

Olympic Peninsula Resource Advisory Committee Summary of Meeting

November 25th, 2024;

Meeting begins 8:37 am PT

Location: [Virtual](#) and 1835 Black Lk Blvd SW, Olympia, WA 98512- Willaby conference room

Forest Service Region 6 and SRS Staff Present

- Brianna Salazar, SRS Program Specialist
- Cara Vasso, SRS Program Specialist, notetaker
- Jennifer Garcia Santiago, RAC Coordinator
- Kelly Lawrence, DFO
- Alison Center
- Amberose Longrie
- Robert Ontiveros
- Alex Weinberg
- Kathryn McGillvray

Project Proponents in Attendance

- Laurie Thorpe; Alex Weinberg
- Heidi Steinbach
- Christina St John
- Sophie Degroot
- Cheryl Bartlett
- Aaron Stanton
- Jen Gradisher
- Carrie Clendaniel

RAC Members Present:

- Eric Nagle
- Michael Spears
- Dane Bonnell
- Phillip Wolff
- Matthew Steward
- Mitzi Schindele
- Paul Pickett
- Gregory Brotherton
- Jill Warne
- Nicole Rasmussen
- Julie Anne Metzger

8:37 Welcome and Housewarming

- Safety talk
- Asks members of public to hold questions
- Introductions

Roll Call – Quorum reached

Presentation/updates on previous year projects

Gave updates and reports on the following past projects:

- Clean up Oly Project -have arranged the removal of several abandoned vehicles for this winter
- Quinault Trails System Project - lots of progress has been made including repair and replacement of power tools, brushing and removing trail blowdown, etc.
- Northwest Youth/Adult Corps Program project
- Washington Conservation Corps Project

Projects in progress:

- Callam County Corrections Crew Project
- Stewardship Sale Monitoring and Community Outreach Project
- Trailheads Facilities Repair Project
- Lena Lake Composting Toilet Removal Project

Chair Voting

- Nicole is current chair and said if anyone else wants to volunteer they can
- No one else volunteered to be chair
- Nicole remains the Chair

Project Presentations:

Recreation Operations Field Staffing, Laurie Thorpe and Alex Weinberg

- Laurie introduces herself and her role as the Director of Outdoor Recreation Collaborative
- Asking for 50k for 2 positions for outdoor recreation maintenance
- Goes over all the sites the funding would go toward
- Goes over current problems, such as FS funding and hiring stalls which means the Olympic National Forest has a shortfall of staff
- This project would be grant where the funding would go towards a Partnership Agreement
- Question: Can we talk about how the 2 positions will cover all counties?
 - Answer: 1 position would cover the West side, 1 position would cover the East side
- Question: How do you set priorities for the sites?
 - Answer: Maintenance for sites where fees are being charged are prioritized first; dispersed sites are tackled next. This proposal focuses mostly on keeping recreational sites open. There isn't a "Master Plan", but the forest does have a recreational site analysis to figure out priorities.
- Question: How does this differ from the Rec Shed managers?
 - Answer: The Rec Shed managers' (4 positions total) priorities have been shifted to reduce redundancy – they're the subject matter experts for their zone
- Question: FS is selling NW Forest passes (revenue to the forest) so how are the zeroing out with funding?

- Answer: Fee money is available for the work. However, it is insufficient to cover staffing. During this CR we don't have any appropriated dollars, only fee dollars. It's a decision at the Washington Office level not to fund seasonal workers.
- Question: What kind of staff are you hiring?
 - Answer: We like to hire local when we can. Partners can help with recruitment.
- Question: What happens if the FS has money to hire seasonals in the future?
 - Answer: This project is only for FY25 – covering 2 temp employees for this coming summer field season. FS won't have money to cover those positions in FY25.

