

HOOD/WILLAMETTE RESOURCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

P.L. 106-393; SECURE RURAL SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITY SELF-DETERMINATION ACT OF 2000

HOOD/WILLAMETTE RESOURCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

P.L. 106-393: SECURE RURAL SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITY SELF-DETERMINATION ACT OF 2000

February 11, 2020, 0900

Meeting Minutes

Keizer Community Center, Claggett Room, 930 Chemawa Road NE, Keizer, OR 97303

HOOD-WILLAMETTE RAC MEMBERS PRESENT: Will Tucker, Patrick Davis, Steve Wilent, Jon Tullis, Hayden Price (chairman), Neila Whitney, Jeff Jaqua, Kevin Cameron, Ron Adams

HOOD-WILLAMETTE RAC SUPPORT STAFF PRESENT: Jennifer Sorensen, Rachel LaMedica, Matt Peterson

Acronyms:

RAC: Resource Advisory Council

SRS: Secure Rural Schools

FS: Forest Service

FY: Fiscal Year

DFO: Deciding Federal Official

REA: Recreation Enhancement Act

FLREA: Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act

NEPA: National Environmental Policy Act

NHPA: National Historic Preservation Act

SHPO: State Historic Preservation Office

CRGNSA: Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area

WNF: Willamette National Forest

MTH: Mt Hood National Forest

Q: Question

A: Answer

OVERVIEW OF AGENDA: Today's purpose is to: 1. Wrap up discussion on wilderness permit proposal and 2. Discuss and make funding recommendations on Title II proposals.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

WRITTEN (attached).

IN-PERSON (recorded and transcribed):

- **Mitsu Iwasaki**- My name is Mitsu Iwasaki, I am the Executive Director of the Mazamas, and first and foremost thank you to all of you, the recreation advisory committee members and the Forest Service, for your service to our public lands. Again I am Mitsu Iwasaki, I am the Executive Director of the Mazamas. We are a 125 year old non-profit based in Portland Oregon. Our non-profit exists to inspire a love for the mountains through education, advocacy and community building. As the Executive director I represent the voices of our 3600 current members as well as our 125 years of history. Our identity, as climbers, hikers, skiers and trail runners is wrapped up in the central cascades and informed by the central cascades and our history. The first thing I wanted to see is to thank all of you for postponing making a recommendation to move forward with the proposed US Forest Service fee. And I recognize that being said the urgency for me to make any

HOOD/WILLAMETTE RESOURCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

P.L. 106-393; SECURE RURAL SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITY SELF-DETERMINATION ACT OF 2000

comments at this point may be somewhat moot. At our offices in Portland we have an archive of photos and written materials that reach back to 1894 and in those archives we can see the impact of humans on the landscapes of the central cascades. And with this lens and while we will have been significantly impacted we understand the Forest Service's position on implementation of the limited entry permits. However, we are opposed to the proposed fees to access our public lands. We have not heard from the Forest Service sufficient justification for the fees, its interaction with the FLREA, or how the new fees may interact with existing fees. We know the cost of recreating in the central cascades on our public lands would become cost prohibitive for many of our members and our families. This is especially troubling for us as Oregon seeks to right our history through equity and inclusion initiatives. But with all this said, again, at this point the Mazamas would simply like to express our gratitude for the postponement of making a recommendation and we hope that we will not see fees in the short or long term future. Thank you.

- **Russ Lipetzky**- Good Morning my name is Russ Lipetzky. I personally hike up in the wilderness areas that are the subject of the proposal I am also the organizer of the 2000+ member Salem Outdoors meetup group and I also represent a group called the Cascade Hikers. I came prepared to make substantive comments in opposition to the proposal. It's kind of backwards here we're being asked to make public comment before there is a presentation that we're responding to, but, based on Matt Peterson's representation to me that the proposal is going to be essentially pulled at this time and that as a proponent he is not going to be here today making arguments in favor of the proposal, I'm not going to stand here and make arguments against the proposal because I understand it's pretty much off the table at this time. So having said that though I just want to take the chance since I have about 2 minutes left, to thank Jennifer for her considerations and scheduling and accommodating people that want to speak, she has done a good job for you also, you're lucky to have her and I appreciate your attention and I appreciate some of the comments from the last meeting where, that reassured me at least that this is not a rubber stamp committee and that you're actually looking at these proposals and taking into account some of the arguments in opposition and taking a good hard look at it and I hope you do so in the future. Thank you.

