

Eugene Bureau of Land Management
Secure Rural Schools Resource Advisory Committee meeting
September 7, 2012

3106 Pierce Parkway,
Suite E, Room 214
Springfield, OR 97477-7910

Present:

Secure Rural Schools Resource Advisory (RAC) Committee Members

Category 1: Mike Barnes, Pamela Berrian, Jerry King, Roy Keene (arrived at 1 p.m.)

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

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

BLM Staff present: Virginia (Ginnie) Grilley, Designated Federal Official (DFO), Patricia (Pat) Johnston, RAC Coordinator, Phyllis Trimble, Budget Officer – (arrived at 1 p.m.)

Absent: Kathryn Lynch, Category 3

Notes Prepared by: Katie Isacksen, U.S. Forest Service

Notes Reviewed by: Jerry King, RAC Chairperson, Virginia Grilley, Patricia Johnston

Patricia Johnston (Johnston) called the meeting to order at 8:00 a.m. RAC members reintroduced themselves and went over the project criteria that were previously agreed to, which would produce the best outcomes in terms of allocating dollars.

Virginia Grilley (Grilley) presented the BLM's ranking of the proposals. The top two included Maple Creek Culvert Replacement and the Lane County Juvenile Forest Work Team. The others of interest included: Horn Butte Culvert Replacement, Mosby Creek, Lane County Sheriff's Work Crew, KCC Trail OHV/Recreation, Mohawk Education and Outreach and Northwest Youth Corps.

Johnston led the group in a discussion on the RAC criteria for the Title II project proposal. A few clarifying questions were asked about the program. The group was interested in how projects got reported and to whom, as well as what options for funding existed if there was no extension of funds next year. It was agreed that it would be beneficial to go on a field trip to see the results of past projects.

PROJECT PRESENTATIONS

Maple Creek Culvert Replacement

Celia Barry (Barry) from Lane County Public Works presented the Maple Creek Culvert Replacement project. The project would replace a culvert at milepost 3.2 on Maple Creek Road

that is blocking fish passage on Buckwheat Creek. Replacing the culvert with a larger arch culvert would open up a half a mile of stream that is prime habitat for Coho Salmon.

Questions –

What is the priority of this road to be repaired? Is it primary for fish or is there anything wrong with the road?

Barry - The culvert is failing and when it fails, the road does too.

What kind of backlog do you have on road repair?

Barry - There are many that need replaced.

Gehling – So a half a mile of stream would be opened up and it's estimated 400 salmon per 1 miles of stream?

Barry – That figure is from the Siltcoos Watershed Council's website.

Gehling – Which includes Buckwheat?

Barry - Yes.

Horn Butte Culvert Replacement

The Horn Butte project was presented by Steve Liebhardt, on behalf of the Bureau of Land Management. The project would replace five failing culverts on Horn Butte Road. Four are currently barriers to fish and all are close to failing. The road is a BLM managed road that is used by private industry to haul logs and by the general public.

Questions –

Berrian – (If you don't get enough money from private industry in road agreements) What's preventing you from increasing the cost?

Comment from the audience – It is mutual access. Due to checkerboard, BLM also uses private road so you can't collect cost recovery.

Berrian – Is private industry not maintaining to BLM standard? Or is BLM not maintaining to private standards?

Liebhardt – I would say the latter. They don't thin so when they cut, they get a lot more money. Most of what we do is thinning, so we don't collect as much money.

Peters – There is a difference between maintenance of roads and upgrade. Would they replace the culvert if the road failed?

Liebhardt – Yes. Private has actually been doing a lot of culvert replacement, whereas BLM has been kind of flat. Culvert replacement is not cheap.

Peters - Have you done your NEPA for this yet?

Liebhardt – We have a document of NEPA adequacy. We do this frequently. We know what the effects are if you pull out a culvert and replacement it with a new one.

Matthews – I have more questions than we have time for. Who is the private land owner that the two prioritized culverts are on?

Liebhardt - I don't know. I can get that information to you.

Dedrick – Can you tell me about the design costs? They look the same for each one. Is there a way to be more efficient? When we get ones done in bulk, we can get them at a better price.

Liebhardt - The costs is estimated from previous projects. We have costs associated with surveying and contract administration.

Focus on the Forest

Christina Hubbard, on behalf of Friends of Eugene, presented the Focus on the Forest project. The purpose of this project is to engage a full spectrum of O&C forest stakeholders in an open-ended, collaborative discussion around regional forest futures. The project would use Consensus Associates to conduct a two part situation assessment – by interviewing Eugene RAC members and others and then conducting a three-day community workshop to develop strategies for O & C forest management.

Questions –

Gehling – The BLM is going through plan revision process on O & C lands. How do you see this adding another level to that process?

Hubbard – It will give the stakeholders a chance to get together. We all provide information to BLM but we don't discuss it together. The field trip we held was a good sign that we could have a civil discussion and continue that discussion. If we could find common ground, we could help facilitate.

Berrian – Who are your stakeholders?

Hubbard – The general public, forest managers, RAC, private timber industry, and environmental groups. Right now, there are lots of conflict issues where we end up with lawsuits that impede the process and create hostilities.

Stewart – A decision will be made in court by the end of the year that would give BLM direction. If the court does rule and gives direction on how to manage land, is there some additional benefit that this project would give, given that?

Hubbard – I think there would still be a benefit, if we could find a process that would allow us to begin to work together collaboratively.

Dedrick – The convener matters. What is the level of commitment for stakeholders? What's statement of support that means stakeholders will meet? What is Friend of Eugene's ability to pull these people together?

Hubbard – This is more than getting feedback from environmental organizations and community – yes we would like to go out on a field trip again and we would like to continue this discussion. I know that a lot of environmental groups are interested in sitting down at the table.

Berrian – When I've been involved in litigation, I've found there's no place for collaboration until litigation is over. There is no room for collaboration until we know what the courts say. If that's the cause, would it not be more prudent to wait until court's decision?

Hubbard – Valid question, but I don't know if court's decision will change people's ideas. There is a lot of passion around jobs, forest health, etc. I would love to see the day when we can sit down with forest industry and not bash heads.

