

**DRAFT MINUTES**  
Eugene District Bureau of Land Management  
**Resource Advisory Committee**  
Secure Rural Schools and Community Self Determination Act  
Title II Program

September 1, 2011

Eugene District BLM Office  
3106 Pierce Parkway, Suite E, Room 213 – Springfield, Oregon

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Category 1: Mike Barnes, Pamela Berrian, Jerry King

Category 2: Dana Dedrick, Eric Jones, Kevin Matthews, Sarah Peters, Greg Ringer

Category 3: William Gehling, Kathryn Lynch, Faye Stewart, William Tucker, Denise Walters

**MEMBERS ABSENT:**

Category 1: Roy Keene

Category 2: None

Category 3: None

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Virginia Grilley (Designated Federal Official), Patricia Johnston (RAC Coordinator)

Chairperson Kathryn Lynch called the meeting of the Eugene District Bureau of Land Management (BLM) Resource Advisory Committee (RAC) for Title II of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self Determination Act to order at 8:30 a.m. She invited those who were present to introduce themselves.

RAC Coordinator Patricia Johnston distributed copies of a document which contained “collective statements” made by RAC members at their August 4, 2011, meeting. She explained that the statements were a compilation of overlapping, diverse viewpoints and were not intended to show consensus. She requested that statements entitled “What are the worst possible outcomes of the RAC making project funding recommendations?” and “What are the best possible outcomes of funding Eugene District projects?” be read. She invited members to comment on the statements.

- Kevin Matthews said the depth and variety of the statements showed the value of collective thinking.
- William Tucker suggested that creation of the statements added value to the group process to be followed.
- Sarah Peters said she agreed with the comments already made and observed that it was positive that they had been created before project presentations were made.

- Chairperson Lynch suggested that the statements gave the RAC a basis for evaluating project proposals.
- Jerry King said he appreciated how submitted projects were environmentally sound.
- Faye Stewart said he believed the worst outcome would be that there was not enough funding for all of the worthy projects and that the best outcome would be that all members would be proud of the outcome.
- Dana Dedrick said she was excited to be part of the process of recommending projects for funding.
- William Gehling observed that having less funding that was requested for the projects was going to make it a difficult process.
- Pamela Berrian suggested that identifying potential outcomes was motivation to developing recommendations.
- Greg Ringer said that the collective statements showed there would be meaningful engagement by the RAC to best utilize the limited resources available.

Chairperson Lynch referred to minutes of the August 4 RAC meeting and a transcription of note cards used at the meeting distributed as Agenda support material. She noted that she had also supplied to members notes she had taken of verbatim comments made at the meeting and suggested that others might be interested in doing the same. She finally suggested that the collective statements developed after the meeting be considered part of its record.

Members discussed the minutes and meeting records. Through an informal process, a motion was developed, as follows:

***Moved by Mr. Matthews, seconded by Mr. Tucker, to approve the minutes as submitted, and to add the transcription of note cards, verbatim comments provided by members, and the collective statements developed after the meeting as appendices to the minutes.***

Ms. Walters requested that the seventh Best Possible Outcome identified on page three of the minutes be changed to reflect better her intention in making the statement, as follows: “Projects are non-deficit/reciprocal.”

Chairperson Lynch determined that there was no objection to the request and the minutes were amended.

Members continued to discuss the meeting record, at length.

- Eric Jones suggested that action on the minutes and meeting record be postponed to allow time for additional individual change suggestions.
- Mr. Tucker commented that verbatim comments were not generally expected to be included in minutes. He also said he questioned the appropriateness of accepting additions to the meeting record without having them available for consideration.

- Mr. Jones said he believed it was better to have multiple versions of a meeting record to ensure that the views of all participants were included.
- Mr. Tucker suggested that the concerns raised could be met by adding to the motion that “individual members be allowed to add comments to the record.”
- Mr. Matthews said he was not comfortable with such a provision because he believed concerns about the record should be raised during the meeting for all to consider.
- Ms. Berrian observed that the minutes provided a record of what took place at the meeting and that the current Agenda item was to add or correct them, not create an additional record.
- Mr. Jones said he wished to have it recorded that he did not believe the meeting notes were accurate or reflective of what had happened.
- Mr. Matthews encouraged Mr. Jones to express his concerns and allow the RAC to make additions and corrections.
- Mr. Jones said he believed the summary notes distributed by the Chairperson had been valuable in conveying more accurately the essence of the meeting.
- Denise Walters observed that the distinction being considered was between accuracy and precision. She suggested that if something was missing from the meeting record, inaccurate or incomplete, it should be changed.
- Mr. Matthews suggested that if something was significantly incorrect in the minutes, it should be changed; but if they were incomplete, the concern was addressed by adding the other suggestions for the meeting record. He proposed that voting on the motion be postponed until after the lunch break to allow individual members time to develop change proposals.
- Ms. Dedrick suggested that members be encouraged to sequentially make suggestions for changing the meeting record.
- Mr. Jones stated that the meeting record “did not work” for him because it did not fully reflect the contributions of members. However, he said, he was willing to move forward with the work of the RAC.
- Ms. Berrian said it was her understanding that verbatim notes were outside the realm of meeting minutes.
- Mr. Tucker suggested that the appendices included in the motion should be identified as the personal notes of individual members.
- Ms. Peters said that she had not received or reviewed the notes prepared by the Chairperson and was hesitant to accept them without such an opportunity.
- Ms. Berrian said that if members were given the opportunity to change the notes of the Chairperson, she might wish to add her own to the record.
- Ms. Dedrick proposed that the motion be amended, as follows:

