

EL DORADO COUNTY RESOURCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE (PL-110-393)

El Dorado Center of Folsom Lake College
Community Room, 6699 Campus Drive, Placerville, CA 95667

Meeting Agenda

December 14th, 6:00 to 9:00 pm

Agenda items:

- 1) (All – 10 minutes) – Re-introduction of RAC members and Duane Nelson
- 2) (Dale and Duane – 2 minutes) - Introduction of Jennifer Chapman
- 3) (3 minutes) - Public Comment (General; non-project specific)
- 4) (Duane/Jennifer/Dale – 5 minutes) - Overview of tonight's meeting purpose and objectives
- 5) (Dale and RAC Committee – 30 minutes) – Review EDC RAC operating guidelines and ground rules (*Item 5 – supporting materials attached*)
 - a. Purpose of the Act
 - b. EDC RAC Purpose and Mission
 - c. EDC RAC Operating guidelines
 - d. Member attendance
 - e. Respectful collaboration
 - f. EDC RAC Project evaluation considerations
 - g. Review Call for Proposals
 - h. Adequate preparation
 - i. Chairperson Discussion
- 6) (Duane/Jennifer – 5 minutes) – Review of balance sheet, discussion of RAC “overhead” account.
- 7) (Duane – 15 minutes) – Summary report of last set of authorized RAC Projects
- 8) (RAC Committee – 20 minutes) – defining this year's process and developing a timeline for RAC meetings and decision making
- 9) (All - 40 minutes) – RAC membership discussion
 - a. Recruiting RAC replacement members
 - b. Status of current members when terms expire in September 2016 – can we re-apply? Small Group Consultation and Discussion of Project Proposals
- 10) (All –2 minutes) –Confirm date/time/place for next RAC meeting
- 11) Adjournment

OPERATING GUIDELINES FOR THE EL DORADO COUNTY

RESOURCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

These operating guidelines and ground rules are general in nature and were developed to aid the overall flow of business and are not legally binding for operations of the El Dorado County Resource Advisory Committee (RAC).

- 1) If you are unable to attend a meeting, contact Dale van Dam at 530/642-5615 (office) or 916/826-5518 (cell); email vandamd@flic.losrios.edu or Duane Nelson at 530/647-5301; e-mail dnelson03@fs.fed.us at least 24 hours prior to the meeting time, if possible.
- 2) Whenever possible at RAC meetings, plain English will be used instead of acronyms. If an acronym is used at a RAC meeting, any RAC member that does not understand the meaning of the acronym is encouraged to request a definition in plain English.
- 3) The Secure Rural Schools legislation specifies that three of five members from each of the three groups represented on the RAC must be present to vote on a project recommendation. A simple majority (at least 8 of the 15 RAC members) must be present to have an “official meeting,” vote on RAC process issues, etc.
- 4) Ground Rules during meetings are as follows:
 - 4.1) We will refer the purpose of the Act – to stabilize payments to counties; to make additional investments in and provide employment opportunities through projects in forest ecosystems, and to improve cooperative relationships.
 - 4.2) We will listen respectfully to each other; do not cut people off or participate in side conversations. We will raise our hand to be recognized by the Chairperson to speak and will do our best to make our comments concise and to the point.
 - 4.3) We will try to stay objective during discussion and we will always speak to each other respectfully. We will not use vulgar, accusatory, or inflammatory language.
 - 4.4) We will not bring up topics that have already been addressed and decided upon, or issues that are unrelated to the topic under discussion.
 - 4.5) During meetings, our cell phones and pagers will be turned off or silenced; use of cell phones during meetings (except for emergency communications or while on breaks) will be minimized.
 - 4.6) We will come to each meeting prepared (having reviewed previous meeting’s minutes, completed subcommittee work as assigned, kept the group informed of progress as appropriate).

