

Board of Commissioners Meeting
January 6, 2010

Present: Commissioner Mark D. Davidson
Commissioner Steve McClure
Commissioner R. Nellie Hibbert

Call To Order

Chairman Davidson called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. with all three Commission members present.

Public Comments

PGA Presentation

Bill Rosholt, Director of Golf Promotions and Economic Development, and Scott Marcum, Head PGA Professional at Buffalo Peak Golf Course, came to the Commissioners to inform them that Scott Marcum has earned his PGA Professional accreditation. Commissioner Hibbert presented the PGA Professional plaque to Scott Marcum and thanked him for the work that he does at Buffalo Peak and taking the time, effort and money to earn his PGA Professional title.

Scott thanked Buffalo Peak Golf Course and Union County for the support that they gave him while he was in the process of earning this title.

Census Bureau

Shannon Remily, U.S. Census Bureau Regional Partnership Coordinator, came to the Commissioners to talk to them about the upcoming 2010 Census. She presented information on the Census and explained how important it is for everyone to be counted. She asked the Commissioners to support the Census and help educate the public of its importance.

2009-11 CCF Partnership Agreement

Vicky Brogoitti, Director of Commission on Children and Families, brought a partnership agreement between the Oregon Commission on Children and Families and Union County for consideration. The biennium started July 1, 2009 and the partnership agreement was intended to be in place at that time. Because of some changes that took place the agreement was pulled back from County review and taken before the Association of Oregon Counties Human Services Committee for review of those changes. The State wanted all of the county Commissions to be engaged in five functions which are the functions that the State Commission should be engaged in to successfully complete their work. Those five functions are Comprehensive Community Planning and Implementation, Policy Development, Community Mobilization, System Development, and Service Delivery Improvements. Vicky explained that Union

County is covering each of the functions with about the same level of intensity and focus. She stated that the agreement is asking the County Commissioners to review the Commission's plan in even number years.

Commissioner Hibbert stated that Vicky has done a good job with the level of funding that she has had available.

Commissioner McClure moved approval of the Partnership Agreement between Commission on Children and Families and the State of Oregon for 2009-2011. Commissioner Hibbert seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Transferring of Outstanding Warrants and Checks

Court Order 2010-07, In the Matter of Transfer of Outstanding Warrants and Checks, was presented for consideration. Donna Marshall, Accounting Manager/Treasurer, stated that there was a law passed where entities were to report checks that have not been cashed to go to the State in a centralized area. The purposes are consumer protection and to provide a centralized search. The money is held in trust forever for owners or heirs. Interest earnings from funds held are distributed to the schools through the common school fund. The amount that Union County is reporting in unclaimed funds is \$871.95. **Commissioner Hibbert moved approval of Court Order 2010-07. Commissioner McClure seconded. Motion carried unanimously.**

Consent Agenda

The December 10, 17 and 24 claims journals; and the December 9, 17 and 23 Public Works claims journals were approved as presented on the consent agenda.

Appointment to Grande Ronde Model Watershed Board of Directors

Court Order 2010-01, In the Matter of Appointment to the Grande Ronde Model Watershed Board of Directors, was presented for consideration. Shelley Burgess, Administrative Officer, stated that this Court Order would re-appoint Anna Cavinato to the Grande Ronde Model Watershed Board of Directors. **Commissioner McClure moved approval of Court Order 2010-01. Commissioner Hibbert seconded. Motion carried unanimously.**

Appointment to Union County Ambulance District Advisory Board

Court Order 2010-02, In the Matter of Appointment to the Union County Ambulance District Advisory Committee, was presented for consideration. Shelley Burgess, Administrative Officer, explained that this Court Order would appoint Daniel Johnson to serve as a Union representative on the Board. **Commissioner Hibbert moved approval of Court Order 2010-02. Commissioner McClure seconded. Motion carried unanimously.**

