

**Northwest Oregon Resource Advisory Committee**  
**Meeting agendas and notes**  
**October 13, 14 & 20, 2016**

**Resource Advisory Committee**  
**October 13, 2016**

**Agenda**

**BLM Northwest Oregon District – Eugene Office**  
**Room 214**

**8:30- 9:00**      **Welcome- Informal Meet and Greet**

**9:00-9:30**      **Introductions and Overview of Two-Day Meeting**  
Dave Howell, BLM Designated Federal Office (DFO)  
Annabelle Jaramillo – Northwest Oregon Resource Advisory Committee (RAC)  
  
Chairperson

**9:30-10:30**      **Review Secure Rural Schools, Title II Project Proposals (15 minutes each)**  
Lane (Douglas)- Esmond Creek Tributary Fish Passage Improvement  
Lane- Jordan Creek Fish Passage and Habitat Enhancement  
Lane- Juvenile Forest Work Team  
Lane- Kennedy Conservation Corps Trail Program

**10:30-10:45**      **BREAK**

**10:45-12:00**      **Review Secure Rural Schools, Title II Project Proposals (cont.)**  
Lane-KOG/ODF Lane Fire Prevention & Mitigation  
Lane- Siuslaw Restoration and Monitoring Crew 2017  
Lane- Triangle Lake Noxious Weed  
Linn- County Juvenile Work Service Program  
Lane/Linn Eugene District Illegal Dump Site

**12:00-12:30**      **LUNCH**

**12:30 – 1:00**      **PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD**

**1:00-1:30**      **Review Secure Rural Schools, Title II Project Proposals (cont.)**  
Lane (and Multi)- Eugene (Salem) BLM Youth Employment Project  
*This will be the only time you hear from the Northwest Youth Corps, which is also seeking funding in Linn, Marion, and Benton Counties under the proposal Multi-County Salem Youth Employment Project.*  
Multi- Willamette Valley Native Plant Materials Partnership  
*This will be the only time you hear from the Institute for Applied Ecology (IAE) for this project for which they are also seeking funding from Lane, Benton, and Yamhill counties.*

**1:30-2:00**      **Law Enforcement Proposal Presentation and Discussion**  
Robert Mitsuyasu

**2:00-2:15      BREAK**

**2:15-EOD      Resource Advisory Committee Discussion of the Projects and Recommended  
Allocation of Title II Funds for Douglas, Lane and Linn Counties**

## Introductions – Annabelle

**Members Present** – Dave Schmidt, Ron Price, Mike Ripley, Jeremiah Price, Jim Dundon, John Atkins, Lon Otterby, John Omlin, Will Tucker, Annabelle Jamamillo, Jerry Bailey, Debbie Porter.

**Members Absent** – Craig Pope, Peter Giordano, Glen Crinklaw.

Others Present: Dave Howell (DFO, Acting Northwest Oregon District Manager), Jen Velez (RAC Coordinator, Public Affairs), Patricia (Pat) Johnston (South Zone Program Lead), Mike Matthews (North Zone Program Lead), Diane Morris (NRSA-Marys Peak Field Office), Paul Tigan (Field Manager-Marys Peak Field Office), Stefanie Larew (note-taker-Marys Peak Field Office), Shami Predmas (Planner-Upper Willamette Field Office), Mike Korn (Field Manager-Siuslaw Field Office), Cheshire Mayrsohn (Botanist-Upper Willamette Field Office), Jay Ruegger (District GIS Coordinator-Northwest Oregon District)

## Agenda Review and Welcome – Dave

This is week two of being the Northwest Oregon District.

- Housekeeping: Restrooms, drinking fountains, emergency exits, sign-in sheets, pre-order café lunch options.

We do have a quorum today.

## Updates

- The Salem and Eugene Districts have consolidated into one district, now called the Northwest Oregon District, so some information in the binder may be outdated.
  - New maps (handouts) for binders
  - Staffing changes
    - District Manager: from two District Managers to one (Dave Howell is currently Acting)
    - John Huston (former DFO) is currently on a 120 day detail. Dave Howell is filling in as DFO
- New RAC members and contact information are in the binder. This is a reminder to keep information confidential. If there are errors or updates, contact Jen Velez.
- Flash drives with project information are available.

Objectives for the next couple days: The RAC has a lot of projects to review. Each proponent has been invited to talk about their project and its importance.

Next Thursday will be a more traditional meeting. Historically, Oregon RACs have focused on Secure Rural Schools. This is the last round we have to decide on unless the Act is reauthorized by Congress. We will discuss the new Resource Management Plan (RMP) and how the RAC can help with making recommendations on implementation and planning. We'll also talk about

recreation and we'll have an opportunity for the RAC to share what they would like to talk about. Field Managers will be invited to talk to the RAC about issues they want the RAC's input on. Several BLM staff will be sitting in a listening capacity during these three meetings; questions should be directed to the managers or Dave.

**Q:** It would be helpful to know about the amount they have to allocate versus how much has been requested. Do we have that?

**A:** The information is available on the handouts.

**Q:** Are we going to review the eligibility priorities (e.g., habitat or watershed projects as priorities for funding previously)? Confirming no difference from before?

**A:** Correct. We don't address that specifically; applicants should address that in their presentation.

**A:** Also, it's in the spreadsheet (does it meet the points of the Act, infrastructure, etc.).

Annabelle's clarification: The two contact points for Annabelle is intentional.

## **Orientation – Pat**

Handouts for each member:

- Previous projects
- The list and amounts of money this RAC gave to projects at the last meeting

Douglas County is included; that's a difference from last time.

There's roughly \$38,000 in addition to what was already there. It's from previous projects that aren't tied to a specific county (e.g., projects that came in under budget).

Keep in mind while voting, since this may be the last voting, it may be worth voting for a set of contingency projects. That way, if a project falls through, the RAC won't need to reconvene to decide what to do with the money.

There are 15 minutes for each presentation. There will be a 10 minute warning (10 minutes for presentation, 5 minutes for questions).

**Q:** Will we be approving the meeting notes?

**A:** A copy will be printed and reviewed later in the meeting.

## **Presentations**

### **Esmond Creek Tributary Fish Passage Improvement**

This project consists of replacing a failing culvert. Goals and objectives of the project include improving fish passages for ESA-listed coho salmon and maintaining access to public and private lands (also, fire suppression). It's located in Douglas County (Esmond Creek is a major tributary to the Siuslaw River), on paved BLM Road 19-8-21, about 1.25 miles below Esmond Lake. The culvert failed in a 2012 storm and has been a complete barrier since then to fish and

traffic. 2016 fish surveys showed fish downstream, but none upstream. There are approximately 0.3 miles of coho habitat above the culvert on BLM land, and excellent gravels for coho spawning. The culvert was removed and NEPA was completed in September 2016. BLM is providing more than 1.25:1 match.

**S:** The project will pick up 1/3 mile of coho spawning habitat. The main thrust of the project is to repair the road and the failing culvert. Esmond Creek is a substantial tributary, the real impact is the sedimentation to the waterways.

**R:** Cold water refugia is important. It's one of the Siuslaw's limiting factors.

**Q:** How much access does this open up, mileage-wise?

**A:** Just about 2 miles of road above the culvert.

**Q:** Will the culverts just be replaced?

**A:** Yes, with a 65 foot long corrugated metal pipe. It will have rock on the bottom running through it, with ridges to retain the gravel.

**Q:** Will the gradient be such that it won't impede fish passage?

**A:** Yes. I believe it will be less than 5 percent.

**Q:** How will success be measured?

**A:** Primarily by post-project surveys above and below the culvert.

**Q:** So, if fish are spotted above the culvert, it's a success?

**A:** Yes.

**Q:** Who is being paid for inspections afterward (the \$2,000)?

**A:** The Siuslaw Watershed Council is tasked with the surveys.

**Q:** How has success been measured in other similar projects?

**A:** Unsure of specifics, but we have ongoing monitoring efforts that support success of other projects.

**Q:** What do you do to protect fish during the projects?

**A:** We are consulting with the BLM fish biologist to ensure adequate protection.

### **Question about Douglas County Funds (generally)**

**Q:** Most of Douglas County is in the Roseburg District and will get most of the funding.

Douglas County gave \$23,582. Confirming that this was the only Douglas County proposal?

**A:** Confirmed.

### **Jordan Creek Fish Passage**

The goals and objectives of the project are to improve habitat quality and connectivity for native fish and wildlife species in the Jordan Creek drainage, stimulate the local economy, and educate local youth in natural resources. The project consists of removing fish passage barriers at

multiple sites, installing log jams (120 logs at 25 sites on BLM and private lands), educating Boy Scouts and Boys and Girls Club Members. Logs for the log jam will be repurposed from an oak restoration project. Culverts are perched (vertical barriers), undersized, and failing. Proposed solution is similar to the Bear Creek site (that the group visited earlier).

**Q:** What are the benefits of large wood placement?

**A:** The goal is to provide cover in areas with simplified habitat, where streams were previously cleaned out. Another goal is to create more spawning areas and scour deeper pools that native fish prefer. Local data shows that such projects have been effective.

**Q:** Is monitoring included for this project?

**A:** Yes.

**Q:** What is the primary anadromous fish?

**A:** Cutthroat.

**Q:** The proposal includes scalability. This looks like a three project proposal. If we fund less than \$70,000, what does it mean for the project?

**A:** It's preferred that fish passage work be kept together, but the project is scalable.

**Q:** There are three project sites. Would it make sense project-wise to start at Coyote Creek (most downstream)? Is it possible to show costs as it goes up stream (tying in to scalability)?

**A:** Correct. Yes, I can crunch numbers.

**Q:** About the log placement: will there be floodplain extension?

**A:** Yes, that is a goal. It's a good site without infrastructure. A goal is to reconnect the stream with its floodplain.

**Q:** What types of native material will be planted? And the number of youth involved?

**A:** Native trees and shrubs include willows, bareroot redcedars, and vine maple. There are 20-30 different species altogether. There's currently a lot of canary grass. The number of youth involved is estimated at 40-50 Boy Scouts. The Boys and Girls Club is a newer addition; I'm unsure of the precise number.

### **Juvenile Forest Work Team**

The group has worked with the RAC since the beginning of the legislation. Their program provides educational and vocational opportunities to high-risk youth in the county. Nearly half of their participants had their first criminal referral at 13 years of age or younger. It's a year-round program, but they typically work with kids for 2-3 semesters. In 2015, the group received less funding, but still served 122 youth. About 50 percent of time was spent on OHV trails in the Shotgun Creek area. They work with every school district in the county. Each year, about \$25,000 in restitution goes back to the community.

**Q:** What about partnership opportunities, such as the NW Youth Corp?

**A:** We refer kids there when they graduate our program.

**Q:** You spoke of a reduction in recidivism: Across how many years is that measured?

**A:** It's measured after one year.

**Q:** How are you going to measure success? It's been discussed broadly at the individual level, not at a project-specific level. Can you speak to support of the organization vs. support of projects?

**A:** The requested funding is specific to projects; it's not to be used as general funding. We have the flexibility to adjust to the projects that the BLM needs; the proposal isn't tied to a specific project. We measure success by the amount of miles treated, acres treated, and structures done. Work is measured each day and reported back to the BLM.

**Q:** What's the average age and gender of the youth served? How is restitution paid (do you pay kids who turn around and pay restitution)?

**A:** Ages are between 16-17. The gender mix is approximately 75% male, 25% female. Restitution victim's fund: the kids earn \$50 towards restitution per day.

### **Al Kennedy Alternative High School**

The goal is to provide a rich educational experience that gives students the tools they need to pursue their goals. They serve students in extreme poverty: 50 percent are homeless, 30 percent are in special education, and 100 percent participate in free or reduced lunch programs. The school promotes experiential learning. School success in attendance, grades, and behavior determines eligibility. Students receive college credit from Lane Community College. The application is specifically for continuing work on the Row River Trail with the BLM. Success this far has been with blackberries; they have been cut twice and the group has found a significant cut back on regrowth.

**Q:** How many youth does the school serve now, per year?

**A:** School capacity is 90, but because of transitory nature, 130-150 (kids can come and go) per year.

**Q:** How do kids get on the crew?

**A:** They apply and have to pass a walking test, and then they become employees. \$20,000 of proposal goes directly to kids.

**Q:** How do you know when you're done? Does X dollars tie to X number of hours?

**A:** We have started projects as volunteers. Calculations are done based on the students earning minimum wage during school year. This translates to 38 work days at an 8 person crew. If we run out of money and there's a need for us to volunteer, we can be flexible.

Note from the BLM, since there are several similar proposals: Recreation planners identify work. Also, work crops up. These groups have been flexible as needed.

**Q:** The proposal doesn't reflect prior funding, but you were funded?

**A:** Yes. The prior year spreadsheet shows \$12,000 funded in March.

**C:** It's a great program that's open to many partnerships. We see a lot of potential for additional partnerships moving forward.

### **Housekeeping – Dave and Pat (BLM)**

The meeting tomorrow will be in the Salem office. Directions are available if needed. A weather advisory is out; the BLM has cautioned its employees already. There are likely even more precautions tomorrow as the last remnants of a Pacific typhoon comes through. We have the ability to reimburse for mileage and hotels. If you want reimbursement, talk to Dave and Jen. What about parking? If we run out of space in the main lot, Safeway is open, or perhaps we can open the gate for the day.

In response to questions about funding, Pat passed around Title I, II, III allocations by county. This RAC is working with Title II funds. Fiscal Year 2015 SRS payments made in FY 2016. When SRS was reauthorized, it was authorized retroactively for two years. The meeting in March allocated 2014 funds; this meeting allocates 2015 funds. Regarding the spreadsheet in the email, numbers don't always match one for one (e.g., Douglas County, where funds were split). If there are questions, ask Pat.

