

**Long Tom Watershed Council  
Board of Directors Meeting  
Thursday, April 4, 2013  
751 S. Danebo Ave., Eugene, OR 97402**

Present: Mike Brinkley, Steve Cole, Cary Hart, Jason Hunton, Beth Krisko, Max Nielsen-Pincus, Jim Pendergrass, Therese Walch (8)

Absent: Sue Kacskos, David Ponder, Charles Ruff, Deborah Saunders Evans, Chad Stroda, David Turner (6)

Staff: Dana Dedrick, Rob Hoshaw, Jed Kaul, Katie MacKendrick

Guest: Virginia Grilley, BLM District Manager

Meeting called to order at 5:33 p.m. by Chair Jim Pendergrass

**Business**

**A. Approve March 2013 Board of Directors Meeting Minutes – Secretary Cole**

Jim asks for any comments, questions, or changes.

**MOTION TO APPROVE MARCH 2013 BOARD OF DIRECTORS MINUTES  
by M Nielsen-Pincus, seconded by T. Walch. Approved unanimously.**

**B. Approve February 2013 Financial Reports – Jim for Treasurer Brinkley**

**Profit & Loss Report** – The February income was \$3,048 from donations. Our income was low, which makes sense because we're not getting reimbursed for a lot of project activity right now. Normal payroll accounted for most of our expenses. Professional Services, Accounting line item paid for our annual fiscal review and IRS form 990 payment. Contracted services and website/database work accounted for much of the rest of the expenses. February saw a net loss of \$38,652.

**Balance Sheet Report** – shows a year-to-date loss of \$155,000 through Feb 28, but cautions that finances are tracking as expected. We will receive new revenue that will show up on the March fiscal reports, including prepaid grant funding. **Dana** concurs, and adds that we will receive \$90,000 for an Owens Creek restoration grant soon because the permits will be in. We are waiting on permits to clear first (need permits in for all projects before you can receive OWEB funding). Meyer Memorial Trust is also prepaying the next year of the Model Watershed Program and Amazon Creek Pesticide Stewardship Partnership grants. Adds that May's board meeting will include a Quarter 3 budget vs. actual report

**MOTION TO APPROVE FEBRUARY 2013 FINANCIAL REPORTS by M.  
Nielsen-Pincus, seconded by B. Krisko. Approved unanimously.**

**Jim** asks if we're prepaying accounts payable (in reference to Statement of Cash Flows). **Dana** explains that it always looks like that due to credit card

payments. **Max** comments that we earn very little interest, and **Dana** concurs, adding that we earn only .02 or .03 percent interest. The percentage is very low right now because it's a low interest rate environment. **Jim** feels this will be a continuing trend for the foreseeable future. **Cary** asks if it would be wise to invest in a 6-month CD. **Dana** explains that the interest rates are not good on those right now either, but that it's a good point overall - we made \$5,000 on an initial \$60,000 grant for the Amazon Initiative that we invested in a CD. When we last checked the rates were better on our Money Market account so we kept the funds there.

### C. Committee Updates

#### a). **Resource Development** –*Dana for Deborah*

##### Campaign Update

Mentions that we achieved 100% Board Giving, and thanks everyone for their contributions.

The fundraising event brought in more than double the gifts from last year, and our campaign numbers are looking great overall. The remaining steps for the campaign are 1) finish major asks in April, and 2) send out general letter asking for support in May. All campaign efforts end June 30.

Campaign stats to date:

- Almost \$15,500 total (only a couple thousand short of \$17,500 goal).
- Average gift is \$186.40
- Range of giving is \$20 - \$2,100

**Mike** – asks if there are outstanding pledges; **Dana** responds that one or two of Deborah's contacts have pledged to give, and we now have recurring gifts from two different donors (one monthly, and one quarterly).

