

SISKIYOU RESOURCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

February 4-5, 2002; Brookings, Oregon

Chetco Community Public Library
405 Alder Street

FEBRUARY 4, 2002

Attendees:

RAC members: Jerry Becker, Veva Stansell, Laura Mayo, Steven Nicholson, James Rogers, William HisleBeard, Romain Cooper, Jack Shipley, Tom Kitchar, Harry Hoogesterger, Jim Brock, Ernest Cofrances, Dominick Della Sala, Lucy LaBonte, Bud Schmidt

Forest Service: Tom Lavagnino, Nancy Rose

DFO: Jack Williams

Facilitator: Rita Dyer

Note Take: Charlene Mikkelsen

Public Forum: Peg Reagan, Rocky McVay, Kevin Davis, Hans Heil, Chuck Davis, Paul Weber, Jan Weber, Phyllis Cottingham, Joan Titus, Joan Cortell, Lee Riddle.

Expectations for first meeting (Jack Williams):

- 1) To provide background, framework, etc. of the Committee
- 2) To become acquainted with one another
- 3) Establish protocols for Committee
- 4) Discuss charter and bylaws of Committee
- 5) Get an overview of the kinds of projects the Committee will be addressing
- 6) Select a chairperson
- 7) Discuss how to recommend a project for approval
- 8) Discuss budget items

Why did you apply to the RAC? (All Members):

- 1) Jerry: Would like to see the forest policy go towards progressive conservation
- 2) Veva: Wants to contribute her knowledge & expertise to the Committee
- 3) Laura: The tribe would like to be part of the decision making process which affects their territory.
- 4) Steve: Wants to be a part of sound decision
- 5) James: Concerned about fisheries
- 6) William: Wants to ensure his group was represented
- 7) Romain: Represents a conservation interest group
- 8) Jack: Wants to bring a sense of community
- 9) Tom: Protect mining rights
- 10) Harry: SW Oregon is a magic place which must be protected
- 11) Jim: Great opportunity to show that the local community and interest groups can work with government agencies to create a win/win situation for all of us. Wants to use facilitation skills to bring this about.
- 12) Ernest: Wants to help others resolve their problems
- 13) Dominick: Significance of the place is huge! Wants an ecological balance
- 14) Lucy: Feels this is similar to Watershed Council and wonderful things can happen
- 15) Bud: Wants to represent his city in a meaningful way, hopefully some employment opportunities will come of all of this

What are your expectations? (All Members):

- 1) Jerry: Not sure
- 2) Veva: Will end up with good projects that will help employment & the area
- 3) Laura: Wants to help make good decisions
- 4) Steve:
- 5) James: That we can all come to agreement on the management
- 6) William: Expects big things to happen to the forest ecology
- 7) Romain: Improve employment
- 8) Jack:
- 9) Tom:
- 10) Harry: Airing of differences
- 11) Jim: Create a model
- 12) Ernest:
- 13) Dominick: Hope that we can do this in a scientific way
- 14) Lucy: That we find some really good projects to help the forest
- 15) Bud: That we will have projects for his area that will bring employment opportunities

What are your worst fears and best outcomes? (All Members) :

- 1) Jerry: That the group will be rubberstamped and nothing done
- 2) Veva: That the group will just sit and argue
- 3) Laura: That group won't move forward
- 4) Steve:
- 5) James: That we can't come to agreement
- 6) William:
- 7) Romain: The committee will remain in contention and not move forward
- 8) Jack: Best outcome would be we can leave without bloodshed
- 9) Tom: Doesn't want more of a split between resource users and conservationists
- 10) Harry: That we are too entrenched in old ways
- 11) Jim: That we won't move ahead.
- 12) Ernest:
- 13) Dominick: Wants an ecological based restoration of economy and become a model. Doesn't want to waste time for nothing or bad projects
- 14) Lucy: Worst fear is that process will fail...Best outcome is we come out with some really great projects
- 15) Bud: That nothing will get done

Kinds of Projects Desired (All Members):