Regarding project binders – If you don't want a printed binder, that's fine. Demand has superseded supply. Let Jen know if any additional binders are needed.

## **Presentations (continued)**

### **KOG/ODF Lane Fire Prevention and Mitigation**

The organization has been around since 1941. The Keep Green movement started in Oregon (Klamath) and spread across the country. Of all the associations founded in the 1950s and 1960s, this is virtually the only one left. Surveys have shown the group isn't very well recognized. The group has statewide scope; they do a lot of education in the spring. The requested funding would go to fire prevention and fuels reduction. KOG fights fire through education. They would like to put variable reader message boards in critical times and places. We're seeing historical conditions in Oregon that we haven't seen in 25 years. Their efforts would go to both signs and social media; they want to try to reach people in a variety of means. There are only 8 signs in Lane County, so there's a lot of opportunity for expansion.

**Q:** People are familiar with KOG as a slogan, but perhaps not as an organization. Could signage include a website or other information? How many members are in the organization?

**A:** There are about 35 members on the board and about 200 paying members/contributors. We recognize that we could have a better digital presence.

**Q:** Could you speak to the fuels reduction portion of the project?

**A:** Defensible space is critical. A lot of fires are starting at home and spreading to WUI. This is where community outreach and education comes in.

**Q:** Are there numbers you're trying to achieve to measure the effectiveness of the funds? e.g., the number of homes adjacent to BLM?



**A:** The target is to treat homes that are across the fence from federal lands. Objectives are expressed in number of acres, not in the number of homes. We can offer grant funds to residents, but they do have to make the decision to do the work. In the past, the target has been about 225 acres or 200 homes.

### **Lane Siuslaw Restoration and Monitoring Crew 2017**

There are two full-time employees and they have been supported previously by the RAC. Goals and objectives are to contribute to restoration and protection of native species and improved water quality through in-stream large woody debris surveys, temperature monitoring, and riparian restoration projects. Also have a goal of contributing jobs to the local economy; Mapleton is an economically challenged area. Projects would occur in Upper Siuslaw. Crews are trained by BLM fish biologists.

**Q:** Are the staff members typically the same two season after season? Who are they employees of and do they have other tasks? How's the accountability between the different funding sources?

**A:** Typically it is the same two season after season, but there is turnover. They are direct employees of the watershed council. They allocate a portion of their time to these projects, but they have other tasks funded through other means.

**Q:** Is it scalable?

**A:** Yes, because there are several components to the projects.

**Q:** What's the status of the NEPA (EAs/CXs)?

**A:** They are done.

### **Triangle Lake Noxious Weed**

The group submitted a three year grant request. The program began summer of 2006 and has had a few summers off since then. Some of the students they serve are considered special education or participate in free or reduced lunch programs. Students have to provide their own transportation to the pick-up spots, but the group provides transportation from there to the work site. It is centered out of the Triangle Lake Charter School. They have six students on the crew, and have one as an alternate. The crew has covered lands throughout Lane County west of Eugene. The crew eradicates noxious weeds using hand tools. A movement in the Triangle Lake area is against use of chemicals. It's a helpful way to fit in with the community. Plant focus: knotweed, false brome, tansy ragweed, herb Robert, and invasive blackberries. Up to 300 acres can be covered in six weeks of work, at a cost of approximately \$76/acre or \$24/mile. The youth learn about work ethics, community service, and job skills.

**Q:** What's the success of the hand grubbing? Do you have to revisit sites frequently?

**A:** It varies year to year or place to place. They do monitoring after a year. They've visited some places after a year and found very high rates of success, and other places they've had less success. They're hoping a new crew boss will improve precision.

**Q:** Grubbing of knapweed: is it gathered up and left or hauled away?

**A:** We do whatever we're asked to do. Some weeds are bagged up and removed. Others can be pulled up and left. Knapweed was likely bagged up.

**Q:** How would it work to expand into other communities?

**A:** We're looking to have new crew members from farther away, provided they can make it to the pick-up point. We want to service more than just the core local area.

**Q:** Have you thought about replicating this project elsewhere?

**A:** No, but I believe it would be beneficial.

### **Linn County Juvenile Work Service Program**

They have been working with the BLM since 2001. At the time, there was no compensation, it was pure community service. Title III funds were used until 2009. Since then, the crew has come to the RAC for funding for this part of the program. They were funded by the RAC last year at \$23,000 (of approximately \$27,000). The project is scalable at \$500, because that's the reimbursement measurement for one work day. The work varies: noxious weed (blackberry or false brome), splitting firewood, trail maintenance, cleaning up winter storm debris, and forage enhancement projects. A large focus has been the Fishermen's Bend and Elkhorn Valley recreation sites. Funding goes directly to the crews, and includes vehicles, safety equipment, and tools. The funding request translates to 53 days with 5-7 youth.

**Q:** Funding is \$26,500: what is grant contract administration?

**A:** We were initially instructed by the BLM to describe it as such. Realistically, it's supplies, small tools, vehicle fuels, and the rest goes to the salaried staff (work program officers who supervise the crew).

**Q:** As a probation officer: how many clients do you have in a year? Are clients directed to join or do they volunteer?

**A:** We get about 800 referrals per year. The number of adjudicated youth – 241. Non-adjudicated – 84. This is community service or in-lieu of being on probation (directed by the court).

**Q:** What percentage of youth are improved?

**A:** It's a positive experience for the vast majority of youth. Some youth with tough home lives come back to volunteer upon completion for a continued positive role model experience.

**Q:** What's the range of community service hours the kids are required to perform?

**A:** It can be as little as 8 hours and up to about 100 hours.

### **Lane/Linn Eugene District Illegal Dump Site**

The purpose is to remove illegally dumped solid waste and abandoned vehicles from the Northwest Oregon District. Appropriated program funds cannot typically be used for solid waste (non-hazardous materials) site cleanup. This would add to the existing agreement from previous RAC funding (\$15,000). The proposal is scalable. It restores and improves land health, protects public land uses, and discourages further illegal dumping.

**Q:** How many dump sites are known vs. those that are newly found?

**A:** We find between 1-2 dozen sites per year.

**Q:** Is this just for the Eugene District?

**A:** Yes. This is for the southern portion of the district, because the north has resources and partnerships we don't.

**Q:** You now have \$50,000 you didn't expect at the time of the application, now what?

**A:** It's spread across three years. The \$15,000 we got last year only cleaned up half the identified sites to clean up. The RAC funding would help clean up the remaining sites.

## **Lunch Break**

### **Public Comment**

No public present.

## **Presentations**

### **Northwest Youth Corp**

The group works primarily with ages 15-26, but does work with younger ages for some school programs. The goal is to get people outside and engaged. They operate in three different states, but are based out of Eugene. The group has a lot of experience building partnerships (USFS, BLM, National and State Parks, etc.) and do fuel reduction, trail building, and other projects. Students are paid and build professional and technical skills. The groups are independent and just need a project. This proposal is for three weeks and employment of up to 15 to work in the Quartzville corridor on trail restoration and maintenance. If projects are completed ahead of schedule, the group can be moved around where needed.

**Q:** Did you apply for Coastal RAC funds as well?

**A:** Unsure. I will look into it.

**Q:** Will there be future foresters you're bringing up through the ranks? How does that work?

**A:** We work with the Oregon State University (OSU) Forestry Department to connect students with work happening at Alsea Falls. It is currently happening. The goal is to hire the whole crew from OSU.

**Q:** Could you clarify the reference to "building" two miles of trail? Was it building or was it maintenance?

**A:** It was likely maintenance, not construction.

**C:** Applaud to the good work you do.

### **Willamette Valley Native Plant Materials Partnership**

They are a national leader in region-wide restoration effort with lots of resources and partners. Demand for high-quality native plants exceeds supply (species diversity, sufficient quantities). OWEB proposal initially supported development of the partnership. Connects local growers with restoration communities to meet needs for projects. Initiated seed production for 19 high priority restoration species. First fields producing seed in 2014. Large start up time before peak production (2-8 years). Expecting self-sustainability by 2019. Requesting 11% of total funding need from the RAC (~\$40k). Goals are to create resilient landscapes that reduce restoration costs.

**Q:** Is there a slide with a range of the native species you use?

**A:** Not in this presentation, but we use graminoids, bulbs, and forbs.

**Q:** Do you charge for seeds?

**A:** Yes.

**Q:** What is preventing you from being self-sufficient today?

**A:** Fields take 2-8 years to go from initial seed collection to field production. We're still in that lag time. Once they're all producing, we expect to be able to fund ongoing production.

**Q:** Are these species otherwise available?

**A:** It depends. Yarrow, as an example, runs out locally every year. Some commercial growers won't grow on spec.

**Q:** How are they paying the people growing the seed?

**A:** Growers get the same amount whether the field is unproductive or whether it produces 1,000 pounds.

### **Law Enforcement Proposal Presentation and Discussion**

This includes six counties; issues repeat through the counties. We've seen a big increase in trespass and abandoned property on public lands in recent years. Other issues include dumping, illegal encampments, emergency response, search and rescue, litter from target shooters, special forest products, resource damage, damage to property, and timber theft. We need sheriff's departments to help us out. The population isn't going down, use of public lands is increasing, and we need help deterring the abuse.

**Q:** Has the BLM looked into the feasibility of establishing target sites (e.g., an embankment)?

**BLM:** It's a possibility, but it's hard. If an agency develops a designated target site, there's a huge increase in liability and clean up concerns (increase in lead). We're looking at experiments that other agencies/departments are doing (developing sites with shooting clubs as stewards).

**Q:** What will you get with the \$200,000?

**BLM:** It costs approximately \$800 for a weekend. We try to emphasize in the contracts that it will be concentrated into the busier times.

**Q:** For clarity, the funding would go to hire county sheriff's department? How many officers does BLM have?

**BLM:** Correct. The BLM has four in the Northwest Oregon District (one in Tillamook, one in Salem, and two in Eugene). Agreements and funding varies by county. BLM LEOs are not deputized and cannot get involved in crimes of people or private property.

**C:** BLM Prineville has a shooting range.

**C:** At the shooting range at McGowan Creek, there's not a sign left standing. They're all shot up.

**S:** A lot of discussions about this at the national level. BLM policy nationwide is to lean away from that, and help maintain sites instead. We are unlikely to develop a site ourselves.

**Q:** What county needs the most help?

**BLM:** It's hard to choose.

**S:** Statement in support. Sheriff departments are underfunded to begin with and will go where the calls are. Without funding to support them going to the woods, you won't see them out there. It's too vast an area to cover for 4-5 BLM LEOs.

**Q:** What's the accountability (Benton County) that we know they're going out there to patrol BLM? And that it's not just put in the pool to go elsewhere?

**BLM:** It's written in the contract that they report to us. Dave receives weekly reports from LEOs in Lane County. They work closely with BLM LEOs and have a good rapport.

## **RAC Discussion and Recommended Allocation of Title II Funds for Douglas, Lane, and Linn Counties**

### **Douglas County**

#### **Esmond Creek**

Proposal to fund the project for the amount of \$23,416 – Motion made and approved by all present.

### **Lane County**

#### **KOG/ODF Lane Fire Prevention and Mitigation**

**C:** I'm requesting to discuss this first, because of opportunity to free up some funds. I have some concerns about the project, since it's mostly a signage project. The proposal isn't clear about who will do the work (contract or otherwise). Also, I'm concerned the signs will be shot up. There was no discussion of maintaining signs or infrastructure for maintenance/replacement.

Electronic readerboards get vandalized as well. I have concerns about how long will they last on a rural highway without maintenance.

**C:** I also have no interest in funding this project at all. The idea has merit, but is lacking a concrete proposal.

**C:** KOG started in 1941 with ads as a small office. It has great intentions for expansion.

**C:** It doesn't match up very well with the criteria.

**C:** It's missing a lot of detail about costs per sign.

*Motion to take out of consideration (\$0 funding). Motion seconded. Approved by all present.*

### **Remaining Funds**

Remaining funds after KOG/ODF removed: \$530,000 requested (fully funded), \$402,000 available.

The \$39,850 for footprint of Eugene District. Additional \$19,000 for the Salem District.

**C:** It could be put towards youth funding programs.

### **Triangle Lake Noxious Weed**

**C:** Doesn't seem like enough "bang for the buck" and would rather see it go towards law enforcement. It's only six kids and doesn't seem very organized.

**C:** Triangle Lake area is encumbered by issues with chemical use. While handtools may not be the most effective, there is no other way but handcrews. Looking at the whole "bang for the buck," it's less about the project on the ground and more about the kids they serve, who are underprivileged and at a charter school.

**C:** There's funding left on the table from the previous years. Do we want to dump more money into this? It shows funding levels without accountability.

**C:** In March, we gave them \$23,000. There were logistical difficulties with them in getting them the money.

**C:** Next year they need to show what they've done with the money.

**C:** Reminder that there might not be a "next year."

*Motion: The application be denied entirely (\$0). Motion seconded. Approved by all present.*

**BLM:** Regarding the law enforcement proposal: There's a lot of scrutiny with contracts, moreso than with agreements.

Process check: The RAC can identify early which proposals may be excluded. The RAC votes on each one if a quorum is present.

With latest vote: Remaining projects: approximately \$457,000 in requests and \$442,085 to allocate (including approximately \$39,000 from prior years).