Mosby Creek Spring Chinook Habitat Project Phase II

Pam Reber with the Coast Fork Willamette Watershed Council presented the project. The project aims to increase fish habitat and spawning grounds through habitat restoration. Goals include constructing a series of channel-spanning boulder weirs in key locations. Phase I is already seeing temperature improvements from placing six weirs at five project sites.

Questions –

Gehling – Any problems with competitive species?

Reber – No, not that I'm aware of.

Gehling – Do you plan on collaboration with Row Valley Water District?

Reber – Yes, we are gearing up to help them with the drinking water protection program.

Berrian – Is this scalable? Says if you only receive partial funding you will have to wait.

Reber – It is scalable to the \$180,000 level.

Dedrick – How much did you ask from OWEB?

Reber - \$106,000. What we will do is ask for the balance of work with the permittee and move into advanced design. If it moves off Weyerhaeuser, we will need more money for design.

Matthews – The watershed appears to be mostly on Weyerhaeuser. It says it's a temperature impaired waterway, which makes me think of tree cover. What do we know about tree harvest in this watershed? How will the structure work be supported or undermined by harvest activity?

Reber – This watershed has been heavily mined for gravel and logged. This is a very durable work for this stream. It will take more than 100 years for the stream to recover if we do nothing - but this will speed the recovery. The stream still has pacific salamanders, macro-invertebrates, but those are on a downhill slide and will continue to do so if we do nothing.

Matthews – What kind of protective set backs on this stream?

King – So Weyerhaeuser gives you rocks but doesn't transport them?

Reber – That is actually done by a sub-contractor so would be an out of pocket expense for them.

Stewart – I've lived along Mosby creek my entire life. Georgia-Pacific cut everything to streambed. Weyerhaeuser operates now with stream buffers. I haven't seen the water flow like I did when I was a kid. I don't think the efforts to bring back the streams will be impaired by the current activity.

Are chubs a competitor for cutthroats?

Reber – No.

Bear Creek Fish Passage

Jed Kaul with the Long Tom Watershed council presented the project. The project would restore fish passage at three locations on Bear Creek, providing access to 5.5 miles of high quality habitat.

Questions –

Peters – Is it scalable? How do you break it out?

Kaul - We could deal with a slight reduction but we would have to ask for more from OWEB and make it less competitive.

Gehling – Do you have any concern that the stair step will be blown out by high water?

Kaul – We had a design group that determined the type of rock that won't be blown out by high flow.

Gehling – Can this stair step design be used to help with the culvert issue?

Kaul – You can for some, but with the smaller culverts, it is also a velocity barrier.

Calico Creek Restoration Project

Kloster from Aprovecho presented the Calico Creek project. The project would enhance riparian fish habitat and hydrology in Calico Creek and provide educational opportunities for youth and adults. Actions would be to place woody debris in the stream, use youth crew, student and volunteers to restore and monitor the riparian area and increase public awareness on watershed health.

Questions –

Berrian – In your budget, you have units a little different – in one its hours and one its days. I can't tell.

Kloster – The Kennedy Conservation Corps (KCC) charges by the day. The cost reflects time for an eight person crew.

Gehling – Have you ever considered doing anything like introducing beaver to this area?

Kloster – We have, but it's our understanding that beaver require year round water flow, which we don't have right now. That will be something we do after we bring year round flow back to the creek.

Dedrick – Who would do the selection and staging the trees? Who's the technical advisor?

Kloster – Leo Poole is.

Dedrick – Is there a scalable component? Like do a publication and education piece in a subsequent year?

Kloster – Yes, I think the funds on Aproveche could be reduced by half.

Lane County Youth Services

Matthew Sterner presented on behalf of the Lane County Forest Work Team. This group has a long history of working with the BLM. It provides restoration of public lands through a variety of manual labor while providing meaningful work for kids at the Martin Luther King Education Center.

Questions –

Gehling –Do you do anything with dumpsites on federal roads?

Sterner – We do. When we started, about 90% of what we did was dumpsites. But now it's around 5-10%

Dedrick – I'm confused on the budget.

Sterner – We are asking .6% of a kid's annual cost.

Tucker – Is it scalable? Is there a level you can't go below?

Sterner – It's scalable to the amount of days we go out. Less money is less days we go out.

Berrian – How many days does this accommodate?

Sterner – I think 114. It's in the application.

Sheriff Work Crew

Dan Buckwald presented on the Sheriff's Work Crew project. The work involves intensive hand labor such as noxious weed control, refuse, removal, trail maintenance, road maintenance, campground maintenance, and wildfire hazard reduction. Through their long term partnership with the BLM, the work leaders know the grounds, know what the BLM's expects and the crews' capabilities.

Questions –

Berrian – Are the workers the ones in minimal security? With those people being matrixed out due to budget cuts are the most dangerous offenders the ones going out? Then who is doing a work?

Buckwald – No, we don't allow people out that we aren't comfortable with.

Dedrick – In regards to the budget - where is county indirect contributions? Is that a fiscal cost?

Buckwald – We broke it down to the cost of having the deputy, staff time, etc.

Kennedy Conservation Corps

(Weed and Trail OHV/Recreation Projects)

The Kennedy Conservation Corps (KCC) programs were presented by Matt Hall, Don Kaizer and Mike Ingman. The KCC works with students that are at-risk. The purpose of the project is two-fold: improve forest health and enhance recreation lands and increase the employability of Lane County youth through a summer service-learning work program. The project would fund an eight member crew for six weeks during the summer.

Questions –

Gehling – Are you paying them a stipend?

Hall – No, we are paying minimal wage.

Gehling – How do you get around BOLI requirements?

Hall – I've looked into the rules, they can't run tractors or chainsaws. They carry everything.

(Matthew Sterner) – We apply and get a BOLI certificate each year.

Ingman – We have 15 year olds that have different rules according to BOLI that we make sure we meet those.

Berrian – Do you have a waiting list and have to turn away kids?

Ingman – We have a huge waiting list. We touch 40 – 50 kids but we could probably employ half the population if we had the funding.

Clean Forest Service

No presentation.

Mohawk Education and Outreach

The project presentation was made by Jared Weybright of the McKenzie Watershed Council. The goal is to develop teams of high school and middle school students from a variety of schools to do on-the-ground water quality monitoring. This will also enhance cooperative partnerships among landowners and the McKenzie River Watershed.

