

**SECURE RURAL SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITY
SELF-DETERMINATION ACT OF 2000
RESOURCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE (RAC)
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
SALEM DISTRICT, LOBBY LEVEL CONFERENCE ROOM
August 15, 2002
Meeting Minutes**

Attendees:

RAC Members: Mark Luedtke, Dave Schmidt, Richard Williams, Wayne Giesy, Leon Wilbanks, Sara Vickerman, David Hanson, Don Hopkins, Walter Cate, John Lindsey, Annabelle Jaramillo, Charles Hurliman, Clifford Adams, Robert Van Creveld.

Salem District BLM: Jose Linares, Paul Jeske, Judy Akahoshi, Randy Gould, Trish Hogervorst, Jim Irving, Cindy Enstrom, Rick Kneeland, Dana Shuford.

Oregon State Office BLM: Jim Hallberg

Public: Rocky McVay, O&C Counties, Kevin Loe, Oregon Wholesale Seed.

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Dave Schmidt at 9:00 a.m.

The meeting minutes from the July 11-12, 2002 meeting were reviewed and a motion was made to approve the minutes as written and seconded. The chair then asked for a vote on the motion. The motion was unanimously passed by the committee.

The agenda was reviewed. Dave asked if anyone wanted any changes made to the agenda, received none, so proceeded with the agenda as written.

Paul Jeske led a discussion and review of the RAC Meeting Operating Guidelines (Attachment 1) and the RAC Roles and Responsibilities (Attachment 2)

Dave: AThis is a good list to follow, keep this in mind as we go through the meeting.@

Jose: AWe want to refresh what our roles and responsibilities are since our last meeting was not one of our more productive ones. It was an important meeting, bringing issues to light that we need to address. We don't want to belabor this but we have built in some time in the agenda to discuss it.

Part of the RAC-s responsibility is to decide the process of evaluating and reviewing projects and making recommendations. The charter stresses the collaborative decision making process and regular commitment to committee work by the members.

Rocky McVay, O&C Counties Representative:

AA lot has happened since the first Salem District RAC meeting; especially related to the regional perspective. A number of wildfires in SW Oregon, including the Biscuit fire that now exceeds 400,000 acres, may have a significant relationship to future RAC projects on a regional basis. An example would be the meeting I attended related to the retention of the air tanker base in SW Oregon. It was clearly defined that with the affects of the fire situation this year that there is a need for a regional fire suppression plan which is clearly a Title II project and crosses over 5 Resource Advisory Committees in both BLM and the Forest Service. This was a project that came up after the deadline for submission of projects and thought that it could possibly still be submitted after the application deadline had closed. This is a project that everyone will probably support.

I am surprised at what happened at the last Salem RAC meeting. I thought with the way the other Salem meetings had gone that it would be the last RAC to have problems. He called the meeting a melt down.

Counties need to let the process work. The dollars are up to the RAC to allocate, then it goes to BLM to make final approval. The counties do not control the purse strings.

In the second round of RAC projects there were a lot more outside projects being submitted by other groups learning about the RAC process. The intent of the legislation is to benefit the federal resources and kick start projects that could not be funded in the past. Members of the O&C Board feel BLM needs to look at projects and set a percentage of dollars for outside projects, ie: for 90% BLM and 10% for outside projects.

Dave: I would not call what happened a melt down but more a bump in the road. Only one vote was needed to get over the issue that got us to where we were not able to move on for the rest of the day. There is a level of trust that we must have with the members of the RAC which goes a long ways in working together. We have some healing to do to get there.

Robert Williams: Projects need to be selected on merit and not necessarily spent in each year. This does not necessarily mean we need to report back on whether outside projects were funded or not and this is one problem that has bothered me all along; doesn't seem the right way to go about it.

Annabelle: Perhaps there was not clarity in the beginning on how the resources were to be expended and on the issues involved. What the County's role was and some concerns also with the counties that the legislation pointed out a safety net for counties, also some proprietary concerns in many counties that are already strapped for resources. Counties saw this as one way to maybe take care of some of these projects in their county that they would not be able to fund without the RAC.

Leon: I had the understanding that monies would go back to the counties who agreed to participate at the funding level they put into Title II. Otherwise counties will not want to contribute to Title II if the funds do not go back to their counties. I can see some problems with some counties not participating in Title II funding and still getting projects completed in their county.