### **Lane/Linn Eugene District Illegal Dump Site**

**C**: We could put \$10,000 in Linn and \$15,000 in Lane for a total of their requested funding.

### **Remaining Funds**

**C**: That puts the group overspent by about \$5,000 in Lane County if everything else is fully funded.

**C**: Institute of Applied Ecology is interlocked with other counties. The amount shown in Lane represents the full amount requested.

**C**: We can remove \$5,000 from Institute of Applied Ecology, with the intent to try to make it up from another county.

**BLM**: The group might want to consider contingency projects and look at anything funded at less than 100%. We have to obligate this money by September 2017. The RAC could look at it again, but would have to meet again.

*Motion to approve the “amount funded” column (remaining projects fully funded). Motion seconded. Approved by all present.*

### **Contingency Funds**

**BLM**: If legislation isn't reauthorized and money has been allocated (per RAC recommendations) that comes back to the funding table. We will need to meet again and have discussions about what to do with the funding, and would have to put out a call for additional proposals. Voting for contingencies presents an opportunity for efficiencies.

*Motion: Any contingency money from projects on the board go to the Triangle Lake project for the full amount. Motion seconded.*

*Rolecall vote:*

Schmidt - yes

J. Price - yes

R. Price - yes

Ripley - yes

Dunden - yes

Atkins - yes

Otterby - yes  
Omlin - yes  
Tucker - yes  
Jaramillo - yes  
Bailey - yes  
Porter - yes

Comment on Procedure: Projects about the youth: When reading public law (Title II), it very specifically states what constitutes a valid project. It doesn't sound like the youth projects fit as presented. Not saying to change anything now, but to consider how projects meet the intent of the Act.

### **Linn County**

**C:** Total asked is approximately \$90 over available funds. We can subtract \$92 from Lane/Linn Illegal dumping.

*Motion to submit Linn County as noted on the spreadsheet. Motion seconded. Approved by all present.*

**Q:** Contingency: Should we be considering by county or by overall project?

**A:** Regardless of the county location, we want the money to go to the right project.

**C:** Vote again on contingency, deferring until all projects are reviewed? Do we want to rescind the motion to accept Triangle Lake as a contingency project?

**C:** It has not been withdrawn, it has been tabled until tomorrow.

**Minutes Review – Send electronic copy overnight and review tomorrow.**

**Summary of the day's voting:** RAC voted with allocated funds of \$402,235, funds remaining from prior years in Eugene (\$15,391) and \$23,919 turned back.



## **Resource Advisory Committee**

**October 14, 2016**

### **Agenda**

**BLM Northwest Oregon District – Salem Office**

**Room- Lower Level Conference Room**

- 8:30-9:00**      **Welcome- Informal Meet and Greet**
- 9:00-9:15**      **Introduction and Review Agenda**  
Dave Howell, BLM Designated Federal Office (DFO)  
Annabelle Jaramillo – Northwest Oregon Resource Advisory Committee (RAC) Chairperson
- 9:15-9:30**      **Review Multi-County Environmental Stewardship Proposal – Youth of Tillamook County**
- 9:30-10:15**      **Review Benton and Clackamas County Title II Proposals**  
Benton - Alsea Falls Trail System  
Benton - Marys Peak Resource Area Pavement Maintenance  
Clackamas- Dump stoppers
- 10:15-10:30**      **Resource Advisory Committee Discussion and Recommended Allocation of Title II Funds–**  
Youth of Tillamook, Benton and Clackamas County Proposals
- 10:30-10:45**      **Break**
- 10:45-11:45**      **Review Columbia County Title II proposals**  
Columbia - Native and Invasive Plant Program  
Columbia - River Youth Corps  
Columbia - SBWC Native Plant Nursery  
Columbia - Vernonia Schools' Nehalem Native Nursery
- 11:45– 12:00**      **Resource Advisory Committee Discussion and Recommended Allocation of Title II Funds**  
Columbia County Proposals
- 12:00 -12:30**      **Lunch**
- 12:30-1:00**      **Public Comment Period**
- 1:00-1:45**      **Review Marion and Multnomah County Title II Proposals**  
Marion- North Fork Park Parking Improvements  
Marion- Sinker Flats  
Multnomah and Washington - Upper McKay Watershed Forest Restoration
- 1:45-2:00**      **Resource Advisory Committee Discussion and Recommended Allocation of Title II Funds**  
Marion and Multnomah County Proposals

- 2:00-2:45**      **Review Polk County Title II Proposals**  
Polk- Dump stoppers Project  
Polk- Noxious Weed Project  
Polk- Gooseneck Fish Passage Restoration  
Polk- S. Fork Pedee Survey and Design  
Polk and Yamhill- Rapid Bio Assessment Phase I
- 2:45-3:00**      **Break**
- 3:00-3:30**      **Resource Advisory Committee Discussion and Recommended Allocation of Title II Funds**  
Polk County
- 3:30-4:15**      **Review Washington and Yamhill County Title II Proposals**  
Washington and Yamhill- Northwest Oregon Restoration Partnership  
Yamhill- Nelson’s Checkermallow Restoration at Walker Flat  
Yamhill- Trask Paired Watershed Study
- 4:15-4:30**      **Resource Advisory Committee Discussion and Recommended Allocation of Title II Funds**  
Washington and Yamhill Counties
- 4:30-5:00**      Next steps and preview of October 20<sup>th</sup> meeting

**Members Present** –Dave Schmidt, Ron Price, Mike Ripley, Jeremiah Price, Jim Dundon, John Atkins, Lon Otterby, John Omlin, Will Tucker, Annabelle Jaramillo, Jerry Bailey, Debbie Porter, Craig Pope.

**Members Absent** – Peter Giordano, Glen Crinklaw.

**Others Present:** Dave Howell (DFO, Acting Northwest Oregon District Manager), Jen Velez (RAC Coordinator, Public Affairs), Patricia (Pat) Johnston (Program Lead), Karen Schank (Tillamook Field Office Manager), Mike Matthews (Program Lead), Diane Morris (Marys Peak NRSA), Stefanie Larew (notetaker - AM), Jay Ruegger, Whitney Wirthlin (notetaker – PM)

### **Introduction and Review Agenda – Annabelle**

- Process review – review of proposal, reminder of minutes review
- Questions about previous notes?
  - *Motion to approve meeting minutes. Motion seconded. Approved by all present.*

### **Welcome and Thanks – Dave**

- Previous notes have been routed
- Tillamook presenter(s) have called in
- Logistics: restrooms, break room, drinking fountains

## **Multi-county Environmental Stewardship Proposal**

### **Youth of Tillamook County**

This program has provided an eight week summer crew since 2006. Students are employees and they partner with the Tillamook School District. The ideal crew size is four to six students. The crew does a broad spectrum of actions including timber sale prep (boundaries) and elk fence maintenance. The crew works with a range of BLM specialists and gets a large sampling of what the BLM does, learns about being responsible land managers, and being stewards for the community. A large number of students go into natural resource careers after participating in the program.

**Q:** The proposal says it's scalable: what increment can it break into?

**A:** Much of the costs are in personnel; i.e., how many students we can accommodate. It costs about \$3,000-\$4,000 per student. Transportation costs vary and are hard to predict. It also accounts for safety equipment, including work boots.

**Q:** You applied for funding from 4 counties – do you have any guidance as to proportionality from the counties?

**A:** It's a difficult question to answer – we don't know until that summer where we'll be working. We're new to the application process. Each summer, they've worked in every county, but we can't predict where the needs will be (for timber sale, elk fence management, etc.)

**BLM:** We don't typically know until the spring where the work will need to be done. There are a lot of variables that are hard to predict, but we work hard with specialists to ensure a breadth of experience and across counties.

**Q:** How do you measure success if you don't have projects outlined at the beginning of the process?

**A:** Each summer yields the same type of projects, but they are in different locations. This includes coarse woody debris surveys and timber sale boundaries.

**Q:** This is a long-standing engagement – has it been successful, have there been any issues?

**BLM:** It's a balance. It's an educational opportunity. It may not be as efficient as hiring a contractor, but they do provide a benefit to us (as well as us to them).

**Q:** \$15,000 of other contributions, what's their source? Is it contingent?

**A:** Sometimes the school district will offer that if need be to cover administrative costs. It is contingent upon the budget. It's not earmarked for BLM, because we do hope for federal funding, but we have had to contribute money in recent years to make it work.

**Q:** Let's assume this is the last funding opportunity; do you have a plan for self-sustainability?

**A:** No. The program would likely die.

## **Benton and Clackamas County Title II Proposals**

### **Clackamas Dump Stoppers**

The group has had a long-standing partnership with the RAC/BLM since the beginning in 2003. Over half of lands in county are federally managed. They have three main goals: clean up and dispose illegal waste on forested lands (not just federal), educate people, and enforce county ordinances. Funding has been more equitably split in recent years. The program runs about ten months a year at a cost of \$15,000 per month. Two seasonals are hired each year (March-December). Of the 40-50 dump sites reported a year, about 30-40 are cleaned up. The group also conducts outreach at fairs, earth day events, OHV and firearm organizations, and watershed cleanup events.

**Q:** Impressed with collaborate funding model – What's your plan going forward if this funding completely ends?

**A:** We talk to county commissioners a couple times a year about this. We use their funding as a challenge grant opportunity. At this point, we will continue to seek other sources. If unsuccessful, we either shut the program down or get the counties comfortable with using county dollars in support of federal lands. Short answer: The counties would be the 100% funder, but we would talk to FS/BLM about what that looks like. After one to two years, the counties may want to pull out.

**Q:** In reality, your budget has higher federal contributions. Is that not reflected in your application?

**A:** It's a complicated world of stacking grants. We're asking for two months' worth of funding. We have more, about two to three years' worth of funding. We plan in about five year increments.

**Q:** Budget is about \$150,000 annually – do you know the status of the other funds you submitted for this year?

**A:** We've been successful this year with RACs (BLM and FS), and the retained receipts request has been approved. We request about \$30,000 for each funder. We're pretty secure on each of our asks right now.

### **Alsea Falls Trail System – Benton County Chapter of IMBA**

This group promotes mountain biking and responsible resource use with participants of all ages. Mountain biking provides economic benefits for local economies. Alsea Falls has about 9.6 miles of trail and attracts 15,000 annual riders. It's in the top 20 mountain bike destinations on BLM land nationally, but it is lacking a challenging trail. The trails system already has easy and intermediate trails. The concept of trail systems is about safety and convenience. The higher you climb, the more difficult it is. Team Dirt has a robust volunteer network with over 10,000 volunteer hours. Team Dirt maintains all 9.6 miles of trail. Trails are built with low impacts to ecology.

**Q:** Estimate about Sandy Ridge usage – what's the estimated use for the Alsea Falls trail system? How do you qualify it and how will this investment improve that number?

**A:** About 15,000 annually. This purchase would provide an additional experience that's missing from the region. It would be a major signature point in Oregon. For tracking, we have a counting device at an exit checkpoint year-round.

**Q:** What kind of positive impact do you have on the local economy? What are the dollars spent?

**A:** More folks are going through smaller towns of Monroe and Alsea. Mountain bikers are both hungry and ready to drink, so we create great tourists. The Team Dirt trails have sold a number of high-end bikes locally.

**BLM:** Alsea Falls Campground has seen increased use. People from Vancouver BC, and Alabama.

**Q:** Explain briefly the provisions you use when you design a trail to protect a watershed.

**A:** Trail design is built to NSA standards (acceptable grade and width) to avoid undue impacts. We avoiding fault line trails, which would be unsustainable and prone to rutting. We look at drainage, small footprints, and to minimize erosion. At Alsea, much of the trail system is no more than 18 inches wide. We're respectful of roots of trees and leave very little bare dirt. We ensure revegetation, either replanting ferns or avoiding the need to disturb trees, shrubs, or sensitive areas.

### **Discussion and Recommended Allocations of Title II Funds for Tillamook County – decided to wait until the discussion about Columbia County.**

*Motion to approve Dump Stoppers and Clackamas Law Enforcement at full amount. Motion seconded. Approved by all present.*

**Marys Peak Resource Area Pavement Maintenance – primary presenter  
unavailable**

The Marys Peak Field Office has worked with the sponsor for about 12 years, using Benton County Public Works crew to supplement our road work needs. The byway receives a lot of use. The Marys Peak Field Office has an assistance agreement set up with Benton County. Three paved roads in Benton County are in need of maintenance and repair. Additionally, the BLM has applied for Federal Land Access Program funding to widen the South Fork and has recently met with the group on-site.

**Q:** Brushclearing – are you also improving the berms for bicycle riders?

**A:** Will follow up with the engineer – it is a consideration for the widening portion.

**Q:** These are county roads (South Fork byway), correct?

**A:** Correct. The nexus is the access to public lands.

**BLM:** The road still needs constant maintenance. It gets heavy use in the summer.

**Q:** Fall-Cole is a BLM road, correct? Is this for maintenance after the timber sale? Resurface? What's the scope for the \$100,000?

**A:** Correct. It's for culvert replacement and maintenance, but not for the widening of the South Fork. That information was just additional context for what's going on in the area.

**Status Check on Funds**

**BLM:** The RAC has now heard from all projects for the county. In blue, the Institute of Applied Ecology, the balance was \$5,318 and NW Youth Corp. The bottom line requests for \$186,738, and the RAC has \$123,012 allocate. As of last county discussion, you have \$8,585 left over from Clackamas County. Carryover amount of 19,288 from Salem District. The total is close to \$30,000 that you can put anywhere today.

Do we want to look at the \$30,000 yet or see what we have the rest of the day? Other comments?

