



Western Oregon Resource Advisory Committee Meeting Notes



January 26-27, 2023

9:00 AM – 12:00 PM; 1:00 PM – 3:00 PM

Attendees: From Bureau of Land Management: Heather Whitman, Roseburg District Manager (DM) and Designated Federal Officer (DFO); Megan Harper RAC Coordinator and Public Affairs Officer (PAO); Coos Bay District; Kyle Sullivan, PAO Medford District; Martin Onuegbu, Co-Host, Zoom Tech Support; Pat Johnston, NW OR Partnership Coordinator and Statewide Lead on SRS and Title II; Stephanie Messerle, Coos Bay District Fish Biologist and Title II Coordinator; Steve Lydick, DM Coos Bay, Dennis Teitzel, DM NW OR; Jen O’Leary, PAO NW OR; Cheyne Rossbach, Asst Field Manager and PAO, Roseburg; Elizabeth Burghard, DM Medford; Christina Beslin, Title II Coordinator for Medford, Roseburg, Klamath Falls and Lakeview; Angela Bulla, Acting DM Lakeview; Ann Chappel, Oregon State Office Management and Program Analyst; Lisa McNee, PAO Lakeview, Jan Mathis, Admin Coos Bay, notetaker.

RAC members:

Category 1: Bree Yednock, Dino Venti, Tom Carstens, Samara Phelps

Category 2: Sarah Rockwell, Sue Martino, Sophia Kaelke, Ken McCall

Category 3: Mike Kennedy, Tasha Livingstone Davison, Jack Edwards, Randy Smith

Welcome / Introductions

Heather Whitman, Designated Federal Officer (DFO)

Good morning everyone. Before I can officially call the meeting to order, we needed to ensure that we had a quorum (which we do) for the first meeting in 2023 of the Western Oregon Resource Advisory Council. Really looking forward to working with all the new appointees as well as the returnees on our RAC over the next few years. You are here to help provide advice and recommendations on all aspects of public land management. Today and tomorrow, we will mainly be focusing on the Secure Rural Schools Title II projects and subsequent recommendations from the RAC for distributing the Title II funds. These projects are intended to make additional investments in and create additional employment opportunities through projects that improve the maintenance of existing infrastructure, implement stewardship objectives that enhance forest ecosystems, restore and improve land health. The projects are also intended to improve the cooperative relationships among the people who use and care for the land, and the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) who is responsible for managing the land.

It has been almost seven months since our last Western Oregon RAC meeting which was in May 2022. We have some new faces, we’re excited to have some new members and really glad to welcome back people who served on the RAC before. The RAC can have up to 15 members, but we have four in each category. And we’re happy to have everyone here to help us go through the projects.

Elect a Chair for the RAC

Heather Whitman

One of the positions that's really important for coordinating the meeting and communicating out to the members is the Chair, so our first order of business is electing a Chair for the RAC. The Chair will be responsible for coordinating with Heather and Megan as RAC Coordinator and helping prepare meeting agendas, draft recommendations on behalf of the members to Heather and will help run meetings, we will be having the RAC Chair facilitate the conversations as we discuss the Title II projects today and tomorrow.

- **Motion made by Ken McCall to nominate Samara Phelps as Chair. Received a second from Tom Carstens and a third from Mike Kennedy.**

Vote:

Category 1: Bree yes; Dino yes; Tom yes; Samara yes

Category 2: Sarah yes; Sue yes; Sophia yes; Ken yes

Category 3: Randy yes; Jack yes; Tasha yes; Mike yes

- **Decision:** Samara Phelps has been voted in as the RAC Chair. Congratulations Samara!

SRS Title II Project Process (Pat Johnston)

Pat explained how the process will go for the next two days and some background information:

The projects you will be seeing today, the project proponents applied for funding last spring. We had opened the Notice of Funding Opportunity on grants.gov in Feb and it was closed in May 2022, so all of these projects were submitted prior to May last year.

We had hoped to meet late summer or early fall to move the projects forward, but because it's been some time, Pat or one of her colleagues have been in contact with all of the project proponents and advised them if there have been any changes to their projects that they should emphasize that in their presentations today.

We also advised project proponents that RAC members have had their three-ring binders for awhile and have had a chance to look at the projects and asked them to keep their presentations at a higher level to be additive to the written word in order to make the best use of time we have available.

We received 48 proposals and a technical review has been done at the BLM Oregon State Office to make sure the projects are eligible for funding.

Available SRS funding:

- Because legislation was reauthorized, any of the funds left on the table over the last number of years that were not allocated is still available.
- When we do allocation of funds, projects are funded basically on a county-by-county basis. When projects are submitted, one of the questions on the application is what county the project is in, so we know where to put the money.