Chuck: It is hard to get a handle on; Tillamook County is strapped for funding and looked at this funding to help cover some of the shortfalls. Otherwise the county could agree to not support Title II and use Title III and do more in the educational field. This funding was to kick start the shortfall of the agencies to get programs and management moving and may make it a hard sell back to other commissioners.

Dave: Asked if other RACs were allocating to counties like we are with the funding staying within the county except for the regional projects that were submitted? Rocky said pretty much the same at all RACs.

John: There were some problems with economic development and other save-the-forests proposals.

Jose: The process was set up as a three-way partnership between agency, county and RAC. There is no requirement in the legislation that the dollars have to go back to the counties who are allocating funds to Title II projects. The counties do control the dollar amount with which they want to participate, with the understanding that they want to see some benefit to their counties. The County's role is to let RAC do their job to establish criteria. It's a delicate balance and will require everyone's trust for it to work.

Mark: Partiality toward our county problem could be resolved if we had some outstanding regional projects submitted, e.g. the fire projection in Southern Oregon. We would have no qualms to use money out of county for these types of projects. I don't think a county would condemn that action, but naturally they favor projects within their county.

Dave: There were a lot of reasons why we had agreed to allocate by county and we could reconsider that if we get projects that benefit more counties.

Paul initiated a discussion on how to be successful as a RAC. The brainstorming session resulted in the following categories being developed and items listed and brought up by the RAC members.

To be successful, the RAC should start:

- Create % target for BLM projects off federal lands. Others don't want to do that.
- Need to do some work with counties to build support for programs and benefits for the resource.
- Need to compromise.
- BLM make a commitment to high quality and diversity of projects.
- Large map showing where projects are located and how fit with other counties or other RACs.

To be successful, the RAC should stop:

- Holding proposals hostage for bargaining

To be successful, the RAC should continue:

- Building personal trust and understanding from RAC members perspective.
- Continue putting proposals in counties which provide the funds.
- Keep all projects coming to RAC for review with BLM assessment of legislative intent.
- Be collaborative.

To be successful the RAC should change:

- Need to have a category for regional projects and if vote to approve money from all counties.
- Provide full funding by taking funds from partially funded projects.
- BLM make sure each project meets Title II legislative intent, a concern however, there is room for judgment and subjectivity don't want projects removed.

Rocky asked, How familiar is the RAC in how funds are allocated?

Dave: Formula in state revenue derived by sales is a percentage based on O&C lands within the county and benefit all O&C lands prorated not necessarily specific to counties that the revenue is collected in.

Annabelle: Need to remember the non-extractive value of forest resources also.

Chuck: Tillamook received funding last year from other counties allocated by other RACs to cover. This year those counties that received the extra funding took a cut in dollars by that amount that was to be distributed to the contributing counties.

Wayne: If dollars are not going to the counties that are already stretched for money; they may choose to not participate in the future.

Robert: If going to go to the counties why not let counties just say here it is and why even meet if counties expect all funds to come back to the counties who gave it. So why are we here.

Dave: The crux of the problems seems to be those projects other than county or BLM sponsored.

Rocky suggested RAC take percentage of money that counties allocated to Title II such as 90% on Federal O&C lands and 10% other lands or whatever percentage the RAC decides upon.

Dave: The county proposal benefits counties and also benefits federal lands.

Sara: Selecting a specific percentage is arbitrary and she didn't want to go there.

Annabelle liked the concept to separate regional projects from the county lists. This might be part of the problem and need to judge regional projects on merit even if they go to counties that don't put in money.

Jose went over the Status of 2001 and 2002 projects

No further update from last meeting.

Jose said BLM was asking for the RAC to defer the Native Seed Project from funding this go-round. There is some merit but not sure appropriate venue to fund. We have proposed to the BLM OR/WA State Office that they work directly with the Native Seed Network and try to fund this project at a regional level. BLM may be able to use an existing agreement for this type of work with the Native Seed Network by doing a task order to the agreement.

Walter: There was an article in the Capital Press on Aug. 9, stating the Natural Resource Conservation Service is looking to fund a native seed program to the tune of \$50,000.

Cliff made a motion to defer the Native Seed Network project; Chuck seconded the motion.

Discussion: Chuck: Thanks need to go to Jose for his work on this proposal with the RAC since the last meeting.

Dave called for a vote: All in favor voiced Aye-s; All opposed: None, Motion passed.

Jose led a discussion related to proposals for next year (see Attachment 3).