Appointment of Official Newspaper

Court Order 2010-03, In the Matter of Selection of an Official Newspaper, was presented for consideration. Shelley Burgess, Administrative Officer, stated that this Court Order would designate The Observer to be the official newspaper for 2010 since it is the only newspaper in circulation within the area. **Commissioner McClure moved approval of Court Order 2010-03. Commissioner Hibbert seconded. Motion carried unanimously.**

Appointment of Engineer of Record

Court Order 2010-04, In the Matter of Appointment of an Engineer of Record for Union County, was presented for consideration. Shelley Burgess, Administrative Officer, stated that since there is no engineer employed within the County an engineer of record is appointed. **Commissioner Hibbert moved approval of Court Order 2010-04 appointing Howard Perry, as Union County's Engineer of Record. Commissioner McClure seconded. Motion carried unanimously.**

Appointment of Budget Officer

Court Order 2010-05, In the Matter of Appointment of a Budget Officer for Union County for Fiscal Year 2010-2011, was presented for consideration. This Court Order would appoint Shelley Burgess, Administrative Officer, as the Budget Officer. **Commissioner McClure moved approval of Court Order 2010-05. Commissioner Hibbert seconded. Motion carried unanimously.**

Appointment to Health and Human Services Advisory Committee

Court Order 2010-06, In the Matter of Appointment to the Union County Health & Human Services Advisory Committee, was presented for consideration. The order appointed Paul Kangas to the Health and Human Services Advisory Committee. **Commissioner Hibbert moved approval of Court Order 2010-06. Commissioner McClure seconded. Motion carried unanimously.**

Agreement with Public Transit Division Oregon Department of Transportation

Shelley Burgess, Administrative Officer, presented an agreement between Union County and the Oregon Department of Transportation Public Transit Division for consideration. This is the agreement for the Special Transportation Operating Formula Program. This agreement allows Union County to accept the funds for the Special Transportation Funds that have been approved by the Special Transportation Advisory Committee. This is a biannual agreement for \$67,864 to be passed on for transportation services for seniors and people with disabilities. **Commissioner McClure moved approval. Commissioner Hibbert seconded. Motion carried unanimously.**

May Park Ditch Company Dissolution

Hanley Jenkins, Planning Director, stated that this is a continuation of a process that was initiated in May 2009. There was a letter received that requested the County initiate the dissolution process. Hanley explained that it was complicated

since there is no formal May Park Ditch Company. The Statutes require that when there is no formal company the dissolution process must be initiated. There was a hearing held by the Commissioners where Resolution 2009-13 was adopted which started the dissolution process. A dissolution plan had to be created. There are funds in an account that needed to be transferred to the County. Those funds are to be used for all of the property taxes and outstanding commitments of the May Park Ditch Company. The Commissioners are acting as the board for the May Park Ditch Company. The funds in the bank are \$1,995. The funds will be used for any final Ditch Company expenses. Hanley brought the Bargain and Sales Deed to the Commissioners for consideration, which would transfer the property the company owned to the County.

Commissioner McClure asked if the Commissioners will no longer serve as a board for the May Park Ditch Company once the process is completed. Hanley stated that the Commissioners will no longer serve as the board because the May Park Ditch Company will be dissolved. **Commissioner McClure moved approval of the May Park Ditch Company Bargain and Sales Deed. Commissioner Davidson seconded. Role Call: Commissioner Hibbert: abstain, Commissioner McClure: Yes, and Commissioner Davidson: Yes. Motion carried.**

