

ROB BAUER

September 16, 1996

Tape 4, Side 1

M.O'R.: This is a continuation of the interview with Rob Bauer on September the 16th.

R.B.: The survey said they'd either been at zero or up to ten times or more, three, four times. The length was just about right; a few people said it was too short, a few people said it was too long, but the majority said it was just right. Got some feedback we could do a little statistics on and see what worked and what didn't work.

M.O'R.: Did you say this was new this year?

R.B.: Yeah. This was just something I did the night before, and I'd hand them back on a clipboard to the people in the middle row of my van and randomly have them fill it out. Whether they'd read the Tualatin River Tales, a booklet we write on each stretch that talks about what's going on, the geology, water quality, history, stuff like that. Kind of get feedback to see where we're going.

The question was really asked at one point: Do we want to still be a group of people that go out and do Discovery Day and explore the river the rest of the time, or do we want to pursue this 501(c)(3), writing grants and becoming more visible? And so that's obviously the way we went, and some board members weren't interested in pursuing that, and they left and then we got the membership organization. Now we've got staff and an office.

M.O'R.: Cathy Claire herself is not ...

R.B.: She's not on the board anymore. I'm not on the board anymore.

M.O'R.: Okay.

R.B.: April's still on the board.

M.O'R.: What was April's last name?

R.B.: Olbrick.

M.O'R.: Okay. Just for the record. So the organization and the event itself has changed a little bit over the years.

R.B.: Well, yeah. It's grown.

M.O'R.: Right.

R.B.: It's grown. One of the things that's still missing is a way to get people that don't own canoes out on the river. You know, are we preaching to the choir here by arranging canoe trips for people that already have canoes? I mean, we're looking at a small segment of Washington County.

When I wrote the river mile sign grant, I wrote the river mile sign grant, I wrote one for getting six canoes and a canoe trailer so that we could get people that didn't own canoes out there, the press or dignitaries, whatever. We've always had to scrounge and try to put two canoes on top of a car to haul it out there, and it's a real nightmare. But the endowment board at that time, didn't feel that - They thought we could go out and get a canoe from Tektronics and get a canoe from Intel and get a canoe from these guys, and so that's still a weak spot in the organization.

We did get money from REI, and someone donated a drift boat and trailer and motor to us, and I converted the trailer to a canoe carrier; made a rack so we can haul six canoes behind a vehicle. But we need the canoes.

M.O'R.: So you're working on that idea kind of slowly, is that right?

R.B.: Right. But I was on the board for years, and spending a whole lot of time, and my wife was grumbling because I was at that time taking away from her and the kids and the house and the yard and everything else. So I agreed to step down from the board.

I just don't have to go to meetings, I still am doing a lot of work. Then later she thought, gee, she liked organizational development, and stuff like that. What did I think about her becoming president of Riverkeepers? So, what could I say? Fine! And so now she's spending way much more time than I ever did, being president, you know, hiring staff, dealing with the executive director and the office and all that. I'm still involved with Discovery Day and a few other committees and have to learn how to say no a little better. Our children are grumbling: "Why are you working so hard? You're not even getting paid for it."

Last week she had a meeting or was gone every night, and one of those nights we went out to dinner, but the kids are grumbling.

M.O'R.: And these are meetings having to do with the Riverkeepers?

R.B.: Typically, yeah. Well, I have one at four o'clock this afternoon, and of course spending this morning. It looks like I'll have to do a canoe tour next Monday. Tualatin High School wants me to do this slide show the Monday after that, and wants to work out a river tour. So -.

M.O'R.: And now your wife is the president of the Riverkeepers currently?

R.B.: Right.

M.O'R.: But her name for the record is -?

R.B.: Sue Marshall.

M.O'R.: And that's also an unpaid position.

R.B.: Right. Overworked and underpaid.

M.O'R.: Right. It sounds like a kind of volunteer organization.

R.B.: Right.

M.O'R.: I was on the board of directors of KBOO radio for many years. I finally got kind of tired of that.

Well, you're still obviously very committed to the Riverkeepers at this point. Are you satisfied with the kind of evolution the organization has made over the last five years, six years?

R.B.: Yeah. Once we made that decision. There's other forks in the road that need to be decided. You know, most of the riverkeeper organizations are quite litigious; they sue people a lot, and we're coming from basically a recreational/educational background. And the water quality issues, there's the DEQ, USGS and US Air always sampling the river for nutrients. I think there's issues about - I always get questions, you know, are fish safe to eat, are the crawdads safe to eat? Those kinds of things are much harder to define. I'd like to have somebody do the same thing they did on the Columbia, where they looked at like river otters because they're the top of the food chain, and see if they're having any problems. There's a lot of problems on the Columbia with - oh, the pesticides mimic estrogen, so the males have like very small penile bones and their testes haven't dropped because they've been feminized from these PCB's and pesticides and stuff like that. And I'd like to see what the river otter bio-assay is on the Tualatin.