**Q:** Can we come back and reverse a decision?

**A:** Yes.

**Q:** I'm having a hard time finding justification for bike paths under Title II. I can see how there's money to maintain, but I'm not sure how building fits into the criteria. Unless construction reduces bushwacking or user-created trails. Is there an interpretation that allows that use of the funds?

**A:** Directing users to appropriate trails protects the environment. If we can get them into systems designed and maintained for that use, it protects the ecology. We want to promote recreation and support use of the forest. Offering up a tourist attraction by bike path gives the

riders that exposure. We see good in diverting people from where they don't belong. This benefits private landowners and federal lands.

**C:** Also happening with equestrian and hiking – the more biking trails, the more pressure on other areas and the resource damage associated with it. This opportunity keeps forest ecology intact. We need to look at sustainability and long-term potential. Mike Ripley recused himself from voting.

**C:** Comment on native plant proposal, where we allocated \$5,000. How do we make up the rest?

**C:** The full \$123,000 can be allocated to Benton County. The remaining \$30,000 can be distributed elsewhere.

*Motion to fully fund Sheriff Patrol and Youth, minimally fund Alsea trails, MP pavement project, 0 for Native Plant. This leaves \$315 to allocate later. Approved by all present, except for Mike Ripley, who has abstained from this vote for involvement with Team Dirt.*

**C:** I am not in favor with entirely funding a county road project. We have a heritage seed problem in the United States. We need to keep the biology of the land in mind. I would like to see that funded at some level.

**C:** We have already funded at the minimum yesterday, the question is whether we fund it now or wait and see if it fits with the remaining \$30,000.

**C:** Additional bike presence in the forest is helpful from a law enforcement perspective.

## **Columbia County Title II Proposals**

### **Native and Invasive Plant Program**

They started mostly as an invasive weed control program. They have evolved into a comprehensive native plant and invasive plant restoration program. They develop native plants for restoration projects and treatment of invasive weeds as their replacement. RAC funding has provided critical match funds. They spray annually for knotweed and garlic mustard, and have been finding success, expecting no need to spray next year. They also support students with technical education programs. The next step to expansion is to hire a greenhouse manager.

**Q:** You're one of three nursery presentations in the same county – As you have presented today, I'd like all of you to give us some thoughts about how this could go. You're all linked by watershed council and other things, but I worry that I'm only hearing one piece of the pie.

**A:** I am open to broader discussions and would like to see it be a county-wide effort.

**Q:** How much of the funding would go to support the greenhouse manager?

**A:** Approximately 1/3 of the total request.

**Q:** If it were scaled down, would it be scaled down proportionally?

**A:** Probably.

**Q:** It seems like there's a great opportunity for schools to learn and take management of this as opposed to hiring a manager. Management should be pushed back to the schools and have the business aspect pushed back to their curriculum.

**A:** We agree that it could be valuable, but we're running into teachers with very limited time. As such, there are holes in what can be accomplished. Students can still be involved, but if we could replace teachers with a manager to oversee the business, then teachers could refocus efforts on more hands-on portions (like seed propagation) and have a more continuous flow of product and more time for students to spend out in the field.

**C:** I'm concerned about sustainability and funding an employee without commitment for future funds. I would suggest where Measure 98 could have real potential as an alternative.

### **Columbia River Youth Corps**

They are an alternative high school with a mission to empower students. They have existed for 21 years and have graduated over 200 students. They currently have two staff: the current presenter and one teacher. They can accommodate up to 18 students, ranging in age from 16-19. Students are referred by high school teachers and other students. Program is split into two crews – one in field, one in classroom, alternating each week. Curriculum varies to meet the needs of the students. They have a partnership with OYCC for college scholarship and are working on dual credit with PCC. They operate under a fee-for-service model. Their goal is to create a full circle and be independent – collect seed, sow, plant/grow, and sell product back to local sponsors, and hire the kids to go plant it. They are currently growing 39 local species.

**Q:** Can you name a few species you grow and their significance?

**A:** We've been focusing on riparian species, dogwood, Oregon ash, willow, redcedar, etc. We're expanding more into forest plants, including salmonberry, bunchberry, roses. Our growing is based on sponsor's wants.

**Q:** Who is your largest purchaser?

**A:** Currently, we're growing plants, but not selling. What's in the nursery belongs to Upper Nehalem, SWCD.

**Q:** There's no revenue yet?

**A:** Not yet. They're taking the plants being grown.

**Q:** Are any of the funds requested expended for salaries?

**A:** Yes. Students work for credit. This keeps me and the teacher afloat.

### **SBWC Native Plant Nursery**

The nursery is located behind Scappoose High School. The group works in multiple areas, but they work more in the southern part of the county and Sauvie Island. They began as a satellite nursery in the late 2000s. They are largely self-sustaining through public sales and they recently expanded plant variety with emphasis on local propagation. The goal is to expand the nursery for



restoration in the Scappoose Bay Watershed. The group also hosts workshops for community education.

**Q:** How do you typically propagate? Seed or cutting?

**A:** Both. We do start a lot from seed. Both using in-house and field collection and transplanting as they go. We also grow from cuttings.

**Q:** Where do volunteers come from? The high school?

**A:** It depends on teacher support. Special needs kids have adopted the nursery and have their own small garden plot.

### **Vernonia Schools' Nehalem Native Nursery**

They are located at the new Vernonia School campus that was built after the 2007 floods. The proposed project is an extension of what's currently in place. The nursery has been around for 2.5 years, but has only been fully operational since Summer 2016. Success has been largely due to the number of partnerships. Requested funds would be for the next three school years to assure continued development of the Nehalem Native Nursery. They involve students in every level of nursery operation, from seed collection to monitoring.

**Q:** About the map – what's the impact of the projects on BLM lands?

**A:** Plants have been used for restoration efforts in the county.

**Q:** Have you gotten out of the floodplain?

**A:** Yes. The school site is now poised to help the community.

### **RAC Discussion and Recommended Allocation of Title II Funds for Columbia County Proposals**

**Q:** Did Columbia County commissioners have any input on projects?

**A:** We did not get any feedback.

**BLM:** Reminder that Youth of Tillamook County is also in Yamhill, Multnomah, and Washington counties.

#### **Funding Status:**

Available: \$54,588

Minimum requests: \$91,700

Full request: \$146,871

**S:** According to the spreadsheet, the number one priority is the Columbia River Youth Corp. It's the only #1 in ranking by BLM.

**S:** Columbia is most susceptible to lack of funding. My general feeling is that it's a higher priority. It serves kids and many other projects and programs.

**S:** We're not in a position to take on any new programs. We have not supported the Scappoose Bay previously. They had grant funding in the past. We have support River Youth Corp and supported heavily Vernonia Schools. I was impressed with their program last year and their breadth of partnerships. They have demonstrated use of the funds given last year. I would support the Vernonia Proposal.

**Q:** Conversely, I have a question about the Nestucca Valley – are they getting money from the Coastal RAC? Are the kids to benefit all from Tillamook County?

**A:** The Coastal RAC has not solicited applications yet. Correct. The program services Tillamook students, but the students work in several counties.

**Q:** There's support for Vernonia and River Youth Corps – what about the other projects?

**A:** Multnomah has two projects and \$17,000. There are 7 projects in Yamhill, and 3 in Washington County.

**Q:** Youth of Tillamook County – is that supposed to be \$10,000?

**A:** This is the first time coming up for review, so the full amount asked for is listed. There's a like number for the other counties.

**S:** All counties from here on out have more requests than money available.

**S:** SBWC was the lowest on BLM's priority. They have more partners than others.

*Motion: Minimum amount to Native/Invasive and Vernonia, Full amount to River Youth Corps, nothing to SBWC or Multi-County Tillamook Youth (total exceeds available amount at \$67,660) – Motion withdrawn (see discussion below)*

Reminder that we still have about \$29,000 that can be allocated later. The other option is to allocate to what's available and come back later and add more.

**Q:** Other counties are also underfunded. Could the Youth Corps be minimally funded to get it closer to what's available?

**A:** So many others rely on that group; I want to keep that infrastructure strong.

**BLM:** Reminder that the spreadsheet indicates the BLM's priority rankings for each project by county. The Tillamook Youth program is ranked differently by county.

*Amend motion to reduce the River Youth Corp to the minimum? Thumbs vote. Affirmed.*

Motion withdrawn.

**Q:** Can we fund below the amount requested?

**A:** The RAC will ask the applicant; they usually say yes.

*Motion for minimal fund of Native/Invasive, fully fund Youth Corp, fund Vernonia at \$14,928. The intent is to not overfund a category, while reflecting our priorities,*

*understanding we can come back later with surplus funds. – Motion approved by all but Dunden.*

**Q:** What's the reason for the "no"?

**A:** I'm particularly impressed with the Vernonia proposal and what they did with the funding last year.

## **Lunch Break**

### **Marion and Multnomah County Title II Proposals**

#### **Marion- North Fork Park and Parking Improvements**

This proposal ties into a corridor-wide improvement plan for public safety at county recreation sites. Specifically, it includes improving existing parking area at the North fork park. Parking area does not handle demand of recreation users currently. The proposal is to minimally expand parking area footprint and provide organization and structure of parking spaces and flow of traffic for personal and emergency vehicles. The County operates the park under BLM R&PP lease. It consists of BLM and County lands.

Marion County Sheriff: Working with public works on issues within the North Fork corridor. Working with recreationists and locals in the area to find a balance for use in the corridor. Currently, park visitors park in no organization, and then utilize the park with no structure (i.e. do not use trail system, they just go wherever they want). Organization of the park will help with structuring the use by identifying trails for use.

**Q:** Is the intention to pave the parking lot?

**A:** No, it will remain gravel.

**Q:** There is a total of 25 parking spaces currently, what happens when those are full?

**A:** The county is improving locations along the roadway for overflow parking. In addition, they're working on corridor-wide plan to manage traffic. The plan includes informational signing and information for parking available at the beginning and along the corridor.

**Q:** \$124,000 worth of requests, \$41,000 to allocate: what projects have priority for the county?

**A:** The competing project is a law enforcement contract. Law enforcement is backing the parking improvement project and supports the project fully.

**Q:** The past several years, RACs have provided a lot of dollars for parking to the county. The plan is great, but who is going to pay for it? What is the connection between staff and the legislation that provides for this RAC applies to the recreation site?

**A:** It's a complex mix between public lands and county lands. Part of the corridor-wide approach is to provide signage and parking to utilize public lands through county lands. We're trying to use ROW to benefit all land status.

**Q:** Why this location in the corridor first?

**A:** Parking area was selected because of river access. Opal creek example: improvements at the Opal Creek site set the tone for the corridor and recreation use. We're collaborating with USFS and BLM to manage public use in the corridor, like the project in Opal Creek. Want to use Opal Creek as an analog.

**Q:** Did RAC fund parking area project last time?

**A:** Yes, only \$4,800. Small improvements were made, but not the full parking area.

**Q:** Will the full funding request complete this project?

**A:** Yes.

**Q:** What if only the minimum amount is allocated?

**A:** If county receives minimum, it would cover material cost and the county will complete the project with Marion county force for labor. \$24,200 is minimum request.

**Q:** How many additional spaces will be added?

**A:** It will have 50 spots after improvements. It can fit right now 28, so the project would roughly double capacity.

**Q:** What's the total cost of the project?

**A:** \$58,000, including contributions from the county.

### **Marion-Sinker Flats**

This is a BLM-proposed fish habitat restoration project. The project location is one of the only floodplain locations along the river. It includes a mix of private and public lands.

**Q:** What is to prevent a high water event from destroying the restoration project?

**A:** The area is very broad flow, so the water is not constrained in a small channel. The floodplain area is so broad, when the water rises it will flow on to the floodplain and not destroy the structure. Typically, we will not see any water deeper than two to three feet more than current height at the project site. The structure will be set to send pressure from water flow to the bank. It's a low risk project location.

**Q:** Do you forecast any shift in the streambed in the project?

**A:** There is a history of change; the river right now is set in where it is flowing. We would like to use this as an example for building projects on private land down stream

**Q:** Will the root wads be utilized from the tree that will be harvested?

**A:** Yes, the root wad is critical to the design of the project. They are good for fish habitat.

**Q:** Is this project specifically on BLM land exclusively. Three other projects, this one the lowest priority, why should the RAC fund?

**A:** Yes, they're all on BLM land. The project is prioritized as low, but there is a need and opportunity to utilize the floodplain for restoration, especially listed species which are having a difficult time in the little north fork right now. Marion county funds were limited, so that is why the project was lowest priority. There is also a possibility of funds from other BLM sources.

**Q:** The full funding is \$30,000, what can be done with minimum?

**A:** We could complete the project with the \$15,000 if an additional \$10,000 can be found with other funding sources. If we only got \$15,000, we will still need another ten elsewhere. BLM can look for other funding sources, but would need to balance this project with all district wide projects. \$15,000 will get us started, and then can look for other funds later.

**Q:** With river movement across floodplain, there are concerns about mucking with what nature is doing at this site. Understands pieces, but I'm concerned about river movement. Are we at risk of slowing the water that would stop river movement? What is the stability of the project with the current river movement? Will this be a lasting improvement to the river?

**A:** The site location has not changed as dramatically as the rest of the river. The site location has been monitored through aerial photography. The project will last for 10-20 years until the wood supply in the river corridor can be generated naturally. The river moved because of the logging in the area in the 1950s. Over a long term, the forest needs to reestablish. The project would help with the restoration of long term processes.