MERA Trails Unit Timber Management Plan Proposal

Hanley Jenkins, Planning Director, explained that there was a group of citizens that made a request to have the opportunity to raise funds to purchase two-thirds of the timber value on the Mt. Emily Recreation Area Trails Unit. The Commissioners recommended to the citizens that they make a presentation to the Non-Motorized Advisory Committee. The citizens presented their work on the development of a Forest Stewardship Plan. That document was reviewed by the Advisory Committee and they made recommendations to the citizen group as well as the Board of Commissioners. Their recommendations to the citizen group included that they remove any references to grazing in the report, they needed to identify benchmarks and assessment protocols, they needed to create proposed management regime, and they needed an economic forecast over time for timber management on the property. The citizens went back and made those changes to the Forest Stewardship Plan. The Commissioners received copies of the revised Forest Stewardship Plan for their review. The Non-Motorized Advisory Committee did vote to recommend the Stewardship Plan to the Commissioners in concept. The Advisory Committee felt that the citizens were moving fast enough that they could not make a recommendation on the details of the plan. The citizens are interested in having in place a stewardship plan that is adopted in some form by the County before they try and secure funding to buy two-thirds of the timber value. The citizens feel that this is something that they can use when they go out to granting sources to try and secure funding that demonstrates the commitment to how this unit would be managed. The County has received correspondence from Forest Capital that states that they need a commitment

from the County that demonstrates that the County has the means to purchase the two-thirds timber value on this unit by February 1, 2010. The acquisition must be completed by March 30, 2010. Hanley explained that this unit is scheduled for harvest this year. The purchase sales agreement between the County and Forest Capital does provide the opportunity to purchase timber value by unit so this is one of the five remaining units that have yet to be harvested on the Mt. Emily Recreation Area

John Warness, Regional Manager of Forest Capital Partners, came to the Commissioners to answer any questions that they might have.

Commissioner Davidson asked John if he knew the amount that it would cost to purchase the timber. John stated that the last published random lengths was in December and he thought it was around \$242 so it would be a total of about \$540,000 for this unit. The random lengths amounts are published weekly so he is not sure where it will be by the end of February.

Commissioner Davidson opened the public hearing for testimony.

Dr. Karen Antell, Eastern Oregon University Biology Professor, explained that she was contacted to help with a stewardship plan for Mt. Emily Recreation Area Trails Unit. There was about a ten day window of time to get the plan done before the next Advisory Committee meeting. She explained that they started with a stand analysis of the area. The group presented the plan to the Non-Motorized Advisory Committee and there was some good constructive feedback and recommendations. They tried to make a plan that would be acceptable to as many users as possible for the area, the County as well as granting agencies who may be able to secure some funds for purchasing the trees. She explained that they understand the time deadline is short but a management plan is needed regardless of where things proceed from here.

Dr. Antell explained that the Forest Stewardship Plan intended to manage the area for forest health, forest diversity, wildlife, and recreation and aesthetics. There are opportunities for timber harvest potential. There are individuals who would like to see the area locked down but the group that put the plan together does not think it is the best thing for the area. The forest will benefit from active management on an ongoing basis. Through the stand analysis that was done some of the stands were identified that timber removal would be beneficial. They see opportunities for timber extraction especially around the perimeter areas adjacent to private land owners to create a defensive fire boundary. There is a large amount of data that can be relied on for future planning. She explained that as they looked at the timber management strategies they based them on using the Forest Services stocking tables to predict at what point the stands will be entering the management zones that are recommended by the Forest Service. There are a few stands that are above the stocking levels so they would

recommend some reduction in the timber for those stands. She stated that their goal is to try to manage the area to bring all of the stands into the recommended stocking levels that the Forest Service uses and promote long term growth of the area. There is potential for this area fifteen years down the road but there is little potential currently for reduction. During their research they discovered that most of the area was harvested five to ten years ago. That is why most of the stands will take a while to reach the upper management zone stocking recommendations by the Forest Service.

Commissioner Hibbert asked if Karen could give her a percentage of how much of the timber could be harvested immediately. Karen stated that she would have to figure out the percentage.

Commissioner Hibbert asked if they are recommending that there be grazing on the land. Karen stated that they did not want to recommend anything about grazing. She suggested that there be a separate plan for grazing.