We've worked at lot with Metro to get more access on the river. That was really the main goal of the organization, and we can really pat ourselves on the back because people did vote for that bond measure, and we've worked closely with Metro to say, "This is how the river's used, and this is where things should be," and they've bought up property where we've - in areas we've suggested.

M.O'R.: How do you feel about Metro as an organization, in terms of what the organization is and also what their goals are, and how they're implementing them?

R.B.: Well, just looking at the 2040 Plan, personally I look and see all the job growth in Washington County, all the industrial lands in Washington County, and all the housing in Clackamas County, around Johnson City and, you know, the Clackamas area. And that doesn't make a lot of sense, that you put the houses there, and all the jobs over there.

Land use is such a huge issue that I haven't really spent a lot of time at it, and Riverkeepers also haven't. We get a lot of calls - you know, that's one thing, some sub-developments going in somewhere, and people want to stop it. So what can Riverkeepers do to stop this? And that's really not - we don't have any expertise on land use. And usually by the time the subdivision's going in, it's way too late.

M.O'R.: You mentioned earlier that the Riverkeepers hasn't been as litigious as ...

R.B.: Litigious?

M.O'R.: Litigious, whatever it is - as some other organizations. It doesn't seem like the organization has particularly had a history, so far, of intervention or militancy on these issues.

R.B.: Well, like an example is the pesticide dump on Highway 47. There was a aerial spray applicator, crop duster, and he has a little dirt strip there, and this is above the drinking water plant upstream of that. I was out looking at floods in November, and stopped there, walked off the side of the road, and here's just mountains of pesticide containers, herbicide pesticide containers. Just literally, you know, three foot tall, 15 feet in diameter, cardboard boxes, five-gallon jugs with the tops off, 50-gallon drums laying around, bags of copper sulfate laying in the mud. Barrels of oil and grease and stuff, and who knows. Just a whole witch's brew of stuff. And it would've been really easy to call up the TV cameras, and they would have had something that would have

been hot on the evening news. But what we did was wrote a letter to DEQ, Department of Ag, you know, talking to them about this. And so Department of Ag worked with the farmer to get the site cleaned up, to work with the vendor where they buy the pesticides, so that he gets great big bags so he can recycle the bottles, and to store them in a secure place, and then take them back to the vendor to recycle them, and basically, clean up his act. I guess we could have exploited that and got some sensational headlines, but we deliberately chose not to.

M.O'R.: But you did intervene, though?

R.B.: Right. The point was to intervene and to do it discreetly. We don't want to antagonize the agricultural community. This guy should be an embarrassment to the agricultural community because of his operations. We don't want to be confrontational or, you know, like that. We want to work the system, you know. Now, if DEQ or Department of Ag had ignored it, and said, you know, "It's none of your business," we might have got a little cranky and done something about it. But you've got to make a conscious decision, you know, are you going for the show boat or are you going for the for the headline, like Jack Churchill, in order to get you mission accomplished, or are you going to do it at a quieter, more responsible level.

M.O'R.: And that's the decision that the organization has consciously made, do you think?

R.B.: Yeah. Well, initially, I wanted to have an *Oregonian* reporter work with me just to follow what we did. Not have an article until everything was all cleaned up. And the Department of Ag said, well, it's a hazardous waste thing. We don't have any regulations about storage of use containers. And DEQ says, well It's obviously an agricultural thing. You know, the typical government-bureaucrat runaround, that's what I had hoped to

document in my original proposal to the board, was to have this reporter, follow us through the process basically as an example of a responsible environmental group, rather than throwing it up on the front page the first thing, you know. If you go through the steps, this is how confusing the steps are, and how different agencies point, you know, "It can't be my job, it must be his job," and have her document that, and then at the end, after everything was cleaned up, the article would be more about the process than about, you know, the event. And they thought that that was too confrontational.

M.O'R.: To have the reporter involved at all.

R.B.: Right.

M.O'R.: Let alone whether it was going to appear right now or down the road.

R.B.: Right.

M.O'R.: But you said the DEQ finally did pick up the ball?

R.B.: No. The Department of Ag bluffed their way through it. She said, "We've got regulation of him storing the pesticides and applying the pesticides, but we don't have any jurisdiction over the empty containers. Now, if he takes them and dumps them somewhere, that's a hazardous waste issue, which is DEQ's, but as long as he's got them on the site there, it was kind of nebulous."