- 1) Forest Resources
- 2) Forest Thinning
- 3) Fish Enhancement
- 4) Recreation
- 5) Restoration Projects: Restoring ecosystems on wildland interface (start small); restoring Port Orford Cedar; fish related projects; road decommissioning; invasive weeds; creative funding;
- 6) Prioritize projects by importance
- 7) Macro visions (total landscape of forest)/Micro visions and become more familiar with projects and develop process for incoming projects. Improve economics of forest products

- 8) Projects should blend with natural trend of ecosystems
- 9) Potential fire dangers are something we need to put into projects
- 10) Minerals: recreational mining somewhere in the forest
- 11) Noxious weeds, fuel loading, different methods of using products for revenue
- 12) Rural interface needs work to reduce fuel loading, road decommissioning, noxious weeds
- 13) All projects have a multiple use component; integrated land management; decommissioned roads becoming trails; enjoyment and recreation for the public.
- 14) Fisheries restoration in fish spawning streams, plantations need to be commercially thinned with business set up to use the thinning products
- 15) Resource management/multiple use; and don't try to invent the wheel with each new project
- 16) Fish habitat improvement; fuels; access to cultural sites; native species restoration
- 17) Weed Control! Roads to Trails with easy access; Monitoring in forest; recreation facilities (out houses); Sudden Oak Death; growing native plants
- 18) Stewardship contracts; Oak woodland restoration

RAC OVERVIEW: (Nancy Rose)

Roles & Responsibilities:

- 1) Pubic Law 106-393 defines roles & responsibilities. Three-year terms for members
- 2) Purpose of act was to carry on the good things of payments to the counties and get rid of the baggage
- 3) Improve collaborative relationships
- 4) To advise the land management agencies
- 5) Duties:
 - a. Review proposed projects
 - b. Recommend those projects & funding to the secretary (Forest Supervisor has the authority to approve)
 - c. Provide early & continuous coordination with the land manager.
 - d. Provide opportunities to the public to participate openly & meaningfully (public forum must be advertised in local newspapers and Federal Register for at least 15 days)
 - e. Must disclose any interest you may have with the federal government in the Siskiyou N.F.
- 6) Determine when & where the meetings are and must attend (in order to hold the meeting must have a quorum). A quorum consists of a simple majority. To recommend projects must have all three of the categories represented and projects are supported by three out of five of each category. Proxies cannot be appointed.
 - a. **Category 1:** Organized labor, developed outdoor recreation, energy and mineral development, commercial timber or individuals or groups who hold federal grazing permits or other land use permits. Consists of: Lincoln Phillippi, Steven Nicholson, William HisleBeard, Tom Kitchar, Jerry Becker and Ernest Cofrances as an alternate.
 - b. **Category 2:** Persons representing nationally recognized environmental organizations, regional or locally recognized environmental organizations, dispersed recreational activities, archaeological and historical interest, or nationally or regionally recognized wild horse and burro interest groups. Consist of: Dominick Della Sala, Romain Cooper, James Rogers, Harry Hoogesterger, Veva Stansell and Ashley Henry was an alternate (has officially resigned and will be replaced).
 - c. **Category 3:** Members who hold State elected office (or their designee), hold county or local elected office, represent American India tribes, are school officials or teachers, or

represent the affected public at large. Consists of: Jim Brock, Lucy LaBonte, Laura Mayo, Jack Shipley, Robert Van Leer and Bud Schmidt as an alternate.

Why we are here?

- 1) The Secretary has approved the charter.
- 2) The By Laws are proposed at this time. Must be approved by RAC.
- 3) Purposes of Act:
 - a) To stabilize payments to counties to provide funding for schools and roads that supplements other available funds.
 - b) May include, but not limited:
 - (1) Road, trail and infrastructure maintenance or obliterations
 - (2) Soil productivity improvement;
 - (3) Improvements in forest ecosystem health;
 - (4) Watershed restoration and maintenance;
 - (5) Restoration, maintenance and improvement of wildlife and fish habitat;
 - (6) Control of noxious and exotic weeds; and
 - (7) Reestablishment of native species
 - (8) To improve cooperative relationships among the people that use and care for Federal lands and the agencies that manage these lands

What are the expectations?