Road Maintenance and Sedimentation Reduction Project, Amberose Longrie

- Roads are essential part of forest infrastructure
- Saw decrease in funds by 60% in Olympic, which makes road maintenance difficult
- Goes over Title II funds granted to past road maintenance projects
 - Last year SRS funds went to over \$900k in road maintenance work/ over 300 miles
- Showed example of past projects with pictures
- Goes over effects of unmaintained drainage structures
- Extreme weather events can cause more road closures
- Potential roads listed in proposal in following counties: Callam, Jefferson, Mason, Grays Harbor
- Question: How do you prioritize sites?
 - Answer: There are sometimes roads that are decommissioned. It's a continuous cycle of figuring out priorities to decide which roads get prioritized or decommissioned.
- Suggestion: Update pictures for next presentation and add different road systems
 - Response: A lot of road maintenance involves multiple steps with multiple years of funding involved – we are in step 2 of the projects shown and that is what the new funding is for
- Question: How much of the funding goes to equipment versus salaries for staff?
 - Answer: We don't tell contractors how to work out their staff and salary, so it is ultimately up to them.
- Question: Is there fire money available for some of this?
 - Answer: At this time, no.
- Question: Is timber a funding source?
 - Answer: A lot of these road maintenance projects are to get roads ready for timber sales.

Mason County-Hood Canal Ranger District Cooperative Noxious Weed Control, Heidi Steinbach

- Heidi introduces herself as Program Coordinator for Mason County Noxious Weed Board
- Goes over why noxious weed control is important
- Discusses how effort to control noxious and invasive weeds is a collaboration between counties, Forest Service, and partners
- Must cooperate with many landowners
- Discuss how they survey and control noxious weeds, do rock source inspections, do special projects, early detection and rapid response, and community education and outreach
- Amount requested: \$23,340 for 14 weeks of MCNWCB crew time over two years
- Question: How does Forest noxious weeds compare to last year?
 - Answer: Can't compare. Some areas have made progress, others have not.
- Remark: The issue of noxious weeds in the forest has gotten significantly better over the last 16 years

- Question: Do you do events to share the word?
 - Answer: Yes! Most presentations are at targeted groups.

Clallam County Cooperative Noxious Weed Control, Christina St John

- Discussion on why we should care about weeds
- Highlights how SRS act highlights the control of noxious and exotic weeds
- Discusses goals of project
 - Treat known noxious weed populations
 - Stop spread of noxious weeds
 - Prevent introduction of new weed species
 - Coordinate weed control efforts across jurisdictional boundaries
 - Re-establish native species where treatment has occurred
- Discusses benefits of using the Weed Board
- Gives 2024 update and the progress made – surveyed 183 acres and treated 171.3 acres
- Partnered with the Backcountry Horsemen of Washington, Quileute Tribe, and USFS
- Gives project examples
- Funding request: \$34,040 for 1 year (Clallam County only)
- Question: What is the treatment method?
 - Answer: Depends on the time of the year. Sometimes you can use herbicide, sometimes manual removal, etc.

5 min break

Olympic Peninsula Cooperative Noxious Weed Control – East Jefferson County, Sophie DeGroot

- Discusses why weed management is important
- Discusses why *local* weed management is important.
 - Jefferson County Noxious Weed Control Board is already doing this work.
- Discusses why building a relationship with local communities is important for weed management.
- Question: Does this project include West Jefferson County?
 - Answer: These funds wouldn't apply to West Jefferson; the West Jefferson County is with the Forest Service. This is just East Jefferson County
- Discusses goals of the project.
 - Treat existing noxious weed infestations.
 - Performing weed control on FS roads, grounds, pits, campgrounds.
 - Monitor for new and/or isolated infestations.
 - Compile/distribute all activities at the end of the season
- Funding request: \$27,500 and this doesn't include county + FS contributions. This will fund a .5 FTE. This funding would include a 2-person crew going out and doing the work. Likely able to monitor 100 miles with treatment of 50-125 acres.
- Discusses East Jefferson County boundaries.
- Discusses watersheds and priorities and the rapid movement of the weeds and other invasive species.
- Project Timeline: Start surveys in April, Treatments as early as May through September, monitoring to happen 2-6 weeks post treatment, Follow Up as needed (June- Nov)
- Discusses prevention through weed-free inspections and importance of prevention and treating pits for the FS.

- Question: Did you have staff that would work in the past? How familiar are you with the geography you're working on?
 - Answer: Jefferson County Weed board was staffed since early 2010's. We got an assessment in 2016. Sophie came on years ago and is familiar with the area. The transition itself wasn't smooth. 2025 we feel ready to take on the new projects.