### **RAC Discussion and Recommended Allocation of Title II Funds for Marion and Multnomah Counties**

4 projects total: NW Youth Force, law enforcement contracts, Sinker Flats, North Fork

Minimum amount: \$66,272

Maximum amount: \$124,800

**Suggestions:** I do not think Sinker Flats is a priority use due to river movement. Law enforcement is always prevalent in the area; the local community will demand law enforcement. The parking area is a priority for the commissioners. BLM lands will benefit from parking and law enforcement projects. The RAC provided \$4,800 toward parking area already. Very little has been done for habitat restoration so far from the RAC. It's important for benefit to the species in the area.

*Motion proposed: Put \$15,000 to Sinker Flats. Youth employment gets \$10,700. Remainder of money to the parking lot improvements (\$16,236) and not fund the Marion county law enforcement contract. There was a second for the motion. No quorum was made for the motion. (suggestions: Same proposal but switched the parking lot amount to the law enforcement contract. People did not want Sinker Flats project)*

*Motion proposed: Fund parking lot to minimum, \$10,700 for youth, and remainder to sinker flats project, \$7,036. Second for the motion.*

**Q:** What can be done with the \$7,036 for the Sinker Flats project?

**A:** BLM can look for other funding, even if \$0 was allocated. BLM would put on the unfunded needs list for the fiscal year. Balance from the \$7,036 would go on the unfunded needs list. \$7,000 could be better spent on another project. Schmidt did not see the benefit in funding the project for \$7,000.

*Motion Amendment proposal: Sinker Flats to \$0, spread \$7,036 between Youth Corp and park. \$0 on Sinker Flats, \$27,718 for park, \$14,218 for Youth Corp, \$0 for Law Enforcement contract.*

*Maker of the motion agrees to amendment. Substitute motion. Call for vote: Passes with majority in each of the categories.*

## **Multnomah and Washington - Upper McKay Watershed Forest Restoration**

**Q:** Clarifying-two separate proposals, one for Multnomah and one for Washington. If one was funded and the other wasn't, how would that affect proposals?

**A:** They could go forward without the other, but it would be limited. We could still use the funds regardless, we just couldn't achieve as much. The minimum requested is \$7,500.

**Q:** This proposal different is from others, not earmarking money to go to a specific task in the overall group of tasks. If the project is funded, how could the monies be evaluated to know the money went to good use without a specific project?

**A:** Listing projects in application, but no specifics. We asked for monies to help with help in general. We do not have projects prioritized, but landowners have shown a want to fix.

**Q:** Are all projects completed on private land?

**A:** Yes.

Tabled the decision on this project so the RAC can determine how the other projects within the counties are balanced.

Decision: 2 projects, Multicounty project for Youth of Tillamook City, Upper McKay Watershed Forest Restoration. \$17,450 total to allocate, request for \$58,449 total. \$41,000 for four counties for the youth program, looking for a minimum of \$20,000 from all four counties.

*Motion: Fund youth program for full amount allocated to Multnomah of \$17,450. Motion seconded. \$0 allocated for Upper McKay.*

Suggestion: would like to see the minimum \$7,500 go to McKay for Multnomah. There are two counties, so there is an opportunity to fund under Washington County. Recommend at least getting the amount from one county since the other counties have projects that need to be allocated as well. Motion denied.

*Motion: Fund McKay at \$7,500, and fund youth program \$9,950. Motion seconded. Call for vote: Passes with majority of the group.*

## **Polk County Title II Proposals**

### **Polk- Dump Stoppers and Noxious Weeds Projects**

Last year they received less than usual from the RAC. Since last year, the Dump Stopper efforts have increased due to phone calls from citizen in the county to take care or dump sites. The Dump Stopper program is well known throughout county. Each year there are more and more sites discovered. Since last year, they completed 5,200 miles of patrol, collected 43,000 pounds of garbage, 123 tires, and used 2,000 man hours. For noxious weeds in the last year: 2,500 man hours, cleared 169 sections, and 4,800 miles of road.

**Q:** How much BLM land is there in Polk County?

**A:** Approximately 16,000 acres, mostly in Coast Range. Most of Dump Stoppers is in the Coast Range, but used everywhere throughout the county.

**Q:** Any indication on whether or not the amount of dumping goes up or down based on funding?

**A:** Polk County has worked to inform the residents of no dumping.

**Q:** The proposal doesn't indicate a minimum amount: is that by design?

**A:** Noxious weeds was listed as highest priority, then Dump Stoppers. They are asking for all or nothing for the funding.

### **Polk-Gooseneck Fish Passage Restoration**

Coordinated project with Polk County public works, BLM, and watershed council. The group is requesting \$25,000, but will still need to contribute approximately \$70,000 to complete the project.

**Q:** What will the culvert be replaced with?

**A:** BLM has completed initial designs. It will be a larger sized culvert that will handle larger water capacity with stream simulated bottom.

### **Polk-S. Fork Pedee Survey and Design**

This is regarding an undersized culvert that failed in 2012. It had improper slope replacement. The project is to replace the culvert to restore fish habitat. It affects BLM and private land, but it's a private owner of the culvert. They asked for partnership due to the multiple use of the culvert for timber haul. They're looking for information first with this proposal, then they will work with partners to decide and implement the project.

No questions.

### **Polk and Yamhill- Rapid Bio Assessment Phase 1**

They received \$8,000 from the RAC after last session of review. They are applying for additional funds from this round of review, a total of \$40,000 across two counties.

**Q:** Has the \$8,000 been spent?

**A:** Not yet. We're trying to accumulate funding from RAC and other sources.

**Q:** Fish barrier projects have been funded in the past; has there been any of that work completed in this watershed?

**A:** Yes, there are projects being completed within the watersheds proposed. The proposed RBA would also show fish barriers in the basins.

**Q:** Is there a deadline on expending funds?

**A:** Yes, for \$8,000, there is a 5 year period of when the monies can be spent. It would take 3 years to accumulate funds before use.

**Q:** Could the project still be completed with only half of the funding?

**A:** Yes. We would need to make cuts and prioritize locations to fit the amount of funding that was generated.

### **RAC Discussion and Recommended Allocation of Title II Funds for Polk County**

Decision: There were 5 proposals (noxious weeds, Dump Stoppers, Gooseneck, Pedee, RBA). There is \$67,340 to be allocated, but \$128,094 has been requested. BLM's preference is Dump Stoppers, fish passage, noxious weeds. The County supports funding the Gooseneck project at minimum and fully fund weeds. The group sees value in all projects.

**Q:** What does \$10,000 on Gooseneck project get?

**A:** At \$10,000 they could get the culvert in. Ongoing fundraising is being done for additional dollars.

Suggestion: Gooseneck \$10,000, fully fund weeds \$27,640, remainder to Dump Stoppers \$29,700. The weed project does not have any partners, so they could look harder to get funding and work partners. The weed project is very important; it's the only program on public access roads for controlling weeds. Weeds and dumps are there year round; if there is no clean-up/control, they both spread fast. Bio assessment needs to get done anywhere we have the opportunity to do it.

Suggestion: Dump Stoppers is not a priority, so recommend Pedee be fully funded at \$14,454 and reduce Dump Stoppers by \$14,454. I'd rather see an engineering study completed on the culvert than sit in RBA. There are other funding options for the RBA. There are significant partners for the Pedee project, plus there is a significant amount of timber that could be removed in the future. Clarification: they did not use funds last year and banked money so they could do as many miles as possible at once.

*Motion proposed: fund Dump Stoppers \$23,700, weeds fully \$27,640, Gooseneck at \$10,000, and RBA at \$6,000. Motion seconded. Call for vote: Passes with majority of the category members.*

**BLM:** Reminder of reimbursements for travel, motel etc. Blue envelopes available for receipts.

## **Washington and Yamhill County Title II Proposals**

### **Yamhill-Nelson's Checkermallow Restoration at Walker Flat**

T & Endangered species (State & Federally listed) - <1% habitat; perennial forb to wet prairies in Willamette Valley & SW Washington. It's a nectar species for the listed Fender's blue butterfly. Coast range focus- up to Washington state and stops in Lane county. Recovery goals – minimum number of populations as well as minimum number of individuals especially in Yamhill County. Meadow habitat is rarest habitat in the coast range. The largest population of checkermallow population 4,359 individuals, and the next largest is on private land 2,000+ individuals. There's no legal protection on private land. There's a current need to strengthen relationship with McMinnville city and improve habitat so that population meets.



**Q:** Are the butterflies migratory that feed on the nectar.

**A:** They are year-round fliers.

**Q:** Are the butterflies threatened and endangered?

**A:** It's endangered; they are looking to downgrade them next year so endangered only.

**Q:** This is a relatively small request, can you take smaller amounts?

**A:** They will work with whatever amount is given.

**Q:** Any kind of minimum required to sustain their populations?

**A:** That's a good question; I'm not sure.

### **Yamhill-Trask Paired Watershed Study**

2016-2018 publication-The project has run out of money to put together the publication. The original study revolved around the Forest Practices Act. It started in 2006; Watershed studies in western OR in the Trask River Watershed and the Alsea Watershed. Manage the harvest unit scale with the Trask/Alsea Watershed.

**Q:** The study been going on for 10 years, and there is a lot of data. Is the request to take some data and create a conclusion?

**A:** Yes, finish the research to make conclusions. We need additional funding to finish up.

**Q:** Budget-applying to coastal RAC and Northwest RAC. Asking for \$52,000 from both RACs or splitting?

**A:** Asking Northwest RAC for \$17,325, we are going to the Coastal RAC for \$35,000. This is based on footprint of area in relation to footprint of RACs.

**C:** Three studies that have enormous influence on public policy for land management. Very important work to be completed.

### **Washington and Yamhill-Northwest Oregon Restoration Partnership**

The program started in 2003. The program consists of seed collection of native plants in coast range and in the valley. They started working in upland areas recently. They will also use past funding from the RAC for other projects. There are two proposals: one out of Washington County, and one out of Yamhill. They are separate, not additive.

No questions.

### **RAC Discussion and Recommended Allocation of Title II Funds for Washington County**

There are three projects: Northwest Oregon Restoration Partnership, Upper McKay watershed forest restoration, youth of Tillamook City.

*Motion proposed: fund partnership at \$5,000, McKay at \$10,000, and youth program at \$4,906.*

*Motion seconded. Call for vote: Passes with majority of the group members.*

## **RAC Discussion and Recommended Allocation of Title II Funds for Yamhill County**

Decision: There are eight projects, checkermallow restoration, law enforcement, northwest Oregon restoration partnership, Yamhill RBA phase 1, Willamette valley native plant materials, Yamhill trask, Youth of Tillamook City. Checkermallow edited for a minimum of \$5,000.

Suggestion: The Trask is very critical project. They are also going to the Coastal RAC, so the \$17,325 is for the Northwest RAC is based on geographic area.

Suggestion: Fund Trask at \$10,000, Checkermallow at \$5,000, law enforcement at \$13,200, partnership at \$5,000, RBA at \$6,000, Willamette Valley at \$0, and youth program at \$5,144. This would total \$44,344, so would need to find the overage.

*Motion proposed: \$4,239 checker, law enforcement \$13,200, RBA \$0, Trask \$17,325, youth program \$0. Motion seconded. Call for vote: Passes with majority of the group members.*

### **Miscellaneous**

\$27,600 left over. We need to revisit the motion on Benton County. The available budget is \$123,012, but remaining balance of \$315. Added \$315 to Willamette Valley plant material. Project only funded in Lane County, for \$34,769.

*Motion proposed: add \$315 from Benton county budget to the Willamette Valley plant material project. Also want to add to fund at the full amount, which would be an additional \$5,500. Motion seconded. Call for vote: Passes with majority of the group members.*

**C:** There's approximately \$27,000 left to allocate. I suggest looking at high priority projects to spread money to rather than picking. The decision yesterday was to put additional money to Willamette valley.

For Clackamas County, there's currently \$8,585 available. Previous years left over is \$19,288.

Tillamook youth program requested \$14,856, or \$5,144 would fund to minimum. No funding for Marion County law enforcement, minimum was \$14,575. Pedee survey \$14,454 to fund.

Yamhill RBA for minimum amount of \$6,000.

**Q:** Does BLM have separate contract for Marion County Law Enforcement?

**BLM:** BLM has contracts with the county. If it was not funded could be added to the unfunded needs list for BLM.

*Motion proposed by group: fund smaller amounts (Willamette Valley \$5,500, Youth program \$5,144, Yamhill RBA at \$6,000) remove Marion law enforcement and keep funding at \$0, fund Pedee to \$11,229. Motion seconded.*

*Motion Amended: fully fund Pedee at \$14,454 from the Willamette valley (difference of \$3,225) since it has already met the minimum and leave the others as above. Fund Willamette valley at \$2,154. Amendment accepted. Call for vote: Passes with majority of the group members.*

**Q:** Is RAC still meeting on the 10/20? Yes.

**BLM:** The meeting on the 20<sup>th</sup> will cover the traditional resource advisory role. Four topics will be discussed: Recreation fee proposals and the Wildwood Recreation Site proposal, RAC field trip ideas, RMP discussion, and an open forum if the RAC is interested. Annabelle requested the open forum to discuss topics from the group, especially the county priorities for projects. It is not expected to be a full day meeting; we expect to be done around 3pm. You need to have a quorum at this meeting as well to be able to make recommendations.

**Q:** Is there a conclusion wanted for the recreation fee?

**BLM:** It is an ongoing process, so no decision right now, just a briefing. We will present comparative fees and business plan.

