steve: Should we invite smaller groups: Bdmn Crk or Rynerson?

-Pat: It's crucial to include Happy Valley in the discussion. How do they feel about this group? Expresses concern about active role of the two cities and the county.

-John: Which jurisdictions are included when is our discussion

-Nicole: Suggests Mollala group that has not received council support funds from OWEB

Closing Discussion

-Shirley: Recaps value of watershed group as a home for large body of watershed information.

Group is called to vote, based on five finger consensus, on level of interest to move forward toward formation of a Watershed Council.

Votes range 1-3 with overwhelming majority of votes being one.

Notes:

In reference to a question above, OWEB criteria used to prioritize projects is posted at: http://www.oweb.state.or.us/OWEB/GRANTS/docs/grants_restoration_prioritization_fm_work.pdf

Flip Chart Notes for each Discussion Topic

Why form a Council?

- Professional knowledge
- Inclusion in conversations and discussions
- Voice is identified and BIG
- Bring together partners w/conservation as a goal
- Gain power to achieve goals
- Fill existing gap of “key entity/person” for fish recovery in county
- Go-to entity on creek issues
- Establish a place where all information is kept and contacts are available

What tasks would Council engage in?

- Monitor who’s polluting the creeks
- Advocacy

What territory should be covered?

- At least Mount Scott and Kellogg Creek Watershed
- Consider combining with adjacent Councils? (Clackamas or Johnson Creek)

What jurisdictions need to be included?

- Gladstone
- Johnson City
- Milwaukie
- Happy Valley

What other organizations should be included?

- Chamber of Commerce
- Special Districts: NCPRD, CCSD#1, Soil and Water Cons District
- CPOs
- Neighborhood Associations
-

What strengths and resources do we already have?

- Passion
- Concern
- Interest

What else will we need?

- Coordinator – part time
- Someone to handle administration

What are the next steps?

- Meet again in February
- Invite Johnson Creek and Clackamas River Council Board members to speak to us about their by laws, charters and histories

Kellogg Mt Scott Watershed Council Meeting 3

Date/Time: 3/18/09, 6:30-8:30pm

Location: The Pond House, Downtown Milwaukie

Introductions

Rob Kappa (Resident Environmentalist)	Susan Shawn (Urban Green)
Dick Shook (Friends of K/Mt S Creeks)	Dion Shepard (Historic Milwaukie NDA)
Chris Runyard (Tsunami Crew)	Shirley Stageberg (Milwaukie Presbyterian Church)
Jeff Lesh (North Clackamas Parks)	John Nagy (Clackamas County, WES)
Nicole West (City of Milwaukie)	Steve Berliner (Friends of K/Mt S Creeks)
Tonia Burns (North Clackamas Parks)	Marshall Johnson (Previously Wetlands Conservancy),
Pat Russell (Salmon Advocate)	Eric Shawn (Friends of North Clackamas Parks)

Guest Speaker, Oak Lodge Sanitary District: Michael Read

Michael Read: Apologizes for the by pass of pump station 3 that occurred recently. Described the “lead and lag” system for the pumps used by the District which had caused the by pass. They have taken 2 main actions to prevent future incidents. The computer was reprogrammed. Now the lead pump will recognize when the secondary pump doesn’t come on, and will kick back on. Another problem was that the alarm system was programmed to turn off at 7am when someone came back on duty for the day. The morning the pump station failed that employee didn’t get the alarm/have his phone. That has also been changed.

There have been 4 by-passes since he came on board in Jan of 2008. In the first instance, a goose flew into the generator. The second instance was during the repaving on McLoughlin Blvd when a crew member threw waste concrete down the man hole. The third was a result of the roots of an aggressive plant (bamboo) breaking the main. They should have noticed this earlier if they were doing their TV scans properly.

He concludes by apologizing offering Oak Lodge offices to the group as a place to meet if we wish to use it.

Dick: suggests that, on a side note, if the Kellogg Plant is decommissioned and pipe is constructed under Trolley Trail to Tri Cities plant - even with due diligence spills are going to continue happening.

Michael Reed: Reminds that each plant (all point-source polluters, i.e. someone who has a pipe emptying directly to a natural body of water) has TMDL allocations for temperature. This is point of maximum impact is below Willamette Falls and Oak Lodge is not in jeopardy of exceeding TMDLs. However, the Tri-City plant doesn’t have the reserves, doesn’t have much capacity to take on higher temps in their discharge. If the discharge is too warm it would have to be pumped all the way back to Kellogg. The energy costs of this would be significant.