Questions –

Dedrick – Water quality, how well known is water quality in this basin?

Weybright – EWEB/DEQ used to run monthly sampling but now they run quarterly sampling, and that's dropping. We've done similar things with students in the past. In terms of needed data, its moderate but it's more an educational component.

Matthews – Who are the dominate landowners in this watershed?

Weybright – BLM and Weyerhaeuser

Matthews – What is the participation of Weyerhaeuser?

Weybright – None at the moment.

Matthews – I wonder how we could make that connection. Is it necessary from a monitoring section to have a budget line for teachers?

Weybright – First and foremost, the priority is the educational component.

Northwest Youth Corps

Joe Waksmundski presented on the Northwest Youth Corps program. It has a long standing relationship with the BLM and does a variety of trail maintenance projects. The program employs youth from Lane County and enhances public land that thousands use to recreate. So far in 2012 accomplishments include: 10 miles of trail on the BLM, 55 drainage structures, 17 acres of noxious weed eradication, new trail construction, 2 bridges, 71 picnic tables and 9 trail steps with a total of 4,000 hours of project work.

Questions –

Dedrick – Can you recommend a way to look at these budgets? You have a one week expense.

Waksmundski – We come in with eight people on crew, with supervisors and that also includes administrative support. It's about 432 hours of work time. We're scalable as well. \$8,000 a week is what we come in at.

Carpenter Bypass Trail Maintenance and Learning Program

Jason Boone presented on the behalf of the Disciples of Dirt, part of International Mountain Biking Organization that is dedicated to multi-use trails. The proposal request funds to assist in developing a trail building and maintenance program on the Carpenter Bypass trail network.

Questions –

Berrian – On page 4, it is mentioned that it will help a diverse group of people. Do they come together and work on trails that aren't just for mountain bikes?

Boone – Yes, we have lots of running groups, families that go with kids and mushroom pickers.

Dedrick – And OHV is also in consideration?

Boone – Yes, but more than likely it won't be allowed.

Dedrick – Is it scalable?

Boone – Yes, it is.

Siuslaw Restoration and Monitoring

Liz Vollmer-Buhl with the Siuslaw Watershed Council presented the project. It would implement, maintain and monitor riparian restoration projects that increase the native riparian vegetation and reduce the presence of invasive species by employing crews of displaced workers. These funds will be also used to train crews to perform mollusk surveys along the main-stem Siuslaw River and its tributaries in support of BLM monitoring efforts.

Questions –

Matthews – I see that there is training on aquatic mussels but I don't see doing the work.

Vollmer-Buhl– The crew time is split between restoration and survey.

Matthews – How would the RAC understand the value of \$25 an hour a work?

Vollmer-Buhl – These are adults making a family living wage. And that is not what they make, that is a mark-up over the years for workman's comp. These are displaced workers that wouldn't have a job otherwise.

Berrian – From whom do you get the referrals to the dispersed workers?

Vollmer-Buhl – When OWEB started the restoration crews, the salmon crews had to be certified displaced. From there, we took on other displaced workers. Based on funding, they had to be from timber or fishing. At first it was from the state, but now, it's just displaced.

Total Requested Funds by Project:

Carpenter Bypass Trail Education and Improvement Program	45,000
Kennedy Conservation Corps Trail OHV and Recreation Program	31,192
Mosby Creek Spring Chinook Habitat Project Phase II	114,217
Siuslaw Restoration and Monitoring Field Crew	46,179
Mohawk Education and Outreach Project	21,370
Lane County Juvenile Forest Work Team	110,153
Maple Creek Road	39,000
Northwest Youth Corps Environmental Stewardship	49,998.14
Clean Forest Project	100,800
Bear Creek Fish Passage	99,813
Focus on the Forest	39,000

Calico Creek Restoration Project	17,400
Kennedy Conservation Corps Noxious Weed Removal Program	71, 247
Horn Butte Road Stream Culvert Replacement	180,000
Lane County Sheriff's Work Crew	156,416
Total amount requested:	\$1,050,538

Public Comment Period

No public comments were made during this period.

The meeting adjourned for lunch at 12:15. It was called to order at 1:00 pm.

Roy Keene and Phyllis Trimble joined the meeting at 1:00 pm.

Deliberation Period

The group convened to discuss merits of projects and determine which projects would receive what amount of funding. The group had \$450,000 to divvy up among the projects, which totaled \$1,050,538 in cost.

Johnston – From some suggestions at lunch, what we could do is eliminate some of the projects. I have some dots and you can place them by the projects you support.

Dedrick – Are we going to have time to ask clarifying questions?

Johnston – Who would you need in the room?

Dedrick – Just Ginnie. Which one of the work crews do you need the most? Which ones are the most efficient?

Grilley – For us, it is DYS, Lane County Juvenile Work Crew. The Northwest Youth Corps is another higher priority. KCC has done some great stuff with noxious weed program. We funded them through Fiscal year 2014, so they may have some money to spare. Because we liked working with them, we prioritized their OHV project, but didn't place their noxious weed proposal as a high priority as we have funded them from other funding sources. We get a lot of work done by the Sheriff's crew that we can't get done anywhere else. They are adults; they are on a flexible work crew. Sheriffs in charge are very familiar with projects so we don't have to spend a lot of staff time showing them a project.

Peters – I have a follow up with OHV project. How much do the OHV users maintain these trails? We funded them last year and it feels like throwing money into a pit.

Grilley – It is a very expensive trail system at Shotgun. We get funding from OHV groups that help pay through user fees that go to the state and then come back to us.

Peters – Do they have volunteers that come out and work?

Grilley - I know the motorbikes have an organized group; I don't know that the four wheelers do.

Matthews – Are there any groups asking for funding that if you don't get them any funding, there is no way to do an inter-government agreement? If there was no funding for sheriff's work crew and the RAC didn't do anything, there is no mechanism for the BLM to fund them money?

Grilley – When the Secure Rural School (SRS) expires, we don't have the authority to create a work agreement with the county correctional crews.

Matthews – What about with the culvert replacement?

