

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

Advisory Committee Meeting 2 Summary

April 29, 2026, 10:00 a.m. PT

Location virtual meeting (Zoom)

DEQ posted a copy of the meeting PowerPoint presentation on the [project rulemaking web page](#).

Email 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 (Alternate)
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
Bill Hoyt	Douglas County Livestock Association	Absent
Cindy Bright	Douglas Soil and Water Conservation District	Present
Hannah LaGassey	Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians	Present
Geoff Rabinowitz	Oregon Association of Clean Water Agencies	Present (Jim Baird)
Jim Baird	Roseburg Urban Sanitation Authority	Present
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	Absent
Soctt Adams	Douglas County	Present (Tracy Pope)
Stanley Petrowski	South Umpqua Rural Community Partnership	Present
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

Absent

Agenda

10:00 a.m.	Welcome, introductions, meeting agenda
10:10 a.m.	Fiscal and economic impact review
10:40 a.m.	Draft Water Quality Management Plan revisions
11:20 a.m.	Wrap up, next steps
11:30 a.m.	Adjourn meeting

Meeting summary

Mia Pan, DEQ: Mia started the meeting at approximately 10:02 with staff introductions, followed by the agenda covering meeting materials that DEQ posted on April 16, 2026, in advance of the meeting. She then reviewed logistics and ground rules, and performed a roll call of rule making advisory committee (RAC) members. Mia continued with the project background and schedule. She reviewed the purpose of the RAC and expectations for fiscal impact review before asking the following questions from RAC members:

1. Will the draft rule have a significant adverse impact on small businesses?
2. If a significant impact is identified, how could DEQ reduce the fiscal impact on small businesses?
3. Will the proposed rule impact racial equity?
4. What are additional considerations for environmental justice for this draft rule?
5. What types of entities will be impacted by the proposed rule?
6. How and to what extent will the proposed rule have a positive, negative, or no impact on these entities?

AC – Stanley Petrowski: Permitting fees for instream projects, is there a way for DEQ to subsidize costs for private landowners and small business?

AC – Beth Pietrzak: There are potential costs associated with the loss of agriculturally productive land adjacent to riparian lands, we don't have a way to quantify that at this time. Also, the potential costs to establish and maintain riparian plantings, livestock exclusion fencing, and off stream watering systems.

AC – Tyler Ernst: There are similar costs to private forestland landowners for loss of productive timber lands adjacent to riparian lands, especially for no-cut buffers beyond ODF rules.

AC – Jim Baird: The cost per acre in the FIS is underplayed, mostly because of scale. Larger projects have a lower cost/acre than smaller- mostly urban- projects. He recommended that DEQ incorporate higher urban costs into our analysis.

AC – Rebecca McCoun: With all the temperature TMDLs coming, there is a lot of work for ODF staff that is an unfunded mandate. There is an impact to implement at this scale for the agencies.

AC – Jim Baird: The 120-ft buffer could be averse to smaller cities/agencies that have limited riparian area available. Smaller projects have benefits too, even if they have smaller buffers. 120 ft buffer may not be needed for smaller, headwater tributaries.

Sarah Norpchen, DEQ: Sarah presented changes to the WQMP based on feedback provided at the first RAC meeting. She reviewed how WQMP fits into the TMDL framework, the project scope, and reviewed a few topics that came up repeatedly. 1) DEQ does not require a fixed, 120 ft buffer. 2) the 10 percent cumulative shade per

decade benchmark is a basin-wide tracking metric. It is not an individual requirement. 3) The WQMP requirements reflect current state and federal agency rules and plans, and DEQ may revisit our requirements if those plans change. Then she reviewed both organizational and substantive changes to sections 4 through 11. Then she concluded DEQ's prestation and opened the meeting for questions and feedback.

AC – Jim Baird: Concerned that the TMDL applies two separate wasteload allocations to the Roseburg Urban Sanitary Authority (RUSA), submitted comments to EPA that the WLA should be combined. Separate WLA is not reflective of current temperature mitigation efforts – including the natural treatment system – and would be very difficult to attain.

Sarah Norpchen, DEQ: EPA established the TMDL, so any questions about the TMDL should be addressed to them. The WQMP is primarily a nonpoint source management tool, it recognizes that DEQ manages point sources through the NPDES/permitting programs.

Ranei Nomura, DEQ: DEQ is aware of RUSA's concerns and shares them to some degree. We don't have a clear answer or response at this time. DEQ will work with RUSA during permit issuance.

AC - Keri Morin Handaly: Wanted to confirm that the new draft removes the requirement that BLM complete a shade gap analysis. Sarah confirmed. What is the effort/process to complete shade gap analysis? Is the procedure so long that it would really take four years?

Sarah Norpchen, DEQ: WQMP Table 3 now lists who must complete a shade gap analysis. WQMP Section 8 includes DEQ's adequacy analysis. We gave closer look to ODA, ODF, BLM, USFS management because they collectively manage about 93% of the streamside lands in the basin. The analysis concluded that USFS/BLM current management is likely to meet load allocations. ODA/ODF do not provide reasonable assurance, so they must do a shade gap. The purpose of the shade gap is to quantify data and prioritize locations for restoration. DEQ hopes that ODA/ODF can standardize methods and apply them to other basins.

AC - Hannah LaGassey: What is the process if the BLM Resource Management Plan is edited? Would DEQ evaluate the new version for sufficiency?

Sarah Norpchen, DEQ: Yes, we would evaluate the new RMP for sufficiency to meet load allocations. If DEQ finds that it is not adequate, then we may change our expectations. DEQ approves agency implementation plans that are tiered to the WQMP. If agency rules or plans change, and they are no longer following their implementation plan, they would be out of compliance.

AC – Beth Pietrzak: Streamside evaluation/shade gap analysis – ODA does not have staff resources to do the analysis on all agricultural lands in temperature TMDLs across the state. ODF is investing a lot of resources and there's a chance for coordination and a standardized method that can be used and compared across the state. There's a need for coordination, so we don't have a mix of methods/results. There's also a need for resources to complete these tasks. The state agencies could request resources from the legislature. The state agencies should work together. ODA can provide a copy of revised WQMP template language (Word file added to chat).

AC – Rebecca McCoun: ODF is working on developing a model that uses newer canopy height data, and they are currently testing the model with DEQ. ODF is working with ODA too. Mostly at the proof-of-concept stage.

Steve Mrazik, DEQ: The agency is trying to comprehensively cover the basins with shade gap analyses, and we are working with ODA and ODF. We are supporting an on-going conversation for interagency collaboration and data sharing.

AC - Keri Morin Handaly: Requested responsible persons provide fiscal impacts/costs expected to implement the WQMP.

Sarah Norpchen, DEQ: The WQMP, Section 10 requires implementation plans to include a fiscal analysis for each action. WQMP appendix D includes a list of financial resources. Sufficiency is a nuanced determination that depends on an entity's capacity, sources, and site-specific conditions. That's why we offer streamside/evaluations to prioritize actions and shade targets/curves that are site specific.

Mia Pan, DEQ: Mia concluded the presentation with next steps. RAC members have until May 20 to submit comments to DEQ. A 45-day public notice period is tentatively scheduled for August-October.

AC - John Colby: Will DEQ accept comments in the margins?

Sarah Norpchen, DEQ: We traditionally advise against that because comments need to be shared

Bill Meyers, DEQ: Bill accepted that approach in the Rogue because it's easier for people to submit their comments.

Sarah Norpchen, DEQ: Following the precedent in the Rogue, the Umpqua will also accept comments in the margins.

Meeting adjourned at approximately 11:10 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](#).