

Northwest Oregon Resource Advisory Council

Agenda March 16th, 2017 Salem, OR

- 9:00-9:30** **Meet and Greet**
- 9:30-9:45** **Introductions and Review Agenda**
Jose Linares- BLM Designated Federal Official
A Annabelle Jaramillo – Northwest Oregon RAC Chairperson
- 9:45-10:00** **October Meeting Minutes Review**
Jose Linares- BLM Designated Federal Official
A Annabelle Jaramillo – Northwest Oregon RAC Chairperson
- 10:00-10:30** **RAC Council Chairperson Nomination and Approval**
Annabelle Jaramillo – Northwest Oregon RAC Chairperson
- 10:30-10:45** **Break**
- 10:45-11:45** **Transportation and Access in Western Oregon**
Dustin Wharton – Oregon and California (O&C) Right-of-Way Program
Lead
- 11:45-12:30** **Lunch/Public Comment Period – (Lunch Delivered to office)**
- 12:30-1:30** **RMP Implementation Update and Discussion**
Panchita Paulete – Planner Western Oregon Plan Revision
- 1:30-2:30** **Sub-committee Involvement and Opportunities**
Discussion
- 2:30-2:45** **Break**
- 2:45-3:00** **Next Meeting and Future Agenda Items**
Discussion
- 3:00-3:15** **Review Action Items**
Stefanie Winfree – Note taker

RAC Meeting
Thursday, March 16, 2017
9:30 a.m – 2:30 p.m.

Location: Bureau of Land Management (BLM), Northwest Oregon District office (Salem, OR)

In attendance: See attached sign in sheet for member and public attendance.

BLM attendees: José Linares (District Manager), Dave Howell (Associate District Manager), Jen Velez (Public Affairs Officer), Kathy Angstrom (Management Support Specialist), Mike Mathews (Program Officer), Paul Tigan (Marys Peak Field Manager), Stefanie Winfree (note taker), Lisa McNee (OSO), Whitney Wirthlin (Cascades Planner), Jeff McCusker (Supervisory Outdoor Recreation Planner)

Meet and Greet

The RAC does not have a quorum present for this meeting. A member is missing from Category 1. The RAC may call in a 3rd member for Category 1 for decisions on the agenda. A quorum exists for categories 2 and 3.

Introduction and Agenda Review

Additional agenda items proposed by RAC members (if time allows)

- August Solar Eclipse. The RAC would like to hear from the BLM about how coordination will occur in preparation for the August eclipse
- Wildwood field trip debrief. Jeff McCusker (Northwest Oregon District, Supervisory Outdoor Recreation Planner) will be available this afternoon for discussion.

District Manager opening remarks: José has been DM for the district for about 6 weeks. He has previous experience with the Salem District and previous RACs. José has about 35 years of experience in natural resource management, primarily with the Forest Service in Oregon.

Housekeeping items (Jen) – Jen reviewed facilities locations in the Northwest Oregon District office, along with plans for lunch, safety, and emergency escape. Handouts are available for today's two presentations on the O&C right-of-way program and Resource Management Plan (RMP) implementation. Additionally, there are leftover folders available from the Wildwood field trip. It includes present and future development opportunities at the site.

Term expirations: Five come up each year with the existing rotation. Jen has a list of when member terms expire. The next round occurs in August. The call for nominations is back in DC. Once the Federal Register is published, we can officially start taking nominations for the terms that are expiring. Current members are welcome to reapply. The BLM welcomes the RAC's assistance in spreading the word about opportunities for serving on the RAC.

October Meeting Minutes Review

Summary: The RAC members in attendance have been provided with a hard copy of the notes. Jen had previously e-mailed the notes to the RAC. Dave Howell (DFO for the October 2016 meeting) has no additions to the notes from the October meeting.

Voting for approval is TBD.

Questions:

RAC-Question (Q): When does the distribution of the funds occur for the approved projects in October?

BLM-Response(R): It's in the process now. The funding has been allocated. The BLM is working on assistance agreements and contracts with the proponents. Funds can be transferred once agreements are in place.

RAC-Q: What about the contingency projects voted on by the RAC?

BLM-R: None have been identified yet. As projects get towards completion (towards end of the fiscal year), then we get together and see what funds might be available.

RAC Council Chairperson Nomination and Approval

In order to do that, we'll need to call someone in Category 1.

The RAC called Ron Dunton (Category 1) to provide for a quorum to allow the RAC to make decisions today.

Nominations for Chair: Annabelle. Motion seconded.

Nomination for Vice Chair: Jim (John Omlin?)

No other nominations. Unanimous approval for Chair and Vice Chair.

Solar eclipse event in August

The RAC would like to hear from the BLM about coordination efforts. People have been planning for this event for a long time. It will occur around 10am on August 21. The BLM first started hearing about it approximately 4 months ago when another District Manager in Oregon had a request for a Special Recreation Permit (SRP) for a large gathering in central Oregon. This is a significant event, not just in Oregon, but nationwide. It's exciting for our district, since it includes the center point for the path of totality (Just barely north of the BLM's Yaquina Head Outstanding Natural Area.

