

Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000
Fremont and Winema Resource Advisory Committee Meeting

Thursday, May 5, 2022
Virtual Zoom meeting
Klamath County and Lake County Project Proposals

Meeting Minutes

Contents

Attendees.....	3
Welcome, Introductions, and RAC Business – Mike Ramsey.....	3
Introduction to Zoom and Best Practices – Avery Kool	3
Agenda Review – Melanie Fullman.....	4
Ethics Review – Avery	4
External Project Proponent Presentations	4
Klamath County.....	4
Monitoring of Rare Plant Habitat for Management Action Prioritization	4
Bear Wallow All Lands Project	5
Three Mile Creek Restoration – Monitoring Report	6
Upper Klamath Basin Chinook Salmon Outmigration Study.....	6
Upper Sprague Low-Tech Process-Based Restoration	6
Sprague and Keno Weed Eradication	7
Lost River Weed Eradication	8
Obenchain Forest and Rangeland Health	8
2022 LFLP Paddock Butte.....	9
Klamath and Lake Counties.....	9
EFM Shaded Fuel Break	9
Lake County.....	10
Summer Lake Wildfire Risk Reduction – Monitoring Report	10
KV Bar Forest Resiliency renamed Thomas Creek Forest Resiliency Project – Monitoring Report	10
Lake County All Lands Restoration Initiative Prescribed Fire Implementation	11
Warner Fuel Break II	11
Internal Projects – U.S. Forest Service	12
Klamath County.....	12
Hog Creek Meadow Restoration.....	12
Williamson River Highway Wildfire Safety Corridor	12
Pumice Moonwort Habitat Modeling and Restoration	13
Green Mountain White Bark Pine Restoration	13
Public Comment Period	14
Discussion and Prioritization of Klamath and Lake County Projects	14

Attendees

Resource Advisory Committee (RAC) members: Reid Sherwin, Betty Riley, Jan Murphy, Lani Hickey, Daniel Leavell, Todd Kepple, Bill Wilkins, Bill Ganong, Nick Kimbol, Kelley Minty Morris

Designated Federal Official: Mike Ramsey

Meeting Facilitators: Melanie Fullman, Lani Hickey

Notetakers: Shannon Holt (Public Affairs Specialist)

Zoom Coordinator: Avery Kool (RAC Coordinator)

Presenters: Sean Prive, Justin Hallett, Nell Scott, Charlie Erdman, Tommy Cianciolo, Mark Johnson, Leigh Ann Vradenburg, Duncan Livingston, Mary Jo Hedrick, Autumn Muir, John Cluck, Tia Adams, Evan Wright, Erin Rentz, Kari O’Leary

Others: Jeannette Wilson (District Ranger), Barry Imler (Forest Supervisor), William Dunk (Deputy Forest Supervisor), Catherine Callaghan (Planning and Public Services Staff Officer), Amber Brazil (Olympic National Forest RAC Coordinator)

Members of the Public: None present, no requests for comment received

Welcome, Introductions, and RAC Business – Mike Ramsey

- Thank you for volunteering to be on the RAC committee and participating today. We can’t make this happen without your help and Avery’s help.
- Reminder: Quorum required for vote, request everyone’s presence for voting segment.
- Reminder: 50% of funds need to be put to watershed or road related maintenance or improvements.
- I will be here for entire meeting, may not have all the answers, but I will find them quickly.
- Role of Designated Federal Official (DFO), assigned to committee to ensure compliance with FACA rules.

Introduction to Zoom and Best Practices – Avery Kool

- Thank you all for being here.
- Short PowerPoint introduction with a few Zoom slides before getting into project presentations.
 - Best practices: If anyone has a question, raise your hand either virtually or in Zoom, whatever works for you.
- If you get disconnected, please give me a call or text, my phone number is listed, and I will place it in the chat as well.
- If your Internet goes out, you can dial in to the Zoom meeting, I will place the number in the chat.

Agenda Review – Melanie Fullman

- I really appreciate everyone's effort and dedication to this.
- If I've missed a comment or raised hand, please notify me.
- Avery will review ethics information and then we will get to external project proposals, we'll start with Klamath County.
- We will take a break, if you need to step away beforehand, please do so, and make sure you are muted.
- When we return, we will hear presentations from Lake County project proponents, then internal (Forest Service) project proposals.
- Following the presentation we will have a public comment period, then lunch break.
- Please do what you need to for your own wellbeing.
- After lunch, Lani will take over and facilitate discussion of projects and we plan to wrap up by 3:30 pm.
- I cannot begin to express my appreciation for the job that Avery does for all of us in providing such an organized package and timely information that keeps us all in engaged.

Ethics Review – Avery

- Any conflicts of interest from RAC members please raise your hand.
 - Sounds and looks like there are none.
- Presenters do not need to stay for the whole meeting, I will let you know what the RAC decides following the meeting.
- I have received no requests for public comment, and I will continue to monitor my phone and e-mail for requests.
- Project monitoring updates from last meeting will be presented intermixed with other proposals.
- Funding just came through on the grants and agreements side for most projects from our August meeting; we will provide an update next meeting.
- Will notify presenters in the chat when 1 minute left, then move to questions from RAC members.

External Project Proponent Presentations

Klamath County

Monitoring of Rare Plant Habitat for Management Action Prioritization

The Understory Initiative – Sean Prive

Funding Requested: \$29,924

- Description: We are a small nonprofit that focuses on habitat restoration for rare plant habitat in underserved ecosystems. We're a relatively new organization with nine staff members and we're heavily engaged with outreach to the public and bringing students, volunteers, and other interested community members into our projects. Last year started the rare plant monitoring network of Southern Oregon. We've been working with Erin Rentz and the Fremont-Winema National Forest to monitor rare plant species in their habitats. Continuing that program in partnership with USFS, BLM, Native Plant Society, Master Gardeners, and others. We have adapted our program from models in WA like Rare Care and Citizen Rare Plant Watch. Straightforward work with agency messages, to identify rare species and to determine if they are stable or declining and risks to their habitat, variety of threats from fire exclusion, noxious

weeds, drought, and other threats, poaching, unauthorized OHV (off highway vehicles), hiking, mountain biking, etc. Goal is to establish baseline data and recommend habitat treatments to preserve habitats. As far we know, we are the only monitoring and only source of scientific info used to make management decisions. Hoping to document habitat conditions at 45 sites. Reaching out for volunteers, have 30 already from Jackson County, believe we can amplify effort with additional funding.

- Questions:

- **Daniel Leavell:** Have you considered doing probability assessments to prioritize land areas that you will do surveys on, instead of gross landscape?
- **Sean Prive:** Yes, revisiting known sites, 50 years ago plants were documented high degree of probability that plants are still there. Could be used for several years in a row, establish extinction risk data or models, quality, and quantity of data not available yet for any of these species.
- **Lani Hickey:** Will you come back for methods that will maintain or enhance populations? I'm assuming you have that in your plan. What is the potential of enhancing these populations?
- **Sean Prive:** This is establishing where the work needs to be done, and which work needs to be done at each site, and in the future, we would seek additional funding to implement or the land managers themselves would complete the work.
- **Mike Ramsey:** I'd like to make sure everyone knows that this group is working with Erin Rentz. She's been elevating species and sites informing where we do the work, and regional botanist, Clinton Emerson, working hand in hand with them. We are supportive of this project.

