

Myrtle Creek Rural Community Partnership



Return communications to: 2888 North Myrtle Road, Myrtle Creek, Oregon 97457 chaws@frontier.com

July 11, 2012

Roseburg District BLM

Steven Lydick,

South River Field Manager

777 NW Garden Valley Blvd

Roseburg, OR 97471

08 JUL 11 11:07 AM '12
BLM
ROSEBURG DISTRICT

RE: Buck Risking Protest. EA# OR-R050-2011-0006

In accordance with 43 CFR 5003, this is a protest of the Buck Rising Variable Retention Harvest decision. It was considered in the BLM OR R-050-2011-0006 Roseburg Secretarial Demonstration Pilot Project EA.

The decision made by Steven Lydick, South River Field Manager, on June 26, 2012. This protest is submitted by Cindy Haws representing MCRCP as signed on attached petition.

The comments and petition from the Myrtle Creek Rural Community Partnership concerning the Roseburg District Secretarial Demonstration Pilot EA dated April 3, 2012. DOI-BLM-OR-R050-2011-0006-EA <http://www.blm.gov/or/districts/roseburg/plans/files/PilotProjectEA.pdf> have gone unaddressed and unresolved. The BLM's analysis has been found to be unsound and biased leaving very significant information gaps and conditions unknown while assuming an existing condition which is inconsistent with reality and the best available scientific information. The actions of the proposed timber harvest will harm our lands, our salmon and our water quality all inconsistent with current environmental laws including the clean water act and endangered species act.

The Myrtle Creek Rural Community Partnership represents about 50 affected citizens who live and have livelihoods dependent upon the natural resources of the Myrtle Creek watershed. We are an important element of the social economic fiber of this community and our social economic condition and importance is not being considered in the proposal. This proposal impacts us. The social and economic elements that we represent are the community's best future rather than this BLM Pilot proposal which

was driven by a corporate timber agenda causing more long term damage while simply helping provide short term profit to a few corporate mill owners. It does not in any way resolve jobs issues in our community. Particularly, this proposal will do nothing for what is really needed which is long term stable income. In fact, we request that a current up to date non-timber bias independent economic analysis for this area should be conducted and should involve us. We are all aware of many changed conditions since the assessments in the Northwest Forest Plan upon which this proposal tiers.

We support small scale logging such as thinning that helps our small local businesses. We support activities that do not further impacts to our water, our fish, our wildlife and the overall integrity of our public forests. We see significant economic benefits to our community sooner with no further degradation to our streams and habitats. If activities focus upon restoring functional conditions so that we may someday be able to increase our economic base with harvestable wild salmon for food, abundant clean water for many uses, and a public landscapes full of other forest products and interest so near to our town we will have a bright economic future for our community.

Sincerely,

Cindy Haws
Spokesperson for the MCRCP

Encl(s) Comments and Petition with community signatures

1. Water Quantity: High and Low Flows

Summary of dispute:

- The EA does not assess the cumulative effects of similar actions and conditions from private lands in the watershed which in conjunction with the proposed BLM logging will exacerbate water quantity and quality and impacts our downstream water well into the future.
- The EA uses old reference to justify road impacts when newer Grant and Jones (1996) and others demonstrate that when >25% of a watershed is logged with the type of prescription they propose that largely removes canopy and 4% of the area is in roads peak flows are exacerbated. There is no doubt that >25% of the watershed has been logged and there are enough roads as indicated by the problems we downstream users are having on our lands and with both high and low flows.
- The proposed action is inconsistent with the Aquatic Conservation Strategy objectives and will retard recovery of our watershed.
- The EA fails to do any real on the ground analysis or inventory and reporting to determine if the assumptions used from general publications and the FSEIS are correct. We, the public have nothing to go on except references that do not necessarily fit the existing conditions here is our watershed.
- Water Quantity issues are separated from water quality issues however water quantity has a direct effect upon quality particularly in our downstream areas. The EA suggests that the project does not affect water quality downstream and this is false.