The north half of the NWO district has a small staff to work on this effort. Dave and Jen are part of a larger regional planning team (USFS, USFWS). Regular check ins with the other agencies.

RAC-Comment (C): This is a large, collaborative event. Public safety and law enforcement are large issues. In terms of land uses, there are a lot of sensitive areas that will need to be protected. The number of visitors expected is significant.

BLM-C: To be successful, BLM needs to be looped into a bunch of groups (including Coastal Visitors Association, Travel Salem, etc.). We're thinking across unit boundaries to ensure visitors have a great experience. We've participated in county meetings and "Government Solutions Team" recently. They've been great information sharing opportunities since it's such a unique event. One example is in regards to a case study in Australia and things people don't expect. We know to expect road congestion, but we might not have expected people to stop on roads when the eclipse happens. This could be a major concern for I-5.

One of the largest safety concerns in western Oregon is access to medical care if roads are congested and how do you communicate if regular communication channels (e.g., cell phones) are overloaded and unavailable.

We are planning for a lot of people at YHONA. It's been stated as a prime place to visit, since it's the first place in Oregon to view the eclipse. We're also planning on a large number of people at Marys Peak. Additionally, we expect locals to seek out other high elevation peaks in the district. Other eclipse chasers are expected at better known spots (YHONA, MP).

Lodging and reservable campsites offered by USFS, BLM, and state are completely booked. That increases the likelihood of dispersed camping on public lands. The BLM is working with FS on messaging for camping about "leave no trace" and caring for public lands.

The BLM is also coordinating management on waste and safety. We expect to have additional staff working the Wednesday before the eclipse to Wednesday after the eclipse to be good hosts to public lands and to help visitors have the best trip they can.

RAC-Q: What about personal safety to visitors? Viewing the eclipse can be damaging to the eyes.

BLM-R: The BLM showed a blog post about personal safety (2017 Solar Eclipse Viewing on Public Lands in Western Oregon). The post includes mentions of protective eyewear and that it's never good to look at the sun. Many places will be offering glasses for free.

RAC-Q: Is there a method for recruiting volunteers in Oregon to help with safety, the land, or crowd control?

BLM-R: There may be opportunities with the BLM for help with answering questions. We wouldn't be the only source for volunteer opportunities. Jen will check in with the Oregon Solutions Team to see what they are thinking on that front. They would be great to coordinate those opportunities.

RAC-C: The Sierra Group in central Oregon is looped in with volunteer opportunities. Crowd estimates are at half a million people.

BLM-C: The event will occur at a prime time for farm burning. There have been discussions about potential burn bans the week before.

BLM-C: There have also been discussions about wildfire prevention. This includes Oregon Department of Forestry (ODF) restrictions on forest management and other actions. We're also looking at other activities (like bow hunting), so we can get the message out to other people who use public lands. Not necessarily that they need to change what they're doing, but to be aware of what's going on.

BLM-C: We need to be aware of other events out of our control: Rainbow Family Gathering (July). This is 10-14 days ahead of Burning Man.

BLM-C: The BLM is cognizant of the checkerboard landscape (especially in this district). When we talk about dispersed camping, it means visitors aren't far from other land owners or industrial lands. The BLM intends to be very heavy on upfront messaging to visitors about being good neighbors. Next BLM committee meeting is tomorrow.

Travel Salem website has a gathering of local eclipse events.

RAC-C: There's a large music event occurring the weekend prior to the eclipse in Linn County. Expectations are for 30,000 people for the Sunday music festival. The permittee has asked to extend permit by one day. Expecting about 8,000-10,000 to state. Other farmers have applied for permits for 500-1,000 people. All county sites are full. Parking spots at the campground are

being reserved. Linn county is stretched thin (Brownsville Music Festival). It becomes the second largest city. LE, SAR are stretched thin.

RAC-Q: Has there been discussion on statewide incident command?

BLM-R: Working on it right now. Oregon office of emergency management. NIMO team is helping to plan and manage this event.

RAC-C: Things change quickly. As we get closer to the event, someone will need to monitor communication. With the Internet, people are in constant communication. There could be a large group summoned to one spot on short notice.

RAC-C: People stopping on the highway could be a major problem on I-5. Drivers distracted by sprint boat races in the past have caused chain reaction crashes. Similar crashes on the Yaquina Bay bridge.

RAC-C: Second the comment about monitoring the internet. Perhaps it'd be good to join recreation groups to see what's going on. (Example: Willamette Side to side group, self-organizing (up to 450 members), the sister group in central Oregon has 650.) Quickly monitor for alternate facts and to get message out. Example from this week of a 2009 travel management plan released that discussed closing the dunes. RAC member was able to jump in and provide context about the date of the document. It will let you know where people will be going and the associated traffic expected.