Bear Wallow All Lands Project

Oregon Department of Forestry – Justin Hallett

Funding Requested: \$149,773

- Description: We've located an area that would benefit multiple ownerships between the Gilchrist State Forest and the Bear Wallow Timber Sale. The goal is to carry over work through a GNA (Good Neighbor Authority) timber Sale. Hoping work will start this summer. We have identified some work on Fremont-Winema National Forest to carry over to Gilchrist State Forest. The idea is to masticate, clean up, and prep for cross country burn. Game plan to get fire on the ground to treat both ownerships. In time, we would like to tie in project with southern boundary to meet with Deschutes National Forest land and gain a fire resistance corridor from Highway 31 to Highway 97. A lot of overstock stands have not been treated since ODF (Oregon Department of Forestry) acquired the property in 2010. Currently, pre-commercial thinning work, have residual fuels that need to be scattered, and ladder fuels need to be cut. Limited options for funding to do this service work, because 2/3 revenue from any sale goes directly back into the county, and it is not as flexible as GNA (Good Neighbor Authority). This RAC (Resource Advisory Committee) proposal is the only avenue to acquire funds for restoration work on state-owned property.
 - Questions:
 - **Todd Kepple:** Does this treatment work equally well in stands where you have some ponderosa pine? What does the plant community look like after a burn?
 - **Justin Hallett:** We will remove as much lodgepole as possible to help ponderosa. For pure lodgepole stands, we are trying to thin diseased trees to encourage the

strong, healthy, vigorous lodgepole. The plant community I am not too familiar with, if establishing a recurring fire interval, my hope is to get forward response in terms of plant community.

- **Lani Hickey:** When we the open a stand like this how susceptible are smaller trees to high winds? I have seen a lot of blowdown in some areas recently.
- **Justin Hallett:** Always the risk when you open a stand with no wind break. I would say in this setting the topography is relatively flat, so for the most part roots are stable and branch out far. I haven't seen too much blowdown on our projects, a lot of our treatments try to mimic natural processes.

Three Mile Creek Restoration – Monitoring Report

Trout Unlimited – Nell Scott

- Description: The project is restoring a more natural meandering stream channel. We filled in ditches and simultaneously built stream channel to remove obstacles to the fish. The flow of water slows down and creates extensive wetland habitat.
- Questions:
 - **Bill Wilkins:** Is this project scalable?
 - **Nell Scott:** Yes, a lot of work needed downstream, both 7 Mile Creek and 4 Mile Creek need to come out of the ditch, as well as creating new stream channels to reconnect with the lake.

Upper Klamath Basin Chinook Salmon Outmigration Study

Trout Unlimited – Charlie Erdman

Funding Requested: \$90,992

- Description: Object is to understand how Chinook salmon migrate from the Upper Klamath Basin. The landscape very different from 100 years ago, when salmon used to be in the upper basin, we know that tributaries offer excellent habitat. Juveniles now have to navigate very large hypereutrophic lake, many irrigation diversions, and two dams. This is a collaborative project with UC Davis (University of California Davis), USFWS (United States Fish and Wildlife Service), and ODF (Oregon Department of Forestry). In 2022, we released over 1,140 salmon into Wood Creek and Williamson River with acoustic tags, which record several different data characteristics. Expensive pit arrays allow tracking of the fish as they move downstream. Requesting funding for another year of study to refine the survival model, release another 1,200 salmon, and 300 acoustic tags (\$250 each), and support tag arrays. Data will go into model to identify limiting factors, guide reintroduction, and habitat restoration efforts in identified reaches with high mortality.
 - Questions:
 - **Lani Hickey:** What was the survival rate on the release prior to this proposal?
 - **Charlie Erdman:** We do not have data yet, UC Davis downloaded receivers last week and are still processing data. I was told a number of fish have been detected on the Link River pit array.

Upper Sprague Low-Tech Process-Based Restoration

Trout Unlimited – Tommy Cianciolo

Funding Requested: \$157,475

- Description: Upper Sprague Basin has many miles of degraded stream and habitat for many reasons including severe wildfire, cattle grazing, channel straightening, and removal of beavers.

Low-Tech Process-Based Restoration (LTPBR) attempts to restore degraded conditions with a cost-effective hand-built approach that mimics wood accumulation and beaver dam activity such that geomorphic, hydrologic, and biological processes maintain riverscape health. The proposed work will build on previous LTPBR work in the Sprague Basin building a collaborative effort that seeks to restore many miles of stream and riparian habitat. One benefit is restoring habitat for the ESA (Endangered Species Act) listed Bull Trout, also increasing ground water storage, return of willows and floodplain diversity, traps sediment, and facilitates overbank flow in flood events. Proposed two different project sites, both in North Fork Sprague Basin, impacted by Bootleg Fire. One within Klamath County on USFS (United States Forest Service), on main stem. Two at Long Creek on Green Diamond property with even more channel incisions, greater than 10 feet in some places.

- Questions:

- **Jan Murphy:** Does your proposal include time and money to go back and maintain structure that you put in?
- **Tommy Cianciolo:** One thing about this type of work is, it usually requires maybe a couple of phases into the future. We will be seeing how the stream responds to the first set of structures that we put in and adjusting from there. For this specific proposal, this is a phase one where we'll go in, put in those structures, and we do have a monitoring line item, which we do for all of our LTPBR projects. Some require minimal maintenance, others require more.
- **Bill Wilkins:** Really this is one of the best fire breaks there is and it's one of the best ways to do it as far as I can see, I'm a huge fan of prescribed fire but this is a whole lot better as far as the ecosystem management goes in general.
- **Jan Murphy:** Is this part of an allotment that cattle are grazed on? And will they be allowed back in?
- **Tommy Cianciolo:** On Green Diamond land, have seen cattle impacts in the area, but have not been in conversation with them regarding cattle grazing. If you look at aerial photography, there are impacts of cattle on the ground. There is active grazing in the Forest Service area, and we have been working with the Forest Service. These techniques work just as well with cattle and the grass grows back better when the water table comes up.

Sprague and Keno Weed Eradication

Klamath Watershed Partnership – Mark Johnson

Funding Requested: \$30,935

- Description: We work in the Upper Klamath Basin, and we work with landowners to implement best management practices on their properties and help to restore private lands. Our proposal is for noxious weed eradication in the Sprague River watershed and Keno reach of the Klamath River watershed. Noxious weeds have been an ongoing concern throughout the area due to their prolific nature and propensity to outcompete native vegetation. Controlling these weeds can be difficult, due to the patchwork of public and private lands and different entities treating in different rates. This proposal is to assist private landowners in a treatment of these noxious weeds on their property, in turn reducing a spread on adjacent lands mainly owned by other Federal and State agencies. This grant would treat approximately 400 acres annually, based on densities, on certain properties prioritized by the proximity of waterways or canals. Everything that gets in the waterway goes downstream and affects all downstream lands, the treating of

these properties improves riparian and upland habitat for wildlife and livestock forage for material and labor to benefit local restoration efforts, and to control weeds on properties. KWP (Klamath Watershed Partnership) contracts with Klamath County weed control for labor and equipment and the landowner is responsible for cost of chemicals. Once controlled, landowner can control easier. Request is for ongoing grant, typically conducts post-treatments to evaluate post program success, matching state funding is available.

- Questions: None.

Lost River Weed Eradication

Klamath Watershed Partnership – Mark Johnson

Funds Requested: \$30,935

- Description: Lost River watershed, focus and interest in lands between Merrill and Klamath Falls on lands serviced by Klamath Irrigation District. Concern about fallow lands issue and noxious weeds taking hold. Extra beneficial to the Basin, this is a super popular program. Like previously presented Keno and Sprague, treated 752 acres. Expectation that landowner will continue treatment.

- Questions: None.

Obenchain Forest and Rangeland Health

Klamath Watershed Partnership – Leigh Ann Vradenburg

Funding Requested: \$225,334

- Description: Obenchain Ranch is a 3,000-acre property, mixed juniper/ pine/ sagebrush flats and rangeland. Forests are overstocked with pinyon, juniper, and ponderosa, which leads to stressed trees that are more vulnerable to disease and wildfire and insects, and loss of habitat. Last year 300 acres were hit by the Bootleg Fire, and it would have been worse if not for night burning and a change in conditions. Landowners are interested in reducing juniper encroachment and improved forest health. Landowner initiated salvage to retain most valuable trees, current work valued at \$330,000. This project seeks to continue work of landowner and adjacent Harmony Preserve Ranch. Treatment on Obenchain is for 628 acres, use of prescribed fire on 17 acres. Building toward 4,000 acres of contiguous treated private land, increases buy-in for prescribed fire essential for landscape treatment in the future. Over next 10-20 years untreated areas of Bootleg with experience increased fuel loading.

