MID-COAST WATER PLANNING PARTNERSHIP

May 30, 2018

WELCOME

Mid-Coast Water Planning Partnership



Introductions

- Your name
- Organizations(s) you represent
- □ Your role in the Partnership



Objectives for tonight

□ Share work of MCWPP Work Groups (WG).

- Report on results of WG surveys and discuss priority issues/needs for further study.
- Discuss funding needed
- Decision on recommended Charter language.
- Communication and Outreach status report.

Meeting guidelines

- Future focused
- Spirit of togetherness
- All viewpoints matter
- Strive to understand
- Practice patience
- □ Seek win-win
- Identify yourself
- Help us stay on track
- □ Be present



Partnership Mission

The purpose of the Mid-Coast Water Planning Partnership is to . . . Develop an inclusive community forum which examines water use in the region, identifies current and potential water challenges, and creates a unified plan to balance water needs.

What are we doing here? Integrated Water Planning

YES!!!

- Cooperative approach that balances voices and interests
- Local solutions identified through consensus
- Focused on the future of water, not the past
- Built on strong partnerships
- Voluntary, non-regulatory
- All about shared goals and shared gains
- Shaped by the will of this group

Not so much...

- Not your average planning process
- Not a regulatory process and does not affect law or policy
- Cannot impact water rights
- Isn't about pointing fingers or placing blame
- Isn't a venue to pursue singular interests or agendas
- Doesn't prevent partners from pursuing actions on their own

Recap - Planning process and schedule



Schedule



Announcements

□ Grant stipend

Report from water planning meeting in Bend

Work Group Reports

- Overview of Needs Assessment (GSI)
- Work Group Briefings
- Proposed Prioritization of Issues ("Straw Dog")
- Prioritization Input (Exercise)

Step 3 – Needs Assessment Objectives

□ Identify and prioritize water-related needs and vulnerabilities

- Out-of-stream and Instream
- Direct and indirect
- Near- and long-term
- Define and quantify needs to set up Step 4 implementation
 Actionable strategies, policies, and projects

Step 3 – Workplan and Schedule



Step 3 – Survey and Processing

- □ Goal of survey
 - Continue and refine input from partners and stakeholders
 - Engage work groups
- Workgroup distribution
 - Meetings, direct outreach, interviews
- □ Survey responses
 - Raw responses
 - Processed themes



Work Group Briefings

- Instream and Ecology Work Group
- Self-supplied User Work Group
- Municipal and Special District Work Group



Instream/Ecology

Illegal Water Diversions

Less Flow = Lower Water Quality

Evidence may require trespassing

Pumps are private property

Low Habitat Complexity

Less Woody Recruitment and **Fewer Riparian Plantings =** Temperature Increases, Suspended Sediments, Higher Peak Flows, and **Chemical/Nutrient Input**

Channel Dredging

Altered Channels Substrate Impacts **Compromised Water Quality** Temperature Increases Low Dissolved Oxygen Levels **Increased Pollutants and Nutrient Inputs Poor Quality Habitat**

Lack of Connectivity

Reduced access to alcoves, off-channel areas, wetlands

Dikes and Tidegates Barriers to Fish Passage Reduced Spawning/Rearing Area

Additional Problems: Over-Allocation of Water Siletz River on Oregon's 303d List **Biosolids Dumped on Land Near Rivers Increased Impervious Areas Landscape Management Activities**

Solutions:

In-stream Structure (complexity) Restore Beavers Grants for Water Testing Organic – Agriculture, Households

Above all, Conservation

Self-Supplied Water Users

Users

- Domestic
- Agricultural
- Industrial

Sources

- Deep & Shallow Wells
- Springs
- Surface Water

Self-Supplied Survey Responses

Water Quantity

- Seasonal Water Availability
 - Climate change
 - Population growth
 - Less natural storage

- Aging Infrastructure
 - Leaky systems
 - Financial cost to upgrade
- Regulations
 - Water rights

Self-Supplied Survey Responses

Water Quality

- Nutrients
 - Fertilizer & biosolids
- Sediment
- Herbicides & pollutants
- Naturally occurring elements
- Bacteria (E. coli)
 - Deteriorating wells
 - Livestock

- Financial Costs
 - Additional treatment
- Regulations
 - Well testing
 - Lack of protection & enforcement
 - Lack of monitoring & data collection

What the survey didn't answer...

