

**Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs
2017 Summer Annual Convention Resolutions**



**Sunday, August 27, 2017
Siskiyou Field Institute
1241 Illinois River Road
Selma OR 97538**

1. Resolution Opposing Efforts to Shrink National Monuments
2. Resolution Regarding The Defense of the Enlarged Cascade-Siskiyou National Monument, Oregon
3. Resolution Regarding Managing Wilderness Areas of the Deschutes and Willamette National Forests
4. Resolution Opposing Disposal of Federal Public Lands
5. Opposition to the Westerman Bill to Facilitate More Logging
6. Resolution Defending the Endangered Species Act
7. Resolution for a Comprehensive Policy on Grazing on Public Range Lands
8. Resolution Urging an End to Logging Old Growth in Oregon's Elliott State Forest
9. Resolution Urging Resistance to Efforts of the Trump Administration to Weaken U.S. Programs to Protect the Climate
10. Resolution on the Need to Keep a Regulation Governing the Discharge of Toxic Materials into the Air and Water
11. Resolution In Opposition To Logging Proposed in the BLM's Pickett West Project
12. Resolution Expressing Thanks to those who Put on the Conference

Resolution 2017-1: Resolution Opposing Efforts to Shrink National Monuments

Background:

President Trump has ordered his Interior Secretary to review the size of 27 national monuments, with a view to shrinking a number of them. His order applies to those monuments established since 1996 where they exceed 100,000 acres. Also his review will include the 87,500 acre Katahdin Woods and Waters N.M. in Maine. The review is to be completed by the end of August.

Altogether, 27 monuments are being reviewed, with 21 of them being in the West. In addition, five large marine monuments are being reviewed.

Interior Secretary Zinke emphasizes that the Antiquities Act calls for the President to limit his monument designations to “the smallest area compatible with proper care and management of the objects to be protected.”

Many legal experts doubt that the President has authority to abolish national monuments, pointing out that none have ever done it. However, the issue has never been tested in court. In 1938 a U.S. Attorney General ruled that the President did not have that authority; and more recently the Congressional Research Service doubted that could be done legally.

However, there is less doubt that Presidents can modify the boundaries of national monuments, including reducing their size.

Environmental groups believe the purpose of the review is to facilitate more private ownership of these lands and to enable extractive industries to operate on the deleted lands.

Resolved:

The Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs opposes wholesale efforts by the President to shrink existing national monuments. The boundaries of monuments should not be altered to serve political agendas calling for minimizing the size of federal reservations.

The size of these monuments should be respected because they have been the product of careful study to justify the inclusion of the acreage needed to serve the purposes for which they have been established.

A presumption should arise that boundary enlargement is justified where a showing has been made by the President that each addition serves the purpose of properly caring for the objects protected by the monument, or by the passage of time without challenging questions being raised in courts.

It is long settled law that national monuments do not have to be small. For many decades large areas have been set aside and have been well accepted: e.g., with the Grand Canyon National Monument (Arizona); with the Death Valley National Monument (Calif.); with the Olympic National Monument (Washington state); and in Alaska when President Carter withdrew 80 million acres of D-2 lands under the Antiquities Act. These initial uses of monument status has often been built upon when Congress thereafter expanded them and made them national parks.

Any attempt to modify the protection afforded to the lands now in these monuments will be opposed by our organizations to the fullest extent of the law.

Submitted by Resolutions Committee, the Friends of Mt. Hood, the Mazamas, the California Alpine Club, and the California State Park Rangers Association

Resolution 2017-2: Resolution Regarding the Defense of the Enlarged
Cascade-Siskiyou National Monument, Oregon

Background:

On January 12, 2017, outgoing President Barack Obama enlarged the Siskiyou National Monument by 48,000 acres, mainly in Oregon. This monument had been established by President Clinton on June 9, 2000 because of its biological diversity; it is at the convergence of three eco-regions (Cascade, Klamath, and Siskiyou). It provides habitat for many endemics in this unique ecotone.