SRS PROGRAM UPDATES:

1. RAC Membership: There has been movement on some RAC nomination packages at the Secretary's office. Hood-Willamette RAC package will be resubmitted for consideration since it's been over a year.
 - a) This package includes reappointment requests for R. Ragan, J. Parker, and M. Kate-Mason (second term).
 - b) All current members expire in August 2021. W. Tucker's current appointment may be extended beyond his Dec 31, 2020 retirement if a letter is obtained designating him as proxy for Linn County Commissioners. This would allow him to complete the remainder of his appointment.
 - c) ETHICS: RAC member should recuse themselves from voting on a recommendation if there is any real or perceived personal benefit.
 - i) Potential conflict from K. Cameron and H. Price who both own land in one of the Title II proposal areas. Last meeting DFO determined this is not a real or perceived conflict and should not inhibit participation.
 - ii) Confirmed that all current RAC Members have completed the annual ethics certification.

HOOD/WILLAMETTE RESOURCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

P.L. 106-393; SECURE RURAL SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITY SELF-DETERMINATION ACT OF 2000

2. Reminder, Congress passed PL 116-94 on December 20th 2019, which reauthorized SRS payments for FY19 and 20 (payments in FY20 and 21)
 - a) This pushes deadlines to 9/30/2022 for project recommendations and 9/30/2023 for funding obligation. All previous funds now follow these new deadlines.
 - b) RAC will solicit another round of proposals in Fall 2020 (pending funds availability). Plan to reconvene in fall/winter 2020/2021.
3. There is interest in a 2020 summer field trip to visit one of the funded projects. Suggestions include natural resources, recreation and youth engagement projects.

CENTRAL CASCADES WILDERNESS RECREATION FEE PROPOSAL Matt Peterson, WNF:

1. The fee proposal presented at the January meeting has been taken off the table for the time being. It is unknown whether it will be revisited in upcoming years.
2. The limited entry system will still be implemented this year. The Recreation.gov platform will be used for the reservation system, including a \$1 reservation fee for day use and \$6 for overnight permits. Reservations will tentatively open April 7th and permits will be required starting May 22, 2020.
3. Q: What type of ID will be required if encountering a Forest Officer within a permit area? How will youth hikers who may not have proper ID be handled? A: the forest is working with Law Enforcement on what the rules and regulations will be regarding ID requirement. In the past it has been the group leader listed on the limited entry permits who is required to show ID.
4. Q: Will the rules be the same as what was published for the Deschutes National Forest? A: Yes, ultimately the requirements will be the same on the Deschutes and the Willamette. This is a joint project between both Forests.
5. Q: Are there any other solutions being considered outside of limited entry? A: The decision to implement limited entry permit system has already been made, so not at this time. One of the goals of the new requirements is to spread out use throughout the Wilderness. The quotas are not designed to keep people out of the wilderness.
6. Q: What does it mean that you will try and disperse people? A: When those quotas are met for the day at the most popular trailheads, we hope people will choose another location and ultimately be dispersed into a different parts of the Wilderness.
7. Q: How closely is the FS working with county, state, etc.? A: Depends on the topic and nature. Since wilderness is on a federal level, our coordination has been limited. With record numbers of people camping in recent years on a State and County lands we do work with other agencies on other issues.
8. Q: An important area that sees high summer traffic is Opal Creek. Marion County manages a portion of that area as well as the Forest Service. Are we looking to limit Opal Creek usage in the future? We as a county have considered a possible staffed entry kiosk or permit system. A: Not that I'm aware of.
9. Q: What happens when an individual's desired trailhead is full on Recreation.gov? A: Other trailheads and their availability will show up for consideration.
10. Q: What happens when an angry visitor arrives at a trailhead not realizing there is a limited entry program in place? A: The first year of these regulations we will be focused on educating our visitors with the help of rangers and Law Enforcement in the field, as well as volunteer trailhead hosts. Ticketing violators will be a possibility, but is not the agency's ultimate goal in the first year.
11. Q: Will there be information pertaining to the new regulations on a television platform for hikers who don't use social media? A: There are no current plans for commercials. News channels may cover that information, but guests will have to rely on social media, internet or our offices for information.