Grilley – We may be able to fund a county road improvement with federal appropriations if it benefits public lands. However, there are no other federal appropriations that I know of beyond SRS available for this type of work. The only money we can do is SRS.

Johnston – Before we get any further, we need to elect a chair to be the voice of the RAC. Essentially, when we get the notes back, the chair is responsibility will be reviewing those notes. The chair will also facilitate the next section of this meeting. At this point if there is a nomination or volunteer, that would move us forward.

Matthews nominated Jerry King.

King – If no one has an objection, I could do it.

Dedrick – Seconded.

A vote was held to elect Jerry King as the chair of the RAC. Votes were cast by raising hands in favor.

Results: All in favor, none opposed.

Jerry King was elected chairperson.

Dedrick – What is the rationale of the highest priority of the BLM?

Grilley – We selected them based on the criteria of youth employment, ecosystem health and sustainability. We ranked the top two and the other seven are not prioritized in order.

Dedrick – Bear Creek wasn't listed.

Grilley – I'm sorry I forgot to list that one. The ones we like are: Maple Creek, Mosby Creek, Horn Butte, Bear Creek, Juvenile and Sheriff work crews, KCC OHV, Mohawk Education, and Northwest Youth Corps.

Five dots were passed to each RAC member so they could place them under what they would want to see funded. Projects that receive very few or no dots will be considered for elimination.

Dot results:

Carpenter Bypass Trail Education and Improvement Program	2
Kennedy Conservation Corps Trail OHV and Recreation Program	0
Mosby Creek Spring Chinook Habitat Project Phase II	5
Siuslaw Restoration and Monitoring Field Crew	2
Mohawk Education and Outreach Project	5
Lane County Juvenile Forest Work Team	7
Maple Creek Road	8
Northwest Youth Corps Environmental Stewardship	6
Clean Forest Project	0
Bear Creek Fish Passage	4
Focus on the Forest	3
Calico Creek Restoration Project	2
Kennedy Conservation Corps Noxious Weed Removal Program	3
Horn Butte Road Stream Culvert Replacement	5
Lane County Sheriff's Work Crew	8

Matthews– Does anyone object to the KCC OHV and Clean Forest being left from discussion?

King – For general purposes, those are off the table. There are several that are in the two dot category.

Walters – I put two because it was multi youth and it looks like they have some longevity.

Peters - My rationale as well.

Matthews – Restoration crew – I would like them to get a small amount of funding. I don't think they pencil out for the full request of \$46,000. I could see them get \$10,000. That's my thinking around my dot. And the dot on Calico Creek – they are only asking for \$17,000 and it's scalable. If they got \$5,000 or \$10,000 they could do something with that. It has potential. The group that came here last year and really built on what they gave us before.

Dedrick - Which ones were scalable?

King – There are a lot of dots on Maple Creek and Bear Creek and they aren't scalable. They had the most dots - should we fund them and then look at the rest of the projects?

Dedrick – Let's wait until we break it down further.

Matthews - We should talk about all the projects first.

King – Let's just start with Northwest Youth Corps.

Peters – We could figure out how many weeks we want to fund. It's \$8,000 a week.

Gehling – What's the total amount we have?

Grilley – \$450,000, 90% of 500,000.

Trimble – The BLM is authorized 10% for the administration of the RAC, which we take off the top.

King – And you want us to figure where to put an additional \$100,000?

Grilley – Yes, and then wait and see on the funding. We could do like last year and any extra money that comes in would go to a certain project.

Johnston – The money must be obligated a year from now, by October 1, 2013. Like you heard earlier, we allocated money to KCC and that will carry them forward.

Dedrick – I propose we list them via their dots and then see where we get for a rough prioritization.

King – That's where I was going – take the top ones and discuss. We've got the BLM weighed in and some of those are teamed up (with ours).

Berrian – It's okay with me so long as they all get discussed.

Gehling – The Work crews are high priority. I've seen their work so that's high priority for me.

Matthews – I want to discuss them in some sort of order rather than a random slew.

Berrian – Why is one site \$99,000 for a fish culvert? But another project is \$39,000?

Dedrick – It depends on the complexity and match.

Berrian – If we start at the top – the work crew is great but I would want to scale them if it gives non-offender youths jobs.

Dedrick – As we discuss we should discuss the funding range of scalable projects.

Matthews – Let's discuss the projects without numbers.

King – So we will leave the numbers out while we discuss.

Matthews - I agree with the general purpose with the youth sheriff crew but I don't think that the 156,000 dollars is a magic number that they need to do.

Tucker – Socially, I really feel good about the youth work crews because it's a chance for them to give back. It's good for the BLM and efficient. I'm very much for this.

Denise Walters – What other possible sources of funding that they might be able to tap into if they are so successful?

Tucker – In Linn County, we have to draw the line differently. There aren't a lot of different sources of funding right now. It's tough times.

Stewart – Public safety took a nearly 25% cut. In youth services, we are down to something like 16 beds. Anywhere we can fund work crews like this, it's a place to put them - same with the adult work crews. DOL funds are dried up. DYS has culinary work programs, but with outdoor programs like these, there is very little opportunity to fund them.

Tucker – (For funding) I would say a school has more opportunity than the sheriff's work and a watershed council has more than a school. There aren't environmental groups out there working on breaking that culture of poverty.

Matthews – I feel (on to NYC) I compare them to DYS, I'd rather it go to DYS. NYC is a fairly big, fairly well-funded program and \$50,000 doesn't mean as much to them. I am not impressed with their project proposal, it's a grab bag. It seems similar to the work crews. In these times, people in the DYS have more needs than the NYC. So when I see we are going to give the BLM some services, NYC is not one of the places I'm not too worried about cutting down.

King – The act is about helping the counties. DYS is a county program, with county personnel. That makes it a higher priority.

Berrian – I don't know about the NYC to say they are doing okay. But if they have a history of success, I don't not want to give them money for being successful. If the BLM checked both as high priority, I don't think they would do that if they had the same footprint.

Grilley – We can use them both, we don't duplicate efforts with DYS and NYC.

Stewart – NYC just gave us an update. 75% of their funding is from selling their services, doing jobs for people, and 25% is from grants and donors. I don't hear that they've had to make reductions. I think they are well-run organization with a lean administration. NYC has been a good program, folks they've trained are able to duplicate these programs.