Now under President Trump, the Secretary of Interior has ordered a review of whether this enlargement is warranted. Trump feels that many recent enlargements have not been justified.

In his executive order establishing the enlargement, President Obama was careful to document the reasons for adding each area involved. Most are important to providing migration corridors for rare and endemic species of plants and animals and bolstering the resilience of the area to varied threats, such as fire, insects, disease, drought, floods, and invasive species. Such enhanced resilience is needed to deal with the challenges arising out of a changing climate.

Those challenging this enlargement must demonstrate that the areas added do not support the purpose for which the National Monument was established: viz., protecting the unique biodiversity at this convergence of eco-systems. They must show that a smaller area would serve that purpose just as well.

This will not be easy to show; the critics will be challenged to make this showing because a strong, well documented case has been made to justify the enlargements.

In the past, the Federation has supported the establishment of this monument (Res. 23, 2001) and its enlargement (Res. 5, 2010).

This national monument was the first to be established entirely for its biological diversity. It is important for it to include all critical habitat at this crossroads of eco-regions.

While the outer boundaries of this enlarged national monument do include private inholdings, the federal government can only manage federally owned lands (under a theory of proprietorship), though efforts will likely be made over time to acquire inholdings from willing sellers (by purchase, exchange, or donation).

Resolved:

The Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs calls upon federal authorities to maintain and defend the current enlarged boundaries of the Cascade-Siskiyou National Monument and to turn down all efforts to shrink its size.

Resolution 2017-3: Resolution Regarding Managing Wilderness Areas of the Deschutes and
Willamette National Forests

Background:

1. *The Problem:*

Wilderness areas of the Deschutes and Willamette national forests face increasing recreational demands that are degrading natural resources and altering the wilderness experience. Current management dates from forest plans of the 1990s, which included provisions for free trailhead permits that provided data about the tremendous increase in use in the Mt. Jefferson, Mt. Washington, Three Sisters, Waldo Lake, and Diamond Peak areas.

Within some travel corridors, use has increased over 500% in the last two years, and over 800% in the last 16 years. As Oregon's population is growing faster than the national average, with Deschutes County and Bend having the highest rate of growth, this increase in use is likely to continue.

Parking at certain trailheads is beyond capacity (even on weekdays), resulting in dangerous conditions as visitors park along busy highways.

There is also an increase in user-created trails and campsites, with an increase in damaging impact as people build structures, harm trees, leave garbage and deposit human waste.

A partial survey recorded nearly 100 miles of user-created trails. About one-third of them have experienced complete loss of vegetation and soil erosion. In 2015-16, rangers packed over 1200 pounds of garbage out of the Three Sisters Wilderness and buried 830 incidences of human waste. Rangers dismantled 590 structures and naturalized 600 fire rings.

In the Mt. Jefferson Wilderness, rangers buried 700 incidences of human waste, packed out 1200 pounds of garbage, and dismantled 385 structures.

Mt. Washington provided 43 miles of trails, but users created an additional 21 miles of trail that are not properly located and have destroyed sensitive areas and wildlife.

2. *Action Proposed by the Forest Service*

The Forest Service is seeking comments on its proposal in order to develop an Environmental Assessment. The proposal employs the technique of "Adaptive Management," which in this case means flexible regulations will be developed to protect wilderness values. After they are put in force, if the damage is reduced, the regulations will be relaxed; if the damage does not go down, the regulations will be increased.

The proposal has three components: an increase in education about the wilderness ethic, an increase in the presence of rangers, and a limitation on entry into areas that are over-used.

3. *The Proposed Strategy for the Limited Entry Permit System*

Day-use areas, where limits would be put in force, would be established initially at trailheads along highways 46 and 242 in the Three Sisters Wilderness and off Highway 22 along the Mt. Jefferson Wilderness. A reservation system would set up, with a designated number of permits for those who want to enter the wilderness areas.