*. . . to approve the minutes as amended; and allow members to suggest editorial changes, and additions to the transcription of note cards, verbatim comments provided by members, and the collective statements developed after the meeting which will be added as appendices with approval given at the conclusion of the meeting.*

*A seemingly informal vote was taken on the motion as proposed for revision, it was adopted, 10:0:2, with Mr. Jones and one other member abstaining from voting and Mr. Barnes having not yet joined the meeting.*

Ms. Johnston distributed copies of a document which contained guidelines of standards and procedures for RAC provided in the Code of Federal Regulations, 43CFR1780.174 Cooperative Relations, Advisory Committees. She reviewed portions of its section entitled “Avoidance of Conflict of Interest,” as follows:

*. . . no members of sub-groups of such advisory committees shall participate in any matter in which the members have a direct interest.*

*. . . Members of advisory committees shall be required to disclose their direct or indirect interest in leases, licenses, permits, contracts, or claims and related litigation which involve lands or resources administered by the Bureau of Land Management.*

Members discussed the guidelines. There appeared to be agreement: (1) that a member should not lobby for or vote on projects submitted by a group with which s/he was affiliated; (2) that a member should self-recuse from voting on a project in which s/he had a personal pecuniary interest; (3) if a conflict of interest exists, members are allowed to participate in consideration of the proposal, but not vote on its recommendation; and (4) *ex parte* contacts regarding proposals outside the meeting should be reported.

In response to a request, members reported potential conflicts of interest:

- Mr. Stewart reported that he held interest in mining claims, the filing of which was administered by the BLM.
- Ms. Berrian reported that she was an employee of the City of Eugene, which had contracts and contacts with the BLM.
- Ms. Dedrick reported that her employer had received grants and contracts from the BLM.
- Chairperson Lynch reported that the Environmental Leadership Program (ELP) with which she was associated, had received grants and contracts from the BLM.
- Mr. Matthews reported that he was treasurer of a group which received BLM support.

Designated Federal Official Virginia Grilley stated that she was not aware that any of the reported potential conflicts involved personal pecuniary interests as defined by the guidelines.

Ms. Grilley reported that Eugene District BLM staff had reviewed project proposals to be considered by the RAC, but that she would distribute their ranked listing after presentation of all of the projects

Ms. Johnston referred to Collective Statements distributed earlier and reviewed with members the section entitled “What criteria would help us move toward our best outcomes?” She invited members to express evaluations of the criteria identified.

- Mr. Matthews said he believed it was a “good list” that could be improved, but that it provided a “scaffold” on which the RAC could develop its recommendations.
- Mr. Tucker said he believed the criteria would be improved if they were “fleshed out.”
- Chairperson Lynch said she believed the criteria made the enabling legislation more clear.
- Ms. Dedrick, Mr. King, Mr. Ringer, Mr. Stewart, and Ms. Walters said they found the criteria valuable and helpful.
- Ms. Berrian questioned whether the criteria encouraging a proposal to be sponsored by the RAC was appropriate.

## **PROJECT PROPOSAL PRESENTATIONS**

### **1. Whitewater and Martin Rapids Recreation Site**

BLM staff Liz Aleman presented the Whitewater and Marten Rapids Recreation Site Improvements project submitted by the Eugene District BLM. She said it would create needed features at popular river recreation sites within in a Special Recreation Management Area on the south side of the McKenzie River. She explained that the improvements would include a vault toilet, trash cans, grills, parking lot surfacing, signing, and entry area fencing. In addition she described how the Martin Rapids site would be expanded to include two additional picnic tables, river viewing benches, and vegetation management.