Restoration Through Invasive Plant Prevention and Control, Cheryl Bartlett

- Discusses project status for previously funded work – includes staffing challenges and accomplishments – successful year despite the staffing challenges
- Discusses project goals
- Discusses how goals will be accomplished
 - Survey, treatment, and monitoring of invasive plant infestations
 - Inspection of rock sources both on and off FS lands
 - Planting and seeding of native plants to accomplish multiple goals
- Discusses project location: primarily will occur in Grays Harbor and west Jefferson Counties; additional work will occur in Clallam, Mason, and east Jefferson Counties
- Funding requested: \$40,000 to go into an agreement that will hire interns to complete the work described in the proposal and pay for some associated travel costs and supplies
 - Will partially fund the interns
- Discusses why they're a good investment including:
 - Project is NEPA ready
 - The program is well established and has a record of success
 - Has permanent staff dedicated to invasive plant management and restoration
 - Have had seasonal crews for many years
 - Part of a large and active restoration community in the Olympic Peninsula and have multiple partners who greatly increase their capacity to accomplish work
 - Treat multiple priority weed species, and survey and monitor for new arrivals
 - Flexibility built into program
- Discusses project examples
- Question: How do you find your interns?
 - Answer: Last 2 years we hired them from the Student Conservation Association (SCA)
- Question: How does the treatment correlate with counties?
 - Answer: There is communication with counties if needed. There's a need to work directly with counties and prioritizing which species to treat.
- Question: Can you explain why this project overlaps with the additional counties?
 - Answer: Some infestations are so big that forces must be combined, and we need to work in partnership with more counties (more efficient)

VetsWork Internship, Aaron Stanton

- Discusses what VetsWork program is
 - A career development internship program for military veterans interested in natural resources management, public lands, and the environment sector
 - Purpose of the program on the Olympic National Forest aims to strengthen the partnership while increasing program capacity
 - Intern will assist with recreation site maintenance, trail surveys, trail work, leading youth and young adult crews, etc.
- Discusses benefits to veteran and to forest and partners

- Funding would go to one of three positions
- Question: Clarify duration
 - Answer: 10-and-a-half-month program
- Question: What would the vet internship do with road maintenance?
 - Answer: Maintaining roads going into campgrounds
- Question: Request appears to all go towards the intern's salary?
 - Answer: It's about 21% towards staff costs and the rest towards intern salary and associated costs
- Question: Clarify the \$84/hour for the coordinator
 - Answer: This includes all the roles that will play a part
- Question: Where do you receive funding from?
 - Answer: AmeriCorps and our partners
- Request to revise funding and percentage amounts

Improving and Maintaining Trails in the Olympic National Forest (WTA), Jen Gradisher

- Discusses Washington Trail Association (WTA)
 - Largest state-based trails nonprofit in the USA.
 - Provide a broad range of services in support of trails and the communities that rely on them.
- Discusses prior year funding received by the RAC last year for the Olympic NF 2024 Season.
 - Over 90+ volunteer events
 - Worked over 13,000 hours (over \$400k in donated labor)
 - 1,003 total participants, 22 youth
 - Several trails worked
- Proposal Brief: Continuing to maintain the level of commitment that we have on the forest and want to continue.
- Funding requested: \$60k
 - Salaries – Hire a crew leader(s)
 - 15,000 hours of trail maintenance annually
 - Sustain and increase our current level of trail maintenance completed annually on the ONF
- Question: How much of the contract funds are you requesting to go to the crew leader's vs other costs and is there a threshold if we provide less funding where the crew leader is less viable. Can the crew leader be part-time?
 - Yes, the crew leader can be PT. We are hoping the bulk goes to the crew leader capacity. The reduction would impact the work and the crew leader. Other ways we are supplementing funding is with RCORTP funding.
- Question: Geographically are there areas you would focus on? Would you prefer we funded certain areas?
 - Answer: The bulk of where volunteers are is along the Hood Canal area, Jefferson and Mason County is where we have the most momentum and we can fill those work parties. With our continued reliance on the coordinator, we hope to expand in other parts of the forest.
- Question: Does Olympic Coordinator name and does he reside on the Olympic Peninsula?
 - Paul Barano resides more on Kitsap area but planning to reside north on the Hood Canal.