At all other trailheads, there would be no limits on permits, though self-issued permits would be required.

For those seeking to climb the South Sister, a sub-set of permits would be required at the Devil's Lake trailhead.

No fees are planned at this time.

Resolved:

The Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs supports the Forest Service plan to safeguard and protect wilderness values in the Three Sisters and Mt. Jefferson Wilderness Areas in the central Oregon Cascades by increasing education, increasing the presence of rangers, and by adopting a wilderness entry permit system.

Resolution 2017-4: Resolution Opposing Disposal of Federal Public Lands

Background:

The state of Utah has called for all federal lands in Utah (with few exceptions) to be turned over to the government of that state, arguing that federal lands are poorly managed and adversely affect private properties. Its legislature has passed legislation demanding that the federal government turn over 31 million acres to it, and Utah is contemplating filing litigation in pursuit of this aim.

In Congress, the House Natural Resources Committee (chaired by Rep. Bob Bishop, Rep. of Utah) has issued a report calling for major conveyances of federal lands throughout the West, with no strings attached. In the state of New Mexico, a legislator has introduced a bill to turn over federal mineral rights there to the state.

With regard to Utah, it should be noted that when it was admitted to the union it passed an enabling Act in which it promised "... to forever disclaim all right and title to the unappropriated public lands [of the federal government]..." in that state (see sec. 3, 2d par., Act of 1894). The Enabling Act embodied Utah's promises to the federal government to adhere to the terms it had negotiated with them (such as not taxing federal property and ending polygamy).

On its admission, Utah was given grants of federal land that compare well with those given to other western states. It was given sections 2, 16, 32, and 36 in each township. Other western states often got half these number of sections.

When most western states were admitted to the union, they were given between 5 and 10 million acres to support schools and universities and another comparable grant of land for public improvements. And so was Utah.

Moreover, for decades the federal government made liberal grants in the West to encourage settlement and development, such as grants to homesteaders and grants to railroads to encourage construction of tracks in the West. This was done under the provisions of dozens of laws.

However, the federal government began to turn away from these approaches in 1934 with the enactment of the Taylor Grazing Act when it virtually closed public rangeland to homesteading and initiated a system of land planning on its lands and regulated grazing under term permits, with a fee charged. Many legal analysts think Congress then began to envision public lands as a trust.

Federal policies changed completely with enactment in 1976 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA, PL 94-579). Under that Act, most of the many disposal laws were repealed (under title VII, sections 702-706).

Moreover in that Act, Congress proclaimed: "It is the policy of the United States that public lands be retained in federal ownership" Furthermore, that Act provided that "public lands

are to be managed to protect the quality of the scientific, scenic, historical, ecological, environmental, air and atmosphere, water resources, and archeological values.”

That Act, also specified that there shall be “uniform procedures for any disposal of public land.” For the most part, the only circumstances permitted for disposal were to be of a particular parcel as a result of a planning process. And since that time, most disposals have been of parcels that were small, scattered, or isolated and hard to administer (and even these may have wildlife values).

Arguments Against Disposals of the Public Lands:

All of the western states got their land grants on being admitted to the union and are not entitled to any more. Utah got treated equitably in this regard and is not entitled to increasing its share now.

Other western states would also feel entitled to additional grants if Utah were given more today. Moreover, when it was admitted, Utah promised not to claim more federal land.

If western states can now claim more federal land, it may trigger a rush to eviscerate the land base of federal agencies such as the BLM. This would unbalance the allocation of land uses on the remaining federal lands.

FLPMA tried to put an end to major disposals of federal land; it has been the governing policy for over forty years. It enunciates the policy goal of retaining ownership of public lands in the United States and that disposals only be made of specific parcels as a result of detailed planning. This alone provides a basis for denying Utah’s claims. Its demands are not limited to specific parcels, but are vast in their nature.