Ms. Aleman reviewed application information, noting that work on the project would be done on the project by contractors, Lane County workers, federal workers, and volunteers. She reported that the required National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process had not yet been completed on the project and that \$56,370 was being requested in Title II contributions to complete its estimated \$76,177 cost. She said the project could be scaled down if a smaller grant were recommended.

Members discussed the project proposal.

### **2. Carpenter By-Pass Trail Network**

Jared Hanley said he represented Disciples of Dirt, the 500 member co-sponsor with the BLM of the Carpenter Bypass Multi-Use Non-Motorized Trail Network project proposal. He said the group was a newly recognized 501(c)(3) nonprofit corporation. He said the project would establish an authorized, sustainable, multi-use, non-motorized recreation area. He described the currently used area near Lorane which would be improved. He explained that a vehicle parking site would be created, an educational kiosk erected, and toilet facilities installed. He said planning assistance for the project was being provided by the International Mountain Biking Association.

Mr. Hanley reviewed application information, noting that work on the project would be completed by contractors, federal workers, and volunteers. He reported that the NEPA process for the project had not been completed and that \$91,052 in Title II funds was being requested to be matched with 2500 hours of volunteer labor.

Members discussed the project proposal.

### **3. Juvenile Forest Work Team**

Matthew Sterner stated that he was Director of the Lane County Youth Services Martin Luther King Education Center, sponsor of the Lane County Juvenile Forest Work Team project proposal. He distributed copies of a brochure describing the services of the Center and its ongoing youth employment training that included experience working on restoration of forest lands. He explained that the Department of Youth Services provided fully staffed work crews which worked four days a week, year round, on a variety of BLM projects, emphasizing construction, maintenance, and decommissioning of trails within the Shotgun Park for off highway vehicles. He said the program had a record of reducing recidivism among juvenile offenders by 74 percent and saved tax payer resources.

Mr. Sterner reviewed application information, noting that the project cost was intended to cover County workforce, equipment, and minimum wage pay for participants. He explained that a NEPA process for the project was not required and that \$120,750 in Title II contributions was being requested to complete its estimated \$141,067 cost. He said the project could be scaled down if a smaller grant were recommended, but that there was a limit to which it could be reduced without its being impossible to continue.

Members discussed the project proposal.

### **4. Lane County Sheriff's Work Crew**

Lane County Sheriff's Deputy David Bones presented the Lane County Sheriff's Work Crew project proposal. He explained that inmate crews paid for by Title II funds worked on the backlog of maintenance and restoration needs of BLM lands. He said the work required intensive hand labor not available through other sources. He said all work was assigned and monitored by the BLM and included improving campgrounds and hiking trails, brushing and opening roads, and trash, debris, and noxious weed removal. He reviewed statistics of work performed through the project in previous years.

Deputy Bones reviewed application information, noting that NEPA process requirements for the project were completed by the BLM. He explained that the project cost estimate of \$233,456 was budgeted for prisoner deputy supervision, supplies and material, travel and other direct and indirect costs. He said the total cost of the project could be scaled down by reducing the number of crews assigned until it became not cost effective for the duties of a single deputy.

Members discussed the project proposal.

## **5. Northwest Youth Corps**

Joe Waksmundski stated that he was Director of the Northwest Youth Corps (NYC) located in Eugene. He distributed a brochure entitled "Great Kids Doing Great Things" and highlighted information it contained. He explained that NYC provided outdoor job training and work opportunities for area youth on District BLM projects. He said NYC had a 27 year history of working with federal agencies throughout the northwest. He described project activities that included improvement and maintenance of existing infrastructure, enhancing forest ecosystems, and restoration and improvement of land health and water quality. He said significant hiking and camping for as long as several weeks were often involved in the activities. He said youth were paid a stipend which equated to minimum wage for work on activities.

Mr. Waksmundski reviewed application information, noting that NEPA requirements for the project were completed by the BLM. He said that \$53,892 was being requested in Title II funds, which would be matched by \$41,264 of other contributions.

Members discussed the project proposal.

## **6. Wolf Creek Culvert Replacement**

Jared Weybright stated that he was Projects Coordinator for the McKenzie Watershed Council, sponsor of the Wolf Creek Culvert Replacement project proposal. He described existing culverts on Wendling Road at milepost 3.9 which blocked fish passage and impeded downstream migration of debris. He said the project would install a concrete arch open-bottom culvert that would allow fish passage, restore natural migration of substrate, and protect water quality and road infrastructure. He explained that it would restore access to four miles of rearing and spawning habitat for cutthroat and rainbow trout. He described how the project would be completed by cooperative work among the BLM, Lane County, McKenzie Watershed Council, and Weyerhaeuser.