TITLE II PROPOSALS:

HOOD/WILLAMETTE RESOURCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

P.L. 106-393; SECURE RURAL SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITY SELF-DETERMINATION ACT OF 2000

1. Overview of funding and committee breakdown

Forest	County	Available funding (FY18)	Requested Funding	Difference	Proposed Lead for Funding Recommendations
Mt Hood	Wasco	\$83,904	\$178,160	(\$94,256)	Davis
	Hood River	\$44,805	\$42,155	\$2,650	
	Clackamas	\$93,453	\$184,714	(\$91,261)	Tullis, Price, Adams, Whitney, Jaqua, Wilent
	Marion	\$31,876	\$46,505	(\$14,629)	Cameron
	Multnomah	\$14,938	\$0	\$14,938	N/A
Willamette	Marion	\$66,231	\$66,157	\$74	Cameron
	Linn	\$265,535	\$352,115	(\$86,580)	Tucker
	Lane	\$508,685	\$677,104	(\$168,419)	
	Douglas	\$33,000	\$33,705	(\$705)	Default to Chairman Price (only 1 proposal)
Total		\$774,220	\$1,326,595	(\$552,375)	

a)

2. Discussion on RAC’s role and recommendation space:

- a) RAC members are responsible for reviewing all proposals, ensure intent of the legislation is met, contact other pertinent stakeholders as appropriate, and vote on formal recommendations. Recommendations require a majority of members from each of the 3 categories to vote in favor. Given current vacancies all current HW RAC members must to vote in favor in order to move a recommendation forward.
- b) Ultimately the DFO, Tracy Beck, is the decision maker. It is uncommon for him to break with RAC recommendations. The DFO cannot fund projects that lack a RAC recommendation, but he could decide to not fund something recommended. The DFO can also fund previously recommended projects (as was done with in FY17 funds).
- c) Counties have made a conscious decision to fund, in order to improve the Forest. Linn county priorities include engaging youth, enhance/improve trails and access, road infrastructure
- d) Review role and allocations for Title I, II, and III funds.
- e) Q: Can Title II dollars fund a contractor and a federal employee’s salary? A: yes to both, contracts must work within procurement and contracting laws.
- f) Q: Does the RAC we get documentation if there is an adjustment on the funds that are spent? A: No. Checks and balances exist to ensure the funds are spent per the recommendations generally.

3. County by county proposal review & vote:

- a) WASCO COUNTY- lead P. Davis
 - i) Discussion on P. Davis’s vetting process. Two projects which are not recommended for funding are likely to be funded through other means.
 - ii) RAC voted to recommend the following projects/amounts:

County	Sponsor	Project Name	Project Number	FY18 Funding Awarded (Overhead + Project)
Wasco	Mt. Hood NF	2020 Rocky Fuels Reduction	HW-18-112	52,744.00
Wasco	Mt. Hood NF	Badger Creek Regional Cooperative Trail Restoration	HW-18-111	7,350.00
Wasco	Mt. Hood NF	Flag Point Road Maintenance	HW-18-110	13,310.00
Wasco	Walama Restoration	Invasive Veg Mgmt in the Crystal Clear Restoration Proj	HW-18-114	10,500.00
Wasco	Mt. Hood NF	BRD Invasive Plant Control	HW-09-003	0.00
Wasco	Mt. Hood NF	Government Flats Fire Restoration	HW-18-113	0.00
WASCO TOTAL				83,904.00

- iii) RAC recommends any additional funds which become available from this portion should augment the Rocky Fuels Reduction project.

HOOD/WILLAMETTE RESOURCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

P.L. 106-393; SECURE RURAL SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITY SELF-DETERMINATION ACT OF 2000

- b) HOOD RIVER COUNTY- lead reviewer: H. Price
- i) Discussion on H. Price’s vetting process. Project proposals came in under total amount available for this County.
 - ii) Verified that funds are only for use on federal lands.
 - iii) RAC voted to recommend the following projects/amounts:

County	Sponsor	Project Name	Project Number	FY18 Funding Awarded (Overhead + Project)
Hood River	Mt Hood NF	HRRD Invasive Plant Control	HW-11-045	21,000.00
Hood River	Mt Hood NF	Laurence Lake Road Storm Proofing	HW-18-105	8,505.00
Hood River	Mt Hood NF	West Fork Hood River Redhill Phase II Restoration	HW-18-106	6,350.00
Hood River	Mt Hood NF	Mt. Hood Cooperative Trail Restoration	HW-18-107	6,300.00
HOOD RIVER TOTAL				42,155.00

- iv) At the DFO’s discretion, the remaining \$2650 left in FY18 funds for Hood River County can be put toward past recommended projects or be allocated during next round of proposals. REC preference is to allocate during next round of proposals.

