

# Temperature Total Maximum Daily Loads Replacement Project: Umpqua River Basin, Water Quality Management Plan

## Advisory Committee Meeting 1 Summary

**Location** virtual meeting (Zoom)

**Feb. 18, 2026, 10:30 a.m. PT**

Email [umpqua.tmdltemperature@deq.oregon.gov](mailto:umpqua.tmdltemperature@deq.oregon.gov) to request a copy of the video recording or transcript of the meeting chat.

### Rule advisory committee members

Name	Affiliation	Present
Ashley Russell	Confederated Tribes of the Coos, Lower Umpqua and Siuslaw Indians	Absent
Becky Anthony	Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife	Present
Beth Pietrzak	Oregon Department of Agriculture	Present (Rob Hibbs)
Bill Hoyt	Douglas County Livestock Association	Absent
Cindy Bright	Douglas Soil and Water Conservation District	Present
Hannah LaHassey	Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians	Present
Geoff Rabinowitz	Oregon Association of Clean Water Agencies	Present
Jim Baird	Roseburg Urban Sanitation Authority	Present (Raj Kapur)
Joe Blanchard	U.S. Forest Service	Present
John Colby	Bureau of Land Management	Present
Keri Morin Handaly	Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde	Present
Rebecca McCoun	Oregon Department of Forestry	Present
Lonnie Rainville	City of Canyonville	Present
Soctt Adams	Douglas County	Absent
Stanley Petrowski	South Umpqua Rural Community Partnership	Absent
Steve Albertelli	PacifiCorp	Present
Tyler Ernst	Oregon Forest Industries Council	Present

### DEQ staff

Sarah Norpchen, Heather Tugaw, Mia Pan, Steve Mrazik, Ranei Nomura

### EPA staff

Sydney Clark

## Agenda

<b>10:00 a.m.</b>	Welcome, introductions, meeting agenda
<b>10:10 a.m.</b>	Rule Advisory Committee Charter Review
<b>10:20 a.m.</b>	Draft Water Quality Management Plan
<b>10:50 a.m.</b>	Draft Administrative Rule Language
<b>11:00 a.m.</b>	Draft Fiscal and Economic Impact Statement
<b>11:25 a.m.</b>	Wrap up, next steps
<b>11:30 a.m.</b>	Adjourn meeting

## Meeting summary

**Mia Pan, DEQ:** Mia started the meeting with staff introductions, followed by the agenda covering meeting materials that DEQ posted on January 28, 2026, in advance of the meeting. She then reviewed logistics and ground rules, and the rule advisory committee charter. Next, she performed a roll call of rule making advisory committee (RAC) members. Mia continued with the project history, scope, and schedule.

**Sarah Norpchen, DEQ:** Sarah started by clarifying this meeting and RAC process is for input on the Umpqua Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) to implement the Umpqua Basin Temperature Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL). Questions about the TMDL should be directed to EPA. Sarah defined TMDL and WQMP and how they relate to TMDL implementation. EPA developed the TMDL, DEQ is responsible for implementing it. This project only addresses temperature, remaining TMDL and WQMPs for other parameters are in effect and unchanged. She reviewed WQMP required elements, definitions of Designated Management Agencies (DMAs) and responsible persons. The WQMP names responsible persons, including DMAs, responsible for TMDL implementation. She reviewed rationale for naming responsible persons, which persons must prepare implementation plans, and required implementation plan components. Next, she paused for input on the list of named responsible persons and screening criteria.

**AC – Raj Kapur:** Requested DEQ update decision tree (Figure 2) with yes/no responses. How did DEQ come up with the 120 ft buffer? That level of shade protection may be unnecessary and difficult to attain. Why can't it be site specific? Is it a benchmark? How can people use the 120 ft buffer?

**Sarah Norpchen, DEQ:** See TMDL Appendix C: Stream Buffer Literature Review. DEQ is not requiring a 120 ft buffer. The literature review concludes that 120 ft will ensure shade loss does not occur. Responsible persons are required meet their load allocations, which are measured through TMDL surrogate shade targets. Responsible persons can come up with site specific strategies to meet their shade targets. 120 ft buffer is one way to meet load allocations.