Mr. Weybright reviewed application information, noting that a NEPA process was not required because the project was to replace an existing pair of culverts. He said that \$118,160 was being requested in Title II funds, which would be matched by \$53,500 in other in-kind contributions.

Members discussed the project proposal.

## **6. Kennedy Conservation Corps**

Don Kaiser stated that he was a teacher at Cottage Grove High School in the South Lane School District, sponsor of the Kennedy Conservation Corps Noxious Weed Removal Program project proposal. He said the project provided youth crews from AL Kennedy Alternative High School in Cottage Grove to eradicate invasive plant species on BLM land by hand cutting, pulling, girdling, solarization, and grubbing. He explained that education in plant identification, site assessment, Global Positioning Satellite (GPS) mapping, and environmental principles were included in the program. He said the project was designed to be on BLM land and directed by a BLM resource specialist, with teachers also assigned to the work.

Mr. Kaiser reviewed application information, noting that a NEPA process was not required for the project. He said that the application was for \$76,735 in Title II Funds, which would be matched by \$1,683 of in-kind contributions from other sources.

Members discussed the project proposal.

### **7. Calico Creek Restoration**

Abel Kloster stated that he represented Aprovecho Sustainability Education Center in South Lane County, sponsor of the Calico Creek Restoration Project. He said the project would enhance riparian fish habitat and native prairie plants within the West Fork of the Calico Creek watershed and provide education opportunities and job training to local youth and adults in ecological systems and historic land use patterns. He explained that it was an extension of a project already occurring on Aprovecho property. He said paid youth crews from the Kennedy Conservation Corps, students, and volunteers would be involved in the removal of excess trees, brush and invasive species from the riparian and woodland areas.

Mr. Kloster reviewed application information, noting that the required NEPA process for the project was complete. He said the application was for \$42,300 in Title II Funds, which would be matched by \$20,300 of in-kind contributions from other sources.

Members discussed the project proposal.

### **8. Siuslaw Restoration and Monitoring Field Crew**

Jeff Jones stated that he represented the Siuslaw Watershed Council, sponsor of the Siuslaw Restoration and Monitoring Field Crew project. The project would implement, maintain, and monitor riparian restoration projects to increase the presence and survival of native riparian vegetation and control invasive species on BLM and nearby non-industrial private lands. He explained that, in addition to planting and maintaining native trees, a crew of displaced commercial fishers and other workers were trained to assist with aquatic surveys of a type of mollusk that was a biological indicator of water quality in the West.

Mr. Jones reviewed application information, noting that all work on the project would be accomplished by a contractor and that a NEPA process was not required. He said the application was for \$46,538 in Title II Funds, which would be matched by \$11,662 of in-kind contributions.

Members discussed the project proposal.

### **9. Siuslaw Road at Mile Post 42.0**

John Pech stated that he represented Lane County Public Works, sponsor of the Siuslaw Road at Mile Post 42.0 project. This project proposal was to replace a metal culvert 100 feet from the Siuslaw River with a 120" corrugated steel pipe. He said the existing culvert was deteriorated and undersized, preventing fish passage to spawning areas. He explained that the replacement would open

approximately 1.3 stream miles of spawning, rearing, and migrating habitat for Coho Salmon. He said the project was scheduled to be completed during the summer of 2013.

Mr. Pech reviewed application information. He noted that all work would be completed by Lane County workers. He said that a NEPA process was not required for the project. He said the application was for \$54,839 in Title II funds, which would be matched by \$80,000 in Lane County contributions.

Members discussed the project proposal.

Chairperson Lynch declared a lunch break at 12:25 p.m.

Chairperson Lynch reconvened the meeting at 1:00 p.m.

Mike Barnes joined the meeting at 1:00 p.m.

#### **10. Focus on Forests**

Kevin Matthews stated that the Focus on Forests project proposal, officially sponsored by the Friends of Eugene, had been developed because of the interest of some RAC members in submitting a project in the application process. He said he had volunteered to meet with other members and BLM staff to prepare such a project.

Mr. Matthews reported that the project, as finally conceived, was to seek to engage Oregon and California (O&C) forest stakeholders in an open-ended, collaborative discussion around local and regional forest futures. He explained that expert facilitation would be engaged to break down stereotypes and increase mutual understanding and to build a shared vision of economically and environmental sustainability in forest management. He said the proposal suggested that Consensus Associates be hired to conduct interviews and then conduct a three-day community workshop involving community members, agency representatives, and leaders to develop recommendations around shared best outcomes for conflicted natural resource planning situations.

Mr. Matthews said \$39,000 of Title II fund was being requested to engage Consensus Associates to conduct interviews with 15 RAC members, 60-80 interviews with community leaders with RAC members participating as listeners, and organize and facilitate the community workshop. He said that it was estimated that 200 person days would be contributed by participants.

