

Western Oregon RAC Meeting Notes

Date: December 8-10, 2020

Location: Virtual meeting on Zoom

RAC Coordinator/Facilitator: Kyle Sullivan

DFO: Elizabeth Burghard, Medford District Manager

Day 1 – December 8 from 9 AM to 4:00 PM

9 AM Meeting called to order (Elizabeth Burghard, DFO)

Introductions (Kyle Sullivan)

Attendees: Elizabeth Burghard, BLM Medford District Manager and Designated Federal Official; Kyle Sullivan, Facilitator and Public Affairs Officer, BLM Medford District; Ann Craig, Budget Analyst BLM Roseburg District; Kaard Bombe, Tech Support; Jan Mathis, notetaker.

Presenters: Anne Marie King and Brad Grenham, Solicitor's Office.

BLM District Managers: Jose Linares, NW OR; Heather Whitman, Roseburg, Steve Lydick, Acting DM Coos Bay; Todd Forbes, Lakeview.

SRS Title II Coordinators: Pat Johnston, State Lead; Christina Beslin, Medford, Klamath Falls, Roseburg; Megan Harper, Coos Bay District and Public Affairs Officer; Stephanie Messerle, Coos Bay District.

District Public Affairs Officers: Cheyne Rossbach, Roseburg.

BLM Field Manager: Kevin Heatley, Klamath Falls **Associate District Manager:** David Howell, NW OR.

RAC members:

Category 1: Dean Finnerty, Dino Venti, Samara Phelps, Jack LeRoy, Lance Powlison.

Category 2: Matt Swanson, Ken McCall, Stanley Vejtasa, George McKinley, Edwin Anderson.

Category 3: Lily Morgan, Co-Chair, Michael Kennedy, Bob Main, Kevin Christiansen, Craig Pope.

Public: No attendees from the public.

Review and approve notes from last meeting Oct 26 and Oct 30 (Elizabeth Burghard, Kyle Sullivan)

Will do a roll call vote.

- **Dean Finnerty, Chair, makes a motion to vote to accept the notes as written. Stan Vejtasa and Ken McCall second the motion.**

Vote:

Lance – approve; Dean – approve; Dino – approve; Samara – approve; Matthew – approve; Edwin – approve; Ken – approve; Stan – approve; George – approve; Mike – approve; Robert – approve; Kevin – approve; Lily – approve; Craig – approve.

- **Motion has passed based on the roll call vote.**

Ethics training – Review Section 13 of RAC Charter (Anne Marie King, Brad Grenham, DOI Solicitor’s Office)

Anne Marie King presented a powerpoint on basic Resource Advisory Council (RAC) ethics obligations.

RACs are authorized under federal regulations addressing advisory committees that apply throughout the federal government. All agencies have advisory councils, however the BLM is a little different because we have the Organic Act which includes a particular set of regulations, 43 CFR and 1784 CFR, that address the RAC that you sit on.

All of you come from a variety of places in the public and private sector and are here to represent the views and interests of the communities that you come from, which can include timber interests, environmental organizations, local government officials, state employee members, tribe members, academics, members of the public, etc. As a group, you are drawn from a very diverse constituency.

The reason you’re here is to provide your own independent judgement and insight into the business of the RAC. The hope is that you can all discuss in a manner that is free from conflicts of interest under the regulatory guidance in the Charter.

You were appointed specifically to provide a point of view from the community from which you come, whether it be the industry sector, a labor union, environmental group, etc. All of the constituencies that have an interest in the subject matter that the RAC addresses.

If you find yourself in a position regarding a deliberative matter at the RAC and taking an action that would directly affect your interest, first talk to Elizabeth Burghard and recuse yourself from participating in the vote.

You are on the RAC because you have special expertise, experience, and community interests. The RAC exists for you to share your insights with the BLM. We just want to make sure we don’t have an ethical conflict under the Charter or the appearance of one.

Elizabeth: If you have ties to an organization on a project proposal this week, let us know and we’ll put you down as abstaining from that vote on that specific project proposal and we’ll reflect that in the notes. If you have any questions as we move forward, let me know.

Plan for today (Elizabeth Burghard)

- The group will hear on project proposals, county by county.
- Chair Dean Finnerty will lead a discussion on the projects.
- Vote on inclusions on individual projects like a slate.
- We have 98 proposals scheduled to review.

General business for the day (Elizabeth Burghard)

General information on the proposals that we received: The funding announcement was open from June through the end of September 2020. Through that process, we received about 110 proposals, we had 80 applicants for Secure Rural Schools (SRS) funding for this year, and we have approx. 6.5 million dollars for three years of SRS funding for distribution.

Where can SRS funds be used? In the legislation for the SRS Act, here are the criteria for funding:

- Projects must be determined to benefit Federal land. The term Federal land in the Act means – land within the National Forest System except for the National Grasslands and certain withdrawn areas within the National Forest System.
- Applicable to Western Oregon – such portions of the revested Oregon and California railroad and reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands are as or may hereafter come under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior.
- We had some projects that had no nexus identified, they were perhaps on other types of withdrawn lands or public domain land, but no NEXUS to O&C lands, so we were not able to carry those projects forward for your review for funding, because they did not meet that criteria.

What qualifies for SRS funding?

- Section 204 of 16 USC 7121-7128 lists conditions of approval for projects proposed for SRS funding. For every project that the Secretary decides to fund, the project must meet these five criteria:
 1. The project complies with all applicable Federal laws including regulations.
 2. The project is consistent with the applicable resource management plan and with any watershed or subsequent plan developed pursuant to the resource management plan and approved by the Secretary concerned.
 3. The project has been approved by the resource advisory committee in accordance with section 7125 of this title, including the procedures under subsection (e) of that section.
 4. A project description has been submitted by the resource advisory committee to the Secretary concerned in accordance with section 7125 of this title.
 5. The project will improve the maintenance of existing infrastructure, implement stewardship objectives that enhance forest ecosystems, and restore and improve land health and water quality.

When we did our reviews at the BLM, we looked at criteria 1, 2 and 5 of these requirements. For every project that you receive, you will be able to communicate that yes, it meets all applicable laws including regulations; it was consistent with all applicable or subsequent resource management plan; and it will improve the maintenance of existing infrastructure, implement stewardship objectives that enhance forest ecosystems, and restore and improve land health and water.

There were some great projects that were submitted, however they may not have necessarily met the criteria for improving the maintenance of existing infrastructure, implementing stewardship objectives that enhance forest ecosystems, and restoring and improving land health and water.

Secure Rural Schools (SRS)

Thank you for making yourselves available for this week and the opportunity for our project proponents to make their presentations.

The process for this week:

Elizabeth mentioned the five criteria for the Secretary of the Interior to allocate funding towards projects under SRS. This week, you have a key roll related to two of those criteria:

1. Project has been approved by the RAC in accordance with Section 7125 of this title.
2. A project description has been submitted by the RAC to the Secretary for the funding. This will be one of the follow-up items that Dean Finnerty will do as your Chair.

➤ Chair Dean Finnerty will take the lead in writing recommendations to the Secretary.

- There is 6.5 million in funding. If the funding is not allocated at this meeting, it will carryover to a future funding effort. Another funding announcement will be going out shortly.
- SRS Act requires that at least 50 percent of all project funds be used for projects primarily dedicated to 1) Road maintenance, decommissioning or obliteration, or 2) Restoration of streams and watersheds.

Overview of the RAC Committee Recommendations spreadsheet (Ann Craig, Pat Johnston)

A spreadsheet was developed to help track the projects and county allocations. Kyle Sullivan emailed the latest version of this spreadsheet to everyone this morning.

- Not all counties have the same allocation of project dollars. That is reflective of the formula that Pat Johnston reviewed at our first meeting in October and tied to the SRS Act, economic factors, the O&C Act, and how timber receipts are distributed between counties as well.
- We will track the funding on a county-by-county basis.
- There may be some flexibility in terms of multi-county projects, you'll be able to work through that on the spreadsheet, however we want encourage everyone to strive for projects to be funded from the county the funds are coming from so we get a good distribution throughout western Oregon.
- If all the funds are not allocated in this meeting, there will be future funding opportunities, and more proposals in the near future.
- Expect an additional SRS funds to be allocated this spring, approx. 2.4 million anticipated.

Q&A

Q. On the spreadsheet, there is 300K dollars not allocated to a specific county, can we allocate those funds to any county we would like?

A. These are funds leftover from past years from previous projects that came in at less cost, was deobligated and went back into our budget under SRS Title II and are no longer allocated to a specific county. So yes, you will be able draw on these funds. (Elizabeth)

Comment: Have concerns about the leftover funding no longer being allocated to the county it came from.

A. The RAC can recommend to proportionally allocate funds or propose ways to address that funding in the future. However, for the purpose of this meeting, we are unable to track which counties those leftover funds came from. (Elizabeth)

Project proposals:

Columbia County

Columbia Soil and Water Conservation District

6 – Columbia County Fish Passage Project – withdrawn from consideration for funding.