If states can receive additional land grants in significant amounts, many of them would be apt to place greater emphasis on managing them for commercial purposes. In contrast, under FLPMA their ecological and environmental values (among others) are supposed to be protected from damaging commercial activity.

Many western states would also be likely to sell or otherwise dispose of the lands they would come to them, with people there already talking about doing that. Adequate investments are not made by the federal government in these lands because their critics in Congress repeatedly limit the funds appropriated for their upkeep. It is even less likely that a state such as Utah would be willing to pay the heavy bill for their upkeep, making it more likely that it would sell off much of this huge amount of land.

Transfers of federal lands to western states will deprive citizens of all states from enjoying the benefits of these lands and having the opportunity to share in shaping their management.

Resolved:

The Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs opposes significant disposals of additional federal public lands to the states or other entities.

Resolution 2017-5:

Opposition to the Westerman Bill to Facilitate More Logging

Background:

H.R. 2936 by Rep. Westerman (R.-AZ) et al has now been reported out of committee in the House of Representatives.

It applies to most lands in the national forests and to those managed by the BLM, such as O & C lands.

It does not apply to lands in the national wilderness system, nor to those in the national parks. It also does not apply to inventoried roadless areas where logging is not now permitted.

However, it may apply to those national monuments set up by Presidential decree (where no statute prevents logging).

Ostensibly, the bill deals with salvage logging in areas burned by wild fires (which are often seen as catastrophic events).

However, other provisions speak of such things as the following:

- building resilient forests through removing older forests (which they call “over-grown” ones), supposedly to stimulate the growth of younger ones;
- the production of timber;
- maximizing the production of priority species (e.g, douglas firs?);
- and removing timber to create early successional forests.

(see sections 111, 113, and 114, Title I, sub-title B)

Under these provisions, the special dispensations which the bill provides to speed up the planning process to get out more timber could be used to damage the environment in the process. And even in burned areas, it is not always wise to salvage all trees in the area affected; many are still useful to wildlife if they are left standing.

Under this bill, as many as 30,000 acres could be logged as a so-called reforestation project. And there is no limit on how many such projects could be set up apart from burned areas.

For such projects, various provisions of NEPA are waived: those requiring environmental impact statements, as well as environmental assessments. This waiver constitutes a fundamental attack on NEPA.

Streams buffer requirements could be waived (see sec. 112 (d)(1), Title I, sub-title B).

Courts could not issue injunctions to stop logging (see sec. 203, Title II).

The provisions of the Endangered Species Act are constrained.

Courts cannot make monetary awards to winning parties.

And court action is replaced by poor arbitration provisions.

Resolved:

The Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs opposes the Westerman bill (H.R. 2936), and bills with similar intent, which are designed to suspend NEPA procedures and to bar law suits to stop its logging projects, and urges its members and allies to organize to defeat it.

Resolution 2017-6: Resolution Defending the Endangered Species Act

Background:

The Endangered Species Act (ESA), passed in the U.S. in 1973, is the key device the United States uses to protect species that are endangered. The International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) reports that one-third of all species of plants and animals in the world are now endangered. 1652 species in this country are now given protection under that Act, with the protection given to 47 being instrumental in their recovery.

Now, however, the chairman of the committee on Environment and Public Works (Sen. John Barrasso, R.-Wyo.) has announced that his committee intends to revise the ESA. He thinks that too many species remain on the list for too long, tying up the land wanted by developers.

Critics of the ESA in Congress want to weaken it in various ways: to prevent a listing of endangerment unless the state's governor consents; to prevent continued listing after five years unless Congress concurs; and various proposals from the Western Governors' Association giving state's a larger role in the listing process. They also want to delay judicial review of listing decisions until the affected states have had the opportunity to help with recovery.

Even Democrats in the Senate contemplate taking the matter up, but hope to make improvements.

However, Defenders of Wildlife have pointed out that most of the required consultations with the Fish and Wildlife Service have not gone slowly. In the last seven years, 88,000 went quickly; no projects were held up because of a jeopardy finding. In the great preponderance of cases, developers got their answers without delay.