- Questions:
 - **Bill Wilkins:** Thank you for saying there is a place for some juniper! Is your project scalable?
 - **Leigh Ann Vradenburg:** Yes, project is scalable, and we would like to maintain the prescribed burn as planned and budgeted. The rest is based on acres and per-acre rate.
 - **Todd Kepple:** I agree with Bill, not every juniper needs to die. Can you describe how juniper slash will be handled?
 - **Leigh Ann Vradenburg:** As far as we know, it will be piled and burned. We do have partners with Klamath Lake Forest Health Partnership looking for juniper markets. However, with remote areas, trucking costs typically outweigh the benefits, so unfortunately it is likely pile and burn.

2022 LFLP Paddock Butte

Livingston Family Limited Partnership – Duncan Livingston

Funding Requested: \$104,000

- Description: The project is to thin 130 acres of overstocked ponderosa, white fir, and incense cedar on Paddock Butte. Extended family has owned the area since 1980s and began thinning by hand on flat and more gentle aspects, used dozer to crush the slash, prescribed fire treated 240 acres. Early 2000s, treated with masticator, in 2016 with help of NRCS (Natural Resources Conservation Service) we received a grant for juniper eradication and left trees that would have naturally been on the landscape. The USFS (United State Forest Service) had 630-acre GNA (Good Neighbor Authority) project completed in 2021. Protected northern boundary from catastrophic fire from forest land. Other juniper removal projects include Juniper West, just west of 130, proposing treatment of last 130 acres of ponderosa pine that hasn't been treated on private or federal property. Areas are very steep. Trees initially stressed by mistletoe are now succumbing to bark beetle. Partnership management plan includes prescribed fire, however, due to high fuel load created by high stand density, needs to be thinned before prescribed fire can be used. Funding requested for mechanical treatment and the trees skidded, decked, and eventually burned.
- Questions:
 - **Lani Hickey:** Can you take partial funding?
 - **Duncan Livingston:** Affirm, mechanical treatment is the most expensive but there are other methods we could consider if we don't get the full funding. Other methods include hand thinning and piling as well as hand thinning and lopping. I don't really want to go with the hand piling and lopping as that is like slash busting and will leave a lot of fuel on the ground.

Melanie Fullman: We are scheduled for a break, should we take it or keep going?

Lani Hickey: I propose we take a 10-minute break.

Melanie Fullman: Let's go round it up to 13 minutes and return at 11:00 am.

Klamath and Lake Counties

EFM Shaded Fuel Break

EFM – Mary Jo Hedrick

Funding Requested: Lake County: \$42,050 / Klamath County: \$82, 650

- Description: Recent drought has magnified issues on the land including overgrown roads and a high risk of unintentional fire starts. Project is for treatment of the 265 Road for 5 miles, plan is to create a fuel break. Using all lands restoration goals, we will create a lands level change for wildlife improvement and fuels reduction. Pre-shaded fuel break in an area of dense stands 395 trees/acre of mixed conifer, sugar pine, western white pine, high canopy closure, ceanothus 6-8 ft tall in places. Identified high use mule deer migration corridor. Project will create a 300 ft buffer along 1.6 miles of road, 57 acres in Klamath County and will create .8 mi buffer in 29 acres in Lake County. All tree species will be cut, skidded, and piled to 60-100 trees/acre. Will favor sugar pine, white pine, and ponderosa. Goal: no two crowns touching in 300 ft. Follow with masticator to remove small trees and brush. Creating shaded fuel break will reduce groundfire and fire spread, improve forest health and livestock grazing and wildlife forage.

- Questions:
 - **Daniel Leavell:** You mentioned Walker Range FPA (Fire Protection Association) would be doing the timeline and implementation of the project. Is that still true and is the RAC money going to Walker Range? How will that work?
 - **Mary Jo Hedrick:** We are currently working with Walker Range, and they have identified PODS, which were identified during the Bear Wallow project. For Walker Range, this is one of their scariest areas. There are more trees down after every windstorm and they always need a chainsaw to get in. I did go to Walker Range for a bid as they have a skid steer and there are others available. Walker Range is in the mix, but no guarantee it would be them, Walker Range's plan is to rent equipment and have four people do the work. Quicksilver is also interested. Cost estimates are based on Walker Range's estimate. All contractors in the local area and will benefit the local community.
 - **Melanie Fullman:** Potential Operational Delineations (PODs) are spatial units or areas defined by potential control features, such as roads and ridge tops, within which relevant information on forest conditions, ecology, and fire potential can be summarized.

Lake County

Summer Lake Wildfire Risk Reduction – Monitoring Report

Lake County Umbrella Watershed Council – Autumn Muir

- RAC (Resource Advisory Committee) funding awarded August of 2021.
- Bid tours held in November 2021.
- Contracts awarded and signed January 2022.
- Partially flagged and mapped spring 2022.
- Work has not yet initiated.
- Landowner will be responsible for burning hand piles 12-18 months after project completion (in kind).
- Questions:
 - **Todd Kepple:** Can you point out the tract that is being funded with RAC (Resource Advisory Committee) dollars?
 - **Autumn Muir:** The blue is the tract of land funded with RAC (Resource Advisory Committee) dollars. The cost ended up being high due to labor intensity of work so we were only able to get 191 acres done, but I am excited about the competency of the crew and how it will look afterwards.

KV Bar Forest Resiliency renamed Thomas Creek Forest Resiliency Project – Monitoring Report

Lake County Umbrella Watershed Council – Autumn Muir

- Project was renamed because we are trying to get away from landowner names and shift to geographic names.
- Landowner has completed approximately 650 acres of juniper removal and piling.
- OWEB (Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board) mini FIP (Focused Investment Partnership) completed 200 acres of juniper and conifer thinning associated with meadow and aspen habitat.
- NRCS (Natural Resources Conservation Service) Joint Chiefs funds awarded and in progress.
- RAC (Resource Advisory Committee) \$98,000 awarded in August 2021 and 190 acres completed.

- Bid tours held in November 2021.
- Contracts awarded and signed January 2022.
- Flagged and mapped spring of 2022.
- Work initiated April 13, 2022.
- Inspection performed on April 25, 2022.
- Landowner will be responsible for burning hand piles in 12-18 months, will be contribution in kind.

Lake County All Lands Restoration Initiative Prescribed Fire Implementation

Lake County Umbrella Watershed Council – Autumn Muir

Funds Requested: \$80,460

- Description: Project is for successful landscape level coordinated restoration efforts including extensive thinning across public and private lands set the stage for reintroducing fire as an ecological process. Currently have OWEB (Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board) TA (Technical Assistance) grant for \$49,020. We will have education and outreach with landowners and others, including workshops and one-on-one meetings. We need to complete of planning for prescribed burning and create burn plans. Burn unit layout, identification of potential control lines, agreements, permitting, liability, and other protocols need to be established. Previous investments by USFS (United States Forest Service), OWEB (Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board), and others has generated impressive measurable impacts. Timing is opportune to continue engaging interested and excited landowners These efforts will result in better understanding and acceptance of the beneficial uses of fire. Dry forest restoration involves reducing fuels and wildfire risks to adjacent or nearby private and public land parcels.
 - Questions:
 - **Mike Ramsey:** We did receive feedback from Lake County Commissioner Barry Shullanberger, he liked the project a lot and is supportive of it, especially the cross boundary and WUI (Wildland Urban Interface) aspects.