Upper Nehalem Watershed District (Aaron Miller, presenter)

7 – Nehalem Native Nursery

Approved amount funded: \$20,822

➤ **Motion made by Lily Morgan recommending to fully fund the proposal for the Nehalem Native Nursery. Bob Main seconds the motion.**

Vote:

Cat 1: Lance – yes; Dean – yes; Dino – yes; Samara – yes; Jack – yes.

Cat 2: Matthew – yes; Edwin – yes; Ken – absent; Stanley – yes; George – yes.

Cat 3: Craig – yes; Michael – yes; Robert – yes; Kevin – yes; Lily – yes.

➤ **Motion passes.**

Benton County

Mid-Coast Watershed Council (Evan Hayduck, presenter)

2 – Bummer Creek Tributary Fish Passage and Wetland Restoration

Approved amount funded: \$50,000

Marys River Watershed Council (Kathleen Westly, presenter)

3 – Restoring System Process in Reese Creek, Phase I

Approved amount funded: \$150,000

Q. *Has the BLM agreed to provide logs for this project?*

A. We are working with fish biologists from the BLM and they have committed staff time as well as stream logs and plants for riparian planting.

Q. *Is this project a combination of DNA sampling survey and restoration work?*

A. DNA sampling has been underway and we have that funding already. We will continue to do that as part of the monitoring, however the essential project is the instream restoration.

SOLVE - Multicounty project (Joy Hawkins, presenter)

90 – Taking Care of Oregon Together: Volunteer Litter Cleanups

Approved amount funded: \$6,421

Q. Does your organization have the ability to deal with large vehicles that are left behind?

A. We would have to work with other agencies to remove vehicles.

Q. Does your organization have the capacity to expand to other counties in SW Oregon?

A. Yes.

Institute for Applied Ecology - Multicounty project (Tom Kaye, presenter)

95 – Willamette Valley Native Plant Materials Partnership

Approved amount funded: \$29,936

Q. Do you sell the seed to your partners and if so, does the sale of the seed sufficient to cover operating costs?

A. We do sell seed as a partnership to partners to cover costs. Working towards a model where those revenues sustain the operation of the organization. Right now we need to bridge the gap to get to that sustainability.

Luckiamute Watershed Council - Multicounty project (Kristen Larson, presenter)

102 – Temperature Monitoring Luckiamute Watershed

Approved amount funded: \$24,000

Discussion and funding recommendations for Benton County projects.

- **Motion by Craig Pope to vote on funding recommendations as presented for the slate for Benton County and consider the \$10,805 overage at the final reconciliation. Lily Morgan seconds the motion.**

Vote:

Cat 1: Lance – recuse; Dean – yes; Dino – yes; Samara – yes; Jack – no.

Cat 2: Matthew – no; Edwin – yes; Ken – absent; Stan – yes; George – yes.

Cat 3: Craig – yes; Michael – yes; Robert – no; Kevin – no; Lily – yes.

- **Motion passes.**

Clackamas County

The Freshwater Trust (Mark McCollister, presenter)

4 – Upper Sandy River Basin Restoration

Approved amount funded: \$77,260

Clackamas Soil & Water Conservation District (Samuel Leininger, presenter)

5 – Clackamas County Priority Weed Management

Approved amount funded: \$40,000

Q. Is the minimum amount requested of \$40K and \$100K scalable and how would that be done?

A. Yes, it's modular, so it's scalable at any level.

Q. Has the location of the proposed 300 acres been determined yet?

A. We'll be looking at a vector pathway analysis, thinking about areas we would propose for initial survey and treatment, roads, trails, and streams. We would focus on those areas first and depending on the funding available, we would scale based on the priority sites.

Northwest Youth Corps – this is a consolidation of five multicounty projects (Jeff Parker, presenter)

96 – Northwest Youth Corps NW Oregon BLM District Fire Rehabilitation

Approved amount funded: \$22,836

- 16 – Coos Bay - NW Youth Corps Youth Partnership
- 36 – Northwest Youth Corps-Recreation Youth Crews
- 54 – NYC Medford BLM Youth Crews
- 77 – NYC Lakeview BLM Youth Crews

Discussion and funding recommendations for Clackamas County projects.

- **Motion by Dean Finnerty to recommend funding of \$77,260 for project 4 Upper Sandy Basin Restoration; \$40,000 for project 5 Clackamas County Priority Weed Management; and \$22,836 for project 96 NW Youth Corps NW OR BLM District Fire Rehabilitation. Stan Vejtasa seconds the motion.**

Vote:

- Cat 1: Lance – yes; Dean – yes; Dino – yes; Samara – yes; Jack – yes.
- Cat 2: Matthew – yes; Edwin – yes; Ken – absent; Stan – yes; George – yes.
- Cat 3: Craig – yes; Michael – yes; Robert – yes; Kevin – yes; Lily – yes.

- **Motion passes.**

Lunch break 12:35 – 1:35 pm.

Reconvened at 1:35 pm.

Roll call:

- Cat 1: Lance – absent; Dean – present; Dino – present; Samara – present; Jack – present.
- Cat 2: Matthew – present; Edwin – present; Ken – absent; Stan – present; George – present.
- Cat 3: Craig – present; Michael – present (to recuse for first Lane County project #84); Robert – present; Kevin – present; Lily – present.

Elizabeth: Based on a discussion with facilitators on the project review process during lunch break, we recognized that we were missing attendees who were raising their hands to ask questions. We have asked Megan Harper monitor the “raise hand” feature in Zoom to call on attendees who have questions.

Kyle: Request that when you are calling for a motion or calling for a second to state your names, so we can capture it correctly in the notes.

Continuation of project presentations:

Lane County

Confederated Tribes of the Siletz Indians (Josh Seekatz, presenter)

84 – Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians Camp Creek Property

Approved amount funded: \$49,500

Q. *What is your long term management strategy to prevent re-encroachment of both conifers and blackberry?*

A. With the acquisition we have a significant lump sum of stewardship dollars, that was the match that I mentioned in the presentation, so we have a fund that (in theory) in perpetuity do mowing and spot sprays to maintain those habitats after the initial restoration.

Coast Folk Willamette Watershed Council (Reilly Newman, presenter)

85 – Carnine Upland Oak Prairie Restoration Project

Approved amount funded: \$47,728

Q. *Concerned that the project isn't scalable, what's going to happen if it's not fully funded?*

A. Oak restoration is an expensive process and we tried to tailor it down to be as cost conscious as possible. Typically, oak restoration project can run up to \$8K to \$10K per acre. Right now, we're sitting at a cost between \$3,600 to \$3,800 per acre.

Q. *Do you have a plan for maintenance and keeping encroaching species out of the restored oakland?*

A. The property is protected by a conservation easement held by the McKenzie River Trust. There are operation and maintenance funds available. Not allowed to use the funds for initial restoration work, but can be used for maintenance in perpetuity.

Q. *Is there any commercial potential to this project?*

A. The areas we are focusing on don't have any merchantable timber. The trees are already dead or dying conifers growing on bedrock, and once they reach a certain height they die off and become a fire hazard.

McKenzie River Trust (Daniel Dietz, presenter)

86 – Finn Rock Reach Floodplain Restoration

Approved amount funded: \$100,000

Q. *Have the wildfires altered your plans?*

A. Our plans won't change very much. We had 250 trees staged up there for implementing into the project that were burned. We were able to recover that loss from all the hazard trees, so we have more wood than previously.

Q. *Noticed that there's quite a bit of funding from OWEB, has that been recommended for funding yet?*

A. We won't know about the OWEB funding in December, they will be ranking the projects in the third week in December. If OWEB funding isn't imminent, we could break the project into two phases and proceed with Phase 1 with SRS Title II funding.

Long Tom Watershed Council (Jed Kaul, presenter)

88 – Long Tom Headwaters Aquatic Restoration

Approved amount funded: \$143,999

Lane County Youth Services (Matthew Sterner, presenter)

89 – Lane County Youth Services MLK Juvenile Forest Work Team

Approved amount funded: \$64,651

Q. *What are biggest challenges for getting more kids out in the woods on a broader scale?*

A. More funding and consistent funding would help us expand the program on a broader scale.

Q. *Is the cost estimate for this project scalable, but don't see a minimum amount. How could that be done?*

A. We ask our partners for a commitment of four weeks (four to five days a week) which is about \$3600 per week. We could scale it down to a base minimum of 16 days for \$14,000.

Q. *Curious about your applicants, how many students do you put through and how many are turned away?*

A. We haven't had to turn any kids away in over three years. Generally, we serve about 150 kids a year. Not all of them will go through the forest work team. We have a variety of different opportunities available for them. They do apply for the forest work team, however to be approved for the team, they have to show an 80 percent attendance rate and participation which is equal to an average of B minus in school.