Resolved:

The Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs urges friends of wildlife in Congress to make every effort to defend the integrity of the Endangered Species Act. The Act is a key mechanism to protect critical habitat throughout the country. Over the years, many efforts have been made to weaken the Act, with none succeeding. We must continue to hold the line.

The Federation urges its member organizations to be energetic in contacting their members of Congress to urge them to rise to the defense of the Endangered Species Act.

Resolution 2017-7:

Resolution for a Comprehensive Policy on Grazing on Public Range Lands

Background:

The grazing that occurs on western public lands provides forage for less than three percent of U.S. cattle. And demand in the market place for red meat from cattle has been steadily declining (down 15% in a recent decade).

This has led, in turn, to a slow, but steady, decline in the amount of grazing on western public rangelands.

The number of permitted AUMs (amount of forage needed to sustain one cow for a month) has been declining as well in many western states. These declines may explain why recent estimates of the condition of public rangelands seem to be improving, but many experts doubt that enough current information exists to make accurate estimates.

Historically, grazing has caused grave environmental damage to public rangelands. Habitat for wildlife has been depleted; streams have been polluted by the wastes of cattle; spawning gravels needed by fish in streams have been damaged; riparian strips have been compromised; forage been degraded; soil is compacted by trampling cattle, and biological crusts are damaged; fences block migrating wildlife; native strains of wildlife have been infected by diseases prevalent in species such as sheep (as in Hells Canyon); and by releasing methane the flatulence of cattle adversely affects the climate.

Resolved:

Public rangelands should be managed to protect the fertility and quality of the range, to foster biological diversity, to protect the habitat for diverse biota, and to safeguard the climate, riparian habitat, and the quality of the streams affected.

Where the quality of the rangeland has been degraded, restoration of the environmental quality of those rangelands ought to be a goal: viz.,

- restoration of native plant and animal communities
- the quality of habitat along water courses
- the quality of the water in them
- and of the fertility and forage on the rangelands themselves.

Grazing should not be allowed on lands receiving less than 12 inches of annual precipitation and on cold (i.e., cryic) soils (those with mean annual temperatures lower than 8 degrees C.). Nor should it be allowed where it would degrade the habitat needed by threatened species of plants and animals, nor on sensitive habitats.

The many costs of damage to the environment, and its grave nature, should be taken into account when decisions are made to permit cattle grazing on public lands.

In accordance with the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), federal agencies contemplating grazing by private parties should prepare regional analyses (EISs) of the likely cumulative impact of these programs on the environment.

Grazing should not be continued where it would degrade the quality of the water of streams running through the grazed lands. Means must be found to keep grazing cattle out of riparian zones and to prevent cattle from trampling stream banks and doing damage with their hoofs. And it is critical to keep cattle urine and feces from draining into water courses.

The impact of cattle on the quality of the range and its streams must be regularly monitored. If monitoring cannot be maintained for various reasons, such as inadequate funding, grazing there should be suspended.

Those granted permits to graze on public lands should be charged fees which reflect the market rates being charged in the region for grazing on private and state lands. Public land grazing is not an activity which deserves to be subsidized by the government; such grazing provides little food of importance and does a great deal of environmental damage. (The current level of fees is set at only about ten per cent of market rates and covers a small portion of the costs of management.)

The granting of grazing permits should lie in the discretion of the agency managing the public rangelands. The permit to graze is in the nature of a privilege, not a right. Also being granted an opportunity to graze cattle on public lands does not establish a continuing right to such permits. If a permit is not extended for another term, the person who had held that permit is not entitled to any compensation.

However, legislation should be enacted which grants parties, who act in the public interest and who raise funds for this purpose, the right to buy-out the value of the remaining term of any grazing permit (when that is the most expedient way of terminating an abuse of the lands impacted). Such buy-outs should only be allowed from willing sellers. When permits are terminated in this way, that land should not be subject to grazing in the future.

