

Missoula Resource Advisory Committee

April 29, 2021 | Meeting Notes

RAC Members present:

Category A

Zachary Bashoor
Kristen Baker-Dickinson
Scott Kuehn

Category B

Seth Wilson
Ben Horan
Christine Hastings
Sawyer Connelly
Steven Gaskill

Category C

Alisa Wade
Jim Burchfield
Janet Krivacek
Chris Fellet
Commissioner Strohmaier

- The meeting began shortly after 1:00 pm
- **Roll call: the committee reached a quorum so the RAC can proceed with the meeting.**
- The RAC introduced themselves for members of the public and press.

AGENDA ITEM: Previous minutes

- Ben Horan, reviewed April 8 Public Meeting Minutes
- **Motion to approve the minutes by Steve Gaskill.; Jim Burchfield gave a 2nd. All in favor; meeting minutes approved.**

AGENDA ITEM: 2021 Funding Update

- New funding amount \$63,699.19
- Scott K. noted a mistake on the spreadsheet, for the Missoula Front-Country Ranger position requested for \$12,500 (not \$12,000) and Kate fixed the spreadsheet.
- Ben noted that the spreadsheet fix now put the RAC in a position to make a decision on funding.
- The revised total amount requested is now \$63, 980.00

AGENDA ITEM: Project proposal review process & funding decisions

- Ben proposes working through the established process for practice
- It was noted that the RAC received project questions back from proponents.
- Kate noted that she received 14 individual project rankings from Committee Members
- Ben asked if any proponent presentations were scheduled. Kate noted that she didn't receive requests from RAC members to arrange a presentation.
- Ben noted that the next step is having a group conversation about the watershed/roads (50%) funding requirement.
- Jim took the first turn for identifying which projects he thought should be considered for the watershed category and which should not.
- The group discussed these three project/positions and if they constitute or qualify for the watershed project.
- Alisa Wade suggested going back to last year's project for consistency when it comes to the Ranger projects/position funding requests.
- Ben posed this question about the Bog Lemming Subnivian Monitoring – does this constitute reestablishment of native species? Is there a difference between a study and an implementation project?

- A few members of the RAC gave their opinions on the Ranger projects and the subnivean project as it relates to the 50% watershed.
- **Dave S made this motion: The Subnivean Bog Lemming project does NOT qualify to be counted among the 50% for watershed/roads funding requirement. Alisa W. gave a 2nd to the motion. None opposed. Motion passes. All projects listed except for the Bog Lemming, qualify for the watershed/road decommissioning funding requirement.**
- **Steve Gaskill made a motion to accept the project rankings** (with discussion) as presented on the screen. **Seth Wilson gave a 2nd to the motion.**
- Alisa Wade would like to discuss and points out that the ranking may affect the funding of low-ranked projects She suggests removing the money from the Placid Gold Project because it would have the least impact from a percentage standpoint.
- Kristen suggested looking at the projects with equity.
- Jim B. noted he would take the remaining money out of Placid Gold because \$281 equates with 1% of the funding for that project whereas \$280 taken out of the Lemming project may alter the project entirely.
- Alisa brought up the need for the RAC to consider long-term implications of some of the projects the Committee is funding.
- Ben moved the group into the next step of the process to start talking about the allocation of the funds. Ben noted the group does not want to be bound to eliminating the bottom of the list projects based on rankings, and the group wants to take a wholistic look/approach to funding.
- Point of order, the RAC needs to deal with Steve's motion.
- Steve was asked to reiterate. **Steve moves to accept the list as presented on the screen. All were in favor of the rankings as is.**
- Ben opened the floor for public comment. There was no public comment.
- Ben referred the group back to the process.
- The group acknowledged that fully funding the first 3-4 projects would cover the 50% funding requirement for roads and watersheds.
- **Alisa makes a motion that all projects get fully funded with the exception for the difference (\$281.81) being taken out of the Placid Gold project, the largest project. 2nd by Sawyer. All in favor; none opposed.**
- The RAC invited Heather Brighton on to speak about the Lolo Stream project
- The RAC invited Geoff Bogie to make comments about the Placid-Gold project.
- **Janet K. made a motion to adjourn the meeting; Steve gave a 2nd – all are in favor. Motion passed & meeting adjourned after 2 p.m.**

Missoula RAC Rankings & Funding Allocations - April 29, 2021

Project	Total Rank:	Amount requested	Amount funded
Lolo Creek Stream Restoration	32	15,000.00	15,000.00
Holland Lake Area Weed Control	44	8,000.00	8,000.00
Ninemile Front Country Ranger	52	5,500.00	5,500.00
Forest Service/City of Missoula Conservation Lands Front Country Ranger	56	12,500.00	12,500.00
Placid Gold Phase 1 Herbicide Application	65	16,000.00	15,719.19
Ninemile Youth Conservation Corps Crew in Missoula Co.	65	5,000.00	5,000.00
Northern Bog Lemming Subnivean Monitoring	78	\$1,980.00	\$1,980.00
TOTAL	n/a	\$63,980.00	\$63,699.19

Missoula RAC Project Proposal Review Process (agreed to/adopted at April 8, 2021 public meeting)

1. RAC receives written project proposals.
2. Individually rank projects by merit.
3. Individually identify watershed/road decommissioning projects (50% requirement)
4. Individually compile questions for project proponents
5. Provide project proponents with written questions (Please send questions to RAC Coordinator who will compile these questions).
6. Responses to questions are received from proponents, RAC members may opt to re-rank projects.

RAC will meet in person/virtually for the following steps

7. Receive project presentations from proponents, on an as-needed basis.
8. Discuss and agree on which projects constitute watershed restoration/road decommissioning.
9. Discuss ranking of projects and agree on a project ranking.
10. Allocate 50% of the funding toward watershed/road decommissioning projects.
11. After the 50% requirement is met, go back to the top of the list, and allocate the remaining funds.
12. Process complete

50% of all Title II funds must be used for projects that are primarily dedicated to:

- Road maintenance, decommissioning, or obliteration or
- Restoration of streams and watersheds

Project objectives may include, but are not limited to:

- Road, trail, and infrastructure maintenance or obliteration
- Soil productivity improvement
- Improvements in forest ecosystem health
- Watershed restoration and maintenance
- Restoration, maintenance and improvement of wildlife and fish habitat
- Control of noxious and exotic weeds
- Re-establishment of native species