Peter Farnam, 903 O Avenue, La Grande, stated that he is a small woodlot owner in the County and a contributor to the stewardship plan. He commended the Commissioners for moving so quickly on this matter. It was only a month ago that a small group of citizens presented comments encouraging the Commissioners to consider purchasing the timber on the Trails Unit. In the few short weeks since a group of resource professionals took on the task of writing the management plan that if adopted will allow the Trails Unit to keep the extraordinary natural qualities that exist there today while addressing several stewardship goals. The goals and objectives listed in the plan were developed with the intent of preserving and improving the resources that exist on the trails unit that have been used and appreciated by a large cross section of County residents for years. Among the resources is the scenic view offered by the unique quantity and quality of large diameter trees that have been nurtured there by past stewards. There is an extensive network of trails that are used by hikers, bicyclists, and horseback riders. He believes that the quality of these and other resources will be seriously diminished if the scheduled logging takes place. In the event that the timber is cut, the County will be responsible for the increased maintenance and rehabilitation costs resulting in soil disturbance, the opportunistic growth of weeds, brush and small trees. He understands that there is a small window of opportunity in which to commit to buying the timber from Forest Capital. Once the County has done so he believes they can raise the necessary funds to meet the obligation through a combination of private donations, grants and sustainable prescriptive harvest of timber. Union County will have taken the first step in creating a valuable and lasting legacy for future generations of Union County residents.

Catherine Bola, 60522 Bushnell Rd. La Grande, stated that she is a property owner adjacent to the Trails Unit. She is in agreement with the proposal and she

believes that it is entirely consistent with the County's original intent for the recreation area. She agrees that if the timber is harvested by Forest Capital as planned the County would inherit some long term issues for which they would be responsible for financially. Catherine explained that she observed the recent timber harvest on the Fox Unit and she doesn't think that the result of that harvest is beneficial to recreational users and won't be for a long period of time. The impacts of timber harvest at that level relative to the goals that were originally set for the area needs to be looked at.

Diane Lewis, 62139 Fruitdale Lane, La Grande, explained that she uses the area for recreation. Her understanding of what is being discussed at this meeting is whether to adopt a management plan so that the citizens can go and try to find the funds to purchase the timber. There are a lot of knowledgeable people who have worked on the plan. She feels that the community is lucky to have all of this nature around and it is not appreciated that it can be lost. Diane stated that the timber should not be harvested in such a manner for the quality of life. She asked the Commissioners to approve the plan so the funding can be found.

Cheryl Cosgrove, 407 Main Avenue, La Grande, explained that she wants to speak as a registered nurse that has worked in the County for thirty-one years. She has been involved in trying to recruit physicians and also people that work in radiology. One of the key drivers to bringing people to this area is the beauty of Union County. It is not the financial reward because physicians can make a lot more money outside of Union County. Obesity and poor health is plaguing the American population. Children are playing video games and not getting out in the woods. They are not eating well and not having the role modeling necessary to keep them healthy and fit in the future. She asked the Commissioners to consider the plan and to save the trees.

Gary Koegler, 1105 Antles Lane Cove, stated that he is on the fence on this issue. He asked the Commissioners if they were to purchase these trees and they harvest these trees in a sustainable fashion would the money go to the County. Commissioner Davidson stated that the money would go to the County who would own the trees and the money would be reinvested back into the Mt. Emily Recreation Area for management and improvements. He asked how the area is going to be logged. Commissioner Davidson stated that by reading the plan it sounds like it will be conventional logging methods that will be used. Gary asked the Commissioners if the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife will be involved in the analysis of the management of the area. Commissioner Davidson stated that there are two advisory committees for the Mt. Emily Recreation Area, Motorized and Non-Motorized, and there are representatives for the U.S. Forest Service, Oregon Department of Forestry, and Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife on each of the committees. Gary stated that he would like to see the area as a multiple use area.