**AC - Hannah LaHassey:** Is the 120 ft buffer a no-touch buffer?

**Sarah Norpchen, DEQ:** No, and please let us know if there's text in the WQMP that implies that. Section 4 (management strategies) lists thinning and vegetation management as proposed strategies.

**AC - John Colby:** (chat) Does "generally less than 25 acres" mean 25 acres calculated as a buffer width from the stream centerline x a stream length? Can a soil and water conservation district (SWCD) be considered a responsible person or do they fall under ODA?

**Sarah Norpchen, DEQ:** Yes. DEQ calculated streamside jurisdictions using variable buffer distances relative to stream size (see page 15). DEQ does not consider a SWCD a responsible persons because they do not

have jurisdiction over pollution sources. They are an important technical resource that can help private landowners with TMDL implementation.

**AC – Raj Kapur:** If site specific assessments show 120 ft buffer is not necessary, can that be used as justification for other management strategies to meet load allocations?

**Sarah Norpchen, DEQ:** Please hold that question and ask again if not fully addressed. Next, she reviewed priority management strategies to address TMDL pollutants and load allocations including those for riparian vegetation, water withdrawals and flow alteration, channel modification, dams/reservoirs, background and climate. She asked what management strategies are missing or not practical for the Umpqua Basin.

**AC - Hannah LaHassey:** Gravel augmentation, particularly below dams. What constitutes overly-dense vegetation?

**Sarah Norpchen, DEQ:** The list of proposed strategies is not exhaustive, and DEQ will consider adding gravel augmentation. Overly dense is something responsible persons should evaluate on a case-by-case basis.

**AC – Raj Kapur:** The TMDL temperature expectations are unattainable [due to background loading]. Is DEQ considering site specific criteria or realistic goals.

**Sarah Norpchen, DEQ:** DEQ’s standards team will be evaluating basin-specific criteria as part of their triennial review process. It is on their work plan.

**AC – Cindy Bright:** Bank stabilization/shaping should be a strategy, along with gravel augmentation. Removing ponds could be a challenge to agricultural landowners relying on them for stock water.

**Sarah Norpchen, DEQ:** WQMP Section 4 (Table 2) lists strategies. DEQ is not requiring landowners to remove dams, the WQMP lists it as a proposed strategy.

**Ranei Nomura, DEQ:** DEQ takes Raj’s concerns about the Umpqua Basin seriously given its naturally warm waters and will have to follow up on a timeline.

**Jeff Navarro, DEQ:** Has Raj provided DEQ comments about the triennial review?

**AC – Raj Kapur:** no but we will have a look.

**AC – Rob Hibbs:** Buffer width is site specific. It would be helpful if the WQMP included alternative avenues of funding because the investment required is significant.

**AC – John Colby:** (chat) Avoid stream crossings where feasible and decommission unneeded roads to restore floodplains and stream function. Assess adequacy of existing stream gages; support current gages and consider limited additions or low-cost monitoring. Add 2024 Coastal Oregon and 2022 Southwestern Oregon climate vulnerability publications to referenced documents.

**AC - Keri Morin Handaly:** Would agricultural subsidies be appropriate?

**AC – Rob Hibbs:** Yes

**AC - Hannah LaHassey:** limits on planting density of conifers near streams should be considered

**Sarah Norpchen, DEQ:** Sarah reviewed additional assessments required to prioritize areas for restoration and protection, including the streamside evaluation and shade gap analysis. All persons required to prepare implementation plans must perform a streamside evaluation. Sarah provided an example of the City of Scotts Mills evaluation. ODA, ODF, and Bureau of Land Management, must complete a shade gap analysis. DEQ used screening criteria to determine which dam and reservoir operators need to monitor. Douglas County needs to monitor Ben Irving (Berry Creek) and Galesville reservoirs, PacifiCorp has to monitor their entire project. They have to develop and implement monitoring plans to evaluate TMDL compliance, results will

determine implementation pathway. Table 6 provides the schedule. Sarah then asked for feedback on proposed monitoring and analysis framework.

