Meeting Date(s): January 13, 2022

LAC Members Present: Judy Bible, Barry Bushue, Bob Underwood, Roger Fantz, Paul Staehley, Lydon Scheeff, Kurt McKnight, Ambrose Calcagno, Jacqueline Tommas, Sam Doane

Reporting Time Frame: Calendar years 2018-2021

PROGRESS MEASUREMENT

Management Area: For TSS, the mercury TMDL establishes a measurable objective for maximum instream TSS at 4 mg/L in 2049, with a 2019 milestone of 17 mg/L.

Focus Area: No Focus Area

Strategic Implementation Area (SIA): 2020 Lower and Middle Clear Creeks SIA

ODA Measurable Objective: By July 29, 2025, all 40 tax lots identified as a Potential Violation or an Opportunity for Improvement will be downgraded to Low or Limited.

Current Conditions: As of July 29, 2021, 40 tax lots were identified as either a Potential Violation or an Opportunity for Improvement. LIMITED = 1,998, LOW = 215, OPP = 35, PV = 5

Progress Towards Measurable Objective: SIA is open and SIA work is continuing. Adaptive management discussion will be available at the next Area Plan review.

Management Areawide Activities (Clackamas SWCD and Clackamas River Basin Council)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Events That Actively Engage Landowners</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Small farm school, Clackamas County Fair, Manure Horse Workshop, North Willamette Horticultural Society Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowners Participating in Active Events</td>
<td>1,254</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riparian restoration work parties</td>
<td>1,033;4,056</td>
<td># volunteers; # hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowners Provided Technical Assistance</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Visits</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Plans Written</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Applications Submitted</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Applications Awarded</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>Not reported to ODA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LAC DISCUSSION

Summary of Progress

- Strong cooperation amongst all groups (community, organizations, agencies, and SWCD)
- Local groups have realistic understanding of what’s achievable
- Good communication with landowners
- Many opportunities for cost-share
- Good networking and coming up with solutions
- Landowners have healthy relationship with SWCD
- There are more fish in the river so WQ must be improving
- Some increase in water quality monitoring
- LAC meeting and discussions are helpful

Impediments

- Landowners grow hundreds of specialty crops; there is not enough research and knowledge to provide plans for all these crop types (e.g., customized integrated pest management)
- State agencies don’t communicate enough amongst themselves
- TMDL process is not ag-friendly
- TMDLs set unrealistic targets
- Landowners don’t get credit for the work they are doing on their own, e.g., planting cover crops
- Lack of water quality monitoring data to show status of agricultural streams
- Lack of data to show improvements in either land conditions or water quality
- Local organizations do not have the capacity to design monitoring programs

**Recommended Modifications and Adaptive Management**

- DEQ and ODA provide TMDL information to landowners (e.g., presentations to commodity groups)
- DEQ and ODA need to be clearer on what landowners need to do to respond to TMDLs
- Collect baseline data to determine and set realistic goal posts
-需 a monitoring strategy, probably led by ODA and DEQ
- Set goals to limit erosion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ODA COMPLIANCE ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>Letter of Compliance</th>
<th>Pre-Enforcement Notification</th>
<th>Notice of Noncompliance</th>
<th>Civil Penalty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outside SIA(s)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within SIA(s)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>