Further Discussion

The environmental assessment does not address impacts from high and low flows that are created in the project area and impact the stream and fish habitat downstream on our lands.

EA: "Average road density, an index of the relative amount of road in the analysis area, is 4.53 miles per square mile. Roads under BLM-administration account for 45 percent of the total road mileage. Based on an assumed average right-of-way width of 40-feet, roads cover approximately 1,293 acres, representing approximately 3.43 percent of the analysis area. Increases in peak flow can be found when the roads and other impermeable areas occupy more than 12 percent of a catchment scale watershed (Harr et al. 1975)."

The analysis refers to an old publication (Harr et al 1975) regarding road density and 12% percentage occupancy of roads. Newer publications refer to 4% which is very close to the BLM road occupancy and the BLM did not include the cumulative effects of private roads in the watershed as well. Further, site specific assessment within the areas influenced by the project would be necessary to determine if the

general guide of 4% is accurate for that particular area based upon the condition of the streams and other factors that reflect evidence of peak flow issues. On the ground assessment to determine if the assumptions made in the Harr publication are correct for the affected areas have apparently not been done. Further, newer more relevant publications exist including (Wemple and Jones 2003, Coe 2004) that demonstrate significant impacts upon peak flows from roads in watersheds. Also the fact that roads increased drainage has an effect upon water storage that affects low flows has not been addressed and it important for our summer flows that we depend upon. The EA just simply assumes that a broad, single, old publication covers all variability which is never true in natural landscapes.

Further, Harr et al only addresses impermeability not all of the water processes affected by roads including interceptions and surfacing of underground water created by road cuts and the amount to which stream networks have been extended in the entire watershed including roads on private land that cumulatively add to conditions along with the project. Shallow underground springs are characteristic of this landscape (which residents are well aware of since they feed the hyporheic zone which supplies water to many of our wells). Roads cut into these springs which normally were connected underground to the stream and had much longer, slower occupancy in the ground versus cutting open creating surface water that is ditched, collected, concentrated and drained into the creek.

EA: "The potential for peak flow effects varies for different stream types (Grant et al. 2008). The 2008 FEIS (p. 758) found that within the high gradient cascade and step-pool stream types, common to the project area, there is little potential to affect sediment transport or enhance peak flows. The 2008 FEIS (pp. 755 and 757) found none of the subwatersheds in the analysis area to be susceptible to peak flow enhancement, and without any changes in current vegetative cover there would be no change in the magnitude or rate of surface water runoff and delivery to the stream network."

"Large openings in a forest canopy greater than two tree heights across can affect precipitation, snow melt and peak flows (2008 FEIS, p. 355). However, in the rain-on-snow hydroregion, variations in climate conditions would have more effect on susceptibility to peak flow increases than timber harvest (2008 FEIS, p. 757). None of the subwatersheds in the analysis area are considered susceptible to increases in peak flow stemming from unrecovered canopy openings (2008 FEIS, pp. 755 and 757)."

High flow damage to stream morphology which are annual to biannual conditions have increased in frequency and magnitude due creation of openings by logging, basic loss of storage capacity and higher efficiency of drainage during regular winter events. The EA ignores water processes and cumulative effects. It is clear in the Grant et al 2008 document that adding more clear cut type openings will further degrade and contribute to peak flows.

Examples though there are many more references to this effect in Grant et al 2008 are Pg40: "We constructed a maximum response line for studies with less than 2 percent roads. This maximum no-roads response line reaches the detection limit at approximately 15 percent harvested." "The Andrews Watershed 3 data point that includes roads (25 percent harvested, 16 percent increase), and the modeled points from Bowling and Lettenmaier (2001) that include roads (35 percent harvested, 23 percent increase; and 66 percent harvested, 29 percent increase) all plot above the no-roads maximum reported response line."