Matthews – When I suggested I won't mind not funding, that's purely in the context is that we can fund about 40% of the projects on our list.

Stewart – As I think of the projects here – one the priorities is an enhancement and an improvement to the environment. Mosby Creek was flushed out due to early logging operations. Any type of program that can offer some long time improvements like this is a good choice.

Dedrick – When I look at restoration, I look at who is participating in it. There is no OWEB involvement in Mosby Creek.

Tucker – She mentioned the \$40,000.

Dedrick – They could go with significant scaling.

Stewart – Does this operate a lot like other projects? If we were to put some level of funding to Mosby will that improve the competitiveness with OWEB?

Dedrick – Yes, I think so. She said \$80,000 would get 3 weirs.

Matthews – I'm just not sure that is the most cost effective way to decide this. I would love to see them get some money but push back and make them think how they are using the money. I

don't really see Weyerhaeuser as the one needing money. Weyerhaeuser is giving the boulders, but moving the rocks is \$80,000.

Stewart – It won't be Weyerhaeuser getting the money, it would be a sub-contractor.

Dedrick – It's a big expense to move the rocks, to move the logs.

Stewart – She explained to me, that they would prefer to use logs but because of the conditions of the stream, it isn't feasible. They would need to use rock, even though it's more expensive.

Matthews – We are in a balancing act. Let's not write a full check but give them some money.

Johnston – I feel like we're getting close to putting a dollar by Mosby.

Dedrick – 30-40?

King – Okay, we're starting to get involved in the money again, which we said we weren't going to do.

Walters – I might be a little biased because I live near Mohawk. I just really like the community aspect.

Matthews – (On Mohawk) my perspective is – \$8,000 is going to pay school district staff. There are a lot of other environmental programs that wouldn't conceive of spending money on district staff. WREN's model has been to we provide services that fit into their curriculum but we don't pay for their costs to participate. We construct our curriculum to fit into their program. The statement was this was outside of school time. I would deal with it by giving them partial funding.

King – The school would have to have some direct involvement.

Gehling – If you have a kids involved in a school directed [program], you are probably going to need someone from the district that's involved in the program. Which will require extra time and extra duty - it's not on school time.

Dedrick – I think Jared thought about that. I would like to fund with the condition that it be class A data. I want to see monitoring that's not just for as an exercise.

Gehling – Working in a four day class period. It becomes real difficult.

Walters – It is a SRS Act [proposal] and it is a school. It seems to dovetail well.

Stewart – The name was used to garner widespread support. On O & C lands, they don't necessarily go to school.

Dedrick – The watershed councils have learned that unless you provide substitute and busing, you won't get kids out in the field.

Matthews – (On Horn Butte) Ginnie – I have a question - we can't do cost recovery on roads of private lands because of reciprocal agreement, but if we have reciprocal agreement why are we doing so much work on the roads?

Grilley – This is a BLM controlled road, we hold the whole bundle of rights on it. It's not a benefit to the private land owner to replace the culvert; it's a benefit to the fish. We have all the responsibility on that road.. Now if it's Gustina's road – and we want to haul logs and a culvert is failing – they have to fix it without cost to us. Our agreements don't have to do with fish passage.

Berrian – I know the fish passage is for the fish. I was disappointed that he didn't know the property owners and didn't ask them to see if they would give money.

Grilley – We don't typically ask when we have to do road repairs. Private landowners don't typically give the federal government money; they usually feel they give enough in taxes.

Matthews – Can the federal government even ask for money?

Grilley – No. We can't ask.

Dedrick – Maybe because it isn't as much a feel good project. Others open up to spawning habitat and this one seems to open only a little bit.

Stewart – Do we want to list the scalable opportunities? \$47 – 79 on Horn Butte.

Matthews – Can you explain to us how KCC has funding through FY2014?

Grilley – Do you know, Pat?

Johnston – It would be on our website. The money they have will take them through 2014.

Gehling – You obligate the funds this year and they can spend it whenever?

Johnston – Exactly. [Usually an Assistance Agreement requires the expenditure within 3-5 years.]

King – Ginnie, if you could only take one or the other – fish passage and noxious weeds, which would you choose?

Grilley – It's really hard to do that. But I guess I would go with noxious weeds because I could reprioritize my work force and ask for money from congress for fish passage but not for noxious weeds.

Walters – Were they (Kennedy Conservation Corps) scalable?

Dedrick – Yes. Now we are getting to the part to where we draw a line through proposals that are equally ranked.

Matthews – I see it differently. They are already funded through 2014; I might give them a token amount of money but unless there is something else special about the projects why give them money for longer than the others?

Tucker – That crossed my mind as well. I crossed it to zero.

Berrian – If somehow the applications could put in a placeholder for two years then there is some confusion. When I've worked on grants, there was a must use by date.

Gehling – On the flip side, if we don't apply this year and there is nothing next year, they are trying to get it as soon as possible.

Berrian – So does everyone else.

Matthews – My impression is that gives us clearest package of what a project is going to do. It gives me a favorable impression.

Dedrick – I was wondering if it gave people a different feeling now that we know where the BLM stands because we didn't know when we did our dots. It would open up all the drainages in an entire basin.

Gehling – If we went through and funded the other high priority and took that 100,000 and say that if it came through it would go through KCC weed.

King – I was actually enamored with finishing drainage but it's a lot of money.

Walters – They have a lot of match too.

Berrian – If Kennedy is not funded, I want them to know they had a good proposal but it's that they have future funding.

Keene – It is the timing on it. I highly favor putting youth to work. I have been an ardent fish restoration supporter, but the social system of the youth is dire. I would like us to see us make some small contribution.

Peters – Carpenter does use the NYC.

Walters – \$30,000 of that was going to NYC.

King – We are now on Focus on the Forest.

Tucker – This has great promise but I look at our objectives and my personal side, if we could get some logs moving, I would prefer it. But I'm not convinced that we would end up with a forest plan that's modified. I would like to bring people to the table but I'm not sure the RAC is the right place to make that request.

Keene – If we had some consensus building, a lot of these conversations like fish passage is going to get dealt with. I don't know where a little startup money is going to come from.