- c) CLACKAMAS COUNTY- lead reviewer: Tullis, Jaqua, Price, Adams, Whitney, Wilent
- i) Discussion on vetting process. Each project was scaled back by a percentage. Consideration was given to FS priorities.
 - ii) Discussion and changes made to Rd 4600 Drainage project- clarification made that Rd 4600 serves recreation traffic as well as alternate route to Portland.
 - iii) Discussion and changes made to fully fund Jackpot Meadows project due to time sensitive nature of the project.
 - iv) RAC voted to recommend the following projects/amounts:

County	Sponsor	Project Name	Project Number	FY18 Funding Awarded (Overhead + Project)
Clackamas	Clackamas County OR	Dump Stoppers	HW-09-127	20,150.00
Clackamas	MT Hood NF	Clear Fork Salmon Steelhead Instream Restoration	HW-18-104	27,330.00
Clackamas (+Marion)	MT Hood NF	Hunter White Pine Pruning (2 counties)	HW-18-101	4,580.40
Clackamas	Walama Restoration	Jackpot Meadows Reed Canary Grass Eradication	HW-18-103	7,944.00
Clackamas	MT Hood NF	NFS Road 4600 Drainage Maintenance	HW-18-100	11,760.00
Clackamas (+Marion)	MT Hood NF	Westside Precommercial Thinning & Piling (2 counties)	HW-18-102	21,688.60
CLACKAMAS TOTAL				93,453.00

- v) RAC recommends any additional funds which become available from this portion should augment the Dumpstoppers project.

- d) MARION COUNTY (MHNF)- lead reviewer: Cameron
- i) Discussion on vetting process.
 - ii) RAC voted to recommend the following projects/amounts:

County	Sponsor	Project Name	Project Number	FY18 Funding Awarded (Overhead + Project)
Marion (+Clackamas)	MT Hood NF	Hunter White Pine Pruning (2 counties)	HW-18-108	7,917.00
Marion (+Clackamas)	MT Hood NF	Westside Precommercial Thinning & Piling (2 counties)	HW-18-109	23,959.00
MARION TOTAL				31,876.00

- e) MULTNOMAH COUNTY- lead reviewer: Price

HOOD/WILLAMETTE RESOURCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

P.L. 106-393; SECURE RURAL SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITY SELF-DETERMINATION ACT OF 2000

- i) Discussion on vetting process. Only one proposal came in. Request was more than available in FY18 funds, however all of FY17 funds were also available, making it possible to fully fund the request.

- ii) RAC voted to recommend the following projects/amounts:

County	Sponsor	Project Name	Project Number	FY18 Funding Awarded (Overhead + Project)
Multnomah	Trailkeepers of Oregon	Trailkeepers of Oregon Volunteer Stewardship	HW-18-115	24,104.00
MULTNOMAH TOTAL				24,104.00

- iii) RAC recommends any additional funds which become available should be invested in deferred trail or road maintenance in the county.

- f) MARION COUNTY (WNF)- lead reviewer: Cameron

- i) Discussion on vetting process. Proposals did not exceed available funds.

- ii) RAC voted to recommend the following projects/amounts:

County	Sponsor	Project Name	Project Number	FY18 Funding Awarded (overhead + project)
Marion	Willamette NF	Whitewater Fire Hazardous Fuels Reduction	HW-18-027	2,499.00
Marion	Willamette NF	Summer Home Chipping- Hazardous Fuels Reduction	HW-18-026	1,499.00
Marion	Willamette NF	Breitenbush Wildland-Urban Interface Hazardous Fuels Reduction	HW-18-023	4,998.00
Marion	Willamette NF	Detroit Ranger District Deferred Trail Maintenance	HW-09-117	10,000.00
Marion	Willamette NF	Detroit Deferred Rec Site Maintenance, Dispersed Site Rehab & Lake Sweeping	HW-09-121	17,430.00
Marion	Willamette NF	Elk Lake Aquatic Organism Passage & Rd Decom/Maintenance	HW-18-024	7,500.00
Marion	Willamette NF	FSR 46 Safety and Signage Improvements	HW-18-025	10,074.00
Marion	Willamette NF	Marion County Road Maintenance	HW-09-112	12,231.00
MARION TOTAL				66,231.00

- g) LINN COUNTY- lead reviewer: Tucker

- i) Discussion on vetting process. Significant coordination with County officials and USFS District Rangers.