- 4.7) We will respect each other and each other's time.
- 4.8) We are committed to making our meetings a forum at which all attendees feel encouraged to participate in discussions and resolutions of local issues. Members should feel free to speak up when they have relevant input or seek clarification.
- 4.9) We will respect differing opinions while recognizing each others' expertise and diversity. If necessary, agree to disagree.
- 4.10) We will keep it fun and productive.
- 5) The Designated Federal Official, Duane Nelson, will ensure that Forest Service representatives and specialists will be at the meetings as needed.
- 6) Meetings need to start and end on time (especially end on time).
- 7) The Chairperson will serve as the meeting facilitator
- 8) Unless urgent, decisions will not be considered final until read and approved in the minutes
- 9) Public Comment at RAC meetings
 - 9.1) At or near the start of each meeting, public attendees will be queried as to the nature of their comments: if they have attended to make a general comment or observation, they will be allowed to do so at or near the beginning of the meeting; if they have attended to make a comment on a specific project proposal or other agenda item, they will be asked to stay until that agenda item or project comes up for consideration.
 - 9.2) Those making public comments are expected to abide by the same rules as RAC members when attending or speaking at a RAC meeting (refer to section 4, above).
 - 9.3) Public comment of a general nature (unrelated to a specific agenda item or project) shall be limited to three (3) minutes per person.
 - 9.4) Public comment on a specific agenda item or project proposal will be accepted after each specific agenda item topic discussion (by the RAC) and before each vote. Discussion and comment from the public will be limited to 15 minutes for each topic or project (three [3] minutes per person). The majority of the RAC can vote to extend public comment time as deemed appropriate and necessary. RAC members will not respond to the public comments.
 - 9.5) Public comments not pertaining to agenda items may also be submitted in writing, but written comments must be submitted to the Designated Federal Official at least three (3) weeks prior to the next meeting.

- 10) When members of the RAC speak in a public meeting (at a venue other than the RAC), they will not identify themselves and speak as an official representative unless they are designated as the official representative of the RAC at that meeting. We will exercise discretion in our public presentations and conversations with others.
- 11) RAC members will avoid conflict of interest, defined as a project or item that will financially benefit the individual member or the organization with which the member is affiliated. If a member questions whether they have a conflict of interest, the RAC can discuss and vote on whether the member's vote on a particular item or project would constitute a conflict of interest. If it is determine that a conflict of interest exists for a RAC member, the member can still participate fully in the discussion of that item or project, but shall not vote on that item.
- 12) Jennifer Chapman will be the contact for all RAC letters, correspondence, and agendas and will email them to the RAC members in a pre-meeting packet. If a RAC member needs to receive the pre-meeting packet in a form other than email he or she should provide Jennifer Chapman with their format preference.
- 13) Replacement RAC members will attend and have full participation at all meetings, except that replacement members cannot vote.
- 14) Absenteeism – A member absent for two consecutive regular meetings who has not notified the Chairperson or the Designated Federal Official prior to the absences may be subject to removal by the Secretary of Agriculture. The absent, a reasonable attempt will be made to contact the absent unexcused member. Depending upon specific circumstances, the committee may discuss and recommend the members removal. Attendance via teleconference will be considered as full attendance.



News Release

For Immediate Release

Date: November 20, 2015

Contact: Jennifer Chapman, 530-957-9660

Twitter: @EldoradoNF

Web: <http://www.fs.usda.gov/eldorado>

EI Dorado County Resource Advisory Committee Accepting Project Proposals

PLACERVILLE, CA - The EI Dorado County Resource Advisory Committee (RAC) is accepting proposals for projects that benefit National Forest lands in EI Dorado County. These projects will be funded under Title II of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act. The deadline for applications is January 22, 2016. Applications, instructions, project evaluation considerations, and other information can be found on the Eldorado National Forest website: www.fs.usda.gov/eldorado.

EI Dorado County is expected to have approximately \$297,000 for eligible projects during this project cycle since authorization for this program has been extended for two years. After reviewing the proposals, the committee will recommend projects to the Eldorado National Forest and the Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit Forest Supervisors for implementation on their respective units.

"The first step in the application process is to go to the website," said Dale van Dam, EI Dorado County Resource Advisory Committee Chairperson. "Duane Nelson, the Forest Service Designated Federal Official, will review the proposals to insure they meet the intent of the law, Forest Service rules and regulations, and the Forests' Land and Resource Management Plans before presenting them to the committee".