Berrian – What troubles me is the lack of specificity. There is no list of stakeholders. You already know exactly what you need to work on. If I had a conflict resolution staff, I would want to know what is on agenda. In this proposal there wasn't an agenda. I don't think you need to do polling. If you had an agenda and a commitment from all to come together, I would be willing to put in \$39,000 for that.

Stewart – A lot of plans haven't gone anywhere because of requirements of certain agencies – like the USFWS. One plan couldn't move forward without consultation – it doesn't matter if communities want it.

Matthews – From a practical point of view – the assessment phase of this is not about polling people, its about hearing them individually. When you bring people together in a circle you need to know who you need to have in the circle. Like the Klamath Dam project – that brought together a large group of people.

King – There was a very critical point that brought them together. This is very general. I would like to see this scaled down to a particular watershed.

Matthews – The critical situation is what's happening with Lane County government.

Grilley – Certainly the BLM realizes the sense of urgency. Where we are now, we've got our cooperator group together and contracted with a consensus group to put together stakeholders – and are looking for an area of agreement on the lands. In terms of broader outreach to the public, we're still talking about that.

Gehling – To me, when I look at Focus on Forest, the BLM has a process for doing that and I would rather see us spend our money on other things.

King – The kids are next group of proponents.

Stewart – Kevin, have you looked at a variety source of funding?

Matthews – I haven't, because this proposal didn't come from Friends of Eugene, it came from this RAC. I think the issues with the Forest are bigger than the BLM. The issues with rural community, quality of watershed, endangered species. All these issues have a huge BLM nexus, but it's larger than that. If the RAC doesn't fund money to work on that, we hope someone will. It seems to me that this group of people that are talking about this issue.

Barnes – Is this scalable?

Matthews – That's a good question. I'm not real sure. I'm not the consultant for this. I can't see us running large meeting for less than half.

Tucker – I would be willing to say \$20,000 and going to find another funding source. The promise is there.

Ringer - I think there are higher priorities for that money.

King – Good discussion.

Johnston - There were a lot of questions about the Kennedy Conservation Corps. I have clarifying information. The BLM has funded the KCC some into next year and the year after. They are also asking RAC money. They did not get RAC funding beyond last year.

King – Lets discuss last of the three. (Siuslaw, Calico, Carpenter)

Peters– I think they should get some funding, but given how tight our funds are, I would focus on the youth.

Matthews – Liz chatted with me afterward but she said, in all sincerity, \$10,000 would make a difference to them. I don't think we should fund it the full amount.

Dedrick – I have a comment about our process – when we put our dots, we weren't asked to put dots on all different projects. They could be weighted.

Berrian – I was glad to see a project from that part of the county. I think it would help if we saw the value of their intent being leveraged by other sources of funding. I don't see the displaced workers as cleanly aligned with our group.

King – It was nice to see the pictures of the bridge and a finished project.

Walters – Was the mussel data collecting data that currently isn't being done?

Dedrick – Yes.

Tucker – Would the group be willing to \$10,000 on this amount and move on?

King – We could put 25% for the lower priority to show support or help match some funds. So let's speak about Calico.

Matthew – I feel the same way. I was thinking \$5,000. I think they are flexible.

Stewart – At \$12,000, they could take out all of the educational component.

King – And the BLM was involved in a small way?

Grilley – Yes. But on the whole its not high on our priorities.

Dedrick – Aprovecho could do with half of the cut.

King – On to Carpenter and the Mountain Bikers. I didn't see number of volunteers.

Dedrick – They had like 100 adults and will also learn from the NWYC and use their tools.

Peters – I feel like it could be taken down.

Berrian – I feel like anytime a group of stakeholders can come in and look beyond their own interests we should support it.

Grilley – This has been an ongoing issue with mountain bikers. We just recently found out that they had built all those trails out there. It was a lower priority for us because we already put in a lot of federal dollars – putting in toilets, a kiosk, and a parking lot.

Berrian – So they were illegal trails?

Grilley – Well, you could say they were undiscovered.

Berrian – So they use the same trails that you walk on?

Matthews – Yes. It’s called multi-purpose.

Berrian – I don’t like that.

Grilley – It’s a good project but since we’ve already put some money in....

Matthews – I don’t want to see us funding OHVs when I don’t see volunteers not out there doing it.

Peters –I like to see non-motorized trails put in and it makes sense they are getting a training.

Dedrick – How about give them a week of training?

Matthews – I think that they’ve already got a lot of federal dollars to elevate guerrilla trails into a sustainable status.

Ten minute break at 3:00 pm.

Johnston – Each of you are in a category you are in three categories. There are 12 here today and four in each category. You need a quorum – which is three in each category. I’ve see RAC divided up in their category to determine their platform than try and convince the other nine which way to go. Or like last year, we continued an open discussion to determine funding. In the end, we have to have a least nine of you, three from each category, to agree.

King – From my point of view, I would like to keep it open, unless someone has an issue. I have my ideas but I would like to open it up to the floor.

Barnes – I say we start to put lower numbers on some of these projects.

Peters – I wonder if we could start with a lower priority. I would like to give Carpenter some.

King– I know it might be tainted with people double-dotting so we could go through in order or cost.

Stewart – I think we should start from highest down.

Johnston – I have more dots with different colors; you could each get one vote.

Matthews – I don’t think we need to do that.

First round –

Carpenter Bypass Trail Education and Improvement Program	10,000
Kennedy Conservation Corps Trail OHV and Recreation Program	0
Mosby Creek Spring Chinook Habitat Project Phase II	40,000
Siuslaw Restoration and Monitoring Field Crew	10,000
Mohawk Education and Outreach Project	21,000
Lane County Juvenile Forest Work Team	70,000
Maple Creek Road	39,000

Northwest Youth Corps Environmental Stewardship	24,000
Clean Forest Project	0
Bear Creek Fish Passage	100,000
Focus on the Forest	20,000
Calico Creek Restoration Project	0
Kennedy Conservation Corps Noxious Weed Removal Program	20,000
Horn Butte Road Stream Culvert Replacement	79,000
Lane County Sheriff's Work Crew	100,000
Total:	533,000

Johnston – We need to know when you don't fully fund a project, what exactly you are funding. So that is something to think about that as we move on.