We're hoping to capture with additional outreach

Self-Supplied Data Gaps - Quantity

- What is the current consumption of surface water & groundwater?
- What is the distribution of users across the Mid Coast?
- What is the projected water availability based on population growth & climate change models?
 - Will future availability meet needs of self-supplied water users?
- How is water being used?
 - Are there opportunities for efficiencies or conservation?

Self-Supplied Data Gaps - Quality

Groundwater

- Do you test your well? How often? Any concerns? Additional treatment?
- Trends in impairments?
 - Basin? Land use? Upstream activities?

Surface Water

- Review monitoring data
 - Turbidity, nutrients, pollutants
- Expand on current monitoring programs
- Trends?

Municipal / Water District Supplied

Proposed Prioritization

- Priority Levels
- Priority Groupings (Straw Dog)
- Partnership Input (Dot Exercise)

Types of "Needs"

Resource Needs

- 1. Water User Demands
- 2. Surface Water (supply and instream)
- 3. Groundwater (supply and yield)
- 4. Habitat (non-flow)
- 5. Monitoring

Administrative/Legal Needs

- 6. Regulations
- 7. Funding
- 8. Collaboration

Prioritization of Needs

- □ Why prioritize?
 - Limited resources and time
 - Recognize past work
 - Varied interests of group
 - Incremental but forward progress
- Eye toward action: funding and implementation
- Priorities include filling data gaps



Priority Levels

Baseline Assessment

Basin-wide; high-level; existing county, state, federal data

Focus Area

Priority, overlapping needs in localized area; requires additional data and analysis

Pilot Project

Focus Areas with data limitations and unknowns to be addressed with additional study

Cataloged Issue

Lower priority or much longer-term issues; identified but not addressed directly by PBP plan

Step 3 – Baseline Assessment

□ GSI led

- Basin-wide
- □ High-level
- Existing data
 - water provider, county, state, federal, non-profit data

Example outcomes:

- Understand municipal water supply vulnerabilities
- Identify instream water rights and when they are not met



Step 3 – Focus Areas Assessment

WORK GROUP led

Focus Areas

Priority, overlapping needs in localized area; requires additional data and analysis

Pilot Projects

Focus Areas with data limitations and unknowns to be addressed with additional study (longer-term)







Example Pilot Area/Pilot Project:

Issue # 11-Understand elevated turbidity and its effects within the Siletz River and Siletz Bay-Ocean Tributaries drainage areas.



Prioritization Exercise



Step One

21 Priority Issues

- Issues include "Focus" and "Pilot"
- Refer to handout for descriptions
- **6** dots per participant
 - OK to put multiple dots for one issue
 - Each work group has its own color
- □ **15** minutes to dot your priorities

Step Two

Write your thoughts on 'graffiti chart' in response to 2 questions:

□ What did we miss?

Are there synergistic opportunities we haven't yet recognized?



Get acquainted

Get dinner

Sign the Charter

Prioritization Debrief

- Share Results
- Final Dot Exercise
- Next Steps

Debrief Results of Prioritization Exercise

Steps 1 and 2



Final Dot Exercise – Step 3

'Bonus' Dot

Place on any issue of your choice



Working Group Break-Out Agenda

- Following USACE Presentation:
- How priority issues apply to your work group
- Other input for GSI
- □ Agenda for June meeting
- Action items



Climate Change Analysis

US Army Corps of Engineers

USACE AND MCWPP

Keith Duffy, Army, P.E., Army Corps of Engineers Spencer Narron, PPPMD, Army Corps of Engineers

May 30, 2018





U.S.ARMY

Portland District

USACE – LESS WELL KNOWN AUTHORITIES

- Planning Assistance to States : Wide number of applications, but no construction or design work
- Continuing Authorities Program : Specific types of work authorized, intended for design/construction
- Floodplain Management Services : Provides site specific data on flood related issues
- Silver Jackets Program : Cooperative program intended to bring different agencies together around flood risk reduction





CORPS SCOPE BACKGROUND

Climate change will alter the future state of the Pacific Northwest including its coastal communities and natural habitats.

The Corps has developed procedures and guidance dealing with impacts to inland hydrology (ECB-2016-25), evaluation of seal level change (ETL-1100-2-) and guidance for detection of non-stationarities (ETL 1100-2-3), i.e. are there signs of climate change in the observed record.

Based on this, the Corps offered to provide general knowledge as well as data dealing with future temperatures, precipitation and runoff trends, in the 2070's timeframe.



Portland District



CORPS SCOPE BACKGROUND (2)

Unfortunately, there is not high resolution, future climate dataset for the Oregon the coast.