The EA does not address impacts to summer low flows and tiers to Grant et al 2008 which does not address summer low flows. ("Our focus is exclusively on hydrologic changes to peak flows and

consequent effects on stream channels" Grant et al 2008). Scoping reply in the EA on this issue ignored the community's concerns and erroneously stated findings in the Grant et al paper were on peak flows. Further riparian thinning treatments where logging out conifers around hardwoods to enhance hardwoods is proposed will increase evapotranspiration causing additional lower summer flows in addition to a regeneration harvest prescription that will cumulatively contribute to a landscape of young conifer trees that have high rates of evapotranspiration when the existing stands are at an age within or very close to conserving water during summer. (Perry 2007)

Scoping responses to our issues simply referred to the 2008 FSEIS. Simply tying to the FSEIS for a determination without conducting on the ground site assessment of the assumptions in the FSEIS is arbitrary and erroneous as the FSEIS and Land Management Plan assumes that on the ground site specific assessment of conditions will be conducted during project planning phase to ensure the generalized assumptions in the Plan (where site specific analysis is not done) are correct in order to make a reasoned decision otherwise it is a circular argument which is fallacious.

The EA addresses only the portion of the streams that are directly associated with units in the project area ("within the high gradient cascade and step-pool stream types, common to the project area, there is little potential to affect sediment transport or enhance peak flows."). The increase in stream flows may not affect channel, sediment transport etc in the small stream directly associated with the units but the cumulative effects of this logging and others in the area will affect our downstream, low gradient gravel, cobble streams.

The EA does not address the Aquatic Conservation Strategy (ACS) to which the Northwest Forest Plan requires consistency. The logging proposal and associated road access will retard and further degrade the stream conditions in a watershed already degraded by the very kinds of logging and road construction proposed which is inconsistent with the ACS objectives.

Every time a planning effort is conducted in a watershed a site analysis of the existing features such as the roads impact to the ACS objectives should be conducted to take action to bring the area into compliance. The EA did not consider all of the features and conditions that are retarding restoration of the aquatic ecosystem including the elimination of mid-slope roads which are severely affecting both water processes and soil movement.

EA: The interaction of groundwater with the fens in Section 25, T. 28 S., R. 3 W. would remain unchanged.

No reasonable evidence is provided as to what the hydrologic system is that supports the very rare, unique "fens" in the harvest area. Harvesting mature trees and creating young stands adjacent to the fens have not been adequately investigated to determine how evapotranspiration and other affected conditions might impact the fens. This feature is a key example of a water storage feature that needs protection and the associated riparian buffer with logging units next door has not been demonstrated to protect them.

EA: As existing roads and drainage structures age, they are subject to degradation and an increased risk of failure, particularly during major winter storm events. Some road and culvert failures would result in direct inputs of sediment into the stream network. The amount of introduced sediment would vary depending on the severity of the storm event and the condition, stability and proximity of the roads or culverts to a stream.

EA: Along the section of County Road 15 between Stacey Gulch and the juncture with BLM Road No. 28-3-8.1, discussed on page 108, runoff would continue to actively erode and degrade the ditch line and sediment directly routed into Stacey Gulch, and would continue to increase stream turbidity in Buck Fork, at least on a seasonal basis.

EA: Existing roads and landings may modify storm peaks by reducing infiltration, allowing more rapid surface runoff (Ziemer 1981). Roads may also intercept subsurface flow and surface runoff and channel it more directly into streams (Ziemer 1981). Statistically significant increases in peak flows have only been shown when roads occupy at least 12 percent of the watershed (Harr et al., 1975). Roads in the analysis area occupy an estimated 3.43 percent of the land base, and no perceptible increase in peak flows would be expected.

The EA points out that as roads and drainage structures age and with storm events further impacts to the watershed will occur. This is a prime example as to why no additional harvest actions should take place in the watershed until all roads and drainage features are either removed or treated such that they will not fail or require future maintenance that cannot be guaranteed due to highly variable congressional budget allocations. Responsible and economical management should leave a condition that can function independent of the need of future management treatments.

2. Social Economic Analysis

The social economic analysis simply tiers to the FSEIS and that which was from the Northwest Forest Plan. It is too narrow in scope to a focus upon profit and jobs for timber workers. This does not take into account our local conditions involving other economic livelihoods and factors. Availability of abundant clean water has an economic value far exceeding corporate short term profit.