So they had an open file on it. They'd had complaints with him before, and so she was going to bluff him and say, "Look, you're an embarrassment to the agriculture of the whole state, and it's guys like you that make it hard for everybody else, when you're just such obvious jerk here and doing something that anybody can tell is wrong. It paints the whole agricultural community the same way."

So she worked with the vendor to get the recycling going, and got him to clean up. She couldn't have pulled his license for what

he was doing. That was her ultimate threat was, you know, "I can pull your pesticides license." So there's obviously some loopholes in the law. About two weeks after the cleanup, he clipped some powerlines with his airplane and crashed and literally burned. Somebody saw him crash, ran over and drug him out of the plane, and then the plane caught fire and burnt to the ground. Whether he's just a lousy pilot, or if his thing was that messy, he could have been, you know, high on malithion, you know. Suffering the effects of his own pesticides.

He sprayed me one time in February when I was looking at flood damage. He was spraying a filbert orchard, and I had to turn the wipers on because I got the vehicle coated with some of his spray. If we were a little more militant, we could put an ad in the *Hillsboro Argus*, asking for people that have ever been sprayed; had their property oversprayed, or their vehicles - because that's how you shut somebody down; because the Department of Ag would have authority over that.

M.O'R.: When does this incident date from?

R.B.: Last November.

M.O'R.: Okay, just this year. That's right. You were saying that.

R.B.: Right. Well, he'd been out there for years. So, yeah, it was this November. And actually, I think some of the barrels he had there floated down and we retrieved them out of the Tualatin and they were sitting in my front yard.

M.O'R.: So this is during February?

R.B.: During the February flood.

M.O'R.: Right. So he hadn't sufficiently cleaned it up to avoid that?

R.B.: Well, that was after. It was in January, February, March, that - actually after February is when he cleaned it up.

M.O'R.: But he did clean it up.

R.B.: Right.

M.O'R.: Under duress, do you think, or do you think he felt all right about it in the end?

R.B.: Well, maybe the Department of Ag had convinced, made him a believer. But it's hard to say.

M.O'R.: Do you want to leave this particular farmer unnamed on the tape?

R.B.: Well, this guy was leasing this airstrip from the farmer. So Stevens, he was the high school teacher, and he did this part time.

M.O'R.: Stevens is his name?

R.B.: I can't remember his first name.

M.O'R.: And he operates a part-time spraying business?

R.B.: Yeah. And he's got a record for crashing and stuff like that, when I talk to the locals. And then some people in governmental agencies have actually said, "Boy, I wish Riverkeepers would do something about this or that. We can't do it because our City Manager goes to the Chamber of Commerce meetings with these guys, so you know, the City can't actively pursue something because of the political reasons," and that they'd look for an outside group that could get things done. But we don't have the staff - we don't have a Riverkeeper yet. Hopefully when we have a Riverkeeper they'll have the technical skills to be able to know the laws and do some more enforcement. There's still some people on the board that are very reluctant to get involved in enforcement issues.

M.O'R.: Because of the political problems?

R.B.: Well, yeah. You start burning your bridges if we get publicized. I mean, I'm guessing what people are thinking. If we had publicized that Ag sprayer guy, and he'd gotten shut down,

maybe a farmer who now gives us access for a Discovery Day event would say, "The hell with you guys. I didn't get my crop sprayed because you had this guy in court."

It's real touchy with an environmental group - if we're an environmental group - to deal with the farm community because they're matter and antimatter, typically. They don't want restrictions on what their property can be used for. They don't want someone to tell them that you can't farm within a hundred feet of the river, that you've got to take that land that you're paying taxes on and that you bought and let it go to weeds. It's what they would see it as. Well, it's just like calling people about putting in river mile signs: Some people were very gracious. Other people said, "No! I don't want anybody out on the river."

M.O'R.: You only encourage then if you put up a sign, eh?

R.B.: That's right. So that was an education, talking to the different property owners.

You know, Washington County has a history of hostility to parks and recreation, basically. There's no parks that Washington County ever developed. They got Hagg Lake forced down their throat. The Tualatin was completely ignored as a recreation resource. I think the farmers, they own property, they can go down and fish on the river where they wanted, and they didn't want anybody messing with their irrigation pumps or their dead cow they pushed over the bank, or you know, to see that the water was sucked dry. It would just cause problems for them.

