

**Marys River Watershed Council**  
**Board Meeting**  
**January 13, 2009**  
**6:30 -8:30 PM**  
**Philomath City Hall**

Meeting started at PM

**Introductions and Announcements**

Board Members present: Jennifer Beathe, Ken Crouse, May Dasch, Bud Laurent, Curt Seeliger, Mark Taratoot, Wayne Phillips, Thom Whittier,  
Contractors present: Sandra Coveny and Karen Fleck Harding  
Guests present: Jim Fairchild, Jana Seeliger, Michael Wolfson, R. Foster, Stacy Moore, Steve Northway, Joy Gipson.

**Reports**

**Secretary**

There were no additions or changes to the previous report.

**Treasurer**

Bud handed out a custom summary report and a balance sheet that was produced by our current accountant, Ann White. She is experienced in non profit accounting and is here to talk about and explain the MRWC books, financial statements and balance sheets.

The board discussed the \$50,000 gift to the MRWC that is earmarked for projects in the Beaver Creek basin. The board wants to make sure that the funds from the gift are separate from other MRWC accounts so that they are easily tracked. The board agreed to invest the funds in two laddered CD's.

**Council Coordinator**

There were no additions to the written report. Curt asked about the change work order on the Rock Creek project. Sandra explained that the contractor hit bedrock when excavating for the project, so the design had to be modified during construction. There were additional meetings to make sure that all parties in the project were/are satisfied with the change in design.

**Education and Outreach**

There were no additions to the written report. Bud asked how activities are posted on the website and thinks that projects should be highlighted there. Mark said that the easiest way is to create a PDF and send it to him to be posted. Bud thinks it should be the

responsibility of a designated person to get information about events to Mark to be posted on the website. May asked about the Newton Ck wetlands and asked about the status of the purchase by the Marys Peak Natural Resources Interpretative Center. Karen informed the board that the Interpretative Center group no longer holds the option to purchase the land because they were not able to make the payment this year. It is unknown what the landowner will do with the site. She added that there is an understanding that the wetlands are a protected area irregardless of who owns the land. Curt asked about the Greenberry Irrigation District (GID) projects. Karen said that meetings and discussions are occurring about who will be the applicant and fiscal agent for the grant proposal that the GID hopes to submit to Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board (OWEB) in April.

### **Chair report**

Thom has met several times with Karen and Sandra. He also reported that he went with Bud and Sandra to Salem to work out some reporting issues ODFW. Additionally, he met with Bud and Wayne.

### **Benton Soil and Water Conservation District Contribution**

The funds for the \$1000 contribution to the MRWC will be released to the council when we send a letter to the SWCD stating how the council plans to utilize the money. Board ideas include onsite biological surveys, general support (postage/printing), grant/organizational development, or moving to larger office space. The board agreed to write the letter designating the funds for project development and printing and mailing costs.

### **Website updated**

Mark said that he is going to be working on the website to clean it up a little bit and also with Karen to make some ongoing updates.

### **OWEB Council Support Proposal**

Sandra asked if anyone else (Bud and Thom are already planning to review the grant proposal) would like to be part of reviewing that grant. Sandra said that there are no decisions to be made at this point and that no new council commitments are not included in the proposal. Curt offered to help review the proposal. Sandra was asked to send it out to Karen and the full board.

### **Benton County Prairie Species Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP)**

General discussion regarding the involvement and role of the MRWC in relation to the Benton HCP. So far the MRWC has had a primary objective of assisting with

outreach and education regarding the Benton HCP. It has not been the objective of the MRWC to take a position on the HCP.

A 90 day public comment period began on January 9<sup>th</sup>. The HCP can be viewed online. Jim Fairchild commented that there is a stakeholder advisory committee charter and wanted to convey to the Board that there is a presumption that participating groups are accepting or supporting the HCP as it is now. Sandra asked if the charter was signed by anyone and it appears that it has not been signed.

Karen told the board that the stakeholder advisory committee has been inconsistently attended though not at the fault of the planners. There have been efforts by organizers to solicit input, but because of sporadic involvement, there hasn't been sufficient time to discuss questions or issues. The committee meetings are open to the public and there has been citizen attendance/comments. The committee was never a consolidated decision making party.

Thom suggested inquiring to our membership if anyone wants to look into this issue more and make a recommendation to the board.

Karen reminded the board that the MRWC role is that of outreach and public process rather than the taking a position on the content of the proposal.

Bud suggested that there needs to be a new way of habitat restoration that is less bureaucratic and can make it easier for landowners to improve wildlife habitat.

Steve made comments about the HCP and its impacts on listed species. He noted limited opportunities for public comment.

Thom asked how we should we move forward as a council?

There are three public meeting that are scheduled this month for the HCP. Do we want to have our March outreach meeting be another opportunity for the public to get involved in the HCP? Discussion on whether or not to have a forum.

Board voted to organize a meeting for March that will be a forum about the HCP.

The board noted that the format of the meeting should make sure that there is a specific focus and to possibly make people suggest alternatives to the HCP or what should be different rather than to simply disagree with the current draft HCP.

### **Other suggested meeting topics**

- Land use issues/City of Corvallis land
- Water use forum.
- Conservation easements
- Headwater streams; Steve Trask, BLM, USFS/NEPA in the Marys River Watershed

The meeting adjourned at approximately 8:50 PM