- ii) J. Jaqua raised concerns about the status of SHPO concurrence for Camas Prairie and Santiam Wagon Rd projects. District Ranger will be responsible to ensure this before project is implemented. Request for confirmation of SHPO and NHPA concurrence (including year) in next year's proposal template.

- iii) W. Tucker is confident that Rangers have done their due diligence on all Linn County projects.

- iv) RAC voted to recommend the following projects/amounts:

HOOD/WILLAMETTE RESOURCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

P.L. 106-393; SECURE RURAL SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITY SELF-DETERMINATION ACT OF 2000

County	Sponsor	Project Name	Project Number	FY18 Funding Awarded (overhead + project)
Linn	Willamette NF	Hazard Tree Removal Roadside- SHRD	HW-16-107	7,500.00
Linn	Willamette NF	Summer Home Chipping-Hazardous Fuels Reduction	HW-18-016	0.00
Linn	Willamette NF	Hazard Tree Removal Roadside- DRD	HW-16-106	1,000.00
Linn	Willamette NF	Stahlman Wildland-Urban Interface Hazardous Fuels Reduction	HW-18-015	5,000.00
Linn	Willamette NF	FSR 11 Asphalt Repairs	HW-18-014	20,000.00
Linn	Willamette NF	Linn County Road Maintenance	HW-14-037	30,000.00
Linn	Willamette NF	SHRD Deferred Trail Maintenance	HW-13-040	12,500.00
Linn	Willamette NF	DRD Deferred Trail Maintenance	HW-09-051	8,000.00
Linn	Willamette NF	Detroit Deferred Rec Site Maintenance, Dispersed Site Rehab, Lake Sweeping	HW-09-158	20,000.00
Linn	Willamette NF	McKenzie River Ranger District - Portable Toilets - Linn	HW-11-102	3,885.00
Linn	Willamette NF	Patjens Lake and Deferred Trail Maintenance	HW-18-017	20,000.00
Linn	Willamette NF	Pamelia Lake Reed Canary Grass Removal	HW-18-013	5,000.00
Linn	Willamette NF	Invasive weed treatments-MRRD Linn	HW-18-019	5,000.00
Linn	S Santiam Water	WASSAU Tract Youth Restoration Project	HW-18-022	13,000.00
Linn	Willamette NF	SH Deferred Recreation Site and Dispersed Site maintenance	HW-13-041	7,000.00
Linn	Willamette NF	Quartzville Corridor partnership with Linn County	HW-18-021	8,000.00
Linn	Willamette NF	Historic Marion Forks Guard Station and Garage Re-roofing Project	HW-18-012	5,000.00
Linn	Walama Restora	Santiam Wagon Road Revegetation Project	HW-18-018	6,480.00
Linn	Willamette NF	Invasive Weed Survey and Treatment - SHRD	HW-09-005	20,000.00
Linn	Willamette NF	Fish Lake Remout Depot Historic Structure Stabilization/Maintenance	HW-13-047	5,000.00
Linn	Willamette NF	McKenzie River Deferred Road Maitenance	HW-11-088	16,000.00
Linn	Willamette NF	Young Stand Density Management - Linn Co - McKenzie River	HW-09-176	11,000.00
Linn	Oregon Timber	Old Cascade Crest Rehabilitation	HW-18-020	9,500.00
Linn	Northwest Youth	Camas Prairie and Cascadia Day Use Area Invasives Removal	HW-16-102	20,000.00
Linn	Willamette NF	Young Stand Density Management- SHRD	HW-09-192	6,670.00
LINN TOTAL				252,035.00