- We will be going county by county to review the projects, there will be a certain amount of funding available, we will have a discussion, and then make funding recommendations to our DFO.

TITLE II PROJECT APPLICATIONS

Lane County

Lane County Youth Service (Matthew Sterner, presenter)

41 – LCYS MLK Juvenile Forest Work Team

Approved amount funded: \$69,296

Q. Is this project scalable?

A. We could go either direction 50 percent.

Q. What is your success rate with at-risk youth?

A. We measure success in two ways, first is with recidivism. Over the last 10 years, we have had above 75 to 80 percent reduction in recidivism. Of the kids that come to us, 80 percent are basic skills deficient, which means they are about two grades behind where they should be. By the time they successfully complete our program, they are at least two grades above where they began, so we are meeting the metrics in those two areas.

Siuslaw Watershed Council (Caleb Mentzer, presenter)

42 – Fish Creek Tributary Enhancement and Watershed Resilience

Approved amount funded: \$131,720

Siuslaw Watershed Council (Caleb Mentzer, presenter)

43 – SWC Riparian Revegetation and Coho Monitoring (Caleb Mentzer) (tab 43)

Approved amount funded: \$60,903

Q. Vegetation coho monitoring would fund 2 to 3 positions, the amount requested looks a bit low?

A. It would be for 2 to 3 technicians during the winter spawning season, November and December.

Q. Fish Creek culvert project, is there coho downstream to the culvert and would the culvert open up a passage for not only coho, but other salmonids?

A. It could potentially open up some passage, but it's more of a hydrologic process restoring sediment.

Q. Can you explain why the design hasn't been done yet?

A. Brittany and crew will go out and do a low tech design.

Long Tom Watershed Council (Jed Kaul, presenter)

44 – Lower Upper Long Tom Fish Passage and Floodplain Restoration

Approved amount funded: \$97,465

Q. In the photos and descriptions on thinning, I see hybrid poplar encroaching on the oak, where did the poplar come from?

A. Landowner had planted them in the 1990s when it was hybrid poplars were the thing to plant. They're encroaching into the bottomland oak habitat, so we would remove those poplars to restore the oak habitat.

Q. *Is the OWEB funding still pending?*

A. Yes, we have two separate OWEB proposals that are still going through the approval process, one is for restoration work on the ground, the other is for technical assistance funds to complete the designs for the flood plain reconnection work.

- **Motion made by Mike Kennedy to fully fund all the projects presented for Lane County. Tom Carstens seconds the motion.**

Vote:

Cat 1: Tom yes; Samara yes; Dino yes; Bree yes

Cat 2: Sophia yes; Sue yes; Ken yes; Sarah yes

Cat 3: Tasha yes; Jack yes; Mike yes; Randy yes

- **Motion passes.**

Clackamas County

Clackamas County Juvenile Department (Kelli Russell, presenter)

2 – Restorative Project Payback

Approved amount funded: \$26,569

This project is scalable to almost one-third by reducing the number from 12 to six months and days from 73 to 26.

Q. *You mentioned partnering with a local non-profit, have you selected that non-profit yet?*

A. Yes, we have identified one.

Q. *From reading the application, it looks like you will reach 12 youth?*

A. There would be six per work crew, they can rotate through.

Clackamas River Basin Council (David Bugni, presenter)

3 – North Fork Eagle Creek Fish Habitat Restoration Project

Approved amount funded: \$25,000

Clackamas County Dump Stoppers (Lisa Harmon, presenter)

1 – Dump Stoppers

Approved amount funded: \$28,860

This project is scalable, typically we pick up around nine months of the year, we would just shorten our season a bit.

Q. *Have you approached any partners or organizations for a match or additional funding?*

A. We have been reaching out to private timber organizations, such as Weyerhaeuser. We haven't received funding from them in the past.

Chris Dannenbring added that currently our matching funds come from Clackamas County Sustainability and Solid Waste Division. They have pass through dollars to basically cover all the costs that our grants don't cover. Over the past number of years, we have received about \$45K from that division.

- **Motion made by Mike Kennedy to fund based on the amounts that are showing in the accounts. Dino Venti seconds the motion.**

Vote:

Cat 1: Tom yes; Samara yes; Dino yes; Bree yes

Cat 2: Sofia yes; Sue yes; Ken yes; Sarah yes

Cat 3: Tasha yes; Jack yes; Mike yes; Randy yes

- **Motion passes.**

Columbia County

Upper Nehalem Watershed Council (Maggie Peyton, presenter)

4 – Riparian Restoration with Nehalem Native Nursery

Approved amount funded: \$27,205

Q. *What is the scalability?*

A. We could scale up to as much as \$65,000. We have no end of riparian reforestation projects and the capacity to do the work. We have a really good crew right now, we have students and underemployed community members who are doing a good job, and a lot of plants in the nursery that need to go out.