What was really interesting, Pacific University - Rob Stockhouse, a professor there - they got a grant to do a canoe trail on a section of the river. And so the first thing they did was send out letters announcing the project to all the property owners. And they about had people with pitchforks and burning brands descending on the County Commissioners: "What the hell do these guys think

they're doing? This is my property. They can't go through my property in a canoe. This is private property." And the phones were ringing off the hook at the County Commissioners' office, and the college, and they were just totally blown away by the rapid militant attack that they got for being polite and telling people what they were planning to do on this stretch of river.

As you're paddling down the river, you see a big garbage dump here, where somebody's dumping garbage past their barn down the bank. Grandpa did it, their dad did it, and they're doing it. So now somebody's in a canoe and sees it and reports it; causes them a lot of problems. You know, let's keep the damned snoopy people off the river.

M.O'R.: Although the public, I think, would have a right-of-way to be on the river, right?

R.B.: Well, up to a certain point it's a navigable river up to Cornelius, and then, as long as you're on the water, you're on the water of the state and you're not trespassing. But if you get out and stand on the bottom, then you're trespassing. So if you come to a log jam and have to walk around it ...

M.O'R.: It's a trespass?

R.B.: Right. So that's a real touchy, touchy issue. I've got these special levitating shoes, so on these stretches where there are log jams and I have to get around, I actually don't touch the property. Just levitate. And you know, when people call up and say, "Where can I go canoeing?" you know, we can't tell them to go trespass on somebody's property, even though there's a big old dirt road going through it and people use it every day. We can't say, "Go behind the Twin Oaks Tavern there, because that's where everybody has gone for the last 30 years," because we don't have permission. They don't have permission. That's why the Metro greenspaces were so important.

M.O'R.: To help with access to the river.

R.B.: Right.

M.O'R.: You mentioned something way back when we started this conversation today that I wanted to follow up on briefly. You mentioned that about the time you - I thought it was about the time you first got involved with Discovery Day, that you had been out on the river and discovered illegal irrigation pumps in the water?

R.B.: Oh, I was looking for them. You can find them, but to find out whether they're legal or not, or where you are - you know, here's this pump - this was before global satellite positioning - and I'd crawl up and look on the power meter. The power meters had a number because once a year somebody from PGE has to go out there and read the power meter. And then I called up PGE and said, "Who owns this power pole, and who pays the bill?" And they were a little hesitant at first, but then, since this was a USA project I was working on - then they gave me the information because there had been all these stories that, you know, 90 percent of the water is sucked out illegally. But most of that has been taken care of. The Water Master is pretty much on top of that.

We've got this Watershed Watch program, where people take chunks of the river and routinely go down it and note what's going on and report any problems. What we're looking for is new things, like somebody's got a diesel-powered pump or something new there. That we'll report to the Water Master.

One of our board members is running for a state office, and I'm going to see if he wins - I'd like to see a statewide bill that, if you have water rights and pump, that you basically have like a license plate that has your water right number on it. So that when people, if they're on the Deschutes or anywhere, if you see a pump without a license plate and a current sticker, I mean, it could even go that effect, that you report that.

M.O'R.: So you wouldn't have to go to all the trouble you did to find out whether or not the pump was legal?

R.B.: Right. And the Water Master has some summer help that were actually out on the river here and brought our River Mile 30 sign and signpost that had been broken - the post, which is like a 25-pound steel post - it's really heavy, 12 feet long - had been snapped in half, and the sign washed downstream to an island during the flood. And they were up checking water rights, and so they brought that into the office. And they mentioned how helpful the river mile signs are to them to figure out where the heck they are.

M.O'R.: Now, just an aside on the signs, are they actually literally every mile?

R.B.: Yeah. The lower forty-four miles.

M.O'R.: So even in the cases where you had reluctant property owners, you were able to convince them to ...

R.B.: Well, we had two property owners, one on each side, and we also didn't have to have it exact, so if -.

On the stretches I did, if a guy on one side squawked, I was able to put it on the other side. Or if the property owner here was a Taiwanese shipping company, the property on the other side was local and willing, so we didn't have any problem getting permission, one way or the other.

M.O'R.: We started this whole conversation talking about that adjudication of water rights document in the '50s. That would probably be about the point when the availability of water for irrigation and for other purposes really started to become an issue. Before that there wasn't the kind of pressure on the river, I guess.

R.B.: One of our members, Lou Scholls, has talked to - I don't know whether it was Clay or Arnie, I can't remember which one was the older one - but the statement I remember from that was it

was after World War II when the aluminum plants started making
aluminum irrigation pipe ...

M.O'R.: One second.