- h) LANE- lead reviewer: Tucker, Wilent
 - i) Discussion on vetting process. Significant coordination with County officials and USFS District Rangers. Interested in additional USFS coordination in the future to better understand the priorities.
 - (1) Q: Why are funds being spent renting portable toilets verses installing vault toilets? A: the Forest does not have the capacity to maintain additional vault toilets.
 - ii) RAC voted to recommend the following projects/amounts:

HOOD/WILLAMETTE RESOURCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

P.L. 106-393; SECURE RURAL SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITY SELF-DETERMINATION ACT OF 2000

County	Sponsor	Project Name	Project Number	FY18 Funding Awarded (overhead + project)
Lane	Willamette NF	Youth Conservation Corps- MFRD	HW-09-071	120,194.55
Lane	Willamette NF	Deer Creek Floodplain Enhancement Project: Phase II	HW-16-202	31,106.25
Lane	Willamette NF	Middle Fork Deferred Road Maintenance	HW-09-073	64,841.86
Lane	Willamette NF	MRRD Ollalie Mountain Reroute and Deferred Trail Maintenance	HW-18-008	35,533.22
Lane	Willamette NF	MF Noxious Weed Eradication Project	HW-18-002	14,806.97
Lane	Willamette NF	MRRD Portable Toilets - Lane	HW-11-102	4,977.00
Lane	Middle Fork Will	Coal Creek Trail Construction and Interpretive Signs	HW-18-001	31,186.04
Lane	Willamette NF	Invasive weed treatments-MRRD Lane	HW-18-011	10,949.40
Lane	Willamette NF	McKenzie River Pollinator Project	HW-18-009	6,636.00
Lane	Willamette NF	South Fork McKenzie River WATERS Project	HW-18-010	7,541.34
Lane	Willamette NF	Respect The River-North Fork of the Middle Fork Willamette	HW-18-003	20,145.00
Lane	Willamette NF	Youth Conservation Corps- MRRD	HW-09-070	25,280.00
Lane	South Willamette	Southern Willamette Forest Collaborative Support	HW-18-004	13,272.00
Lane	Northwest Youth	Diamond Peak/Waldo Wilderness Deferred Trail Maintenance	HW-09-091	12,810.64
Lane	Northwest Youth	Middle Fork Trail Maintenance	HW-18-005	17,215.68
Lane	High Cascade Fe	Willamette Pass Winter Trails	HW-18-006	11,281.20
Lane	Walama Restora	Invasive Vegetation Management in Environmentally Sensitive Areas	HW-18-007	6,636.00
Lane	Willamette NF	McKenzie River Deferred Road Maintenance	HW-09-066	31,106.25
Lane	Willamette NF	Young Stand Density Management - Lane Co - McKenzie River	HW-09-058	13,935.60
Lane	Lane County OR	MLK Youth Forest work Team	HW-09-004	29,230.00
LANE TOTAL				508,685.00

- i) DOUGLAS (WNF)- lead reviewer: Price
 - i) Discussion on vetting process. Only one proposal for consideration.
 - ii) RAC voted to recommend the following projects/amounts:

County	Sponsor	Project Name	Project Number	FY18 Funding Awarded (overhead + project)
Douglas	Willamette NF	Middle Fork Deferred Road Maintenance	HW-09-024	33,000.00
DOUGLAS TOTAL				33,000.00

- 4. Recommendation made that any residual funds that come available should be invested into deferred trail and/or road maintenance within the appropriate County and Forest.
- 5. Recommendations to improve process for future years
 - a) Build in more time to hear from Rangers on USFS priorities. Try to get Ranger representation during initial review meeting to discuss their priorities.
 - b) Set dates for fall meeting earlier to accommodate more time for vetting in between the two.
 - c) Book as many sponsor presentations as possible. Allow proposal review in advance.
 - d) Consider RAC members developing a scoring matrix to ensure consistency across counties.
 - e) Improvements to the proposal template: budget page, assurances.

ADJOURN: 1430.

HOOD-WILLAMETTE RAC

February 11, 2020- WRITTEN PUBLIC COMMENTS

COMMENT 1

The last time my husband and I hiked the saddle area between Broken Top and South Sister, we ran into two Boy Scout Troop Leaders and about 20 Boy Scouts. They were on a two night backpacking trip in the Three Sisters Wilderness Area. It was great to see so many youth out enjoying the outdoors, getting exercise and learning valuable skills, with all electronic devices left at home (except for the Troop Leaders, of course). First and foremost, Congrats to the Deschutes National Forest Service (DNFS) and Willamette National Forest Service (WNFS) Offices on now making a trip like this pretty much impossible in terms of obtaining the permits and paying the associated fees. Good Job Folks!