- **Motion made by Ken McCall to fund this project at \$27,205. Sophia Kaelke seconds the motion.**

Vote:

Cat 1: Tom yes; Samara yes; Dino yes; Bree yes

Cat 2: Sophia yes; Sue yes; Ken yes; Sarah yes

Cat 3: Tasha yes; Mike yes; Randy yes

- **Motion passes.**

Marion County

Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde (Lindsay McClary, presenter)

48 – Chahalpam Floodplain Restoration

Approved amount funded: \$54,848

Q. *How close were the 2020 Labor Day fires to this parcel?*

A. They were a couple of miles up the canyon, we were worried that it would reach the property, but it was not involved in the fires.

Q. *Regarding the scalability, if you remove the planting and just relied on spot treatments, there's a potential for invasive species to come back. Best practices, I would think you would want to do both.*

A. Would prefer to do both. Both will happen, it depends on what the BLM will be able to fund. Hoping that using this methodology, there's a large upfront cost planting 2600 stems per acre and invasive weeds

will be an issue for potentially five years before the plants are free to grow. We're hoping to plant a lot of stems and shade out those other unwanted species in a shorter period of time.

Linn County Juvenile Department (Rob Perkins, presenter)

46 – Marion / Linn County Juvenile Workforce (Rob Perkins)

Approved amount funded: \$60,000 (from Linn County)

Comment from Pat: They are looking for a total of \$60,000 for both counties, so it can be funded from either Marion or Linn County or a portion from both.

- **Motion** made by Tasha Davison to fund fully the Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde project, and not to fund the Juvenile Workforce project from Marion County, but to fund out of Linn County. Sarah Rockwell seconds the motion.

Vote:

Cat 1: Tom yes; Samara yes; Dino yes; Bree yes

Cat 2: Sophia yes; Sue yes; Ken yes; Sarah yes

Cat 3: Tasha yes; Jack yes; Mike yes; Randy yes

- **Motion passes.**

Linn County

Institute for Applied Ecology (Tyler Roberts, presenter)

45 – Oak Basin Prairie Restoration (Tyler Roberts)

Approved amount funded: \$111,442

- **Motion made by Tasha Livingstone Davison to fully fund both projects, Ken McCall seconds the motion.**

Vote:

Cat 1: Tom yes; Samara yes; Dino yes; Bree yes

Cat 2: Sophia yes; Sue yes; Ken yes; Sarah yes

Cat 3: Tasha yes; Jack yes; Mike yes; Randy yes

- **Motion passes.**

Lunch Break

Reconvened at 1 pm

Lincoln County

MidCoast Watershed Council (Evan Hayduk, presenter)

47 – Beaver Creek Nursery

Other counties that this project affects are Lincoln, Benton and Lane. Amount requested: \$75,064

Amount funded: \$36,782 from Lincoln County, \$26,797 from Benton County, \$11,485 from Lane County.

There is \$36,782 available in Lincoln County and available funding in Benton County of \$198,289 and we did not receive any projects from Benton. There is \$28K of funding available in Lane County.

Recommend funding the rest of the projects proportionately from Benton and Lane County which would be \$36,782 from Lincoln County, 70 percent from Benton County of \$26,797 and 30 percent from Lane County of \$11,485.

- **Motion made by Dino Venti that we fund this project as discussed as a slate, Ken McCall seconds the motion.**

Vote:

Cat 1: Tom yes; Dino yes; Samara yes; Bree yes

Cat 2: Sophia yes; Sue yes; Ken yes; Sarah yes

Cat 3: Tasha yes; Jack yes; Mike yes; Randy yes

- **Motion passes.**

Douglas County

Smith River Watershed Council (Brian Jenkins, presenter)

They have four projects in order of priority:

First priority project, (no number) **South Sisters Instream Restoration**

Approved amount funded: \$79,036

Lowest priority, **12 – Herb and Sweden Creek Instream Restoration**

Amount funded: 0

Second priority, **13 – North Sisters Instream Restoration**

Approved amount funded: \$65,260

Third priority, **14 – Wasson Forest Invasive Species Control**. This is a three-year project.

Approved amount funded: \$28,750

Top three projects could be reduced to any scalable amount the RAC feels appropriate. All the funding will be going to on-the-ground work.

Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (Erik Surings, presenter)

16 – Salmon Life Cycling Monitoring Project-West Fork Smith River

Approved amount funded: \$88,660

Bureau of Land Management (Suzanne Shelp, presenter)

26 – Back Country Youth Crews

Approved amount funded: \$50,000

Partnership of Umpqua Rivers (Eric Riley, presenter)

They have seven projects, the top three projects prioritized:

First priority, **11 – Butler Creek**

Approved amount funded: \$63,297

Second priority, **21 – Willis Creek Fish Passage**

Approved amount funded: \$32,387

Third priority, **20 – Rock Creek Post-Fire Imagery**

Approved amount funded: \$75,000

19 – South Umpqua Brockway Stream Gauge

Approved amount funded: \$49,514

22 – Umpqua Basin Stream Reference Temperature Project

Approved amount funded: \$32,902

24 - East Fork Rock Creek Tributaries Restoration

Approved amount funded: \$149,079

29 – Umpqua Basin Strategic Collaboration

Amount funded: 0

The Understory Initiative (Sean Prive, presenter)

17 – Mapping Threats to Sensitive Species

Approved amount funded: \$25,000

Douglas County Protective Association (Jessica Duarte, presenter)

25 – Douglas County Post-Wildfire Road Signage

Approved amount funded: \$29,654

3 PM Public Comment Period (Megan Harper, Heather Whitman)

One of the requirements for RAC meetings is to have a public comment period on each day for members of the public, so they can ask questions, suggest ideas or voice any concerns. We have a half-hour scheduled for the public comment period.

Heather: Over the last few meetings since they've been on Zoom, the public participation period has been a little bit different and there hasn't been anyone registered to make comments. However, the public is invited to attend the entire meeting, and if they would like the opportunity to make comments, there's a designated time. It makes it a bit more complicated with Zoom, we have asked participants to register in advance, but they didn't have to. Hope we can put something in the chat that all attendees can see that we're open to public comment with the time and if they would like to provide comments, they can raise their hand.

Samara: Would like to add we have an appreciation to the public who have participated in various ways and if people want to provide comments that it's greatly appreciated. As RAC members going forward with these meetings, it's an opportunity to encourage our stakeholders to have a direct voice during these windows of time.

- **There were no public comments.**

Continuing with project presentations:

Roseburg BLM (Jonathan Galuchie, presenter)

28 – North Umpqua Chub eDNA

Approved amount funded: \$13,500

Q. With eDNA being popular with doing this kind of work, are there any plans to monitor for other sensitive species that there are any markers developed for to broaden the scale?

A. Yes, there's a lot of opportunity to add more species.

Q. What is the importance of this funding to this project?

A. This funding would cover the sample processing.

Elk Creek Watershed Council (Lee Russell)

Two projects from the watershed council:

18 – Elk Creek Thermal Refuge Mapping

Approved amount funded: \$14,404

16 – Upper Ellenburg Creek Habitat Improvement

This is the highest priority for the watershed council.

Approved amount funded: \$118,308

Q. Which project has the greatest priority?

A. The Upper Ellenburg Creek instream project is the highest priority and is scalable. If we could fund the culvert, the instream sites are scalable.

Coos & Douglas NW Youth Corps (Lee Dudek, Oregon Program Manager)

There are three proposals that span across Douglas, Coos, and Klamath counties. We asked the NW Youth Corps, since they are basically the same proposal. The projects are under tab 7, 27 & 39 in your binders. The work is scalable on a week-to-week basis.

7-Coos County, *Approved amount funded: \$72,040*

27-Douglas County, *Approved amount funded: \$7,960*

39-Klamath County, *Approved amount funded: \$58,492*

Q. What other sorts of funding do you have?

A. We get a lot of funding directly from our partners. We also reach out to all sorts of other grants available to us. There are a few avenues we can take. Generally speaking, we get funding directly from our partners, they pay for our work.

Q. Do you have any data on what happens after the youth finish with the program?

A. Roughly 90 percent end up finishing the program fully, but don't have exact numbers.

- **Motion made by Mike Kennedy to recommend funding the projects as a slate as discussed. Ken McCall seconds the motion.**

Vote:

Cat 1: Tom yes; Samara yes; Dino yes; Bree – absent

Cat 2: Sophia yes; Sue yes; Ken yes; Sarah yes

Cat 3: Tasha yes; Jack yes; Mike yes; Randy yes

- **Motion passes.**

Samara: Thank you all for your work today and active participation. Appreciate everyone putting in the extra time to complete what we needed to do.