RAC-C: The RAC can help with the messaging. Sometimes the message of government agencies can be taken the wrong way. This group can help with notifications or identifying others who can help with the message. Posting the message as a RAC member may be received better.

RAC-C: There are concerns about public safety, and particularly about children viewing the eclipse. There's interest in having a clear message to parents that children need to use a proper device. Sunglasses are not a proper device. If there are free glasses being given out, let the RAC know.

BLM-C: Jen will look into the availability of glasses and will update the blog website about child safety.

Transportation and Access in Western Oregon

Presentation Summary: RMP implementation planning includes transportation management planning. Today's presentation with Dustin Wharton (state O&C right-of-way specialist) will provide background information, an overview of the O&C, and the unique challenges in western Oregon. There will be opportunities in the future to have more in-depth discussions and see how the RAC can be involved with these issues. Any time we talk about public access and O&C access, there's a lot of interest. Today's presentation provides the BLM's perspective, but there may be opportunities in the future to have presentations from others (like the O&C counties).

Presentation: Program/regulations established in 1950, almost a 70 year history with this process. It's an access program for the management and removal of forest products in western Oregon. It does not include access for the public for recreational purposes.

The 2812 regulations only apply to western Oregon, west of R. 8 E. East of that, it's easements or Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA) right-of-way grants. There are 943 RROW agreements westside. 402 agreements in the NWO district, covering about 4,300 miles of road. ROW can overlap. There are 3,003 easements westside. 883 in the NWO district. 98% of non-exclusive easements include no public access (administrative use only)

Westside Access Rights Project (WARP) results describes BLM parcels, access, and road miles (back to the RAC question about access numbers). BLM lands with public access: 75%. BLM roads with public access: 56%. (More lands can be accessed via walking).

Discussion:

RAC-Q: Once the road is paid off, the free use is just for forest management, not for public access, correct?

BLM-A: Correct. The regulations were written for forest management only. It's interesting because the 1937 Act talked about public access.

RAC-Q: Could one argue that forest management includes recreation?

BLM-R: The definition of forest management is defined in the regulations and it does not include recreation. Legal counsel says that it does not include public recreation. If the landowner wants to give those rights, we can get an easement.

RAC-Q: Is this codified? Or is this court or staff interpretation?

BLM-R: It's codified. 43 CFR 2812 (as of 1975, was previously numbered differently)

RAC-C: Recreation was not a primary thought when these were written in the 1950s.

BLM-C: Comments about gates on BLM instead of property boundary. BLM should be negotiating with the property owner on appropriate placement of the gate.

RAC-Q: GPS chip, Maps for public lands and access to hunting? Is it accurate or endorsed?

BLM-R: It's not endorsed by the BLM. Land sales are happening rapidly. It'll be accurate on the public lands side, but it won't likely be accurate on the private side for long.

RAC-Q: Do these restrictions change based on who owns it?

BLM-R: The rights and terms don't change.

RAC-R: The new landowner may have more desire to restrict access than previous landowner. Rights-of-ways are recorded deeds and go with the property. Counties believe public access should be negotiated.

BLM-R: The rights and terms do not change (reminder of forest management access only). The only thing that changes is: when they sell lands, money on the books (road deficits or balances), negotiates how it'll be paid off (who pays what). The permit alone doesn't change. It's up to the property owner how they want to manage their land. BLM doesn't get in to whether the landowner wants to gate it. The BLM will get a key if it is gated.

BLM-C: Reciprocal rights-of-ways and public easements are separate things. The ROW program is exclusive to BLM's access to run forestry program. On some parcels the BLM has legal public access from exclusive easements. If BLM has an exclusive (or non-exclusive) easement and private land is sold, the new landowner doesn't have the right to take away BLM's easement access.

RAC-Q: How does access for surveys work (e.g., for T&E species)?

BLM-R: If it's a BLM employee doing that in support of a timber sale plan, that's forest management. If it's private, then permission is needed from the landowner.

RAC-R: Law enforcement officers monitor use in areas that don't have legal access (e.g., behind a gate). People need to be able to demonstrate legal access.

RAC-C: Would BLM recognize those survey efforts?

BLM-R: If they were from a contractor (with legal access), yes.

RAC-Q: Regarding access to maps, it's a goal as a recreationalist to have access to maps that show the public where they have the right to be. Since they're in a GIS system, they're constantly updated. Where can I get that information?

BLM-R: Maps are available. The maps identify continuous public access or BLM administrative access. The public doesn't have access to scanned documents. The agreements were scanned as a whole document. Permit side has proprietary information that can't be made public. The agreement on the US side is a recorded document and is publically accessible. Easements, as well.

RAC-Q: Do you negotiate. If you had public access to recreation, ownership changed, is that ever negotiated to go backwards (incentive for BLM to exclude public access) and change the agreement?

BLM-R: Not that we're aware of and the BLM wouldn't encourage it. The BLM's stance is the opposite, to advocate for more public access. The deficit balance portion as it relates to decreasing public access is a non-starter. Deficit is only paid down when you haul timber (billing and payment schedules is complex).