City of Cottage Grove (Amanda Ferguson, presenter)

91 – Row River Trail Maintenance Project

Approved amount funded: \$59,039

Q. *Are you asking the RAC to fund for more than one year?*

A. If funds were available for more than one year, we would be happy to sign on for multiple years.

Lane County Public Works (Kyle Terry, presenter)

93 – Swartz Creek Fish Passage Improvement Project

Approved amount funded: \$183,000

Q. *Cost benefits ratio in terms of habitat?*

A. Upstream from the culvert is an intact stream and the last barrier on Swartz Creek, it has good gravel, and good shade. Downstream of the culvert is a different story, it has been logged heavily and there's a road along the side. The BLM and watershed council have been doing surveys and stream enhancement up there. We're trying to make the downstream portion look like the upstream. It's high quality, low gradient, good coho habitat and definitely a spawning area for the threatened fish.

Q. *Is infrastructure benefits to the replacement for these failing culverts?*

A. It's a degrading culvert and the bottom has holes in it. There are definitely benefits to keeping the road open for recreation. The road goes over the ridge and ties in on the low pass side and is open to the general public for travel.

Q. *Can this be scaled?*

A. We would need full funding for this project.

Q. *Are there any contributions from any other road users, ie. private timber, government agencies, etc? Are you taking 100 percent of the burden for replacing the culvert?*

A. Lane County is contributing the surveys and design for \$42K of in-kind match, the BLM fisheries will help with the fish salvage and rescue during the replacement. No other contributions.

Discussion and funding recommendations for Lane County projects.

- **Motion made by Stan Vejtasa to accept all the projects at the full amount except the multi-county projects we will have to adjust to make the requested amount with the amount available. Jack LeRoy seconds the motion.**
- Lily would like to get clarification on which multi-county projects. More discussion.
- **Stan Vejtasa amends to his original motion to distribute the remaining \$78K distributed towards the multi-county projects. Dino Venti seconds the motion.**
- **Stan Vejtasa withdraws his original and amended motions. Dino agrees to withdraw the motions.**
- **Motion made by Michael Kennedy to accept all the projects at the full amounts and three units for SOLV and three units for NW Youth Corps. Jack LeRoy seconds the motion.**

To vote individually on the first project number 84, Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians Camp Creek Property individually since Michael Kennedy is recusing himself from the project.

Vote on project number 84:

Cat 1: Lance – absent; Dean – yes; Dino – yes; Samara – yes; Jack – yes.

Cat 2: Matthew – yes; Edwin – yes; Ken – absent; Stan – yes; George – yes.

Cat 3: Craig – yes; Robert – yes; Michael – recuse; Kevin – yes; Lily – yes.

Vote on the rest of the projects as a slate for Lane County:

Cat 1: Dean – yes; Dino – yes; Samara – yes; Jack – yes.

Cat 2: Matthew – yes; Edwin – yes; Ken – absent; Stan – yes; George – yes.

Cat 3: Craig – yes; Mike – yes; Robert – yes; Kevin – yes; Lily, yes.

- **Motion passes.**

Lincoln County

Mid-Coast Watershed Council

2 – Bummer Creek Tributary Fish Passage and Wetland Restoration

Tillamook Estuaries Partnership – Multicounty project (Tillamook and Lincoln) (Kristi Foster, presenter)

105 – Coastal Native Seed Collection for Northwest Oregon Restoration Partnership (NORP)

Approved amount of funding: \$35,975.

Kristi commented in the Q&A box that this project will also support work in the following counties: Yamhill, Polk, Benton, Washington, and Columbia. They could do \$35,975 of funding for one year, then \$28,500 for two years after.

Discussion and funding recommendations for Lincoln County and Tillamook County projects.

- **Motion made by Stan Vejtasa to fund the minimum amount to \$35,975 for Lincoln County and pull any deficiencies from the leftover funds when we reconcile at the end. Craig Pope seconds the motion.**
- **Dean proposes that we amend the motion and take the \$4,486 deficit from the leftover funds now.**

- **Stan Vejtasa amends the motion to take the \$4,486 deficit from the leftover funds now. Craig Pope seconds the amended motion.**

Ann Craig will build a spreadsheet to keep track of the \$300,000 leftover funds.

Vote:

Cat 1: Lance – absent; Dean – yes; Dino – recuse; Samara – yes; Jack – yes.

Cat 2: Matthew – yes; Edwin – yes; Ken – absent; Stan – yes; George – absent.

Cat 3: Craig – no; Michael – yes; Robert – yes; Kevin – yes, Lily – yes.

- **Motion passes.**

Marion County

Linn County Youth Service

98 – Linn County Juvenile Dept. Work Service Program (Robert Perkins)

Approved amount funded: \$60,000

Q. *As far as work on the ground, is there more work in Marion or Linn?*

A. There's more than enough work to be done in both Marion and Linn.

Q. *Are you requesting \$60,000 total or per county?*

A. A total of \$60,000, \$500 per work crew day, it is scalable. Last year, we processed 11,000 hours last year which translated to 283 youth served.

Q. *On the scalable \$500 per work crew day. What's the minimum amount of days you would have to put together to go out?*

A. One day funds one day. There is more work than one day can cover. Realistically, whatever the RAC will recommend.

Discussion on funding recommendations projects for Marion County.

Ann Craig pulled the spreadsheet up for the RAC to look at the multicounty projects that fall within Marion, Multnomah, and Washington County.

- **Motion by Jack Leroy to fully funded the juvenile program and \$7612 on the NW Youth Corps fire rehab, we have enough funding. Craig Pope seconds the motion.**
- **Motion by Craig Pope to amend the original motion and apply the balance of funds to NW Youth Corps fire rehab. Stan Vejtasa seconds the motion.**
- **Motion by Matt Swanson to amend Craig Pope's motion to fully fund Youth Corps and project 95 Institute of Applied Ecology for all the counties and put the remaining funds (\$4350) towards the project 105 Tillamook nursery project. Stan Vejtasa seconds the motion.**

Vote:

Cat 1: Lance – absent; Dean – yes; Dino – yes; Samara – yes; Jack – yes.

Cat 2: Matthew – yes; Edwin – yes; Ken – absent; Stan – yes; George – absent.

Cat 3: Craig – yes; Michael – yes; Robert – yes; Kevin – yes; Lily – yes.

➤ **Motion passes.**

Yamhill County

Institute for Applied Ecology (Peter Moore, presenter)

108 – Habitat Restoration Nelson’s Checkermallow at Walker Flat

Approved recommended funding: \$46,462

Discussion and funding recommendations for Yamhill County project.

➤ **Motion by Craig Pope to fully fund the project. (couldn’t hear name)? seconds the motion.**

Vote:

Cat 1: Lance – absent; Dean – yes; Dino – yes; Samara – yes; Jack – yes.

Cat 2: Matthew – yes; Edwin – yes; Ken – absent; Stan – yes; George – absent.

Cat 3: Craig – yes; Michael – yes; Robert – absent; Kevin – absent; Lily – yes.

➤ **Motion passes.**

Day 1 Close-out

4:15 PM Adjourn

Day 2 – December 9 from 9 AM to 4 PM

9 AM Welcome/Call to Order (Elizabeth Burghard, DFO)

Elizabeth: Thank everyone for your work yesterday, we got a lot done. Today we will be looking at projects from Linn, Polk, Coos, Douglas, and Curry Counties.

9:10 AM Public Comment Period (Kyle Sullivan)

- No response from the public.
- Kyle did not receive any emails from members of the public for this meeting. If anyone from the public would like to comment, please let him know before 9:25 am.
- With that, Kyle turned the meeting back to Elizabeth.

Discussion how to fund projects when there’s not enough funding in a single county and when to draw from the leftover funds.

Today, one of the items the group may need to look at is prioritizing projects, then the group can circle back during the reconciliation process.

Project proposals:

Linn County

South Santiam Watershed Council (Shannon Richardson, presenter)

97 – Crabtree Creek Knotweed Control Project

Approved amount funded: \$88,286

Q. *Looks like you started work in 2005, if the situation is so significant, why has it taken so long to manage it?*

A. 2005 was the first year it was identified as a need. At that time, knowledge about knotweed and how to treat it effectively was emerging. A concerted effort started around 2013 from funding through the RAC and supplemental funding from OWEB. What we missed was a basin-wide, headwaters down approach to help stop the spread.

Q. *Is this project scalable?*

A. It is scalable, we would start in the headwaters and move down as funding allows.

Institute for Applied Ecology (Jessica Celis, presenter)

99 – Oak Basin Meadow Connectivity Initiative

Funding did not pass.

Q. *How long do you anticipate this project to take?*

A. Hopefully start next year with two years of weed treatments.

Q. *Any opportunity to use some of the wood from the conifer trees for any project nearby?*

A. Would love to make use of the trees, we could partner with Xena Forest or the Oak Basin Tree Farm to see if they can make use of the timber.

