

Watershed Advisory Board

City of Lafayette Council Chambers

January 9, 2001

Meeting Minutes

1. **Call to Order:** The meeting was called to order at 6:30 P.M.
2. **Members Present at the Meeting:** Kathi Futornick, David Breneman, Travis Johnson, Stan Hill, Sue Picciano, Dean O'Reilly, Gary Johnson, Ron Ross, Andy Bryant, Carol Paddock (substituting for Travis Johnson).
3. **Others Present:** Walter Forster, Phil Lieberman (City Administrator).
4. **Approval of Meeting Minutes:** Dave Breneman corrected the minutes from 12-19-00 to indicate that he was present at the meeting. Gary Johnson moved to approve the minutes with the 1 correction; Ron Ross seconded the motion. The minutes were approved unanimously.
5. **Report from the Public Access Subcommittee.** Carol Paddock presented the following: The committee wished to add the public survey to the water bill, but the bill had too many inserts. Phil expressed concern that there would be an expectation of public access. The focus should be on determining the possibility of public access to the watershed. Walter Forster commented that there should be a discussion of the "right" to enter the watershed and that it is illegal to not allow access. The discussion continued regarding rights of citizens vs. the City's concerns for protection of the water supply. Phil stated that it was important to look at the costs of "public access" together with preferences. Andy asked if there was a budget committee within the City who could help with grant writing? Phil stated that there was a budget committee and emphasized that revenues from logging in the watershed in the future were "zero"; and he saw that to be the case for the next 20 years. Phil stated that there would be a budget meeting on the 30th; this was a preliminary budget presented by staff. Andy stated that a "no growth" Urban Growth Boundary (UBG) is not allowed. The City needs to complete an inventory of buildable land. Phil stated that at the town hall meeting (Senators Wyden and Smith) he discussed that tax limitation measures were catching up with low income communities. The discussion then returned to the Public Access Survey led by Carol Paddock. Kathi suggested that the survey be looked at in two phases: (1) useful data to the WCAB to evaluate environmentally sensitive areas: (2) a second survey identifying issues that the citizens would want to pursue. Stan reiterated that the committee should focus in on issues it wants to pursue. Ron commented on previous discussions regarding recreation and that we don't need to discuss recreation at every meeting. Sue noted that Carol was doing all the work. Andy confirmed that as a member of the subcommittee it helped to have a deadline. Walter commented that the committee could go for something more moderate than a park e.g. hiking trail. Discussions continued regarding arboretum, dangers to water supply. Carol closed the discussion by saying that she will work on the information survey and provide it to Phil and Kathi.
6. **Continuation of Subcommittee Report – Chemical Management.** Andy and Carol provided a handout. Jenkins at OSU was contacted as an expert on chemicals. The use of chemicals is complex because we are dealing with drinking water. Phil stated that Bob Long would get information on where recharge areas are located. The questions that need to be answered for City Council are: how do chemicals degrade? How much could get into the water column? Council will want general recommendations and specific action items; cost information and a clear statement that this will not impact drinking water. Discussion continued on the "critical recharge area" and that the committee members did not have a clear idea on where this areas was located. Andy distributed MSDS sheets for chemicals under consideration. Carol stated that chemicals should not be used in the critical recharge area and to use them selectively elsewhere. Andy stated that the committee will also recommend future plantings. Carol - we need to control blackberries perhaps chemically by cutting and then placing

chemicals on the cut area. Andy stated that it would violate the manufacturers recommendations and environmental requirements if the chemicals were to make their way into waters of the state. We should take a look at larger buffers and it was suggested that 100 ft. to 150 ft. be considered. Carol mentioned that mats to protect seedlings need to go down soon. Phil commented that 4500 more trees were ordered. Andy agreed that trees need to be planted to replace the dead trees. Walter recommended that redwoods be planted. Andy continued with Walter's previous suggestion of an arboretum. The Forest Management Plan would be a 100 year plan and maybe we should look at pre-settlement forest with oak savannah. Dean mentioned that some stands should be considered that are pure maple, pure oak and mixed. Phil mentioned that the WCAB proposing forest plans that would reduce the potential for harvestable timber would be a problem. Andy stated that the goal would be to get trees up, protect water quality and heal the area. Maybe selective thinning and not clear cuts would be recommended. Dean stated that he would like to see a "type map" completed and would need the latest topographic map to begin the planning. Andy stated that with regard to chemicals, the City has until April 15th to decide and that a 10 day permit would be needed which means the City Council needs to approve by April 1. Andy stated that cost estimates are needed. Can the WCAB use county inmates, volunteers? There is a concern for liability. Stan stated that Arsenal costs about 8-10K (45 acres); Garlon (berries, contact spray), Accord; 2-4-D (broadleaf plants, contact chemical). There were four herbicides recommended by Cliff Barnhart. Arsenal/Accord are priced at \$90/acre (\$3600); OUST/ACCORD at \$55/acre (\$2200). OUST is good for pre-emergents e.g. grasses, seedlings, broadleaves. Throw out Arsenal/ACCORD and use only if brush are tall as this will set trees back one year. Labor rate is typically \$18-22/hr. The breakdown is \$8-10/hr for comp. rate; the workers are paid \$10/hr; the contractor receives \$1-1.50/hr. Need an insurance certificate. It's difficult to find trained crews. We are targeting a survival rate of 400 trees/acre. Carol discussed manual treatment at 5-10 times the cost. Manual removal might last 1 month or a summer. Chemicals last longer. Mats would cost \$.45 to \$.75 depending on size, 3x3 or 2x2 respectively. Ross asked if mulch would be possible? Stan suggested that we consider spraying outside of the critical recharge area only (.72 square miles). It was estimated that if mats were placed in the critical recharge area, 38 acres x 300 = 11,400 trees (2x2 mats) = \$5,000 without installation. Mats also do not get rid of blackberries. Stan stated that Bob Long did not believe there was a problem with chemical use. That is was important to protect the areas near the spring box with mats and then spray everywhere else. 5 acres would require 1500 mats x \$.45 per mat = \$675 for mats. Ron motioned to protect the subarea within the critical recharge area using polymats to protect the springbox(es): 5 acres + 1 acre. Sue seconded the motion. Discussion included Andy stating that a big buffer should be near the spring. The motion approved with Andy abstaining.

7. **Actions.** Carol would contact Jenkins about which chemicals are safe. He mentioned that there could be political fallout with the use of chemicals within a watershed. It was recommended that other watershed management areas be looked at e.. McMinnville, Newberg, Portland. Stan would call the watershed managers regarding use of chemicals.
8. **The meeting was adjourned at 9:30 PM.**