

Full Meeting recordings available at these links:

- **1st half of meeting:** <https://web.microsoftstream.com/video/d7862f21-f96c-451d-930a-440d796e3367>
- **2nd half of meeting:** <https://web.microsoftstream.com/video/04d64f33-e0e6-4053-ac21-9b1be8d6f54b>
- **Meeting Chat is attached to this document**
- **Please note, these meeting notes are a summarization of the meeting**

Meeting Notes – RAC Sept. 8 meeting

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 |

Meeting Notes

- The meeting began shortly after 3:00 pm
- Kate and Quinn reviewed meeting guidelines, protocol, and went through the agenda
- Ben and Quinn reviewed the charter, parliamentary procedures and the need for quorum in categories with decisions/recommendations.
- Ben reviewed the previous meeting minutes from the informational/preparation meeting
- **Jim moved to accept meeting notes, Steve Gaskill made the second – none opposed, and the previous meeting notes were accepted.**
- The group moved into the first agenda item which was the Lolo National Forest Fee Proposal for sites within Missoula County:
- Carolyn Upton Forest Supervisor spoke on the following themes:
 - Partnership around sustainable recreation planning including talking about friends' groups, GAOA (Great American Outdoors Act) and continued strategic investment in these conversations, community-wide
 - Fees are another tool in the box to improve and continue to provide recreation opportunity.
 - What do fees do for the Lolo: maintenance, staffing, signage, improved experiences
 - Public comments were taken very seriously and based on comment the day use sites were withdrawn to be responsive to public needs.
 - Acknowledged comments were made around meetings management we are aware and will continue to look/work into this.
- Jeff Ward gave his presentation and covered – background of the process, what took place in the public process, comments received, what the fee proposal sites are in Missoula
- Public Comments and Question – the public and RAC members were given time for questions and comments were given three minutes each /Jeff addressed public/RAC questions in the chat window:
 - **Which fees/are seasonal or year-round?** Answer (Jeff): Campground fees are seasonal, but opening dates are discretionary by district, there are some fee sites that are open in the winter, and some that are open year-round.
 - **Phasing fees, is it possible?** Answer (Jeff): We have had this question before, and it has been a part of our original proposals. We were recommended not to go to the phasing direction because there was a thought that phasing opens the door to continue to raise prices. It is not out of the question, open for discussion.
 - **Clarification around the fees for Pattee Canyon?** Answer (Chris James and Jeff): Fees are the fees unless the District changes the amenities. The Ranger would have the discretion to cut fees if we eliminated amenities. Prices are based off amenities. The Group A site is large, and there are two other sites that are suitable for groups under 25. There were also enforcement issues like groups of 75-100 for a site that accommodates 25.
 - **Camping Fees at Seeley:** Answer (Chris James) There was a lot of discussion around the fees here, but the amenities are high here.
 - **Kitty Benzar (public comments):**
 - Supervisor Upton referred to concerns the pre-meeting/files a public response. public should have been able to participate.
 - Second concern is the comments/public response were not shared. Comments were shared with No Fee Coalition and they were given access. Concerns about the objections to the proposal.
 - These fee increases are large, wrong proposal at the wrong time
 - RAC is urged to consider her comments
- Jeff Ward showed the response to comments: Total of 355 comments and 271 respondents (some people made more than one comment on individual sites), Jeff went over the comment themes.