Q. *How many estimated board feet of conifer will be removed and what is expected to happen with the payment from those board feet, because these are O&C acres.*

A. Haven't done any data on how many board feet there would be. In terms of funds, she would like to do more planning on that. I do know that whenever Oak Basin Tree Farm have taken trees off and sold them, it goes right back into restoration work on their property. So hopefully, it will go right back into the project.

Discussion and funding recommendations for Linn County projects.

- **Motion by Matt Swanson recommending to fully fund the oak restoration project with any remaining funds going to the knotweed project. Stan seconds the motion.**

Craig Pope and Robert Main request to vote independently.

Vote on 97 - Crabtree Creek Knotweed Control Project

Cat 1: Lance – yes; Dean – yes; Dino – yes; Samara – yes; Jack – yes.

Cat 2: Matthew – yes; Edwin – yes; Ken – yes; Stan – yes.

Cat 3: Craig – yes; Mike – yes; Robert – yes; Kevin – yes; Lily – yes.

➤ **Motion passes.**

Vote on 99 - Oak Basin Meadow Connectivity Initiative

Cat 1: Lance – yes; Dean – yes; Dino – yes; Samara – yes; Jack – yes.

Cat 2: Matthew – yes; Edwin – yes; Ken – yes; Stan – yes, George – yes.

Cat 3: Craig – no; Mike – yes; Robert – no; Kevin – yes; Lily – no.

➤ **Motion doesn't pass, more information requested.**

Craig: When it comes to questions about BLM management, O&C lands and removal of conifers and there isn't any information on how it's being managed, that's a problem. Understand the value of the project, however when they are removing conifers that have a value, want to understand how that will be distributed. He won't approve funding a project without those details.

Robert: Also has concerns about removing conifers from O&C lands. The presenter didn't know the value of the trees, who would market them, and where the money would go.

Comment from BLM District Manager Heather Whitman: With any project that is occurring on O&C lands, it's required to meet the conditions and the requirements of the Resource Management Plan (RMP). If the land use allocation is late successional reserve compared to harvest land base, different decisions will be made regarding what to do with the timber on those lands. And that's true on any projects on O&C land, they will be required to follow the land use allocation direction for the area in which the project is being performed.

Dean: The project proposal be resubmitted with those questions addressed. There's a new proposal period coming up.

Polk County

Polk County Community Corrections, two projects (John Nyberg, presenter)

100 – Polk County Dumpstoppers

Approved amount funded: \$70,000

103 – Polk County Noxious Weeds

Funding did not pass.

Q. *Is this scalable?*

A. It's scalable to a degree, however we prefer not.

Polk Soil and Water Conservation District - two projects (Jackson Morgan, presenter)

101 – Gooseneck Creek Large Woody Debris Placement and Bank Stabilization

Approved amount funded: \$70,000

104 – Rickreall Watershed Large Woody Debris Structure Augmentation

Funding did not pass.

Q. *Which project would you prefer to get fully funded?*

A. Prefer that Gooseneck gets fully funded with no funding for Rickreall, however we could make both of these projects work with partial funding.

Discussion and funding recommendations for Polk County projects.

Craig Pope recuses from the vote on these projects.

- **Motion by Lily Morgan to fund \$70,000 for project 100 and \$70,000 for project 101. Bob Main seconds the motion.**

Vote:

Cat 3: Lily – yes; Kevin – absent; Robert – yes; Michael – yes, Craig - recuse.

Cat 2: George – yes; Stan – yes; Ken – yes; Edwin – yes; Matthew – absent.

Cat 1: Jack – yes; Samara – yes; Dino – yes; Dean – yes; Lance – recuse.

- **Motion passes.**

Coos County

Curry Soil and Water Conservation District (Drew Harper, presenter)

8 – Bethel Creek Watershed Enhancement

Approved amount funded: \$20,000

Bureau of Land Management (Goldie Warncke, presenter)

9 – Youth Summer Engagement – Coos County and 21 – Curry County

Approved amount funded: \$30,000

Coos Watershed Association, three projects (Freelin Reasor, presenter)

10 – Coos Watershed River Monitoring Network - Operations, Upgrades, and Maintenance

Approved amount funded: \$33,739

11 – Cox, Coal, Mink Creek Road Surveys, Upgrades, and Maintenance

Approved amount funded: \$10,000

Q. *How would you get access?*

A. Access would be through BLM roads.

15 – Noxious Weed Survey & Control Coos & Coquille Watersheds

Approved amount funded: \$50,000

Q. *How would you rank these projects?*

A. Rank project 10 as the most important, the second would be project 15, the third would be project 11.

Coquille Watershed Association, two projects (Rushal Sedlemyer)

13 – Middle Creek Instream Habitat Enhancement

Approved amount funded: \$69,660

18 – Sandy Creek Whole Watershed Restore - Decommission two Legacy Roads

Funding did not pass.

Bob Main: With the wildfires this year, would rather see the culverts upgraded and the roads gated rather than decommissioned.

Q. *How would you rank project 13 and 18?*

A. Prefer to have both projects funded, however if we had to rank them, the first ranking would be project 18 Middle Creek Instream Habitat Enhancement.

Coos County Noxious Weed District Advisory Board (Jill Rolfe, presenter)

14 – Coos County Noxious Weed Control

Approved amount funded: \$13,934

Q. *What are the kinds of anticipated project costs that you refer to?*

A. Costs include purchase of herbicides, we then offer discounted prices for herbicide to the private landowners and treatment plans, put together materials to distribute to the public at events to stress the importance of weed management.

Bureau of Land Management (Shane Presley, presenter)

17 – Public Land Cleanup

Approved amount funded: \$82,198

Q. *What about enforcement to make people accountable for the trash and vehicles that have been left behind. Is that part of the program?*

A. Yes that is part of the program and we do our best to enforce when we can. In the case of abandoned vehicles, often the registration has expired.

Discussion and funding recommendations for Coos County projects.

Bob Main has to recuse himself from project 14 Coos County Noxious Weed proposal and proposes that each project be voted on individually.

➤ **Motion by Michael Kennedy to fund the projects as recommended.** (didn't get the name) **seconds the motion.**

Vote on 8 – Bethel Creek Watershed Enhancement

Cat 2: George – yes; Stan – yes; Ken - yes; Edwin - yes; Matthew – absent.

Cat 1: Jack – yes; Samara – yes; Dino – yes; Dean – yes, Lance – yes.

Cat 3: Craig – yes; Mike – yes; Bob – yes; Kevin – recuse; Lily – yes.

Vote on 9 – Youth Summer Engagement

Cat 2: Matthew – absent; Edwin – yes; Ken – yes; Stan – yes; George – yes.

Cat 3: Lily – yes; Kevin – recuse; Robert – yes; Michael – yes; Craig – yes.

Cat 1: Jack – yes; Samara – yes; Dino – yes; Dean – yes; Lance – yes.

Vote on 10 – Coos Watershed River Monitoring Network - Operations, Upgrades, and Maintenance

Cat 1: Lance – yes; Dean – yes; Dino – yes; Samara – yes; Jack – yes.

Cat 2: Matthew – absent; Edwin – yes; Ken – yes; Stan – yes.

Cat 3: Craig – yes; Michael – yes; Robert – no; Kevin – recuse; Lily – yes.

Vote on 11 – Cox, Coal, Mink Creek Road Surveys, Upgrades, and Maintenance

Cat 1: Lance – yes; Dean – yes; Dino – yes; Samara – yes; Jack – yes

Cat 2: Matthew – absent; Edwin – yes; Ken – yes; Stan – yes.

Cat 3: Craig – yes; Michael – yes; Robert – no; Kevin – recuse; Lily – yes.

Vote on 15 – Noxious Weed Survey & Control Coos & Coquille Watersheds

Cat 1: Lance – yes; Dean – yes; Dino – yes; Samara – yes; Jack – yes.

Cat 2: Matthew – absent; Edwin – yes; Ken – yes; Stan – yes.

Cat 3: Craig – yes; Michael – yes; Robert – yes; Kevin – recuse; Lily – yes.

Vote on 13 – Middle Creek Instream Habitat Enhancement

Cat 1: Lance – yes; Dean – yes; Dino – yes; Samara – yes; Jack – yes.

Cat 2: Matthew – absent; Edwin – yes; Ken – yes; Stan – yes.

Cat 3: Craig – yes; Michael – yes; Robert – yes; Kevin – recuse; Lily – yes.

Vote on 18 – Sandy Creek Whole Watershed Restore - Decommission two Legacy Roads

Cat 1: Lance – yes; Dean – yes; Dino – yes; Samara – yes; Jack – no.

Cat 2: Matthew – absent; Edwin – no; Ken – yes; Stan – yes.

Cat 3: Craig – no; Michael – yes; Robert – no; Kevin – recuse; Lily – no.