##### Cutthroat Migration Study Investment

**Dana** announces exciting news. Dick Evans, who is the brother of project landowner Maryrae Thomson, has pledged a private investment to support the Cutthroat Trout Migration Study for \$15,000 over two years. (Lots of enthusiasm from the board). Adds that one of our goals is to write a professional article through a volunteer and Tech Team member at the U.S. Forest Service. Dick used to live out on Ferguson Creek, and he is currently a retired CEO of an aluminum company and lives in San Francisco.

**Mike** mentioned how excited someone was to hear that we had found cutthroat in Amazon Creek

**Dana** adds that this type of investment is a different kind of giving than we've had before.

**Jim** asks how we're going to recognize Mr. Evans' contribution. **Dana** explains that it's something we'll have to think about.

**Cary** asks how grant funding will be used for the project. **Dana** explains that we ran out of grant money to keep the Cutthroat Migration Study going. Funders don't pay for equipment or staff time to run the study anymore. Mr. Evans' donation is going into a restricted fund, and will pay for Jed's time as the fish biologist and Rob's time to coordinate the volunteers.

#### Thoughts on March 20 Fundraising Event

**Jim** thought the level of engagement was really good, and staff did a good job of circulating and talking with the guests. Thought it was a plus to have so many staff and board there because it helped them understand how committed we are. Enjoyed Derek Johnson's talk; he had some good humor and added to the tenor of the event. It had a different feel than last year's event.

**Dana** adds that we actually missed inviting more people, especially at first when we decided to invite only the people targeted for gifts of \$250 and above. This may have thrown off our RSVPs somewhat, but we also found out that some people have Spring Break during the third week of March. She received a lot of early RSVPs from people who would have otherwise come but were heading out of town. Learned that we can't have events in late March.

**Jason** noted that he talked with Derek Johnson a lot, and felt he was really engaging. Derek feels public service is expected of him. Agreed that the different venue was nice this year.

**Mike** enjoyed the wine & hors d'oeuvres and had fun talking with people who were there.

**Dana** added that a couple people came who hadn't RSVP'd, but that added to the guest total and was good. John Allcott, for instance; he was really interested in talking with Jed. Was fun to see how two prominent families with different generations (Huntons' & Johnsons) came from different backgrounds (urban and rural) but have so many ties to the watershed. Thanks Charles for helping out with the Hilton connections, the donated room, and setting up the food. He even made the truffle butter.

#### **D. Paperwork Moment – Secretary Cole**

Collected Board volunteer match hours forms.

### **Program Topics**

#### **E. BLM Resource Management Plan & Process – Virginia Grilley, BLM District Manager**

**Dana** – Introduces Virginia (Ginny) Grilley, the District Manager for the Eugene District of the Bureau of Land Management (BLM). Notes that watershed councils in Oregon have come a long way in their involvement of diverse stakeholders and

partners, and the experiences watershed councils have had with working with a variety of people and ideas is part of the reason that Ginny Grilley is interested in speaking with us. Notes that LTWC is very grateful for the donated space we receive from the BLM at the Red House. Adds that the BLM is the only government agency with a significant land management imprint in our watershed and this district does a diversity of work.

### Background

**Ginny** Explains that the Eugene BLM is in the process of constructing a new Resource Management Plan (RMP) for O&C timber lands, and thinking of ways to engage people differently than they have during the public comment periods of previous RMPs.

Shows map of the local districts, including the Siuslaw Resource Area within the Eugene District. Indicates the “checkerboard” ownership on the map. Explains that this checkerboard pattern is a legacy of western expansion, when these lands were granted to the O&C (Oregon & California) Railroad. Originally, the idea was to sell the land to settlers at a very low price to raise funds for construction of the railroad, but conflicts with the Railroad company returned most of these lands back to the federal gov’t. Compromises with Western Oregon Counties led to the 1937 O&C Act, the BLM is designated to manage these lands for sustained yield of timber while protecting watersheds and providing recreation. Half of the receipts generated from these lands would be shared with Western Oregon Counties to offset the lack of a tax base.

(The BLM was created within the DOI in 1946 combining the general land office (which had been managing the O&C lands) and the grazing service. National Forests are managed by the U.S. Forest Service and the Department of Agriculture.)