RAC-Q: What about when BLM does a land swap? Are easements negotiated separately?

BLM-R: Unsure. If there's an encumbrance, BLM is unlikely to be able to swap. The BLM doesn't sell O&C lands. For swaps, it has to be Public Domain lands. O&C has no net loss requirement.

RAC-C: Hypothetical situation: Say the BLM has exclusive easement that accesses additional ground. Sections are swapped, does the easement drop or is it renegotiated?

BLM-R: The presenter hasn't been involved in that situation, but would advocate for the easement. It's recorded. The BLM doesn't do a lot of land swaps. A small one (40 acres) in the Medford district took 12 years, and to get done, it has to be a priority congressional authority.

RAC-C: Mollala river corridor was another one (1980s).

RAC-C: hope this groups participates in TMP later. John Omlin has been working on access to public land (BLM and USFS). He's come across maps that users can't use (e.g., bike riding example). Users want information easily and quickly. Haven't found a tool on the BLM side. The site mentioned (blm.gov/or/gis/data.php) isn't user-friendly. The USFS has maps for various areas, using QR readers, which can be uploaded to GPS device.

BLM-C: The BLM isn't there yet. It took 4 years to get where we are now. Perhaps something like that will come out of travel management.

RAC-C: There are a minimal amount of areas where people want to ride (bikes). It would be great to have these few areas posted somewhere for the public to access easily. RAC member expressed interest (JO) is interested in participating in programs/committees that would focus on developing such programs.

BLM-C: There are a few pilot projects in the BLM (not in western Oregon) where they're trying it out and they're getting good reviews. The BLM hopes we can use some of the lessons learned locally.

RAC-C: Not asking for new rights, just for accurate, easy information so we can recreate in the right place.

RAC-C: There are limitations on where people have service. Can research from home, but once you get to a gate and don't have access, then what?

BLM-R: That's the program that's been worked at in the Bureau.

RAC-C: Avenza is a free viewer for geo-referenced PDFs. Local riding groups have been using tablets with GPS for mapping and publishing routes, so they know where to go (including landmarks). The general public is ahead of us now in their use of technology. They're desperate for correct data. Data used by the recreationists is printable (in PDF form). It can be carried if needed.

RAC-C: The O&C counties believed the Act included public access and believe the public has rights to access those lands. Agreements may have been entered into not consistent with the Act. There are concerns about more gates going up quickly. O&C believes public access should be considered as negotiations occur. The issue isn't currently being litigated. Attorneys are still looking at whether it's a suit they think we can win.

RAC-C: Never heard recreation use as a justification as a gate. Usually other reason: dumping or damage to their property. It's a byproduct of other uses.

RAC-C: When damage is done to gates, seedlings, or other resources, recreation suffers.

RAC-C: Dumpstoppers use in Linn County (not Lane County) is a great benefit and deterrent to such detrimental uses.

BLM-C: The BLM isn't the only public entity that holds public access rights-of-way. The counties can hold public rights-of-way on roads (county roads). Counties have the ability to vacate those public rights-of-way. It has been talked about in Marys Peak Field Office. For people who are interested in public access across BLM land, it's not just BLM; sometimes it's the county that holds that ROW, so it's up to the county. If the county vacates it, the BLM doesn't have the ability to keep it.

RAC-C: Recreationists just want current information. "Where can we go today?" People want to do the right thing in the right place. As it relates to RMP and TMP, we need a variety of opportunities. A different demographic (45+, 70+) who also wants to recreate. With the USFS, we have the motorized use map. On the BLM side, we don't. People want to give back and are willing to volunteer and help out with maintenance. We can educate and communicate these groups and tell them where to go and where to avoid (sensitive areas) and they can further help pass the message along to other users.

BLM-C: The BLM is working on it, but it's a slow process. BLM manages 240 million acres.

BLM-C: Not all permittees want to keep recreationists out, but it's about the damaging access (stealing firewood, driving through reprod, dumping, etc.). They're generally not objecting to respectful use.

RAC-C: Many users are good about reporting unauthorized use (including dumping).

RAC-C: Motivation may not just be about resource damage. Some landowners want to privatize and monetize recreation. If you can put up a gate and charge for walking/driving access. Example \$75 to walk on private property. When the gate is 3 miles away from a BLM trailhead, that's another issue that's becoming more frequent.

RAC-C: This BLM office has worked to keep or restore access. It's difficult when gates are suddenly closed (unannounced). Example: fire closures.

BLM-C: Travel management issues are largely driven by recreation. This presentation is supposed to help frame the conversation and show how multi-faceted the issue is. We hope that O&C can come talk to us from their perspective. We'll get into the thick of why this is such a difficult issue.