During its term, those holding the permit should be subject to compliance with environmental standards. A permit should be extended only where steady progress has been demonstrated in achieving assigned objectives in improving the condition of the range involved.

The holder of a grazing permit who invests in wells, fences, and gates on public lands does not gain ownership of them; such installations should be permitted only when it is understood that the permit holder makes the investments subject to an understanding that ownership remains with the government. Permit holders should also not be granted the right to control access to public lands by virtue of their control of gates.

Interested parties, who have no commercial interests at stake, should have equal access to the processes which advise managers on the grazing policies and techniques that are applied in each management unit. They should have equal standing with grazing interests. They should also have full access to the processes for filing appeals of decisions made by managers (under applicable laws and regulations).

Special privileges should not be granted to any person who is granted a grazing permit.

Resolution 2017-8: Resolution Urging an End to Logging Old Growth
in Oregon's Elliott State Forest

Background:

The largest stand of old-growth Douglas fir held by the state of Oregon is in the Elliott State Forest, just south of the lower Umpqua River. While some logging has occurred there, much of the forest is intact. With the increasing rarity of old growth, the value of this tract has grown immensely.

And its value has also grown as habitat for federally protected endangered species, specifically for Coho salmon, northern spotted owl, and marbled murrelets. Since a 2012 court decision, the forest has been given extended protection under the federal Endangered Species Act. Since that time, the state has struggled to produce a habitat conservation plan for that forest, while having to appreciably reduce its amount of logging in the forest.

This state forest is the only Oregon State Forest that is dedicated to generate revenues for the Common School Fund. Because the State Land Board can no longer manage the forest single-mindedly for that purpose, it has tried to sell it. However, conservationists persuaded all three members of the State Land Board to reverse course and to seek to preserve it.

Recently, after entertaining an offer from logging interests to buy the forest, the State Land Board has finally voted to turn this offer down and is now attempting to obtain federal approval for a habitat conservation plan there which would seek to protect habitat and other public values, while still allowing a large amount of logging in this 86,000 acre forest. Oregon State University has also expressed interest in having its forestry school manage this area to train its students in how to log in the midst of critical habitat for endangered species.

Conservationists point out that, in a 1968 vote of the people of Oregon, its constitution was amended to specify that logging to generate revenue on common school lands should be consistent with the conservation of the values of the area and its resources, as well as sound techniques in managing it. Most conservationists argue that logging of any commercial volume in the Elliott State Forest would impair its conservation values as habitat.

Resolved:

The Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs urges the State Land Board to end commercial logging of old growth in the Elliott State Forest and to transfer the lands to a suitable public land manager who will conserve and restore the older forest and watershed values for the benefit of this and future generations, including sustainable and compatible recreation.

Resolution 2017-9: Resolution Urging Resistance to Efforts of the Trump Administration to Weaken U.S. Programs to Protect the Climate

Background:

The worldwide level of greenhouse gases now exceeds the level of 400 ppm. Experts once felt that the best way to stabilize the climate was to keep the level of these gases from rising beyond the level of 350 ppm. For the welfare of all living things, it is critical to keep moving forward with implementation of the Paris Climate Agreement to prevent irreversible trends from being locked in to the change the climate.

The administration of President Donald Trump wants the U.S. to withdraw from participation in the Paris Climate Agreement and plans to rescind various orders issued by the Obama administration to meet the goals of that agreement: viz.

- to rescind Obama's Clean Power Plan, which sets strict standards governing release of CO2 emissions from power plants fueled by fossil fuels;
- to lower fuel-efficiency standards set for cars and trucks (Trump has directed his EPA director to determine how to weaken those standards); and
- to withdraw Obama's rules limiting release of methane (a very powerful greenhouse gas), recently set by both the EPA and the BLM.