[End of Tape 4, Side 1]

ROB BAUER

September 16, 1996

Tape 4, Side 2

R.B.: And the rural electrification brought 480-volt 3-phase power out, so that they were able to have thirty, fifty-horsepower irrigation pumps. Prior to that, the irrigation system was like built into the ground and not moveable. Now, with these lightweight aluminum irrigation pipes, you could irrigate this section and that section and that section, and cover a lot more ground for a lot less money. So that's what he said was the biggest change in the river, was right after World War II when the invention of this lightweight aluminum irrigation pipe putting out the big power to the farmers, that they began to suck it dry.

M.O'R.: So it was partly the march of technology, then, that made it more feasible to exploit the river. And of course at that point, the water rights became much more important, with everybody competing for it.

R.B.: Right. I'm trying to think if it was started because the Lake Oswego Corporation was getting basically no water, and they felt that they had the senior water right, because everybody was sucking it out upstream of them. Those lawsuits from the 1880s, when they put the dam across they blocked a hundred percent of the water, and so the downstream water users had no water, and that was why those two guys sued.

Basically, the State Supreme Court held that putting it in the canal diverted out of the basin. If you pump it out and do irrigation, it's still in the basin and it goes through the soil and goes in the groundwater and comes back in the river, so it's not a hundred percent consumptive loss. You have some loss through evaporation, some loss through growing crops, but it's not like

taking a gallon and just totally removing it from the system. And that's what they were doing there with that canal. It wasn't ever returned back into the Tualatin.

M.O'R.: But they still had the water right to do it, though.

R.B.: Well, that was the 1880s when they did that, and that was before the water right laws of 1909 were instituted. So their water right dates back now to 1909, when the law was passed.

M.O'R.: I guess it became apparent once people did start using the river that they needed more flow into the Tualatin if they were going to use it for irrigation purposes.

R.B.: Right.

M.O'R.: And of course that added fuel to an interest that was already underway to try to get a federal water project on the Tualatin, which ultimately resulted in the Hagg Lake project.

At that time, there were several other sites that were also being considered for a federal project of some sort, including the site just over the ridge from Hagg Lake on the main stem of the Tualatin there.

R.B.: Right. The Gaston and the Mt. Richmond Road sites.

M.O'R.: Right. One of which would have flooded, I guess, the entire community of Cherry Grove.

R.B.: Yeah. Both of those. There was one, the Gaston site was down next to the town of Gaston at the very mouth of the Patton Valley. And then this other one was on Mt. Richmond Road. And they both would have flooded out the town of Cherry Grove.

Well, they also - I haven't reviewed it - but they also had plans for dams on every tributary except Scoggins Creek, because Scoggins Creek was geologically unstable, is what they said. And it turns out that the only dam that was put in was put in on Scoggins Creek.

But if I look at it, the best place for the dam is downstream of the lumber mill. So I think it was the economics of putting the dam there and flooding out the lumber mill, and the jobs and the investment that the lumber mill had there, was the reason that they said Scoggins Creek wasn't a good choice. Then later on they put the dam just immediately above the mill, and it's not the best place for a dam. The dam's wider there; you know, rather than being in the narrow neck of the valley. But I think it was the economic fact of having to buy out the lumber mill that forced them to put it back up there.

M.O'R.: I see. Of course it provides an incredible amount of water and it's really made a difference to the river.

R.B.: Yeah. It's the most singular thing that's changed the river the most to provide minimum stream flow. But really, only a fraction of it goes to create minimum stream flow. That's the section that USA owns and releases. The rest of it is the drinking water plant; when they need ten million gallons a day, they call up the dam and tell them to release ten million gallons. So it just goes down Scoggins Creek down to the pump station, and then it's sucked out. So it doesn't go very far.

M.O'R.: Does it go past the mill, then?

R.B.: Yeah.

M.O'R.: But there's not an impact on that water, then, from the mill operation?

R.B.: Well, I would say that's debatable - but it's not debatable. There's a pretty good pile of violations at the DEQ from the mill. They have a log pond there, and their permit is that they can discharge one gallon into the creek for every 50 gallons that's in the creek. And I've seen it up to like 90 suspended solids. The USA permits are like five. But these guys

have no limits on the amount of stuff they dump in. It's just the volume, the dilution.

The problem is now the way the dam is operated. These guys can't discharge anything during the summer, it's only during the winter. So during the summer, the dam operator's releasing all this water, but Stimson can't dump into that water because it's the summertime. Because in the old days, the flow used to be really really low in the summer. And then in the winter, when the flows were up high and they used to be able to discharge, the dam is storing all the water.

M.O'R.: So the flows are lower?

R.B.: So the flows are lower. So they're stuck between a rock and a hard spot as to how to deal with this water that's in their log pond.