Lunch/Public Comment Period

Lenora Smith, Susie Koppert – rockhounding group

Lenora and Susie are part of a local rockhounding group. They're located on the south side of sandy and they're interested in the respectful use of public lands, collecting (not mining) rocks and minerals, and educating others. They're concerned about losing access rights and not understanding why areas are closed off. The coast, Sandy River, and Rogue River are popular areas for collecting rocks. The group works with enthusiasts of all ages (families, children, retirees). The group expressed appreciation for the presentation on access rights in western Oregon.

RAC-Q: Is there a protocol or controls about the number of people who can participate in a particular area?

SK- Yes, for different areas. Permit use sites are not advertised, in attempts to limit abuse. The group has permission for two areas and there are limitations for safety of the public and the natural resources. They don't want their group to be known for greed or disrespect of the land.

RAC-Q: General rule, if you're not using mechanized equipment, if it's for personal use, you can pick up rocks?

SK: Correct. There's a tight control on artifacts and fossils.

RAC member expressed interest in BLM maps that shows good areas for collecting different types of rocks. Other RAC members expressed concern about abuse that could occur from identifying/advertising these areas. An education trail could be beneficial.

BLM-C: This BLM district doesn't have anything designated (beyond Quartzville and Sharps Creek). In order to avoid disturbance areas, we corralled the recreationists into a particular area and combine it with monitoring.

LS: Expressed interest in having maps of available areas in the district.

BLM-C: Reminder to be aware of mining claims. You need to contact the claimant in advance.

LS: Interest in keeping the sunstone area open to miners. It's around Lakeview (Plush).

BLM-C: Booth at bohemian mining days for a number of years. We team up with USFS to provide information and do education around recreational mining in the area.

RAC-C: July 7-9 is the Oakridge event, going up to Bohemia.

RAC-C: Address committee (non-BLM related) about this summer. Regarding animal health and past outbreaks in Ohio and Minnesota in 2015. There's a current outbreak in Tennessee (avian influenza), destruction of about 20,000 chickens. Wild birds carry it, but aren't susceptible to it. It has impacted Oregon in past infections. No one in US has gotten avian influenza. The

virus is killed if cooked, processed, or pasteurized. Reminder to homeowners with chickens to practice biosecurity at home (keeping strangers out).

RMP Implementation Update and Discussion – Panchita Paulete

Panchita was the Associate Team Lead on the planning effort. This presentation will talk about where we are now and where we're headed. The Resource Management Plans (RMPs) are the governing documents upon which BLM manages its lands.

District designated reserves includes ACECs, SRMAs, and non-forested areas like open water, and structural features (roads and seed orchards).

Consolidation of the Eugene and Salem Districts did not change the sustained yield units. The Northwest Oregon district is responsible for 58% of western Oregon's ASQ. Non-ASQ volumes are predicted as a byproduct of implementing restoration activities.

RAC-Q: What types of things fall under National Conservation Lands (NCL)?

BLM-R: Wilderness areas, wild and scenic areas. It would include national monuments, but we don't have any.

RAC-Q: What makes up the Late-Successional Reserve (LSR)?

BLM-R: BLM blocked large reserves to help the NSO and occupied marbled murrelet areas. One element of this plan was having local staff identify stands that met old and structurally complex (USFWS Recovery Action 32). Of the range of alternatives, all lands that districts local identified as having those characteristics to meet RA 32 are included.

RAC-Q: Regarding volume (ASQ) targets: What does that represent in dollars? What type of dollars can we expect to see pushed back to the RAC for disbursement?

BLM-R: Last year's receipts were about 41 million. Under the O&C, the formula is that half goes back to counties. ¼ comes to BLM, ¼ goes to treasury. Slightly different under SRS. Counties got about 18 million in receipts. Under the new RMP, it's expected to go up. It's also driven by market forces. If prices go up, we'll see increases in receipts. If prices go down, we'll see a decrease.

RAC-C: The O&C folks would say the Act called for 500 million board feet as a minimum. That's what the first lawsuit is about.

RAC-Q: What's the "Natural Hazard" area?

BLM-R: In the former Eugene district, the Lake Creek falls. It's a waterfall. An example of other Natural Hazard areas throughout the country would be sheer cliff faces with high winds.

BLM-C: How might this group engage with the district in getting things done? At a basic level, projects will have to go through the NEPA process before being implemented. This includes public review, and opportunities for managers to reach out for specific projects.

RAC-Q: Will the new secretary affect how the BLM is proceeding with implementing the new RMP?

BLM-R: Not at this time. We're moving forward with implementing the plan. There are changes with any new administration (budget, policy, etc.). At the local level, we have our RMP that's guiding our actions. The 5 year implementation plan shows our full implementation by year 5. If we get less funding, we may have to scale back.

BLM-R: The DOI's budget proposal for 2018 is in the news right now. Budgets can affect how we implement the RMP. The 5 year window is normal operating procedure for getting to full implementation.

BLM-R: We'll do plan evaluation in 5 year intervals to review goals and objectives and how we're meeting them. Are the assumptions and estimates still accurate or have we deviated from them? Are there any physical or political circumstances that change how we're able to implement the plan as intended?