- Quinn noted we were at least 10 minutes behind – time check
- **Dave S. makes a Motion: adopt the fee proposal as presented (Janet seconded the motion)**
 - **The group reached quorum and the motion passed** however they acknowledged the need for more discussion prior to a formal vote.
 - Discussion needs to happen after a motion is made with a second.
 - Jeff added that there are three options for the fee proposals to the Regional Forester – recommending as proposed, not recommending, or recommending with suggestions. The RF has some discretion, if she did not take the recommendation, she would need to talk to the Secretary of Agriculture about it.
 - Dave added – this is an advisory body. The RAC made a clear recommendation to adopt the fees but acknowledging the Regional Forester can consider additional sentiments of the group. Someone could make another motion to encourage the Regional Forester to consider a phased approach.
- **Second Motion by Alisa Wade: That the conversations and concerns about phased implementation, and or discounts, be forwarded onto decision makers for their consideration and discretion. (Alisa Wade) (Zach B. second)**
 - **This second motion was approved unanimously**
- Carolyn joined in at the end of the conversation – she added thanks and appreciation for the RAC for taking this proposal seriously. She heard the conversation, and commits to considering the comments about phasing, and she will get back with the RAC on this.
- The group took a 5-minute break
- Group moved into the second half of the agenda – four project proponents were brought in to further discuss and answer questions about their project proposals.
- The Chair suggested to move right into discussion with the proponents to save time and the Committee agreed.
- Jeff Hayes went into detail about prescribed burn operations projects (Petty Creek and Frenchtown Face), and project costs per unit, covered other funding sources and partner dollars, partial level of funding of 10,000 would be helpful
- Claire Campbell was present for the Rennie Stark Road project questions – regarding why the need for funding, the nature of the road and the purpose of the project
- Caryn Miske – clarified monitoring and use of the funding based on new developments
- Jamie Jonkle and Erin Edge went over multiple year funding for the bear attractant project
- The Committee went into broader discussion about the projects and the project ranking spreadsheet was shared on screen with the group to begin discussion
- There was a lot of conversation around how to define watershed projects – individual committee members voted on whether a project constituted as watershed or not.
- **A motion was made to fund the highest ranked eight projects (Ali made this motion) (Janet 2nd this motion)**
 - **The Committee reached quorum on this motion and approved funding the first eight ranked projects**
- More discussion occurred on watershed projects and how to categorize this including considering all noxious weeds projects as watershed projects.
- Jack suggested the need for a definition
- The committee reviewed the language from the Act/code regarding watersheds/roads requirement
- Meeting managers noted that comments in the chat would be captured.
- Chair recognized a need for the committee to have a standard for ‘watershed’ to apply to the process and to have some consistency moving forward regarding weeds projects
- **Time check at 6:50 for how to proceed given that the meeting was supposed end at 7pm; one RAC member (Jack) indicated he needed to leave the meeting, but the rest agreed to continue.**
- **Zach, Mike, Kristen, Scott stayed; Jack’s departure will not affect quorum.**

- Jim suggested it's a bad precedent to not finish, he followed up with a series of changes to proposal for how to think about the projects specifically trail projects.
- Steve also had a suggestion on how to proceed with funding ranked #11 at half, and the other 4 in the 'blue' or as watershed (funding them at 66%) or the first 3 at 82% and have everything balance. And noted that If we go with what we originally ranked, then the group may not finish.
- Ali has concerns about the inconsistencies with watershed projects classifications
- Dave likes Steve's idea to take some suggestion of the remaining blue projects.
- Zach suggested getting a baseline by using a majority of yes or no on the weeds/trails projects
- Steve suggested the two trail projects made the top 8 (already funded) and the weed control projects need to go into the watershed category
- **Motion: Motion to classify weeds projects as watershed improvement category specifically add new invader/biological control and multijurisdictional weed treatment project (turning them blue on the spreadsheet) (Steve first) (Jim second)**
 - **Unanimous/ passed**
- Jim – suggests adding in multijurisdictional project then it gets us to the threshold
- Steve had the numbers and said it would get them to the 50% threshold
- Christine – funding weeds projects as comparable to one another, and still looking at funding the Bear project to stay in the top dozen ranked
- Ben noted we already fully funded the new invader projects
- Janet is in favor of splitting and giving some of the leftover money to ninemile
- Steve- partially funding Seeley Lake, splitting funding between the two remaining weeds programs and leaving the left-over money for an additional proposal.
- Dave wanted to make sure that the weeds projects lend themselves to the partial funding scenario; it was noted in partner responses that they do but less acres would be treated.
- Some miles are better than no miles of treatment.
- The group wanted to see what it would look like on the spreadsheet to fund the Bear project at \$15,000 and split \$25,000 between the two remaining weeds projects which would leave \$15,00 left over.
- Steve proposed the avalanche forecasting with the big impact they could make this winter and they are struggling for funds, but considering funding them at \$5,000
- Agreement with funding avalanche center
- Agreement to get all the funding down on the spreadsheet and get it taken care of in one last motion
- Janet suggested Rennie or Placid gold for remaining funding
- Kristen advocates for more money to avalanche forecasting because they lost funding sources and the resource will be in higher demand this winter.
- Jim we could fund the full Rennie Stark road decommission and then give another \$4,000 to avalanche
- Dave would not object to allocating balance to avalanche and funding Rennie project
- Seth supports
- Scott supports additional to Avalanche Center
- Steve supports what the spreadsheet says
- Ben notes the money is allocated, and it feels copasetic.