Further things have continued to change so much in the timber industry it also does not take into account significantly changed conditions of the current economy and the true extent to which automation has continued to reduce the value and influence of timber jobs. No new jobs will be created by maintaining this approach of harvesting. Further the true extent and fairness to which the timber industry contributes to our tax base matters in this because of the intertwining county pressure to increase timber from federal tax payer's forests to pay for county services. The impact to people and the future opportunity for people who make a living in other ways other than industrial logging is significant and requires an EIS that considers and mitigates the impacts to us if this project is to go forward.

3. Early Seral Habitat

The BLM states the "purpose" of this type of clearcutting is to create "rare habitat". However, the kind of post logging habitat that they will create is not rare. The BLM states that science backs the need to log to create this habitat. The BLM suggests they will be "mimicking" that which exists after a stand replacing fire disturbance. Logging will not result in this habitat. Rather, there is a general misapplication of the ecology of post fire habitat. Well stated by Professor Richard Hutto, Director of the Avian Science Center, University of Montana¹:

"Many people believe that the conditions present after a clearcut or following one of the newer green-tree retention or forest restoration cuts are basically the same as those present after a severe fire. They

are wrong. Conditions created by a stand-replacement forest fire are biologically unique at the very least in terms of the biomass of standing dead trees that remain, and to a much greater extent, in terms of ecosystem structure and function. While timber harvesting is a form of ecological disturbance, it is a poor substitute for fire-based disturbance because it does not result in numerous, burned, standing-dead trees. Such trees are the most critical component of a biologically diverse post-fire ecosystem and that single component contributes significantly to the production of unique successional pathways and unique wildlife communities that we see after fire.”

The Pilot Project would on the other hand, impact a rare, large block of BLM forest in the headwaters. This block covers 44 sections amounting to 28,000 acres. This alone compared to 640 acre BLM checkerboard blocks surrounded by corporate lands makes this an ecologically important area to restore, not further degrade. Contiguous blocks of forest are very important for the recovery of the Northern Spotted Owl and putting more openings in the forest with logging units makes this worse. Also there is a false assumption about what prey species and how early seral habitat may benefit the spotted owl. This is because the lead forestry scientists consulted by the BLM failed to work with lead wildlife scientists who are the most familiar with these elements.

Both Ann Chamberlin and Cindy Haws are professional wildlife biologists who conducted a site specific assessment of early seral habitat on private lands adjacent to 3 of the units recently in section 17. It was found that there are plenty of the components and species suggested by Jerry Franklin as missing from private lands and needed by this logging. We also note that snag dependent species to which the proposal harms with a reduction to 40% ppc are one of the most sensitive to forest harvest and this proposal reduces their populations that cumulatively with private lands will be less than 40%.

The same impact will be created for down logs. The EA states it will reduce potential down logs of large amounts (basically 100% if a stand replacing natural fire would occur) to a reality of an average 120 linear feet/acre which is little to nothing as far as wildlife habitat is concerned.

Consultation with Dr Robert Anthony OSU, (pers. com. May 3, 2012) a major leading scientist involved in the Northwest Forest Plan and current studies of different forest habitats including early seral concurs that if there are plenty of private lands in a recent clear cut condition in and around the landscape the kind of habitat that will be created by this logging is superfluous. As a matter of fact Seneca and Roseburg lumber are currently logging in the area and creating more of this type of habitat. The small leave tree patches suggested by the BLM will not mitigate the loss of trees to logging to create the kind of habitat that fire creates.

Further, the EA states there is a need to demonstrate this type of logging. We disagree as there are plenty of past logging units all across the Umpqua on USFS lands from past harvest in the 1980's and 1990's that have leave tree patches and are based upon the same old out of date assumptions.