Members discussed the project proposal.

#### **11. Signs for Resource Protection and Interpretation**

Mark Stephens, on behalf of the BLM, presented the Signs for Resource Protection and Interpretation project proposal. He said the proposed sites for posting the signs were Horse Rock Ridge Re-

search Natural Area, McGowan Meadows, and the Dorena Prairie. He circulated examples of the proposed interpretative and rare plant signs and explained that their purpose would be to alert the public to the values and beauty of the sites and to help them to be found. He suggested that the signs could also reduce unintended degradation of the sites.

Mr. Stephens explained that 17 signs would be designed by the Institute for Applied Ecology, constructed by a local sign shop, and installed by work crews from the Department of Youth Services or Northwest Youth Corps. He said the estimated cost of the project was \$15,953, matched with in-kind contributions of \$27,863.

Members discussed the project proposal.

## **12. Triangle Lake Noxious Weed Eradication**

Kimberly Shepherd presented the Triangle Lake Noxious Weed Eradication project proposal sponsored by the Blachly School District. She said it would provide for removal of invasive weeds, re-planting of native species, and habitat restoration on BLM and O&C lands. She said six or seven youth from the Triangle Lake area would be hired to carry out the project. The hired workers would learn occupational ethics, have an opportunity to earn high school elective credits, and expose crew members to career possibilities in the natural resources industry. She said the Oregon State University Natural Resources Department and Siuslaw Watershed Council had served as supportive partners of the project for many years.

Ms. Shepherd reviewed application information, noting that the \$66,605 of Title II funds requested was for three years of support for the project, and that \$3,225 was being received from another federal agency.

Ms. Shepherd introduced members of the current Eradication Team. They spoke of their experience. Members discussed the project proposal.

## **13. Landscape History and Pre-Contact Study**

Mike Dubrasich stated that he was Executive Director of the Western Institute for Study of the Environment, sponsor of the Upper Coast Fork Willamette Watershed Landscape History and Pre-Contact Reference Conditions Study project. He said the purpose of the project was to study and describe vegetation conditions in the Upper Coast Fork Willamette River Watershed before 1800. He said historic cultural features, forest and grassland conditions, fire frequencies, and other ecological influences and functions would be studied. He explained that it would be a collaborative learning program and would involve botanists, foresters, and technicians from BLM, other agencies, adjacent landowners, watershed councils, and other community sectors.

Mr. Dubrasich distributed additional material regarding his Institute and examples of studies similar to the proposed project, as follows:

- Cover Letter – “About W.I.S.E.”
- Résumé – Michael E. Dubrasich

- Curriculum Vitae – Dr. Bob Zybach
- “Stand Reconstruction and 200 Years of Forest Development on Selected Sites in the Upper Umpqua Watershed”
- “The Alseya Valley Prairie Complex, c. 1850: Native Landscapes in Western GLO Surveys”

Mr. Dubrasich reviewed the project application, noting benefits of the proposed study identified. He explained that \$93,000 was requested in Title II funds, which would be matched by \$20,500 of in-kind contributions.

Members discussed the project proposal.

#### **14. Wetland Habitat Improvement**

Trevor Taylor stated that he represented the City of Eugene, the sponsor of the Wetland Habitat Improvement on BLM O&C Lands in the West Eugene Wetlands project proposal. He said its purpose was to restore and improve wetland habitat for plants, birds, and related species by conducting on-the-ground infrastructure improvements, invasive species control, and native plant seeding. He described the tasks of the project: (1) to repair boundary fences and gates to ensure the exclusion of livestock from the North Taylor and Taylor South wetlands; (2) to remove woody species from endangered plant habitat in the Long Tom; (3) to remove nonnative invasive species at North and South Taylor; (4) to collect native seed from plant species; and (5) to create and distribute locally native, site-specific seed mixes for the North and South Taylor and Long Tom areas. He said work on the project would be accomplished by crews from the Northwest Youth Corps and City staff.

Mr. Taylor reviewed the project application, noting that NEPA processes for the project were complete. He said \$61,532 in Title II funds was being requested, with additional cash contributions of \$50,143, and in-kind contributions of \$30,308 also being utilized.

Members discussed the project proposal.

Chairperson Lynch declared a five-minute “wobble break.”