When I worked in the lab, the water plant would call up and say, "The sewer plant at Gaston is dumping in the river high levels of bacteria," because they'd be seeing high levels of bacteria in their plant. Well, we'd go check, and the levels were low downstream of the treatment plant. I mean, they built this water plant downstream of the Gaston sewer plant. The levels were low. But when you sampled from Scoggins Creek, they'd be high because they were coming in from this mill pond.

So the water plant has always had battles with these guys to get some water to dump their waste into, their pond stuff. They've bought water from the dam, had them release like 800 cubic feet per second of water so that they could lower their pond level, and that's a violation of the water law that's called water spreading. That wasn't legal for them to do it.

M.O'R.: An illegal use of that water?

R.B.: Right. But the dam guys go, "Look, we've got lots of extra water; you know, if they're going to pay us some money, no

big deal." That was the logic in Eastern Oregon, and also probably used here.

They make siding; they have a process there that takes the sawdust and makes siding out of it, and then they have big lagoons for the wastewater and they generate this really black nasty sludge that they periodically spread out on this farmland that's right adjacent to - it's just a blackberry hedge away from the creek. And they don't have enough property, so they spread it way too thick. We're trying to get a Watershed Watch volunteer to monitor that and document when they do it, take pictures of it. But it's very hard, you know, if you don't have somebody there watching them daily, basically.

M.O'R.: So which one - the water plant that's just downstream from the mill is Hillsboro's plant?

R.B.: Hillsboro and Forest Grove; it's called the Joint Water Plant.

M.O'R.: It's not the Wolf Creek District.

R.B.: No. No, but they're all interconnected.

I wrote up a letter to the board, a confidential letter to the board, of issues that I think we should be involved with. And you know, protecting public health is the first issue, beyond recreation, beyond wildlife and everything else, and like that pesticide container thing was above their drinking water plant. This industry's above their drinking water plant. You know those were my ...

M.O'R.: And the sewage plant, also.

R.B.: Well, that's been closed.

M.O'R.: Oh, that effluent now goes to USA.

R.B.: Right. They put a pipeline from Gaston to Forest Grove.

So public health issues are my main concern. So that's being looked at in the issues committee.

M.O'R.: Has the Stimson mill been combative, cooperative?

R.B.: We haven't done anything. They've got a big file at DEQ on their past violations, but we haven't done anything. We went on a tour of their logging operation, several of us here with the Watershed Council, which Stimson's a member of, and they provided tours of their logging operation up there, which was pretty pathetic. They're logging forty-year-old trees that are sixteen to eighteen inches in diameter. I mean, they're teenagers. You know, which means every forty years they go in, cut everything down, bulldoze the land all up, spray it with an herbicide, plant trees, and do that on a forty-year cycle. I mean, if you have to do that, it would seem like do it on a sixty-year cycle or an eighty-year cycle, where this massive disruption doesn't have to happen every forty years.

M.O'R.: Plus you get bigger trees.

R.B.: You get bigger trees. But you know, you've got the immediate gratification of getting that log to the mill and making a couple of two-by-four's out of it at current prices.

But it's obviously too cheap to harvest, because they're doing it at a way faster rate than makes sense to me. If you start with a barren piece of land that you've scarified by tearing it all up and weed-killing it and you plant these trees, well, for the first ten years, most of the sunlight is just hitting the ground and growing weeds and grasses and brush. The trees are only a small percentage of it.

Once the trees make a complete canopy, then all the sunlight energy is going into the trees. It would make sense that you'd want to minimize this time where most of the sunshine was hitting the dirt and maximize the time that there were trees actually there

growing. So you'd want to reduce the frequency of harvesting because when you harvest, you get this period of non-production. But I'm sure somebody's got a spreadsheet and a graph that says, you know, here's the earliest point where we can economically harvest. What that tells me is that it's too cheap for them to go in there, and they're not paying for the ecological damage that they're doing by the clear-cutting. The hidden costs are passed on to the people downstream, and that needs to be reflected ...

M.O'R.: And if they had to pay for those hidden costs, then just the economic analysis would lead them to make a different decision than the one they have.

R.B.: Right. So there's a lot of logging going on in the headwaters up there, and it's going to be vastly expanded because a lot of this is from the Tillamook Burn that was planted in the '30s and the '40s and the '50s, and now it's merchantable timber, and they're going to ...

M.O'R.: Forty years have passed, eh?

R.B.: Right. And I remember going there as a kid, driving to the coast on logging roads and stuff with our family, and just hillsides where the soil was basically sterilized because of the heat of the fire, and that there was nothing growing on it, and you go down there now and it's just this lush forest.

