

Shasta RAC

Shasta-Trinity National Forest Headquarters
3644 Avtech Parkway, Redding, CA 96002
March 26, 2014

Call to Order & Welcome Remarks: Ted James

Meeting called to order: 1:10pm

Welcome. This is not a voting meeting, so we don't have to have a quorum in each group. Glen Hawes is coming, but will be arriving late.

Roll Call:

Shasta RAC Members: Group A: Ted James, Glenn Hawes, Stan Leach, Ken Showalter, Steve Uhles.

Group B: Wendy Johnston, Sylvia Milligan, Genevieve Seely. Group C: Brenda Haynes, Carol Perea, Terry Thomas.

Public: Mary St. John (RAC Assistant), Donna Harmon (DFO), Ryan Desantis (UC Cooperative Extension)

Review & Approval of Minutes: N/A

Agenda Review: No changes

Public Forum:

Ryan Desantis: The Forestry Institute for Teachers program is moving along and we will plan another session this summer. As always we still need money for this project to be successful.

USFS Items: Donna Harmon, DFO

Update: Secure Rural Schools Act Extension

There has been an extension to RAC by one more year (2013-14), but by the time they did that, it was well past September 2013 when recommendations would have been made. Since there was no provision made for re-chartering, they decided to re-charter the RACs so we could meet.

Information: National Charter

Please note a couple of things regarding the Charter. Most of you went through some kind of ethics training, and if you didn't, we need to do that with you. There's a video available and we will provide it to you, so let us know. Ken and Steve may need this, and it can be provided. There was a heavy emphasis in the charter regarding notifying the RAC of projects that you may have any financial involvement in.

There was some concern from last year regarding the subcommittee meetings, but what it came down to, is if the subcommittee is meant to do staffing work or monitoring for the full committee then it's permissible. We treated the subcommittee in that way, and used it to provide informal advice in a monitoring capacity. One new piece is that we will start to post agendas and notes in both the RAC and FACA database now, as required by the charter.

Assuming there will be another extension, it's important to note that all the memberships in this RAC, except Steve's, will expire by Oct. of 2014. They have a process that they're working out since this is happening to other RAC's, and they're working with FACA to see if these memberships can be renewed.

Information: Funding available, timeline for obligations, forest supervisor guidance

Funding available and timeline for obligations: We still don't know the funding amount. And this year is not typical, because you're recommending and obligating projects in the same year. Obligation doesn't mean spent, it means obligated in a grant, participating agreement or force account (forest service only). This adds a complication, because there are timelines in grants and agreements (G&A). The G&A office has already extended the deadline for these special funds. We will need to give proponents no more than two weeks to submit proposals and they will have specific instructions.

The Washington Office has been telling us money will come any day since early February, but we don't know when it will come. Last year CA paid the sequestration money back by using Title II money,

Shasta RAC

Shasta-Trinity National Forest Headquarters
3644 Avtech Parkway, Redding, CA 96002
March 26, 2014

because money in Title I and III had already been spent. Other states did not do this, and they will have outstanding bills for last year. I have no idea what that means, but it may have something to do with the calculating happening in Washington. They are promising the states will be notified any day.

Forest supervisor guidance: The FS met with both chairs of SRAC and TRAC. He would prefer pfor projects to be NEPA ready, due to crunch time and so as not to add program of work to the forest because they may not be able to support it with the work load. There is a lot of time involved to oversee planning contracts or agreements. They are not as easy to define deliverables, and it makes it more difficult. For both RAC's, I don't think that's much different than what you've always done.

TED: yes, we've always been more focused on result oriented projects, and less on planning. We like to have projects that are productive in a visible way.

Information: Status for Prior year, Post Sequestration, Unfunded Proposals

See attached spreadsheet.

