

**ARCH CAPE DOMESTIC WATER SUPPLY DISTRICT
FOREST MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE MEETING
MINUTES: Wednesday August 2, 2023**

1. Attendees:

Committee Members – Pat Noonan, Clark Binkley, David Dougherty, Mike Ardington, Doug Caffall. Board Representative – Bob Cerelli, Ben Hayes, Daniel Wear, Bill Campbell

2. Public Comments: None

3. Select chair and vice chair:

No committee member currently has the time availability to commit to the work of Chair or Vice Chair, but will consider. As such, Bill Campbell, acting as staff for the Committee and not a Board member, facilitated the meeting.

4. Organization of Forest Management Committee and Finance Committee

The Finance Committee, whose members have Finance expertise, will operate as a subgroup the Forest Management Committee, whose members have forestry expertise. Clark Binkley is a member of both committees. Members of the Forest Management Committee are encouraged to attend and participate in the Finance Committee meetings, and Finance Committee members are encouraged to attend the Forest Management Committee meetings.

4. RFP – Roads Contract Manager (*Attachment*)

With the upcoming road work and with Ben leaving, Ben recommends soliciting proposals for forest road engineering and project oversight. The proposed budget for these services is \$45,000 in year 1 and up to \$30,000 in year 2.

Recommendation to Board: The RFP drafted by Ben was approved for submission to the Board with the following revisions:

- a. **Reporting:** Will have a contractual reporting relationship to the President of the Board of Directors and will have a functional reporting relationship to the Project Manager.
- b. **Expertise:** Will have local knowledge of the geology of the area and road construction contractors that provide services to the municipal watersheds in the area.
- c. **Budget:** \$45,000 in year 1, with a no RFP renewal of up to \$30,000 for year 2.
- d. **Bidding Process:** Will follow federal procurement regulations and will be approved by Business Oregon
- e. **Selection Criteria:** Criteria for selecting successful bidder will be added.

Action Item – Committee members will send a list of recommended firms / people to whom the RFP should be sent.

5. RFP – watershed overall project manager. (*Attachment*)

Overall Project management responsibilities have been spread across springboard consulting, sustainable northwest and the district manager. With Ben’s departure and Matt’s primary focus on the utilities, those responsibilities need to be consolidated. Any suggested refinements to the RFP? Any suggestions of possibly interested firms / people?

Recommendation to Board: The RFP drafted by Bill Campbell was approved for submission to the Board with the following revisions:

- a. **Reporting:** Will have a contractual and functional reporting relationship to the President of the Board of Directors and will have an advisory reporting relationship to the Forest Management Committee and its Finance Committee subgroup.
- b. **Expertise:** Will have public procurement contract management experience in the state of Oregon and will have experience of executing contracts which are aligned with federal reporting requirements, such as those required by the American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) funding.
- c. **Bidding Process:** Will follow federal procurement regulations and will be approved by Business Oregon
- d. **Selection Criteria:** Criteria for selecting successful bidder will be added.
- e. **Wording Refinements:** Daniel Wear will provide suggested wording refinements relating to the grantor language.

Action Item – Committee members will send a list of recommended firms / people to whom the RFP should be sent.

6. Watershed management questions & priorities

- a. Below is the list of questions to be addressed by the Committee and the priority for answering them
 - i. In order to relieve Matt of operational responsibility for the Watershed, are there operational responsibilities that need to be covered by the Forester or someone else?
 - ii. Which project(s) in the Ecological Road Assessment should we undertake? Are there any suggested refinements? (*Attachment – page 112 135*)
 - iii. What should be our approach-plan for Fire Response?

- iv. What are the minimum maintenance requirements of and operational interventions in the Watershed that we should be considering and factoring into the Finance-Operations plan?
 - v. If logging is to be required, should it be only outside of the source water protection area?
 - vi. Should the two areas, inside the source water protection area and outside of the source water protection area, be managed differently?
 - vii. Should we Quality Assess (QA) the performance against our contracts, e.g. the thinning contract? If so, how and when?
 - viii. What should be our procedure for monitoring-controlling vehicular access to the Watershed, i.e., who has keys, what is the process for managing key access, who is using the roads, who is in the Watershed?
 - ix. Should the Watershed be patrolled and should the Watershed be submitted into the Travel Management Agreement? How should “patrolled” be defined?
 - x. Are there other questions that we should be asking?
- b. Some of these questions have been previously addressed, at least to some extent, by the previous Forest Management Committee, e.g., #iii and #viii. That information would be useful to inform the discussions.

Action Item: Daniel Wear will track down any documentation related to those discussions and send them to me. As the relevant question comes before the committee for discussion, the documentation related to any prior relevant work will be included as part of the pre-meeting packet.

7. Question #i

“In order to relieve Matt (District Manager) of operational responsibility for the Watershed, are there operational responsibilities that need to be covered by the Forester or someone else?”

Recommendation to Board:

In addition to 24/7 point of contact for fire response and contractor emergency, the District Manager should also have responsibility for managing the keys to the Watershed gates and tracking who is on the property. This would include what contractors are on the property. (The exact procedure will be defined as part of question viii above. It should be documented and posted on the District Web site)

8. Next Meeting: Scheduled for Thursday August 31 from 4-6 via Zoom

The primary discussion topic will be: “Which project(s) in the Ecological Road Assessment should we undertake? Are there any suggested refinements? (*Attachment; page 112 - 135*)”

9. Public Comments: None

10. Adjourn

Draft