**Jason** comments that he heard the U.S. Forest Service didn’t receive control of the O&C lands because of logging opposition in the Northwest. **Ginny** understands that the 1897 Organic Act for the Forest Service created most National Forest boundaries. **Cary** notes that there was quite a political battle over the lands.

**Ginny** adds that the O&C lands are still under conflict. The Eugene District BLM manages about 314,000 acres from McKenzie Bridge out to the sand dunes along the coast in Florence. The BLM in general manages 2.2 million acres in western Oregon, which is primarily managed for timber, but there are some other areas such as the West Eugene Wetlands. The Eugene District has 140 employees, which is fairly small for the six districts in Oregon. Notes that the West Eugene Wetlands is a precious spot to manage because it’s very unique, and comments that they couldn’t do it without the partners. Western Oregon is one of the most productive softwood growing places in the world. Timber land was harvested heavily in the 1930s through 50s, which is reflective of the stand composition (young, dense) on the District today. The BLM did regenerative harvests in the 1980s and 90s, but stopped due to public concerns. Regeneration is a harvest type where stands are clear cut and then replanted, typically with bare root seedlings. During the last 15

years, the BLM has mostly done thinning within the young stands. The BLM provides jobs and timber products, and with the thinning, fewer protests.

### Why the Need for a Resource Management Plan?

Notes that the history of the Northwest Forest Plan (NWFP) in 1994 brought together the ideas of conservation, biology, and forest management. Timber harvest was part of that plan. Land management was also guided by the 1976 Federal Land Policy & Management Act, which Congress passed with the goal of a variety of uses on public lands while still managing the land for natural resources. With these forest management plans, the government found that our waters were getting colder, fish were returning – all things the watershed councils have helped with. Northern Spotted owls have not increased since the Northwest Forest Plan due to many factors, including the influence of the Barred Owl. One downside is that the NWFP hasn't facilitated the harvest of much timber and hasn't provided as many jobs and receipts to local communities.

The Western Oregon Plan Revisions (WOPR), finalized in 2008, revised the NW Forest Plan. The Secretary of the Interior at that time decided not to implement the WOPR. There is continued controversy over both the NW Forest Plan and the WOPR. There is new science regarding population dynamics for the Northern spotted owls. In addition, the expiration of congressional appropriations to counties (Secure Rural Schools) has increased demand for timber receipts to support county government.

### Resource Management Plan

Ginny shows a map of the Long Tom watershed, where the yellow areas are the BLM lands (mostly in western Bear & Ferguson basins, and upper Coyote Creek basin). Notes that the BLM is the largest land owner in the watershed except for Lane County (due to all the road right of ways). Weyerhaeuser is third. The BLM has a lot of timber thinning sales in the watershed. Adds that they're completing a Resource Management Plan for the West Eugene Wetlands as well.

The Resource Management Plan (RMP) for Western Oregon BLM lands was initiated last year. Projected to be completed by 2015, this RMP would govern land management throughout O&C lands. Under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), an RMP must be informed by an Environmental Impact Statement, which has many procedural requirements, including public input. . The first round of public comments was completed in July 2012.

The next stage in the process is to open the RMP up again for public comment, which is likely to be in June. . It's highly unusual for an RMP to be completed in 1.5 to 2 years. Her new boss, Jerry Perez, would like the public comment process to be different this time and wants to gain social acceptance from the public, though they're not sure how they're going to do that.

### Potential Role of Long Tom Watershed Council

Ginny notes that she's here to ask if the Long Tom Watershed Council would like to be engaged, and if so, how. Thought that this meeting would be a good forum to hear ideas. The BLM has also hired a contractor to manage public involvement, but she's not sure how that will work yet. Notes that LTWC has had lots of experience working with the public successfully through stakeholder-based solutions. Likes the history of LTWC's work under the Oregon Plan. She would like to have more engagement from the public as long as it can be effective; hoping for better results. The Bureau of Land Management appreciates the relationship it has with LTWC and would like to continue to engage LTWC on this subject

### Discussion

**Jim** notes that we've had BLM staff speak at public meetings.

**Dana** asks Ginny when alternatives will be considered and when would they like to hold stakeholder planning with LTWC.