- 1) Recommend projects
- 2) Determine what kind of process you are going to use to agree on projects.
- 3) Develop a timeline for looking at/recommending projects.
- 4) The Forest Service has projects to recommend for 2002 right now. Any additional projects must be submitted by February 15, 2002 and recommended by the RAC by April 15, 2002.
- 5) Second round projects (2003 projects) into the RAC by June 1st 2002 and due September 30th 2002. Funding becomes available October 1st. Counties will have made their elections by June 1st at latest (each year the County will make the decision in March for the split between Title I, II, & III funding for the next year).
- 6) 2004 projects and beyond must be submitted by April 1st and recommendation by September 30th thereafter for each succeeding fiscal year through fiscal year 2006.
- 7) Description of Projects:
 - a. The purpose of the project and a description of how the project will meet the purposes of this Act.
 - b. The anticipated duration of the project.
 - c. The anticipated cost of the project.
 - d. The proposed source of funding for the project.
 - e. Expected outcomes.
 - f. A detailed monitoring plan.
- 8) Title III funding can be used as matching funds (as non-federal funds). Counties must notify the RAC of any Title III projects they have approved.
- 9) Confer with the counties.

Budget and Travel: (Nancy Rose)

Reimbursements for travel expenses through the Federal government:

- 1) You must have traveled at least 35 miles to be reimbursed for travel (other than mileage expenses).

- 2) You are traveling in the interest of the federal government and are eligible for “government” rates at hotels.
- 3) You are reimbursed for mileage @ 0.365 per mile when you are driving your car.
- 4) Fill out worksheets in entirety and turn into Nancy Rose to be reimbursed.
- 5) Remember to have receipts for lodging or you cannot be paid.

Proposed budget:

- 1) Advertising, meeting room, supply, postage.
- 2) Assumptions in drafting the proposed budget include: three meetings including this one @ four days; Mileage for about 18,900 miles, lodging, note taker, facilitator, (note taker & facilitator can be FS employees provided at no expense to RAC), consulting services extra, legal ads (must be sent federal express for Federal Register), mail, meeting room rentals, supplies = \$25,700. Proposal is that Title II funds pay for these expenses.
- 3) An accounting will be made for project money and administrative expense separately.
- 4) The money is carried over until 2003 unless obligated. Things are constantly changing; try to finish projects as best you can with the change. If the money is not obligated during a two-year time period, the money goes back to the Treasury.
- 5) Also proposing that the RAC determine an administrative overhead rate to cover costs for contracting services, i.e. getting the contract out and on the ground as well as electric, phone, etc. for an office. What level are you willing to fund? We will use this rate on all projects for this fiscal year.
- 6) Questions/comments from RAC members: Can we look other places for funding of administration? A specific proposal can be looked at. Sometimes the bid is higher because it is the federal government. Does administration costs include more NEPA dollars?—not for this year. None of the projects for this year need any NEPA or other analysis work. In future years, analysis will become a separate line item and may/may not be approved.

Public Forum: Opened @ 4:15

- 1) Charles Davis: Read about meeting a few days ago and was intrigued that we were making an effort to improve jobs and community. He was the Caves concessionaire (general manager), and was disappointed when the area was heavily logged. He feels that it affected his business. Has heard Greyback Campground area is going to be logged this year and he doesn't want to see the area cut. Feels that hazard trees should be left in the Campground and not be cut out excessively. All old trees are hazard trees and really need to be looked at carefully before being labeled.
- 2) Rocky McVay: Thanks everyone for taking their time to set this process up and really work with the community.
- 3) Hans Heil: Adding environmental education into the projects so children can learn about the forest would bring a higher level of environmental consciousness.
- 4) Public Forum closed @ 4:45 with no further comments.

The RAC Guidebook: (Tom Lavagnino)

- 1) Intended as a basis from the Regional Office can be added to. Is a dynamic document meant to grow. All documents will hopefully be three-hole punched for convenience.
- 2) Siskiyou website: www.fs.fed.us/r6/siskiyou and will have the RAC Guidebook along with any other pertinent information.
- 3) Contact Information Tab: First change is that Rogue/Umpqua RAC DFO is Jim Caplan

Reminders/assignments: (Facilitator):

- 1) Start at 0900 tomorrow.

