



**MEMORANDUM**

**TO:** Mid-Coast IR TMDL Bacteria Technical Working Group Members  
**FROM:** Jessie Conover, Oregon Consensus (OC)  
**SUBJECT:** DRAFT – Action Items from April 22 Meeting  
**DATE:** May 12, 2015

This memo follows up on the April 22, 2015, meeting of the Mid-Coast Implementation Ready Total Maximum Daily Load (IR TMDL) Bacteria Technical Working Group (TWG), held at the Newport Recreation Center in Newport, Oregon. The memo includes the following: proposed future meeting dates, identified action items, and brief summaries of key topics discussed.

**UPCOMING MEETINGS**

Please take note of the following meeting dates.

Meeting	Date	Location
Bacteria TWG 16	July 15, 2015	Newport
LSAC Meeting	July 15, 2015	Newport
Sediment TWG 13	<i>Early Fall 2015</i>	

**ACTION ITEMS**

Action Item	Who	Date
1. <u>Action Items</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prepare draft Action Items memo and distribute to TWG members for review</li> </ul>	Jessie (OC with DEQ)	Complete
2. <u>Information Follow-up</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Post presentations and meeting documents to project website</li> <li>Keep TWG members abreast of developments between meetings</li> </ul>	David (DEQ) Kevin (DEQ)	By cob, May 20, 2015 Periodically, as necessary
3. <u>Funding</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop and distribute summary funding sources sheet to TWG members</li> </ul>	OC with DEQ	In advance of next meeting

<p>4. <u>Load Duration Curves</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide feedback to DEQ on work scheduling list via email</li> <li>• Contact Paul Engelmeyer regarding Yachats LDC packet review</li> <li>• Add 'Recreational Value' to scoring matrix with a 2-point value</li> <li>• Send link to all LDC packets to TWG members</li> </ul>	<p>TWG members</p> <p>Charlie P.</p> <p>Kevin</p> <p>Kevin</p>	<p>By May 30, 2015</p> <p>ASAP</p> <p>ASAP</p> <p>Complete</p>
<p>5. <u>Beaches</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide beaches sources input</li> </ul>	<p>TWG members</p>	<p>By May 1, 2015</p>
<p>6. <u>Big Elk</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reach out to contacts regarding storm chasing projects conducted by Curry Watersheds)<sup>1,2</sup></li> </ul>	<p>Kevin and David</p>	<p>In advance of next meeting</p>

Bacteria TWG Members Present: Steve Hager (Siuslaw Watershed Council), Charlie Plybon (Surfrider Foundation), Joe Steere (small woodland agriculture), Paul Robertson (Devils Lake Water Improvement District), Josh Lambert (Lincoln SWCD)

Project Team Members Present: Kevin Brannan, David Waltz (DEQ)

Other Attendees: Dana Hicks, Katie Duzik (OWEB, via phone)

Facilitation: Peter Harkema (Oregon Consensus), Jessie Conover (Oregon Consensus)

### Meeting Notes

#### Key topics and themes:

During the fifteenth meeting of the Mid-Coast TMDL Bacteria TWG attendees: (1) heard a presentation on OWEB funding opportunities, (2) heard and discussed load duration curves, load allocations, and potential sources, (3) heard an update on the current status of Big Elk Creek analyses, and (4) discussed next steps. The meeting agenda, meeting materials (including PowerPoint presentations) will be available through the DEQ Mid-Coast TMDL project website at: (<http://www.deq.state.or.us/wq/tmdls/midcoast.htm>).

### **Welcome and Opening**

Peter Harkema (Oregon Consensus) welcomed the group and reviewed the agenda. He revisited the action items from the last meeting and provided an update on a draft list of funding sources that will be a 'living document' and a resource for the TWG. The list is almost ready and will be distributed to TWG members in advance of the next meeting. David Waltz (DEQ) provided an update on an upcoming stormwater workshop tailored to local governments and special districts, which will likely be held in mid-summer. The workshop is on a parallel track with TMDL development. The nexus of small municipalities and beach bacteria may be of particular interest to the TWG, since some small cities are not directly contributing to the other 303(d) listed streams being evaluated for TMDLs.

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.currywatersheds.org/images/Synoptic%20Storm%20Sampling%20Exec%20Summary.pdf>

<sup>2</sup> [http://www.currywatersheds.org/images/Ranch%20Runoff%20Report\\_photo\\_opt.pdf](http://www.currywatersheds.org/images/Ranch%20Runoff%20Report_photo_opt.pdf)

Kevin will attend a public Surfrider workshop focused on beach bacteria on April 28<sup>th</sup>. Charlie Plybon (Surfrider) noted that he would meet with Tim Gross at the City of Newberg regarding beach sources. Kevin reminded TWG members to submit their beach source assessment reviews via the public portal.

Peter Harkema announced that this would be the last time he would facilitate a Bacteria TWG meeting and that Jessie Conover would continue on in the role of facilitator.