Warner Fuel Break II

Collins Company – John Cluck

Funds Requested: \$80,505

- Description: Warner Fuel Break is a juniper removal & non-commercial mixed conifer stand thinning, for a total of 141 acres. That project has been conducted by Collins Timber Company with OWEB (Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board) funds, in cooperation with Lake County Umbrella Watershed Council. Crooked Mud Honey IRP (Integrated Resource Project) is a landscape level restoration with emphasis on mixed conifer thinning and riparian/watershed restoration for roughly 50,000 acres, which was conducted by USFS (United States Forest Service) in cooperation with Lakeview Stewardship Group, Klamath Tribes, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, and US Fish and Wildlife Service. Project Area: 100 acres of encroached western juniper eradication; understory thinning of mixed conifer stands; removal of stems less than 8 inches DBH (Diameter at Breast Height) and drought killed fir and pine individuals; cut material machine piled and burned as conditions permit. The community benefit is that it creates cross-ownership continuity between previous forest health projects in the North Warner area. The project also reduces fuels in a strategic location along a major forest road to

potentially aid in future fire suppression efforts. Improves aesthetic appeal of the road easement by promoting healthy trees.

- Questions: None.

Internal Projects – U.S. Forest Service

Klamath County

Hog Creek Meadow Restoration

U.S. Forest Service – Tia Adams

Requested: \$84,000

- Description: The project will be implemented utilizing a variety of stream restoration techniques including but not limited to large wood implementation, floodplain reconnection, removing berms to prevent channelization of the stream, streambank stabilization, riparian planting, and rehabilitating an old road stream crossing. The ditch that is currently in place throughout the meadow will be filled allowing the meadow to store water naturally. A road crossing through the meadow area will be graded back to past conditions. Heavy equipment will be utilized to move fill and place trees. Due to the ditch removing water off the meadow system so efficiently this meadow is very dry, and it is anticipated that there will be very minimal impact from the heavy equipment during project implementation. Post project when flow is reestablished it is also anticipated that riparian plants and the processes associated with the meadow system will also reestablish very quickly. It is also anticipated that the response of the project will provide an abundance of water in the meadow system longer term and that will help suppress/slow the spread of invasive Reed Canary grass. This project in combination with other potential treatment techniques will hopefully help reduce the abundance of Reed Canary grass.
 - Questions: None.

Williamson River Highway Wildfire Safety Corridor

U.S. Forest Service – Evan Wright

Requested: \$780,000

- Description: Current Conditions are heavily overstocked timber stands, dense understory, canopy connectivity, limited sight distance on curvy roadways, inadequate separation of fuels, roadside to roadside. Values at risk include the town of Chiloquin, which is a listed community in the vicinity of Federal land “At Risk of Wildfire” with 75 plus residential dwellings. Area has multiple thousands of acres of private inholdings, private forested lands, private grazing and agriculture, the Applegate Butte Communication Site, cellular towers, microwave radio communications equipment for 911 & Lakeview Dispatch, and the Head of the River Campground. Proposed action is 250-foot treatment from road center by mechanical or hand thinning, prescribed fire implementation, prescribed fire maintenance with a frequent return interval. This treatment is more cost effective, an ecologically appropriate fuels management practice, helps reduce ladder fuels, creates a fire containment feature, and creates an easier/safer traffic flow. Project benefits include increased sight distance on roadway, improved evacuation efficiency, improved emergency resource response, less severe fire impingement on roadway, safer environment for responders, increased probability of functioning as a wildfire control feature, improved protection for “At Risk” community, private residents, grazing &

timber lands, ecological benefit of reintroducing fire into a fire adapted ecosystem, protection of Applegate Butte Communication Site, Head of the River Campground defensible space, and continuation of fuels mitigation efforts from existing projects and activities on private inholdings.

- Questions:

- **Bill Wilkins:** Would you be starting on the east or west side of the project?
- **Evan Wright:** We are still discussing it, but the intent is to build off the western end where we have been doing other project work and moving to the east /northeast. If we had enough funding, we may start on both ends and work toward each other.

Pumice Moonwort Habitat Modeling and Restoration

U.S. Forest Service – Erin Rentz

Funds Requested: \$29,200

- Description: Pumice Moonwort is a small fern that grows in the understory of lodgepole and sagebrush communities. Of 80 sites on Fremont-Winema, half have disappeared. Species prefers open habitat and we tried to replicated openness created by powerline corridor, but without success. This project will help identify the habitat requirements to protect this sensitive species. Objectives are to collect habitat information at sites with healthy populations, use information to refine model to identify most important habitat for restoration, and use refined model to develop fuels reduction treatments that can be incorporated into upcoming North end restoration project.

- Questions:

- **Jan Murphy:** Are the funds for eradication?
- **Erin Rentz:** This is not an invasive species; it is a rare plant that we are trying to promote on the landscape.
- **Jan Murphy:** What is the benefit?
- **Erin Rentz:** The benefit is that it increases diversity in the area and is typically in an area with diverse populations; it is a plant we would like to keep on the landscape.
- **Lani Hickey:** The budget for model development seems super low, are you using something already in existence?
- **Erin Rentz:** We will use what the original modeler used.

Green Mountain White Bark Pine Restoration

U.S. Forest Service – Kari O’Leary

Funds Requested: \$171,784

- Description: Whitebark pine is currently a Candidate Species for listing under the Endangered Species Act and is considered a sensitive species in Region 6 (Oregon and Washington). It is an interagency sensitive species to date. We were successful in treating 650 acres across this landscape, and we’re hoping, with your contribution to continue to treat the remaining 217 acres. This project area falls within Conservation Area 802, which is one of 30 genetically unique conservation areas designated for Region 6 (Oregon and Washington) in the Whitebark Pine Restoration Strategy for the Pacific Northwest Region. The Bootleg Fire (2021), Watson Creek

Fire (2018), and the Brattain Fire (2020) all impacted Conservation Area 802 on a landscape level, with effects to be evaluated in the coming years. Green Mountain Whitebark is an 870-acre restoration project on the Paisley Ranger District. Treatments began in 2018 with funding received from Forest Health Partnerships and ISSSSP (Interagency Special Status/Sensitive Species Program). To date, approximately 650 acres have been treated. 217 Acres remain to be treated.

- Questions: None.

Public Comment Period

- No members of public contacted Avery Kool regarding request for comment.

Melanie Fullman: We will take a 30-minute lunch and return at 1:00 p.m. Pacific for discussion of projects.

Discussion and Prioritization of Klamath and Lake County Projects

Lani Hickey: I want to thank Avery and Melanie and everyone else for the work you put in, with the presentations and binders that were sent out, the organization of the binders, and getting all the presenters to present. I think that the whole group would like to commend all of you for what a great job that you did, all the hurdles that you had to jump over to get us to where we are today. Thank you very much.

We are now going to open the meeting for discussion, and my choice would be to tackle the Klamath side first, just because then we move on to the easier stuff because of the funding amounts, and, as I was starting to say earlier from our books and our binders, we can see that on the Klamath County side that we have funds available at \$796,000 and the requested amount is \$1,967,002. On the Lake County side, we have requested funding amount in \$243,615, and the funds available is \$80,505, so we have our work cut out for us.

Avery Kool: I'm sorry to interrupt. The funding for the new fiscal year just came in. We do have more funding and I'm going to bring up the spreadsheet so you all can see. The funding requested like Lani said, is roughly, \$1.9 million requested, we have available now roughly \$1.6 million, so there's about \$300,000 difference. The original \$796,000 was what was left over from our previous meeting, and then the new fiscal year funding came in right before this meeting. I've added it together and it is all available for these projects on the Lake County and Klamath County side. For Klamath County, we have \$1,611,327 available and for Lake County we have \$313,651 available.

Lani Hickey: Now that funding is verified and we have the prioritization spreadsheet, my proposal and suggestion is to move forward with the Klamath County projects, and we can just go through them in the order they are listed in our binders. Are there any projects in this list that are not supported at all by members? I know we used to break out in groups of three, but this is a little different in the virtual world. Are there any projects that any members have any opposition to? Seeing that we don't, let's just start with the very first one: Monitoring of Rare Plant Habitat for Management Action Prioritization presented by Sean Prive from The Understory initiative, any discussion?