Proposed changes to the project review process would have pre-proposals submitted early on and an additional meeting in March to allow RAC to review draft proposals. This would give an opportunity for informational feedback to proponents. The RAC could identify a need for clarity or make suggestions on how to improve the project. The timeline would give proponents a couple of months to fine tune them for the June deadline.

Other proposed changes would be to send all projects to counties early on but ask for a formal response before the first RAC. We think this would be beneficial to have county review first and the RAC would have that information up front for consideration.

Field trips can be scheduled if the RAC would like.

Annabelle asked about a field trip this September to see how projects are progressing that are in the works.

Jose said that October might be better timing due to fire assignments.

Jim Irving: The Yellowbottom Road project in Cascades may be in a stage for the RAC to see the progress of the project.

Rick Kneeland: In Tillamook, there are a couple in the Scappoose area with work in progress.

Jose: We would take a look at them and see which ones would be best for a field trip.

Field trips are also identified for June and July for next year on the potential schedule and after an initial screen of proposed projects we could do some field trips if the RAC likes.

Potentially this new schedule shows more meetings for the RAC but an opportunity for more dialog with the RAC and project proponents.

Dave: With the field trips we may be able to complete the funding allocation with the same number of meetings and the pre-proposal which would better prepare the RAC for decision making.

Paul asked about specific dates. Are there days of the week that we should avoid or work better?

Annabelle: Tuesdays are bad for Commissioners; Chuck: Also Mondays and Wednesdays.

Thursdays seem to work better for most so we will focus on Thursdays.

Try to avoid two-day back-to-back meetings.

Mark suggested rather than field trips to look at one or two projects, have the proponents give feedback via video or other media presentations since field trips take a lot of time and are limited to one or two projects.

If field trips could be scheduled to view a number of sites, it would be beneficial unless it would be to see an outstanding regional project. There is a desire for efficiency if field trips were held.

John asked if when proposals go out for prescreening, could they also be sent to the counties since in the past the full proposals haven't sent.

BLM will send the counties the pre-proposals and also the final package in June.

Robert said one problem was that it generates a lot of paper to view, can you burn CD's to send out instead of the paper copies. We can make CD's and we are also posting these on the Salem BLM internet site.

Since the pre-proposals would be unscreened, does that mean they have not yet been screened against whether they meet the intent of legislation? Answer: Yes, but by the June submissions they will be fully screened. What we are trying to do is to get the RAC involved in the screening process.

Jose: There would be some screening on pre-proposals, preliminary screening could be done as part of the process and we could maybe build in some time in the schedule to allow BLM to do an initial screening.

Jose announced that Melissa Leoni did resign from the RAC and her letter of resignation was included, with her permission, to all of you. We are opening up the process to fill that slot. If RAC members know of anyone interested, please let us know and we will get application information to them.

Discussion of remaining proposed projects for this year.

It was decided to continue on from last meeting and vote on the remaining project proposals.

Benton County:

Annabelle: The top two priorities for the county are the stream restoration and fish passage. The county has an emphasis on sustainability, both economic and ecological and holistic management of BLM lands and adjacent lands is desired. This is how they prioritized Benton County projects. The top four projects in the ranking fall into this philosophy.

Dave asked how she would recommend allocating the funds.

Annabelle: The Willamette Basin Invasive Weed has already been approved if they combine to do together the Honeygrove and Green Creek proposals. They can be done at a lowered cost and save \$10,000. Suggestion is to allocate remaining funds Honeygrove, Green Creek reduced by \$10,000 the remainder to the Fish Passage and Habitat Assessment Program.

Wayne made a motion to vote on this funding allocation for Benton County; Robert seconded the motion.

Called for discussion: None voiced.

Role call: see spreadsheet for voting record.

Motion passed.

Columbia County:

Could combine both Scaponia projects which do meet the intent of legislation. Scaponia Park is on BLM land and the proposal is for a master plan for the entire area.

Robert suggested that Pisquah road get done since it is a nasty spot and a local land owner will contribute funding for half. Next in priority would be the Nehalem riparian restoration. Leave what's left for later discussion.

Motion was raised and seconded for Columbia County to do Pisquah Road, the Invasive Weed Project and the remainder of the funds to go to Nehalem Riparian Restoration.

Dave asked if there were any objections to the motion. None raised. Since there were no objections, they decided to do an oral vote by all. If no objections, instead of individual role call on motions, use this method for the remaining motions during today's meeting.