In accordance with the Act, Title II funds may be used to make additional investments in and create additional employment opportunities through projects that improve the maintenance of existing infrastructure, implement stewardship objectives that enhance forest ecosystems, and restore and improve land health and water quality.

The Act goes on to say that projects should have broad based support with objectives that may

include, but are not limited to: road, trail, and infrastructure maintenance or obliteration; soil productivity improvement; improvements in ecosystem health; watershed restoration and maintenance; restoration, maintenance and improvement of wildlife and fish habitat; control of noxious and exotic weeds; and reestablishment of native grasses.

At least 50% of the funds must be used for projects that are primarily dedicated to: road maintenance, decommissioning, or obliteration; or restoration of streams and watersheds.

The El Dorado County Resource Advisory Committee (RAC) is made up of 15 member positions and 3 replacement positions who represent a cross section of the county including representatives from industry, environment, education, elected officials, recreation, tribes, cultural resources, and other groups. The purpose of this local advisory committee is to recommend projects for funding to the Forest Supervisors of Eldorado National Forest and the Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit.

RAC meetings are open to the general public. The next scheduled meeting is December 14, 2015 beginning at 6:00 p.m. in the community room (C-102) at the El Dorado Center of Folsom Lake College, 6699 Campus Drive, Placerville, CA 95667. The purpose of this meeting is to provide a public forum; reconnect with RAC members; present a summary report of previously authorized RAC projects; define this year's process for proposal consideration and selection; and discuss recruiting replacement RAC members. Anyone wishing to address the committee on RAC related matters during the public forum must contact the RAC Coordinator at 530-621-5280 or jenniferachapman@fs.fed.us by December 7, 2015 to be added to the agenda. Comments during the public forum will be limited to 3 minutes in length.

Additional meetings for this project cycle are tentatively scheduled for February 8th, March 7th and March 21st, 2016.

-USFS-

JUNE 17, 2014

Official USFS "Project Number"	Short Title	Requested Amount	Proponent	Funded	Funded in 2014	Priority for Provisional Funding	Provisional funding if available (by priority order)
				Yes or Provisional			
	Generation Green (replace funds reduced by sequestration)	\$18,320	Joy Barney	Yes			
ELD-100	2 Chaix 2014 RAC Mastication	\$88,000	Dana Walsh	Prov		4	88,000
ELD-101	Ballarat Trail Bridge #2	\$11,000	Jon Jue	Yes	11,000		
ELD-102	Barrett 4wd Trail Reconstruction	\$60,500	Diana Erickson	Yes	60,500		
ELD-103	Chaix Culverts	\$40,000	Don Errington	Prov		1	40,000
ELD-104	Darling Ridge Road Repair	\$19,034	Jackie Bozeman	Prov		3	19,034
ELD-105	Forest Trash Clean-Up Efforts	\$4,500	Cathy Bounds	Yes	4,500		
ELD-106	Forest Walker Program	\$4,500	Kathy Piaszk	Yes	4,500		
ELD-107	Mosquito Road Brushing	\$13,600	Robert Scott	Prov		5	13,600
ELD-108	Plummer Guard Station Toilet Facility	\$25,000	Cathy Bounds	Yes	25,000		
ELD-109	Tells Creek Equestrian Camp Improvement Project	\$31,470	Charis Parker	Yes	31,470		
ELD-110	Wrights Lake CG Repair	\$8,000	Don Errington	Prov		2	8,000