M.O'R.: I did an interesting interview with a logger that lives up in Cherry Grove - a former logger - who was in there in the '30s with the logging companies. He had to take the train to get up to the camp, and he'd stay in the camp until the weekend or whatever. But he mentioned that he'd been around there long enough - this was Harold Sieffert. He mentioned that he'd been in Cherry Grove long enough to notice the impact of that logging, which of course was carried out under even worse conditions in terms of any concern for the environment, and he noticed that there was a big

impact on the stream flow in the Tualatin itself, that the flow was greater, apparently, and that the pool at the bottom of Lee Falls was much, much bigger before these logging operations had really taken their toll, and apparently the pool silted up and the flow was reduced, both.

R.B.: You know, they spent a lot of times showing us the culverts and stuff like that, and the flood damage that they had, and showed where there were landslides where nothing had been logged. Their perspective.

And I take a fairly moderate row, you know. I've got a bunch of xeroxes here, they have to be out of paper. And I've got three kids, I don't want them to live in my house forever. I will expect them to move out into another house at some point. So I have to accept some expansion of the urban growth boundary and of houses being put in places. It's hard to be a purist without being a hypocrite.

M.O'R.: But at the same time, there's probably sustainable ways that maybe some of these goals could be met.

R.B.: Right.

M.O'R.: You just mentioned the urban growth boundary, and you already talked a little bit about Metro and the fact that you see a lot of houses in Clackamas County and a lot of jobs in Washington County.

R.B.: Yeah, that's what their plan looks like.

M.O'R.: Right. But in general, Metro's not a very popular organization out in Washington County, it seems like, at least ...

R.B.: Oh, government isn't a popular organization out in Washington County, period. There's a split from the growing urban and the past ag that had pretty much control of the county, and I guess there's - I don't keep up on Washington County politics - but it's kind of gone from the Good Ol' Boy Ag to pro-development, and

now that there's a slate of people that are kind of running together that are interested in the quality of life, and not so much selling their soul for development. I just read where the town that got - I think it was Feb 12 or something; Intel was proposing this great big fabrication plant, and they wanted the state and county and local governments to throw money at them. Even though they had a billion dollar quarter year last year, they feel that they should have their handout and we should bribe them to come to our community. And apparently our bribes weren't as big as this town in New Mexico. And they needed like eight million gallons a day of water. So this town in New Mexico threw a big enough bribe that they moved there, and now the town is nearly bankrupt. They can't afford to pay for portable classrooms for the schools that are overwhelmed. They can't afford police protection. They can't afford roads. They can't afford sewers. They can't afford the water plant. Because they gave these guys such a big subsidy, and then the subsequent growth - growth is always subsidized - cost them way too much. And I'm glad they got it and we didn't.

I think it should be a federal law - that's interference in interstate commerce. If you literally bribe somebody to put their plant here rather than over here, you're interfering with interstate commerce by bribing them, and there should be a federal law against it. If you want people to come to Oregon but say, "Well, look at our schools. We have 20 students in the classrooms. Your employees will be happy to come here because we have a great school system. We've got a great transit system, we've got a great higher educational system. Washington County's loaded with parks, so on weekends your employees will be able to have recreation right here, and it's a great place to live, and in fact, we'll charge you a premium to come here."

Rather than competing with Mississippi and Alabama by throwing money at them, we'll end up like Mississippi and Alabama, low tax rates, but no infrastructure.

M.O'R.: We kind of got away from the subject of the dam up there at Hagg Lake and got to talking about the Stimpson mill below it, but the dam site on the Tualatin that was considered before they built the dam at Scoggins, from what I hear is still a viable possibility because we're now back in a situation where people can kind of see the water running out and the need for maybe another project.

R.B.: It was studied here and, I don't know, it gets studied about once every ten years. Basically, it's going to flood a community, it's going to be politically impossible, I think. And what I encouraged Cherry Grove to do was to build a community park so people could come out there, have recreation, have memories of playing in the Tualatin up there where it's crystal clear. So if somebody proposes a dam, they'll go, "Wait a minute, I used to take the kids out there, and we had a great time." Somebody in Hillsboro to have some ownership, you know.

What will happen now is people will go, "Oh great, another place to water ski." So you can hide Cherry Grove and its assets away from everybody and have it to yourself, but then you're not going to have much of a fan club when it comes to defending it against being under water.

Well, when they decided to do the expansion on the Trask instead, and it was designed in the dam originally to be expanded - it was hard for them to find a contractor that had experience building dams because in the last 20 years, there's hardly been any dams built anywhere.