Heather: The meeting went really well today. With many of you being new to this process, hope the meeting today helped you get more comfortable with the roles and responsibilities of the RAC. Tomorrow, we'll start our meeting tomorrow at 9 a.m., please attend since we need a quorum in order to be successful. We'll go through the rest of the projects, then we'll start talking about future RAC meetings and the other work that the RAC is involved with beyond the Title II. Give some thought to what, as a RAC, you would want to focus on in the future.

Megan: Please bring your calendars for 2023 to the meeting tomorrow. We will be on the same link tomorrow around 8:45 a.m. Feel free to join us a bit earlier if you would like.

Meeting adjourned.

January 27, 2023 session

Role call for RAC members:

Cat 2-Sarah, Sophia, Ken

Cat 3-Mike, Tasha, Jack, Randy

Cat 1-Dino, Tom, Samara, Bree

9 AM Meeting called to order

Heather Whitman, DFO

Welcome to Day 2.

RAC members discussed the Post Wildfire Road Signage project that they recommended funding for yesterday. Several members were a bit frustrated with how the proposal was written and the presentation.

Clarification from Heather: The proposal was not just to put signs on BLM lands, it would be used to put signs on roadways that also traveled through private lands that were destroyed by the Archie Creek Fire, Milepost 97 Fire, etc. DFPA was looking at facilities maintenance on all lands, not just BLM.

Tasha: If there are presentations in the future that we have questions about, we can always ask the person to come back for the next round and propose the project again.

Samara: If there are overriding concerns, we are still actively in this meeting, and we can make changes to that funding recommendation since it's not official yet. Does the group want to make a change?

- **Motion made by Tom Carsten that we zero out the funding recommendation for the signage project and carry the remainder over for another time. Ken McCall seconds the motion.**

Vote:

Cat 1: Tom yes; Samara no; Dino yes; Bree yes

Cat 2: Sophia no; Sue no; Ken yes; Sarah no

Cat 3: Tasha no; Jack no; Mike no; Randy no

- **Decision: This vote will revert the funding back to what was allocated yesterday.**

Comment: Mike didn't have any problem with providing funding to DFPA for the signage. We have worked with DFPA on fire protection issues and always found if they say they are going to get something done, then they get it done. It would have been better if they had given us a rough estimate of signs.

Q. *When do the applicants get the money with this round? How long does it take?*

A. One to two months for this round of funding to arrive with the current applicants. That depends on whether we are doing new assistance agreements, or if we already have an assistance agreement with someone, we can get the money to them sooner because there's less paperwork.

We will be revisiting all of Secure Rural Schools in August/September and then, it will take two to three months after that to turn that money around.

Project proposals

Jackson County

Siskiyou Uplands Trials Association (Joy Rogalla, presenter)

30 – Jack-Ash Trail Phase II Construction

Important comment from Heather: Appreciate the presentation and proposal, however the RAC is going to need to consider, which was an oversight by the BLM, is the eligibility of this project for Title II funding. The way the legislation is written, the projects need to improve existing infrastructure and this project is for new construction. Wanted to bring this to the attention of the RAC.

Decision: DFO Heather Whitman has removed the project proposal for the Jack-Ash Trail Phase II for consideration.

Klamath Bird Observatory (Sarah Rockwell, presenter)

32 – Imperiled Oregon Vesper Sparrow

Approved amount funded: \$45,561

Q. *Why wasn't the data analysis and publication worked into the earlier proposals? Why is this a totally separate proposal?*

A. It's been hard to fund, a lot of the foundations we work with only fund the field work and others only cover the supplies and not salary. This is entirely for salary for staff to do the analysis and outreach. We received about half of it from a previous Title II cycle. We're looking to wrap up the other components that weren't funded by that initial Title II grant.

Q. *Does this sparrow exist in any other areas?*

A. Breeding range is restricted to Oregon and a tiny part of Puget Sound in Washington. The strongholds are mostly the Willamette, Umpqua, and Rogue Valleys. We have partners studying the same bird in the Willamette Valley and in Washington. We are covering the southern range with our study and are working with them to have similar data collection methods. Eventually we will synthesize all the data together from our partners.

Bureau of Land Management (Don Robinson, presenter)

36 & 37 – Roadside Improvement Projects

There will be one presentation for two projects, one for Jackson County (tab 36) and one for Josephine County (tab 37)

Jackson County, *Approved amount funded: \$28,500*

Josephine County, *Approved amount funded \$28,500*

Q. Since the project covers parts of two counties, is there any numbers in term of percentages?

A. Both counties have a high number of these project areas that we can implement and do. Josephine County by far has a higher percentage of these areas and sites around the urban interface. We have enough sites identified to take care of what's been presented.