This is primarily because there has not been resources to generate detailed data (e.g. submonthly rain and flow timeseries) input used by hydrologic and hydraulic computer models.

Therefore the Corps will focus on providing a <u>qualitative</u> analysis for the 2070's timeframe (i.e. 2055-2085) trends over the next year.

These will be used to make a qualitative vulnerability assessment of water supply, drought and flooding, and ecosystem/habitat related impacts.





CORPS SCOPE BACKGROUND (3)

Based on recent study drivers surveys, the Corps will focus on:

Seasonal trends for groundwater, stream and other surface water declines in the 2070s.

Qualitative impacts on water quantity in terms of temperatures, turbidity, etc.

Trends to more extreme high flow (flooding) as well as potentially drier (droughts) seasonal events.





QUESTIONS



Can Stock Photo



Portland District



Work Group Huddle – 30 minutes

- In-Stream / Ecology
- Municipal / Water District Supplied
- Self Supplied
- Communication & Outreach

Working Group Break-Out Agenda

- Form into Work Groups for 30 min meeting AGENDA -
- How priority issues apply to your work group
- Other input for GSI
- □ Agenda for June meeting
- Action items



Work Group Huddle

- Form into Work Groups for 30 min meeting
- □ Agenda:
 - Discuss results of prioritization exercise
 - Identify next steps for your Work Group
 - Identify next meeting time / location

Business Meeting – Charter Revision

Co-Convener Alan Fujishin

Charter Revision

Coordinating Committee recommends 'housekeeping' edits to the Charter – see Charter pages 3-4.

- Proposed change
 - Updates the co-convener list by adding the local co-conveners as approved at our last Partnership meeting
 - Clarifies that future changes in leadership will be vetted with Coordinating Committee
- Motion to approve recommended changes

Funding Status Report

Co-Convener Alan Fujishin

Awarded Funding



Funding Status - How can YOU help?

- To continue the planning process through the end of FY18-19 (June 30, 2019) the Partnership needs an additional \$285,000.
- □ Using resources efficiently during Step 3 is essential.
- We are approaching potential funding sources both inside and outside the Partnership.
- Your personal participation in partnership activities is the basis of our success! Facilitating that participation and leveraging it toward results requires funding.



How does participation in the MCWPP benefit your organization?

- Water Suppliers/Cities
- Natural Resource Industries
- Local Businesses
- Conservation Groups
- Community Development
- Local Residents



Consider other ways you can sustain the partnership:

- Consider hosting a MCWPP meeting in the future, providing a venue or sponsoring a meal for participants.
- Coordinate with other partners to develop and host a field tour.
- Develop an informational panel discussion or presentation for the Partnership
- Sponsor the cost of consultants' time to attend MCWPP meetings.



Contributions to date 5-18-18

\$2,000

\$1,500

\$5,000

\$

300

- Local Contributions \$:
- Lincoln City
- Lincoln Co.
- Seal Rock WD
- Lincoln Co Farm Bureau
- Gibson Farms\$ 200
- OWRD Matching Grant \$15,000

Total \$24,000

In-Kind Contributions City of Yachats – host 8/28 Partnership Meeting

Communication and Outreach

- Harmony Burright, Co-Convener
- Caroline Bauman, Coordinating Committee

Thank You!

Next Partnership Meeting: August 28, 2018

Midcoastwaterpartners.com

a south the states a settled the

TIMOTHY GROSS	HARMONY BURRIGHT	ALAN FUJISHIN	ADAM DENLINGER
DIR. OF PW/CITY ENGINEER	PLANNING COORDINATOR	CO-MANAGER	GENERAL MANAGER
CITY OF NEWPORT	OREGON WATER RESOURCES	GIBSON FARMS, SILETZ	SEAL ROCK WATER DISTRICT
T.GROSS@NEWPORTOREGON.GOV	HARMONY.S.BURRIGHT@OREGON.GO	V <u>ALAN.GIBSONFARMS@GMAIL.COM</u>	ADENLINGER@SWRD.ORG
541-574-3369	503-986-0913	541-270-6210	541-563-3529



- □ Meet New People
- Make Connections
- Swap Stories
- Share Information
- Build Partnership





Step 3 – Prioritization of Focus Areas



Siletz Bay-Ocean Drainage Area

Key Issues

- **Devils Lake Water Quality** 1.
- D River/Rec Site Water Quality 2.
- Infrastructure: Aging, lack of 3. interties

Strategies/Early Actions

- Backup water supply sources 1.
- **Rock Creek Limiting Factors** 2. Analysis
- IGAs: intertie efforts 3.
- **Devils Lake Improvement District** 4. water quality improvement efforts

Key Species

- Coho 1.
- 2. Fall Chinook
- Winter steelhead 3.
- Pacific lamprey 4.
- 5. Green Sturgeon
- White Sturgeon 6.

