

August 19 Missoula RAC Notes

Attendance

Roll Call 2020	Member	4.14.20	8.19.20	9.8.20
CATEGORY A:				
Organized Labor or Non-Timber Forest Product Harvester Groups	Zachary Bashoor	x	x	x
Developed Outdoor Recreation, Off-Highway Vehicle Users, or Commercial Recreation Activities	Mike McGrew	x	x	x
Developed Outdoor Recreation, Off-Highway Vehicle Users, or Commercial Recreation Activities	Kristen Baker-Dickinson	x	x	x
Commercial Timber Industry	Scott Kuehn	x	x	x
Federal Grazing Permit or Other Land Use Permit Holders, or Representative of Non-Industrial Private Forest Land Owners	Jack Rich			x
CATEGORY B:				
Regionally or Locally Recognized Environmental Organizations	Dr. Seth Wilson	x	x	x
Dispersed Recreational Activities	Dr. Steven Gaskill	x		x
Dispersed Recreational Activities	Ben Horan	x	x	x
Nationally or Regionally Recognized Wild Horse and Burro Interest, Wildlife or Hunting Organizations, or Watershed Associations	Christine Hastings	x	x	x
Nationally or Regionally Recognized Wild Horse and Burro Interest, Wildlife or Hunting Organizations, or Watershed Associations	Sawyer Connelly	x	x	x
CATEGORY C:				
County or Local-Elected Office	Commissioner Strohmaier	x	x	x
Area School Officials or Teachers	Dr. Alisa Wade	x	x	x
Affected Public-At-Large	Dr. Jim Burchfield	x	x	x
Affected Public-At-Large	Janet Krivacek	x	x	x
Affected Public-At-Large	Chris Fellet	x	x	x
DFO -Quinn Carver		x	x	x
Coordinator - Kate Jerman		x	x	x

Bin Items:

- **Jim:** Not in this meeting, but I hope in future meetings our RAC can discuss recreation fees in broader terms to address complex problems like impact management (including apparent but often ignored problems like accompanying pets), voluntary revenue collection from "friends" groups, and fee structures to commercial users.
- Field trip next summer to project site
- Kate will re-send the charter and highlight the voting requirements for quorum on decisions prior to the next meeting so everyone is clear.

- Kate will query campground closing dates Missoula County – this is typically done at Ranger discretion based off staffing capacity and use patterns.
- Absolutely need a voting quorum for the next meeting – ie – three members per each category need to be present to make official recommendations.

Meeting Minutes:

- Meeting began at around 2:00 pm with limited technical issues – great job everyone!
- There was some discussion about how to proceed with meeting notes. Jim Burchfield suggested that the Committee get into the habit of reading the notes and approving them as good practice even though it is not an official meeting.
- RAC coordinator reviewed orientation meeting notes for the Committee and Jim made a motion to approve and Seth seconds the motion.
- **Orientation meeting minutes are approved.**
- The group moves on to going over the process for reviewing the project proposals: Kate reviews funding amounts, money limitations and requirements:

Missoula RAC	
17xx	54,745
18xx	50,163
19xx	46,629
Total	151,537

- **General Notes:** 17 project proposals were submitted; 50% funding requirement for roads and watersheds is: **\$75,768.50**. The recent RAC direction for the 17 and 18 year funds are that projects have to be initiated by 9/30/2022 (approved by RAC and Carolyn). The funds must be spent and/or obligated by 9/30/2023. The Committee is well on track to meet those deadlines.
- The Committee moved on to a proposed ranking process for the project proposals.
- Kate reviewed the individual ranking sheet and the associated spreadsheets for calculating overall rankings in preparation for the discussion on Sept. 8.
- There was a lot of good discussion on this process. Notably, Jim wants to rank the projects that ‘most worthy’ highest and then address the watershed/roads requirement at the next meeting. Alisa and Quinn discussed ‘definitions’ for the roads and watershed funding requirement.
- Ben suggested adding a column to the ranking sheet where Committee members could decide individually if a project meets the 50% watershed/road requirement.
- Alisa brought up the potential to overlook outliers within the proposed ranking process.
- Group agrees this could be an issue with the proposed method but discussed giving 15 minutes of discussion time at the next meeting to evaluate this issue and discuss before making recommendations.

- Janet asked about a clarification for the priority of ranking projects (recreation vs habitat); the group revisited the statutory requirement to fund the roads/watershed piece at 50%.
- Ben made **three** motions based on this discussion for the committee to move forward with ranking and reviewing proposals.
 1. Motion to approve the ranking/voting system for project proposals.
Alisa seconded; Jim third; all were in favor
Motion approved to move forward with the current ranking system.
 2. Motion for committee members to indicate on the ranking sheet whether the individual committee member believes the project meets the criteria for a 'roads or watershed' project to address the 50% funding requirement.
Dave seconded; Seth third; all were in favor
Motion approved to have a column on the ranking sheet for committee members to indicate if the project meets the 'roads/watershed' funding requirement.
 3. Ben makes a motion to acknowledge statistical outliers in the ranking process for at least 15 minutes in the next meeting's agenda.
Alisa seconded; Seth third; all in agreement
Motion approved to dedicate at least 15 minutes of discussion time to potential outliers in the ranking system.
- Kate needed two more agreements from the committee regarding preparation for the Sept. 8 meeting: ranking sheet deadlines and a discussion around how to handle project proponent presentations/clarifying questions because those need to be scheduled in advance.
- With discussion, the group agreed to have ranking sheets into Kate by **Monday, August 31st**, when sheets come in, Kate will calculate rankings for the working spreadsheet and also work with Ben, Quinn and RAC to determine which project proponents need to come in front of the RAC on Sept. 8 for clarifying questions/presentations.
- The group also wanted to add a 'questions' and 'comments' column to the ranking sheet. The *Questions* column will be used if the committee member needs to ask clarifying questions to the project proponent; the comments will be for general comments/thoughts.
- The amount of 'questions' for each project will determine the need to bring the proponent in front of the RAC for the Sept. 8 meeting.
- The group took a quick break after these discussions before the next piece of the meeting: Lolo Fee Proposal.
- Jeff Ward (Northern Region of the Forest Service) and Chris James (Lolo National Forest) came on board to present general background information on the Lolo National Forest fee proposal process, public comments, and proposal.
- ***A lot of great discussion happened that included themes of:*** the amended proposal based off previous public comment, 'pricing' out of disadvantaged populations out/social justice; sliding scale options, friends groups, enforcement, comparable rates for State/private options, how does Great American Outdoors Act funding play into this, dispersed camping opportunities that still exist, fee increases have not happened for 20 years, outreach in general and outreach to target communities, shoulder season use for 'locals', locals passes, other RAC recommendations on the fee proposals.

- Jeff and Chris will be at the Sept. 8 meeting and will present on the topic; the Committee will hear from the public and will have final discussion to make a recommendation
- Chris's contact information will be provided to the RAC for additional questions.
- Kate committed to sending the Ranking Sheet promptly the next day; and following up with meeting minutes, press release/legal notice, new draft agenda for next meeting, and Committee charter.
- Meeting was adjourned at 5:03 pm