**Q:** Will there need to be input from stakeholders at this time?

**BLM:** Not for this meeting, but there will be a lot of information to bring back to stakeholders.

## Resource Advisory Committee

October 20, 2016

### Agenda

BLM Northwest Oregon District – Salem Office

Room- Lower Level Conference Room

- |                    |   |
|--------------------|---|
| <b>8:30-9:00</b>   | <b>Meet and Greet, Conversations</b>  |
| <b>9:00-9:15</b>   | <b>Introduction and Review Agenda</b><br>av David Howell- BLM Designated Federal Official<br>Annabelle Jaramillo – Northwest Oregon RAC Chairperson   |
| <b>9:15-10:00</b>  | <b>Recreation Fee Proposal Status and Process</b><br>Jeff McCusker – Supv Outdoor Recreation Planner, Northwest Oregon District                       |
| <b>10:00-10:30</b> | <b>RAC Subcommittee Assistance with BLM’s Wildwood Rec Site Proposal</b><br>Jeff McCusker– Supv Outdoor Recreation Planner, Northwest Oregon District |
| <b>10:30-11:00</b> | <b>Break</b>  |
| <b>11:00-11:30</b> | <b>RAC Field Trip Ideas and Discussion</b><br>Paul Tigan- Marys Peak Field Manager, Northwest Oregon District   |
| <b>11:30-12:30</b> | <b>Lunch</b>  |
| <b>12:30-1:00</b>  | <b>Public Comment Period</b>  |
| <b>1:00-2:30</b>   | <b>RMP update and discussion</b><br>Carolyn Sands– NEPA Planner, Northwest Oregon District  |
| <b>2:30-3:30</b>   | <b>Open Forum</b><br>Annabelle Jaramillo- Northwest Oregon RAC Chairperson  |
| <b>3:00-3:30</b>   | <b>Break</b>  |
| <b>3:30 – 5:00</b> | <b>Open</b>   |

**Members Present:** Jim Dundon, Debbie Porter, Ron Price, Peter Giordano, Will Tucker, Annabelle Jaramillo, Jerry B, Lon Otterby, John Omlin.

**Members Absent:** David Schmidt, Mike Ripley, Jeremiah Price, John Atkins, Glen Crinklaw, Craig Pope.

We have a quorum issue; we don't have two members in Category 1. We can proceed with discussion and come up with some ideas that we forward to full RAC participation. To make decisions, we need a full quorum in each category. It's less critical today than last week. Today is more informational. We have one item from recreation where we do want at least a sensing of the group, but we won't be asking for any recommendations in this meeting.

**Others Present:** Jen Velez (RAC Coordinator), Mike Mathews (Program Lead), Dave Howell (DFO, Acting DM for the Northwest Oregon District), Traci Meredith (Outdoor Recreation Planner), Mike Korn (Field Manager), Jeff McCusker (Supervisory Outdoor Recreation Specialist), Paul Tigan (Field Manager), Stefanie Larew (notetaker)

### **Recreation Fee Proposal Status and Process – Jeff**

The purpose of this discussion is to show the RAC where we are in the process, to get the group teed up for the next meeting where we can get a recommendation for the fee proposals.

We're being cautious to ensure we're doing good outreach. We could use the help of the RAC in outreach. We started officially August 11, 2016, and this included draft business plans. A big part is to look at the market; there are a lot of options in this area. The law says we're supposed to be right in the middle with fees: don't overcharge and don't undercut. We've looked a lot at what others (private, state, etc.) have been doing.

Getting people engaged and keeping them focused for the duration can be a struggle. We've brought it up at public meetings and put the draft business plans on the website. The BLM has received five comments thus far, and they aren't all relevant to BLM fees, which indicates there's confusion out there.

We have 13 draft business plans, which is high. One per year is more common. There's been a backlog and that's in part because we haven't had a RAC that could consider recreation fees. Without the RAC, the process stops in its tracks. Some sites in Eugene haven't seen price increases in 20 years. We're just proposing to keep up with the market; we're not trying to recover lost profit. The law tells us to keep up with the market.

By the first meeting next year (perhaps March), we hope to show our first set of proposals. A key site is the Molalla. We have two campgrounds in the Molalla corridor: Three Bears and Cedar Grove. They were built a few years ago and we haven't been able to charge fees. We have just been taking donations, which hasn't been very successful. In the Willamette Valley we've had an influx of transient/homeless who have moved into recreation sites (BLM, federal, state), and we're not quite sure of the reason. For the Molalla campground, it's been really degraded this summer. We try to keep people in their campsite (preserve the footprint, not create trails, and trample vegetation). Efforts to sell firewood haven't been successful, because many campers

can't pay. We didn't have a full time presence at the site. The volunteer host left mid-summer and left BLM to monitor. Without a fee in place, people are going for the 14 day limit until the BLM moves them away.

**Q:** Do they have to move after 14 days within the BLM system and not go to another BLM park? In the county, they hop between county sites, but never leave the county system.

**BLM:** Rules are set across OR/WA and require people to move 25 air miles from where they spent the 14 days. It's easy to track in eastern Oregon, but can be more difficult in western Oregon. Whenever we do a shift, we document who is staying where. We try to stay on top of whether they've moved far enough.

**Q:** What do you use to track it? Paper? Reservation system?

**BLM:** We started doing shift reports digitally. Staff will enter information into a Word document and then e-mail it to other staff. We would like to go to a shared drive that can be accessed by staff remotely, but we don't have the technology yet for the staff. Many of the sites aren't on the reservation system, but we're looking at moving that way. It would make it easier to manage and track that.

**BLM:** We can't put Molalla on the reservation system until we're on the fee schedule. We're hoping that the RAC will have a feel from the communities about the proposals by the March meeting. We will be presenting proposals for recommendations at the next meeting (tentatively March).

**Q:** The fee system works well at Shotgun Park. To collect the fees, you have to have a campground host. Is that a wash?

**A:** We have a great host at Shotgun Park. However, it's not the case with all sites. Hours can be random and the public can't always expect a reliable experience. We rely on the good will of volunteers and it doesn't always pan out. We want to keep our sites open as often as possible.

**Q:** Is the proposal for camping or OHV use? These appear to be the two big, distinct areas. Are we going to see a proposal for fees in the OHV areas that currently don't have fees?

**A:** The drafts we put out (currently online) do include a fee for the developed trailheads. We have to be careful to not preclude access to OHV areas through the levying of fees. Other areas have gotten in trouble for doing so. The trailhead itself (Shotgun, example), can have fees charged. We're looking at getting public input on this. We provide patrol, bathrooms, and trash services. Those we're allowed to charge fees for.

**Q:** So, if I don't want to pay, I can park along the road?

**A:** At Shotgun, we'll have to look into it. We don't want people parking in an unsafe place.

**C:** There's perhaps a presumption on the part of federal agencies that it's easy to find information (information that constitutes legal public notice). As an avid recreationist, I've never heard of this. There's no way to subscribe, I can't get a notification. The lack of input could be because that no one knows about it.

**BLM:** This is a good point that we struggle with: how do we reach the public that will really care about this? Maybe we can explore this more later: what's the best way we can reach folks out there? We don't want a dearth of information.

**C:** Tonight I can reach 318 people and give them links to your business plans. From there, it can be forwarded to another 1,000 people.

**BLM:** So, a better use of social media?

**C:** Yes, it's huge.

**BLM:** Regarding the discussion on sharing links. BLM websites are changing at the national level. We will no longer have district-specific websites. The go-live date is tomorrow (Friday, 10/21). The information we have out currently won't be available in the same place it is today. It's a big change. We'll send out the current links, but don't be surprised if it changes. However, how and where to submit comments won't change.

**C:** I sell these permits at my store. The national forest permit is extremely popular. A person can pay once a year and it covers all the sites. It's much easier than the other, specific permits (e.g., county parks). I'd recommend one permit that's broader. If not cross-agency, at least one fee for all uses within BLM.

**BLM:** That is within the proposal. It will give even more value, because it'll include Eugene and Salem, now that we're in one district.

**C:** There's a lot of confusion with the public, and even among the LEOs, about statutes on a given road. I appreciate trying to improve clarity and consistency.

**BLM:** To change our rules, we have to go through the Federal Register, which is a rigorous process.

**Q:** About the FR process: The staff does a bunch of work, recommendations are made, BLM sends to west coast, then it goes to the Washington Office for them to change, and then it goes to the RAC?

**BLM:** They're not changing it; they just want to make sure we are following the law.

**Q:** So, if we change a dollar amount, does it have to go back through the Washington Office process?

**BLM:** If RAC changes the schedule at the local level, no, we don't have to go back. Once the recommendation is made, it's very onerous for the BLM to override it. It's higher than the State Director.

**Q:** Is there a possibility to talk about concessionaires? Should counties be talking about BLM taking over? It would be nice to have one pass. What about analysis to show the threshold for having season or full-time presence (e.g., number of sites/nights). Full-time presence is much more effective than part-time or seasonal.

**BLM:** We tried to make something happen with Linn County (Quartzville), a three way position with the Forest Service, but it didn't work out.

**BLM:** I have worked other places where fee programs have been shared (10 boat launch sites). It has to be contained and well-organized; they share the fees that come in. One of the benefits is that we've committed to the fees collected staying where they're collected.

**Q:** Help me understand fee charging not precluding “pay to play.” We’re creating and building systems...there’s the concept that I can just park down the road, use the fee system, and not pay. I’m not against “pay to play” if we’ve done something (an investment or restoration) that requires we recover or manage with ongoing fees. We have to invest money to protect and to create a better experience; we should be able to charge fees.

**BLM:** I was quoting from a national group against fees. The law doesn’t address making a recreation site completely fee-based. The law is based on what we provide there: amenities. It’s a political consideration.

**C:** If you charge a fee to use that trail, you potentially lose access to some other funds.

**Q:** Fee proposal for Shotgun: for day-use or trail system?

**BLM:** We’re calling it a “staging area”, not a parking lot or trailhead. The fee proposal would be for the staging area, not the trails. We want to attract people into our staging areas and make them better. We’re trying to use the fee to “up our game” and provide better amenities.

**Q:** Is there a mechanism to post proposed fees? A large sign?

**BLM:** It’s a standard piece of paper, but it can be done bigger.

**C:** It would be helpful to explain what the fees go to.

**C:** Most people don’t know that fees stay within the site in which they’re collected (Alsea Falls trip as example). There’s a perception that it goes elsewhere (like overhead, a general pot, DC). The BLM should emphasize that fees stay within the site. Most people don’t object to paying for what they use.

**C:** Agree. This needs to be started more prominently.

**BLM:** When we advertise that, we get compliance above 90 percent.

**C:** Regarding compliance, I don’t know how you’ll enforce the issues with fees and homeless populations with so few rangers. There ought to be a surcharge built into fees to go to LEO. BLM needs to increase the LEO component on public lands. There’s no way to stay on top of the issues unless you do. It should be across the board.

**BLM:** We need to see what the law allows.

**C:** It’s a real challenge, especially if you have transient populations lingering in the parks as we go into the winter.

**C:** Federal agencies aren’t great with marketing. I’m close to Shotgun Creek. You need to engage the local groups (2 wheel, 4 wheel) for ownership of that OHV area. Example: If you see an unauthorized trail, you should post a sign about what the restoration costs would be.



**BLM:** We have a trail lead. He's been recently introduced to the Shotgun area. He's an avid recreationist and he's ridden the Shotgun area. We're going to start a whole new plan for Shotgun Creek.

**Q:** Alsea is a great place. They have great teams who shoulder the most of the work. Is there anything in the plan to consider a gift pass for volunteer work?

**BLM:** Team Dirt brought that up. We think it's a wonderful idea. If you look at the business plan for the district-wide annual pass (\$30), you can earn that pass with 12 hours of volunteer work. The mountain bikers will earn that quickly. We aren't supposed to talk exact prices right now.

### **Wildwood**

Wildwood is one of the oldest, most established sites in the District and in the Mount Hood corridor. It's about 500 acres and has parking for 200. It's along the Salmon River and has a lot of infrastructure, including sewer systems, power, and group shelters with kitchens. It's a very accessible site with paved trails. The site has a unique, wheelchair accessible experience to look at spawning bed in the river. Unfortunately, use has been declining, and we're not sure why. There's parking for 200.

The site was originally developed with overnight use in mind. We get several comments about turning the site into a campground. We started the planning process last summer with scoping and came up with an idea for camping. We aren't proposing to turn it to campground, but to add camping to one part of it. About 3 acres of new disturbance could be dedicated to overnight use. Some public up there objected; they have a deep connection with the community. There aren't many public places for people to take an easy, accessible walk. (Courts, ball fields, accessible trails.)

The message got out that the BLM was going to turn it into a campground. The social media presence took over. We had a fairly contentious public meeting with about 80 attendants. We took people on tours and showed them what we're proposing, but we don't know that it's helped. We'd like help from the RAC in outreach and connecting with the public up there. We started with a 30 day public comment period and extended it to 90 days. Thus far, we have about 50-60 written comments. We want to connect more with local business. It's why camping was proposed about 15 years ago. Other campgrounds didn't want the competition back then, but now that places are often filled to capacity, competition isn't an issue:

**Q:** How many campsites are you proposing? BLM should share the message about how fees are necessary to upkeep the site.

**A:** We've tried to discuss costs and fees at public meetings. We aren't proposing to increase the day use fees. We agree we need that message out there more. The full proposal is about 40-42 campsites. It's a mixture of RV sites, yurt sites, elevated (tree canopy experience), and tent sites.

