

**Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000
Resource Advisory Council Meeting
Bureau of Land Management
Salem District Office Conference Room
February 1, 2002
Salem, Oregon**

Attendees:

Name	Interest	Name	Interest
Richard Williams	Timber	Leon Willbanks	Off-Highway Vehicle (alternate)
Wayne Giesy	Timber	Sara Vickerman	Regional/National Environment
Mark Luedtke	Timber	Dave Schmidt	Timber
David Hanson	Local Environmental	Don Hopkins	Local Environmental
Walter Cate	Dispersed Recreation	Melissa Leoni	Regional Environmental
John Lindsay	Elected Official	Annabelle Jaramillo	Elected Official
Charles Hurliman	Elected Official	Clifford Adams	Tribal Representative
Robert Van Creveld	Public-At-Large	Jose Linares	Designated Federal Official
Paul Jeske	Facilitator	Tina Tyler	Recorder

Absent: John McGehey, Timber and Kurt Schrader, (alternate) State Official

Other attendees:

Rocky McVay	O&C Counties	Maya Fuller	BLM Oregon State Office
Jim Hallberg	BLM, OSO	Kevin Davis	O&C Counties
Raylene Erickson	Lincoln Co.	Mark Wilkening	BLM, Eugene
Jim Irving	BLM, Salem	Cindy Enstrom	BLM, Salem
Randy Gould	BLM, Salem	Gil Riddell	Assoc. of Oregon Counties
Dick Prather	BLM, Salem	Dana Shuford	BLM, Tillamook
Trish Hogervorst	BLM, Salem	Judy Akahoshi	BLM, Salem

Welcome: Jose Linares welcomed everyone. He noted that this process gives people a voice but also requires close coordination between the RAC, counties, federal agencies and others. The key is collaboration. RAC members were chosen because of their willingness to work with others and their collaborative skills.

Jose introduced Jim Hallberg who will be the point of contact at the Oregon State Office (BLM) as the County Payments Coordinator. Paul Jeske will be the RAC's facilitator.

Introductions: Members introduced themselves, why they were interested and their opinion of what would make a successful RAC.

Interests included:

- Like to see public land properly managed
- Efficiency in projects
- Legislative involvement
- Interest in natural resources
- Tie commodities to land management
- Important to have advisory groups for responsible management of lands
- Preserving and enhancing recreation interests
- Collaborative decisionmaking
- Conservation of biodiversity
- Like to see agencies have 'freer' hand in managing lands
- Trails, OHV, multiple use
- Want to help

Indicators of Successful RAC:

- Reaches agreement without animosity
- Spends funds appropriately
- No turf battles
- Choose and implement projects which have great value to our constituents, the economy and the community
- Opportunity to get wood products into the economy
- Respect for different opinions, collaboration
- Collaboration, agreement between parties
- Meeting that ends early or on time and gets the job done.
- Look for effective projects that go beyond the lowest common denominator
- Recommend good projects
- Good measurement of success for projects
- Utilize public lands for the public

Agenda Review: The agenda was reviewed and approved. Paul Jeske distributed a handout, 'A *Facilitator's Role*' to assist members in understanding his role. All members and alternates received a binder - *Resource Advisory Committee Guidebook*.

Background and History of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000:

Handouts:

- *Secure Rural Schools and Community Self Determination Act of 2000 (P.L. 106-393)*, slide presentation
- *Secure Rural Schools and Community Self Determination Act of 2000*, synopsis
- *15%-20% Funding*, decision point graphic

Rocky McVay, Director of the O&C Counties Association, described the process under Title II like 8 spokes of a wheel.

- 1) Passage of the legislation after a 5 year effort
- 2) Signed by the President
- 3) Geographic boundaries established
- 4) Counties elected to designate a portion of the safety net revenues to Title II
- 5) RAC members were appointed
- 6) RAC selection of projects to go to Secretary of Interior (hopefully the authority will be designated down to the district level.
- 7) Work on projects is completed.
- 8) Steps 4, 6, and 7 are repeated five more times.

This is an historic piece of legislation. Because it is not permanent legislation, success will be critical towards developing a long term solution. Counties make 3 elections to opt in or out - all 34 Oregon counties took full payment. They must spend 15-20% on projects. Anything not spent is returned to the U.S. Treasury. Title II projects must show a demonstrated benefit to federal lands and usually involve a federal agency. Title III projects are solely county projects and are not involved with the RAC unless it is a collaborative project. Oregon will probably be audited on what is expended, especially in Title III.

Project considerations include:

- Be prepared for project overruns
- Multi-year projects will require funding each year to guarantee success.
- Projects that are through federal agencies must address NEPA, consultation and other concerns.
- RAC's must be willing to buy in for the long haul.
- Look for companion projects.

The RAC's are 10 months behind. Projects for the first cycle should be selected by mid-April. Projects selected for the next cycle will not be funded until October 2002. Counties will be watching to see what is selected in April as they make the next round of selections.

Administrative costs and overruns won't usually get funded by the RAC but the RAC can set the administrative costs. In some cases, be prepared to absorb some of the administrative costs of the federal agencies. There may also be opportunities to access grants and other funding sources such as the National Fire plan funding. If uncommitted money exists at the end of the entire process, it is lost. It will be important to have other projects ready to replace projects that cannot be completed. Rocky also felt that RAC members might be asked to testify at national congressional oversight hearings. He emphasized, again, the importance of showing success.

Overview of the RAC charter (see binder):

Handout:: *Resource Advisory Committee*, copy of presentation

RACs were established to improve collaborative relationships and to provide advice and recommendations to the land management agencies consistent with the purposes of the Act. Categories were established for membership. Another important consideration for membership is geographic representation.