#### **15. Leaburg and Crooked Creek**

Joe Lynch presented the BLM sponsored Leaburg Waste Transfer Site Access Road Surfacing project. He said its purpose was to ensure safe access to the site by vehicles and emergency services. He explained that it would prevent unwanted sediment to the EWEB Canal and other water ways downstream of the project location. He said it would also reduce long term maintenance costs, reduce dust and sedimentation, and provide for transportation of waste materials and forest products. He said the project would be accomplished by Lane County employees and BLM workforce. He said NEPA processes had not been completed for the project. He explained that \$20,700 of Title II funds were being requested for the project and that BLM would match it with \$3,500 of in-kind contributions.

Mr. Lynch presented the BLM sponsored Crooked Creek Road Chip Seal Surfacing project. He said its purpose was to maintain an all weather, long term collector road used by the public, off highway vehicle riders, and for private and BLM timber haul. He said chip sealing would provide for safety, and prevent chronic sediment sources that degraded nearby water quality and influenced fish habitat conditions. He said chip sealing was several times less expensive than asphalt and was expected to last approximately half as long. He reviewed the project application, noting that NEPA processes had not yet been completed for the project. He said \$118,390 of Title II funds were being requested for it and that BLM would match it with \$7,500 of in-kind contributions.

Members discussed the project proposals.

### **16. McGowan Creek**

Tim Whitley stated that he was with the 4J School District and that his position was funded by EWEB. He said he was responsible for the McGowan Creek Environmental Education Project proposal. He said its purpose was to provide a safe and accessible destination for area school-aged students to learn about and experience the natural world through field-based, hands-on education activities. He explained that he had developed the curriculum, conducted pre-trip classroom visits, and led the ongoing education program with assistance from trained teachers of 4J and other area school districts, watershed councils, and the BLM. He said one goal of the project was to provide physical improvements to the site including construction of a permanent bathroom facility and chip seal resurfacing of the approach road.

Mr. Whitley reviewed the project application, noting that NEPA processes had not yet been completed. He said \$79,455 of Title II funds were being requested, that \$5,000 would be provided by the 4J School District, and that \$26,350 of in-kind contributions were expected.

Members discussed the project proposal.

### **17. Owens Creek**

Jed Kaul stated that he was a member of the Restoration Team of the Long Tom Watershed Council, sponsor of the Owens Creek Fish Passage Restoration project proposal. He explained that it would replace two culverts that were fish passage barriers and open 9.7 miles of quality trout and lamprey habitat upstream. He said it also had the potential for improving winter rearing habitat for juvenile Spring Chinook. He said the culverts would be designed by Lane County Road Maintenance engineers and would provide passage for natural sediment and wood passage at 100-year flood levels.

Mr. Kaul reviewed the project application, noting that required NEPA processes for the project were complete. He said \$198,179 was being requested in Title II funds, which would be matched with \$59,211 in other cash contributions and \$40,000 of in-kind contributions.

### **18. Clean Forest Project**

An unidentified gentleman stated that he represented Julie Lockman who had been scheduled to present the Identify and Cleanup Illegal Dumpsites project proposal of Clean Forest. He said the project was an ongoing effort to restore dumpsites to a natural condition that included the planting of native species, engagement of youth, and eradication of invasive plants and weeds. He explained that, in addition to hiring youth and adults for the cleanups, Clean Forest held large community events to eradicate extensive dumpsite and educate about the consequences of illegal dumping on public land, visited schools with anti-dumping programs for students, and media education. He reported that Clean Forest removed 225 dumpsites from Eugene District BLM lands properly disposing of 122,000 pounds of trash in 2010.

The project application was reviewed and it was noted that a NEPA process was not needed for the work of the project. It was also noted that \$60,000 in Title II funds was requested and that it would be matched with \$3,200 in other cash and in-kind contributions.

Funds Requested Summary

<i><b>PROJECT</b></i>	<i><b>REQUESTED</b></i>
Whitewater & Martin Recreation Site	\$56,378
Carpenter By-Pass Trail Network	\$91,052
Juvenile Forest Team	\$120,750
Sheriff's Work Crew	\$223,456
Northwest Youth Corps	\$53,892
Wolf Creek Culvert	\$118,160
Kennedy Conservation Corps	\$76,735
Calico Creek	\$42,300

Siuslaw Restoration & Monitoring	\$46,538
Lane County Siuslaw Road 42.0	\$54,839
Focus on Forests	\$39,000
Signs for Resource Protection	\$15,953
Triangle Lane Youth Noxious Weed	\$66,605
Landscape History Study	\$93,000
Wetland Habitat Improvement	\$61,532
Leaburg Proposal	\$20,700
Crooked Creek Proposal	\$118,398
McGowan Creek	\$79,455
Owens Creek	\$198,170
Clean Forest	\$60,000
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>\$1,790,660</b>

Chairperson Lynch declared a ten minute recess at 2:55 p.m.