Q. Have you done anything for prevention?

A. Yes, we work with the Oregon State Police, Sheriff's Department, we have a contract Deputy that works with us are constantly out at these sites. We go out and educate the public on the uses, what they can and cannot do and what's allowed at certain times of the year including fire prevention. The problem is a lot of the groups do not comply with the rules and regulations and it's a continuing ongoing problem.

The Understory Initiative (Kathryn Prive, presenter)

35 - Native Seed Production and Seed Storage

Approved amount funded: \$40,930

Q. Noticed in the match, you mention OSU Extension, what's their role?

A. OSU Extension is the location of our seed increase plot, they allow us the space to do the seed production on their land The Understory Initiative, we don't own any property, there's a cooperative agreement to utilize their land.

Q. Is there a library of all these rare plants already?

A. The BLM maintains a database of all the known populations of rare species on the district, however most of those records are at least 15 years old, if not 30. There's not extensive information on the threats which is what we're addressing. We trying to find out if the populations have declined since they last time they were visited. What we produce is a heat map of where the rare plants are in that population and an overlaying heat map of the threats, especially noxious weeds. We provide that to BLM managers and we are in the process of preparing proposals to treat the noxious weeds in those populations or do thinning or burning if that's what's needed. (Sean)

Applegate Partnership (Caleb Galloway, presenter)

33 – Provolt Noxious Weeds

This is a project that will affect both Jackson and Josephine County.

Josephine County: *Approved amount funded \$169,462*

Jackson County: *Approved amount funded \$5,941*

Q. Are you going to be doing anything to enhance the native shrub reestablishment or do you expect that might happen more passively?

A. We're hoping it will happen more passively and to see what actually comes back after the removal to assess more species to put out. Aside from the native grass and seed the BLM will be putting out, we also have local property owners in the area gathering white and black acorns from their properties in the same ecoregion and spread as many buckets of acorns out on the site to help encourage the oak savannah habitat and maybe encourage more elk populations and other wildlife.

Q. *Do you have people in the community involved in this project?*

A. We started the Provolt Volunteer Team in 2020. We have a volunteer day happening the day we will be putting out park benches and rehammering out some of the trails that we've already implemented. We gather volunteers at least twice a month or as needed and we usually have a turnout of about 10 community members helping us out. There has been a substantial increase of public awareness of the site and interest in helping out.

Q. The project is taking place in Josephine and Jackson County. What is the breakdown of how much work will be done in each county?

A. Approximately 97 percents is located in Josephine County and 3 percent in Jackson County.

- **Motion made by Sophia Kaelke to approve all the projects in Josephine and Jackson County at the full amount as a slate. Tom Carsen seconds the motion.**

Vote:

Cat 1: Tom yes; Samara yes; Dino yes; Bree yes

Cat 2: Sophia yes; Sue yes; Ken yes; Sarah yes

Cat 3: Tasha yes; Jack yes; Mike yes; Randy yes

- **Motion passes.**

Klamath County

Bureau of Land Management (Kerry Johnston, presenter)

40 – Klamath Falls BLM Weed Treatment in Klamath River Canyon

Approved amount funded: \$100,000

Q. *Was the additional \$60K over the five years or is that per year?*

A. That would be a one-time purchase for roughly 5,000 lbs of seed. We would not seed every year, we would have to treatment effectiveness monitoring process, so it's an adaptive management process. Typically, we would go out and see the areas that could use the seed and we would apply as needed. The 5,000 lbs of seed could be spread out over the course of a couple of years.

Q. *Is your target 300 acres per year?*

A. In our annual treatment plans, we typically have treated between 150 up to 300 acres per year. It depends every year on funds availability, it has been on the lower end, but it could potentially reach up to 300 acres per year.

39 – NW Youth Corps

Approved amount funded: \$58,492

- **Motion by Tasha Livingstone Davison to fully fund both projects in Klamath County.**
Randy Smith seconds the motion.

Vote:

Cat 1: Tom yes; Samara yes; Dino yes; Bree yes

Cat 2: Sophia yes; Sue yes; Ken yes; Sarah yes

Cat 3: Tasha yes; Jack yes; Mike yes; Randy yes

- **Motion passes.**

Coos County

Bureau of Land Management (Rushal Sedlemyer, presenter)

5 – Lower Steel Creek Restoration

Approved amount funded: \$62,699

Q. Will the NEPA that will be done in April impact this project?

A. It shouldn't impact the work we need to do. We just completed a draft of the cultural resources surveying and reporting, so we are almost completed with that part of the permitting, and we are working with the Coos Bay BLM office to permit the project under the programmatic.