**Ginny** – Phase 3 of the RMP is looking to shape a purpose and need within the next three weeks.

**Cary** hopes that a lot of the initial work from the WOPR is brought back and that the process doesn't have to start from scratch. Asks why the Secretary of the Interior and President decided to do away with the WOPR.

**Ginny** explains that the Secretary reasoned that the BLM didn't consult the Endangered Species Act about the Northern Spotted Owl. Two courts had two different opinions, and when the administration changed, they decided to go in a different direction.

Adds that the economies of local counties are getting pretty severe; they just got the final payment for Secure Rural Schools last month. Lane County was getting about \$50 million that went towards rural schools five years ago. This year, that number was only four million. Having that money in the counties' general fund is important because the money isn't restricted and can be used for anything. For that discretionary fund to mostly go away has meant a big hit.

Notes the O&C Act of 1937 was the first environmental law that recognized "sustained yield" of timber, and saw timber as renewable. The goal is to not sell more than what's growing. In the Eugene District, the BLM produces 52 million board feet/year. On Western Oregon O&C lands timber growth is about 1.2 billion board feet/year.

**Cary** feels there's room in a sustained yield plan.

**Dana** states she was told by another BLM employee that the Long Tom watershed would be facing a larger amount of harvest relative to other watersheds because we don't have a lot of endangered species present in our watershed.

**Ginny** is confident that 90% of BLM lands in the watershed are within critical habitat for spotted owls. Probably at least 95% of this is managed for owls. On the east side of I-5, much more logging is planned because this area is less important for spotted owls.

**Jason** asks what 50 million board feet is worth. (After Cary & Steve do some rough calculations – somewhere in the broad ballpark of \$10 billion). **Ginny** adds that the counties receive about half of those sale receipts.

**Dana** notes that Bill Hatton at the BLM said the Long Tom Watershed would face more logging pressure. **Cary** notes that we have large stream buffers and doesn't feel this watershed would feel more pressure relative to others. Adds that plans for an economically viable regen harvest plan has been thought of before. Old growth will not last forever because trees will eventually die.

**Ginny** - early seral habitat is very fertile and brushy. Private industry doesn't manage for early seral habitat because it's less efficient. Notes that a project in the Coburg Hills is a regen harvest, but it doesn't look like a standard clear cut. There are clumps of old growth trees with clearcutting around them. In instances of root rot, the trees are dying anyway, so it makes sense to clear them out. Planting rot-resistant trees in those areas.

**Cary** asks if regen harvest will become part of plan. (Yes, likely).

**Max** - presuming 90-95% of our watershed is critical habitat, what other revenue options are there? At EWEB, for instance, it will cost \$50-80 million to build new treatment facility to improve quality at their intake on McKenzie River. There is real value in clean water coming from McKenzie.

**Cary** asks if there's a problem with clean water on the McKenzie. **Max** – no, but there is the potential concern with future development. We've well surpassed the initial development goals. **Cary** has read that the primary threats to clean drinking water are septic tanks, pharmaceuticals, and development – not forestry.

**Ginny** adds that we have to be consistent with the Endangered Species and Clean Water Acts. We do an analysis to make sure we're consistent.

**Mike** asks if the BLM only replants a site with Douglas fir after timber harvest.

**Ginny** - no, the species mix varies on site condition. **Mike** feels that approach provides a much more sustainable, healthy forest. **Ginny** explains that Douglas firs do love to grow here and do very well – so much so that they can't keep them out of harvested areas even with low stocking percentages. They naturally seed themselves. In some cases, 10 years after a harvest Douglas fir are growing close together and 20 feet tall from natural seeding. It's too expensive to remove those.