Vote: All in favor Aye-s, Opposed none.
Motion passed.

Marion County:

Leon: With the carryover, we need to fund the Butte Creek Fish Habitat Restoration this year. If we do the Invasive Weed partnership it leaves approximately \$18,000 to go toward the Road Culvert Removals.

Leon made a motion for Marion County for the above listed projects to be funded.

Jose asked Jim Irving if the road culvert project was doable with partial funding. Jim said he was not sure but it could be deferred and funding added to it for the next year.

The motion will commit the remainder to culverts and carry over the funds towards this project for next year if this amount is not enough to be used effectively.

1

Dave asked for discussion on the motion.

Robert: Are we allowed to commit to a project for more than one year since we would be committing to next years=funds? Dave said if they can do part of the project with funds allocated it would be okay, otherwise could ask for more funds for the next year.

John: We were not committing funds for next year, just partially funding a project.

Dave called for objections to the motion. None received.

Voting on motion.
Called for all in favor; Aye-s, Opposed, None.
Motion passed.

Polk County

Discussion: Beck Oak project is high priority; Annabelle suggested we see what may be residual left from other counties that could be used to put towards this project.

Suggestion made to hold oak release and see if there may be other resources from other counties to cover the difference.

Randy: The Beck project is the first one we are proposing to do as a sale in a two step process. The first step is to pay a contractor to do the logging and deck the logs. The second step would be to sell the logs. This would be a pilot project and a different method that has been used in the past. The money collected from the timber sale would go into the general treasury.

An option would be to do this project as a timber sale only and not with RAC funding. Jose said that the legislation allows for dual contracting procedures. This is part of a new pilot project and that is why this project was proposed as it is.

Sara: It is really a bookkeeping project.

Randy said that if it was not approved by the RAC, the project would be completed otherwise.

Last year the RAC approved this project for costs to cover the planning process of this project. BLM has an ID Team that has been working on this project.

Cindy Enstrom: There is a cadastral problem on this project. We had to reestablish boundaries that are not identified. This will increase the cost of the project.

Chuck: We are starting to get vague, Maybe we should roll this one over to next year and look at another project for this year.

John asked why do this as a RAC project instead of a regular timber sale. The timber sale money would go back to treasury.

Dave suggested that we should defer Beck Road.

Chuck made a motion to fund the Invasive Weed Project only for Polk County and defer the remaining for next year.

Mark suggested that instead of deferring, maybe we could use the leftover money toward a project in another county.

Annabelle reminded the group that the amount Polk County allocated is the deferred amount from last year; they did not allocate any Title II funds for this year.

Motion was made to defer Polk County dollars to next year except for the Invasive Weed Project.

Discussion: None.

Any Objections: Yes
Went to Role call
See spread sheet.
Motion did not pass in Category 2.

Dave then asked for another motion.

Robert moved to defer funds into a general pot; Sara seconded the motion.

Chuck asked for clarification, Would the money be credited back to Polk County or does it go to another county?

Cliff: Polk County put \$356,000 into Title III and all they allocated for Title II is the carryover from last year which looks like Polk may be opting out of Title II projects. He pointed out that if we allocate their dollars out of county this year, they might not want to participate next year.

Robert said that if we use this year's dollars to partially fund a project in another county, the county should be formally notified as to what happened with their allocation.

Robert made a motion to put Polk County dollars into a general fund to help fully fund other county projects. This was seconded.

Asked for objections: Yes
Went to Role call (see spread sheet).
Motion passed.

Polk County dollars left over from Invasive Seed Project will go to the general pot to be used to help fund other county projects rather than partially fund another project in Polk.

RAC members wished to point out to OR/WA BLM State Office that it would be hard to implement the new pilot joint contract proposal.

Washington County

Dairy Creek is the top ranked project.

Robert made a motion to fund the Dairy Creek at \$22,046 which is what is left of funding after the Invasive

Weed Project.

Motion Seconded.

Discussion:

Mark asked what happens if the county does not want to go along with this project, since this is a BLM project.

Jose said he would look and see if the Dairy Creek project could be reduced or see if we can supplement it with other funding. Otherwise we could hold it over and ask for additional funding next year.

BLM's intent would be to move ahead with the project through scaling back costs or by obtaining supplemental funding.

Asked for Objections: None received.

Called for vote.