Mike Gooderham, 61946 Black Hawk Trail, La Grande, stated that he opposes taking part of the recreation area out of what he voted on as a voter. He does not agree that there should be a sub-plan inside the master plan. He suggested that the voters should decide whether another management group should manage part of the area. Preservation is a word that is used very freely and throughout the woods economy. The County knows better than anyone else that public land timber is not harvested at the rates that it used to be. The timber harvests used to pay for part of the schooling and the County road maintenance. It doesn't happen anymore because people want to preserve part of the timber. That doesn't show up in revenue and doesn't come off public land. He would like to see no diseased trees or wildfire in the area. He likes the idea of what Forest Capital has gone out of their way to assist the County in developing this which will serve everyone's purpose particularly recreation. He believes that if the plan is going to be changed or adapted it should have the input of all the voters and not just special interest groups in the community.

Ed Barton, 91 Walnut Street, La Grande, stated that he is a taxpayer and he thinks the creation of the Mt. Emily Recreation Area has been a good thing and he supports it. He is in opposition to the plan that has been presented. He thinks that the concept that was presented and voted on by the citizens of the County with the rules stated therein that this piece of property would be managed for recreation and other multiple uses as well as timber harvest which is a source of revenue and a source of timber for local processing facilities is a good thing. He stated that to shortcut or intervene in that process with a plan that has been formulated over a few days by people who may or may not be experienced in the creation of such a document is risky. He would like to know where the money would be coming from to pay for the timber. He knows that grants are tight now so he is not sure where the special interest group will be coming up with the money to purchase the timber. Ed pointed out that some people have fascinations with big old trees. He was a Forester for a living and he knows that big old trees are generally a liability. He opposes this plan. Commissioner Davidson stated that Union County does not have the money to purchase the timber. The proponents are asking for the Commissioners to adopt the plan so they can go out and raise money to purchase the timber.

Vince Naughton, 62404 Igo Lane, La Grande, stated that he worked for Boise Cascade for years and was a Forester so he is familiar with the area. The timber will grow back and he thinks that Forest Capital has done a good job of marking the timber. They left plenty of big trees that he wouldn't have left if he was marking the property. He has to agree with Mike and Ed that the community voted for this because the County was going to manage the timber. He is totally opposed to preservation of the trees. He explained to the Commissioners that he believes the area can be managed but not with this management plan.

Bruce Rynearson, 62289 Owsley Canyon Road, La Grande, told the Commissioners that there have been some good comments from people who are familiar with the industry. He is not totally in opposition but he thinks there is a problem with creating a management unit within a management area. He would feel a lot better if there was this much effort in the community right now to see that his grandchildren have a good education. He thinks that people lose sight in what the true priorities should be in this area. The population in Oregon is declining and it is good to get tourism in which helps everyone. He thinks that population is declining for a reason and that is jobs. He believes that there is no way the County can dodge the bullet of not spending extra money because under this plan there would need to be a resident forester to manage the area. The area was purchased in a high real estate market and it is being logged in a low timber market. That was out of many people's control.

Dan Pokorney, Washington Street, La Grande, stated that he likes the recreation area. He explained that he also likes jobs. The citizens voted on the logs going into this community to help the people that process them not just the logs but all the other residuals that go along with that. He doesn't use the area but he believes it can be managed by the people that are going to log it. It is what is best for this community for jobs and livelihoods. The recreation and the scenic value will not change.

Karen Antell explained that the group that put together the management plan did consider the wildlife habitat needs. She did not point it out in her discussion with the Commissioners but it is in the report. The Oregon Conservation Strategy is represented in the report which is an ODFW document. She explained that ODFW did not have any direct involvement in the plan but they did follow the provisions of the Oregon Conservation Strategy which identifies priority habitats and species of concern in the State of Oregon. She stated that the Trails Unit of the entire Mt. Emily Recreation Area represents 13.5% of the entire area. Karen addressed the concern that one of the citizens had about education. She said that it is no longer the era of unlimited resources. It is essential to learn how to conserve and how to use the resources available. She has never used the word preserve. She teaches in her classes the difference between the concepts of preservation and conservation. Conserving resources and learning how to use them wisely will ensure they are available forever. Conservation comes first so there will not need to be preservation. Education is a critical component of what should be occurring on Mt. Emily regardless of the outcome of the timber harvest situation. Karen explained that they tried to come up with a plan that addresses the sustainable needs for the community opposed to a short term plan. Her hope is that the forest will continue to thrive and grow and there will be opportunities to extract timber resources generating some income for the County while also maintaining the opportunity for education and how to best manage the resources. When the land was purchased by the County there was not a lot of data about the land. The more that is learned and understood about the property the