Rob Kappa: Asks guest to look into his crystal ball, based on his background, when the economy turns around there will be an enormous pressure for exponential building. Where are we going to face our greatest challenges in the watershed?

Michael Read: Responds that the challenge will be to enact rules to preserve open spaces within the watershed. For waste water, there is less concern. Storm water run-off will be the challenge. Water quality is the future and so far there is no form of technology to make storm water cleaner. Technology does exist for wastewater. References “in lieu of” fees that are accumulated from run-off properties that pay for a regional facility.

Susan: Asks for guest’s advice on whether the group should go for a council or not. And would Oak Lodge Sanitary District be interested in becoming a partner.

Michael Read: Absolutely (encourages group to form and wants District to be a part of it)

Susan: Asks if Oak Lodge, as a partner, would be interested in supporting the small groups within the District’s boundaries who don’t have a hope.

Michael Read: Absolutely. Concludes by recommending the group proceed with asking for OWEB Council Support funds, even if we are discouraged from it.

John: Asks a final question regarding the pump station and a 12 inch main that dead-ends near there and wonders if the overflow could go into that line.

Michael Read: Responds that it could be an opportunity, especially with the Tri-Met light rail coming through. They are looking at the viability of that option. It could buy time, and it’s all gravity from there going into Kellogg Creek. Tells a story about an antiquated pump station down on Ankeny (“Agony” pump station) that by-passed thousands of gallons. Components were from the 30’s and 40’s, and got updated with a new computer system. It was a total mess. His moral: Sometime technology creates your problem rather than solving them.

Guest apologizes one final time and leaves the meeting.

JoAnn: Sums up the activity of the group to date. There have been two meetings. In the first, we were visited by Wendy Hudson of OWEB who very clearly told us what we could, and certainly could not do. In the second, we heard from the Johnson Creek Watershed Council and the Clackamas River Basin Council about their bylaws, evolutionary process, how they function, funding sources, etc. We have heard no discouragement from anyone up until this point about moving forward to start a council. In this meeting she proposes we talk about what being a watershed council means for each of us. That is, what would the roles of a Council be?

Group decides on a “talking-stick” method.

Chris Runyard: Being a watershed is a lot. We will end up taking on everything anyway. First, we are getting our asses kicked out there at public meetings where the rules are being made. We need to prevent ass kicking. Gives example of the Harmony Campus/Sunnybrook Rd extension project. If such an extensive community outreach and advocacy campaign wasn’t taken up by the Tsunami Crew, The Friends of, Logan etc. they (DTD) probably would be preparing to break ground soon. Second, a council

could run a program like Greg Ciannella's (from the Johnson Creek Watershed Council). Door-to-door style neighborhood outreach. Encouraging stewardship, talking to property owners about weeds and erosion. Some people hate government but watershed councils are different. Many backyards in the watershed are similar; lawns leading right up to the back of an eroding stream. Education, Outreach. The low hanging fruit is being dealt with by the agencies. A council needs to get in and talk to property owners. We also can partner with the agencies doing what they already do.

Rob Kappa: It's a valuable function in our region that councils can advocate differently that government. It's better to be at the table than to be on the menu. A council can change habits and change culture toward preserving what precious greenspaces we have left. Build out is going to become an incredibly big problem. Protection has to be aggressive with education and outreach. His experience with JCWC (formerly represented Milwaukie on the Board) was very positive. It's a lot of work, but a lot of good work.

Dick Shook: Initially had a problem getting his arms around the idea of a watershed council. He's also leery about bringing in the smaller groups. Expresses concern about problems with money to hire staff. Will the group be large enough to hire someone full time? Is hopeful about the idea of an over-arching management to bring all the groups (Friends of, Tsunami Crew, Urban Green, North Clackamas Parks etc) together.

Eric Shawn: Thinks that a watershed council should be a mix of several things. There will naturally be a lot of interest in restoration, but wants to stress the importance of being at the table. A council can do that. It must have a view that is broad enough to include all the pieces. A strategic component is necessary. The council can squeeze into the spaces between agencies to identify and work out why they are not working together. Looking at the picture like it's a natural system, in a systematic way.