**AC – Cindy Bright:** (chat) What about stream substrate surveys or analysis? Second by AC - Hannah LaHassey

**Sarah Norpchen, DEQ:** Thanks for the suggestion. DEQ trying to keep temperature WQMPs framework consistent, and this is not included in the others.

**AC - Joe Blanchard:** The streamside evaluation and shade gap requirements are not practical for USFS at a small scale. USFS will focus on places with most impact, such as after fires, and places with the greatest need, and where funding priorities align. Much of USFS land base is already protected.

**Sarah Norpchen, DEQ:** The WQMP requires USFS to complete an implementation plan, streamside evaluation, and monitoring. It found that USFS riparian reserves are sufficiently protective and therefore does not require a shade gap from USFS. We can coordinate streamside evaluation with what other forests are doing under statewide or regional implementation plans.

**AC - Rebecca McCoun:** The streamside evaluation and shade gap analysis are a lot and can be useful. To be useful, it [shade gap] needs to be revisited frequently. This combined with temperature monitoring is a lot of time and money.

**AC – Rob Hibbs:** ODA does not have the resources to do a shade gap analysis or streamside evaluation, and they do not plan on enacting a 120 ft buffer. Of course they will do an implementation plan.

**AC – John Colby:** (chat) Modeled shade gap data rely on outdated datasets and may not reflect recent vegetation changes. Full field monitoring of all Class 3 intermittent streams is likely infeasible; prioritize updated remote sensing (with limited field verification), potential UAS use, and recent flow models to assess critical-period surface flows.

**Sarah Norpchen, DEQ:** Sarah presented a basin-wide target of 10% cumulative shade improvement every 10 years, along with a review of the implementation plan cycle, starting with plan submittal, DEQ review and approval, annual reports, and five-year reviews. Implementation plans must include a plan for performance monitoring. ODA, ODF, BLM, and USFS also required to do temperature monitoring. Next Sarah asked RAC members for feedback on the benchmarks and tracking.

**AC - Keri Morin Handaly:** The 10% target may be difficult for individual landowners and can have a large financial impact. This goal should align with financial resources.

**Sarah Norpchen, DEQ:** This is a basin-wide cumulative target based on other WQMPs. Is this an appropriate target for the Umpqua Basin?

**AC - Rebecca McCoun:** Conditions are constantly changing, so it's difficult to say. Would it be possible for DMAs to see results of others? Is DEQ planning to have database for shade gap ground truthing?

**Sarah Norpchen, DEQ:** DEQ requires responsible persons to make plans and reports publicly available and to report data to OWRI. Unsure about a database.

**AC - Keri Morin Handaly:** Urban areas buffers for new developments should be considered. Need to push more at a state level to meet state goals for conservation of water quality resources and salmon, and I don't know if DEQ is pushing hard enough.

**AC – Cindy Bright:** (chat) What is the average growth rate of riparian vegetation given current and increasing climate temperatures?

**AC – John Colby:** (chat) Climate-driven tree mortality may affect the ability to achieve the 10% per decade effective shade target; coordination with Roseburg and Medford Districts is needed. The Draft WQMP clarifies that shade loss from natural disturbances is not a violation, but affected areas should be prioritized for restoration or protection. Consider a basin-wide temperature monitoring approach, potentially through a financial assistance agreement.

**AC - Hannah LaHassey:** (chat) Is this 10% shade increase goal meant to carry on in future decades? At what point does this shade (especially from conifers) become the "overly dense" state that will need managed in the future?

**Sarah Norpchen, DEQ:** We gave extra time for questions/comments today, so we are going to postpone the fiscal impact discussion until RAC 2.

**Mia Pan, DEQ:** Reviewed draft rule language and provided background on the fiscal, economic, and racial equity impacts review. She read the required questions and shared next steps. RAC members have until March 11 to provide written comments.

Sarah closed the meeting. Meeting adjourned at approximately 11:30 a.m.

## **Non-discrimination statement**

DEQ does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, disability, age, sex, religion, sexual orientation, gender identity, or marital status in the administration of its programs and activities. For translation or other formats, visit DEQ's [Civil Rights and Environmental Justice page](#).