Tiger Tail - ONF Forest Health and Local Economic Benefit Thinning Project, Thomas O'Keefe

- Discusses Olympic Forest Collaborative Mission
 - Brings timber and conservation together
- Discusses OFC-ONF Accomplishments
 - Worked on 8 different thinning sites
 - Generated hundreds of thousands of dollars of stewardship revenue to be used for ONF aquatic restoration project
 - Public meetings and field tours.
- Discusses last year's funding 2023 OFC-RAC, all on track with the money and timelines.
 - Budget Summary: \$50k
 - Finished 5-year remeasurement.
 - Going to do a post-treatment remeasurement
 - Pre-Treatment Plot Establishment on Tiger Tail
 - Monitoring Report Writing
 - Student Field Lab Curriculum
- Funding Request: \$12,000
 - Matching Funds with American Whitewater (\$1,740) and Washington Wild (\$1,020)
- Key deliverables:
 - Completing the last pre-bid tasks
 - Enable project to be put out to bid, awarded and completed by ONF
 - Fill ONF Capacity gap
- Discusses summary of the tasks that are scheduled to get the project out to bid.
 - Piece OFC takes on is Tree Marking
- Discusses the importance of monitoring and last year's request being focused on monitoring.
- Discusses Monitoring Plan, 6 approaches:
 - Photo points
 - Informative hiking trail
 - Vegetation monitoring (this is the main piece of this)
 - Wildlife and habitat use monitoring
 - Aquatic habitat condition and response
 - Studying specific harvest-related outcomes.
- Question: It was mentioned a hiking trail is part of monitoring; do you mean there is already a trail in Tiger Tail Unit?
 - Answer: No, the monitoring is for all the areas. We are trying to identify places to take people through to see the projects.
- Question: Can you clarify the miles? Discrepancy in what was written in the form. We aren't sure what category to put this in. Right now, it will be in Forest Health. If you do have a road Maintenance like you checked, maybe it would fall into road maintenance?
 - Answer: This specific 12k probably wouldn't, probably checked just as overall. Could follow-up.
- Question: If a collaborative can do this work up front and get refunded from merchantable timber has that ever happened?
 - Answer: With the retained receipts that come from timber sales from collaborative project, we can put them in an account and use for other aquatic projects instead of Federal Treasury. Only way it could be reimbursed is if the collaborative takes the project on themselves, to where they bid it out, they have to take the ownership of the project, but the FS will still hold this and the money wouldn't go back to collaborative itself to reimburse 12k.

- Question: If we were to wait for the FS to flag/tag it themselves what would the timeline be?
 - Answer: Unsure but the collaborative would speed up this process, With the funding challenge just trying to identify where we can come in to fill some gaps.
- Question: What about Good Neighbor Authority?
 - Answer: We are using this and have tapped into Good Neighbor Authority. Plan to get in there early and discuss how important it is.
- Question: What role does DNR play for this particular sale?
 - Answer: We have tapped into DNR's resources for other projects.
- Question: If you don't get full funding, will you just seek additional funding?
 - Answer: Yes – there are other places we are looking for funding to move all the projects forward.
- Question: Clarify more about the monitoring plan wanting to put hiking trails in so we could see.
 - Answer: Not a formal hiking trail, more like having an interpretive opportunity to show what we have done.