**Jim** - In regards to soliciting public input and engagement, asks if the BLM is assuming that the existing plan will stay in place with the goal of tweaking the plan, or is the entire plan being reshaped?

**Ginny** – feels that parts of the NW Forest Plan is working, but has not met the needs for a predictable timber supply. The BLM wants a predictable supply of timber and jobs that was also not achieved in the NW Forest Plan.

**Jason** asks about the population of spotted owls. **Ginny** isn't sure. **Cary** adds that the main issue for spotted owls is that barred owls, moving in from the east, are pushing out spotted owls. Asks if critical habitat would preclude management on those lands.

**Ginny** – no, we have one project for ecological sustainable forest within critical habitat. Not sure how native fish & wildlife will respond, but the BLM has been given the green light to move forward with it. Feels it's difficult to remove trees in critical habitat and not receive push back. This project area is a ridgetop harvest because the nearby riparian buffers are really big; the land is too steep to showcase to the public for comment.

**Jim** – asks what level of timber sales the BLM wants. **Ginny** – notes that her boss is not focused on that question. The first question is how to manage habitat for endangered species (birds, plants, fish). Spotted owls can move from Cascades through corridors north of Roseburg/Cottage Grove to Coast Range, so that area south of Veneta is an important corridor. Owl numbers are tanking now due to lots of barred owls.

**Mike** asks what happens after the BLM thins late successional reserves (LSR).

**Ginny** – anything over 80 years of age in LSR is left alone.

**Dana** asks if this is the level and type of discussions Ginny is looking for in a workshop.

**Ginny** states that she would like to hear basic interests associated with BLM management (e.g., clean water, butterflies, sustainable income to counties, etc.). She's more interested in what we're interested in than in opinions about timber harvest levels.

**Dana** adds that if the BLM talks with the right people, they're willing to help develop solutions to maximize both timber harvest and wildlife, especially when you include people coming from different perspectives. We're very respectful in this watershed council of other people's needs and perspectives.

**Cary** adds that there's a lack of information about what exactly will happen on the ground. People really don't know and understand. Suggests the public comment process could be a sounding board for helping people understand, and the BLM could actively listen and help fill in the gaps of information.

**Jim** – adds that it's easier to provide perspective if people understand the objectives and plan as it sits in more detail. Reiterates that it would be helpful to know if the revisions are tweaking the current plan due to spotted owls or if this is a wholesale revision. Adds that species conservation, watershed restoration, helping out schools, etc. are all great goals, but what matters is how all of those goals are put together to maximize the potential for each one without jeopardizing the others.

**Ginny** – LTWC has experience moving through conflicting issues, and would like to take advantage of it. **Dana** asks if it's fair to say the goal is to increase timber production, and advanced science can help us increase production in places. **Ginny** - the BLM's goal isn't to increase timber harvest, though it is the goal of the governor and county. Goal to maintain a sustained yield. We can't maintain sustainable harvest off reserves only.

**Cary** – wildlife biologists & ecologists are recognizing unsustainable things with early seral habitat too. Not all native species can use closed canopy habitat.



**Mike** asks how long can you wait to harvest before you essentially create an LSR? **Ginny** - that depends on market conditions, but about 7 years on average. Explains different forest management terms:

- Matrix – managed for sustained yields (timber plantations).
- Late Successional Reserves (LSR) – looking to enhance old growth forest.
- Riparian Reserves – timber areas along streams managed for habitat and water quality.

**Jason** notes that a relative showed him plot of land during 1981/82 that looked like old growth, but it was logged in 1938, and the size of the timber was phenomenal.

**Dana** notes that LTWC would like to invite our Technical Team to this workshop. Feels that it would be beneficial if people put themselves in the position of a BLM land manager and thought of ideas to work with all these goals and needs. Adds that the watershed council has people capable of thinking on a broader scale and are also interested in learning from one another.

**Jim** adds that we bring diversity to the board, and could offer a broader perspective.

**Dana** – asks if the group is interested in participating in a workshop with the BLM. Many people nod in assertion. Suggests holding it at the June Board Meeting. Asks Cary & Steve their thoughts.