management plan should be adapted to use the best practices. The area should not be managed all the same because there are different areas that have different uses. The management plan recommends timber removal from eight out of the fifteen stands within the next five years.

Catherine Bola stated that in terms of opportunities for employment the current situation in which Forest Capital is harvesting the trees were proposed to be logged within the next few years. So, there would be a limited number of jobs that would be available during the harvest of those units then the jobs would be gone. It would be a short time window where the current plan would actually provide jobs. As opposed to a continued stewardship program over the long term which would provide for harvest within this particular unit over a number of years so she believes there is a misconception of availability of employment. She understood that the advisory committees were there for the continuing need for management decisions and should situations change that those committees would be able to advise changes in the management plan. The primary driver for the Mt. Emily Recreation Area is to provide quality recreation on that property. She believes that areas that are being harvested by two-thirds of the timber is not a quality recreation experience. A reasonable timber harvest can be maintained under this plan and still provide a quality recreation area.

Mike Gooderham stated that it sounds like the Trails Unit might reflect more acreage in the Mt. Emily Recreation Area. He hasn't read the plan but it looks like it is going to spread to some other units rather than just being for one unit. Mike explained that some of the best forest management has been integrated since the 1940s fire of the Tillamook burn. It has grown up and gone again. It is a well managed forest that has been under appeal to try to establish new old growth segments again and they can't begin to get through the legal part of it of trying to make that an agricultural crop and produce wood fiber off the Tillamook forest. He would like to commend Forest Capital for adhering to the Oregon State Department of Forestry and the State of Oregon's forest practices plan in their management of their land. The County bought the package of forest management that Forest Capital developed when the land was purchased. He would like to see that management plan of Forest Capital happen rather than the new proposal.

Louise Squire, 69804 Squire Loop, Cove, explained that she voted for the MERA because she wanted to see it preserved as a recreation area and she was disappointed that it had to be logged as much as it has. She is excited of the possibility that there can be this one small section that people can use the area for recreation with the beauty that it has now. She would like the Commissioners to preserve the area.

Peter Farnum stated that the Commissioners asked in the development of the plan what some of the projections of growth and potential harvest might be. He

explained that the group did what they could to provide projections in the plan. He hasn't heard anyone talk about the projections for the same elements for the rest of the Mt. Emily Recreation Area that has been harvested. The figures should also be looked at for MERA as a whole given that the harvest has happened. How much production and future revenue will be available for the County if something different is not done.

Diane Lewis stated that the point that the plan is being looked at now is so that the citizen group can go out and look for donations to purchase the timber and be able to say to them that it is the plan so they know what their money is going towards.

Commissioner Davidson then closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Davidson stated that he feels it is unfortunate that this is happening in such a short period of time. The plan is remarkably different than what Mary McCracken had proposed to the Commissioners. The way he understood what Mary was asking for was to preserve what was there and limit the grazing. This plan does make recommendation for harvest and treatment and if the Commissioners choose includes grazing. He thinks it is unfortunate that the Commissioners haven't had an opportunity to circulate the plan and allow the people who are here today in opposition to have a chance to read it.