Duckabush Corridor Habitat Enhancement Project, Carrie Clendaniel

- Discusses Jefferson Land Trust mission.
- Discusses Jefferson Land Trust and the areas managed.
- Discusses the Duckabush Riparian Forest Preserve being the focus for this project.
- Funding Requested: \$57,668.07
- Over 36.7 acres of upland forest. The project helps connect the wildlife corridor.
- Project Goal: Accelerating the structural, age and species diversity of the forest to better respond to wildlife needs and changing climate. Nearly 37 acres for this project.
- Discusses the current conditions
 - 200 trees per acre
 - Limited structural diversity
- Discusses desired future conditions:
 - Abundance of logs, standing snags. These are host sites for the wildlife that can move about.
- Discusses wildlife use and how they will benefit from this project
 - Abundant elks, cougars, bear
- Discusses the objectives of the project
 - Thinning to reduce the number of trees per acre. Leave the material on the ground for volunteers to use for downed logs that would otherwise take 100s of years to happen naturally.
 - Create 16 habitat piles
 - Create 123 standing snags
- Discusses community partners and contractors
 - US Forest Service
 - East Jefferson County residents and visitors
 - Washington State Department of Natural Resources
- Discusses who will get this work done
 - US Forest Service to provide advice
 - Community volunteers
 - AmeriCorp Members
 - Jefferson Land Trust staff
- Discusses the \$57,668.07 Budget:

- Funding would go to contractor services
 - Working with contractors and volunteers
- Discusses other means of funding:
 - Bringing in nearly \$55k in matching funds from USDA Environmental Quality Incentive Program cost-share.
 - Cornell Bird Conservation initiative grant
 - Community volunteerism
 - Washington Service Corps AmeriCorps member cost-share
 - Jefferson Land Trust staff time and supplies.
- Question: What about waiting and doing a commercial?
 - Answer: The 37 acres project would be commercially sized trees but no a commercially viable harvest since the slope is so steep. While there is equipment that could do it wed have to bring out all the logs in order for it to be viable that wouldn't be fit for habitat purposes. Best case is to leave it on site for habitat.
- Question: Confirm if this is adjacent to the Forest Service land?
 - Answer: Yes, the Duckabush Corridor is directly adjacent to FS lands.
- Question: Is this the same corridor that had a fire?
 - Answer: That was across the river on the north side
- Question: Any consideration for fire control?
 - A: For Fire reduction risk, the material we are bringing down will reduce the fire risk. As the logs begin to decompose, they will hold moisture and act like sponges. The original idea for this project was to reduce fire risk.

Lunch Break @ 12:30PM PST

Public Comments

- Comment from Ed Bowen: No agenda, no materials to review including the projects, Teams without a URL link, people in the Forest can't access this link. FS is continuing to exclude the public. I oppose any obligation or approval of project until public accountability is answered. Issues with joining and person missed the presentations.
 - Answer: The link was posted 2 weeks prior to the website. The phone number for the Teams should work. If you don't have access to Teams, you should be able to access via phone.

Sub-Group House Keeping

- Discusses procedures/guidelines for breakout groups.
- Discusses how to categorize projects.
- Question: Are invasive weeds under water restoration and forest health?
 - Answer: Yes, you can have 2 categories and weeds are in water restoration.
 - 50% are reserved for roads/trails and stream and watershed.
- Question: Does this committee decide which category it's in? Not a staff decision.
 - Answer: In previous years the committee decided.
 - Suggestions: It makes sense to categorize in more than one group.
- Vote: Do you feel invasive weeds are watershed category? Majority said yes.
- Question: What project didn't qualify?

- Answer: The Denali Orchard Project and that is because it didn't have cultural compliance completed. And there was prior work that needed to be complete before it moved forward.
- Question: I thought invasive weed falls into both categories?
 - Answer: It could be both Forest and Watershed.
- Discussing categorizing Type of Project-Primary (R=road maintenance; I=infrastructure Maintenance or Obliteration; W = watershed; F= Forest ecosystem Health)
 - Clallam County Cooperative Noxious Weed control: W&F
 - Restoration through invasive plant: W&F
 - Road Maintenance and Sedimentation Reduction Project: R
 - VetsWork Internship: I
 - Recreation Operations Field Staffing: I
 - Improving and Maintaining Trails (WTA): I
 - Tiger Tail: F
 - Duckabush Corridor Habitat Enhancement Project: F
 - Olympic Peninsula Cooperative Noxious Weed Control: W&F
 - Mason County-Hood Canal Ranger District: W&F
- Question: Does 50% have to go to roads and watershed restoration or does it have to go to Category 1 and 4?
 - Answer: At least 50% of all project funds are to be used for projects that are primarily dedicated to road maintenance, decommissioning, or obliteration; or to restoration of streams and watersheds.