- 2) Review Guidebook & look over By Laws
- 3) Consider any potential conflict of interests you may have.
- 4) What skills would you like your chairman to have?

FEBRUARY 5, 2002

Lincoln Phillippi joined the meeting today, as he was unable to attend yesterday. Bud Schmidt could not attend today's meeting.

Public Forum: Peg Reagan, Maggie McHugh, Paul Weber, Jan Weber, Rocky McVay, John Hawkins, Harold Haugen, Joan Cortell, John Owen, Bill Lundquist, Jim Nolan, Ron Smith, Lee Riddle

Meeting Norms: (Facilitator):

- 1) Respect for everyone
- 2) Don't interrupt
- 3) Minimum amount of side-talking
- 4) Active listening
- 5) Concise speaking
- 6) Be recognized before speaking
- 7) Work ethic consistent with public law: advancing the projects in a timely manner
- 8) Trust in each other is important
- 9) Speak in positives and not negatives – be civil towards ideas you do not agree with
- 10) Honor the diversity of opinion

Legal Framework: (Jack Williams):

2002: 2/15/2002 – Project submission (Monies available now); 4/15/2002 – RAC must make recommendations to Jack Williams (DFO);

2003: 6/1/2002 – Projects for 2003 submitted to RAC; 9/30/2002 – RAC submits recommended projects to Jack Williams (DFO) (Monies available 10/1/2002);

2004: 4/10/2003 Projects submitted to RAC; 9/30/2003 – Project recommendations to Jack Williams (DFO) (Monies available 10/1/2003).

The Secure Rural Schools...Act: Is now Public Law 106-393. Purpose – 1) Stabilize payments to counties to provide funding for schools and roads (Title I); To make additional investments in, and create additional employment opportunities through, projects that improve the maintenance of existing infrastructure, implement stewardship objectives that enhance forest ecosystems, and restore and improve land health and water quality (Title II); Improve cooperative relationships with other agencies (Title III). We are focusing on Title II opportunities within the Act. Title II: special projects on federal lands. Can include projects on private land if there is a benefit to federal lands. Section 202 has general limitations on project funds. Section 203 submissions of project proposals. (Title III projects are county funds and RAC will be notified of which projects the county will be funding.)

Charters: Signed by the Secretary of Agriculture. Contains listing of RACs for Oregon and Washington. There are RACs for BLM that are not included in the listing. Special instructions are in

Article 2b. They describe the quorum or consensus required for projects. Duties of RAC, filling chairperson position, project selection; compensation, cost estimations, numbers and frequency of meetings, etc. are included.

Bylaws: Drafted in FS Regional Office and are proposed bylaws for RAC to use if agreed to and adopted. Can be changed as deemed necessary and should be considered a “living” document. Must be consistent with the “Act” and the Charter”. Includes definitions; geographic jurisdictions; DFO; administrative support; duties of the RAC; member qualification, selection and service; attendance is critical; filling vacancies; RAC members may serve on more than one RAC; disclosure concept; serve without compensation; elect chairperson annually; procedures and quorum; project submittals; standard form; submission of project proposals to the DFO; required description of projects; (forms are available on the websites); authorized projects shall be consistent with the purposes of the act; environmental review costs; schedule & costs; Title III notifications; staff assistance & meetings; field trips; recording & interpreting. DFO recommends adopting the Bylaws and changing them as necessary.

Dominick wants to know who determines the split of monies between Title I, II, and III and do we have any influence in this process? The counties elected to put 85% into Title I and the county has the discretion of the split of Title II and Title III. Lucy LaBonte says that Title III monies for Curry County must go towards some really crucial projects. Monies left will probably go towards Title II. Anyone can come to county meetings and discuss a project that they may want to have County finance.

Adopting the Bylaws: (Nancy Rose)

Proposed Changes to Bylaws:

Jack Williams: Change to February 15, 2002 to accept proposal since the February 1st date passed before the RAC’s first meeting.

Jim: Item 5e: Does the county have the ability to approve or disapprove the projects approved by the RAC. Nancy: Only in terms of NEPA (National Environmental Policy Act)--must confer with the counties for the proposed NEPA costs due to the expense of the environmental analysis. If Counties disapprove NEPA costs, the RAC/agency/proponent would then need to review the costs and look at how else it could be funding. Projects cannot go forward through the process without the county approval of the NEPA costs.