RAC Discussion/Action:

Ted: We did put out a request for proposals this year, it was non-specific as we were unable to put a number amount because we still don't know what we will be receiving. We can estimate an amount of money, and we will use \$160,000, but it's a guess. Last year we had \$169,000. This is new money and needs to be obligated this year. An option is to look at the projects that were voted on and approved last year, but effected by sequestration, and confirm if we want to spend monies on these projects. We can only confirm for the amount that was recommended and un-funded last year. For instance it's been confirmed Shasta College does want to do their project from last year. We could confirm that today up to the amount recommended by RAC last year, in this example the \$87,000. If they needed or wanted more money, they would have to bring the additional balance to us in a proposal in June at a voting meeting. There is a possible \$113,000 of recommended projects last year that did not receive full funding. If we confirm funding these projects, we will need to let proponents know what money is remaining for new proposals for June's voting meeting.

Donna: Note that you can only confirm the recommended amount, nothing more. These recommendations were made in a voting meeting, which were open to the public and provided opportunity for discussion and opinion. Contingency projects cannot be confirmed at this time, as they were not approved by the Forest Supervisor. An additional suggestion is that we don't put any more money into the 1-5 Soda Creek project. They've had trouble providing deliverables and I'm not quite convinced that G&A would give them any more funds since they've been having trouble managing existing funds.

Action:

PCT Trail Feeder Plus: \$1,583: Confirmed

Great Shasta Rails to Trails Project: \$3,288: Donna: Confirmed

I-5 Soda Creek: \$5,654: Not confirmed due to concerns over organization of project and priorities.

Proponent welcome to submit a new proposal in June.

Shasta FIT: \$2,261: Confirmed

Shasta Forestry Challenge: \$1,809: Confirmed

Shasta College Natural Resource Youth Training: \$87,213: Confirmed

Hat Creek Restoration and Revegetation: \$11,523: Confirmed

Donna: This would leave \$52,000 for June proposals, and it would be great to have contingency projects. Projects can be new projects or it's much easier to turn around projects that are already approved and

Shasta RAC

Shasta-Trinity National Forest Headquarters
3644 Avtech Parkway, Redding, CA 96002
March 26, 2014

in motion and just add money to them. There is also the possibility of re-scoped funds if other RAC's who do not have quorum to meet, cannot recommend projects or spend their monies.

Ted: Anyone who wants to come with a new proposal or to add money to an existing proposal will have to submit their request in June.

Discussion:

RAC Membership Renewal

RAC: What can we do to assist in renewing our committee membership?

Donna: If you would like to do something as a group it's possible to send a letter to Chris Nota. I'll also ask if it would be helpful to fill out renewal forms in advance. Nota will not know more about the process until she works through the process of renewing the RAC she's working with right now. I will also notify her once we know the total amount of recommended projects and contingency projects so she will be fully aware of the amount of funds we could use if extra monies become available.

Action: Elect New Chairman:

Wendy: Moves to nominate Ted James as Shasta RAC Chair.

Carol: Seconds the motion

Approved: Unanimous

County Items:

Title II/III County Allocations: Sue Crowe

There was an audit on all Title III funds by the Governmental Accountability Office (GAO), and GAO indicated that it is very restricted as to what the funds can be used for. Based on that audit, there were recommendations on how Title III be spent with the next round of funding. Even though the legislation has not changed, the GAO has a right to review expenditures and make recommendations. Now, no equipment or fire tender purchases are permitted. Now you can use the money for only three things: community wildfire protection plans; fire wise community program as federally defined; and the reimbursement of Counties for search and rescue and firefighting on Federal Lands within 45 days after the Board of Supervisors approves the expenditure.

Ted: Every year the county gets the funding for Title I, II, III. This year there was 15%, and how was that split between II and III?

Sue: The minimum 8% went towards Title II and 7% towards Title III.

Current proposals include one from Western Shasta RCD requesting \$61,000 for updating wildland fire community protections plans in various locations. The other proposal is a budget that county fire put together. They're asking for \$51,500 to be used towards un-reimbursed fire services.

What I would suggest, is that the difference in funding vs. proposals be set aside for fire or rescue on federal lands. This money would go to county treasury and would be used for county fire for search and rescue or fire-fighting on federal lands. It would be authorized for the director to approve disbursements for "future reimbursements for fire or county services."

Action:

Shasta RAC concurs unanimously for Title III funds to support the current proposals for Western Shasta RCD and County Fire. Shasta RAC encourages that since there are so many restrictions to the Title III funds, it would benefit the region, the community and the citizens to put a higher percentage of funding towards Title II in the future.