El Dorado County Approved RAC Project List

PROJECT MANAGER	JOB CODE	PROJECT NAME	PROJECT AMOUNT	OBLIGATED by 9/30/14	Amount spent FY2014	RAC ALLOCATED BY 9/30/14	Amount Spent FY2015	Total Spent	BALANCE OF RAC ALLOCATED				
Jon Jue	S21501	Ballarat Trail Bridge 2	11,000.00	0.00	9521.29	9,521.29	-695.45	8825.84	695.45				
Joy Barney	S21511	Generation Green	18,320.00	11,559.59	6760.41	18,320.00	10451.57	17211.98	1108.02				*note: payroll adjustment (LOST)
Charis Parker	S21509	Tells Creek Equestrian Camp Improvements	31,470.00	17,331.56	156.92	17,488.48	10636.56	10793.48	6695.00				*note: Great Basin Institute agreement
Cathy Bounds	S20520	Forest Trash Clean-Up Efforts	4,500.00	0.00	2737.55	2,737.55	47.94	2785.49	-47.94				\$6,695 on contract, not spent, Inc Bst Svcs
Diana Erickson	S21522	Barrett 4WD Trail Reconstruction	60,500.00	53,576.56	6695	60,271.56	47659.06	54354.06	5917.50				*purchase card (Dave Alecia, May 2015)
Cathy Bounds	S21508	Plummer Guard Station Toilet Facility	25,000.00	23,165.39	1230.4	24,395.79	23110.6	24341.00	54.79				*\$5,505 + 412.50 not spent, c1+c2
Kathy Piaszk	S20520	Forest Walker Program	4,500.00	0.00	0	0.00							*note: payroll adjustment (LOST)
		EL DORADO COUNTY TOTAL						118311.85					
			155,290.00			132,734.67							
					RETURNED	22,555.33							

FY 2015 PAYMENTS BY THE USDA FOREST SERVICE TO THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

PAYMENT TO THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA UNDER PL 110-343

FY 2014 Funds

COUNTY	Full Payment Amount <small>(columns 1 + 2 + 3)</small>	TITLE I (Schools & Roads)		TITLE II (Projects on FS land)		TITLE III (County projects)	
		pct	amount	pct	amount	pct	amount
		column 1		column 2		column 3	
ALPINE <i>R4 H1NF</i>	436,639	85.00%	371,143	8.00%	34,931	7.00%	30,565
AMADOR	287,207	85.00%	244,126	8.00%	0	7.00%	43,081
BUTTE <i>Plumas NF</i>	403,694	80.00%	322,955	13.00%	52,480	7.00%	28,259
CALAVERAS	153,680	85.00%	130,628	0.00%	0	15.00%	23,052
COLUSA <i>Mendo NF</i>	113,750	85.00%	96,687	15.00%	17,062	0.00%	0
DEL NORTE <i>6R NF</i>	1,336,963	85.00%	1,136,418	15.00%	200,544	0.00%	0
ELDORADO <i>Eldorado</i>	1,822,264	85.00%	1,548,924	8.00%	145,781	7.00%	127,558
FRESNO <i>Sierra NF</i>	1,240,865	85.00%	1,054,735	8.00%	99,269	7.00%	86,861
GLENN <i>Mendo MF</i>	323,880	80.00%	259,104	13.00%	42,104	7.00%	22,672
HUMBOLDT <i>6R NF</i>	949,505	85.00%	807,079	8.00%	75,960	7.00%	66,465
KERN <i>Sequoia NF</i>	195,357	85.00%	166,053	8.00%	15,629	7.00%	13,675
LAKE <i>Mendo NF</i>	447,448	85.00%	380,331	8.00%	35,796	7.00%	31,321
LASSEN <i>Lassen NF</i>	1,747,831	85.00%	1,485,656	8.00%	139,826	7.00%	122,348
MADERA <i>Sierra NF</i>	502,199	85.00%	426,869	8.00%	40,176	7.00%	35,154
MARIPOSA	283,997	85.00%	241,397	0.00%	0	15.00%	42,600
MENDOCINO <i>Mendo NF</i>	311,939	85.00%	265,148	8.00%	24,955	7.00%	21,836
MODOC <i>Modoc NF</i>	1,507,729	85.00%	1,281,570	12.00%	180,927	3.00%	45,232
MONTEREY	16,237	100.00%	16,237	0.00%	0	0.00%	0
NEVADA <i>Tahoe NF</i>	347,574	85.00%	295,438	8.00%	27,806	7.00%	24,330
PLACER <i>Tahoe NF</i>	742,678	80.00%	594,142	13.00%	96,548	7.00%	51,987
PLUMAS <i>Plumas NF</i>	3,273,024	85.00%	2,782,070	8.00%	261,842	7.00%	229,112
SHASTA <i>S/T NF</i>	1,809,615	85.00%	1,538,173	8.00%	144,769	7.00%	126,673
SIERRA <i>Tahoe NF</i>	833,253	85.00%	708,265	11.50%	95,824	3.50%	29,164
SISKIYOU <i>Klamath NF</i>	4,180,144	85.00%	3,553,122	8.00%	334,412	7.00%	292,610
TEHAMA <i>Mendo NF</i>	1,079,869	85.00%	917,889	9.75%	105,287	5.25%	56,693
TRINITY <i>S/T NF</i>	3,485,420	85.00%	2,962,607	12.00%	418,250	3.00%	104,563
TULARE <i>Sequoia NF</i>	490,069	85.00%	416,559	8.00%	39,206	7.00%	34,305
TULUMNE <i>Stan NF</i>	1,155,812	85.00%	982,440	8.00%	92,465	7.00%	80,907
YUBA	107,756	85.00%	91,593	0.00%	0	15.00%	16,163