➤ **Motion doesn't pass.**

Vote on 14 – Coos County Noxious Weed Control

Cat 1: Lance – yes; Dean – yes; Dino – yes; Samara – yes; Jack – yes

Cat 2: Matthew – absent; Edwin – yes; Ken – yes; Stan – yes.

Cat 3: Craig – yes; Michael – yes; Robert – recuse; Kevin – recuse; Lily – yes.

➤ **Motion passes.**

Vote on 17 – Public Land Cleanup

Cat 1: Lance – yes; Dean – yes; Dino – yes; Samara – yes; Jack – yes

Cat 2: Matthew – absent; Edwin – yes; Ken – yes; Stan – yes.

Cat 3: Craig – yes; Michael – yes; Robert – yes; Kevin – recuse; Lily – yes.

12:35 pm lunch break

Reconvene at 1:35 pm

Roll Call:

All present: Lance, Dean, Dino, Samara, Jack, Matt, Edwin, Ken, Stan, George, Mike, Bob, Kevin, Lily, Craig.

Project proposals continued:

Douglas County

Bureau of Land Management (Sean Stapleton, presenter)

25 – Skull Creek Campground

Approved amount funded: \$24,000

Bureau of Land Management (Suzanne Shelp, presenter)

27 – Back Country Youth Crews

Approved amount funded: \$120,000

Bureau of Land Management (Amanda Cutler, not on the call)

28 – Bear Creek Prairie and Oak

Approved amount funded: \$40,000

Elk Creek Watershed Council, two projects (Lee Russell, presenter)

29 – Big Tom Folley Limiting Factors Analysis and Action Plan

Approved amount funded: \$23,185

30 – Douglas County Noxious Weed Control

Approved amount funded: \$63,827

Partnership for the Umpqua Rivers, six projects (Kevin Keller, presenter)

31 – Olalla Creek and Tributaries Fish Passage and Enhancement

Approved amount funded: \$97,647

33 – Council Capacity and Project Development

Approved amount funded: \$45,040

35 – Rock Creek Restoration - Phase 1

Approved amount funded: \$99,621

41 – Umpqua Basin Collaborative Monitoring

Approved amount funded: \$60,427

42 – Umpqua Basin Stream Reference Temperature Project

Approved amount funded: \$29,864

43 – Yellow Creek Instream Design & Technical Assist

Approved amount funded: \$45,722

Q. *What is the project for number 33?*

A. Project 33 is for staff capacity to continue to develop and manage projects.

Q. Does the partnership receive OWEB council capacity funds? If you do, is this request for additional capacity, because the OWEB funds are insufficient for all of your needs?

A. Yes, Kevin Keller has found that the OWEB capacity funds are very limited in our ability to not only manage and cover operating costs, but also for the executive director to get out, develop, and plan projects. These projects take a significant amount of planning.

Bureau of Land Management (Shane Presley, presenter)

32 – Douglas County Public Land Cleanup

Approved amount funded: \$200,000

Comment: Buy more game cameras!

Shane: Totally agree, when people see the pictures from the game cameras, they pay the fines.

Q. What about prosecutions, are you getting the U.S. Attorney's office to pick these up or are you going to County? Anyone going to jail?

A. No, not going to jail. If we're going with state charges, the fines are a bit stiffer than federal charges. When they are transients, it's hard to charge them.

Bureau of Land Management (Vince Randall, presenter)

34 – GPIO Roadside Brushing – Douglas County

Approved amount funded: \$76,000

Q. On the roughly 40 miles of road that you identified, are you prioritizing that for land that will be harvested or recreation land?

A. We incorporate that in all our timber roadside brushing contracts.

Q. Doesn't the money from timber sales pay for the maintenance?

A. We do receive funding from timber sales for maintenance, however there are 375,000 acres to manage and we don't bring in enough from our timber sales to cover all those acres.

Smith River Watershed Council, two projects (Brian Jenkins, presenter)

38 – Smith River SONAR Monitoring

Approved amount funded: \$25,000

Q. You mentioned there's a component of student involvement from the University of Oregon.

A. Yes, we use a lot of interns for the data processing. We do get those graphical images generated from the sonar, but someone needs to physically go through all the images and count the fish. We also need someone to supervise the interns to do quality control on the work that they do to make sure the data is accurate and then basic device maintenance.

39 – Spencer Creek Instream Restoration

Approved amount funded: \$79,674

Q. On the Spencer Creek project, which species are making use of that?

A. Coho and Chinook get up to the very lower reaches, and Coho, Steelhead, Lamprey and Cutthroat make use throughout the full project.

Coquille Watershed Council (Cyndi Park, presenter)

40 – Twelvemile Creek Basin Instream Habitat Enhancement

Approved amount funded: \$38,793

Douglas Forest Protection Association, two projects (Pat Skrip, presenter)

106 – Dutchman Butte Smoke Detection Site

Approved amount funded: \$79,106

107 – Nickel Mt. Smoke Detection Site

Approved amount funded: \$85,500

Q. Do these projects qualify for Title III funding?

A. No, they don't meet the qualifications for Title III funds.

Discussion and funding recommendations for Douglas County projects.

Q. On work for road maintenance on recreation roads, does the RAC have the ability to put out a request for proposal (RFP) to contractors to that work?

A. The project proponent can put in a project and they can hire a contractor to do the work that's in the proposal that they put before the RAC.

- **Kyle Sullivan: The next time we have a request for funding proposals for Title II funding, he will make sure that the RAC has the news release. He encourages the RAC to send out to interested parties so they can get those projects in the queue.**
- **Motion by Dean Finnerty to fully fund all Douglas County projects. Stan Vejtasa seconds the motion.**
 - Dean Finnerty to recuse himself from project 38 Smith River SONAR project.
 - Stan Vejtasa to recuse himself from the Partnership for the Umpqua Rivers projects 31, 33, 35, 41, 42 and 43.
- **Motion by Dean Finnerty to vote on the projects individually. Bob Main seconds the motion.**

Vote on 16 – NW Youth Corps

Cat 3: Lily – yes; Kevin – yes; Bob – no; Michael – yes; Craig – no.

Cat 2: George – yes; Stan – yes; Ken - yes; Edwin – yes; Matthew – no.

Cat 1: Jack – no; Samara – no, Dino – no, Dean – yes, Lance – yes on all.

- **Motion doesn't pass.**

- **Motion by Lily Morgan to amend the amount funded for project 16 to \$35,098 and revote. No individual member seconded the motion, but the group agrees on the motion.**

Revote on 16 – NW Youth Corps:

Cat 3: Lily – yes; Kevin – yes; Robert – yes; Michael – yes; Craig – yes.

Cat 2: George – yes; Stan – yes; Ken – yes; Edwin – yes; Matthew – yes.

Cat 1: Jack – yes; Samara – yes; Dino – yes; Dean – yes; Lance – yes.

- **Revote on Motion passes.**

Vote on 17 – Public Land Cleanup

Cat 3: Lily – yes; Kevin – yes; Robert – yes; Michael – yes; Craig – yes.

Cat 2: George – yes; Stan – yes; Ken – yes on all; Edwin – yes; Matthew – yes.

Cat 1: Jack – yes; Samara – yes; Dino – yes; Dean – yes; Lance – yes.

- **Motion passes.**

Vote on 25 – Skull Creek Campground

Cat 3: Lily – yes; Kevin – yes; Robert – yes on all; Michael – yes; Craig – yes.

Cat 2: George – yes; Stan – yes; Ken – yes; Edwin – yes; Matthew – yes.

Cat 1: Jack – yes; Samara – yes; Dino – yes; Dean – yes; Lance – yes.

- **Motion passes.**

Vote on 27 – Back Country Youth Crews

Cat 3: Lily – yes; Kevin – yes; Robert – yes; Michael – yes; Craig – yes.

Cat 2: George – yes; Stan – yes; Ken – yes; Edwin – yes; Matthew – yes.

Cat 1: Jack – yes; Samara – yes; Dino – yes; Dean – yes; Lance – yes.

- **Motion passes.**

Vote on Project 28 – Bear Creek Prairie and Oak

Cat 3: Lily – yes; Kevin – yes; Robert – yes; Michael – yes; Craig – yes.

Cat 2: George – yes; Stan – yes; Ken – yes; Edwin – yes; Matthew – yes.

Cat 1: Jack – yes; Samara – yes; Dino – yes; Dean – yes; Lance – yes.

- **Motion passes.**

Vote on 29 – Big Tom Folley Limiting Factors Analysis and Action Plan

Cat 3: Lily – yes; Kevin – yes; Robert – yes; Michael – yes; Craig – yes.

Cat 2: George – yes; Stan – yes; Ken – yes; Edwin – yes; Matthew – yes.

Cat 1: Jack – yes; Samara – yes; Dino – yes; Dean – yes; Lance – yes.

