

Middle Fork Willamette Watershed Council  
General Council Meeting

19 Sep 2007  
Springfield, OR  
6:30 PM

Present: Eve Montanaro, Robert Emmons, Barbara Hazen, Marc Paulman, Sean Stewart, Stephanie Schroeder, Bill O'Sullivan, David DeMoss, Nena Lovenger, Nancy Sawtelle, Kelly Reis, William Blair, Bonnie Blair, Dan Kruse, Gary Roy, Don Hampton, Fergus McLean, Marion McLean, Donna Riddle

I. Welcome and Introductions – Ms Montanaro

II. Review and Approve Meeting Agenda - Ms Montanaro

The agenda was approved as posted.

III. Adoption of MFWWC Bylaws – Ms Schroeder and Ms Montanaro

Ms Schroeder and Ms Montanaro presented an overview of the Bylaws for the new MFWWC 501c3 non-profit corporation. These Bylaws were drawn from the Charter of the MFWWC which was adopted in 2000. One significant change is with regard to the voting rights of the Federal employees on the BOD. Due to Federal restrictions they will be non-voting members of the BOD. The attendance requirement for General Council members to vote at a meeting has changed from attendance in the last 3 months to attendance in the last six months because we have decreased the number of General Council meetings per year. The question was asked about attendance requirements for members of the BOD; there is no policy at this time. However, those attending agreed that creating one would be a good idea.

MOTION: Ms Lovenger moved to adopt the Bylaws as presented with the proviso that a policy be written that defines the attendance requirements for the members of the BOD. Ms Reis seconded the motion. Passed: Unanimously

IV. Western Oregon Plan Revisions (WOPR) – Mr O'Sullivan and Mr DeMoss

Mr O'Sullivan called attention to the copies of the WOPR in both paper and DVD format, and the handouts he had brought summarizing the effects of the plan, the schedule of meetings, comparing the Alternatives and listing the public workshops being held. They were available at the meeting or at the BLM office.

WOPR deals with 2 ½ million acres of land west of the Cascades. 2,100,000 A are O & C lands. These lands in Oregon and California were given to the railroads to open up the West. However, the railroads didn't live up to some of the criteria of the grant so in 1919 the government took the land back. In 1937 the O & C Act stated that these lands were to be managed for forest production in conformity with the principle of sustained yield. An annual productive capacity would be declared and it would be sold annually. The yield on these lands increased until the 1980s at which point they sold billions of board feet. The O&C Act does not trump Acts like NEPA and the NW Forest Plan which came along later. Due to these acts and the resultant decline in cut there was a dramatic decline in timber revenues to the counties in the 1990s.

The BLM discovered that it had not met the harvest levels allowed under the NW Forest Plan. In 2008 due to litigation, the BLM was required to revise their RMP and follow the directives of the O&C Act without reserves except as was needed to avoid jeopardy due to endangered species and

the ESA. The result of the revision of their RMP is the DEIS being presented tonight. There are 4 alternatives. There is a possibility that individual components of different alternatives can be combined to make the final RMP which is due out next summer. The BLM's preferred alternative is number 2 which offers the highest payment to the counties. The allowable cut would be 127 million board feet which is 2 ½ times the current cut. In the first decade 8% would be harvested (clear cut) and 8% would be thinned.

The BLM wants public input. You can attend meetings to talk to the scientists and let your opinions be known. Comments are due by Nov 9. They are especially interested in information that will help refine their information. Comments can be made thru the website. Beware if you download from the website; the maps are huge files.

#### Question and Answer session.

- Alternative 2 is preferred by the District managers. The State Director will make the final decision.
- The comment was made that it is an old growth liquidation plan. Only half of what they have now will remain. Ans: Within late successional management level they would have to make the case that it would improve the old growth to cut there.
- In the northern districts like Eugene, there are a lot of younger stands which will be thinned. The definition of an old growth tree is 200 plus years old. Under Alt 2 350,000 to 200,00 A would be reserved.
- In answer to the question about why old growth is being harvested, the response was because of the sustainability of the timber harvest.
- Herbicides are not dealt with in the plan. The BLM presumes that they can get trees back on the land without using herbicides.
- 143,000 A would be clearcut every 10 years.
- One of the performance issues is what is the effect of even aged management on the forest. They may have to mitigate due to fire risk in fire prone forests.
- They may have to make a different riparian strategy and meld it with the different Alternatives due to DEQ requirements.
- Both Alt 2 and 3 increase the risk of invasives. They would have to do mitigation.
- In deciding riparian setbacks they focused on peak flows, coarse wood debris, flow and temperature signals. The point was made that they should consider creatures other than fish that depend on a larger riparian setback.
- The point was made that they should also consider broader concerns such as how does this affect global warming and clean water.
- When asked how the Northern Spotted Owl is projected to fare under this plan, they said that even under the NW Forest Plan there was a projected loss of owls. Under Alt 2 they are actually expected to improve.
- The comment was made that there are errors in the information and neglected information that should have been analyzed; for example they don't have a full analysis of the effects of carbon sequestration.
- There was a question about extending the comment deadline. Send in your request and the BLM will consider it.
- When asked about the Forest Service Plan as FS lands about the BLM lands in many situations, they said that the FS plan is their No Action Alternative.
- The BLM suppresses all wild fires as they are checkerboarded in with private timber and residential lands.

- In checking their analysis and the Alternatives, Mr DeMoss said that they asked “what if” questions and analyzed Sub Alternatives. They also did bookend analysis from no cut to intensive cut.
- A suggestion was made to consider the Precautionary Principle. For example: What to do with the Biomass coming from full treatments, etc. Should it be burned or a way found to utilize it?
- They were asked if they considered the cost of controversy. The Forest Service has been working in collaboration with the community. The BLM seems to be going back to the path of most resistance. Ans: they have considered it.
- Comment was made that this plan seems to offer more land to off-road vehicles. They were unaware of this; they had thought the plan was more restrictive.
- Comment was made that BLM land is pretty much a managed landscape and it looks that way. Most of the stands are roaded and will remain that way. However, there are plans to build 1000 miles of new road. This is costly and detracts from the monies the counties get as they get from the net, not the gross receipts.

V. Oregon Chub Enhancement Project in the Upper Watershed – Ms Montanaro  
Postponed.

VI. Closing Public Comments – Ms Montanaro

Oct 9 – Education & Outreach Committee Meeting 3 to 430 PM. Lowell

Oct 24 – BOD meeting. David Atkin Seminar for Nonprofit Organizations. 6-8 PM. Lowell.

Nov 28 - General Council Meeting: Implementing TMDLS in our communities and Watershed  
Education for Our Schools. 630-830 PM Oakridge.

IX. Next Meeting

November 28, 2007

Oakridge High School

Oakridge, OR

6:30 - 8:30 PM

Meeting adjourned 8:30PM.

Barbara Hazen

Recorder