SUBTOTALS	29,586,397	25,077,360	2,721,851	1,787,185
------------------	-------------------	-------------------	------------------	------------------

25% Payment to State
FY 2013

<i>County</i>	
INYO	458,567
LOS ANGELES	1,480,189
MONO	514,595
ORANGE	123,167
RIVERSIDE	341,519
SAN BERNARDINO	403,790
SAN DIEGO	629,246
SAN LUIS OBISPO	21,882
SANTA BARBARA	72,423
VENTURA	67,691
TOTAL	4,113,069

FY 2014 TOTAL PAYMENT	33,699,466
------------------------------	-------------------

History and Legislative Summary of Secure Rural Schools

Secure Rural Schools Legislation Summary

Since 1908, when Congress enacted what is commonly known as the Twenty Five Percent Fund Act (16 U.S.C. 500) to compensate local governments for the tax-exempt status of the national forests, the Forest Service has shared 25 percent of gross receipts from national forests with states to help fund public schools and roads. The so-called “25 percent payments” are made to the states for the benefit of public schools and public roads in the counties in which national forests are located. The allocation of the funds between schools and roads varies according to state laws. The receipts, on which the 25 percent payments are based, are derived from timber sales, grazing, minerals, recreation¹ and other land use fees, deposits, and credits.

In the late 1980s, 25 percent payments began to decline significantly and fluctuate widely. This was largely due, especially in western states, to a significant decline in timber sales. The declines and fluctuations created hardships for local officials charged with providing services to communities in and near the national forests.

The decline in timber sales, and corresponding reduction in the 25 percent payments, was particularly acute in northern California, Oregon, and Washington. To address this concern, Congress provided “safety net payments” to counties in California, Oregon, and Washington for FYs 1994 to 2003. The safety net payments were enhanced payments structured to decline annually and were intended to help the counties transition to the reduced amount of the 25 percent payments.

Before the safety net payments expired, Congress enacted the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (the Secure Rural Schools Act or SRS, P.L. 110-343), which provided the option of decoupling the payments from receipts, by authorizing enhanced, stabilized payments to states for FYs 2000 through 2006. The 2000 SRS Act provided eligible counties with two options. A county could elect to continue to receive its share of the State’s 25 percent payment, which fluctuated based on receipts, or the county could elect to receive a share of the State’s “full payment amount”, which was a stabilized amount. A county that elected to receive a share of the State’s full payment amount was required to allocate 15 to 20 percent of the payments to Title II (special projects on federal lands) or to title III (county projects). Title II funds could only be spent on projects that were recommended by resource advisory committees (RACs). As part of the initial implementation of the Act, the Forest Service established 55 RACs.

Congress appropriated payments to states for FY 2007, and in October 2008, amended and reauthorized the SRS Act for FYs 2008 through 2011 and again in 2012 and 2013. With a few notable exceptions, the Secure Rural Schools Act reauthorizations mirrors the 2000 Act. The primary change in 2008 was a new formula for the stabilized State payment, which includes a ramp down of funding each year. In addition, the 2008 reauthorization amended the Twenty-Five Percent Fund Act to reduce the fluctuations in the 25 percent payments. The 25 percent payments are now calculated as the rolling average of the seven most recent FYs’ 25 percent payments.