Members break out into sub-groups.

Members reconvene at 2:30

Counties Report-Out and RAC Project Proposals

Report out Clallam County

- Fully fund VetWorks Internship and Recreation Operations Field Staffing
 - Reasoning: With the lack of FS hiring this is really needed to keep facilities cleaned. We are hoping this will help with the hires.
- Noxious Weeds: \$28k
- WTA - \$0
- Asked for questions –none.
- Additional funds should apply to Road Maintenance.

Report Out of Grays Harbor County

- Fully funding Tiger Tail Project
- Fully funding Restoration Through Invasive Plants
- \$11,216.20 for Road Maintenance and Sedimentation Reduction Project

- Request/Follow-Up: Like \$2k of the amount to go a section of road on the 2270 (about 1.3 miles from where Tiger Tail ends)
- VetsWork – Not Funding
- Recreation Operations Field Staffing – Not funding
- Washington Trails Association - \$4,000
- Asked for questions – none
- Additional funds should be applied to Road Maintenance

Report out for Jefferson County

- \$30,595 for Duckabush Corridor Habitat Enhancement Project
- Jefferson Noxious Weed – Fully Funded
- Forest Service Invasive Plants - \$10k
- Road Maintenance - \$10k
- VetsWork Internship - \$0
- Recreation Operations Field Staffing - \$11.5k
- WTA Project - \$20k
 - Note: It looks like this is for 2026 not 2025.
- Note: Any remaining to go to the Duckabush Corridor Habitat Enhancement and beyond that it should go to Roads.

General Remarks

- Remark: VetsWork and Recreation Field Staffing if they don't get a minimum they can't do their project.
- Question: What does less funding = more out of FS Rec money?
 - Answer: Less funding they get here the more they would have to get it out of appropriate funds. However, this was written before the budget was formed so this isn't an option.
- Question: Is the work VetWorks going to be different this year?
 - Answer: It would support hiring veterans and supporting the partnership with Mount Adams. The work the individuals would be doing is probably similar to the previous year.
- Remark: If VetWorks gets less money it may cut the work back a bit, but it will still be useful transitional work experience for them.
- Question: Is it possible to push the time frame back or is it 10.5 months?
 - Answer: I believe it could be split into smaller terms. They have other programs that do 6 months programs. It would be beneficial to have a longer term.
- Question: If you had a proposal near for the total amount, would you consider giving Mason County Weed project the total amount?
 - Answer: Yes, if the money is there.
- Discussing the Recreation Operations Field Staffing funding
- Discussing splitting up efforts and combining efforts for Recreation Operations Field Staffing and VetsWork Internship.
- Discussing pros/cons between VetsWork Internship and Recreation Operations Field Staffing.
 - Similarities between the two.

- We need seasonal workers out there
- If we are going to zero one out, that would be zeroing out VetsWork.

Report for Mason County

- Fully Funding Noxious Weed Control
- Discussing VetWorks and Recreation Operations Field staffing and how to split that money.
- Remark: Issue with VetWorks being funded by the Forest Service when it should be the Veterans Association that should be funding them.
- Remark: VetWorks is all or nothing and the Operation Field Staffing is 1 or 2 positions to fund.
- Comments: Discussion on fully funding all 3 positions within VetWorks and Recreation Operations Field Staffing. Wanting to take the money from another area.
- Motion by Eric, Take the \$14,518 from VetWorks and move it to Recreation Operations Field Staffing.
 - Voting: 2 abstained, 3 nays, 5 yay
 - Majority Approved
- Discussing if there are match funds in both of the proposals, important to note if we are washing that money away by not funding.
 - Answer: Matching funds on both in terms of Federal but in the VetWorks there is staff in Mount Adams Institute that is also being matched.
- Motion by Gregory: Come up with the deficit from Jefferson to fund 2 positions for East and West. Motion is 2nd
 - Voting: 9 Yay, 1 Nay, 0 abstained
 - Majority approved
- Discussing the total proposed budget and if a project is fully funded or partially or not at all.
- Discussion about taking capacity away from Clallam County from somewhere else. Took the same money that Clallam was trying to put for 1039 hire replacements and consolidated it in one bucket where it could be more effected. It is still the same amount of money just consolidated.
- Comment: There was never \$12.5k split across the counties.
- Comment: For those who didn't specify the county were split by percentage so we can switch those around. The percentages were based on how much money was available for each county.
- Discussion about constituents paying for work done in other counties. RAC funding from a county needs to go towards work done in that county.
- Discussion about last year's proposals and the shares of which county it came from.
- Response: If Clallam just put the percentage into WTA, then we'd have some money to spare. We have an opportunity to put that into VetsWork or Recreation Operations.
- Question: Does the FS keep indirect costs? Is there already an admin fee taken off the top?
 - Answer: Yes, 10% is for Admin Overhead.
- If you put a proposal and you have a duration of x-amount of years, you will have to use that exact duration. However, you don't have to use the funds, and they could be taken and reappropriate.
- Comment: For Mason County, Weeds fully funded – this could be a place that we put more into staffing as well.