Resolved:

The Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs urges maximum resistance to these efforts to undermine the ability of the United States to meet the goals of the Paris Climate Agreement and urges the United States to remain a party to that agreement (notwithstanding the efforts of the Trump Administration).

It encourages lawyers for the environmental movement to carefully examine the legality of various efforts of the Trump Administration to weaken U.S. programs to stabilize the climate, looking particularly at the adequacy of required environmental impact statements (EISs). It anticipates promising challenges will be filed in the courts.

When enough support manifests itself in Congress, it urges the Congress intervene to stop this backsliding.

Resolution 2017-10: Resolution on the Need to Keep a Regulation Governing the Discharge of
Toxic Materials into the Air and Water

Background:

The Obama administration issued new regulations through the EPA limiting the discharge of toxic materials into public waterways. These are materials containing such substances as arsenic, lead, and mercury, all of which are very toxic.

That administration also issued new regulations limiting the levels of mercury that can be released into the air by coal-fired power plants. While coal is not thought of as a major source of mercury, it contains trace amounts which can accumulate to dangerous levels through combustion. Breathing mercury can cause brain damage.

Both regulations are important measures to protect public health.

The Trump Administration has announced its intent to try to rescind or weaken these new regulations.

Resolved:

The Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs opposes efforts to rescind or weaken these EPA regulations to protect public health by limiting the discharge of toxic materials into public waterways and of mercury into the air by power plants.

It urges public interest lawyers to examine the legality of efforts to rollback these needed regulations, with particular attention to the adequacy of environmental impact statements (EISs) for the weakened regulations. It imagines that measures of questionable legality will be challenged in court.

Resolution 2017-11: Resolution In Opposition To Logging Proposed
in the BLM's Pickett West Project

Background:

The Bureau of Land Management's Pickett West Management project spans 200,000 acres and would directly impact 17,000 acres from the Deer Creek watershed of the Illinois River Basin by Selma, to the Lower Applegate River watershed by Murphy—all the way up to Galice on Wild and Scenic portions of the Rogue River.

The scale of the project is unprecedented and will likely generate numerous large industrial timber sales--destroying much of what remains of the rare and ancient natural ecosystems in southwest Oregon.

Pickett West is proposing to log thousands of acres of low elevation late seral and old-growth ecosystems adjacent to communities in the locality. The results will be a massive loss of late seral habitat for the Northern Spotted Owl and an increase in fuel loads and fire hazards with the Wildland Urban Interface.

Over 80% of the proposed units and acres in the Deer Creek watershed are located on lands designated as a Late Successional Reserve in the 2016 Regional Management Plan (RMP). The BLM is attempting to log off the Late Successional Reserve (LSR) network in violation of the 2016 RMP and before the agency is required is required to manage these areas for late successional characteristics.

The Pickett West project is perhaps the worst old growth timber sale in many years in southern Oregon. Those living there depend on these healthy intact, natural ecosystems for high quality drinking water, fire resiliency, property values, vital carbon sequestration, critical wildlife habitat for threatened and endangered species, for the sustainability and success of the booming recreation and tourism economy, as well as the quality of life there. These places are part of our national heritage and belong to all of the current and future generations of the American people.

Resolved:

The Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs opposes the logging proposed in the Pickett West project and the destruction of the affected natural ecosystems on public lands. The FWOC calls upon the managers of public lands there to cancel the Pickett West logging project.

Submitted by the Indian Creek Botanical Mission Project (Mary Camp)

Resolution 2017-12: Resolution Expressing Thanks to Those Who Put on the Conference

The Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs thanks:

- the Siskiyou Field Institute: Cat and Linda for their care and kindness;
- Stephanie Moore of the “Gallopig Goose” catering and her staff for delicious and plentiful food;
- Shellie Spalding for effectively introducing and managing the room for those making presentations;
- John Rettig for saving us from audiovisual failures, and
- above all, Jan Walker, for planning and executing the annual conference virtually single-handed.