To: Honorable Representatives Peter A. DeFazio, Greg Walden, and Kurt Schrader
RE: O&C Trust, Conservation and Jobs Act

To: U.S. Department of the Interior Secretary Ken Salazar
RE: Roseburg Pilot Project, the newly proposed Western Oregon Plan Revisions

To: Roseburg District Manager, Bureau of Land Management, Katrina Symons
RE: Input to the Myrtle Creek Pilot Project Draft Environmental Assessment

To: Governor John Kitzhaber
RE: BLM Myrtle Creek Pilot Project, Western Oregon BLM Plan Revisions and the O&C Trust, Conservation and Jobs Act

MYRTLE CREEK RURAL COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP

GOOD NEIGHBOR PETITION FOR THE RIGHTS OF CITIZENS OVER CORPORATE WEALTH

We, the Myrtle Creek Rural Community Partnership, stand against the loss of our basic human rights to the clean water and healthy forest lands that support our livelihoods and quality of life. We strongly oppose the misguided Roseburg BLM Pilot Project (hereinafter the "Project") and the Timber Trust Bill (hereinafter the "Bill") proposed by Congressman Peter DeFazio and others. Both the Project and the Bill, with its feigned promise of job growth and ecological forestry principles, distract from the truth and place corporate interests above our basic human rights.

The timber industry is proselytizing an agenda based on wealth accumulation and expansion. The Project and the Bill adversely impact us by harming the quality and quantity of our water resources. This cost is not worthwhile. We oppose a repeat of history, when industry took advantage of economic downturns to expand wealth and control to only a few. For example, in the 1980s, industry was given government buy-outs and cheap timber under the guise of job welfare, yet jobs were extensively eliminated and wages reduced. Simultaneously, the industry earned big profits and used them not to employ more people, but to automate mills and logging equipment, expand mill ownership throughout North America, and buy and clear out more land. "Breaking the Federal Timber Log Jam" will amount to a drop in the bucket for community jobs and harm the efforts of the rest of us.

The Timber Trust Bill is like the sweet deals given to corrupt railroad barons in the early 1900s and to Roseburg Lumber Inc. from the county during the 1930s depression. This Bill literally steals control of our public land to fill corporate timber bank accounts. The Bill blatantly ignores the very reasons we have become so entrenched in timber issues in the first place.

There has been too great a loss of our unique and world-renown community assets, our independent livelihoods, native habitats and species, healthy, highly-prized and abundant foods, and quality recreation resources. The industrial economic model that underlies the Project and Bill has run its course across rural America. Reaching its peak in the 1950's, industrial forestry put communities on a long-term decline, adversely impacting these communities' social, environmental and economic potential, along with our home values and water resources. Our rural communities have effectively been given third-world treatment. Short-term corporate profiteering took advantage of boom and bust cycles with political support and expanded the wealth of a few, but it tore holes in our social-economic fiber and landscape.

Undue political influence and control has been given to corporations to further this model and is demonstrated here in the Project and Bill. This is unjust and it is time to stop.

As good neighbors we petition the Roseburg District Manager, Secretary Salazar and the Oregon Congressional Delegation to restore the watershed health of our public lands at the headwaters of Myrtle Creek and set aside the profit driven interests of a few rich Douglas County timber corporations. We insist that the BLM be responsible for the restoration of natural water storage capacity at the headwaters of our watershed, which all citizens from the headwaters to the confluence with the South Umpqua depend upon to provide abundant clean water. All of the Project action proposals, as designed, retard recovery of water holding capacity and cause more water pollution and impacts to streams. This is evidenced by over 50 years of hydrology monitoring (Perry 2007) of regeneration cut logging.