Chairperson Lynch proposed a process for the RAC to follow in developing its project funding recommendations: Following a general discussion, a straw poll of member project preferences is held to determine if there are consensus choices, two discussion groups are formed to determine predilections, results are reported and advocated, final decisions are made. She reminded that that the support of three persons in each RAC membership category of five was required for a recommendation to be made.

Chairperson Lynch invited members to comment sequentially on the project proposals and her suggestion of a decision making process.

- Mr. Jones said he was surprised by the number of applications that had been received from the BLM and other government agencies, as opposed to private organizations. He suggested that it made for an “unfair playing field.”
- Mr. Tucker said he believed there were many good projects proposed.

- Mr. Steward said it was his experience that there were an increasing number of non-governmental agencies applying for Title II funding. He recommended that member choices be based on the merit of a project.
- Ms. Walters said the presentations better enabled her to understand the needs presented in the project applications.
- Ms. Dedrick said she was amazed with the amount of work the project proposals made possible, especially among youth, the unemployed, and for fish.
- Ms. Berrian said she believed the presentation process had been helpful and unbiased.
- Mr. Matthews said he believed the metric measurements to determine between the project proposals were difficult to determined. He said he would have difficulty supporting chip sealing projects on environmental grounds. He said he was concerned about matching funds identified in private versus government applications. He said he believed restoration, community engagement, and youth involvement were important criteria in determining recommendations.
- Mr. Ringer said the mix of private and public agency application was approximately what he had expected and that he held no “prejudice” against government project proposals.
- Ms. Peters said she had appreciated the presentations.
- Mr. King said he was positively impressed with the proposals that incorporated providing jobs for youth. He said he was also concerned about the environmental impacts of the use of chip seal road paving.
- Mr. Burns said he agreed with most of what others had said.
- Mr. Gehling said that he was disappointed that more proposals did not provide for sustained development projects. He said that overall he felt there were many good projects. He said he had a concern about the reliability of project sponsors “without a history.”

Members engaged in a straw poll, expressing their individual preferences for project proposals by placing colorful dots on a wall chart.

Ms. Grilley reported that BLM staff had ranked project proposals and identified those having high and low standings.

STRAW POLL AND BLM STAFF RANKING RESULTS

<i>PROJECT</i>	<i>REQUESTED</i>	<i>STRAW POLL</i>	<i>BLM RANK</i>
Whitewater & Martin Recreation Site	\$56,378	4 Votes	
Carpenter By-Pass Trail Network	\$91,052	6 Votes	High

Juvenile Forest Team	\$120,750	9 Votes	High
Sheriff's Work Crew	\$223,456	5 Votes	High
Northwest Youth Corps	\$53,892	10 Votes	High
Wolf Creek Culvert	\$118,160	2 Votes	
Kennedy Conservation Corps	\$76,735	13 Votes	
Calico Creek	\$42,300	5 Votes	
Siuslaw Restoration & Monitoring	\$46,538	9 Votes	High
Lane County Siuslaw Road 42.0	\$54,839	6 Votes	
Focus on Forests	\$39,000	4 Votes	Low
Signs for Resource Protection	\$15,953	5 Votes	Low
Triangle Lane Youth Noxious Weed	\$66,605	10 Votes	High
Landscape History Study	\$93,000	5 Votes	Low
Wetland Habitat Improvement	\$61,532	8 Votes	High
Leaburg Proposal	\$20,700	0 Votes	
Crooked Creek Proposal	\$118,398	0 Votes	
McGowan Creek	\$79,455	4 Votes	
Owens Creek	\$198,170	6 Votes	
Clean Forest	\$60,000	8 Votes	
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>\$1,790,660</b>		

Members discussed how to determine which project proposals to recommend for Title II funding.

Mr. Matthews suggested that project proposals not receiving votes in the straw poll be eliminated from consideration for recommendation to be funded.

Chairperson Lynch suggested that members vote on whether to agree to recommend that project proposals receiving six or more votes in the straw poll be funded.

Mr. Jones stated that he did not believe there had been “enough process” to make decisions about funding, but that he was willing to follow the will of the rest of the RAC members in deciding recommendations.

Mr. Matthews proposed that the Carpenter By-Pass Trail Network project proposal be eliminated from consideration for recommendation for funding because of the lack of experience of its sponsoring organization.

Chairperson Lynch determined that there appeared to be agreement (with one abstention) to the proposal of Mr. Matthews.