**Q:** Is the objection because they don't want people camping there?

**A:** Yes. That's a large part of it.

**C:** Desired recreation experiences vary by demographic. Families today often travel in vehicles other than RVs. They're looking for the yurt experience. Counties can't have heaters in yurts, but the state can. We've gone to cabins with outdoor fire rings. I can't build those fast enough. The proposal includes tremendous ways to change the park. Part of the resistance may be due to that change. "Urban" changes have been objected to in the county. A network system (cable, wi-fi) was considered "urban." The Wildwood facility is seen as an "urban" experience already. Those aren't amenities at other federal sites. If you're going to sell this, you need to provide a diversity of experiences, including urban experiences. You need to connect with the business community.

**C:** Living in the area, there are good odds that community is worried the homeless are going to take over the park. It's really a state of emergency in the Portland area. It's the highway, cabins, summer homes, but also people who have lived there for generations. It's going to be a big hurdle, but if you offer something more upscale (yurts, "glamping"), and you have a system to monitor and protect the residents, that can really go a long way.

**C:** State parks have yurts and they are full all the time. People travel from far away. It is the trend in recreation. I've managed BLM sites with similar amenities and they're still there and still get used.

**C:** Down in our area, we've been increasing awareness for OHV riding activities through what we call "connecting communities" for economic gains. To get community support, we adjusted the marketing model to talk about how much revenue these activities can bring into the community. It can't be an outside group pushing in. I recommend switching the model to 'economic gain' and have a strong commitment to increase law enforcement presence and address issues of the community.

**BLM:** There's been a theme in discussion: how do we better connect with communities? We want the RACs involvement. In the past, other RACs have helped be a third party to broker discussions with local communities, to be the link between the government and the public and it worked out great. We're hoping a similar thing can happen here. We have the ability in the charter to create subcommittees to do exactly this, to help coordinate this conversation (with BLM as technical experts). We're not sure the public sees the economic benefits, but perhaps a subcommittee could help relay their positive experiences and elicit some alternatives from the public. We don't think we have all the ideas; we want to hear from everyone.

Travel Management Plan - The roads and trails network that the BLM manages. By regulation, they guide how we manage our roads and trails. In Idaho, we did a whole field office in a year and a half. That's not the model we'll be using here; it'll be a different process.

**C:** Be careful about assumptions. Make sure you listen to what the community wants. There's been a heavy focus on economics, but that may not be their concerns. It's not always about revenue. It may get tiresome to people who see it more as a lifestyle issue. More fees to provide more amenities to attract more people – sometimes what we think we need to do may go against what the community wants. In this example, maybe they don't want a restroom. People know that more amenities often means higher fees. You need to be careful about how you talk about it and how you listen about it.

**C:** There's a source of information that hasn't been tapped yet: Schools. Schools are actively taking classes to recreation sites. Those kids are bringing their families back. Granges are also active users. Another thing the RAC can help with is further access. There's a lot of opportunity to get people involved if you talk more about fees and talk about opportunities for more use. The two are tied together.

### **Great American Shake-Out Drill and Discussion – 10:20**

What would staff do? Try to find cover. We don't encourage people to run out the door. Make sure there aren't overhead hazards. Avoid windows. After shaking stops, exit the building, gather centrally, and get a head count. A seismic assessment has been done on this building. For field-going staff, overhead hazards are a big concern. Slopes and rolling material are also of concern. There may be slides and unstable soils. Situation awareness is key.

Do we have emergency information for visitors? We require check-in, so we know who is in the building. That assume we have power, though. Is it backed up so smart phone can access? Unsure. We do have In/Out board to check on staff status. There are a lot of trees at this BLM site.

### **Recreation Fee Proposal Status and Process (continued)**

**Q:** Is the RAC interested in creating a subcommittee? It would need at least three members, one from each group.

**A:** Yes. Interest indicated by John Omlin (Category 2), Debbie Porter (Category 3), and Pete Giordano (Category 1).

**BLM:** There needs to be a Federal Register notice for subcommittee meetings, 30 days in advance. Dates can be batched in one notice.

**BLM:** We will try to organize how to reach out to the community. Perhaps we could host a public meeting with RAC members and/or BLM staff.

**C:** It's very important for the RAC to come up to speed and have discussions prior to the end of the comment period. The RAC needs to be all on the same page. It would be detrimental to extend the period and have the RAC express multiple opinions. A lot of groundwork goes in ahead of time to get a consensus and to talk to people. Previous examples have taken a year. Some people need more handholding to keep engaged. Attention spans can be short and there can be little willingness to read long documents.

**Q:** Can we batch a Federal Register notices with several meetings?

**BLM:** Yes.

**C:** People are interested in horses, but they don't always mix with campgrounds. Are there other opportunities for other recreation that extend beyond the park? Or is it just in the park? It's also a law enforcement issue. Where are people and how do we keep them safe?

**BLM:** Camping is only part of the proposal, but it's the part that people focus on. We also want to explore trails and increasing the environmental education component. Other people have talked about indoor tennis courts and equestrian trails. There are a lot of different ideas. We have our proposal, but we're also going to look at alternatives, costs, and benefits.

**C:** Another project in Mount Hood area included a series of meetings with huge maps of the area. People self-selected with maps that interested them. The personal contact helped get that project moving forward. A similar method could be beneficial for the BLM.

**C:** It needs to be two separate trips. I haven't read the comments or the plan. I need to read the plan, read the comments, and visit the site. Have lunch at a restaurant in town, invite the mayor, clubs. Have lunch and not force a conversation, but see if one needs to be had. A similar effort has been undertaken with the county; it's been a multi-year process (Cascadia). We need to walk carefully into the community. "If we don't get enough revenue, we can't do any upgrades." – The threat of closing it got the public worked up. Didn't want the site to be closing down, even if it's costing the state money. The conversation should be about how to manage the investments, not just threaten to close.

**C:** We've done something similar in the Oakridge area. We had early discussions with the Mayor and City Administrator to get their thoughts on OHV. They provided a lot of info about what has and hasn't worked. They're some of the biggest supporters about increased OHV use. It's about "grassroots" before meetings with the public. We need to demonstrate we listen to what the locals want, not us coming in from the outside. It changes the nature of the conversation.

Agreement that additional discussions are needed.

## **Break**

### **Regarding Socio-Econ Benefits**

**BLM:** What have we done to show local benefits? We have two handouts. The first one is of recreation profiles; the information based on the last year. They were created when we were still two districts. We also have a handout that shows the contributions that the BLM has made at the national level. Finally, we have the BLM Facts book that we put out each year. They're published annually, but we're always about a year behind. This one is from 2014 and is a one-stop shop for program information in BLM Oregon/Washington. This is great background information for some of these discussions.

### **RAC Field Trip Ideas and Discussion – Paul**

Paul introduced himself at the Field Manager for the Marys Peak Field Office, a field office that encompasses the Polk, Benton, and Lincoln counties.

The purpose of this topic: What kinds of field trips are the RAC interested in the next year or so? We don't have to figure it all out today. The RAC serves many purposes: Title II, Recreation,

and general management. The BLM needs the RAC's help to fulfill obligations under FLPMA. The law that gives us this process is about transparency. Even if the public doesn't always show up, the transparency is what matters. We're not here to encourage people to come "yes men." You have a more nuanced understanding of what we want to do, but you bring that nuance back to us in what you're hearing from the public.

Because of the proximity to Portland, we have a lot of experience in hosting field trips with various parties. The RAC needs to have a discussion in what you want to see, and what will help you as you move forward.

**Q:** Structure of the field trips: There's no requirement that we have to have all categories represented, correct?

**BLM:** Correct. Representation is about a quorum for decisions. The field trips are about fact finding, seeing the projects, and the land.

**C:** I'm retired and I've enjoyed the field trips I've been on. It seems like the field trips should be broken geographically by field office and cover different aspects. Not everybody needs to go to all projects. To make a decision about fees, I don't feel I need to see every campground, just a representation. Also, there are a lot of projects that are multiples (e.g., nursery), maybe I just need to see one. We don't necessarily need to see one per district or field office.

**C:** Second the comment above. Additionally, I would like to see a watershed-level discussion with the different landowners (private and federal). Specifically about culvert replacement and not fixing them in sequence (missing a blocked culvert). This includes past projects, currently in progress, and ones currently being proposed.

**C:** Alsea Falls area could work for recreation and culvert/road improvements. It could be an overall look at several priorities in the area.

**C:** Additionally, I would like to see a categorization of the resource area for (campgrounds, OHV areas, rec types), and perhaps the "best" and "worst" from each group or most/least problematic. If I'm travelling in an area, I'll swing by if I know it's there, but I don't want to replace the field trips which are educational.

**C:** Is there a model of something that works (e.g., Forest Service site)? If we had a list of those type of sites, we could visit on our own. Some type of a hierarchy of the projects in the planning stages to compare their success.

**C:** Each project has a monitoring component. This could dovetail into monitoring by the RAC.

**C:** We looked at projects in Benton County (Alsea Falls area) and west lane county. This area is so big, I think we should focus the trips to limit time spent in vehicles. Focus in on key areas for each field trip. Wildwood sounds like a large one we all need to participate in.

**C:** I like the idea of an integrated approach. There might be something in state forests as well. There are private landowners doing restoration work. That might fit in for us to see.

**BLM:** Silver Falls has an electronic vending system. We asked them “how’s it working for you guys?”

**C:** Starker Forests hosts regular field trips.

**BLM:** I haven’t heard about proposals to see timber sales. Is that something the group is interested in?

**C:** I think it would be appropriate to look at.

**C:** I would like to get a better understanding of the issues around driving on BLM roads as they checkerboard across public land. There’s a misperception. Statistics don’t lie. We hear about how many miles we can travel beginning to end, but often fail to describe relation to gates and private ownership that has to be crossed.

**BLM:** This ties in really well with travel management planning and right-of-way agreements. This group should be familiar with it if communicating with the public.

**C:** Reciprocal ROW agreements don’t always recognize the public recreation component, because the public wasn’t recreating then. As the population grows, there is pressure to ask to open private gates. I have still not seen how the BLM got authority for ROW management. Not sure the Act calls for locking the gates up; it may actually be the opposite.

**C:** One of the huge impacts in the RMP is riparian zones. It’s a huge impact for state rules (OFPA). It would be good to look at a couple cuts and be able to appreciate what 150’ setback is vs. 200’ setback is, and how slopes figure into that and how it affects the cut or not. Polk County has a lot of water/streams and leaves very little available for harvest in timber sales. It’d be good to hear from the foresters and the engineers.

**BLM:** It sounds like a good fold in from the state to understand the view of the landscape.

**C:** In riparian zones, the soil type is key to a lot of what BLM, plants, and animals can do. I’m interested in hearing about an overarching communication plan and communication availability out there, for both campers and law enforcement. My cell phone doesn’t always work out there. When we talk about keeping people safe (fires, natural disasters), people need to know where they are and what the communication blanket is keeping them safe. I understand that sometimes that’s the point of recreation (being disconnected). Is there an app that’s best? Do you know of one or have you developed one?

**C:** Speaking of ODF: Would love to go to Trask River and review 10 year overview study. I would like to get someone from ODF to talk to us about it. It’s the most recent study for anyone in the coast range, a pretty good study of to see about forest practices/setbacks, different stream types.

**C:** About mapping – I have been unable to find a digital BLM map. The BLM map site is “buy the paper map.” I run GPS; I have my entire map of the US from the USFS.  
Jen will send what’s available.

**C:** There’s a 20 year study that might be interesting to review.

BLM summary of sites mentioned:

- Wildwood
- Trask River
- Alsea (group visited last year, but enough new faces it might be worthwhile)

**BLM:** I heard a comment about trying to break it up into a handful of smaller trips that go out of Eugene or Salem, understanding people don’t want to spend all day in the car. We could schedule them once a month through the winter. I’m also hearing that being in the field would help facilitate some of the questions you have about access, right of ways, monitoring, etc.

**C:** I would like to know about BLM priorities on some of these (e.g., Wildwood).

**C:** If you have a tour already going for another reason that is similar to the information we would receive, you may want to invite us. I would be open to attending a session as a tagalong.

**BLM:** We will review the notes and have some internal discussions with BLM staff before making commitments. Perhaps making the field trips more informal (a smaller group on various Fridays) seems like a good approach.

**BLM:** Agreed, more conversations are needed. We need to understand commitments for the next 6 months. For the field tours, we need to be clear about recommendations. We probably won’t have a quorum in these trips, and need to be sure in the Federal Register to state that we won’t be making decisions or recommendations. We will state that those will be deferred to the next RAC meeting.

## **Agenda Review before lunch – Annabelle**

**Q:** Is the rest of the agenda a bit more flexible if we don’t want to take a full hour for lunch?  
How much time do we want for lunch?

**A:** 30 minutes. We will stop if public comes in for the public comment period.

## **Lunch Break**

**Additional items to discuss before the end of the day: timeframe for next formal meetings.**

**Priorities:** We don’t have a quorum. I can make a decision as a DFO about what SRS projects to put funding to if it becomes available. We can get ideas and not make formal recommendations.

**Q:** Will we have an updated list of what we did fund?

**A:** Yes. The project leads are working on that. Once they ensure everything is reflected accurately, it will be sent out.

### **Resource Management Plan (RMP) Presentation – Carolyn**

The presentation includes an overview of the RMP, Record of Decision (ROD) boundaries, and Next Steps. The RMP had a robust public outreach process, with over 41 public meetings and collecting over 4,500 comments. The public outreach report is available online:

[http://www.blm.gov/or/plans/rmpswesternoregon/files/BLM\\_march\\_outreach\\_session\\_report.pdf](http://www.blm.gov/or/plans/rmpswesternoregon/files/BLM_march_outreach_session_report.pdf)

Plan-wide, approximately three-quarters of the land base is in a reserve designation and approximately one-quarter is within the Harvest Land Base. A history of legal challenges and policy changes caused less thinning to occur than the 1995 RMP predicted. Comparisons in the FEIS are based on how the 1995 plan was written, not as it was implemented.