All in favor; Aye-s, Opposed: None.

Motion passed.

This completes the county by county allocation.

The remaining amount not yet allocated is approximately \$14,500 which comes from Polk and Columbia Counties.

John questioned Jose as to whether the recent fire would affect a Linn County Project?

Jim Irving: The fire was not in the proposed project area.

Items suggested for using the \$14,000 unallocated funds to fully fund some shortfalls in other counties included: Washington County Dairy Creek, Benton County fish passage, Clackamas illegal dumping, Marion culvert. It was also mentioned that the Siuslaw RAC had also funded the Knotweed project in Lincoln County so it may have been double funded by more than one RAC. Trish went to call to verify the Siuslaw RAC allocation on this project.

Mark moved that we fund the remainder of Dairy Creek and apply the remainder towards the Benton County fish passage assessment project.

Robert seconded the motion.

Discussion: None.

Objections: Yes, Wayne said this use of funds was not consistent with the counties' expectations. He thought the dollars allocated should go to counties that put in the funds, otherwise counties may stop participating in Title II projects. This will set a precedent that we'll regret in the future which might affect long range projects.

Leon: There is some merit in rolling over into next year back to the same county but if there was a regional project to allocate it to it would be different.

Called for Roll call

Vote: See Spreadsheet.

Motion did not pass in Categories 1 or 3.

Robert made a motion to roll over the unallocated moneys back to the participating counties to next year.

Discussion: None.

Objections: None.

Vote: Aye-s; No-s None:

Motion passed Unanimously.

Chuck made a new proposal for Tillamook. There is a chance that Nestucca Connections may be funded through Title III. He suggested that the Title II dollars be allocated to Southern Flame if other funding is provided for the Nestucca Connections project.

A Motion was made that if alternate funding is provided for Nestucca Connections; then the Title II funds be applied to the Southern Flame Project.
Motion was seconded.

Discussion:

Chuck said he thought there may be some double funding here. He also recommended we not wait another year and use the funds for this forest management project. A decision on Nestucca Connections should be made within a couple of weeks.

Asked for Objections: None received.

Called for Vote: All in favor: Aye-s; No-s: None.
Motion passed.

This completed the allocation of funding for this year and leaves \$14,504 deferred to next year. See spreadsheet for specific allocations approved by county.

Discussion followed related to the RAC project proposal development process.

Robert asked, How does the county decided on their priority projects?

Chuck said theoretically most commissioners trust the RAC to make good recommendations.

Annabelle said that in Benton County they made a determination before deadline of their highest priority projects then relied on the RAC. Chuck said the same with Tillamook.

John: Have the counties already done funding level elections?

Richard: If we carry over by county from year to year, all counties need to address the issue. Basically not clarity of thought in common ground with commissioners but what about those that do not have commissioners that are here and part of the RAC.

Chuck: That's why it's important to sell the program to other commissioners. Let them know that if funds roll over to next year it gets back to them as carryover. As long as the county puts funds back into Title II for next year, they get a fair share. If there are no regional projects, there will be ownership.

Richard: Feel this needs to be addressed. Instead of carrying over the funds, they could fully fund other projects. We are missing the intent of legislature from a collaborative standpoint.

Robert: Has talked to county commissioners and some were disappointed to hear that the allocations were being done county by county and not on a regional approach.

Chuck: There needs to be an accountability system of where the money is going. I think both maybe able to be achieved. Need to roll over the funds to next year but need to work to sell the RAC process to county commissioners so that county would put back into the pot for the next year.

Dave: We need a communications venue to counties.

Chuck: Tillamook has more pressure to put funds in for Title III. If the county is losing money to other counties, it would be easier to put more into Title III instead of Title II.

Annabelle: There were other pressures for using Title III; such as educational, urban resource interface, fire, competing interests, etc.

Leon: Have the feeling that when the county commissioners allocated money they believed the funds were

already allocated to their county. How the funds are spread was up to the RAC, but they assume it would be spent in their county.

Richard: Would like clarification from the counties on where they stand regarding use of funds outside of their county.

Cliff: Thought we did good job today in allocating funds by only leaving \$14,000 on the table which a good residual to leave.

Dave is looking forward to the sitting commissioners to take this discussions back to their counties to see each counties=policy regarding use of these funds.

Mark said that if the counties were jealous it behooves the counties to give the RAC some projects they sponsor.