Members discussed each project proposal receiving six or more votes in the straw poll in light of only \$731,251 in Title II funds being available to be recommended for allocation. Mutual interaction appeared to lead to agreements to change project proposal recommendations from requested amounts and to add a recommendation for Signs for Resource Protections, as follows:

Juvenile Forest Team – From \$120,750 to \$110,000 – Project is scalable

Northwest Youth Corps – From \$53,892 to \$46,571 – Project is scalable

McGowan Creek – From \$79,455 to \$23,983 – Eliminate road resurfacing

Signs for Resource Protection – From \$15,953 to \$6,000 – Use County resources

Owens Creek – From \$198,170 to \$178,353 – Project is scalable

Chairperson Lynch determined that there was consensus to vote on whether to recommend that project proposals receiving six or more votes in the straw poll, as revised, be funded.

#### RECOMMENDATION VOTING RESULTS

Membership Category One: Mike Barns – Yes  
Jerry King – Yes  
Roy Keene – Absent  
Pamela Berrian – Yes

Membership Category Two: Eric Jones – Abstain  
Kevin Matthews – Yes  
Sarah Peters – Yes  
Greg Ringer – Yes  
Dana Dedrick - Yes

Membership Category Three: Kathryn Lynch – Yes  
William Gehling – Yes  
Denise Walters – Yes  
William Tucker – Yes  
Faye Stewart – Yes

Chairperson Lynch declared the vote affirmative.

PROJECT FUNDING RECOMMENDATIONS

<i><b>PROJECT</b></i>	<i><b>REQUESTED</b></i>	<i><b>STRAW POLL</b></i>	<i><b>BLM RANK</b></i>	<i><b>RECOM- MENDED</b></i>
Whitewater & Martin Recreation Site	\$56,378	4 Votes		--
Carpenter By-Pass Trail Network	\$91,052	6 Votes	High	--
Juvenile Forest Team	\$120,750	9 Votes	High	\$110,000
Sheriff's Work Crew	\$223,456	5 Votes	High	--
Northwest Youth Corps	\$53,892	10 Votes	High	\$46,571
Wolf Creek Culvert	\$118,160	2 Votes		--
Kennedy Conserva- tion Corps	\$76,735	13 Votes		\$76,735
Calico Creek	\$42,300	5 Votes		--
Siuslaw Restoration & Monitoring	\$46,538	9 Votes	High	\$46,538
Lane County Si- uslaw Road 42.0	\$54,839	6 Votes		\$54,839
Focus on Forests	\$39,000	4 Votes	Low	--
Signs for Resource Protection	\$15,953	5 Votes	Low	\$6,000
Triangle Lane Youth Noxious Weed	\$66,605	10 Votes	High	\$66,605
Landscape History Study	\$93,000	5 Votes	Low	--
Wetland Habitat Improvement	\$61,532	8 Votes	High	\$61,532
Leaburg Proposal	\$20,700	0 Votes		--
Crooked Creek Proposal	\$118,398	0 Votes		--
McGowan Creek	\$79,455	4 Votes		\$23,983
Owens Creek	\$198,170	6 Votes		\$178,353
Clean Forest	\$60,000	8 Votes		\$60,000
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>\$1,790,660</b>			<b>\$731,156</b>

Ms. Johnston

invited mem-

bers to identify additional recommendations for funding, in the happenstance that a project did not require all of its recommended funding, or that a project was not able to be completed and was required to return its recommended funding.

Mr. King said he was required to leave the meeting, but that he would provide a proxy to vote yes to another member of Membership Category One on any recommendations made by the group as suggested by Ms. Johnston. He said he believed it was necessary to do so because his absence would vacate a quorum in the category. He left the meeting at 4:00 p.m.

Mr. Jones left the meeting at 4:00 p.m. Mr. King identified his need to leave as well, post-haste. Mutual interaction appeared to lead to an agreement to recommend the following project proposals for Title II funding, if funding from recommended allocations was returned or otherwise became available:

- Sheriff's Work Crew up to requested allocation
- Owens Creek up to requested allocation
- Whitewater and Martin Recreation Site for one toilet
- Whitewater and Martin Recreation Site for second toilet
- Juvenile Forest Team up to requested allocation
- Northwest Youth Corps up to requested allocation

RECOMMENDATION VOTING RESULTS

Membership Category One:	Mike Barns – Yes Jerry King – Yes by Proxy Roy Keene – Absent Pamela Berrian – Yes
Membership Category Two:	Eric Jones – Absent Kevin Matthews – No Sarah Peters – Yes Greg Ringer – Yes Dana Dedrick - Yes
Membership Category Three:	Kathryn Lynch – Yes William Gehling – Yes Denise Walters – Yes William Tucker – Yes Faye Stewart – Yes

Chairperson Lynch declared the vote affirmative.

The meeting adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

*(Recorded by Dan Lindstrom)*