Q. Where have you secured other funding?

A. We do have funding secured with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS and Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board. Most of that funding will be going to the riparian portion of the project. The BLM RAC funding will go to removal of the concrete weirs and instream restoration.

Comment from Randy: It will be a great demonstration project because it is highly visible in Dora, and definitely need to get some good positive projects in that community.

Coos County (Jill Rolfe, Coos County)/Casey Bosse, OSU extension)

6 – Controlling Noxious Weeds is Everyone's Responsibility

Approved amount funded: \$34,117

Q. What is the pilot project that was mentioned in the proposal?

A. The pilot project is the Whiskey Run mountain bike trail, to put up the informational kiosk, train trail managers and provide a lessons learned guide. The continuing program that we have for the cost share herbicide program, it's been our main focus is to get on the ground herbicides and partner with the other watersheds which is very helpful to other grants that they have to match to this grant.

Q. Is there any water available for a bike washing station?

A. There are two options, if there's water, we will use that or if not, it will be a dry station.

Q. Are there also strategies around other user groups?

A. It is the volume of mountain bikers who are using this trail and going to other recreational trail areas. We can take this process with our lessons learned and adapt it to fit any of the other trails.

Q. *It's a great idea with the washing stations, are there others around the state?*

A. There are some in the larger counties, so we would reach out to these other counties that have these projects before we start to find out if they had any issues come up. Most of the conversations we have already had was about security, to make sure the area is secure for the tools.

Q. *What is your track record of eradicating weeds?*

A. We have had some success with eradicating weeds mostly on smaller lands, it can take years to eradicate weeds. We have people that have been coming back to us and sharing the results and we're pretty happy with the success rate. Our target is to reach out to more people, but we don't have the funding to do that. We are working on capacity and funding.

Comment from Dino: I would encourage a campaign to bike shops and companies, because I don't want this to become an access issue for mountain bikers. As a mountain biker myself, our user group would respond to that very seriously, because we take access to public lands as a privilege. If you could use Dino's help, he can provide his information, so he can help spread the word.

Comment from Randy: The Dept of Forestry particularly on the Tillamook and Clatsop state forests have a very robust recreation program and they have numerous staff, kiosks, and washing stations. They have a huge volunteer work group as well that help with the trail systems. If you need any suggestions or ideas on washing stations, etc, highly encourage you to reach out to those folks.

7 – NW Youth Corps for Coos County

Approved amount funded: \$72,040

The group approved to fund \$7,960 from Douglas County, then the rest from Coos County which fully funds Coos and Douglas Counties.

- **Motion by Randy Smith to fully fund all the projects in Coos County as a slate. Tasha Livingstone Davison seconds the motion.**

Vote:

Cat 1: Tom yes; Samara yes; Dino yes; Bree yes

Cat 2: Sophia yes; Sue yes; Ken yes; Sarah yes

Cat 3: Tasha yes; Jack yes; Mike yes; Randy yes

- **Motion passes.**

Curry County

Curry Soil and Water Conservation District (Kelly Timchak, presenter)

They have three projects:

8 – Rogue Estuary

Approved amount funded: \$10,479

9 – Willow Creek

Approved amount funded: \$20,000

10 – Most Wanted Weeds II

Approved amount funded: \$20,000

Q. *Noticed that you're consulting with a lot of people on the Rogue River Estuary, are you consulting with fishermen too?*

A. Yes, we have close relationship with several sport fisherman and guides. We also keep in regular touch with ODFW who has relationship with fishermen. We also have someone on the board who is part of the hatchery group that works on Indian Creek.

- **Motion by Bree Yednock to funding the slate as shown. Dino Venti seconds the motion.**

Vote:

Cat 1: Tom yes; Samara yes; Dino yes; Bree yes

Cat 2: Sophia yes; Sue yes; Ken yes; Sarah yes

Cat 3: Tasha yes; Jack yes; Mike yes; Randy yes

- **Motion passes.**

Lunch break

Reconvened at 1 pm

Heather: The past day and a half went really well. You went through and allocated \$2,500,850 of funding in this round of Title II projects. Great job! This is money that is going directly to projects that are going to benefit public lands and these are projects that people will see. We will be sending out a press release, but sometimes those don't get picked up in local community newspapers, so as RAC members, you can help us make those connections to people.