Betty Riley: I'm not sure that I would rank as high as other projects. Not that it is not important, just not as important as fuel breaks and other fire related projects.

Lani Hickey: I'm not sure how to move forward as effectively as if we were in person. Should we take a tentative ranking on these projects?

Daniel Leavell: Yeah, I've gone through and prioritized each project for each of the counties. I don't know if you want to take a vote, I was going to suggest, that I ranked with a 1-5 ranking. With Sean's, I ranked as a 3, I didn't like that one so much.

Lani Hickey: I have also ranked my projects, maybe we can make a list of higher priorities and then as we move to the bottom we can open for discussion. I like ranking 1-3 as it sounds more logical, and we can get to the priorities. This is going to be an analysis for where we end up at the end.

Klamath County Projects – Total Funding Available \$1,611,327							
Project Name	Amount Requested	Category	1 (high)	2 (medium)	3 (low)	Total Votes	Project Priority
Monitoring of Rare Plant Habitat for Management Action Prioritization	\$ 29,924	O	0	1	9	10	3
Green Mountain Whitebark Pine Restoration	\$ 171,784	O	3	3	2	8	2
Bear Wallow All Lands RAC Project	\$ 149,773	O	3	3	2	8	1 or 2
Upper Klamath Basin Chinook Salmon Outmigration Study	\$ 90,992	O	1	3	5	9	3
Hog Creek Meadow Restoration - FS Chi/Che #3	\$ 84,000	RW	3	1	4	8	3
Upper Sprague Low-Tech Process-Based Restoration	\$ 157,475	RW	6	1	0	7	1
Sprague and Keno Weed Eradication	\$ 30,935	RW	2	3	2	7	2
Lost River Weed Eradication	\$ 30,935	RW	2	3	2	7	2
Williamson River Highway Wildfire Safety Corridor - FS Chi/Che #1	\$ 780,000	RW	2	3	3	8	2 or 3
Obenchain Forest and Rangeland Health	\$ 225,334	RW	3	5	0	8	2
Pumice Moonwort Habitat Modeling and Restoration - FS Chi/Che #2	\$ 29,200	RW	1	5	1	7	2
LFLP 2022 Paddock Butte	\$ 104,000	RW	0	7	1	8	2
EFM Shaded Fuel Break	\$ 82,650	RW	0	4	3	7	2
Total Funding Requested	\$ 1,967,002						

Category

O = Other Project

RW = Road or Watershed Related Project

Note: This was not an official vote by members. This was an exercise used to determine project and funding priorities of Committee members. Total votes vary due to some members experiencing technical difficulties with internet connection, camera, and Zoom functionality. Members who were unable to vote for some priorities voiced thoughts during the following discussion.

Lake County Projects – Total Funding Available \$313,651		
Project Name	Amount Requested	Category
Lake County All Lands Restoration Initiative Prescribed Fire Implementation	\$ 80,460	RW
Warner Fuel Break II	\$ 80,505	RW
EFM Shaded Fuel Break	\$ 42,050	RW
Total Funding Requested	\$ 203,015	

Category

O = Other Project

RW = Road or Watershed Related Project

Note: Lake County projects were not prioritized at this time due to having more funds available than requested.

Lani Hickey: This is up for discussion now, the Williamson River Highway Wildfire Safety Corridor, that's a very important one for keeping the fire jumping from one side of the highway to the other, and we saw the pictures. I would ask the group, maybe to suggest a bit of a lower funding amount?

Bill Ganong: I have two comments on that. One, that looks like a perfect project for all the Federal money we keep hearing is coming to do thinning and fire protection and fire prevention work, you know that's coming through the Forest Service, and I wonder if maybe this is a little bit premature, or I would like to know what's being considered there. The second thing I'll just say I think it's hugely important.

Bill Wilkins: The project is generally providing a safety corridor. I watched the Bootleg fire. In this day and age and with the weather we're seeing and the conditions that are out there, I don't believe roads are great fire breaks any longer. It's just a different kind of world.

Reid Sherwin: May I say something on that? I notice this is a 5-year project. Do we need to fund the whole 5 years upfront?

Lani Hickey: I would propose we consider funding those higher priorities and with the money left over, not including the lower priority, go to this.

Mike Ramsey: Thinking about other funding that's coming, we received some disaster relief funds for fires that did occur already. We have some infrastructure money coming, and I believe the direction most of that is headed towards is our roads work. Probably not all of it, but a lot of it it's probably headed that way. There is supposed to be at some point some Klamath Basin restoration money coming, but I don't know when, I don't know how much, and I don't know how that's going to get prioritized between Federal and other private lands. So, there's money coming I'm not sure how it's going to be allocated, exactly.

Lani Hickey: One of the ones that I had ranked pretty low is the Upper Klamath Chinook Salmon Outmigration Study and the reason that I had that one ranked pretty low was because I personally would like to see some results from initial studies first, before we invest more. That was just one of the ones that probably ranked a little lower on my priority list, and that being the reason so, if anybody has any comments in any other projects, please speak up now.

Bill Ganong: I agree completely. I think you'd need to look at what comes up the study that's going on right now and then decide whether you need more to study or decide how to fine tune it to get to the next study. In addition, I'm kind of with Reid to some extent on the Williamson River Highway project.

Daniel Leavell: I recommended half for the Green Mountain Whitebark Pine Restoration of what was requested. I recommended two thirds of what the Upper Sprague Low Tech Process Based Restoration recommended, and two thirds of the Obenchain Forest and Rangeland, and half of what the Paddock Butte recommended and then allocated 100% for the Hog Creek Meadow Restoration.

Todd Kepple: We can add what was left from that to go to the Williamson River Highway Corridor effort, which I hope is partnered with other funding, like people have been saying. I like Daniel's list. I think the one point where I might depart from his list, was I really liked the Low-Tech Process Based Restoration efforts on the Upper Sprague. I think that might have a lot of promise for what we have coming in the next couple of years. It looks like that's going to work if their structures last long enough. I think we might be wanting to do a lot more of that kind of work.

Lani Hickey: Avery, are you handy enough with excel formulas to total up the projects that got all the number one votes?

Avery Kool: Yes, I can share my screen. If you all want to say what you recommend for each project, I can do an equation on the side, and we can see what we have left.

Lani Hickey: If I could jump in again, what I was going to suggest is that Avery could off to the side somewhere do a formula that adds up the figures from all the projects that got a lot of number one level votes. Does that make sense?

Avery Kool: Affirm, I will do that.

Lani Hickey: We can jump to the Lake County side because guess what they have? More money than projects, so that's an easy one! Let's just jump to the Lake County project proposals. There were three there here on my list, Lake County All Lands Restoration Initiative Prescribed Fire Implementation by Autumn Muir requested an amount 80,460. If anybody is opposed to full funding, please speak up. Warner Fuel Break II, Collins Company requested Amount is 80,505. If anybody is opposed to full funding, just speak up now, please. I hear no objections. EFM Shaded Fuel Break from EcoTrust Forest Management. If I miss somebody, please just interrupt me. Is there anybody opposed to full funding of that project?

Todd Kepple: So, I would just make an observation here that there's plenty of money to go around for Lake County, so there'd be no reason to deny them. But on the Klamath County side, that same project did not score well.

Lani Hickey: Well, so that makes it kind of a weird situation. I know if we have sufficient funding for Lake County.

Todd Kepple: But I wanted to not recommend full funding for that project and that's why I rated it low priority for the Klamath County side. But remember, we cannot move funds between county, so we might as well spend the money.

Avery Kool: I'm sorry to interrupt, I wanted to point out that I accidentally put an incorrect figure on the spreadsheet I gave you. The correct funding is \$42,050 that they requested for Lake County, which is correct on the spreadsheet you can see.