### **Funding Sources**

As the third installment in the implementation funding sources series, several presenters addressed OWEB (Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board) grants programs. Josh Lambert (Lincoln SWCD) reviewed the OWEB Small Grants programs in the MidCoast from the perspective of a grantee, as well as some other nonpoint source and habitat projects. He provided a handout. The small grants are provided on a first come first served basis, usually starting with technical assistance and outreach and then expanding to a specific project; the SWCD typically performs agriculture-related projects. All funded projects are included in the OWRI database and can be accessed at: <http://www.oregon.gov/oweb/monitor/pages/owri.aspx>

Dana Hicks (Interim Grant Program Manager for OWEB) and Katie Duzik (North Coast Regional Program Representative for OWEB) presented on OWEB's "regular" grant programs which solicit applications once or twice per year. Dana reviewed the six OWEB regions and presented a brief overview of the regular grant cycle. She described a large program that draws from a statewide pot of money and a more involved review than the small grants program. OWEB grant staff review applications to compare then to available funding and then make recommendations to the OWEB board. Grants are available in the following four areas:

- **Technical Assistance.** Three categories: project design, landowner outreach, and prioritization. Maximum \$50,000.
- **Restoration.** On-the-ground work to restore watershed health. No maximum.
- **Monitoring.** Evaluating project effectiveness and/or data collection. No maximum.
- **Outreach.** Activities necessary to lead to work on the ground, and working with landowners to demonstrate need for watershed health. No maximum.

There is also a separate land and water acquisition program with its own review process. More information about the OWEB grant programs is available at

[http://www.oregon.gov/OWEB/GRANTS/pages/grant\\_faq.aspx#Regular\\_Grants](http://www.oregon.gov/OWEB/GRANTS/pages/grant_faq.aspx#Regular_Grants)

[OWRI](#) (Oregon Watershed Restoration Inventory) is a useful resource to identify the location and type of projects already completed in a particular geographic region.

OWEB recently developed the FIP (Focused Investment Priorities) program with two paths: 1) capacity building funding, and 2) implementation funding. Information on the FIP program is available at:

[http://www.oregon.gov/OWEB/Pages/FIP\\_Main.aspx](http://www.oregon.gov/OWEB/Pages/FIP_Main.aspx)

### **Meeting Overview**

Kevin briefly reviewed meeting objectives and Bacteria TMDL progress, including follow-up on action items from the February 24<sup>th</sup> meeting. The review period for the beaches source assessment tool is 2/4/2015 through 5/1/2015. Kevin agreed to send the beaches tool to OHA's beach monitoring staff and Charlie Plybon agreed to send it to Coast Watch.

Kevin is hoping to have a broader review of the LDC packet for the Yachats River. Charlie recommended that Paul Engelmeyer could lead a discussion with local volunteers regarding the review process, and agreed to contact him.

### **Load Duration Curves**

Kevin presented and explained the work scheduling list of LDC watersheds and reviewed the criteria for scoring each watershed as well as a scoring diagram (see presentation slides and handouts), and noted that the

scoring diagram is dynamic. Peter noted the change in the name of the list from “prioritization” to “work scheduling,” which better reflects the process, which is not intended to rank watersheds by importance. Kevin explained that the TMDL approach will be targeted at specific watersheds to utilize an effective scale for implementation work, and that each geographic grouping would receive a freestanding TMDL document. TWG members suggested that ‘Recreation Value’ be added to the scoring tool as a 2-point criterion. A TWG member recommended that Tenmile and Yachats be approached together, based on the parties involved in those watersheds. Kevin encouraged others to provide similar insights on work scheduling. Others suggested that DEQ communicate to DMAs in terms of management actions rather than load allocations, as they are more understandable. In response, Kevin reviewed the full timeline through Water Quality Management Plans and Implementation Plans that will be developed by DMAs.

Next steps for LDC watersheds are that Kevin will begin to develop TMDLs for watersheds with the highest scores, and Kevin and David will start working on Water Quality Management Plans with DMAs. TWG members will be kept informed of these conversations as they progress. TWG members are asked to review the scoring diagram within two weeks. Kevin requested that feedback be the form of a suggested category and point value.

### **Big Elk Creek**

Kevin reviewed the Big Elk Creek watershed and the HSPF modeling process, in general. For context, the Big Elk Creek Bacteria TMDL is being developed on the same timeline as the LDC watershed Bacteria TMDLs. Kevin provided examples of results and source analysis for specific reaches. He noted the value of this tool in predicting the impacts of specific management actions and in targeting monitoring. He also reviewed the “identifiability” concept. TWG members encouraged Kevin to incorporate ‘first flush’ information and look at how animals (birds) are grouped in the model. Model input for waterfowl was briefly discussed. The current input is zero (no waterfowl estimate), but specific information from the TWG on waterfowl use is welcome.

Next steps for Big Elk Creek include continuing to refine the submodels, extending the simulation to include recent data, developing load allocation scenarios, and uncertainty analysis.

### **Next Steps**

The next meeting of the Bacteria Technical Working Group is tentatively planned for July 15<sup>th</sup>, 2015 (morning) and DEQ will announce soon whether it plans to hold an LSAC meeting that afternoon. In the meantime, Kevin will start to develop TMDL reports for LDC watersheds with listings, provide a short overview of the beach review responses, and continue with next steps on Big Elk Creek watershed modeling.