**Cary** feels it's a big and complicated issue. Will think about it some more.

**Therese** asks how public becomes aware of a draft RMP. **Ginny** – media outreach, radio, internet site, and through public meetings. Consultants & people would come in and mark on maps what they wanted done in certain areas. The goal is to draft the RMP for June 2014 and ask small and large groups of people for their input. After that, synthesize input, revise plan, and make a decision in the summer of 2015. After that the public will have another opportunity to comment.

**Cary** asks if she feels things will change politically by then. **Ginny** – notes that we'll have a new Secretary of the Interior.

**Mike** asks if there is a significant difference in the way the BLM and Forest Service manages land. **Ginny** – the goal of the Forest Service is to manage species across their range and in theory is more restrictive for timber harvest, although the BLM manages very similarly. The underlying legislation is very different, but the overall management is similar.

**Mike** asks what the setback requirement is for streams. **Cary** – at least 50-100 feet on a fish bearing stream.

**Jason** points out on the map that there are parcels of BLM land north of Fern Ridge that are near his home and farm. **Katie** - those units are called North & South Taylor and Long Tom ACEC (Area of Critical Environmental Concern). These parcels are near the Johnson & Erickson properties where we've done restoration work.

#### **F. Slideshow on Restoration Projects upcoming this summer – Katie**

Katie presented on the upland oak, prairie, and wetland projects that are underway or upcoming this summer, highlighting three projects at the Brown's, Watkins' and the South Marsh Prairie. The Watkins' property is near the Mattson's along Territorial Hwy (close to Sweet Cheeks Winery & Briggs Hill Rd), and they have two streams – Coyote and Nighswander Creeks. Twelve acres of oak habitat was enhanced, and over one mile of riparian habitat was improved via fencing and planting native vegetation. The Browns' own a smaller parcel of oak habitat southwest of Eugene, but the proximity to other oak habitat projects, particularly the Kime project, made it a higher priority for restoration. A combined 24 acres of oak savanna and woodland is being restored. Finally, Katie talked about the South Marsh Prairie project, owned by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers just south of Fern Ridge Reservoir and Hwy 126. We're restoring 69 acres of wet and upland prairie, and 15 acres of oak woodland. A significant challenge is the removal of many acres of Reed canarygrass.

There were some questions that Katie answered during the presentation.

#### **G. Public Meetings & Events** - *Therese*

**Therese** (speaking of the March 19<sup>th</sup> public meeting), felt there was lots of good conversation. Wished more people would have attended. Felt Melisa Nicol was a perfect person to tie together the holistic themes of healthy bodies and a healthy environment. She was very positive. Noted that she spoke about the City's Stormwater Program and Amazon Creek water quality. Holde Fink, of Native & Urban Gardens, generated the most questions and conversation.

**Dana** notes that it was another Spring Break meeting, and feels that had something to do with the low turnout. Felt Jason's and Therese's presentations were really good and complemented each other perfectly. Saw several new people. Felt there was good engagement and discussion. We're trying to call and chat with new attendees. Wants to get the word out about meetings. We went door to door with flyers in businesses.

**Beth** suggests calling it an "event" instead of a meeting because "meeting" isn't an attractive word, and not something most people want to attend.

### **Reports & Announcements**

#### **H. Staff Reports**

**Dana** notes that staff reports are in the background of the board packet. Adds that we've brought on Jane Christen from the UO as our new Marketing & Communications Intern. She'll be starting for us in April.

Also holds up the new Trout Friendly Landscaping sign, which will go to all the Amazon Creek stormwater projects and people who get their properties certified as "trout friendly." Thanks Jason H. for finding the idea of the sign.

#### **I. Board Member Reports**

None given.

**J. Action Items Summary**

None requested.

Meeting adjourned at 7:36 p.m. by Chair Jim Pendergrass

Notes prepared by Rob Hoshaw, reviewed by Dana and Steve, and submitted by Steve Cole.