- Question: Was there a general consensus on priority of things that generally should be funded?
 - Answer: No, this conversation didn't happen. We did this in our sub-groups however as each county has a different interest. Group decided they did this exercise organically through looking and discussing the funding request.
- Comment: This is a small pot of money insufficient to fix federal procedures. Us to attempting to fix those decisions (i.e. 1039) is not possible.
- Comment: The FS is trying to hire 2 field going people and another supervisor in Recreation. Rec and Public Services is a priority work which means other people in the Forest can be assigned to do that work. We think it is a priority whether we have the money or not and we are using fee dollars to pay for permeant staff.
- Idea of Mason taking some of the funds for the operation staff and reducing the weeds control funds. Open up for discussion if anyone wants to make a motion.
- Motion: Move \$5,000 from the Mason Noxious Weed to the Recreation Operations Field. Taking away \$5,000 from Clallam County and moving that to roads. Staffing and 2nd by Eric.
 - Comment: We are going to Clallam County and will shift from Operations to the Roads so that was Clallam isn't carrying all the load.
 - Voting: 8 yay, 1 opposed, 0 abstained.
 - Majority approved motion.
- Clallam funds moved to roads because of the leftover money.
- Comment: Another RAC was going to discuss the proposals and priorities. Next year, we can do that instead of breaking out or before if you'd like to think about that for next time.
- Comment: Everything has some money except the VetsWork. This one had some from Clallam but wasn't enough to do anything with, so it was adjusted.
- Comment: What is the percentage of each project and the total funding?
 - Answer: Member goes over each percentage funded for each project.
- Discussion on the percentage of watershed and roads and meeting the 50% threshold that is needed.
- Suggestion: There should be a Title II legal document that defines what falls under watersheds and roads.
- 58% at what is watersheds and roads.
- Question: What happens to these recommendations, do they go on to the FS?
 - Answer: If these look good, we will finalize some notes and the funding approval and we will get an approval letter signed by Kelly the DFO and the notes signed by Nicole and Kelly and will move forward on the implementation of those projects (agreement or contract).

Next Steps & Closing Comments

- Request for comments or questions
- Suggestion: Reconsider the meeting location next year
- Question: Is there a way to be updated on the projects?
 - Answer: Yes, I will do a follow up especially on those that we haven't received an update on. I will share that with everyone.
- Comment: If people are interested in going out and seeing the projects in person, could be a good idea for us.

- Question: Are you going to do a post-meeting survey?
 - Answer: Yes, any input on how to improve is appreciated.
- Comment: We should be hearing about the 2024 funds soon and once those get broken down by county and we can plan the next meeting around Fall next year.
- Comment: Earlier in the fall would be better since the days are longer and we won't have to drive in the dark. Earlier in the year the better for WTA to plan.
- Comments: WTA has huge contributions and economic benefit.
- Comment: Member worked with WTA and very familiar with WTA and they get a lot of funding from RCO.

Closing remarks

Meeting concluded at 4:12 PM

Meeting Minutes Approved by:

Nicole Rasmussen

Olympic Peninsula RAC Chair

Kelly D. Lawrence

Forest Supervisor