Note: Trish checked with the Siuslaw RAC related to the Knotweed control project. They funded it for \$55,900 according to their website. Not sure if this was double funded by Salem-s allocation or if they asked for separate funding from each RAC for specific parts of the project.

Dave: His understanding that we continue to follow up on this project funding question and if duplicated funding that moneys will be used on a worthwhile project.

Motion was made that if the Knotweed project received duplicate funding from more than one RAC the dollars would be held over to next year.

Call for discussion: None received.
Asked for Objections: None.
Called for Vote:
All in favor: Aye-s, Opposed: None.
Motion passed.

Public Forum:

No visitors to the meeting wanted to address the public forum.

Develop guidelines for future projects.

See handout on potential RAC guidance for future RAC project proposals (Attachment 4).

Paul: Used the brainstorming list from the previous meeting to develop this guidance. He suggested that we list these on a chart and give everyone stickers to vote on their top 5 priorities.

Sara: Not sure this would work. It does not get to the heart of what we want which is a diversity of projects. The list is so abstract it is meaningless. I don't know what it means.

Need to focus on priority watershed or at risk habitats.

Chuck: With the recent events and the fires we may be looking a whole different array of projects after the fire season. We can brainstorm to capture and jumpstart projects but don't think we have seen type of project we need. He agrees with Sara that the RAC would like to leave guidelines open for BLM purposes.

May be some regional things come forward based on the fire situation. There may be changes in projects based on affects of fires.

Dave asked BLM, What do folks in field need from RAC today.

Randy: The resource area staff needs to look at intent of legislation first and determine what fits criteria. Projects that are hard to come by are those like Beck Oak. The Resource Area is trying to fund this project with fire plan funds. It is hard to get a diversity of projects that meet the intent of the legislation.

Rick said that brainstorming a list ideas and voting by dots might give BLM an idea of the support from the

RAC for certain types of projects.

Dave Hanson: Looked at the ranking of projects for this year. The highest ranked project was the Beck Oak which is an indication of the RAC's preference of types of projects.

Rather than dot style voting; Richard said every project has value.

Suggested a 10 point value point voting system to get a feel of where the group stands and the 10-4 would give a relative value.

Randy: The ranked listing of the current year's projects says a lot as to which are higher priority projects.

John: Restoration needs to be done and legislation has road maintenance as standing out in meeting the intent of the legislation.

Sara suggested listing what is in legislation to look at when checking criteria if want to express priority fine, but not spend a lot of time word smithing. There are many road projects but there are all kinds of stream projects and what there is not as much of is terrestrial habitat like oak release and restoration projects.

Chuck agrees with Sara; restoration needs to be separated out.

Wayne: Would prefer to take the list home and review and digest before putting it to a vote.

Chuck agreed and also to incorporate comments back from the RAC.

Like Richard ideas of 1-4 and how fall; can send comments to BLM by e-mail.

Dave: Feel we had enough tools already to show priorities.

Jose agreed that they had enough to work with from vote, and last year's process but you can send in any additional comments.

Dave said that it was okay to let the level of project guidance remain as it and we may discuss next year.

Sara suggested we have a one page brochure for project solicitation package to potential applicants. However, if mainly looking at only county or BLM sponsored projects we shouldn't solicit outside.

Attached is a [Get Funding for Your Local Watershed Project](#) as an example that BLM has been handing out at meetings (Attachment 5).

We can cleanup add pictures graphics to make more attractive.

Sara: This brochure implies that only on-the-ground projects are funded and only watershed projects would be considered. It does not include what is higher priority coordination projects along the lines of the invasive weed project.

Richard: The handout needs to clarify that the project must benefit federal lands and resources. The last sentence of types of projects funded needs to be spelled out.

If the project is on private land, it needs to demonstrate how it would to benefit O&C lands (BLM/USFS).

Need to emphasize different types of projects.

RAC members were asked to review and send any comments by via e-mail to Paul Jeske or Jose Linares (Paul_Jeske@blm.gov or Jose_Linares@blm.gov).

Identify next meeting dates & location:

See Proposal for RAC Discussion (Attachment 3).

Dave mentioned that March 21 is a Friday and need to move to March 20, Thursday. This may also conflict with spring break, if it does, may move this meeting to the first week in April.

RAC is to review proposed schedule and provide any feedback to Paul or Jose.

Feedback on how today's meeting functioned:

Dave: Appreciated how everyone worked together today to get back on the right track. He feels this is a great bunch around the table to work with.