- **Motion passes.**

Vote on 30 – Douglas County Noxious Weed Control

Cat 3: Lily – yes, Kevin – yes, Robert – yes, Michael – yes, Craig – yes.
Cat 2: George – yes, Stan – yes, Ken - yes, Edwin – yes, Matthew – yes.
Cat 1: Jack – yes; Samara – yes, Dino – yes, Dean – yes, Lance – yes.

➤ **Motion passes.**

Vote on 31 – Olalla Creek and Tributaries Fish Passage and Enhancement

Cat 3: Lily – yes; Kevin – yes; Robert – yes; Michael – yes; Craig – yes.
Cat 2: George – yes; Stan – recuse; Ken – yes; Edwin – yes; Matthew – yes.
Cat 1: Jack – yes; Samara – yes; Dino – yes; Dean – yes; Lance – yes.

➤ **Motion passes.**

Vote on 33 – Council Capacity and Project Development

Cat 3: Lily – yes; Kevin – yes; Robert – no; Michael – yes; Craig – yes.
Cat 2: George – yes; Stan – recuse; Ken – yes; Edwin – yes; Matthew – yes.
Cat 1: Jack – yes; Samara – yes; Dino – yes; Dean – yes; Lance – yes.

➤ **Motion passes.**

Vote on 35 – Rock Creek Restoration - Phase 1

Cat 3: Lily – yes; Kevin – yes; Robert – yes; Michael – yes; Craig – yes.
Cat 2: George – yes; Stan – recuse; Ken – yes; Edwin – yes; Matthew – yes.
Cat 1: Jack – yes; Samara – yes; Dino – yes; Dean – yes; Lance – yes.

➤ **Motion passes.**

Vote on 41 – Umpqua Basin Collaborative Monitoring

Cat 3: Lily – yes; Kevin – yes; Robert – yes; Michael – yes; Craig – yes.
Cat 2: George – yes; Stan – recuse; Ken – yes; Edwin – yes; Matthew – yes.
Cat 1: Jack – yes; Samara – yes; Dino – yes; Dean – yes; Lance – yes.

➤ **Motion passes.**

Vote on 42 – Umpqua Basin Stream Reference Temperature Project

Cat 3: Lily – yes; Kevin – yes; Robert – yes; Michael – yes; Craig – yes.
Cat 2: George – yes; Stan – recuse; Ken – yes; Edwin – yes; Matthew – yes.
Cat 1: Jack – yes; Samara – yes; Dino – yes; Dean – yes; Lance – yes.

➤ **Motion passes.**

Vote on 43 – Yellow Creek Instream Design & Technical Assist

Cat 3: Lily – yes; Kevin – yes; Robert – yes; Michael – yes; Craig – yes.
Cat 2: George – yes; Stan – recuse; Ken – yes; Edwin – yes; Matthew – yes.
Cat 1: Jack – yes; Samara – yes; Dino – yes; Dean – yes; Lance – yes.

➤ **Motion passes.**

Vote on 32 – Douglas County Public Land Cleanup

Cat 3: Lily – yes; Kevin – yes; Robert – yes; Michael – yes; Craig – yes.

Cat 2: George – yes; Stan – yes; Ken – yes; Edwin – yes; Matthew – yes.

Cat 1: Jack – yes; Samara – yes; Dino – yes; Dean – yes; Lance – yes.

➤ **Motion passes.**

Vote on 34 – GPIO Roadside Brushing – Douglas County

Cat 3: Lily – yes; Kevin – yes; Robert – no; Michael – yes; Craig – yes.

Cat 2: George – yes; Stan – yes; Ken – yes; Edwin – yes; Matthew – yes.

Cat 1: Jack – no; Samara – yes; Dino – no; Dean – yes; Lance – yes.

➤ **Motion passes.**

Vote on 38 – Smith River SONAR Monitoring

Cat 3: Lily – yes; Kevin – yes; Robert – yes; Michael – yes; Craig – yes.

Cat 2: George – yes; Stan – yes; Ken – yes; Edwin – yes; Matthew – yes.

Cat 1: Jack – yes; Samara – yes; Dino – yes; Dean – recuse; Lance – yes.

➤ **Motion passes.**

Vote on 39 – Spencer Creek Instream Restoration

Cat 3: Lily – yes; Kevin – yes; Robert – yes; Michael – yes; Craig – yes.

Cat 2: George – yes; Stan – yes; Ken – yes; Edwin – yes; Matthew – yes.

Cat 1: Jack – yes; Samara – yes; Dino – yes; Dean – yes; Lance – yes.

➤ **Motion passes.**

Vote on 40 – Twelvemile Creek Basin Instream Habitat Enhancement

Cat 3: Lily – yes; Kevin – yes; Robert – yes; Michael – yes; Craig – yes.

Cat 2: George – yes; Stan – yes; Ken – yes; Edwin – yes; Matthew – recuse.

Cat 1: Jack – yes; Samara – yes; Dino – yes; Dean – yes; Lance – yes.

➤ **Motion passes.**

Vote on 106 – Dutchman Butte Smoke Detection Site

Cat 3: Lily – yes; Kevin – yes; Robert – yes; Michael – yes; Craig – yes.

Cat 2: George – yes; Stan – yes; Ken – yes; Edwin – yes; Matthew – yes.

Cat 1: Jack – yes; Samara – yes; Dino – yes; Dean – yes; Lance – yes.

➤ **Motion passes.**

Vote on 107 – Nickel Mt. Smoke Detection Site

Cat 3: Lily – yes; Kevin – yes; Robert – yes; Michael – yes; Craig – yes.

Cat 2: George – yes; Stan – yes; Ken – yes; Edwin – yes; Matthew – yes.

Cat 1: Jack – yes; Samara – yes; Dino – yes; Dean – yes; Lance – yes.

➤ **Motion passes.**

Curry County

Curry Watersheds Nonprofit (Drew Harper, presenter)

20 – Cedar Creek Enhancement

Approved amount funded: \$19,749

Curry Soil and Water Conservation District (Drew Harper, presenter)

22 – Curry's Most WANTED – WEEDS

Approved amount funded: \$53,568

23 – Storm Chasers: Monitoring & Modeling w/Citizen Science

Approved amount funded: \$53,012

24 – Willow Creek Restoration 2021

Approved amount funded: \$61,651

Klamath Bird Observatory (Jaime Stephens, presenter)

55 – Klamath Siskiyou Oak Network: Capacity for oak restoration

Approved amount funded: \$19,460

Discussion and funding recommendations for Curry County projects.

Dean supports funding projects 20, 22, 23, 24 for the betterment of the community of Port Orford.

Matt Swanson recuses himself from the all the watershed projects 20, 22, 23 and 24.

➤ **Motion by Dean Finnerty to cover the \$27,480 deficient with the commingled funds. Craig Pope seconds the motion.**

Vote on projects 20, 22, 23 and 24

Cat 3: Lily – yes; Kevin – yes; Robert – yes; Michael – yes; Craig – yes.

Cat 2: George – yes; Stan – yes; Ken – yes; Edwin – yes; Jack – yes, Matthew – recuse.

Cat 1: Samara – yes; Dino – yes; Dean - yes, Lance – yes on 20, 22, 23 and recuse for 24.

➤ **Motion passes.**

Vote on the rest of the projects as a slate:

Cat 3: Lily – yes; Kevin – yes; Robert – yes except line 44 number 55; Michael – yes; Craig – yes and a no for number 55.

Cat 2: George – yes; Stan – yes, Ken – yes; Edwin – yes; Matthew – yes.

Cat 1: Jack – yes with a no on number 55; Samara – yes; Dino – yes, Dean – yes; Lance – yes.

➤ **Motion passes.**

3:50 PM - Loose end wrap-up

Elizabeth: Thank you to everyone for your discussions and deliberations today. Any comments from the group?

Dean: Like the way Kyle has been populating with who's coming up for the presentations.

Enjoy the discussions and that we can disagree with each other in a respectful way.

Jack: This has been my first experience and I'm getting a lot of good information about the Title II process which will help me for the next round of project proposals.

Samara: Extending gratitude to the BLM staff for making the Zoom meeting work so well.

Elizabeth: Tomorrow we will be looking at Jackson, Josephine, and Klamath Counties.

We will need to address any reconciliation of funds.

Preview of our next meeting where we will be looking at fee proposals.

Day 2 Closeout

4:00 PM Adjourn

December 10

9:00 AM – 12 PM, 1:00 PM – 4 PM

9 AM Call to Order

Roll call RAC members: Everyone is present today except Jack in Cat 1 (who will join later) and Kevin in Cat 3, but we have a quorum.

Welcome comments (Elizabeth Burghard, Pat Johnston)

Two projects have been removed from the agenda today: Jackson County Project 74 has been withdrawn, and Josephine County Project 69 has been withdrawn. They have been removed from the spreadsheet.

Project proposals:

Jackson County

Bureau of Land Management (Tye Morgan, presenter)

44 – Medford District Clean Up

Approved amount funded: \$100,000

Q. *Any flexibility in the amount in the scalability of the project?*

A. Yes, there's flexibility and we would be grateful for any amount. It costs anywhere from \$250 to \$1000 to remove one vehicle, and 30 yard dumpsters are about \$700 per day, so we are trying to be as prepared as possible to prepare for costs to clean up public lands.

