

Meeting Minutes

Resource Advisory Council Committee Meeting for 2012 RAC funding cycle May 17, 2011

Members:

Group A

Peggy Spieger – Deschutes – Oregon State Snowmobile Association
John Morgan – Crook – Ochoco Lumber Company
Greg Bedortha – Crook - Cattleman, Rancher
Patricia Gainsforth – Deschutes – Deschutes Soil/Water Conservation District

Group B

Timothy Lillebo – Deschutes – Oregon Natural Resources Council
Kelly Cannon-Miller – Deschutes County Historical Society
Ryan Houston – Deschutes – Upper Deschutes Watershed Council
Amy Waltz – Deschutes – The Nature Conservancy

Group C

Clay Penhollow – Jefferson – Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs
Ken Roadman – Deschutes – Retired Teacher
Mike Daly – Deschutes – Public at Large
Ken McCarrell – Deschutes – Public at Large

Unconfirmed Appointees

Chuck Long – Oregon B.A.S.S. Federation

Absent:

John Asher – Wheeler – Rancher, Grazing Permittee
Timothy Deboodt – Crook – OSU Crook County Extension Service
Michael Gangstead – Deschutes – Redmond Chapter Oregon Hunters Association

- Tim Lillebo came to meeting at 11:30am, Ryan Houston left at 1:00pm

Staff:

Mark Christiansen – USFS Title II Program Coordinator
John Allen – Forest Supervisor for Deschutes National Forest and the Designated Federal Official
Katrina Van Dis – Central Oregon Intergovernmental Council, Program Coordinator

Introductions and Agenda Review

Members introduced themselves; Katrina Van Dis reviewed the agenda

Update on RAC (Designated Federal Official and Title II funding amount)

Mr. Allen welcomed Regional Advisory Council (RAC) committee members and thanked them for their time and commitment to the process. He informed them that Jeff Walter (the former DFO) had taken another position and that the interim Ochoco Forest Supervisor was not able to be the DFO for the committee at this time.

He introduced Mark Christiansen as the new RAC representative for the Forest Service.

Katrina informed members that the available funding had decreased significantly from the previous years and that the total amount was unknown at this time. The usual reduction in funds from year to year will vary this year. Because of this, the RAC will need to choose projects based on a range of possible total amounts.

Election of Chair

Amy Waltz nominated Greg Bedortha to be the RAC chair. John seconded the motion and Patricia agreed. John Allen confirmed.

2012 Binder Corrections and Updates

Binder corrections were reviewed (see attachment in binder)

Project Review Q & A

Grant applicants presented a brief overview of their projects and answered questions from the committee. The following notes are pertinent questions and answers asked by the RAC of presenters.

- Alan Unger, Deschutes County Commissioner – Mr. Unger stated that the priorities for Deschutes County are the Deschutes Skyline, Tri-County Weed and Weeds Along Public Roads (in no particular order)
- Dan Sherwin explained that education funding is for important weed control
 - Q: How do you gauge success? A: brochures are given out each year.
- DE009 – Volunteer Coordinator position. Kim, Ken and Peggy stated their support for the project.
- JE005 – Project coordinators are in the process of looking for additional funds
 - Q: What is angler response? Are you willing to work to define trails that are used and not used? How do you harden trails? A: We define a trail and put in stepping stones and a rock platform.
 - Q: There are a large number of landowners, do you coordinate with them? A: Not yet, but we can. We interact with a lot of people.
 - Q: Do you reach out to other organizations? A: Yes, this is part of a larger project.
- PE006 – Clarification – staff time is for design and NEPA
- MU004
 - Q: Are you going to provide ATV access? A: Currently there is mix use. We are closing the NEPA identified roads or those roads close to riparian areas. We would like to use tax money to educate and inform the public.
- KL001 – Project was partially funded last year and will continue
 - Arlie is in support of the project
- CR002 – NEPA is complete. This will be used for 100 cow/calf pairs. The portable corrals are usually stolen.
 - Q: What is 4H management? A: this is determined by a panel.
 - Q: Is there a future need for a quarry? A: There could be a future use.
- DE004 – provided a hand-out
 - Q: How many acres is this project? A: Refer to handout

