

The meeting was called to order at 7:30 p.m. by Chairman Henry Schwartz. All Board members, Doug Dodd, Edith Mastne, Jim Mastne and Joe Riehl were present; Budget Committee members, Bob Colclessor, Peter Grant, Klaus Heyne, Ed Hlke and Jim Leckron were present as were Ed Hendricks of Longview Fibre, Alan Smart of the USFS, Steve Alexander from LGPI, visitors Al Kimbley and Jerry Stomps, and Supt. Vance Hubbard and Dist. Clerk Carol Quinn.

The minutes of the last meeting were read and approved as printed.

Mr. Alexander explained to the Board how LGPI had arrived at the job descriptions and salary schedules contained in their job analysis report. They proposed a step system within the job categories. An employee needs to be on a step, and if necessary, they suggest adjusting to the closest step that will not result in lower pay. Employees were interviewed and filled out analysis questionnaires pertaining to their jobs. The Superintendent reviewed these as well. The Board can review the Supt.'s job description. He suggested job performance appraisals indicating whether the performance is acceptable, above expectations, or needs improvement where and how. The system they use suggests raises be based on per cent. Mr. Alexander suggested that the Board not formally adopt the job descriptions but acknowledge receipt of them to be used as guidelines or a communication tool. Mr. Dodd moved to discuss the Superintendent's job description at the next meeting. Mr. Mastne seconded. Passed. Mr. Alexander advised the Board that he would be available if the Board needed additional help or information.

Mr. Grant notified the Board that he had a petition for Rep. Wyden containing 200 signatures from people who didn't want total closure of the Gordon Creek Watershed as the Board had voted by asking to be included in the Bull Run Watershed Protection Act of 1994. He asked the Board if there would be additional cost to the District for fences, signs, patrol, etc. if the watershed is included in this legislation. He was advised that if this was done by Federal Legislation there would be no cost to the District. However, if on our own we insisted on this closure, the Forest Service could require funds for such items.

Mr. Colclessor informed the Board that he was very disappointed that they had voted to have Gordon Creek included in this legislation without more consideration and input from the community. He believes that a select group influenced this decision for the community and he asked the Board to reconsider this decision to be included in the legislation.

The Board read letters from Ron Bates and from Darren Martin asking for additional adjustment on their bills for the large leaks they incurred. Since the District estimated meter readings in February, both households and probably been leaking for two months. Mr. Riehl moved that Mr. Bates bill be reduced to average and he be advised that the Board suggests he instal a PSI Reducer at the meter to protect against future leaks due to the high pressure on this line. Mr. Dodd seconded. Passed with ~~one~~ abstention. Mr. Riehl moved that Mr. Martin's bill be adjusted to average. Mr. Dodd seconded. Passed with one abstention.

Under audience comments Mr. Stomps strongly critized the Board for its decision to ask to be included in the Bull Run Protection Legislation which will close Gordon Creek Watershed to public access. He was also strongly critical of the process by which the decision was made.

Mr. Hendricks of Longview Fibre asked the Board its position on private land within the watershed. He was advised that the legislation dealt

with public land and that they felt private property should not be effected or taken without compensation. Mr. Hendricks advised the Board that nearly all of the city of Sandy's watershed is on Longview Fibre land and they have gotten along very well. Gates have been installed on many of their roads to protect the watershed and their land from vandalism and threat of contamination. The logging has not hurt the water quality. He believes there is more threat of contamination from the Larch Mt. Road which has a lot of traffic than from foot traffic or logging practices within Gordon Creek Watershed.

There was some discussion regarding Section 13 being included in the area closed because it is not in our watershed. Mr. Smart advised that Section 13 was included because ONRC developed the map and thought they would go ahead with it as it would be a buffer. It was not a studied effort and the public didn't have a voice in its inclusion. Mr. Dodd moved that the Board write a letter asking that Section 13 be removed from the Legislation because it is not in Gordon Creek Watershed. Mrs. Mastne seconded. Passed.

Mr. Smart noted that there has not been a timber sale in our Watershed since 1979. There has been some thinning and blowdown taken. A timber sale allows for five years to complete the contract. He mentioned that the gates that were shifted in the past were done so for reasons--as a response to legislation regarding trespass into the Bull Run not an effort to trash the Gordon Creek Watershed. In 1972 the Forest Service made an effort to develop an MOU with Corbett Water District but it was never signed by the Board. The Forest Service has recognized Gordon Creek Watershed and has recently encountered a rapidly shifting situation. It is public land and it is not common to close public land. Since 1991 the Forest Service has been willing and has tried to be cooperative and has been willing to make some changes. He mentioned that there is some exception language that could be included in the Wyden bill.

Mr. Mastne based many of his comments and his fears on dealings with the Forest Service previous to 1990 and he says there is nothing in the regulations to stop the Forest Service from opening the Watershed to recreational use in the future. Mr. Smart advised that it cannot be reopened simply on a whim--that to do so would take process and time just like closing it has taken time. He also advised that the position of the Forest Service on land management has changed from primarily timber harvest to ecosystem management. There are also stricter regulations because the area is a special-emphasis watershed. Mr. Smart said that the DEQ is preparing a report on the testing site contamination.

Mr. Leckron asked if the Board's request to be part of the Bull Run Legislation would stall the negotiations for an easement on the South Fork pipeline installation. He was told that Mr. Brand of Frank Lumber said he wouldn't negotiate if the Board sent such a letter. However, it is now in the hands of our attorney and their attorney and it appears that negotiations are proceeding.

Mr. Hendricks mentioned that as a citizen he would like access to public land and stressed that he didn't feel foot traffic is a watershed threat.

Mr. Kimbley stated that he feels that land is too precious to limit it one use that that controlled logging would be beneficial to the watershed and the public. \$1,000,000 is being appropriated in taxes to manage the Bull Run and there will be no revenue from logging to compensate.

At 9:45 p.m. the regular monthly Board Meeting was suspended in order to reconvene the Budget Committee Meeting begun at 6:45 that was suspended

at 7:30 p.m. to proceed with the Regular Monthly Board Meeting. See attached minutes of the Budget Committee Meeting.

The Regular Monthly Water Board was reconvened at 10:40 p.m. Mr. Dodd informed the Board that he had asked Cloudy Sears to work for him with Evelyn Weill on the education/conservation water program at the school.

There was some discussion of the time frame necessary to implement the rate increase necessary to be in effect July 1, 1994. A letter needs to be sent to customers informing them of the need for the rate increase and a public hearing must be held before such an increase can take effect. The public hearing must be advertised within a certain time period.

Mr. Hubbard again emphasized it is improper procedure for an individual Board member to order information or services without Board approval. If there is a cost for such an item, that Board member can be held personally responsible for payment. The responsibility of the Board is to establish policy not administer it. It can be difficult and be a problem to conduct District business and find that individual members have intervened in the process. It was a surprise to contact Mr. Tye regarding information only to be told he had already been approached by two Board members separately ordering this information. It has also been a surprise to come to Board Meetings to have speakers ready to make presentations on issues and have not been notified that this was going to be taking place because it was ordered on an individual basis, with no knowledge or authorization of the staff or Board.

An executive session had been scheduled to discuss salaries for the coming budget year but because of the late hour, Mr. Mastne moved to reschedule it for the May Meeting. Mr. Dodd seconded. Passed.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:00 p.m.