Bureau of Land Management (Molly Allen, presenter)

45 – Willow Planting with Rural Schools

Approved amount funded: \$14,400

Q. *Are the agreements in place with Ashland and Butte Falls schools? How Ashland and Butte Falls were determined to be underserved in Jackson County?*

A. We've had a long term relationship with the Green Springs School to do work in the monument that is why that area was selected in the past. The Butte Falls area is one of the more underserved communities. From the scale of the project, we wanted to start small to see how it worked and potentially expand from there, because there are certainly other schools in the area that would qualify.

Q. *Is there any impact on this request from the Openchain and Almeda fires?*

A. One of the sites from this request up in that region, this is something that needs to be determined.

Q. *With regards to busing, does the school district take care of that?*

A. In the past, we have reimbursed the schools for the busing in the past rather than contract it out. With COVID, may have to look at it differently and contract that out.

Lomakatsi Restoration Project (Marko Bey, presenter)

46 – Anderson Creek Hazardous Fuels Mitigation Project

Approved amount funded: \$50,000

Q. *How many residents in this area?*

A. Around 300 residents.

Bureau of Land Management (Adam Raymond, presenter)

47 – Winter Game Range Habitat Enhancement

Approved amount funded: \$50,000

Q. *Good Neighbor Authority was listed on your application, are you going to use ODFW to take care of the contracting piece?*

A. Yes, Good Neighbor Authority will allow the ODFW to take the lead and in talking with them, they will be sub-contracting the work out.

Q. *Similar projects have been done in the Butte Falls area, have you done any outreach with OHA?*

A. Held off on doing any formal grant applications until he knew if the project was moving forward.

Bureau of Land Management (Thomas Hender, presenter)

48 – Noxious Weed Treatment

Approved amount funded: \$46,044

Q. Does the BLM treat weeds with herbicides or do they contract that out?

A. The BLM does some treatment around sensitive areas and this year we've had contractor do out a lot of the spraying and pulling.

Motorcycle Riders Assn (Jack LeRoy, presenter as President of the Motorcycle Assn, not as a RAC member)

49 – Cliff Hill Trail

Approved amount funded: \$25,925

Q. Have concerns about damage from vehicles and appreciate whatever can be done to reduce erosion.

A. The association has a very long history of taking care of trails, volunteers subscribe to training through NOHVCC, a motorized recreation organization, and we subscribe to a trail manual called Great Trails. We've managed our OHV areas on granitic soil which are some of the most difficult soils and have been able to maintain them sustainably. Would be happy to conduct a tour of our trail areas to see the work that we have done.

Bureau of Land Management (Jenna Volpe, presenter)

51 – Dry Forest 10-year monitoring

Approved amount funded: \$24,600

Comments from Jack and Stan: Monitoring of these projects is essential.

Siskiyou Upland Trail Association (Joy Rogalla, presenter)

52 – Jack-Ash and Sterling Mine Ditch Trail Maintenance

Approved amount funded: \$18,791

The Understory Initiative (Sean Prive, presenter)

53 – Utilizing Local Seed Growers Increase Native Plant Resources Oak Habitat Restoration

Approved amount funded: \$25,000

Bureau of Land Management (Sasha Joachim, presenter)

56 – Rare Plant Habitat Project

Approved amount funded: \$50,000

International Mountain Bikers Association (Shane Wilson, presenter)

57 – Mountain Rogue Trail Maintenance & Enhancement

Approved amount funded: \$49,792

Comment from Dino: There are many benefits to supporting user groups of this kind and they have a positive impact to local communities.

Friends of Wagner Creek (Tuula Rebhahn, presenter)

58 – ID & Treatment Invasive Shiny Geranium Wagner Creek Watershed

Approved amount funded: \$31,645

Q. *What does naturalized mean, does that mean it repopulates in the area with its own seed?*

A. Naturalization basically means it becomes invasive like a blackberry or annual grass like medusahead.

Q. *How would it be scalable?*

A. We would only do the survey of the area, not the treatment and ongoing monitoring.

Bureau of Land Management (Nick McDaniel, presenter)

59 – Table Rocks Trail Maintenance

Approved amount funded: \$68,240

Q. *Is there a local nonprofit that helps out with trail maintenance?*

A. We have worked with nonprofits on trail maintenance, however it's a wider trail really difficult to do a lot of the maintenance by hand.

Southern Oregon Forest Restoration Collaborative (Terry Fairbanks, presenters)

60 – Prescription for Safety: Thinning & Roadside Treatment

Approved amount funded: \$85,000

Q. *Why did you choose this project?*

A. Landscape resiliency has been important to us. Chose this project primarily for community protection, it would tie in with the Lomakatsi Restoration project.

Q. *Any chance of any wood recovery on this project?*

A. Yes, wood recovery will be up to the landowner.

Klamath Bird Observatory (Jaime Stephens, presenter)

61 – The Imperiled Oregon Vesper Sparrow: Solutions Public Lands

Approved amount funded: \$25,000

Q. *You mentioned that you don't know why it's declining. If its habitat is grassland, what about its environment the same or shrinking?*

A. When we see these populations declining, it's incredibly complex. It appears that there's plenty of grassland habitat, so it's not that the habitat isn't available. There's something else going on and that's what we're trying to find out.

Q. *Indirect rate is about 35 percent for your organization, is that based on a federally negotiated rate?*

A. Yes, it's an approved federally negotiated NEPA rate.

Q. *Have you applied for funding through Douglas County yet?*

A. No, the field work is being done in Jackson County.

Rogue Basin Partnership (Amy Wilson, presenter)

62 – Rogue Corridor High Priority Weed Abatement

Approved amount funded: \$41,965

Rogue Valley Hang Gliding and Paragliding Association (Dan Wells, presenter)

63 – RVHPA Woodrat Mt. Road Restoration

Approved amount funded: \$15,000

Q. *Does the association contribute anything towards the maintenance of the roads and the site?*

A. Members of the association bring in gravel to fill potholes in the road, however, there is more road repair than what the members can provide on their own. They also do their best to maintain the launch area and clean graffiti off signs.

Q. *Do you charge a fee for the sport?*

A. Yes, however other people use the roads.

Applegate Partnership, Inc. (Janelle Dunlevy, presenter)

64 – West Fork Evans Creek Tributaries Enhancement Project

Approved amount funded: \$73,000

74 – Savage Creek Community Watch (project has been withdrawn)

Applegate Trails Association (Geoff Weaver, presenter)

110 – Jackson E Applegate Sterling Crk Rd Trail Improve ATA

Approved amount funded: \$47,000

Q. *Do you have data on how many hours the Applegate Trails Association put in on the stewardship of these trails yearly?*

A. Applegate Trails Association put in about 50 hours last year, we do all the maintenance and planning., there are five members in the group.

Q. *Who will be maintaining the vault toilet.*

A. BLM will take care of the maintenance.

Discussion and funding recommendations for Jackson County projects.

Q. *On Project 44, we learned from the presentation that more of clean up work will be done in Josephine County than in Jackson County. How can the funding be split between the two counties?*

A. We were talking about 60 percent for Josephine, 40 percent for Jackson.

Question for Elizabeth: It's good to see so many recreational projects, particularly trails projects. Given that we don't have enough funding for all of the project, is there any opportunity for Great American Outdoors Act to have funds for the Medford District to help out some of the projects we won't be able to fully fund?

A. There's a large facility backlog so a lot of the funding is going to larger recreation facilities, such as the Smullin Visitor Center in the Rand Recreation Area, road and bridge maintenance that are due for updates. The recreation projects presented today probably won't meet the criteria for funding from the Great American Outdoors Act.

Elizabeth: Regarding the ranking of projects and what can be deferred until the next round of funding. I'm uncomfortable in ranking projects from external partners based on BLM's priorities. We can rank the projects from the BLM. Encourage that the RAC look at granting seed money for many projects. The illegal dumping is a significant need for the BLM.

Discussion and funding recommendation for Jackson County projects.

- **Motion by Craig Pope to vote on projects as demonstrated on spreadsheet. Ken McCall seconds the motion.**

Vote on 49

Cat 2: Matthew – yes; Edwin – yes; Ken – yes; Stan – yes; George – absent.

Cat 3: Craig – yes; Michael – yes; Robert – yes; Lily – yes.

Cat 1: Dean - yes; Dino – yes; Samara – yes; Jack – recuse.

- **Motion passes.**

Vote on 56

Cat 2: Matthew – yes; Edwin – yes; Ken – yes; Stan – yes; George – absent.

Cat 3: Craig – yes; Michael – recuse; Robert – yes; Lily – yes.

Cat 1: Dean – yes; Dino – yes; Samara – yes; Jack – yes.