Besides my overall, total, complete 100 percent objection to paying any type of fee, tax, assessment or charge (or any creative term the Forest Service wants to insert here for money leaving my wallet) to access my public lands, I object to how the both Forest Service offices "crafted" the permitting system. There is one way quota numbers were calculated for day use (individual numbers at trail heads) and a total opposite way quotas were calculated for overnight use (group numbers at trail heads). Why the two standards? In my opinion, the individual day use permits give group hikers (like the Boy Scouts) the short end of the stick and the overnight permit system gives all individuals the short end of the stick. And, please tell me where, in any of the reams of documentation generated by this project, from day one, where "Group" was defined as one person? Also, I never heard it mentioned once in the "Public Break-Out Sessions" I attended ~ I refuse to call these sessions Public Meetings. In email conversations with Matt Petterson, Recreation Program Manager (WNFS), I asked him where a "Group" was defined ~ he responded that a "Group" was anywhere from one to 12 people. As I type, he has not been able to pinpoint anywhere in all of the documentation where "Group" was defined as one person. If the Forest Service is going to use a term such as "Group" and assign it a definition that is uncommon to base common sense, there is a responsibility to define that definition somewhere in the paperwork. To not do so is exceedingly deceitful. Most people (if not all people) when they think of a "Group," they think of more than one person. Webster's dictionary defines "Group" as persons or things ~ both plural. Since when is a "Group" one person? I guess it depends on what your definition of "Is" is.

So, if the goal of the Forest Service is to control numbers in the 400,000 + acres of Wilderness by setting Trail Head quotas, why the two standards? Why an individual permit system by day and a "Group" permit system by night? Say, for example, you have a quota of five "Groups" for a certain trail head for overnight permits. Using your logic, that five group number could range anywhere from five total people to 60 people. How does this make any consistent sense with what you are doing for individual day use permits and overall controlling numbers in the Wilderness? Your permitting systems should be 100 percent consistent between day and overnight users and based on the total number of individual people in the Wilderness. It would be much easier to understand. So, if a person goes on a day hike and obtains a day use permit, it's not a leap to assume if and when they go to obtain an overnight permit that they are going to look for an individual permit because they are not a "Group." Since one is not available, I don't think it's a leap for them to assume they don't need an individual permit for an overnight hike because the Forest Service doesn't offer one! By Constitutional requirement, laws, rules and regulations must be easy to understand and follow. Your permitting system, at a base level, must have some level of consistency ~ it would be much easier to understand and hence, comply with.

And, what about just simple Forest Service overreach? In an email conversation with Lisa Machnik, Recreation, Heritage, Lands & Partnership Staff Officer (DNFS), I asked her about the WNFS' website and their REQUIREMENT for presenting a photo ID along with your permit if asked for by a Forest Officer. My main question to her was how on earth does this not 100 percent violate my 4th Amendment Rights? She got back to me and said the verbiage on the WNFS' website was going to be changed to say "You must carry your permit with you and present it upon request to any Forest Officer or other law enforcement officer throughout the duration of your trip," basically deleting the requirement and need for carrying and presenting photo ID. Great! Score one for our Constitution! But, what if no one had brought this up as a concern? Would it still be on the website as a requirement and instituted in May? How many other issues such as this are buried and hidden in the mounds of paperwork generated by this project, and going to be instituted into the plan as Forest Rules and conversely, turned into citations for citizens? All along, I have shouted from the rooftops that the Final Draft of this project needs to go through the formal CFR process, for oversight and a checks and balances for issues like this requirement for carrying photo ID. When I asked Project Co-Lead Beth Peer about the CFR Process, she told me "No, we aren't going to do that because the CFR Process is too cumbersome." Not a good enough reason, Beth! And, the way I understand Forest Rules (the bureaucratic umbrella the project is being done under) to me, it's a huge leap to craft a set of rules and regulations for 400,000+ acres under Forest Rules.