- Q: Why not provide the money for the staff? A: All the money has to go towards implementation, none of the money is for staff. Staff is for the sub-committee outreach and communications (Katie Lighthall) and monitoring (Phil Chang). We need to line up the day to day staffing.
- CR005
 - Q: Is NEPA complete? A: We will stay in confines of the existing NEPA
- CR007 – Headcut
 - Q: What are you doing? A: Adding large rock.
- WH003
 - Q: Who is responsible for the culvert? A: Forest Service
- WH004 – The entire match is secured.
- DE011 and DE005 – 157 acres is the contracted cost. 164 acres will be done by Forest Service. By purchasing a grapple machine the Forest Service will be implementing projects instead of contacting out the work. The money used to pay for someone’s time to run the grapple machine comes out of a different funding source versus having to find money for implementation costs.
- CR003 – NEPA was completed last year.
 - Q: How many committees are there? A: 2 committees

2011 Project Selection Information

Ms. Van Dis reviewed the Project Selection Information as follows:

- a) Project Selection Principles are in the front section of their binders for member’s reference.
- b) Continuation Projects are indicated on the project application.
- c) County Contributions/Total Amount Available were provided in a handout.
- d) Project NEPA Review included in binder
- e) Forest Service Priorities discussed by John Allen
- f) Process Overview Ms. Van Dis explained specifics for the use of the RAC data base spreadsheet including project voting parameters and the use of colored dots; committee breakouts; and visual tracking of project funding decisions throughout the day. To further explain, she stated that after the first break out session, the recorder of each group will place one colored dot (high priority-green dot, medium-yellow dot, and low-red dot) on the posted spreadsheets for each project indicating their group’s consensus ranking. Also, the recorder will indicate on the posted spreadsheets the committee’s recommended reduced funding amount, if appropriate. If a project has two red dots, that project will not be considered for further consideration. If a project has three green dots, that project will be prioritized for funding. A second round will be used to further clarify which projects are preferred by each group.

Notes

Patricia stated that she would like to review the projects on the ground if the funding is available for Ms. Van Dis to do this.

Committee followed through with decision process.

2012 Deschutes-Ochoco Recommended Funding Allocation

Note: Total amount available for Title II contributions is not currently available; therefore the RAC allocated funds based on the minimum amount potentially granted. Priorities were given to projects that will be funded if additional monies become available.

DFO #	Project Name	USFS Priority by County	Applicant	RAC Request	Recommended conservative funding (\$398K)	Recommended funding beyond minimum (\$511K)	Priority if additional funding is available	Difference between minimum and maximum funding allowance
Crook County								
CR-001	Crooked River Watershed Noxious Weed Control		CRWM	\$ 65,284.00	\$ 40,000.00	\$ 65,284.00	1	full funding
CR-003	Black Snag Corral Construction and Kimlin Spr.	1	ONF - LM	\$ 16,784.25	\$ 15,985.00	\$ 15,985.00		NA
CR-005	Stream Habitat Project in Trout, Dick & Auger creeks	2	ONF - LM	\$ 48,100.00	\$ 40,000.00	\$ 48,100.00	1	full funding
CR-007	Middle Deep Restoration	3	ONF - Paulina	\$50,500	\$ -	\$ 50,500.00	2	full funding
Deschutes County								
DE-001	DC Weeds along Public Roads		Deschutes County	\$ 3,500.00	\$ 3,500.00	\$ 3,500.00		NA
DE-002	Tri-County Weed/Vegetation Education Outreach		Deschutes County	\$ 28,776.00	\$ 20,000.00	\$ 20,000.00		NA
DE-004*	Deschutes Skyline Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration		CO Forest Stewardship Fdn.	\$ 40,940.00	\$ 26,000.00	\$ 26,000.00		NA
DE-005	SET Hazardous Fuels Reduction	3	DNF - BFR	\$ 107,730.00	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 10,000.00		NA
DE-006	Soda Creek Restoration	2	DNF - BFR	\$ 30,000.00	\$ 30,000.00	\$ 30,000.00		NA
DE-009	Deschutes National Forest Volunteer Coordinator	1	DNF - BFR	\$ 36,000.00	\$ 36,000.00	\$ 36,000.00		NA
Jefferson County								
JE-005	Metolius River Trail Restoration	1	DNF - Sisters	\$ 34,000.00	\$ 7,800.00	\$ 12,800.00	1	additional \$5,000
Klamath County								
KL-001	Crescent Lake Guard Station	1	Crescent NF	\$ 34,000.00	\$ 34,000.00	\$ 34,000.00		NA
KL-003	Odell Lake Bull Trout Escapment	2	Crescent NF	\$ 18,000.00	\$ 5,000.00	\$ 18,000.00	1	additional \$13,000
Wheeler County								
WH-001	Wheeler County Weed Management Project		Wheeler SWCD	\$ 43,780.00	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 10,000.00		NA
WH-003	Younger Pond Repair		ONF - Paulina	\$ 2,364.00	\$ -	\$ 2,364.00	1	full funding
WH-004	Jackson Creek Restoration	1	ONF - Paulina	\$ 30,000.00	\$ -	\$ 9,300.00	2	fund at \$9,300
Multiple Counties								
MU-001	Youth at Work in Central Oregon		Heart of Oregon Corps	\$ 170,174.00	\$ 60,000.00	\$ 60,000.00		NA
MU-002	Invasive Plant Control on the Ochoco NF & Crooked River NG	1	ONF	\$ 87,000.00	\$ 30,000.00	\$ 30,000.00		NA
MU-003	Invasive Plant Control on the Deschutes National Forest	3	DNF	\$ 94,400.00	\$ 30,000.00	\$ 30,000.00		NA
			TOTAL		\$ 398,285.00	\$ 511,833.00		