Priority Water Availability Basins for Streamflow

- 1 D River at Mouth
- 2. Schooner Creek at Mouth
- 3. Drift Creek at Mouth
- Diversions/ 2 unnamed Streams at Mouth 4. (WAB 0202 and 0201) Users

Key

1.

2.

Schooner

Creek. LC

Drift Creek:

LC, K-GB-

LB WD

Instream Flows

- Existing: portions of lower 1. Schooner Creek, lower drift Creek, and Rock Creek
- Proposed: portions of 2. Erickson Creek, Schooner Creek, Drift Creek, and D River



Key Infrastructure Water Quality

Reservoirs: LC, 2.

K-GB-LB WD

LC WWTP and

Discharge Point

Storage

1.

2.

Intakes, WTPs, Impairments

1.

3.

6.

- Schooner Creek: Temp, E. coli
- Drift Creek: Temp, Bio Criteria
- Rock Creek: Temp
- Pacific Ocean/D River: 4 Enterococcus Lack of interties 5
 - Unnamed stream/Devils Lake: aquatic weeds/algae; Chl a; pH

Thompson Creek: fecal coliform

Other Key Watershed Features/Habitats

- Devils Lake Watershed 1.
- 2. Drift Creek Area
- Moolack Frontal 3.
- 4. Schooner Creek minimum streamflow at intake: 3 cfs

Key Basin Issues

- Aging infrastructure (pipelines, reservoirs, pump stations, water and wastewater treatment facilities), few interconnections, and limited financial capacity for infrastructure improvements
- Siletz River health: water supply for SRWD, City of Toledo, City of Newport, and GP Mill; supports summer steelhead population
- Supply vulnerabilities for water providers (e.g. low summer streamflow; watershed health)
- Water quality impaired streams listed by Department of Environmental Quality for over 500 miles
- Instream flow deficits identified by ODFW and OWRD for several streams. Schooner Creek, Drift Creek, Yachats River rated highest priority
- Habitat degradation, including stream channel simplification and incision, altered BAY-OCEAN streamflow timing and watershed function, turbidity related to peak streamflow.
- Listed species under the Endangered Species Act Coastal Coho and Green Sturgeon listed as "threatened" along with several species of concern
- Human and ecosystem resiliency to changes in supply and demand, drought and natural disasters.

Key Basin Strategies/Actions

Planning Partnership will develop strategies throughout Steps 3 and 4

- System improvements (e.g. automatic meter reading, pipeline replacements, septic, supply interconnections)
- **Restoration projects** (e.g. in-channel, riparian, invasive species removal, estuary dike removal, fish barrier removal, road improvements)
- Water quality monitoring (USGS, watershed councils, Lincoln Soil and Water Conservation District, Surfrider Foundation, cities, DEQ, ODA, Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians, Weyerhaeuser, EPA)



Key Basin Features

- Limited population growth. Overall population is approximately 50,000. Population will grow \sim 10,000 in the next 40 years, but rate of population growth is expected to decline. Projected demographic shift towards older population.
- Land use is primarily forest owned by private state, and federal (96.5%). Other land uses include livestock grazing, rural residential development, and urban development.
- Basin economy is made up of personal income, pensions, and investments, tourism, and natural resources (commercial fishing, 40%; tourism, 33%; timber, 26%; and to a lesser extent agriculture, 1%)
- Stream flows are rain-dominated. Most precipitation occurs November-March with dry conditions in the summer. Groundwater aquifers have low yield and poor storage capacity.
- 52 potable water providers, 31 of which are required to have certified water treatment plant operators
- 14 entities with wastewater discharge permits (cities, resorts/hotels, and industries).
- 7 "Conservation Opportunity Areas" and 42 streams with existing instream water rights
- 6 Major Estuaries: Salmon River, Siletz Bay, Yaquina Bay, Beaver Creek, Alsea Bay, and Yachats River EstuaryLLIS

LEGEND

Drainage Area Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) ---- County Line WORKING DRAFT To be developed further as part of Step 3

LINN CO.

cument Path: P:\Portland\416-Newport\003-Planning Step 2\Project GIS\Project mxds\PPt MidCoast Planning Area.mxd