



Fremont-Winema RAC Notes March 31,2009

● 805 meeting was called to Order by Chair Lani Hickey

Amy Gowan DFO and Lucinda Nolan RAC Coordinator addressed housekeeping

Anita Ward asked the committee to consider some points regarding the 12.5 % overhead budget line item that appears on the proposal form. She would like to see consistency in all the proposals in regards to this charge. Anita would like to see it spelled out on the proposal that “not everyone has to take the 12.5 %.

Dan Shoun pointed out that everyone has the option to take up to 12.5 % at their discretion.

Discussion about the 4% the Fremont-Winema takes off the top of the Title II funds to cover overhead and therefore internal projects do not ask for the 12.5%

Anita would like there to be a line item on the proposal form (line item #36) to clarify that all external proponents can ask for up to 12.5% overhead.

Al Switzer does not want to see this as a line item. Proponents should understand administrative charges.

Mary Baker made a motion to send a message to the Regional Office that the Fremont-Winema would like to see a clarification on the proposal form regarding the 12.5% overhead.

Melvin Dick seconded

The vote was a tie

Chair broke the tie..motion did not pass

● Chair Lani Hickey explained the prioritization voting procedure and caucusing

Brett Johnson asked what assurance do “we” (the RAC) have that if some of the projects approved for funding today , might also be funded by the stimulus funds, that the title II funds would then come back to our pot?

Title II funds are protected by law and are available for Title II projects only.

Discussion...stimulus funded projects

Lani asked Amy if she could find out when title II monies will be available to the proponents?

Amy answered that she would and will share info as soon as she knows. Karen needs to review and approve, and packets need to be forwarded on to Secretary first. Plan is to expedite process so money can be distributed asap

- **The Committee then began the project by project voting process** (results can be found in prioritization spreadsheets). Lani began by summarizing voting process and then asking each Group to share whether they had “no go” projects. The following highlights **GO/NO** project discussion points made by RAC members.

Group B NO GO: EL-907 (Aspen Restoration Effectiveness Monitoring), **EL-906** (Bauers Creek) and **EK-901** (Beatty Uplands) OUT. Reason for EL-907 shared by Craig was that science methods were not clear. Reason for EL-906 shared by Jayne is that NEPA is not ready so should try again for second round (FY2010). Reason for EK-901 shared by Bill was that cost/acre way too high and too much money requested to fund materials/equipment.

Group C NO GO: EK-903 (Gaging Station). Pete shared the project did not meet intent of legislation but group B (Mary) thought project was worthwhile. **Ninemile Non-WUI a NO GO based on no NEPA.**

- Post voting discussion highlights:
 - Craig stressed that private land project proponents need to provide reassurance that RACs restoration investments will be protected from future sale of land. There needs to be consistency regarding expectations that projects will not be recommended for funding if there is risk of sale without deed protection for projects. Much discussion ensued regarding challenges since may involve legal deed process beyond RAC. Pete offered that RAC explore question prior to next round. Amy clarified that she heard Pete say that a way to go would be prioritizing/voting based on project risk relative to project complexity and/or funding investment. RAC needs to consider types of appropriate restraints.
- Review of voting results elicited following allocation of funds from original amounts:
 - Lake County
 - \$25,000.00 from Thomas Creek (FL-906) in order to fully fund Lake County Barnes Valley Juniper II (FL-901). Pete motioned to accept funding line at FL-906. Mary seconds and motion carries.
 - Klamath County
 - Group first offered funding cut off below WK-902 Native Species but with adjustments to original requests ended up below Copper and Field (WK-909). Process/rationale follows
 - This was based on Brett’s recommendation to cut funds for Middle Jack (WK-11-903) to \$64,000 or 180 acres treated. Pete made motion to cut funds per Brett and Al second; motion carried. In addition, Mary and group C recommended to cut Clean Forest in half (EK- 906) to make budget bubble line. Al moved to accept and Anita second. Motion carried. They all decided to go ahead and fund 3 Buttes fully because want to finish project!
 - Anita also recommended cuts in Tomahawk. Dan recommended cuts to WK904/909 to get closer to \$1.9 mill as wanted both to receive funds since both scored same. Result was to fund Copper \$230,660 and Bay Mill \$200,660. Al moved to accept recommend funds cuts, Dan second, motion carried
- **The meeting then moved to final agenda topics.** Amy and Cindi requested input on RAC proposal tips to share with proponents during April 13/14 workshop.

Dan Shoun began by voicing his concern that there were no projects submitted that deals with Red Dead issue. He recommends proponents emphasize treatments for red area for next rounds. He said the forest/partners need to be strategic about treatments. He is concerned about private property owners being “innocent bystanders”.

They can not do anything about their circumstances. He would like to see projects designed to address spread of disease and get out ahead of the problem. "It is not a natural process".

Jayne and Craig agreed the red zone projects could carry higher ranking or priority for future proposals. Lani clarified that she heard the group say immediate need is to treat the perimeter of the red zone. Anita responded by saying it is important to consider protecting healthy veg growing up within the red zone; possibly thru additional monitoring.

Craig motioned higher priority for future red zone projects. Motion didn't go anywhere.

Brett said it was disappointing that project only provided for safety around campsites. We need to address fuel loads! There was general discussion about how Red Zone safety proposals focus was off track. Emphasis should be forest health; proposals reminded them of past Title II hazard tree proposals.

Training suggestions...

- More consistency in cost per acre from thinning/piling/burning projects
- Identify "actual" treatment, e.g. will it be a chainsaw or slashbuster
- Be in attendance to present your proposal or to answer any questions (shows to them that you really want these funds)
- Clear picture of what you are doing with the funds...spell it out in the budget...no addendums
- No really large ticket items...the money is running out and the RAC would like to fund as many projects as possible
- NEPA needs to be complete
- RAC wants to be strategic as possible in their funding (the TNC is working on a strategic plan, Fire Learning network, Craig Bienz)
- Consistent approach to budget. Clarify as needed below budget chart not with additional budget pages that confuse things

Suggestions for staff and Forest...

- **RAC Title II projects map updated (will be supported via Counties DSS project)**
- **Wants Karen's red zone priority for the Forest**
- **Expedite funding from Forest to proponents**
- **They would also like a forest strategic red zone inventory/treatment map**

● Cindi/Amy discussion on the RAC travel for the July meeting...

Would the RAC be willing to spend the first day – the day the proponents present their projects, on video conf from both the Klamath and Lake county main offices?

Dan Shoun , couldn't we talk to the regional office or the Washington office. The RAC funds are separate from the federally appropriated dollars.

A motion was made by Craig Bienz that a letter be sent to Karen Shimamoto asking that the RAC travel not be capped.

Anita ward seconded

Discussion by RAC on how they like the interaction between the members during breaks and down time. This RAC is highly efficient and they only meet two days a year

It was decided that Lani and Al would draft the letter.

Motion Passed

RAC wants to meet in its entirety for the July meeting

Staff will send RAC members an e-mail with the dates for the July meeting

Motion to adjourn by Dan Shoun

Second by Mary Baker

Adjournment was called by Lani Hickey@ 12:54