Marshall Johnson: Began by talking about the development of management plans for wetlands. Suggests we use management plans to secure funding, to improve water quality, and conserve habitat (particularly the removal of invasives). Private land-owner stewardship. Gave example method; walking the stream with a GIS mapping device. (Nicole's Note: Where is this data? Is there still information on this project somewhere?) Then develop an outreach process of talking to these home owners where the invasives were located. Approaching them with outreach materials. There are so many methods.

Steve Berliner: Insists we should remember that Michael Read suggests we don't take no for an answer from OWEB. He also shares Dick's funding concerns, but without resources we can still have a voice. Watershed is the most important unit. It's the single best environmental health indicator. We have a lot of little voices. But how official is our voice? This is how to get in the game. Legitimacy. Watersheds really need to have a strong voice.

Shirley Steinberg: Expresses the importance of the power of a voice and the advocacy piece. She is also interested in the idea of working with private land owners and identifying smaller coalitions of people/neighbors in the community to work with.

Dion Shepard: If/when the lake becomes a creek, whatever happens to the mouth means less compared to what happens upstream. Restoration will be very important.

Susan Shawn: Advocacy is the most important thing. Having the voice to be officially recognized. Urban Green is very concerned about the loss of the urban tree canopy. She is very interested in the tree canopy particularly with regards to climate change. We are running out of time. Restoration through all kinds of partnerships. Parks are patches up and down the watershed. The council should work to connect the beaded land between them. There is a difference in going to someone's door from a council verses as herself. Now we already have the shared intention, we'll find the money. We already have our manager sitting over there (Marshall). Salmon is also a major concern, and having the council support the City in whatever is necessary to get it done.

Pat Russell: Reminds us that we all know he is here for the salmon. He goes to meeting after meeting, talking to people from various agencies and no one is doing anything about salmon recovery. For him, the purpose of a watershed council is to establish a salmon recovery plan. Everyone has to be there, CCSD, WES, and the Cities. First priority is a salmon recovery plan. One that is science-based. Then the next step is tying it to a Capital Improvement Plan. Then go down to the legislature. How else did the Sunset Highway go through?

Tonia Burns: Now there is a changing of the guards going on everywhere. Federally, State, Locally etc. She just read that OWEB is getting a bunch of money from the federal stimulus package. Loves the idea of partnerships, of community members rising up in a utopia to take care of the lands. She dreams this dream all the time. More partnerships will mean more success. It's a fact that in our society we need to be making more plans and seeking legitimacy. Acquisition will for sure be a priority. And advocacy. It will be especially tough for us to choose the words for our mission and objectives.

Nicole West: Has been focusing on writing what everyone else says, so will summarize the ideas that came up there. Loves Eric's comments that the watershed council can be the lubricant, the group that can "get in the spaces between agencies" and help them communicate better. Very excited to hear so much support in the room for a streamside property-owner outreach program (in the vain of Greg Ciannella). Also, like Rob, sees a huge opportunity for the Council to be a group that can shift public opinion. Clearly these generalizations break down into smaller tangible actions i.e. newsletter, website, outreach materials, etc.

Jeff Lesh: Enjoys this discussion very much, especially being new to the field, but he has been working in the watershed most days through North Clackamas Parks and with Chris and the Tsunami Crew. It's exciting, but a little sad that we are here talking about getting a voice in the watershed. Why don't we already have a voice? Especially liked what Pat said about making sure all the right institutional folks are there. Gave the example of how JCWC made it so easy for people to get connected to the watershed. It's also important to coordinate efforts and avoid redundancies.

John Nagy: It has taken us 15 years to get here. And really, it has only been in the last 40-50 years that degradation has become exponential. We need time to make right on all this degradation, but we need to act now. We need the tools to act effectively. Action that projects and advocacy will be the key. Currently public meetings are very poorly attended. Regarding outreach, many folks aren't reading/receiving the materials sent in the mail with bills or distributed by the government. It's hard for government to do outreach, but a council can. You see home owners that are cutting down everything, the entire existing buffer, up to the creek just so that they can see it, without realizing that they are actually harming the

stream. Education and Outreach, also acquisition is important. And having a strong voice at the table. Agencies do need help from the outside.

Susan: Asks if WES would want to be a partner.

John: Responds that they will need to ask themselves if the council's actions are redundant or better (complimentary) for WES.

Steve: Address the feeling of sadness/regret that we haven't had a voice. After 15 years of work he would like to think the group has a voice. Emphasizes that he and Dick have both sat on committees. Is looking forward to being able to magnify that voice.