Kevin Davis clarified the definition of a majority. 3 out of 5 in each category constitutes a majority of the full committee. Alternates do not vote unless representing an absent RAC member.

Meetings must be posted in the Federal Register with 30 days notice. Minutes must be on file. Money allocated to counties is based on a 3 year high of past revenues. Counties now have ownership and investment in the lands that historically gave them revenues. A chart in the binder shows the monies available, by county, to the RAC

Vacancies will be handled through an announcement to cover all the vacancies. It will follow the same process as the original selection process and include a press release. Previous unselected applicants will be encouraged to re-apply.

FACA: (Video) The RAC falls under FACA rules. The FACA serves 2 purposes:

- Maximizes access to public minutes and reports, requiring a balanced viewpoint.
- Structures management and provides an annual report to Congress.

GENERAL HOUSEKEEPING:

Handout: *Reimbursement for Travel and Per Diem*

Judy Akahoshi, Salem BLM, is the contact person for travel and per diem reimbursement. Members who desire reimbursement are signed up on a volunteer agreement. Under that agreement they can be reimbursed for mileage and receive subsistence of 22.50. If the meeting extends into multiple days, members will be reimbursed for lodging.

Mailing lists were made available for committee use. **Agreement:** Mailing list information would not be shared with the public other than names and affiliation.

PUBLIC FORUM: As part of FACA, a portion of the meeting must be dedicated to members of the public who wish to address the RAC. No presenters came forward today.

PROJECT PROCESSES AND TIMELINES:

Handout: *Payments to Counties*, slide presentation
Project Summary and Information, binder

Highlights included:

- March - first discussion and potential approval of projects
 - first meeting: elect chair, identify additional information needs, future meeting dates.
 - First or second meeting: set potential operation guidelines, and project evaluation criteria. RAC has opportunity and discretion to set meeting guidelines for discussion and review.
- Concurrence by the agency-designated authority
- Contracts assembled
- Fieldwork begins in 2002-2003.

Potential delays could result from:

- Legal requirements involving surveys, NEPA, ESA, engineering design, etc.
- Projects are subject to the same protests and appeals as federal projects.
- Complexity of implementation.

Questions and Concerns:

- Make sure RAC tracks strategic accomplishment of goals - not necessarily how many projects completed. Track the big picture.
- What is the level of commitment from NFMS to review things in a timely manner? Some projects would be covered programmatically - such as culvert replacement. The more complex and greater the level of disturbance the more consultation is necessary. NMFS also has a timeline to meet with other agencies.
- How to ensure quality of projects.
- There is approximately \$711,400. The total funding requested by all the projects comes to \$4,042,000. The RAC could spend all the money in one county. However, counties can veto against having their money spent in another county. RACs could also fund a project in a county that is not contributing any funds.
- The totals listed for all projects, including multi-year represents the full cost. A request was made to break down the multiyear projects to show annual costs.
- The Yamhill Law Enforcement proposal was added.
- Regional projects and multiple county projects appear to have less chance of approval because of the way they are displayed. Need to display those projects by the benefit to individual counties.
- Figure out proximity to other projects when showing watershed restoration projects.
- Need to coordinate multi RAC projects. Jose said the understanding was that the costs would be split 3 ways. That would need to be clarified by the RAC each year.
- Noxious weed projects will need collaboration with neighbors.

Projects where improvements might be blocked by activities further down the stream have not been forwarded to the RAC.

ELECTION OF RAC CHAIR:

The chair responsibilities were reviewed. The members agreed that they would elect a chair and vice-chair; those positions being filled by the candidates receiving the top two number of votes. The vice-chair responsibilities would be the same scope as the chair's responsibilities.

Dave Schmidt was elected RAC chair.

Melissa Leoni was elected as vice-chair in a run-off against Mark Luedtke.

There were 14 voting members present. At this point, Dave assumed the chair for the rest of the meeting.

FUTURE MEETING DATES:

March 7, 9-3 pm, Salem District Office

March 28, 9-3 pm, Salem District Office

April 12, 9-3 pm, Salem District Office

A Federal Register notice submitted for a meeting on March 1 will be corrected to March 7.

Agenda topics for March 7:

- Develop rules of conduct
- Listing of Title III projects
- Discussion and selection of 2001 projects
- Develop criteria for 2002 projects
- Public Forum
- Identify opportunities/needs for field trips

2001 Screening Criteria: Because of the short timeline for selection of 2001 projects, Dave Schmidt suggested different criteria for the first set of projects to speed the process. The criteria would highlight all projects that:

- Have passed NEPA and other consultation,
- Are ready to go to contract,
- AND would show measurable outcome in 18 months.

Merit would be added to the criteria along with a commitment to balance location of the funding with the final selections. A second screen would test the project against the intent of the public law.

Projects not 'ready to go' would roll forward to the next selection process.

Decision: The criteria was voted on and passed by the members.

A resource person for each project will be available to answer questions. The RAC can also request a resource person from the sponsoring group at the second meeting, for those projects which need clarification.

Jose committed to the BLM reviewing and screening projects for next meeting based on that criteria. A summary page will be prepared that identifies the ones ready to go and that have some

measurable outcome. It will be sent to the group in a few weeks.

A RAC subcommittee comprised of Annabelle Jaramillo, John Lindsay, Melissa Leoni, and Dave Schmidt will meet to refine the criteria matrix for rating the projects.

A request by a member to have the BLM give a high, medium or low rating to the federal projects was not approved by the membership.

MEETING EVALUATION:

-Jose and Salem BLM provided excellent materials, especially on short order.

-Good turnout for first meeting - 14 out of 15 members.

-Finished 30 minutes early.