- Steve moves to accept the spreadsheet as shown and Jim seconds the motion; articulate it for the record – Kate reads the spreadsheet as currently shown:

| Row # | Project Name | Project Number | Total Rankings: | amount requested | 50% | Watershed/Roads | Funded Amount |
|-------|---|----------------|-----------------|------------------|-----|-----------------|---------------------|
| 1 | Morrell Creek | 2020-1 | 46 | \$15,000 | Yes | Yes | \$15,000.00 |
| 2 | Upper Lolo West Fork Creek Road Decommissioning | 2020-2 | 92 | \$15,000 | Yes | Yes | \$15,000.00 |
| 3 | Missoula Front Country Ranger | 2020-3 | 101 | \$10,000 | No | No | \$10,000.00 |
| 4 | Ninemile Ranger District Trails project | 2020-4 | 101 | \$16,200 | No | No | \$16,200.00 |
| 5 | New Invader and Biological Control (EDRR) | 2020-5 | 106 | \$15,900 | No | Yes | \$15,900.00 |
| 6 | Ninemile Front Country Ranger | 2020-6 | 112 | \$5,200 | No | No | \$5,200.00 |
| 7 | Montana Biocontrol Coordination Project | 2020-7 | 122 | \$10,000 | Yes | Yes | \$10,000.00 |
| 8 | Wallman Trail Reroute | 2020-8 | 132 | \$11,000 | No | No | \$11,000.00 |
| 9 | Seeley Lake Bear Attractant Removal/Conflict ¹ | 2020-9 | 133 | \$30,000 | No | No | \$15,000.00 |
| 10 | Multijurisdictional Noxious Weed Crew | 2020-10 | 135 | \$25,000 | No | Yes | \$11,618.50 |
| 11 | Roadside Treatment in Upper Ninemile | 2020-12 | 141 | <u>\$21,600</u> | Yes | Yes | \$11,618.50 |
| 12 | Rennick Stark Road Decommission | 2020-14 | 150 | \$6,000 | Yes | Yes | \$6,000.00 |
| 13 | Avalanche Forecasting & Education | 2020-16 | 164 | \$25,000 | No | No | \$9,000.00 |
| 14 | Seeley Lake Stewardship Initiative | 2020-17 | 171 | 10000 | Yes | Yes | \$0 |
| 15 | Frenchtown Face Prescribed Burning | 2020-11 | 135 | \$172,000 | No | No | \$0 |
| 16 | Petty Creek Big Game Proposal | 2020-13 | 148 | \$96,900 | No | No | \$0 |
| 17 | Placid Gold Phase 1 Herbicide | 2020-15 | 153 | 16000 | Yes | Yes | \$0 |
| | TOTAL | | | \$500,800 | | | \$151,537.00 |

Table Statistics

- Standard Deviation of Rankings: 30.769
 - Mean: 126
 - Total Funds available \$151,537
 - Total Funds Remaining \$0
 - Total to Fund 50% roads/watershed = 75,768.50
 - Total amount funded for 50% projects (rows 1-9): 40,000.00
 - Total to fund additional roads/watershed projects: 35,768.50
- Steve confirms we made the roads/watershed category at \$85,000
 - Roll call vote was unanimous to accept the spreadsheet as shown

¹ multi-year proposal: all funding requested needs to be committed to upfront (in this case \$30,000)