In 2013, approximately 73 counties elected to receive a share of the State’s 25 percent payment (based on receipts), and approximately 674 counties opted to receive a share of the State Payment (enhanced, stabilized). All together, the Forest Service makes payments to 41

¹ Receipts do not include fees collected under the authority of the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act.

states and Puerto Rico to benefit more than 747 counties, boroughs, townships, and municipalities.

The last payment under the Secure Rural Schools Act was for FY 2013 receipts, made in FY 2014. Seven-hundred forty-seven counties from 41 States and Puerto Rico received \$289,331,112 for FY 2013 on February 15, 2013. Of these payments, 85.08 percent were for Title I, 10.37 percent were for Title II and 4.56 percent were for Title III. These totals do not include the 1908 payments made in FY 2014.

Overview of SRS Act Titles and Authorities

The Secure Rural Schools Act has three principal titles. The U.S. Forest Service defers to the Department of the Interior for interpretation of Secure Rural Schools' authorities and activities undertaken by that agency on the Oregon and California Railroad Grant Lands (O&C Lands).

Title I—Secure Payments for States and Counties Containing Federal Land

The Act directs that the majority of the State Payment be used to help fund county schools and roads. This portion of the payment is commonly referred to as the title I payment and has averaged about 85 percent of the total State Payments to date.

Title I of the SRS Act, as reauthorized, provides the new formula for the State Payment for FYs 2008 through 2011 with a one year reauthorization for FY 2012 and again in FY 2013. The FY 2015 authorization will last for two FYs, providing SRS payments in FYs 2015 and 2016. An eligible county's adjusted share of the State Payment is determined by a complex calculation involving multiple factors including acres of national forest the county's annual per capita personal income, and a 7-year rolling average payment. The formula reduces the total payments to all states by approximately by 5 percent of the preceding year, which began for 2012 and continued in the FY 2013 and FY 2015 reauthorizations.

Title II—Special Projects on Federal Land

Eligible counties have the option to allocate part of their share of the State Payment to SRS Title II for projects that maintain existing infrastructure or enhance the health of ecosystems on national forests, while supporting local economies. Title II provides for the establishment of resource advisory committees to review and recommend projects. The Secure Rural Schools Act as reauthorized added to the duties of the committees and expanded the interests represented by members.

Title II projects enhance forest ecosystems, restore and improve the health of the land and water quality; and, protect, restore and enhance fish and wildlife habitat. Examples of enhancements are maintenance or obliteration of roads, trails, and infrastructure; improvement of soil productivity; stream and watershed restoration; control of noxious and exotic weeds; and, re-establishment of native species. These projects provide employment in rural communities and an opportunity for local citizens to advise the Forest Service, through participation in RACs, on projects of mutual interest that benefit the environment and the economy. For FYs 2008 through 2013, title II funds totaled over \$231 million for projects recommended in more than 300 counties.

Title III—County Funds

Funds allocated by a county under title III may be used on county projects. Title III initially had six authorized uses: search and rescue, community service work camps, easement purchases, forest related educational opportunities, fire prevention and county planning, and community forestry. When the Secure Rural Schools Act was reauthorized, Congress limited the use of title III funds to three authorized uses: activities under the Firewise Communities program, reimbursement for emergency services on national forests, and preparation of a community wildfire protection plan. As reauthorized, title III now directs each participating county to certify annually that title III funds were used for authorized purposes. For FYs 2008 through 2013, title III funds totaled nearly \$114 million.

Summary

The Secure Rural Schools Act has provided more than a decade of transitioning payments to eligible states and counties to help fund public schools and roads and provided predictably declining payments to states to transition to the 25 percent payment. In addition, it has also created a forum for community interests to collaboratively participate in the selection of natural resource projects on the National Forests, and assisted in community wildfire protection planning. For specific information on Secure Rural Schools and links to the actual legislation please visit: <http://www.fs.usda.gov/main/pts/home>

For more information:

NATIONAL PROGRAM

David Bergendorf – National Program Coordinator
Secure Rural Schools Program
U.S. Forest Service
National Partnership Office
dwbergendorf@fs.fed.us

LOCAL PROGRAM

Duane Nelson – Designated Federal Official
El Dorado County Resource Advisory Committee
Eldorado National Forest
dnelson03@fs.fed.us