Lani Hickey: Okay, so very quickly, we don't know what is going to happen. We never do from year to year on the Secure Rural Schools and this funding source. What happens to this money if it doesn't get obligated today?

Avery Kool: That money will stay in the account, and we can obligate it in the future. We just have to have a committee to recommend funds. The money will be available at the next meeting. Whatever we do, another call for projects, we just have to have the committee and a quorum available to recommend the project area over.

Lani Hickey: Do we have the authority or permission, or whatever it takes to pull a more than the requested amount? If we really like a project.

Todd Kepple: Yeah, I think so. If you want to prioritize and say more money becomes available and they need more funding, you can prioritize.

Lani Hickey: Well, maybe if she is still here, we can hear from Autumn Muir.

Autumn Muir: Yes, I'm still here. I'm really glad you brought that up because the money that I requested was because it was the maximum that we were aware of at the time. But definitely, if we could have more I would either do a larger prescribed burn or multiple landowners, I mean, for sure I could use as much as you are willing to give us.

Daniel Leavell: I would vote for that given the Umbrella Watershed Council's record of good projects completed on the ground working with landowners. My vote would be that they'd be given extra funds to get more done.

Lani Hickey: We will do our calculations at the end and I'm sorry with the Warner Fuel Break at the \$80,000, is John still here? It does not look like he's still here. Once Avery has our calculations for Klamath County, then we'll flip back over here and see what we'll discuss again the EFM at the \$42,050 or is anybody objective to that? Or do you even want to fund that project? I would vote no. We all need to take a vote, and it will have to be a majority vote to vote no on that one so we can hold off on that. Are we ready to flip back?

Avery Kool: Yep, I'll take share my screen for Klamath County projects. I just filled in the numbers for everything that had a 1 or 2, and there is a little less than \$600,000 between the 3 projects that were rated as a 2 or 3. So if you have a calculation, I can just do it on the fly as you as you're talking.

Lani Hickey: Well, I recommend removing the Upper Klamath Basin and Chinook Salmon Out Migration study.

Daniel Leavell: I would vote to remove the EFM Shaded Fuel Break.

Lani Hickey: The part that you have highlighted green. Was that supposed to be totaling the projects that got 2 or 3 votes for one ranking?

Avery Kool: Everything in green that has the full amount of requested funding listed. That was either you all recommended at 1 or 2 and if there's nothing in green column it is because the project was a 3.

Lani Hickey: Well, so like I'm looking at Paddock, which sadly only got one vote for level one. I thought it should have done much better than that. but maybe we should eliminate that one.

Todd Kepple: No, we still have plenty of money here, except for the Williams River Highway project.

Lani Hickey: So, can we put partial funding in for the Williamson River? And what was it? Two thirds of the amount was suggested.

Bill Ganong: Oh, sorry, Dan, what's your concern or what is your reasoning on not liking the shaded fuel break project, the EFM project?

Daniel Leavell: So, Bill, it's just I spent quite a bit of time on that tract of land a couple of years ago, before it was sold and I'm looking at priorities, and I'm looking at what value to the hazards there are from that risk, and the money going into that and I echo what several of you have said, that I don't feel based on my walking the ground and being out there and looking at what resources and what values are at risk, and what the hazard is to that, I don't personally, and this is just me and I hope others chime in, but I would rather put our limited funds in projects that do more good to either produce more values or

protect or enhance more ecosystem worth or bring more social value. That's the reason Bill, I'm not saying it's not important, I'm not saying it's not needed at all, and I appreciate the presentation, but for me after seeing and being out there. I just feel these limited funds could be better placed elsewhere.

Bill Ganong: Good. Thank you. I just don't know that area, and I value your observation.

Todd Kepple: Thank you, Bill, I share some of Daniel's reservations about it. But I would make a couple of observations. One is that I think that's the one project we have in Klamath County that's not in the Klamath River watershed, and so it might be nice to distribute the funds around. You know the county a little bit, and I think I had another point, but I forgot it.

Mike Ramsey: Daniel just answered the question. I was curious, what you guys were seeing about that project that you didn't like the looks of and now I understand.

Lani Hickey: Thank you, I see your hand up, did you have a comment, Bill?

Bill Wilkins: Yeah, just to reiterate what Daniel was saying, that's shaded fuel breaks are wonderful. But they are what you do around urban interface. Cost a lot of money, and they're very good, but you must put them towards the heaviest values of risk. Whereas we have less values and I've been in that country, and it's good that these things occur. Again, limited resources, limited funding we have to go with the largest value.

Todd Kepple: Well said, I agree. This is Todd, for my part I'm okay with leaving out the Chinook Salmon Outmigration Study for this year. Maybe encourage them to come back next year, and also leaving out the Rare Plant Habitat Monitoring, but I would be okay with leaving the EFM Shaded Fuel Break in, and then would that put us pretty close? If we leave most of the Williamson River Highway project in, we're at \$1.5 million, and we have \$1.6 million available.

Lani Hickey: Avery, Is that correct?

Avery Kool: I put it on the screen if you can all see it. You have roughly \$30,000 left to allocate here.

Bill Wilkins: Gosh, can we add it to the Williamson River highway?

Lani Hickey: We can do whatever we want.

Bill Ganong: Yeah, my question on the Williamson River Highway, and I probably should have asked this earlier. Somebody mentioned it earlier. It may have been Bill I'm not certain, and I'm not opposed at all to taking back the fuel coverage along that road in Klamath County. My question is, I guess it would depend on the fire that was encountered at the time, because somebody did mention the sparks jump a long way if the wind and the conditions are right, but I guess we can do whatever we can do to stop or contain fires where they're at. So, I guess I answered my own question. Just rambling.

Bill Wilkins: I'll ramble some more on that Lani, I think Bill's comment is right, especially if we're talking about a strong wind driven fire. But if there's a small fire that breaks out on one side of the road having that road break there might give you just enough time to get up there and catch it before it takes off. I would think they would want to choose sites where they'll do their clearing, maybe in some places the clearing is not quite as vital as it is in others I don't know if shading might be another consideration, like cut more on the south side of the road when it's running east and west. I'm still not sure that I'd want to

throw half of a million dollars at that, it still seems like a lot to me. We are still fully funded on most of the projects.

Daniel Leavell: So Lani, I just had a comment. I agree with the Outmigration study comments that were made. Is there any way to provide partial funding to that project? To do what other comments have said to ensure that it has concrete results to say that it works or not. I'm not sure if I'm phrasing that right.

Lani Hickey: Sure, Daniel, we can definitely discuss that one in detail, and then we'll we can take a vote and the majority vote is the ruling decider on that one so let's just focus on that one for a minute. If everybody's agreeable to that and I would like anybody who wants to chime in on that one for a discussion. Looks like the project proponent is here, if you have any additional questions. Do I remember right that the tags are \$250 each?

Charlie Erdman: Yeah, Hi! This is Charlie, I'm here to answer any questions that folks may have. I think it's certainly scalable like I said we're planning on releasing about 1,200 fish in 2023. We also have our project partners also have proposals in through the infrastructure funding, and some other pots as well. And so, 1,200 tags at \$250 each, you know, that is pricey for sure. We're trying to piecemeal the funding together from a number of different sources. But we are moving ahead in 2023 with the release of those 1,200 fish.

Lani Hickey: This is Lani, and I can't see your face. Was it 1,200 that you had released to date with the trackers on them?

Charlie Erdman: So, I can provide a little bit more clarification on that. about 8,000 fish have been released, 4,000 in the Wood River, and about 4,000 in the Williamson River. 4,000 fish were tagged with pit tags, and then 1,200 were released, so 600 in each tributary were released, and those fish were tagged with acoustic tags. The reason they were tagged with the 2 stick tags is because it's much easier to set up acoustic receivers than it is to set up pit tag arrays. We can have a much wider array of receiver setups, so we can track these fish better.

Lani Hickey: Does anybody else have anything to chime in on this this project?