Romain: He has some confusion between conferring with the county and seeking their approval. Where is the wording in the Act that the county has final say so over a project’s NEPA cost?

William: Do we really want to tell someone that the RAC will look at a proposal without his or her input?

Lucy: 8a the quorum – include all three groups even in a small quorum.

Dominick: Would like to have some process to confer with the county over Title II funds.

Jim: Duties—would like to include an elastic clause “The RAC shall discuss, recommend & advise on any natural resource issues on the Siskiyou NF.

Harry: Jack Williams has recommended that we pass the Bylaws as they are & change them later if we have a problem.

Tom: Need language to clarify how to amend bylaws.

Jim: Duties: Need to add “The RAC shall improve cooperative relationships among the people that use and care for Federal lands and the agencies that manage these lands”.

Jim: Vice Chairperson: an agreed upon facilitator to run the meeting in the absence of the chair.

Jim: Two-thirds of RAC members can change the bylaws and must be advertised a meeting before vote.

Lucy: Would like to see a vice-chair to help run meeting.

Membership Vote on Bylaw Proposals:

- 1) Change application date to Feb. 15, 2002. **Accepted.**
- 2) 16a in the meetings: The RAC chairpersons may require that the submission be reduced to writing. Remove words “if any” so a submitter may have some time to orally submit their project. Time could be limited, but they could have some. **Accepted.**
- 3) 8a – quorum: drop “without regard to representation of each interest group” to “with representation from all three groups.” This would be for meetings outside of project approval process. **Accepted**
- 4) Clarify how to amend the bylaws:
 - a) Propose at meeting before the change and vote at following meeting: **Accepted**
 - b) 2/3 thirds of the members: **Defeated**
 - c) 3 of 5 members of each group: **Accepted**
 - d) Quorum necessary: **Defeated**
- 5) Process to confer with counties on proportion of Title II funds. Tabled at this time. **Dropped per Dominick in light of approval of #7.**
- 6) Duties: May discuss, advise & recommend on any natural resource issues on the Siskiyou NF on a strategic level. **Table at this time.** Need to discuss more the scope of the RAC.
- 7) Add #3 PL under duties: The RAC shall work to improve cooperative relationships among the people that use and care....**Accepted.**
- 8) Who will run the meeting if the chairperson is absence
 - a) Facilitator: **Defeated**
 - b) Vice-chair: **Accepted**
 - c) Chair and Vice-chair from separate categories: **Accepted**
 - d) Vice-chair assumes chairperson in chair’s absence: **Accepted**
- 9) Clarify Duty 5e to reflect the Act. – **Tabled**

Jim made a motion that the Bylaws be accepted as changed, Veva seconded, vote: **Accepted**

Introduction to Projects (Maggie McHugh – FS)

Project submission form (5 pages):

Overview of potential projects:

- 1) Watershed Analyses completed
- 2) Forests identify priority by watersheds
- 3) Other agencies and departments prioritize by watersheds
- 4) Projects are specified within the watershed by RAC project types

-County summary sheets

-Does the money have to be allocated back to the county where the money comes from? – No, but the county may decide to put more money in Title III based on recommendations. Need to decide the priorities very carefully.

-Need to show benefit to all involved counties, but especially the county where the money came from.

-Summary by project type would be helpful.

-Silvicultural prescriptions would be helpful for vegetation management projects.

-Need to be able to cross-reference project lists to necessary information.

-The majority of high priority projects seem to be in the Powers RD or Elk River Watershed.

Maggie said that the people who submitted the project set these priorities. They are waiting for the RAC to voice preferences before her group tries to prioritize.

- Legal descriptions would be helpful
- Web access to information is very helpful!
- Funding from FS depends on the project and will be supplied on a project-by-project basis.
- Important to look at other funding sources other than RAC funds.
- The RAC members want a copy of each project submission form before next meeting.
- The FS has a partnership funding coordinator who could be brought in to talk with the RAC.
- Think about which specialists you would like to have at the next meeting to answer questions.

