

Columbia River Gorge Commission
Assessment Committee Meeting
4:00 pm, December 10, 2007
White Salmon, Washington

4:00 – 4:05:
(5 minutes)

Call to order

- Meeting notes from the November Assessment Committee meeting not ready yet.

4:05 – 4:30:
(25 minutes)

Indicators Project update

- Handout: Final Teams Diagram

4:30 – 4:40:
(10 minutes)

- Discuss update for the Gorge Commission at December Commission Meeting.

4:40 – 4:45:
(5 minutes)

Summarize next the next steps and any requests for Commission staff.

4:45:

Meeting adjourned.

**Columbia River Gorge Commission
Assessment Committee Meeting Notes
December 10, 2007 – 4:00pm
Columbia River Gorge Commission
White Salmon, Washington**

Commissioners Present: Dan Harkenrider, chair, and Jim Middaugh (via conference call).

Staff: Jill Arens and Angie Kenney.

Other Attendees: Susan Wolff, chair for the Technical Advisory Team, Peter Cornelison, Mary Repar (CAT), Susan Crowley (CAT) and Jurgen Hess (TAT sub-group member).

The meeting began with a brief update from Susan Wolff (Susan W.), chair for the Vital Signs Indicators Technical Advisory Team. She explained that the team had experienced a slow start and that it took several weeks to form the actual resource sub-groups (scenic, natural, economic, cultural and recreation). She noted that all five groups had met at least one time, and that she was pleased with their progress so far.

Angie Kenney briefly provided the group with an update on the Community Advisory Team. She explained that the team had been formed and had held their first meeting. She added that they will become more active as the Technical Advisory Team begins producing actual indicators.

Jill Arens discussed how the Future Forum community meetings might overlap nicely with the indicators project. She suggested using the meetings as an additional opportunity to educate the public about the indicators project and for us to learn more about what the communities' value most about the Gorge. She explained that we could collect information this spring by presenting a list of indicators approved by the Assessment Committee to the public at the workshops, work the feedback into the indicators project and bring it back to the next Future Forum to present to the community. Chair Harkenrider added that it may be beneficial to continue the community meetings even after the Future Forum and indicators projects have slowed down. He explained that they are very good opportunities for increased public outreach by the Commission and should try to continue the transparent process for future projects.

Jill suggested that once Jeff Tryens, indicators consultant, arrives back from Australia, the teams would receive more guidance and therefore will probably pick up some speed in the creating of objectives and indicators.

Susan Crowley (Susan C.), member of the Community Advisory Team, suggested a revision to the economic objectives. She explained that objectives 3.1 and 3.3 currently promote more economic activity than the Act intended. Chair Harkenrider agreed that Susan had a valid point, but that it would be better discussed amongst the advisory teams than with the Assessment Committee. Staff explained that the intent of Goal 3 and the

three objectives was to address both purposes of the Act. Susan agreed that she is interested in both purposes, but that "allow" is much softer than "promote". Jurgen Hess noted that outside of the Urban Areas, agriculture and forestry practices are the two key economic drivers. Chair Harkenrider agreed with Jurgen and explained that the Commission has been charged to protect agriculture and forest lands for those reasons. He added that although the use may change (i.e. from pasture to vineyards) the land base is still available for agricultural and forestry uses. He also added that economic development outside the Urban Areas is not strictly limited to these two uses. There is a number of cottage industry type review uses allowed in most land use designations. Again, chair Harkenrider suggested that this discussion be held with the advisory teams.

Mary Repar suggested that economic resources should not be included in the indicators analysis. She stated that the second proposed is secondary to the first and should be treated as such. She said that economic resources should be subordinate to the SNCRs. She also stated that protecting and enhancing are very different and should be used only after careful consideration. Jill agreed that we need to be very clear in what terminology we decide to use.

Susan C. questioned draft objectives for Goal 2 – natural resources. She asked why sensitive species were the only ones being measured. Jill explained that the indicators project will be focusing on a very high level - examining only the critical few indicators that can tell us the most information. Chair Harkenrider thought that the TAT might argue that the "effectiveness of habitat" (quality of habitat) would provide the most information. He suggested continuing the discussion with the natural resources sub-group.

Peter Cornelison asked the Committee, who will be making the final decisions regarding the indicators. Chair Harkenrider explained that the Technical Advisory Team (TAT) will be bringing their list of indicators to the Assessment Committee for approval. The Community Advisory Team (CAT) will have had several meetings to discuss the TAT's list. If the TAT decides to leave off something that the CAT feels strongly about, the CAT could prepare a minority report to the Assessment Committee to explain why it is important and why it should be included. It would then be up to the Assessment Committee to make the final decision.

Jurgen commented that "those of us that worked on the Management Plan felt that we were doing the right thing, but I like the approach of this project and think the questions are appropriate".

Jim Middaugh thanked everyone for volunteering their time and for all of their hard work.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 5 pm.

Attachments

AK

Advisory Committee Structure for the Indicators Project

**Columbia River
Gorge Commission**

Assessment Committee

Technical Advisory Team
(Partner Agencies, University Researchers & Other Experts)

- Bill Weiler , Washington Department of Fish & Wildlife
 - Todd Cornett , Planning Director for Wasco County
 - Charles Hudson, Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fishing Commission
 - Brian Bains, Landscape Architect based out of Portland, OR
 - Rich Davis with WA Parks and Recreation
 - Kevin Price with OR Parks and Recreation
 - Greg Webb and Jim Runkles from the US Army Corps of Engineers
 - Greg Griffith, Washington Department of Archeology & Historic Preservation / State Historic Preservation Office
 - Carolyn Sanco, Oregon Economic & Community Development Dept.
 - Randy Bluffstone, Environmental Economics Dept. Portland State University
- [Staffed by GC and USFS staff and advised by Jimmy Kagan and Sally Duncan of OSU]

Chair:
Dr. Susan
Wolff, CGCC

Chair:
North
Cheatham

Technical Advisor
to the Chair:
Jimmy Kagan, and
Sally Duncan
OSU INR

Community Advisory Team
(Community Leaders & Other Citizens)

- | | |
|--------------------|--------------------|
| • Andrew Brahe | • Simon Sampson |
| • Ronald Carroll | • Victor Schmidt |
| • Susan Crowley | • Phyllis Thiemann |
| • Robert Liepper | • Jaime Tolfree |
| • Robert McCormick | • Catherine Whalen |
| • Don Morby | • Carol York |
| • Mary Repar | • Mark Zoller |
| • Julie Reynolds | |
- [Staffed by GC and USFS staff]

**Scenic Resources
Subgroup of experts**

Todd Cornett
Brian Bains
(Staffed by Angie Kenney)

**Natural Resources
Subgroup of experts**

Bill Weiler
(with help from Jimmy Kagan)
(Staffed by Tom Ascher)

**Economic Development
Subgroup of experts**

Carolyn Sanco
Randy Bluffstone
(Staffed by Tom Ascher)

**Cultural Resources
Subgroup of experts**

Greg Griffith
Charles Hudson
Greg Webb
(Staffed by Jennifer Kaden)

**Recreation Resources
Subgroup of experts**

Rich Davis
Kevin Price
Jim Runkles
Bill Weiler
(Staffed by Jessica Metta)