RAC-C: Public comment periods can be too brief for the public to provide meaningful input, especially if links to key documents are broken. If broken links happen, we would appreciate extending the comment period.

RAC-C: How much are projects in the planning stages affected by outside funding? If you plan 100 projects, but they don't sell or budgets are reduced, one would assume it affects what you can do.

BLM-R: Appropriated dollars (\$106 million) vs. timber receipts (\$41 million, dispersed). It's an interesting hybrid. Operating budget is largely appropriated. If the Congress reduces our budget, then we have to factor that in. We have to ask ourselves what programs or seasons may be affected.

RAC-C: Where does prioritization come from?

BLM-R: Largely, the president's budget. The OMB budget proposal. We step down from there. The secretary will come out with their priorities, the BLM director will express their priorities. The benefit of an RMP is that it helps us define our priorities now and years to come. Implementing the RMP is the priority in the coming years.

BLM-R: Priorities are set at different levels. There are also state and local levels.

BLM-C: We had a 3-5 year engineering strategy for projects. Those are the types of things that the RAC can engage in. Providing feedback and advice.

RAC-C: Regarding recreation, it would be interesting to see a weight or scale for recreation priorities and which projects could benefit from volunteers (fundraising and labor). There have been past successes in fundraising for the USFS.

RAC-C: There isn't statewide direction for agencies to work in concert (with objectives). Trying to get on committees to take advantage of opportunities for getting continuity in some areas. Cross-agency priorities and use of volunteers.

BLM-C: National strategy addresses use of volunteers and other sources of funding. We can leverage other resources for on the ground projects.

RAC-Q: Is the BLM's budget tied to the revenue stream that you receive?

BLM-R: Yes. We have appropriated dollars, receipts, fees.

RAC-Q: Are appropriated funds tied to specific projects or general?

BLM-R: Specific line-items, specific types of work. Some are tied to specific projects. Base dollars and a lot of labor is paid for by appropriated dollars.

RAC-Q: Is there an opportunity for groups to raise money for specific projects or turned into grant money? What happens when a receipt/donation comes in? Is there a vehicle to set it up as a grant/banked for a specific project? Can the organization leverage volunteer hours?

BLM-R: Don't reinvest funds. We can put in separate account outside appropriations account.

BLM-R: The West Eugene Wetlands disc golf course is an example of a similar successful effort. Funds and labor were fundraised/volunteer time to design and construct.

BLM-R: To do that, the BLM would need a formal agreement with that group. There are a lot of opportunities through formal working agreements/memorandum. Partnerships are the best way to spend the dollars.

RAC-C: Some members have had past successes with buying materials for the USFS instead of donating funds.

RAC-C: How is carbon storage working with the new plan?

BLM-R: The process included an extensive carbon analysis (cutting trees, hauling trees, grazing, fuels management, etc.). The analysis showed net carbon storage increase of 32% over current levels. It's higher than expected for the old plan. In part because of the larger network of reserves and in part because of the forest practices.

RAC-C: Regarding riparian zone protections or setbacks in timber sales, the new plan appears to halve the riparian protection. Can you speak to that?

BLM-R: Under the 1995 ACS, fishbearing streams had Riparian Reserve width of 2 site-potential tree (SPT) heights. Others had 1 SPT heights. Under the new plan, all perennial and fish-bearing streams have a Riparian Reserve of one SPT height. Strategy has multiple elements: watersheds are in one of three classes. Ranking generally ranked on importance to ESA listed fish and water quality. The ones that listed fish/water quality of greatest importance have the greatest protections and most restrictions on management. That's about 75% of the lands. Second classification is important of fish or water, but not necessarily both. The 3rd class didn't have the importance to listed fish or water quality. Largely tied to CH for listed fish or where streams have high intrinsic potential (large wood to create habitat and clean water).

Class 1 – 1 SPT height on all RR. It seems half as protective because of the RR size, but we've learned a lot since the 1995 RMP. If we're managing for fish/water, the important areas are really within that first SPT height. Within those areas, there are restrictions on no-harvest, or non-commercial work, or limited commercial work, depending on class and distance from the stream.

Class 2 – no middle zone.

Class 3 – real difference in intermittent, without fish. The entire width of the RR is only 50 feet. It seems really restrictive. Only about 20% of the lands outside the 50 foot zone is adjacent to the HLB.

Additionally, the focus of the RR is different. Under the new RMP, the focus is on fish, aquatics, water. Under the 1995 plan, the ACS/RR had broader objectives and was tied to the NFMA. It wasn't just driven by fish and water.

RAC-C: In those areas with 50 foot buffer, is there where you came up with more timber harvest?

BLM-R: No. We've decreased the amount of land dedicated to timber production, but we've increased our targets. Due to two things: in 1995, we anticipated regen, but did mostly thinning. We now have bigger trees as a starting point. We're anticipating more regeneration harvest in this plan.