Grilley – We also need to decide, if a project drops, which project it goes to.

Dedrick – My proposal would be for any additional money go to the Lane Sheriff's Work Crew and DYS (Department of Youth Service – Juvenile Forest Work Team.)

Second round –

Kennedy Conservation Corps Trail OHV and Recreation Program	0
Mosby Creek Spring Chinook Habitat Project Phase II	34,000
Siuslaw Restoration and Monitoring Field Crew	10,000
Mohawk Education and Outreach Project	21,000
Lane County Juvenile Forest Work Team	70,000
Maple Creek Road	39,000
Northwest Youth Corps Environmental Stewardship	24,000
Clean Forest Project	0
Bear Creek Fish Passage	100,000
Lane County Sheriff's Work Crew	100,000
Kennedy Conservation Corps Noxious Weed Removal Program	20,000
Horn Butte Road Stream Culvert Replacement	79,000
Focus on the Forest	20,000
Calico Creek Restoration Project	0
Carpenter Bypass Trail Education and Improvement Program	10,000
Total:	527,000

Gehling – I say take the last three off the bottom.

Grilley – I would like to talk about the Focus on the Forest. It might not be something that BLM could do, as far as taking recommendations from a group that is not designated by the Secretary of Interior.

Peters – At this point, instead of taking away from youth, I would take away from Focus on the Forest.

Walters – I would second the comment of taking everything from Focus on the Forest down off the table.

King – I would like to take some funding off the top tier to keep more projects funding.

Keene – I like that too.

Gehling – I think you get to the point of dilution.

Dedrick – I would fund with conditions, if I was going to fund it. Are people willing to participate? It's not clear. The BLM isn't part of it. I'm uncomfortable. If there is anything watershed councils have learned is you can't just say you will work collaboratively. You have to show it. I say if we fund, we fund with conditions.

Matthews – Why don't you knock it down 10,000 and have an asterisk with conditions.

Ringer – I don't see what you can do with 10,000.

Kevin Matthews – I don't support the way all of them are allocated so it's premature to cut the bottom.

Dedrick – Why don't we come up with a couple alternatives and then vote on those?

Matthews – Why don't we put several at \$10,000 and put the Juvenile Work crew at a higher amount - then the Sheriff's and Bear Creek to \$95,000.

Jerry King – I would go along with that.

Grilley – Because I have to approve these projects, I would like to know what we would get from the Focus on the Forest for \$10,000. It was budgeted at \$40,000.

Berrian – I agree, I would like to see an agenda.

Dedrick – I feel we are missing out on a process point.

Johnston – We are developing two different alternatives that balance out to \$450,000.

Two different lists were developed.

(Green) First proposal

Carpenter Bypass Trail Education and Improvement Program	0
Kennedy Conservation Corps Trail OHV and Recreation Program	0

Mosby Creek Spring Chinook Habitat Project Phase II	34,000
Siuslaw Restoration and Monitoring Field Crew	5,000
Mohawk Education and Outreach Project	21,000
Lane County Juvenile Forest Work Team	70,000
Maple Creek Road	39,000
Northwest Youth Corps Environmental Stewardship	24,000
Clean Forest Project	0
Bear Creek Fish Passage	95,000
Focus on the Forest	0
Calico Creek Restoration Project	0
Kennedy Conservation Corps Noxious Weed Removal Program	20,000
Horn Butte Road Stream Culvert Replacement	47,000
Lane County Sheriff's Work Crew	100,000
Total:	455,000

(Red) Second proposal

Carpenter Bypass Trail Education and Improvement Program	10,000
Kennedy Conservation Corps Trail OHV and Recreation Program	0
Mosby Creek Spring Chinook Habitat Project Phase II	34,000
Siuslaw Restoration and Monitoring Field Crew	10,000
Mohawk Education and Outreach Project	10,000
Lane County Juvenile Forest Work Team	70,000
Maple Creek Road	39,000
Northwest Youth Corps Environmental Stewardship	16,000
Clean Forest Project	0
Bear Creek Fish Passage	95,000
Focus on the Forest	10,000
Calico Creek Restoration Project	0
Kennedy Conservation Corps Noxious Weed Removal Program	10,000
Horn Butte Road Stream Culvert Replacement	47,000
Lane County Sheriff's Work Crew	100,000
Total:	451,000

King – We need to determine what we will be getting for the reduction of funding in each project.

Stewart - The work crews are the amount of crew times, Bear Creek needs to scale \$5,000 out of their project.

King – The Green slate looks very scalable. The Red side (2nd proposal) is more spread out. On Mohawk, I don't know if they could still do class A data.

Peters – I think that they could, it would just be the amount of monitoring they do.

King – Continuing on – Siuslaw Watershed, fund whatever we can for mussel training/monitoring;, Carpenter, they'd get training and materials for priority trails.

Matthews – There's two ways to do this – either vote on this now or give the numbers to the applicants and have them show us what they can do with it.

Johnston – It's your job as a RAC to determine how to spend the money. The choice is yours.

Berrian – I don't think I like that. We might not like what they come up with.

Matthews - I know we need to get it [Focus on the Forest] down to \$10,000.

King – So we could make it contingent that you find matching funds.

Johnston - You could do that with any of these. If it's contingent that the project gets funding from other sources or it goes back in the pot.

Grilley - Personally I would like to see some core summary of Focus on the Forest. There needs to at least be a product that comes out of this for me to feel comfortable spending tax payers' dollars.

King – Would that make you comfortable Ginnie?

Grilley – I would have to go through my legal team to know if it's viable.

Matthews – I hear three conditions [for Focus on the Forest]: matching funds, reporting, and feasibility of BLM participation.

King – We have a choice – do it as a group and if we don't get consensus, break into small groups and try and find consensus.

Peters – I would like to propose a third group. I cannot support the Focus on the Forest and I would like to move the \$10,000 to Mohawk.

Dedrick - I second it as member of the same [category 2] group.