It is painfully apparent that the Forest Service will go to extremes (including violating the Constitution and Bill of Rights) and not even begin to rein itself in until it is caught, red-handed with its hands in the public's rights cookie jar. So, tell me ~ how on earth does this foster any kind of working, trusting, respectful relationship with the tax paying public the Forest Service is supposed to serve? In my opinion, the Forest Service has a terrible reputation locally with how they have managed the forests and their "let it burn" policy in Wilderness areas. Case in point the August 2017 24,000 acre Milli Fire ~ what a horrible travesty for Central Oregon. Side Note ~ My husband and I watched that fire smolder for four days before it crossed the border from Wilderness acreage into General Forest Service acreage. In those four days, the fire could have very easily been put out with a couple of tanker drops. So, to bolster this already poor reputation with a Wilderness Plan that is poorly researched, poorly thought out, poorly planned, poorly communicated, poorly executed and forced on people, all with a corresponding fee attached, all I can do is shake my head in disgust and be thankful that my home affords wonderful views of the Three Sisters Wilderness Area, because now, stepping foot in it is no longer an option.

Shame on you all ~ I gotta believe you are better people than this ~

COMMENT 2

NO GRAZING SHOULD BE PERMITTED ON ANY PART OF THIS NATIONAL LAND. THIS COMMENT IS FOR THE PUBLIC RECORD PLEASE RECEIPT.

COMMENT 3

Attached.

KEITH CUNNINGHAM-PARMETER

ATTORNEY AT LAW

245 WINTER ST SE, SALEM, OR 97301

January 17, 2020

To: U.S. Forest Service Central Cascades Resource Advisory Committees

c/o Lisa Machnik (lisa.machnik@usda.gov), Larisa Bogardus (lbogardus@blm.org), Jennifer Sorensen (Jennifer.sorensen@usda.gov)

Re: Central Cascades Wilderness Strategies Special Recreation Use Permit and Fee System Proposal

Dear Members of the Resource Advisory Committees:

Because many members of the public cannot attend the RAC meetings which will discuss and review the Central Cascades Wilderness Strategies Special Recreation Use Permit and Fee System, I write to highlight some key points for you and to specifically note the public opposition to the permit and fee system.

The locations, dates, and times of the RAC meetings made it so members of the public are essentially unable to attend. As of today (January 17, 2020), neither the Bend RAC meeting scheduled for January 22, 2020, nor the Baker City RAC meeting scheduled for February 20-21, 2020, were published in the Federal Register or local newspapers. Likewise, the Keizer RAC meetings of January 14, 2020, and February 11, 2020, were not published in local newspapers.

You need to be aware that as of mid-December 2019 (meaning without counting the last month of responses after the U.S. Forest Service finally actually issued its Plan to the public for the Permit and Fee System) there were approximately 12,000 written responses to the U.S. Forest Service's proposed special recreation use permit and fee system. The U.S. Forest Service has acknowledged that fully 11,000 of those are in opposition to the permit and fee system. Since then, additional public comments have been submitted in opposition to the Permit System and Fee.

The public has also submitted numerous articles to the U.S. Forest Service regarding the public opposition to the Permit and Fee System.

Key points raised by members of the public to the U.S. Forest Service, and which some of us were able to briefly raise at the Keizer RAC meeting on January 14, 2020 include:

1. Special Recreation Permit Fees are not allowed under the Federal Land Recreation Enhancement Act (FLREA) for the activities targeted by USFS's proposed Central Cascades Management Plan and Limited Entry Permit System.
2. USFS's Special Recreation Permit and Plan are not justified as necessary and its rationale for the permit system, charging fees, and the Plan are unsupported.
3. USFS's Plan and Permit system are unnecessarily broad.
4. Photo identification requirement is an excessively high burden.
5. Public notice and comment opportunities have been insufficient during this process.

Additionally, while many of us oppose the fee as illegal, logistical problems with the proposed Permit and Fee system abound and remain completely unaddressed by the U.S. Forest Service. Right now, the U.S. Forest Service has not specified cancellation policies, benefits for volunteers, veterans, and seniors, and the "plan" to address the high cost of fees for many persons. A system like this is illegal, and is nowhere near ready to go "live" and be implemented this spring. The RAC and the public are entitled to have all of their questions addressed and these issues resolved before any further action on this Permit and Fee system is taken by the U.S. Forest Service or before the RAC reviews the matter.

Thank you for your consideration of these issues.

Sincerely,

/s/

Keith Cunningham-Parmeter
Attorney at Law