Shasta RAC

Shasta-Trinity National Forest Headquarters

3644 Avtech Parkway, Redding, CA 96002

March 26, 2014

Group Discussion:

Wendy: Burney Hat Creek Community Forest Project: This is project we provided seed money for in Burney. It's been going great; they used the RAC seed money to assist with getting a million dollar grant (allocation) the Lassen NF received. It appears that the FS then cut Kit's (Mullen, Hat Creek District Ranger) budget allocation by the million dollar grant she got, so her budget got cut by the amount of the grant she received, and she had to use it pay staff instead of putting towards projects. The Lassen has requested additional funds. Additionally the Pitt River tribe has a new environmental coordinator and she has taken everything we've (the collaborative) tried to do to a standstill. It's very sad. There is a team (within the collaborative) that has been formed that is trying to work through some of the problems. It's a sad end to a project that was working. The committees were functioning, but the Pitt River Tribal environmental coordinator has put a disruptive stop to it. She wants all the money and work to go to the tribe for the project. Kit is still trying to make the project(s) happen, but it's at a standstill.

Next Meeting Information:

June 18 & 19, 2014: Voting meeting at Shasta-Trinity National Forest Headquarters

As date approaches, if the 19th is not needed for reviewing proposals, it could be used as a field-trip day for the RAC to monitor project progress.

- June 11, 2014: Binders will be available at the Shasta-Trinity headquarters for RAC members to pick up and review before the meeting.

Adjourned 2:40pm

2013-14 RECOMMENDED ONE-YEAR EXTENSION PROPOSALS - SHASTA RAC

Project Name	Title II Funds Requested	9/13/2012 Recommendation	Post Sequestration funding	Balance Unfunded	Funding still needed in 2014	*SRAC Confirmation	Management Unit	Proponent	Proponent email	FS Project Manager
Opening Trails Mtnce-PCT and Feeder Trails	\$14,000	\$7,000	\$5,417	\$1,583	Yes	Yes	SMMU	BCH-Top of State Unit	jjcroteau@sisquel.net	Steve Naser
Great Shasta Rails to Trails Project	\$14,540	\$14,540	\$11,252	\$3,288	Yes	Yes	SMMU	Lassen Volcanic Byway group	bobliz@live.com	Heidi Perry
I-5 Soda Ck Fuels Reduction and Trail	\$35,100	\$25,000	\$19,346	\$5,654	No response	No	SMMU	Dunsmuir FSC	jkforestry@snowcrest.net	Heather McRae
Shasta FIT	\$18,000	\$10,000	\$7,739	\$2,261	Yes	Yes	Lassen NF	NorCal SAF	mjdelasaux@ucdavis.edu	Heidi Perry
Shasta Forestry Challenge	\$10,000	\$8,000	\$6,191	\$1,809	Yes	Yes	Lassen NF	Forestry Educators, Inc.	dianedealeyneill@sbcglobe.net	Heidi Perry
Shasta College Natural Resource Youth Training	\$87,213	\$87,213	\$0	\$87,213	Yes	Yes	NRA-SL	Shasta College	ejiminez@shastacollege.edu	Andrew Kennedy
Hat Creek Restoration and Revegetation	\$33,120	\$18,000	\$6,477	\$11,523	Yes	Yes	Lassen NF	California Trout	drewbraugh@gmail.com	Heidi Perry
GRAND TOTAL	\$211,973	\$169,753	\$56,422	\$113,331		\$107,677	\$161,265	Estimated 2014 remaining after funding the confirmed 2012 recommendations	\$53,588	

***SRAC Confirmation** This was an affirmation that the RAC still supported it's 2012 recommendation for funding each of these projects at the recommended amounts. During 2012 each project was reviewed, recommended by the RAC at an open public meeting noticed in the Federal Register and approved by the Forest Supervisor. All proponents have been asked if they still have viable projects that can use the balance of the recommended amounts not funded due to sequestration. All proponents will have an opportunity to request additional funding in new proposals to be considered June 18th.