Commissioner McClure stated that when the Commissioners went to the vote of the people they expressed that this would not be locked down. They expressed that the land would be actively managed for timber, grazing and other activities. His opposition to the initial proposal is that it was a lock up and it was not acceptable to him. The question is if this plan is acceptable. When the Commissioners went to the vote of the people they were still looking for revenue sources to purchase the timber. The Commissioners were not successful in securing funds to purchase the timber. He also thinks that it is unfortunate that more people have not had the chance to read the plan that is being proposed.

Commissioner Hibbert stated that she would cautiously support the stewardship plan going forward. She has indicated on many occasions at all of the hearings and to whoever wanted to visit with her about the subject that she could only support the purchase of the Mt. Emily Recreation Area if it were used for multi-use. Her position on that has not changed. She supports grazing, recreational opportunities, harvesting and other uses. She is concerned that by extracting a small amount of the whole and beginning a different management style that she would be violating what she said she would support as a Commissioner. She would like to say that she feels that this plan is very well written given the short time that was given to write it. She stated that the fifteen sub-lots that were addressed nearly every one of them indicated that they had been harvested within a five to ten year period, but they were found to be in excellent condition.

She thinks that validates what Boise Cascade has done and the management plan that has been out there. For the Commissioners to go in and try to do something different would be difficult for her to support. As far as educational opportunities she would like to see that the educational opportunities continue with the multi-use management plan that she is hoping the County will adopt. She would like to manage the land most effectively and believes it should be managed as a whole rather than by small lots.

An audience member asked if a management plan has been formalized. Commissioner Hibbert stated that there is a management plan that is being worked on but it is not formalized at this point.

Hanley Jenkins, Planning Director, stated that the recommendation from the Non-Motorized Advisory Committee was to adopt the Stewardship Management Plan in concept and not adopt the specifics of the management plan. The advisory committee recommended that the Commissioners recognize that this stewardship plan provides a greater level of detail and prescription for this unit than anything the County has at this point. It can be used as a vehicle to pursue funding for acquisition of the trees in the Trails Unit recognizing that the time period to do that is short. Forest Capital has told the County that they have to make a commitment to them by February 1, 2010. The Advisory Committees recommendation was not to adopt this plan.

Commissioner Hibbert stated that she feels like adopting such a plan takes the Commissioners out of the management of the area. She feels that they are losing site of what Union County stepped up to do which was to manage.

Commissioner Davidson stated that he wouldn't support anything that would take the decision making or management away from the Board of Commissioners.

Commissioner McClure stated that he agrees with the other two Commissioners that he would not support giving the authority to anyone other than the Commissioners.

Hanley explained that the question was asked of Karen Antell at the Advisory Committee meeting and the answer was that it is their position that the County is responsible for the management and implementation of any plan that would be adopted. It is not their intent that another group would have management responsibilities.

Commissioner Davidson asked if the County's partners such as Oregon Department of Forestry had an opportunity to review the plan and give the Commissioners any comments. Hanley stated that the document was just received a few days prior to the meeting. Mark Jacques from the Oregon Department of Forestry was able to go through the first draft of the document.

Commissioner Davidson stated that he would like to know how different this plan is from something that would be developed for the way the County would manage the entire area after it was logged.

Mark Jacques stated that he did look over the original plan that was presented at the Non-Motorized Advisory Committee meeting. He has not gone through the plan in a lot of detail but the actual implementation of a management plan is not simple. It would be difficult to say that this plan would be real close to or substantially different from what the final plan might be for MERA in terms of overall timber management. If the additional two-thirds of timber was purchased the plan would have to address a different type of timber stand than what the rest of the MERA property might have after harvesting has occurred. The important part of any management plan for MERA should start off with the overall objectives of the Commissioners and the management of that land. Timber harvest would be occurring on an ongoing basis to maintain forest health and maintain the recreational value and what ever other objectives that the County might have. He sees that there is an opportunity for timber harvest in the plan and it is keeping a working forest working. Those elements are in the plan to harvest some timber and the County just needs to figure out to what extent they feel comfortable in taking on.

