

Jim Fairchild September 25, 2023
31540 Homestead Road
Philomath, OR 97370

Supplement to my September 18, 2023 Council Meeting Written

Testimony Mayor Maughan and Corvallis City Councilors,

Thank you for inclusion in subsequent meeting records this follow-up on my hastily assembled testimony presented for the record for the September 18, 2023 City Council meeting. I would like to correct and supplement that written testimony, provided through an online form, with the following statement.

I believe the City Council erred in accepting the recommendation of Public Works Director Jeff Blaine that Corvallis Forest Stewardship policy decision-making be delegated to city staff. Policy advice is now determined solely by appointments made to an operational advisory committee convened by staff without review or consent by elected officials, counter to the language and intent of the Corvallis Municipal Code, Section 1.16.050. [https://library.municode.com/or/corvallis/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=COMUCO].

At the June 22nd Council work session reviewing Corvallis Forest Vision and Guiding Principles, Director Blaine used presentation time to denounce some public members giving testimony to its advisory committee, without citing any ill-informed or reckless comment. He did not relate the combative nature of Committee Chair and former Public Works Director Steve Rogers during public testimony. After its extended presentation, councilors did note to Public Works the absence of anyone on their advisory body with forest hydrology expertise (L. Chaplen), and requested revenue and expenditure data (G. Shepherd), points also previously made in public testimony. To date, neither request has been honored by Public Works. Committee Chair Rogers, seeing that Director Blaine would so freely sully public testimony at a Council work session, launched into greater refutations of testimony with patronizing and misogynistic dismissals of well-informed public testimony at the next Task Force meeting (27 July 2023). His public misbehavior and subsequent abrupt resignation however left a vacancy. This at least presented one opportunity to fill an identified need.

Public Works did not heed Council recommendations to recruit an already-identified gap in advisory committee expertise. It instead appointed a tree geneticist whose career has been dedicated to growing trees more quickly for tree farmers—hardly a need for stewardship of a natural forest system. Public Works also did not announce vacancies or accept applications for the three advisory body member positions whose terms were ending. So there continues to be no advisory expertise in terrestrial wildlife, forest hydrology, or ecological forestry—the state-of-the-art in forest stewardship for disrupted forests missing from the current Corvallis Forest Stewardship Plan (CFSP) [<https://www.corvallisoregon.gov/publicworks/page/corvallis-forest-stewardship-plan-cfsp>].

The question of where logging revenue goes also remains unanswered. Corvallis has yet to

correctly respond to an independent Public Records Request [PRR 14091647] for transaction level revenue and expense CFSP implementation I first filed on behalf of Audubon Society of Corvallis on July 8, 2023, although it has already accepted \$355 to provide two pages of annual summaries—information that was not requested.

Meanwhile, the Corvallis Forest Operational Advisory Committee (CFOAC) has not met since its inaugural meeting (Jan. 25, 2023). It has never been informed of any ongoing management activities, including an upcoming commercial forest operation involving the use of herbicides for planted conifer release from competing vegetation (ODF Notification #2023-551-10286). The current CFSP Standard & Guidelines [pg 46] requires advisory body review which would provide opportunity for public comment on 3-year action plans and annual operations plans, but this has been done or nor is anywhere in evidence. Since 2020, the continued absence of regular public meetings about forest management implementation and operations is also out of compliance with Forest Stewardship Council [Criteria 4.4, FSC-US Management Standard, pg. 20-22].

I therefore urge Mayor Maughan and City Councilors to rescind the delegation of the CFSP “update” revision from the CFOAC, and let it do its allotted work. The mayor, with advice and consent of Council, could then appoint a Task Force of those with needed expertise and interest to develop and recommend policy revisions of the CFSP for Council approval.

Thank you for your attention,

Jim Fairchild

Corvallis Municipal Code Section 1.16.050

Unless otherwise provided by ordinance, resolution, or Council policy, the Mayor has the duty to appoint all Policy Advisory Board, Commission, and Task Force members, subject to the advice and consent of Council.

(Ord. 2021-05 , § 2(Exh. A), 04/19/2021)

Forest Stewardship Council -US Forest Management Standard,

PRINCIPLE 4: COMMUNITY RELATIONS AND WORKER’S RIGHTS Forest management operations shall maintain or enhance the long-term social and economic well-being of forest workers and local communities.

Criteria 4.4 Management planning and operations shall incorporate the results of evaluations of social impact. Consultations shall be maintained with people and groups (both men and women) directly affected by management operations.

Intent: People “directly affected by management operations” may include: employees and contractors of the landowner; community members; neighboring landowners; anglers and

hunters; recreationists; local water users; harvesters and processors of forest products; and others identified to be affected by management operations. People consulted include men and women, ethnic groups and minorities, and all other stakeholders directly affected by management operations.

The Indicators in this Criterion address the need to include meaningful public participation in forest management. Public involvement is required in all forests under FSC-certification, including both the provision of public involvement opportunities as well as the provision of adequate information and communication. Depending on the nature of the issue, consultation may be required prior to an activity taking place or on a regularly-scheduled ongoing basis (e.g., annual meetings).

Indicator 4.4.a The forest owner or manager understands the likely social impacts of management activities, and incorporates this understanding into management planning and operations. Social impacts include effects on:

- Archeological sites and sites of cultural, historical and community significance (on and off the FMU);
- Public resources, including air, water and food (hunting, fishing, collecting);
- Aesthetics;
- Community goals for forest and natural resource use and protection such as employment, subsistence, recreation and health;
- Community economic opportunities;
- Other people who may be affected by management operations.

A summary is available to the CB.

Intent: This Indicator focuses on utilizing an evaluation of social impact to guide management

decisions. These evaluations analyze, monitor, and manage the social consequences of a project for the dual purpose of identifying and improving the negative or unintended consequences of forest management as well as maximizing the positive outcomes for stakeholders. Management activities that may have social impacts include but are not limited to: employment opportunities, harvest, access to land, fire, noise, traffic, and spraying.

Guidance: Social impact evaluations generally include the following three components: a) Assessment of baseline conditions of identified affected resources and social values; b) Identification and description of the activities which are likely to cause impact; c) Identification of the impacts, and how they will be perceived by different stakeholders.

Information may be gathered through the following means: Local community members and groups such as watershed protection groups, BMP committees, fire councils, outdoor clubs; consultation with archeological offices, tribes, universities; consultation with other affected groups; field inventories; municipal and regional plans, landscape biodiversity conservation plans; and cultural plans.

Indicator 4.4.b The forest owner or manager seeks and considers input in management planning from people who would likely be affected by management activities.

Indicator 4.4.c People who are subject to direct adverse effects of management operations are apprised of relevant activities in advance of the action so that they may express concern.

Intent: This Indicator focuses on stakeholder consultation in operations that may directly and negatively affect stakeholders, such as logging, burning, spraying or traffic.

Guidance: To apprise likely affected neighbors and other stakeholders of specific management operations, the landowner or manager may post signs or other measures that are readily noticeable by likely affected stakeholders but that do not necessarily require direct communication. Some situations may warrant direct communication.

Advance notice should be within a time frame appropriate to the situation.

Indicator 4.4.d For public forests, consultation includes the following components: 1. Clearly defined and accessible methods for public participation are provided in both long and short-term planning processes, including harvest plans and operational plans; 2. Public notification is sufficient to allow interested stakeholders the chance to learn of upcoming opportunities for public review and/or comment on the proposed management; 3. An accessible and affordable appeals process to planning decisions is available. Planning decisions incorporate the results of public consultation. All draft and final planning documents, and their supporting data, are made readily available to the public.