Thoughts from County Commissioners:

Harold Haugen, Josephine County Commissioner: Thank you to everyone for their time efforts. Forests are multiple-use and need to be kept healthy. Concerned with separation of counties. Keep in mind that the Siskiyou is a forest and not a county and all counties gain by keeping it healthy. Counties can benefit by spending in another county because it is all spent in the same forest and each county benefits from a healthy forest.

Lucy LaBonte, Curry County Commissioner: Recreational aspect is very important and road decommissioning is a controversial issue for some commissioners. Title III projects involve: environmental education, GIS mapping, communication towers that are in desperate need and may be eligible for Title III monies; conservation easement for Dry Creek which hooks up with Grassy Knob; Ophir School may be turned into a watershed museum by a private individual and may be able to link into Title III.

Jim Brock, Josephine County Commissioner: Impressed with Congress when he read act. This is an experiment or a pilot project to see if stakeholders can work out solutions. Open to creative and innovative approaches. This is a great opportunity to learn how to work together for the good of the community, use dollars more efficiently and be able to prove we can make this work and get the act renewed.

Rocky McVay, Assoc. of Oregon Counties: If you have questions, refer back to the last 4 pages of law. This is the intent of Congress for the RAC. 1) 3 categories of land; two are located exclusively in western Oregon. 34 receiving counties; 6 titles in the legislation; 4 sections pertain to counties & RAC's. All 34 counties opted to take full payment for length of legislation. Project cycles each year for 6 years. We must do two cycles of projects in 1 year. The appropriation is continuous for six years. Management agencies, counties inputting monies into the project, RAC selecting projects. Consider cost overrun. Multi-year projects will be done. Companion projects: Title III such as community service work camps, must have a Title II project to work on. County only pays for supervisors and administration. It is very hard for counties to spend money in the parameters of the Title III. Nonfederal projects won't amount to many in the first list. There will be administrative costs and overhead. It is a cost of doing business. Other sources of money: National Fire Plan (3/15) fit right in with Title II projects. Legislation: 1) Passed 10/13; 2) Signed 10/30; 3) Geographic boundaries of RAC established; 4) Counties elected to dedicate a portion of their monies to Title II projects 7/10/2001; elections of counties to take full payment and how much will be put into special projects 5) revenue comes from the forest generating the revenue and then the balance is made up by the Treasury.

Chairperson for RAC (Nancy Rose/All)

What are roles for Chairperson?

- 1) Call a meeting
- 2) Preside over the meeting
- 3) Keeping meeting on schedule
- 4) Reviewing the minutes and certifying them
- 5) Works with DFO

What skills are we looking for?

- 1) Open mind/objectivity
- 2) Should not dominate the meeting.
- 3) Should keep things moving
- 4) Ensure group norms followed
- 5) Experienced in chairing meetings
- 6) Communication skills
- 7) Facilitation skills
- 8) Delegating skills
- 9) Keep process going in spite of own opinions
- 10) Good speaker

Selecting the Chairperson: (Nancy Rose/All)

- 1) Self Disclosure: Must communicate any direct or indirect interest: lease, contract or potential contracts, etc.
 - a. Veva: Has spent time on Siskiyou NF. Son works for a company who sometimes contracts to FS. Member of Native Plant Assoc.
 - b. Jerry: Is a contractor and may bid on a project contract. Member of Sixes Watershed Council.
 - c. Lucy: Owns property within the forest boundary. Sits on the Southcoast Watershed Council.
 - d. Dominick: Talks with Jack Williams about projects.
 - e. Ernie: Has done EA's and is now retired
 - f. Lincoln: Company currently has road use permits with Siskiyou and buys forest timber
 - g. Jim: None
 - h. Harry: Southcoast Watershed Coordinator and may propose projects
 - i. Tom: Firewood permits, mining claims, uses roads to access mines, etc. Has an application in for a mineral patent.
 - j. Jim: Lives on boundary of Siskiyou forest and is a contractor. Has done contracts in the past and will probably bid on some of jobs. Has bought timber from Siskiyou and was a timber manager.
 - k. Romain: On watershed committee that may have projects and is adjacent to Siskiyou Forest. Has contracted and subcontracted and may in the future.
 - l. William: President of Motorcycle Riders Assoc. And supplies expertise to Prospect R.D. and Rogue R.D..
 - m. Jack: Upper 40 acres surrounded by BLM. Co-coordinator on Nation Fire Plan group. Member of Upper Applegate Watershed Council & Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board.
 - n. Stephen: Works with Forest Service contracts in cutting timber.
 - o. Laura: None. The tribe is negotiating for special forest products.