Timber target volumes have increased over the 1995 RMPs. More harvest, more land in reserves, more recreation, more focused protections on fish and water, more net carbon storage.

**Q:** What's the average volume over the last 5 years?

**BLM:** This is plan wide. I don't have the stats for the NW Oregon District. Plan-wide, we were close to meeting the overall target. For FY 2014, the BLM Facts book as volume offered and volume harvested.

“Regeneration harvest” is a form of even-aged harvest with various levels of retention, depending on site-specific conditions, objectives, and the underlying land use allocation (LITA or MITA).

**Q:** Do you have a map of the county overlay?

**A:** It's not in the presentation. It's available in the interactive map. Jen will send information about the interactive map to the RAC members.

### **12:30 – Open the meeting to the public.**

No public present.

### **RMP presentation (continued) Carolyn**

Salem/Eugene will provide approximately 57% of total ASQ for western Oregon.

**Q:** The money that was received, is there a direct comparison (value received per unit then and now)? Twice the volume doesn't necessarily translate to twice the revenue/receipts.

**BLM:** The value of timber has changed. Economics have changed since 1995. Another thing that's different: a board foot in Salem isn't the same as a board foot in Coos Bay. You can give an average across the planning area, but the values really shift from unit to unit.



**C:** The board foot doesn't really show the economic impact.

**BLM:** The value of timber varies wildly. An analysis today won't tell us much about the value in 10 years. Our requirement under the law is volume, not value.

**Q:** The public may not understand how this works.

**BLM:** We will have more value per acre (regeneration harvests generally generate more value than thinning harvests).

**Q:** Question about forest health. So with the pine beetle and different types of pests and diseases in the forest, is there a feeling about how that's affected timber or how Oregon's forest health is (recognizing that other things affect timber value)?

**BLM:** Compared to other places (Idaho/Colorado), we're pretty good, but we do have hotspots. Sudden oak death is a problem in Coos Bay that can affect those timber markets. Usually when we sell timber here, it stays in local markets. Infestations are typically refined to a matter of acres. For example, Phellinus (laminated root rot). We clear it out and replant with less susceptible species. These aren't landscape-level infestations.

**Q:** Is there a difference between BLM focus and ESA species?

**BLM:** "Special status species" is a big umbrella which includes ESA listed and other BLM listed species.

**Q:** With wilderness lands, was there a minimum size of acres?

**BLM:** Yes, 5,000 acres. In the northwest Oregon district, we typically don't have such large contiguous blocks of land.

**Q:** About dredging in Wild and Scenic Rivers, will you be issuing permits?

**A:** Probably not. Actions that interfere with outstanding remarkable values won't be permitted.

There are two ROD/RMPs. A new planning rule has encouraged RMPs by ecological boundaries, not administrative boundaries.

**1:00 p.m. – public period is closed.** No public present during the open public comment period.

### **Continuing the RMP presentation – Carolyn**

**Q:** Was there review on the front end about what the state wanted?

**A:** Yes. They were part of the cooperators agencies advisory group (CAAG). The group met for approximately 2 years leading up to the development of the draft EIS.

There are five rules for projects in the transition period regarding rights-of-way, thinning in the inner zone Riparian Reserve, take of northern spotted owl, regeneration harvest within the 2016 Late-Successional Reserve, and lands with wilderness characteristics. Restricted thinning in the

inner zone of the Riparian Reserve and no take of the northern spotted owl are most likely to affect timber sales.

**Q:** You mentioned 120 feet on streams; has the definition of streams been changed?

**A:** The 120 feet refers to perennial streams.

**BLM:** Regarding an earlier discussion about upcoming projects: For those of you who have been RAC members for a year, Carolyn had added you to receive the Project Update. The fall edition went out recently. For those of you who are new, Carolyn has been given your email address and will send these to you.

**C:** Acronyms and order of precedence are difficult to understand. A hierarchy of acronyms would have been helpful. Like a decision tree with acronyms.

**BLM:** Interactive maps are available for the draft, proposed RMP, and RMP/ROD.

**Q:** With projects, we asked about NEPA completion. Is there a fast-track method for some projects that may be repetitive (e.g. culvert replacement)? Or do we always have to start from scratch.

**BLM:** One of the first things you do is evaluate the project and see if there is existing NEPA for that particular place. There are several avenues for NEPA.

**Q:** The group used to receive the elected officials report. Do we still do that?

**BLM:** We still do that publication. It used to be a quarterly basis, now it's done twice a year. The next one is being developed right now. We will share when it's ready.

**Q:** Can the Project Update be posted on the BLM Facebook page?

**BLM:** The Project Update and Annual Program Summaries go on our webpage. They do show up on our social media sites.

## **Commissioner's Forum - Annabelle**

**C:** There have been concerns in the past about how much time commissioners spend on the RAC. We wanted to take a few minutes to describe our interests in this whole process.

**Linn County:** The counties elect to (or not to) put money aside to do this. Linn County hasn't always felt that projects are within the realm of what the county would want. At a larger scale, the RAC has done a good job of selecting projects. It's been good to see how the RAC (and the process of looking at projects) can bring people together in a way that the county can't. We don't want to come across as controlling. We see each other in so many forums, it can hard not to come across as same-minded or being in charge, but we're not. We put the money in and have to let this process work. I've tried hard to look at the bigger picture.

A number of commissioners are concerned about what we do here. I try to sit in on the O&C meetings so they know I'm trying to link with them as well. I have an obligation to reach out to

Welches and its community (commissioners included), to step into the area. We have constraints as public officials. In Linn County, we have an objective to look at projects that benefit community. That said, we value youth, watershed look, and law enforcement. In Linn County, we didn't have watershed projects to work on. I met my objectives.

**Benton County:** We have a different perspective in Benton County. How can we work with our partners, BLM, and the USFS. We had more flexibility in past years when we had more funding (outdoor education, for example). In the last few iterations of the RAC, Benton County has put all the funding into Title II. Projects have been in that collaborative framework, so there has to be management across that checkerboard. In order to get to that area is the access piece. Our relationship with the BLM has been about the access. We have a lot of road projects and culvert replacements. We have an agreement with the BLM; they use our public works to do some of that work. It can be an economy of scale.

General management objectives; recreation and Alsea Falls. It's an important spot to the county. Benton County is not a member of the O&C, though it is an O&C county. We have a very vocal public in our county.

When counties come forward and say projects are important, it's not to dictate, it's just sharing what's important with their respective communities. Both counties fund the forest patrol.

We're open to questions.

**BLM:** From an agency perspective: we've had the benefit of having SRS to support great projects and partnerships. My big concern is that if SRS isn't reviewed – now what? There are a lot of relationships/partnerships we'd like to continue. How can we continue to fund and support them?

**C:** It's a great question. SRS was set up for county payments and services. It had to do with the reduction of harvest in those forests. The amount that went to each county varies by land base.

**Q:** I didn't hear about stakeholders; there are 11 counties, how they're represented. Do you two represent the other counties?

**A:** We do and don't. We have linkages with other communities and groups. There used to be more than twice as many commissioners on the RACs. We can do more to establish other relationships with commissioners and community leaders and learn about their priorities and where they might want us to go. This is ground to tread on carefully. We need to stay connected. If you think we're missing somebody, let us know.

**C:** In the past, we could get a recommendation from the board of commissioners about projects/priorities. It wasn't a dictatorial exercise, but an informative one.

**C:** In this political climate and local climate, we don't need rumors started. Having the background, sending out feelers, letting people in the community know what will take place will really make a difference.

**C:** I saw law enforcement throughout. As there's more pressure put on dollars and projects, I would have expected some sort of accountability that went into the law enforcement contracts. How did the dollars to the county come back to support BLM? It goes back to monitoring. That's likely the next target and easy to take money from to allocate to other projects.

**C:** It's a challenge when sending out sworn deputies (on contracts). The first things on the list are fire, life, and safety. Are people doing careful and safe things? Even when we log hours in the forest, the second a call comes from Mill City, they have to go if they're the closest deputy. Other than a number of hours, there's not a crime rate to talk about, such as 911 calls or response rate. It's a contractual relationship. Most of what they're doing is "checking." A lot of those things aren't reported. We only hire back very seasoned deputies because of the responsibility we have to the federal government to do this job safely.

**C:** We've had several proposals in the past. I've talked with fellow commissioners about this. We need to solve this inter-operability on a regional basis. The report out is important; I take it seriously.

**C:** We had the same issue with the grants program. We spent as much on enforcement as on operation and maintenance. We have structured reporting forms. (LETS on park website)

**BLM:** We're talking about the sales pitch. The work on the ground (Benton County) is great. We get day-by-day descriptions of what the Benton Forest Patrol officer is doing (on a 3 month basis). I don't think there's anything lost in terms of the work.

**C:** There is if other people don't understand.

**C:** There are 36 counties in Oregon; we're all different. There's been a lot of growth in collaboration in this growth.

**C:** It's a lot less contentious now.

**C:** I hear disparaging comments about the federal agencies, there's a lot of misunderstanding. It's generational in some cases. We've had success with changing the opinions by giving good information back to the people. It's a slow process, but the more we can share with people, the better the likelihood of success.

**C:** I have a background in agriculture and public administration. You can't sit down in a day and explain public law or BLM's large presence (e.g., water rights).

**BLM:** RACs are great educational tools for the public. It's unfortunate we only get to work with a few individuals at a time.

**C:** The accountability issue brought up repeatedly, the way the BLM goes through these projects when BLM receives them. We are familiar with several of repeat proposals and performers. I would hate to see to spend half their time validating what they did before if half of us already know.

C: It doesn't have to be during the proposal.

C: The Act requires monitoring. What did I do to ensure the money was invested properly and we got the results we wanted? The burden is higher for public officials. I have tours to view sites. That's a mistake when I don't know what's happening in other counties (e.g., Multnomah).

## Next Steps – Dave

**BLM:** To close the loop on SRS, we need to remind everyone that we don't have a quorum today. Between now and the end of September 2017, money has to be authorized under SRS. I can make decisions on behalf of the RAC as the DFO where additional funds can go, but I am looking for suggestions about priorities. It's about 10 months because of how BLM's procurement rules work. We won't likely make disbursements past the middle of July.

**BLM:** Opening for discussion: If any funds are identified between now and the end of the FY, what are my priorities?

C: Law enforcement and projects that fund youth. Not being specific to project, but in general.

C: About YE, we have to be careful, since it's a project-specific approval. We can get big bang for buck, not just on rehab value. Also, I expected more passion around the Dump Stoppers program. It fell short in funding. It was high on people's list on picking up dump sites/shooting areas. Other options? Volunteer groups? That and the seed programs.

BLM: We occasionally have other funds available for Dump Stoppers

C: Any one of the applicants who doesn't have a partner on their application – that's a negative for me. The more partners in the community, the better. Investing in the youth is two-fold. A lot of kids don't have first jobs anymore. Many get out of high school without experience, or they need to support their families and can't get a job. Are any of these projects growing plants that will be browse for timber sales or post-fire? I didn't see a lot about helping mammals. I'm hoping someone has a proposal next year to help wildlife.

C: There were a couple counties that didn't have enough projects for the amount of money they had. We can let commissioners in those counties know.

Commissioner: They do know.

C: Clackamas Dump Stoppers – the project been around for a long time. It's been so successful that they've been getting lots of partners. The amount they request from the RAC has decreased; it's significantly less than what was asked in the past. Restoration around the sites may be something to look at. Almost making it impossible for people to come back and dump at that site would be worth exploring.

C: Columbia Vernonia Native Plant Nursery – he's the guy who pointed to a building the RAC helped fund. They're sponsored by the Nehalem Watershed Council. It has great potential. Their minimum funding was \$28,000, were only able to offer approximately \$14,000. They've proven

to be a good steward of the funding, they're right on the school campus, and they partner with the watershed council. He spoke up about other groups at his own expense.

**C:** Multiple groups work together and share resources. We want to support the collaboration. Many had the youth component.

**BLM:** Perhaps we should broker a conversation between all of the groups. They're all within a small geographical area.

**C:** They're consciously trying to reduce overhead and networking with others. Ameri-Corp example. Just as with Ameri-Corp, the proposals we got here will need to learn to stand on their own, not be funded year after year.

**Q:** What's important to the tribes?

**A:** A lot of stuff isn't close to the reservation in Yamhill County. For the most part, I'm interested in youth employment and recreation. The tribes were quite involved in the development of the new RMP.

**BLM:** Will asked if I would touch on the public outreach part and how we talk about what this RAC does and the recommendations it makes on Title II fundings. How does that play out? We're trying to highlight the positive side of that. As information come back from our project proponents and project leads, and monitoring. I will be looking to do short social media pieces that highlight the work that has been made possible because of the NW Oregon RAC.

General Timeframe of when the RAC would like to get together for the next formal meeting. It goes hand in hand with what the group needs consider. Stay tuned for details on the field trip.

**Q:** Sometime after the first of the year – what's a general time frame? We will also be selecting officers.

**A:** Need to put a calendar out, a busy time for the legislature (which starts mid-January). If we don't have SRS, it will likely only be a one-day meeting.

**C:** I would suggest earlier, rather than later after the start of the year. It'll be easier to plan the rest of the year.

**C:** A lot of meetings cancelled in January last year, prefer February for travel purposes.

**BLM:** Appointment information has been updated and is in the binder. There's no reason we can't ask throughout the year to ask for people who would want to be on the RAC. Of course, people currently on the RAC are welcome to reapply.