

Agenda 2  
Springer

April 24, 2009

Oregon Board of Forestry  
2600 State Street  
Salem, OR 97310

To the Board of Forestry,

My name is Gary Springer and I work for Starker Forests, in Corvallis. I am also a small woodland owner, helping to manage my family-owned property in the Coast Range of eastern Lincoln County.

As one of the survivors of the Forest Practices Act Advisory Committee (FPAC), which gave its final report to the Board in September of 2000, I would like to comment on Agenda Item #2 – FPAC Rule Concepts 8 & 12. Attachment 1 for this agenda item is a spreadsheet documenting the history (Sept. 2000 – today) of the 14 western Oregon and statewide forest practices recommendations delivered to the Board by our committee.

First I would like to say that I am not sure how the title “water protection rule concepts” originated. The FPAC made a variety of recommendations for forest practices changes that we thought would benefit fish and water quality, but we didn’t call them “rule concepts”. Our job was to recommend things that might be done differently to improve water protection and habitat for fish on forestlands and we recognized that it was the Board’s job to decide whether you agreed or not with those recommendations and which of them might be a better fit with FPA rule changes or voluntary actions on the part of landowners. Over the past eight and a half years this and previous Boards have made choices on which way to go with the various recommendations, with the help of ODF staff. Those choices and decision points are well documented in the spreadsheet. The title “rule concepts” perhaps reflects a rule making mindset that we still seem to be stuck with.

The last of the FPAC recommendations (concepts 8&12) are now before you. It has been a long road for the FPAC from its first meeting in early 1999 to here and it will be good to finalize that effort! As a member of that committee, I support the Department’s recommendation to include these last two concepts as voluntary actions in the Oregon Plan.

The original recommendation for concept 8 was to increase tree retention along small and medium Type F streams. At your direction and with landowner input, staff has evolved this “one size fits all” recommendation into a more adaptive, more active management oriented concept that will focus wood placement and tree retention along small and medium stream reaches that are especially productive for fish and where current wood levels are low. That is a good outcome.

Concept 12 evolved out of a concern about potential stream temperature increases following timber harvest along small Type N streams immediately above the end of fish

use in Type F streams below these sites. The FPAC recommendation to retain some level of trees along some distance of these small Type N streams was, quite frankly, a bit of a shot in the dark. Our committee didn't have much in the way of contemporary research to either support or discard the recommendation we made on this. The uncertainty around Concept 12 was recognized by the Department and is addressed on page three of your staff report.

The very best thing that has come from the FPAC recommendation that became known as "Rule Concept 12" are the three paired watershed research projects housed at OSU under the Watersheds Research Cooperative...and in particular the first of these projects to be launched at Hinkle Creek, in Douglas County. This study is also mentioned on page three of your report.

You may not be aware of the connection between Concept 12 and Hinkle Creek:

One of the other FPAC survivors is Dan Newton. At the time of the FPAC report, Dan was timberland manager for Roseburg Resources. He was very concerned about the lack of research data to back up the FPAC recommendations regarding headwater streams, both non-fish and the smaller fish-bearing streams. As a result of that concern and Dan's conversations with scientists at OSU about how to close this research gap, the Hinkle Creek Project was born. As it turned out, Roseburg Resources has an ownership in Hinkle Creek (in the Umpqua watershed) that is an ideal study site for a comprehensive paired watershed research project, focused on measuring cumulative effects of modern, industrial scale forest management and current Forest Practices Act protection rules on multiple downstream resources. The ten year study is now in its eighth year and a wealth of information is flowing regarding timber harvest effects on fish, water temperature, macroinvertebrates, sedimentation and more. This study is being complemented by similar, though more recent, projects in the Alsea and Trask watersheds.

I would very much encourage you to visit the Watersheds Research Cooperative website to learn more about the three paired watershed studies. Collectively, they represent the most important modern forest practices effects research being conducted in the Douglas-fir region. You can find the website at <http://watershedsresearch.org>.

Better yet, I suggest that you plan a Board visit soon to the Hinkle Creek Paired Watershed Study. Your July 23<sup>rd</sup> tour date would be perfect! This summer will mark the third year of post-treatment data collection, following the first series of timber harvests in the small headwater reaches in the south fork of Hinkle Creek. I have already talked to key people at OSU and Roseburg Resources about the possibility of a summer Board visit and they are eager to host you and help you to learn what they have learned in the seven plus years of this project. I have also discussed the possibility with Marvin, Jim Paul and Peter Daugherty. And I would be happy to help coordinate such a tour, if you haven't already scheduled that tour date for something else.

Gary Springer  
Starker Forests, Inc.