Pat did a summary of next steps:

- A cover letter will be prepared and written for Samara's signature as your Chair, from the RAC to the DFO Heather. Then Heather will make the decision to accept the recommendations put forth from the RAC and that will be our official documentation of the work that was done here.
- Next week, we will start the internal process that we take care of, developing purchases requests and executing the actual movement of money. That goes to our BLM Oregon State Office (OSO). At the OSO we have a Grants Management Officer and they will work with our BLM specialist, our point-of-contact on these projects. Each one has a point-of-contact with a BLM technical person, and they will work the project proponent and write an Assistance Agreement which is an agreement between the government and grant recipient and lays out all the things they have to do with the project.
- We put the money that's allocated into an account, project proponents, the grant recipients, are able to draw down the money as prescribed in their agreement with us. They are also required to submit receipts for the work done, these are reimbursement agreements, and they get reimbursed for it. This can happen almost instantaneously because the money is in the account.
- There are 48 agreements, and the process can take a couple of months depending on how quickly things are moving.

Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO)

- The NOFO can be found on grants.gov. Grants.gov is a portal where any federal agency that opens up grant funding can let people know they can apply for grant money. If you go to the site, you can filter the search to look for expired NOFO for SFS to see how we advertised last year. People can look at the old expired NOFO and get a head start framing what projects they would like to do since the new NOFO won't be much different.
- This year, we will be making some changes to make less confusing for applicants and fix some of the glitches that we had this time around.
- Hope to get it published in Feb or March. The closing date will be sometime in May, but that will be on the NOFO.
- Once it closes, we will get all the applications, the OSO will review them for completeness, then they will send them to Pat. Pat will work with the team, Stephanie, Christina, Megan to review them for technical accuracy, start assigning program officers, and start their technical review.

Heather: With the NOFO coming up, RAC members could help us with providing outreach to watershed councils, counties, or other smaller organizations who can apply for Title II and help them be successful in doing so.

Future RAC meetings

Megan

We have this RAC until 2025 and Megan wanted to discuss when the group would like to meet. The Charter says the RAC will meet two to four times a year. Something to keep in mind, at this point in time, if you have a meeting, we have to offer some sort of hybrid meeting.

Suggests the group have a meeting in the spring. Perhaps a field trip. Potentially will have some recreation items to discuss in the spring. We could do a combo opportunity. If the group isn't making any decisions, you don't need to have a quorum.

- Group agreed on the tentative dates of April 6-7 and April 14 for a field trip and meeting. Location of field trip and the topics of the meeting TBD.
- To send out a doodle poll for potential dates for a meeting in September. Request that RAC members let us know any dates they will be unavailable.
- BLM covers the cost of travel, mileage, hotel, and a stipend (per diem).

Recruitment of RAC members

As you have noticed, there are 12 members on this RAC. Full capacity on the RAC is 15 members. There is one vacancy in each of the three categories:

Category 1: Commercial timber, mineral development, developed outdoor recreational, someone who holds a federal grazing or other permit from the BLM.

Category 2: Environmental organizations both nationally, regionally, or locally, dispersed recreation and archaeological and historic interests.

Category 3: Elected officials, representatives of Indian tribes, school officials or teachers, or represent the public at large.

It requires a *Federal Register Notice* being published as a call for nominations. Hope to have it published in the next month or two. Usually, the nomination period is open for thirty days where we're accepting applications. After the nominations are received and we write up summaries and present the applications to the HQ office, then they're transmitted up to the Secretary of the Interior. The Secretary makes the appointments to the RAC and timeframe to get it done is variable.

Heather and Megan will keep you in the loop and we appreciate any help through your networks of anyone who would be good to fill out the variety that we have on the RAC. We will send you all the materials. If someone is interested, they can apply through the Western Oregon RAC website.

If RAC members know of anyone who would be a good addition to the RAC, please let them know. We will send you the materials. They can also apply through the Western Oregon RAC website.

2 pm Public Comment Period

- **No public comments received.**

Heather: As we mentioned yesterday about public participation, people can be here at the entire meeting, but we provide them an opportunity to engage with the RAC with a public comment period.

Q. *Can the public submit written comments to the RAC?*

A. Yes, they can.

Closing comments from the Chair Samara Phelps:

I will work with Heather and Megan so you will have my contact information so this is not the end of the conversation and that it will be a continued conversation and we, as the RAC, can assert our interests and drive the agenda for we would like covered as well as what we heard from the BLM representatives on the work they need out of the RAC.

Heather: I am so excited to be working with all of you. Hearing the thoughtful participation is encouraging, and it's refreshing to have a group who are dedicated in helping us be successful. Thank you for all of your hard work, it's really appreciated by the BLM.

Meeting adjourned.