Rob Kappa: Remembers a county meeting where he was told "we appreciate your voice, but the developers are here every day". This is the power, the political power, we need the political clout behind forming an organization.

Summary of Main Themes and Timeline Brainstorm: JoAnn

Many of the same themes were coming up repeatedly.

- Advocacy
- Restoration
- Legitimacy: Be at the table/Have a voice/Be in the game/Public Voice of Watershed/Voice from Outside Government
- Coordination and Partnership
- Education and Outreach
- Be the source of Action
- Acquisition
- Salmon Recovery Plan and Capital Improvement Plan (not on everyone's list but a major factor for one voice)

Marshall: Adds that a phrase he grew to like while working with the Wetlands Conservancy was "*Promoting Stewardship*"

JoAnn: For now we are a loose-knit group, what needs to be or can be accomplished between now and March 2010?

Group: We need to decide about pulling other groups in, establish bylaws, goals, mission statement, involving jurisdictions, determine boundaries.

Chris: Notes that he thinks it's ok that other jurisdictions are not here. Reasserts that we are doing all of these things already.

Susan: We should identify partners. Oak Lodge, City of Milwaukie. We need it all on paper, before going to WES. First we need to approach WES regarding the process for seeking formal county recognition.

Chris: We can move forward but shouldn't get too wrapped up in those administrative pieces.

Susan: Reminds Chris that she is more than happy and good at taking on those kinds of tasks.

Tonia: Comments that we should decide if we are going to move forward and create a council rather than simply continuing to meet.

Rob: We've got all the projects, Susan has stepped forward and volunteered to take on some administrative tasks. When the time is right we need to call up the commissioners and ask for their support. Kappa personally knows two of them and could do it.

John: Suggests that we identify projects and gaps in those projects. Identify some action items; both short and long term.

Eric: Proposes the "Natural Step" process for principles for operation. It would be a marketing tool. It's a proven process for becoming sustainable.

Susan: Asks the group if we are ready to make a consensus vote as to whether we should decide to pursue forming a watershed council.

Susan Makes a motion to become a watershed council.

Group decided there is no dissenting opinion. Kellogg/Mt Scott Watershed group will begin moving forward to establish a formal watershed council.

Shirley: Wants to clarify that the church is not yet a member. She will take the idea back to the church and make sure it's ok with them, before she represents the church.

Marshall: Comments that the Wetlands Conservancy is probably one of the larger private land owners in the watershed. They own Minthorne and Hearthwood. They have one paid staff member. He could probably call Ester Lev and talk with her about the Council and see where she's at.

Tasks

Tonia: Contact the Greater Oregon City Watershed Council and request they send their bylaws.

Marshall: Contact Ester Lev to find out where the Wetlands Conservancy is at with the idea of a Council

Susan: Contact Lynn Fisher (Boardman) and people from River Forest and Rinearson, find maps

Chris: Offered to call the person from Rinearson

Pat: Resend his list of potential partners, help get needed maps, provide Kellogg Lake doc to Nicole

Nicole: Notes, Maps Support if need be, call Dick and Steve about Oral History project in April

John: Offered to help get access to maps, if need be

Kellogg -for-Coho-Initiative Update: Nicole

Oral History Project: Adds that she would like to speak with Dick Shook and Steve Berliner. Will get their contact information after the meeting.

\$45,000 Award granted from American River Community-Based Restoration Program for the conceptual design of the portion of the stream channel under OR-99 E. Moving forward of signing the grant agreement to begin spending the MTIP grant money on feasibility studies, planning, and design.

Preliminary, unofficial conversations with contractors have begun and a contractor is expected on board for the planning phase of the project within two months.

Expect a letter in the mail regarding a public meeting that will be held at the Presbyterian Church on March 31st, 6:30-8:00pm where the City will discuss a significant Federal Stimulus funding opportunity that has become available.

JoAnn: Clarifies that the Stimulus opportunity came out of a public meeting where the City of Milwaukie was consulting with a group of multi-agency representatives about the project scope developed for the MTIP funding.

Nicole: Adds that it was very exciting to see many people representing about 10 agencies come together to talk about moving the project forward.

Pat: Asks who the opportunity is through.

Nicole: NOAA

John: Adds that during the meeting NOAA, backed by other agencies, strongly encouraged the City to apply for this stimulus money.

Meeting is adjourned at 8:45 pm.