- **Motion passes.**

Vote on the rest of the projects

Cat 2: Matthew - yes except no on project 60; Edwin – yes; Ken – yes; Stan – yes; George – absent.

Cat 3: Craig – yes; Michael – yes; Robert – yes; Lily – yes.

Cat 1: Dean – yes; Dino – yes; Samara – yes; Jack – yes.

- **Motion passes.**

12:00 PM Lunch Break

Reconvene at 1 PM

Roll call: Dean – present; Dino – present; Samara – present; Jack – present; Matthew – present; Edwin – present; Ken – present; Stan – present; George – absent; Michael – present; Robert – present; Kevin – absent, Lily – present; Craig – absent, Lance – absent.

Craig, Kevin, George, and Lance are out, but we still have a quorum.

Project proposals continued:

Josephine County

Bureau of Land Management (Sean Stapleton, presenter)

65 – Cathedral Hills Trails

Approved amount funded: \$43,000

Q. *Is there a local non-profit group that you are working with?*

A. I haven't been in the position for too long, however my predecessor has worked with the Southern Oregon Trail Alliance. If this project gets funded, I would work with them.

Comment: This is one of the most utilized recreation areas in our community.

Q. *How would the maintenance be done?*

A. Would use a mini-excavator and finish with a hand crew behind.

City of Grants Pass (Jon-Paul Bowles, presenter)

67 – Dollar Mtn Trailhead Parking Area

Approved amount funded: \$80,497

Q. *How does this project fit into the bigger picture?*

A. The parking area is on O&C lands, we would like to re-route the trail which is accessed by the community.

Oregon Department of Forestry (Tyler Averyt, presenter)

68 – Firewise Community Partnership

Approved amount funded: \$99,662

Q. *Can this project be funded by Title III funds.*

A. The project doesn't meet the criteria for Title III funds that I'm aware of.

69 – Fuel Reduction and Botanical Restoration (project has been withdrawn)

Presented by resident Cindy Palaios

70 – Holland Woodland Steward Group-Cleanup

Approved amount funded: \$12,357

Q. *Are you in the partnership with the BLM in the process of removing vehicles. What were the impacts of the Slater fire?*

A. We have worked with the BLM before to remove vehicles from this site.

Bureau of Land Management (Vince Randall, presenter)

73 – GPIO Roadside Brushing

Approved amount funded: \$152,000

Q. *Is there a primary area where this project will take place?*

A. Last chance planning area we are looking at is Wolf Creek, Sunny Valley, and spills a bit into Douglas County which would be handled through the proposal we've done for Douglas County.

Cultural & Ecological Network (Suzanne Shelp, presenter)

109 – Illinois River Yellowtuft Alyssum

Approved amount funded: \$30,440

Q. *Is the project scalable?*

A. Any amount would be acceptable to keep the project going.

Q. *Can this plant be eradicated or will it be a perpetual project?*

A. We work with volunteers, but we mostly work with contractors, BLM and Forest Service employees. We're getting closer to getting rid of the alyssum, that is our goal.

Discussion and funding recommendations for Josephine County projects.

- **Motion by Lily Morgan to fund the projects as noted with on the spreadsheet and that we leave the remaining funds for the second round of applications. Mike Kennedy seconds the motion.**

Lily Morgan recuses from project 65 Cathedral Hills and project 68 Firewise.

Comment from Dean Finnerty: Since Lily has recused, another RAC member will need to make a motion.

- **Motion by Samara Phelps to fully fund the projects listed. Dino Venti seconds the motion.**

Vote on the projects as a slate:

Cat 2: Matthew – yes; Edwin – yes; Ken – yes; Stan – yes; George – yes.

Cat 3: Craig – yes; Michael – yes; Robert – yes; Lily yes to all and recuse for projects 65 & 68.

Cat 1: Lance – yes; Dean – yes; Dino – yes; Samara – yes; Jack – yes.

Klamath County

Trout Unlimited (Charles Erdman, presenter)

76 – Annie Creek Fish Passage and Screening

Approved amount funded: \$50,000

79 – Upper Klamath Basin Redband Trout Working Group

Approved amount funded: \$34,378

80 – Sycan River & Brown Springs Restoration & Monitoring

Approved amount funded: \$60,013

81 – NF Sprague River Fish Passage and Screening

Approved amount funded: \$50,000

82 – Threemile/Crane Creek Bull Trout Habitat

Approved amount funded: \$50,000

Lake County Cooperative Weed Management Area (Jason Jaeger, presenter)

78 – 2020 Klamath County Noxious Weed Control Title II

Approved amount funded: \$34,704

Bureau of Land Management (Kerry Johnston, presenter)

83 – 2021-2024 Klamath Falls BLM Weed Treatment

Approved amount funded: \$60,000

Q. *Is there a selective herbicide that you would use?*

A. We would use imazapic which is specific for grasses.

Discussion and funding recommendations for Klamath County projects.

- **Motion by Lily Morgan to fund the projects as recommended with the deficient coming out of the commingled funds. Jack LeRoy and Bob Main second the motion.**

Dean Finnerty recuses himself on the vote for Trout Unlimited projects 76, 79, 80, 81 and 82.

Vote on Trout Unlimited projects 76, 79, 80, 81 and 82

Cat 3: Matthew – yes; Edwin – yes; Stan – yes; George – yes.

Cat 2: Craig – yes; Michael – yes; Kevin – absent; Lily – yes.

Cat 1: Lance – absent; Dean – recuse; Dino – yes; Samara – yes; Jack – yes.

- **Motion passes.**

Vote on the remaining projects:

Cat 3: Matthew – yes; Edwin – yes; Ken – yes; Stan – yes; George – yes.

Cat 2: Craig – yes, Michael – yes; Robert –yes: yes; Kevin – absent, Lily – yes.

Cat 1: Lance – absent; Dean – yes; Dino – yes; Samara – yes, Jack – yes.

- **Motion passes.**

Q. *For those applications that were submitted that we didn't fund or were underfunded, can the proponents reapply again for future consideration?*

A. Applications submitted through grants.gov remain active for one year, so proponents won't need to submit another application, they can make small changes to their application for future consideration. (Elizabeth)

- **Lily Morgan motions that we allocate \$10,805 for Benton County and \$1,000 for Polk County with prior years funds. Craig Pope seconds the motion.**

Vote

Cat 3: Matthew – yes; Edwin – yes; Ken – yes; Stan – yes; George – yes.

Cat 2: Craig – yes; Mike – yes; Robert - yes, Kevin – absent; Lily – yes.

Cat 1: Lance – absent; Dean – yes; Dino – yes; Samara – yes; Jack – yes.

➤ **Motion passes.**

Next Steps

Q. Pat Johnston will be contacting the proponents for those whose application were not funded, does the RAC members want her to invite them to back and resubmit their proposals?

A. Yes, the RAC members would like them to come back.

Elizabeth: Thank you for your work and commitment over the last three days and all of the days leading up to this meeting. I have been really impressed with the amount of work that you did ahead of time which was reflected in everybody's questions and the expertise that our elected officials brought especially related to parliamentary procedures. Also thank everyone for your candid, mostly respectful discussions the last three days. There was some themes that emerged: 1) A lot of alignment from all three categories on many different projects and 2) A common shared value wanting to make sure that high quality projects were funded and the projects were really thought through before they received RAC funding. That will make implementation and monitoring more successful. In reflecting back on the road decommissioning discussion, this is why we have such diversity on our RAC, it's to really see an issue from multiple sides and multiple impacts. Wanted to highlight that this is one of those discussions that BLM staff can take away for future proposals and what we can learn from.

Stan: Thanks to all of the BLM staff for their work organizing everything. And thank you Dean for a great job of facilitating as Chair.

RAC member can keep the project binders.

Q. Did the call for the next round of projects go out yet?

A. Not yet.

Q. Can you send the updated spreadsheet out to show what was funded and the amounts?

A. Yes, we will.

- **Our next meeting scheduled for March 2 and March 5 to review recreation fee proposals for the NW OR District and to finish up other business from our Title II application review.**
- **April 21-23 will review the next round of SRS Title II projects.**
- **June 24-25 for another recreation fee proposal and wrapping up Title II proposals.**

Recreation Fee Proposals (Amanda Deeds, Dave Ballenger)

Amanda Deeds made a brief presentation for recreation fee proposals for Northwest Oregon District. Before the meeting in March, she will send you a copy of the business plan for your review.

Q. Are you increasing current fees or expanding user groups. Is it to pay for infrastructure, what are the main goals?

A. Fees will be increasing for existing facilities and for those that haven't been developed. New fees proposed at different day use sites and trailheads. The goal is to support existing infrastructure and expand recreation opportunities at some sites.

Kyle: We will be doing outreach to those projects that were funded and some external outreach letting everyone know what great work you did funding these projects. Expect some correspondence from us next week as we wrap things up.

CELEBRATE!

4:00 PM Adjourn