DE-004 *Foundation will decide how to allocate funding

WH-001 **Only for implementation

	Estimate of Title II funds available	Conservative estimate based on a potential 41% reduction compared to 2011	Estimate based on current Title II allocations
Crook	\$	126,695.85	\$ 203,116.00
Deschutes	\$	165,609.82	\$ 165,983.00
Jefferson	\$	29,828.32	\$ 44,851.00
Klamath	\$	55,565.46	\$ 67,817.95
Wheeler	\$	20,647.66	\$ 31,710.00
	\$	398,347.11	\$ 513,477.95

Deschutes-Ochoco RAC Allocation Explanation

Conservative Title II Allocation based on a 41% reduction from 2011 allocated project monies

	Estimated Allocation	% Contributed by County	% Allocated to County	Recommended Projects Specific to each County	Recommended Multi -County Projects	Total
Crook	\$ 126,695.85	32%	30%	\$ 95,985	\$ 22,000	\$ 117,985
Deschutes	\$ 165,609.82	42%	42%	\$ 125,500	\$ 40,000	\$ 165,500
Jefferson	\$ 29,828.32	7%	10%	\$ 7,800	\$ 32,000	\$ 39,800
Klamath	\$ 55,565.46	14%	14%	\$ 39,000	\$ 16,000	\$ 55,000
Wheeler	\$ 20,647.66	5%	5%	\$ 10,000	\$ 10,000	\$ 20,000
	\$ 398,347.11		100%	\$ 278,285	\$ 120,000	\$ 398,285
Total FS Project Recommendation	\$ 238,784.99				amt available	\$ 398,347
Total Other Recommendation	\$ 159,500.00				total allocated	\$ 398,285
Total Recommendation	\$ 398,284.99					

Projected Title II allocation based on normal trends

	Estimated Allocation	% Contributed by County	% Allocated to County	Recommended Projects Specific to each County	Recommended Multi-County Projects	Total
Crook	\$ 203,116.00	40%	39%	\$ 179,869	\$ 22,000	\$ 201,869
Deschutes	\$ 165,983.00	32%	32%	\$ 125,500	\$ 40,000	\$ 165,500
Jefferson	\$ 44,851.00	9%	9%	\$ 12,800	\$ 32,000	\$ 44,800
Klamath	\$ 67,817.95	13%	13%	\$ 52,000	\$ 16,000	\$ 68,000
Wheeler	\$ 31,710.00	6%	6%	\$ 21,700	\$ 10,000	\$ 31,700
	\$ 513,477.95		100%	\$ 391,869	\$ 120,000	\$ 511,869
Total FS Project Recommendation	\$ 238,784.99				amt available	\$ 513,478
Total Other Recommendation	\$ 159,500.00				total allocated	\$ 511,869
Total Recommendation	\$ 398,284.99					

Comments/Notes: Minimum change in Deschutes County allocations between estimates; Jefferson County has a large portion of total projects allocated through Multi-County projects. Allocation projections are based on Forest Service projections.