Commissioner Hibbert asked how close the management plan is to being done. Hanley stated that both advisory committees are working on elements of the management plan but are not working on the forestry part yet. They are only working on the recreational elements at this time.

Commissioner Davidson stated that the plan that was presented to the Commissioners has eight sub-units to be harvested. He asked how that exercise compares in volume to what two-thirds of the volume coming off would be.

Karen Antell stated that there is a number of board feet which is 4.1 million board feet. Two-thirds of that would be 2.4 million board feet.

Commissioner Davidson stated that this plan that is being presented is estimating 500,000 board feet be harvested which is less than 20% instead of the 66% that Forest Capital's plan is proposing to harvest.

Hanley stated that in the conversations the Commissioners had with State Forestry preceding the purchase of the property there was a distinction between a stewardship harvest and an industrial harvest. A commercial harvest would be a two-thirds harvest which is what Forest Capital is planning to do. A stewardship harvest would be a one-third harvest. This stewardship plan is recommending less than a stewardship harvest level. The management objectives and goals were more important to the Advisory Committee. Hanley believes that it is those

goals and objectives that the citizen group is interested in the Commissioners embracing in order for them to go out and pursue donations and grant funding.

Commissioner Davidson asked Mark Jacques if one-third of the volume is the general standard for a stewardship harvest but that would vary based on stand conditions. Mark stated that the harvest is done based on what is best for the overall forest health for the stand. Sometimes it may be less than one-third and other times it could be more than one-third. The objectives can dictate how much harvest is done as well.

Commissioner McClure stated that if the Commissioners are going forward with a timber management plan it should be based on the fact that this area was purchased for recreational purposes. He believes that it should be understood that most of the money to purchase this property came from State Parks for recreational purposes so the recreational purposes should be a major consideration when a plan is developed.

Commissioner Hibbert stated that when the property was purchased Union County knew that they would only be purchasing one-third of the timber value so it wasn't any surprise that there is two-thirds that could potentially be harvested.

Commissioner McClure stated that he doesn't feel the plan is that far off of what the County has been talking about and is willing to look at the plan more in depth.

Commissioner Hibbert moved that Union County continue with the objectives as they were stated at the time the property was purchased and continue to manage the land for multi-purpose which is to include harvest, grazing, recreational activity and all other activities as designated by the Board of Commissioners. Commissioner Davidson seconded.

Commissioner Davidson feels that the question is if the Commissioners want to give the group of citizens something to take forward to try to raise the money. He believes they can come to a compromise in the amount that is harvested and still meets the criteria that the Commissioners set forth for the management of the property.

Commissioner Hibbert stated that she is fearful that the community group will want more micromanaging of the forest than this plan is addressing. She is concerned about the concept. When she supported the project in the beginning it was that Union County would do the management for this along with the two Advisory Committees.

Commissioner McClure stated that when they went to the vote of the people there was no plan in place. The County's intent was to find the funds to do a stewardship management plan. The County could not secure the funding so the

timber is owned by Forest Capital and would be harvested by their management plan which is an industrial harvest. He is not sure that he would be willing to support the details of this plan but he would be willing to support a plan that would identify some of the things that are considered in this plan. He has no problem putting in a condition that there needs to be at least a one-third harvest of the timber on this site. He wants to make sure the management would remain with Union County.

Commissioner Davidson asked if Commissioner McClure would add those criteria to the goals and objectives that are in the proposed plan. Commissioner McClure stated that he would add them to the objectives. Commissioner Davidson then asked Commissioner McClure if he would take out any of the objectives from the presented plan. Commissioner McClure stated that he would have to look at the plan in depth to make that decision.

Roll Call on Motion: Commissioner Hibbert - Yes, Commissioner McClure - No, Commissioner Davidson - No. Motion failed.

Commissioner McClure would like to table to look at the plan in more detail but feels that a decision needs to be made soon.

The matter was tabled until Jan. 7th at 11 a.m. for further consideration.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 12:56 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Ashley Wilhelm
Department Specialist