We do not support "variable retention harvest" prescriptions. It is just more clear-cut type regeneration cutting under a new name. This causes the same cumulative impacts to our watershed that have led us to where we are today. Further, the "ecological principles" to drive the purpose, need and design of the Project was not derived from a real foundation of science, as any "principle" would be. The purpose, need and design of the Project are consequentially based upon false assumptions. Conversion of more acres into young stands also increases fire risk in a landscape already full of young stands. This poses the greatest risk of fire spread and severity. The Project does not provide a solution to climate change either by selecting and removing trees and then deciding in advance to manage for dry forest adapted species of trees. No human is yet equipped with the knowledge of natural selection in the trees' gene pool and therefore, cannot determine the best mix of genetics that will positively respond to climate change. By messing with the natural species composition on these sites as proposed, the Project and Bill could in fact weaken forest health and is just another "pulling logs out of the stream" to help fish scenario that we have experienced over and over again coming out of forestry management. It is important to work for real sustainable solutions. These proposed actions are not sustainable and only cause more harm and decline in our community. They interfere with ours and other people's rights to healthy foods, clean water and pursuit of more compatible economic opportunities that do not cause harm to another's healthy living.

We believe that a rural sustainable, Good Neighbor model of federal forest management moves forward only by the consensus of its citizens, which has been and continues to be requested as a means for planning public land management actions.

Sincerely, the undersigned people of the Myrtle Creek Rural Community Partnership: _____

Print Name Sharon Whitley Sign Name Sharon Whitley
Address: 516 Bic Link Lane, Myrtle Creek, OR 97457

Print Name ANDREW DUCLOS Sign Name Andrew Duclos
Address: 2000 N. MYRTLE RD, MYRTLE CREEK, OR 97457

Print Name TARA BROWN Sign Name Tara Brown
Address: 219 LEWIS CREEK RD, MYRTLE CREEK, OR 97457



1) Print Name SANDRA CROCKER-FOOSHEE Sign Name Sandra Crocker Fooshee
 Address: 4163 SLIDE CREEK Rd, Myrtle Creek OR 97457

Print Name F. McWILL-STECKER Sign Name F. McWILL-Stecker
 Address: 3089 N MYRTLE RD M.C. 97457

Print Name DALE W. HIGGINS Sign Name Dale W. Higg
 Address: 8749 S. MYRTLE ROAD MYRTLE CREEK OR 97457

Print Name JUDITH MOCKE Sign Name Judith Mocke
 Address: 15751 N. MYRTLE ROAD, MYRTLE CREEK, OR 97457

Print Name Carolyn Burkhardt Sign Name Carolyn Burkhardt
 Address: 15751 N. Myrtle Rd, Myrtle Cr, OR 97457

Print Name ALTHEA LAWHHEAD Sign Name Althea Lawhead
 Address: 2521 S MYRTLE RD

Print Name DALE CREESELEY Sign Name Dale Cree
 Address: P.O. BOX 722 MYRTLE CREEK, OR 97457

Print Name STEVE A. TAYLOR Sign Name Steve A. Taylor
 Address: 4271 S Myrtle Rd Myrtle Creek, OR 97457

Print Name EMEREA L TAYLOR Sign Name Emera L Taylor
 Address: 7591 S MYRTLE, MYRTLE CR, OR 97457

Print Name Amy Barkquist Sign Name Amy
 Address: 2830 N MYRTLE RD MYRTLE CREEK OR 97457

Print Name Robin Miller Sign Name Robin Miller
 Address: 116 Laura St, Myrtle Creek OR 97457

Print Name Cindy Haws Sign Name Cindy Haws
 Address: 2884 N. Myrtle Rd Myrtle Creek OR 97457

Print Name _____ Sign Name _____
 Address: _____

Print Name _____ Sign Name _____
 Address: _____

Print Name _____ Sign Name _____
 Address: _____

Print Name AMY D REEVE Sign Name [Signature]
Address: 200 N MYRTLE RD MYRTLE CREEK OR 97457

Print Name C. M. WATKINS Sign Name [Signature]
Address: 200 N MYRTLE RD MYRTLE CREEK OR 97457

Print Name ANGIE AMARISCA Sign Name [Signature]
Address: 145 WEEKS RD 97457

Print Name William R Gibson Sign Name [Signature]
Address: 1011 NE Lillian ST MYRTLE CREEK OR 97457

Print Name Keith Martineau Sign Name [Signature]
Address: 7560 S. Myrtle Rd. Myrtle Creek OR 97457

Print Name Scott Gibson Sign Name [Signature]
Address: 1011 NE Lillian St Myrtle Creek OR 97457