Charlie Erdman: Also, I'd like to state that although it's not a part of this funding request, there is also a large outreach component of this project. Rochelle, who's the PhD student at UC Davis was at the Chiloquin High School and elementary schools and did a large outreach with them this spring. And that is intended to be duplicated this next following year.

Bill Ganong: Can I ask a question? not being a fish biologist? So, you've released all the fish up into the closed basin.

Charlie Erdman: Basically right. So, this is to monitor their movement around and through the tributaries and connections with Lake, and potentially down towards the dam area.

Bill Ganong: Just so that I understand a little bit better, the fish are just having a hard time with the migration portion of it, but I understand they'll come from the ocean, they'll come up, they'll spawn, and then if they make it, then the fingerlings will go back out to the ocean. Is that correct? Are we just attempting to see if they're going to survive in that the environment?

Charlie Erdman: That's one aspect of the project certainly trying to figure out how and when they out-migrate throughout the system. The other aspect is because of the array setup and how it's set up in a business way. We can identify, reach specific mortality. so presumably there are reaches in the Williamson and Wood rivers that will have different rates of mortality and by identifying and determining that you'll be able to prioritize restoration of those particular reaches.

Bill Ganong: And then how do you take into all your analysis, especially these drought conditions? Because this is going to have a major effect on them.

Charlie Erdman: Yeah, certainly. You know the only thing I can say about that is that it's much better to have multiple years of data. To identify certain variables that may impact survival. With multiple years of data, we can identify and look at things like flows, river temperatures, Upper Klamath Lake elevation, and those sorts of things and how they impact survival throughout this Upper Basin.

Lani Hickey: Okay, does anybody else have any other questions or discussions?

Charlie Erdman: I don't have an exact number, what I've heard is that there have been a number of fish that have been picked up on the USGS (United States Geological Services) pit tag array on the lake, river acoustic receivers were just downloaded last week for the first time.

Rochelle has not processed those data yet. Mainly because we have 20 plus receivers out and there's significant number of detections on all those receivers, and that she is a grad student and busy and so as of right now, I cannot give you a number as how many.

Bill Ganong: What's the size of these fish?

Charlie Erdman: I would say 4 to 6 inches.

Bill Ganong: See, I think that's pretty fascinating because I was curious as to whether little fish could make it through. What is it like 15 miles of slack water to find their way downstream? I think that's pretty interesting information.

Charlie Erdman: And I believe a few have been picked up downstream of Keno dam as well.

Lani Hickey: Any other discussion on that one? I'm still of the opinion and this is just mine that I would like to recommend that they come back next year with some results, and for funding next year.

Todd Kepple: I don't have strong feelings about it, but I guess I would suggest we put a little money back into it to help them develop a consistent year by year set of data for this research.

Lani Hickey: Okay, Avery, would you mind bringing up the spreadsheet?

Daniel Leavell: I would vote for that too, with the extra caveat that I would also recommend that outreach be boosted like Charlie was saying, like they did at the Chiloquin schools. I would vote that our funding, if we do allocate, that they also boost the outreach education part of it to our local communities.

Avery Kool: You all should be able to see the spreadsheet. Would anybody like to make a suggestion on where the remaining \$30,441 should go?

Todd Kepple: If we stick with the spreadsheet as is I will make a suggestion that we split it in half and give \$15,000 to the Monitoring of Rare Plant Habitat for Management and then the remaining \$15,000 to the Klamath Basin Chinook Outmigration Study, and that way everybody's getting some funding.

Jan Murphy: I think that sounds really good. One of the things since I'm not working daily with government agencies, and more on the grazing and weeds and water issue, I'm going to leave it up to most of you that know these types of things.

Daniel Leavell: I can support that, Lani.

Lani Hickey: Okay. We have exactly how much, Avery?

Avery Kool: Yes, everything is zeroed out. You have three projects in Klamath County that are partially funded, and then the rest of the projects are fully funded.

Lani Hickey: I think that we're to a point, if somebody would like to make a motion, to accept, or recommend funding at the level highlighted in the chart that Avery has put together.

Betty Riley: I motion to accept the Klamath County spreadsheet as listed.

Bill Wilkins: I second.

Lani Hickey: So, Betty made a motion, and Bill Wilkins seconded. Is that correct? I thought Todd seconded it.

Todd Kepple: It wasn't me. It must have been Bill, doesn't matter there's a motion on the table to accept the funding that is up on the spreadsheet and from the projects, I'm not probably saying it correctly because I didn't have time to write it down quickly enough, but Betty made the motion to fund the projects as they are listed on the spreadsheet in front of us for a total of \$1,611,327, and there was a second, which is made by Bill Wilkins.

Lani Hickey: It is now open for a vote and discussion. All those members in favor please raise your hand. All those not in favor, raise your hand. It looks like all voted in favor, so the motion passes. We have to have everyone vote yes, because it's only quorum. Well, it looks like that is the funding on the Klamath County side. So, we can move to the Lake County side. Thank you, everybody Great discussions.

Motion by Betty Riley, seconded by Bill Wilkins, no discussion, all members in attendance voted to pass the motion. Members in attendance: Reid Sherwin (Category A), Betty Riley (Category A), Jan Murphy (Category A), Lani Hickey (Category B), Daniel Leavell (Category B), Todd Kepple (Category B), Bill Wilkins (Category C), Bill Ganong (Category C), Nick Kimbol (Category C)

*Kelley Minty Morris (Category C) lost connectivity and was not present for this vote; a quorum remained in place during her absence.

Klamath County Projects – Total Funding Available \$1,611,327		
Project Name	Amount Recommended to Fund	Category
Monitoring of Rare Plant Habitat for Management Action Prioritization	\$ 15,220	O
Green Mountain Whitebark Pine Restoration	\$ 171,784	O
Bear Wallow All Lands RAC Project	\$ 149,773	O
Upper Klamath Basin Chinook Salmon Outmigration Study	\$ 15,221	O
Hog Creek Meadow Restoration - FS Chi/Che #3	\$ 84,000	RW
Upper Sprague Low-Tech Process-Based Restoration	\$ 157,475	RW
Sprague and Keno Weed Eradication	\$ 30,935	RW
Lost River Weed Eradication	\$ 30,935	RW
Williamson River Highway Wildfire Safety Corridor - FS Chi/Che #1	\$ 514,800	RW
Obenchain Forest and Rangeland Health	\$ 225,334	RW
Pumice Moonwort Habitat Modeling and Restoration - FS Chi/Che #2	\$ 29,200	RW
LFLP 2022 Paddock Butte	\$ 104,000	RW
EFM Shaded Fuel Break	\$ 82,650	RW
Total Funding Recommended	\$ 1,611,327	

Category

O = Other Project

RW = Road or Watershed Related Project

****Projects were not prioritized at the meeting (should additional funding become available). After reviewing the notes, I (Avery Kool) e-mailed all RAC members with the information and confirmed the below prioritization with Chairperson Lani Hickey.***

If additional Title II monies become available, they will be allocated to project KC-2022-01 Monitoring of Rare Plant Habitat until it is fully funded, then to KC-2022-09 Williamson River Highway Wildfire Safety Corridor until it is fully funded, and then to KC-2022-04 Upper Klamath Basin Chinook Salmon Outmigration Study until it is fully funded.

Lani Hickey: Okay, I see Autumn, have you given it some thought?

Autumn Muir: I'm excited. We've got already 27 landowners that are ready to receive prescribed fire and you know it's just about capacity, and if we can get contractors, we've got some bids from Grayback right now, and they were pretty expensive there. They range from like \$500 to \$1,500 an acre for the prescribed fire, and I think that's mostly to cover their liability. But We're hoping to get some collaboration with our local ODF (Oregon Department of Forestry) fire crews and have some BLM (Bureau of Land Management) and Forest Service engines that can come and help support, so there's potential to decrease those per acreage costs. We just really haven't done it before. Whatever you can provide, we will make good use of, and as on the previous stuff if we don't use it, then we would return the unused portion.