Who is interested & what are strengths:

- 1) Lucy: Because she can keep a meeting moving quickly. Has experience as chairperson.
- 2) Jim: Has experience as chairperson and has the skills we have identified.
- 3) Laura: Has facilitation skills from working with tribal council.
- 4) Tom: Has some experience at facilitating meeting; but does not have Internet access or telephone.

Motion for closing of nominations made and seconded.

Discussion: Harry is very supported of Lucy's skills as a chairperson. Dominick doesn't feel we dealt with the conflict of interest issue. Wants to ensure chairperson has the least amount of conflict. Nancy stated that if any one person feels a conflict of interest is an issue on a project, the person would recuse himself or herself from voting. The chair votes and is expected to follow same rule. Jack Williams stated that the conflict of interest issue has been sent up through the channels, but no answer yet. William supports Laura because of her tribal experience. Romain feels the composition of committee is such that there will be conflict no matter who is chosen. Jim suggests that chairperson doesn't vote or votes last. Nancy doesn't think this is allowed under the Act to not vote or carry more weight in vote. William asked if it was necessary that the chairperson does not represent their viewpoint? He would expect that they would...that's why they are here. Jack W. agrees with that. Romain feels a facilitator would help offset the conflict with a chairperson.

A runoff vote for chairperson was taken for the top two members. Lucy and Jim were the top two selected. A final vote for chairperson was taken between the top two members. **Lucy has been selected as Chairperson.**

Selecting the Vice-Chair: **It was decided to wait until the next meeting to select vice-chair.**

Tom: made a motion to change bylaws at the next meeting to enable selecting the Vice-Chair from any category, including the one the Chairperson is from. Dominick seconded the motion. Vote: **Accepted**

Project Selection: An Alternative: Consultants Paul and Jan Webber:

Demonstrated a software program which enables groups to quickly and efficiently hold a public meeting.

Operating Guide: Project Selection: (John Owen)

- 1) Anything more than \$2500 must be put out for competitive bid
- 2) Must have 3 three bids
- 3) Must look at past performance of bidders
- 4) Average Lead Times for Projects after NEPA has been completed and Forest Service has the complete project package.
 - a. < or = to \$25,000: 15 days
 - b. < or = to \$100,000: 45 days
 - c. >\$100,000: 90 days
 - d. >\$100,000 (negotiated offers): 115 days

We can look for a best value instead of the lowest bid. This will enable us to look more into local procurements. The Washington office is looking at defining "local". Can also have multi-agency contracts.

- 5) Complete Project Package Includes
 - a. Request for Contract Action
 - b. Statement of Work (SOW)
 - c. Cost Estimate
 - d. Evaluation Criteria
 - e. Specific/Unique Requirement
- 6) Can contract with nonprofit organizations

- 7) Washington Office looking at flexibility
- 8) We can look at agreements (when party is bringing something to the table and not just getting paid for a service) The FS Washington Office has established an 18% rate for overhead.
- 9) Conflict of interest occurs when any committee member would be bidding on a project. If you plan on bidding on the project, recuse yourself from voting.

Public Forum Opened @ 3:30:

- 1) Joan Cortell: Like the idea of brief oral presentation of each project and also put on the web for the general public. How many members are connected with Forestry UN projects or Wildlands Project? No one from RAC spoke up.
- 2) Ron Smith: Gave copy of proposal of project. Proposal has also been given to BLM. Deals with choked-up forest. This project fits with National Fire Plan. We have high unemployment and the project address this issue. Proposal is to produce firewood from the choked up forest. Charlie Valdez has a machine, which is ideal for this project and makes square firewood, which could be palletized. Can be done anywhere...not just the Siskiyou. Would like the project to be considered by the RAC. Knows he must fill out an application.
- 3) Jim Nolan: Has been a logger and is now an engineer. Is concerned with economy in Illinois Valley. Had a handout. Local communities are the caretakers of healthy ecosystems. O&C funds are dwindling. IV had an increase in population and unemployment rates while funds are dwindling. IV has about 17,000 people and the federal government owns 83% of the valley. Anything the Forest Service does affects the people of this valley. Originally 7% was set aside for commercial harvesting. After riparian setbacks, less than 1.7% is set aside for commercial harvesting. The roadless area incorporates even more of this set aside. Two Rivers District now takes in the Illinois Valley District. In 89-90 we cut 23 million board feet; now we are down to almost zero cut (salvage cuts). This all affects the economy of the area. The Gifford-Pinchot cut has remained substantially higher even though they have approximately the same amount of set aside. They managed it differently however. Several ideas were put out for the Siskiyou to use; but ignored. Some of these ideas, which were in line with the Forest Plan, could have kept Illinois Valley area alive by cutting timber. Please reconsider our management of these areas.
- 4) Peg Regan: Had general question about United Nations and Wildlands Project.

The public forum was closed at 4:00.

Future Meetings: (Jack Williams)

Budget /Travel Overhead:

Facilitator: Do you want the FS to continue to provide a facilitator? Harry & Tom both felt we should continue with the FS. Ernest feels that time constraints dictate we continue with FS provided facilitator & note taker. Jim made a motion to approve the travel budget, have the FS continue with facilitator & note taker and add overhead discussion to next agenda. Second by Jack. **Accepted.**

Time of next public forum: Lucy would like around 11:00. Jack says he prefers before lunch so discussions can take place. ?: feels afternoon enables working folks to attend. Consider other locations besides Brookings. Jim feels there should be public comment after each agenda item in addition to documented time that is published. Tom: how can the people come in and talk to us about proposals?

Nancy Rose stated project discussion times do not have to be advertised; however the public forum gives everyone a time in which they can bring in a proposal that has not yet been submitted. Steve: Don't have it close to lunch. Laura: Have public comment during lunch for people to come in on their lunch break. Jim would like to have public comment at end of day. James: would not like to eat while someone is talking. Tom: One problem of right before or right after lunch, things are a little confusing. We owe them our attention. Hold it in the 2:00-3:00 range. Harry: straw poll for 3:00-3:30 on first day of next meeting, 11:00 am on second. **Accepted.** We'll decide for meeting after that.

Next Meeting Agenda:

- Bylaw change that was proposed at this meeting.
- Overhead discussion
- Vice-Chairperson selection
- Review & selection of recommended projects.
- Clarification on conflict of interest
- Public Forum

How do you want projects displayed & presented:

- Tom: Road issues should be on a decent map
- Jack W: Next meeting should include expertise from the forest to describe projects.
- If we want two meetings we need to decide now so they can be put in Federal Register.
- Jim: Feels 1-1/2 days would be sufficient and enable us to travel.
- Lucy feels we need to set up our next two meetings now.
- Jack W. feels if we just do one more meeting it should be at least 2 days.
- Jack feels we should have already gone through projects before coming to meeting.
- Laura agrees with Jack.
- Jack W. stated we can get these proposals out electronically and could all be read before the

next meeting.

Romain stated that we could read and have questions ready at the meeting.

Vote was for one two-day meeting.

Day: 3/28 & 29

Place: Grants Pass – Anne Basker Auditorium

Public Forum: 3:00-5:00 first day & 11:00-11:30 second day.

Times: First day 10:00-5:00 & second day @ 8:00-2:00 or we're done if later

Nancy Rose: Projects to be sent out hard copy for the first time. Summary sheet can be coordinated with project proposals by number in upper right-hand corner. Can contact Nancy for answers on questions on a particular project.

Veva: Can we release members' names so friends can contact them before the meetings? Jack Williams and Tom L. feel it is handled through advertising. Rita will put Veva's email on the website so folks can send her information.

www.fs.fed.us/r6/coop has the National Fire Plan

www.fs.fed.us/r6/siskiyou has NEPA and watershed analysis

Meeting adjourned

Certified by: /s/ Lucy LaBonte
Chairperson

 /s/ Tom Reilly
DFO

 2/28/02
Date