(Blue) Third proposal

Carpenter Bypass Trail Education and Improvement Program	10,000
Kennedy Conservation Corps Trail OHV and Recreation Program	0
Mosby Creek Spring Chinook Habitat Project Phase II	34,000
Siuslaw Restoration and Monitoring Field Crew	10,000

Mohawk Education and Outreach Project	20,000
Lane County Juvenile Forest Work Team	70,000
Maple Creek Road	39,000
Northwest Youth Corps Environmental Stewardship	16,000
Clean Forest Project	0
Bear Creek Fish Passage	95,000
Focus on the Forest	0
Calico Creek Restoration Project	0
Kennedy Conservation Corps Noxious Weed Removal Program	10,000
Horn Butte Road Stream Culvert Replacement	47,000
Lane County Sheriff's Work Crew	100,000
Total:	451,000

Matthews – You don't know that you don't have that same issue in other groups.

Johnston – You have three groups now – what would you like to do?

King – Is there any other subgroups where you couldn't reach a quorum on this?

Stewart – We haven't been instructed to do this as a group.

Johnston – If want to vote on a slate, I could determine by category if we have a quorum.

King – I want people to vote on the original red vote.

Johnston – if you could do it by a show of hands.

A vote was taken

Results:

RED

Four in favor – Kevin Matthews, Mike Barnes, Roy Keene, and Jerry King

GREEN

Eight in favor – Faye Stewart, Pamela Berrian, William Gehling, Dana Dedrick, Denise Walters, Greg Ringer, Will Tucker, and Jerry King

BLUE

Six in favor – Sarah Peters, Will Tucker, Jerry King, Denise Walters, Greg Ringer, and Pamela Berrian

None of the proposed slates (red, green or blue) meet the criteria of a quorum.

Johnston – Is there something about the green that could change that would compel you to vote for it?

Matthews – I don't agree with the philosophy of the green, by drawing a line through the bottom of the projects after haphazardly putting dots on it. I am against the Green slate. I find it to be simple minded.

Peters – I agree with everything but the simple minded part. I would like to see more projects funded like in the Blue slate.

Stewart – From my standpoint, I'm not comfortable with Carpenter Mountain, which is already getting money from the BLM. And the Siuslaw has had a very successful project - we are making assumptions that projects are going to be able to find funding elsewhere.

Grilley – We have about ten minutes. We could break into groups or find a way to agree. I still need a recommendation from you today or we will have to meet another day.

Johnston – Or we could run down and find out where we are in agreement. We can also approve them project by project.

Peters – I want to change my vote.

GREEN

Nine in favor – Faye Stewart, Pamela Berrian, Gehling, Dana Dedrick, Denise Walters, Greg Ringer, Will Tucker, Jerry King, and Sarah Peters

A quorum is not met.

King – Let's take a voice vote that any of the projects that have the same price point in all three groups be approved.

This includes:

Mosby Creek Spring Chinook Habitat Project Phase II	34,000
Lane County Juvenile Forest Work Team	70,000
Maple Creek Road	39,000
Bear Creek Fish Passage	95,000
Horn Butte Road Stream Culvert Replacement	47,000
Lane County Sheriff's Work Crew	100,000
Total:	385,000

A vote was cast to approve the six projects for a total of \$385,000 dollars.

Yes 12, No 0.

Motion passes.

King – The next vote would be to vote others projects to at least the lowest level:

Mohawk Education and Outreach Project	10,000
Kennedy Conservation Corps Noxious Weed Removal Program	10,000
Northwest Youth Corps Environmental Stewardship	16,000
Total	36,000

Votes were cast.

One opposed (Faye Stewart), 11 yes

Motion passes

Total funded: \$421,000

Trimble – This leaves \$29,000 left to work with. You also have to vote what - if funding comes available – what you want to fund.

Stewart – I propose adding \$6,000 to Mohawk. I don't think that they will be able to get it done with just \$10,000. I think that the school can come up with the \$5,000.

Jerry King – Can we go \$6,000 for Mohawk?

Mohawk Education and Outreach Project	16,000
---------------------------------------	--------

A vote was cast.

11 yes, 1 abstained (Mike Barnes)

Motion passes.

Total funded: \$427,000

Barnes – There seems to be a bone of contention on Focus on the Forest. It seems by voting project by project, we are eliminating it by default.

Grilley – There will be opportunity for public engagement over the next four years with our planning process.

Berrian – I don't see it as a bone of contention.

Ringer – Can we put the other \$23,000 toward the culvert on Horn Butte?

Peters – Is that productive? Will that help you with that culvert?

Grilley – Yes.

Matthews – I think it would be valuable to give \$10,000 to Siuslaw. I don't support giving more money to Horn Butte.

Johnston – There is a proposal to add the other money to Horn Butte and Dana had a proposal.

Dedrick – \$13,000 to Siuslaw and \$10,000 additional to Kennedy Conservation Corps.

King - So let's vote on the third proposal.

A vote is cast.

11 in favor, one opposed (Kevin Matthews)

Motion passes.

Final tally:

Carpenter Bypass Trail Education and Improvement Program	0
Kennedy Conservation Corps Trail OHV and Recreation Program	0
Mosby Creek Spring Chinook Habitat Project Phase II	34,000
Siuslaw Restoration and Monitoring Field Crew	13,000
Mohawk Education and Outreach Project	16,000
Lane County Juvenile Forest Work Team	70,000
Maple Creek Road	39,000
Northwest Youth Corps Environmental Stewardship	16,000
Clean Forest Project	0
Bear Creek Fish Passage	95,000
Focus on the Forest	0
Calico Creek Restoration Project	0
Kennedy Conservation Corps Noxious Weed Removal Program	20,000
Horn Butte Road Stream Culvert Replacement	47,000
Lane County Sheriff's Work Crew	100,000
Total Funded:	450,000

Dedrick – For the 'cool list' (if there is additional money) - First we fully fund the Juvenile Work Crew, then the Lane County Sheriff's Work Crew and then give money for the second [priority] culvert on Horn Butte.

Stipulations for the funded money: The Siuslaw Restoration and Monitoring Field Crew money must be focused on the mussel training and monitoring, the Mohawk Education and Outreach Project needs to produce class A data, Horn Butte Road Stream Culvert Replacement will go for the priority one culvert.

A vote is cast.

12 Yes, 0 No.

Motion passes.

Johnston – One of the things we heard is that we would like a field trip. I will work on it.

Meeting adjourns at 5:15 pm.