For the 50' buffer. This riparian strategy was developed collaboratively with other agencies (e.g., NMFS). We focused to make sure that management of clean water and fish was focused where it was needed and would be meaningful. On the really small subset of streams that we have in Oregon westside with only 50' buffer adjacent to HLB, it was fully analyzed.

RAC-Q: Is the Riparian setback strategy different for the dry forest?

BLM-R: No, it's based on the same evaluative tool. However, we did allow for some fuels management in the dry forest Riparian Reserve. The exception is the eastside (Klamath Falls) with specific management direction.

Wildwood tour information - Jeff McCusker

We're looking for ways to be more financially stable in the future at Wildwood. The fee law we operate under says we aren't supposed to rely on fees exclusively. What were the takeaways for the tour?

RAC-C: Development of the site appears to have fallen behind the curve. Project implementation hasn't kept up with plans for the site.

BLM-C: Great example of how partnerships can help projects move along (e.g., Sandy Ridge).

RAC-C: Wildwood is a spectacular sight. The plans to add camping there are spot-on. You need to get the public into the forest and see what's there. Despite conflicts with neighbors. Huge potential in the area. Hope that the BLM finds the balance that allows BLM to be entrepreneurial that brings revenue to be reinvested in the site. Sites and resources can be damage quickly; it's a shame to see the homeless issue spread into our lands.

Public Q: How much would it take to analyze the impacts before you can get a plan on the table? What are the budget and time requirements?

BLM-A: It's no insignificant amount of time and financial resources.

RAC-C: In addition to homeless camps and the fee issues, general safety of the area was a big takeaway (property safety: thefts, car break-ins, and personal safety).

RAC-Q: Do you have 5-20 year management plan for projects? Based on tour discussions with the staff, the BLM seems to conceptualize these needs.

BLM-R: The BLM recreation program really relies on partners/partnerships. Visions don't always align. BLM recreation planners saw the need to get the land and the potential, but they couldn't have implemented the project alone. Advocate for LWCF, government officials, etc. It's hard to just write down a vision and release it. If you do that, you can exclude other possibilities. Other agencies in the past had put information out there and ignored what's going on around the park. It makes it tough to engage with the communities and leverage partnerships. Special Recreation Management Areas in the RMP were largely based on public input.

RAC-C: Working with the BLM at Shotgun Creek has been very positive. One very restrictive thing for the BLM is the various processes (like NEPA). It'd be nice to be able to anticipate, although we don't know everything today. It shouldn't have to be a big process to make small changes: E.g., uses of a trail. Would like to see the BLM incorporate more flexibility at the local level in the travel management plans. Looking for short-term solutions in between larger planning and analysis efforts.

BLM-R: We had a quick win at Shotgun. Based on ranger and recreation input, we'll be able to allow some side-by-side use that weren't specifically identified for that use. At Shotgun, we will analyze with flexibility in alternatives and making changes.

Subcommittee Involvement and Opportunities

1. Wildwood (Will, Debbie, John O., Pete) Analysis of public comments, discussion with Clackamas County commissioners
2. Opportunities for Public engagement (strategies) – ties into Chamber of Commerce for Rec/Econ impacts and opportunities
 - a. Recreation (OHV, hiking, mtn. biking) (beyond just Wildwood)
 - b. Outbound Communication to users
 - c. Recreation forum? How do we engage with all agencies?
3. Reviewing and providing input to BLM
 - a. Recreation fees
 - b. Other issues
 - c. Watershed councils

RAC-C: What is the current need for the Wildwood RAC subcommittee?

BLM-R: It would be helpful for the subcommittee to do a check-in with local officials and key community groups and provide recommendations back to us.

RAC-C: It would be helpful to know the timeline for the Wildwood planning process to work around.

BLM-R: Verify Wildwood subcommittee members as Will, Deb, Pete and John B.

RAC-C: Another subcommittee could be formed around public engagement.

RAC-C: Sharps Creek. Opportunities: reviewing and providing input for different areas regarding recreational opportunities.

BLM-C: Volunteers can be really important and vital, but they're not a panacea. Volunteers require BLM oversight and management.

RAC-C: Recreationists on BLM typically have discretionary income. We need to address the broader network. It's not just about reporting crime.

BLM-C: Noting recreation theme. It's the one thing that everybody does. We're not all involved in timber.

RAC-C: It's one thing that people can get their arms around.

BLM-Q: Is there a forum in the Willamette Valley or region to talk about recreational issues?

RAC-C: There are several. But part of the challenge is that there's no overall guidance for Oregon recreation. High levels from various agencies in Oregon aren't coming together to develop one plan for Oregon.

BLM-C: It's been discussed to develop that kind of forum, but hasn't happened yet. We recognize that value in having that kind of form to discuss issues.

RAC-C: One member has had discussions with Travel Oregon, BLM isn't always the driver. They can be a seat at the table.