Jose: Also appreciated everyone's commitment to the program.

Sara and others thanked Jose for work he did between the last meeting and this one to help resolve the issues that surfaced.

Other comments: Dave is doing a great job as Chair.

Jose has an article from the Capitol Press on the Benton Oak project (Attachment 5).

The meeting was adjourned at 12:15.

BLM RESOURCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING OPERATING GUIDELINES

- _ Do Not Interrupt Others and No Side Conversations
- _ Listen With Respect
- _ Focus On Subject, Not Person
- _ Do Not Get Personal (in confrontations)
- _ Chair to Ensure Everyone the Opportunity to Speak (Voice their opinion)
- _ Focus on Committee Issues and Objectives
- _ Strive for Common Ground
- _ Be Recognized Before Speaking (by Raising hand, etc.)
- _ Majority by Category on Roll-Call Vote
- _ Leadership is Responsibility of All Members
- _ A Facilitator's Role is to: Maintain Order, Follow Meeting Guides, and to Promote the Committee's Agenda

Attachment 1

Summary of RAC related Roles and Responsibilities

The RAC, the counties, and the BLM each have defined roles and responsibilities in the RAC process. To be successful we must be willing and able to work together. Equally important, we must show trust and allow the other partners to do their part.

The RAC has the responsibility to review proposed projects and recommend which ones to fund. RAC members must be willing to participate regularly in committee work, abide by the meeting guidelines, and demonstrate a commitment to collaborative decision making and consensus building when confronted with contentious issues (see Charter Sec. 10a). It is the RAC's responsibility to recommend projects for funding and to determine what criteria to use in their evaluations of projects.

Counties elect how much funding to put into Title II and have the option of objecting to using their Title II funds for particular projects.

The BLM has the responsibility to provide staff support to the RAC and to provide and solicit projects for consideration by the RAC. The BLM is also responsible for final approval of projects and for ensuring that recommended projects meet the legislative intent before they are approved. Finally, the BLM has the responsibility to ensure that projects are implemented and that the funds are used appropriately.

Proposed 2003 Salem District RAC Schedule

2002

October 1 Begin outreach efforts to encourage submission of diverse and high quality project proposals. Includes distribution of guidance/criteria for RAC project proposals.

2003

March 3 Pre-proposals submitted to Salem District (optional, but strongly encouraged).

March 7 Pre-proposals assembled and mailed out. No pre-screening included in packet.

March 20 RAC meeting
*Proponents provide briefings, answer questions & obtain feedback from RAC members concerning questions they still have & suggestions for improvement.
*Provide updates on status of approved projects
*Identify potential field trip stops.

April 4 Feedback to RAC project proponents, including BLM assessment of how the project meets legislative intent.

June 2 RAC project proposals due to Salem BLM

June 16 Packets distributed to RAC members. Packets include BLM assessment of how project meets legislative intent.

June 26 Potential RAC field trip (existing &/or proposed projects)

July 10 Potential RAC field trip (existing &/or proposed projects)

July 24 RAC meeting
*Provide updates on status of approved projects
*Proponents provide briefings, answer questions regarding their proposals.
*RAC members vote on project recommendations.

August 7 RAC meeting (if needed)
*Proponents provide briefings, answer questions regarding their proposals.
*RAC members vote on project recommendations.

August 28 District Manager decisions

September 11 Potential RAC field trip (existing &/or proposed projects)

Potential RAC guidance for future RAC project proposals

When considering what type of project proposal to submit to the RAC you should consider their previous experiences, expectations for the future and preferences. The Salem District BLM RAC has expressed an emphasis or preference for project proposals with:

“On-the-ground” results rather than studies or data gathering.

Partnerships between several agencies or parties.

Matching funds.

A clear contribution to the intent identified in the legislation, including a demonstrated benefit to federal resources.

A demonstrated connection to a regional or watershed wide restoration effort.

Innovation and creativity.

A focus on priority watersheds or at risk habitats.

Results/changes that people can see and readily understand the benefit.

A high potential for public education/outreach.

A relatively quick (12 months from funding) projected completion date.

Completed NEPA, ESA and other regulatory requirements.

Applications which are complete, yet concise and easy to understand.

Work proposed in categories which have fewer proposals. Typically there are many road related project proposals and relatively few projects related to stream or forest restoration.

No funding from other existing regular (annual) federal appropriations.