Print Name Margan Gibson Sign Name [Signature]
Address: 1011 NE Lillian St, Myrtle Creek, OR 97457

Print Name Amy Murphy Sign Name [Signature]
Address: 535 Taylor Street Myrtle Creek Oregon

Print Name Bobbie Hunt Sign Name [Signature]
Address: 535 Taylor St. Myrtle Creek, Oregon

Print Name Kamy Murphy Sign Name [Signature]
Address: 535 Taylor St

Print Name ANNE HARDERS Sign Name [Signature]
Address: 5301 N Myrtle Rd Myrtle Creek OR 97457

Print Name Rita Lebow Sign Name [Signature]
Address: 222 Laura St Myrtle Creek OR 97457

Print Name GRIFFITH W. DAVIES Sign Name [Signature]
Address: 3477 N MYRTLE RD, MYRTLE CREEK, OR. 97457

Print Name JUNE D DAVIES Sign Name [Signature]
Address: 3477 N Myrtle Rd Myrtle Creek OR 97457

Print Name G. I. T. DAVES Sign Name [Signature]
Address: 3477 N Myrtle Rd Myrtle Creek, OR 97457

Print Name Ann Chamberlain Sign Name Ann Chamberlain
Address: 15066 N Myrtle Rd, Myrtle Creek

Print Name Louis Szabo Sign Name Louis Szabo
Address: 15066 N Myrtle Rd, Myrtle Creek

Print Name Step Chamberlain Sign Name Step P. Chamberlain
Address: 15066 N Myrtle Rd, Myrtle Creek

Print Name Karen Kinnberger Sign Name Karen Kinnberger
Address: 15066A N. Myrtle Rd, Myrtle Creek

Print Name Tim Allen Sign Name Tim Allen
Address: 15066A N Myrtle Rd Myrtle Creek

Print Name _____ Sign Name _____
Address: _____

~~Print Name SETH CHAMBERLAIN Sign Name Seth Chamberlain
Address: 15066 N Myrtle Rd, Myrtle Creek, OR~~

Print Name Rob Stone Sign Name Rob Stone
Address: 721 NE LEON AVE Myrtle Cr. OR

Print Name Ella Allen Sign Name Ella Allen
Address: 14241 W Myrtle Myrtle Creek OR 97457

Print Name Jacob Allen Sign Name Jacob Allen
Address: 14241 W Myrtle Myrtle Cr. OR 97457

Print Name Kelly D. Hill Sign Name Kelly D. Hill
Address: _____

Print Name Ryan King Sign Name Ryan King
Address: 15544 N. Myrtle

Print Name Robert Leo Heilman Sign Name Robert Leo Heilman
Address: 2570 Weaver Rd Myrtle Creek OR 97457

Print Name MIA HANSEN Sign Name Mia Hansen
Address: 2246A B. 14th Creek Riv, Myrtle Creek

97457

Print Name _____ Sign Name _____
Address: _____

Print Name Holly He Haven Sign Name Holly He Haven
Address: 3008 N MYRTLE RD M.C/CR 97457

Print Name JAMES HALTERMAN Sign Name James Halterman
Address: 3008 N MYRTLE RD M.C CR 97457

Print Name Arleen Neale Sign Name Arleen Neale
Address: 5945 N. Myrtle Rd. Myrtle Creek OR. 97457

Print Name CONSTANU NEALE Sign Name Constane Neale
Address: 6041 N. Myrtle Rd. Myrtle Creek

Print Name JENNIFER TAYLOR Sign Name JENNIFER TAYLOR
Address: 5642 MYRTLE RD MYRTLE CREEK OR 97457

Print Name Madeleine Smelcer Sign Name Madeleine Smelcer
Address: 1604 SPRING BROOK RD MYRTLE CREEK OR 97457

Print Name Bob Smelcer Sign Name Bob Smelcer
Address: 1604 SPRING BROOK RD

Print Name _____ Sign Name _____
Address: _____

Print Name _____ Sign Name _____
Address: _____