M.O'R.: Except for small ones, huh?

R.B.: Except for little tiny ones. So there were a limited number of contractors that even had experience, and that's just a reflection of the political reality of putting a dam up and flooding out a community, or whatever. The power boat guys, the water skiers, the jet boat guys, you know, they're all for it.

M.O'R.: What about the issue of water, though? Do you think we'll need another project eventually?

R.B.: Well, what we need to do is use the water that we have wisely. Right now, say the drinking water plant takes ten million gallons out of Hagg Lake and runs it through the drinking water system, and it comes out of USA's plants. A farmer wants ten million gallons, so they release ten million gallons out of the lake, and then he sucks it up and irrigates it. So we've sucked twenty million gallons out of the lake.

It makes more sense to take that ten million gallons we took for drinking water, run it through the wastewater treatment plant, and then provide that to the farmer. So the drinking water guy's got ten million, the farmer's got ten million, and instead of taking twenty million out of the dam, we've only taken ten. So now all of a sudden we've got twice the capacity.

So basically, though, the buzzword is "water used once is wasted, and water used twice is conserved." So if you start looking at those kind of things tying in the whole system, you've got a lot more water out there.

There's laws against converting irrigation water into drinking water, you know, because they've made damned sure that cities wouldn't be able to grow and consume their irrigation water. But that's already been broken down in the Southwest, where cities are buying up farmland. Well, like LA, you know, bought up farmland, got the water rights, and sent it all down to LA. It's happening

in Phoenix and stuff now where the water rights are more valuable than any possible crop you can grow on the property.

So by using the water twice - and I was a proponent of taking water out of the Willamette, right there in the Newberg pool, the most polluted part of the river because, you know, the old story is, you should pass a law that says your drinking water intake is downstream of your sewage treatment outfall, so it's in your interest to have a really clean, well-treated sewage effluent because it's going in the river above your intake. What happens now, is it's reversed. Your intake is up here, and you dump it in the river, and then the next town downstream - Corvallis dumps it in, and Albany sucks it out. Albany dumps it in, and Salem sucks it out. Salem dumps it in -.

So if you start looking at the Willamette as a drinking water source, you're going to have to do some serious cleaning up. And that will then benefit the wildlife, the whole aquatic system. It's funny that people view the Willamette as this cleaned-up river and the Tualatin as this, you know, sewage-filled ditch, when all weekend long there was raw sewage boiling into the Willamette from multiple combined sewer overflows from multiple cities, plus all the pulp mills and stuff like that, all the massive tons of stuff that they dump in. And there's no similar thing on the Tualatin at all. It's just muddy. Just because of the soil particles.

M.O'R.: I've noticed in the paper, I think, just last week - I had actually heard a little about this beforehand - but I've noticed a suit has actually been filed, I guess, by the original organization - not the original people, I don't think, but the original organization that filed the ...

R.B.: Oh, NEDC and Northwest Environmental Advocates, right. That's what they do. NEDC - the Lewis and Clark thing, I've talked to some students there, and it's a class project where the students

go down to DEQ and sit down and go through the permits and look for violations and stuff. One of the students was grumbling because - they get paid now, and before, they didn't get paid, it was just a class project. I got static for trivializing the lawsuit as a class project. But that was their army of unpaid laborers.

M.O'R.: Right. But now they're trying the suit again because I guess they feel that the DEQ hasn't really lived up to the court order that they were under or something.

R.B.: No, no, this doesn't have anything to do with USA. This is about the 304(b) streams, all these 800 streams that had been defined as water quality-limited, and the Tualatin is one of those.

M.O'R.: But that came out at the first lawsuit, didn't it, some of that?

R.B.: Well, the TMDLs did. I'm not sure. So they've started the TMDL process on the Willamette, and these water quality-limited streams, there's like, what, 800 of them? And of course the DEQ's moving so slowly it'll be the year 3000 before plans are made for each of them. I mean, they've had funding cuts and staff cuts and, you know, these laws get passed without the funding to insure that they happen.

M.O'R.: Right. Well, there's some statistic that they'd be a hundred years or something - maybe not quite that long - implementing the water quality standards on Oregon streams at the present rate.

R.B.: And just think, Oregon is a fairly progressive state, and I suppose that's why they sue Oregon, because they'll respond and do something rather than if you sued Louisiana - you know, you'd never get answers to your letter. You'd be frustrated.

M.O'R.: Well, we're just about out of tape here, and close to out of time, also.

So I'd like to thank you for your interview today, good conversation. So thanks a lot.

R.B.: Okay.

[End of Tape 4, Side 2]