Public comment: The requirements for posting a Federal Register (FR) notice is 30 days in advance of RAC meetings, but member of the public has found that posting dates and meeting dates are often much closer (down to even a week).

BLM-C: Past notes indicated interest in having subcommittee for travel management. It's too early right now, but expect to have meetings early next year. BLM is currently working on training staff on the process.

BLM-C: Some proposals just need to be brought to the field manager.

RAC-C: On getting public input and the homeless issue: Communities are stressed and resources are thin, but what if we communicate with Chamber of Commerce of smaller towns near development and bring them in? These are the ones who stand to lose if the recreation doesn't pan out.

RAC-C: This ties into Travel Oregon. One of their missions in the larger met areas was about commerce. This year they've moved to smaller, more rural areas. Working directly with smaller communities about capacity and what they can do with their communities. We can be more efficient if we tag on to the existing efforts. Also, we can send them information about public meetings. The "Go (city)" efforts are Travel Oregon efforts. People get engaged when it's tied to economics.

BLM-C: We're working with some of these groups (Travel Salem) for the eclipse planning. Travel Oregon is headquartered in Salem and we can connect with them.

RAC-C: Native Fish sSociety has river stewards all over the state. Private citizens who provide information to the society, which then decides what to do with that info (who to contact). Could a similar idea be implemented by the BLM for recreation areas? Or perhaps enlarge the role of the river stewards?

BLM-C: A network of additional eyes would be valuable.

RAC-C: Put out these ideas to RAC members about things they're interested in individually. Also include guidance on subcommittee requirements.

BLM-C: The BLM will do that. Reminder about subcommittees, they need to be balanced like the rest of the RAC (representation from each category). Subcommittee meetings operate the same as the RAC, you have to advertise in the FR. We can bring in outside members. It has to be worked into the schedule. BLM will review and provide full subcommittee rules.

RAC-C: What can a committee member do to help the process? Example, eyes on particular sites. Any suggestions would be helpful.

BLM-C: When you engage a subcommittee you are a group who brings back a recommendation to the full RAC. They're formalized through the RAC and then given to Jose.

RAC-C: Regarding terms that are expiring, when will be BLM be recruiting?

BLM-R: It's expected to begin in the next month to 6 weeks. Those with two year terms are about to expire: David Schmidt, Peter Giordano, Glen Crinklaw, Craig Pope, Jerry Bailey. BLM will put out an email about reapplying. If you're not interested in reapplying, but have suggestions, please share with the BLM.

Next Meeting and Future Agenda Items

Considering advertising requirements, how often does the RAC want to meet? Next meeting could be multi-faceted. Full RAC and subcommittee. Or do we need full meeting to set

subcommittee structure? BLM does need a decision on recreation fees on the suite (13 business plans, about 25 pages each)

RAC-Q: When does BLM need the decision?

BLM-R: Recreation staff had hoped to get together for meeting in May. At this point, we do have new guidance. The Oregon State Office needs the FR notices 60 days in advance of meeting dates. The earliest would be at this point would be in June. Perhaps a meeting to review proposals and develop subcommittee structure and then another meeting to decide on fees.

Specific dates: There will be a Doodle poll with potential dates in June and then plan around that. Will include a reminder to have a quorum. There will be decisions on funding (fees).

RAC-C: Bureau need to have a sign at all fee recreation sites that states that fees stay here. "What you pay here, stays here."

BLM-C: The BLM hasn't forgotten that and is working on that.

RAC-C: Interesting in seeing that message as a larger ad.

Tentative vote on the notes and then get confirmation on Category 3.

Vote to approve October notes. Motion seconded. Unanimous vote here. Will verify with Will.

RAC-Q: Who would be interested in a one-day meeting on Dustin Wharton's presentation? Not a RAC meeting. 6-8 RAC members indicate interest.

2:40 p.m. – Meeting Adjourned

Northwest Oregon RAC

Sign-In

Name

Phone

Email

Kathy Angstrom

Stefanie Winfree

Michael Mathews

Lisa McKee

Dave Howell

Susie Koppert

(503) 956-0045

susiekoppert@gmail.com

Lenora Smith

503-646-1932 home

lenorasmith@gmail.com

Dustin Wharton

Paul Tigen

Mark Kogle

Whitney Whirl

Jeff McCosker

Pachota

NW Oregon RAC Members Sign In

Category 1:

David R. Schmidt

Jeremiah A. Price

Ron Price

Peter A. Giordano

Mike W. Ripley

David R. Schmidt
Jeremiah A. Price
(via phone)
Peter A. Giordano

Category 2:

James A. Dundon

John H. Atkins Jr.

Lon D. Otterby

John Omlin

Glen P. Crinklaw

James A. Dundon
John H. Atkins Jr.
Lon D. Otterby
John Omlin

Category 3:

Craig A. Pope

William C. Tucker

Annabelle E. Jaramillo

Jerry J. Bailey

Deborah Porter

William C. Tucker
Annabelle E. Jaramillo

Deborah Porter