Lani Hickey: If we can see that spreadsheet again, Avery. So, we need to discuss the EFM project. Does anybody have any suggestions, or what are your thoughts regarding the EFM Shaded Fuel Break? Is it a reduction? Is it funding at the current amount? Please chime in.

Todd Kepple: Well, we just funded them on the Klamath County side right, so we'd have no reason to deny them on the Lake County side. Do I have that right? So, it may not be Daniel's favorite project probably not mine either, but I'm good with it.

Daniel Leavell: I think we should put it back in. Well, I would vote against it, but I respect the wishes of the majority.

Lani Hickey: That's where we're at, we can always entertain an idea, and maybe cut it in half. We can do whatever we want. We can throw that up to the Lake County All Lands Restoration Initiative.

Daniel Leavell: Well, I would vote for that, Lani. You know, I would vote to increase again, based on the desperate need we have to prove prescribed burning works on public and private land. They have a good record, they get things done, and they do education and outreach along with that. I would just vote to fund them as much as we could personally.

Lani Hickey: So, Avery, if you could cut the EFM in half so with that we can just see it, and then put all the remaining funds up into the top project and let's see where we're at with the total budget. It looks like Mike Ramsey has his hand up.

Mike Ramsey: You're fine. I can't see the total funds available on my screen. I don't know how to make it be different on my screen. Yeah. Sorry I got it now. it's 313,000.

Lani Hickey: Sorry. Oh, it looks like we're going to come close to doubling the funding for Lake County All Lands. Is that really warranted? I wonder if Collins wants a little bit too. I mean I'm all for giving Lake County All Lands that. But without Collins being here, I would vote the way it is now.

Todd Kepple: Do you want to put another \$20,000 in there they can always give a back?

Daniel Leavell: I don't know how to approach this. Well, I would vote for putting an extra \$20,000 in there, and then giving the rest to Lake County All Lands Restoration.

Lani Hickey: I like that, Daniel. Okay, so if we could have you switch that around Avery.

Avery Kool: For clarification, did Collins say that their project was scalable?

Lani Hickey: That's what I have in my notes.

Avery Kool: Another option is we can do another call for projects or keep this extra funding for the next round. Just putting all the options out there. My spreadsheet is showing what we have now, with 50% funding to EFM Shaded Fuel Break and an extra \$20,000 to Warner Fuel Break, and then the remainder to Lake County. Does anybody else have any comments? I would like to just verify with Autumn Muir from Lake County, that she said she could scale up.

Daniel Leavell: But we're talking about more than doubling that allocation and I'd want to hear that she can make good use of those funds for sure.

Autumn Muir: Yes, I can definitely make a use of those funds. We were super excited for the funding opportunity when it came about, but my colleagues and collaborative partners were just wishing it was more. Our wish came true! Yes, if you think about it, you know, with the \$80,000 we were thinking we were going to get about 50 acres done, which is small potatoes for Lake County landowners. Even if we don't know the exact price per acre because it depends on terrain and potential control lines, and those PODS (Potential Operational Delineations) that you've talked about. If we have a burn plan already created through this technical assistance grant that we have, and then we have a contractor coming in, I'm just guessing, even if it came in at \$1,000/acre to implement the burn, that would be 190 acres, which is now starting to really make some sense to a landscape scale. Or we could split it between two neighbors' side to side. We have a lot of options. The biggest concern is doing it right and making sure that it's a very good example of how to do things with all the contingency plans. But yes, I have full confidence that our team can appropriately spend this money efficiently and within the timeframe.

Avery Kool: If the projects are scaled up, then I will get in touch with the proponents, and they will have to submit an updated cost analysis sheet. I will share the updated documents with you all when I receive them, for transparency and documentation.

Lani Hickey: Okay, so if somebody would like to make a motion if everybody's comfortable, or if we'd like to have more discussion, it is definitely open.

Daniel Leavell: Well, Lani, I would. If everyone is comfortable. I would make a move to accept funding for the three Lake County projects, as indicated on the spreadsheet.

Betty Riley: I will second Daniel.

Lani Hickey: We have a motion that has been seconded to accept the funding for the three Lake County projects, as shown on the Excel Spreadsheet. Is there any further discussion? No further discussion, the motion carries. All those in favor say aye and raise your hand. Any opposed? There are no oppositions. The motion passes as stated and full funding is granted to Lake County for the spreadsheet funding dollar amounts. Great job, everybody. We did it, and we're getting you out here of here in time, Todd.

Motion by Daniel Leavell, seconded by Betty Riley, all members in attendance voted to pass the motion. Members in attendance: Reid Sherwin (Category A), Betty Riley (Category A), Jan Murphy (Category A), Lani Hickey (Category B), Daniel Leavell

*(Category B), Todd Kepple (Category B), Bill Wilkins (Category C), Bill Ganong
(Category C), Nick Kimbol (Category C), Kelley Minty Morris (Category C)*

Lake County Projects – Total Funding Available \$313,651		
Project Name	Amount Recommended to Fund	Category
Lake County All Lands Restoration Initiative Prescribed Fire Implementation	\$ 192,121	RW
Warner Fuel Break II	\$ 100,505	RW
EFM Shaded Fuel Break	\$ 21,025	RW
Total Funding Recommended	\$ 313,651	

Category

O = Other Project

RW = Road or Watershed Related Project

****Projects were not prioritized at the meeting (should additional funding become available). After reviewing the notes, I (Avery Kool) e-mailed all RAC members with the information and confirmed the below prioritization with Chairperson Lani Hickey.***

If additional Title II monies become available, they will be allocated to project KCLC-2022-01 EFM Shaded Fuel Break until it is fully funded.

Todd Kepple: I would really like to express gratitude for the opportunity to be on this committee. Thank you very much for that, and great working with everybody, as always.

Lani Hickey: I really appreciate that as well, and I will second that because I do think that the majority of us, if not all of us, are at the end of our term, is that correct?

Avery Kool: Yes, you are. If anyone wants to reapply, let me know! We're outreaching for new members, or if you know anyone who wants to apply because you all do expire in December of 2022. We'd love to have you back; I cannot express my gratitude for you all enough. This wouldn't be possible without you, and I cannot express enough like how much I appreciate you being here and communicating, making this happen to get the money on the ground to projects, so we can do good work. Thank you so much.

Lani Hickey: I just want to thank everybody for allowing me to be the chair, and I appreciate all of your hard work and all these great projects. Gosh, I've been in this since 2001 when Secure Rural Schools first came around. So, I've been able to see it work for a long time anyhow.

Avery Kool: Thank you, everybody, and one more question for you all. Does anyone have any interest in a field trip to see any projects in September?

Response from multiple members: Yes, interested in a field trip and would like to see some Lake County Umbrella Watershed Council projects.

Todd Kepple: An editorial comment before we break up. Well, I emailed a comment to Leigh Ann Vradenburg because I had a question for her, and Autumn said something just now that kind of sparks my interest on this. She talked about increased funding allows them to have more of an impact, that it can have an impact on a landscape scale basis, and so you know, I've been paying attention to every juniper related project that I see come across my desk, and Bill Ganong and I've talked about this a number of times.

We are just barely scratching the surface of this issue with junipers spreading across Eastern Oregon range land and we need to be doing 100 times more treatment than we are. So, I'm wondering if we're going about it the right way not only from a dollar standpoint, but also from an ecological standpoint, when we go out and gather up a bunch of juniper trees that have been taking up nutrients for the last 50 to 100 years. We pile them all on one massive pile and we burn them. We're basically removing all those nutrients from the soil. I just feel like there's got to be a better way out there than what we're doing. My enthusiasm for these kind of juniper projects is declining rapidly.

Daniel Leavell: I think what you need to do is get together with the KLFHP (Klamath and Lake Forest Health Partnership) or the Umbrella Watershed Council and propose a project to do exactly that. What I'm really hoping is that if we can get into the prescribed burning business that Bill talked about, I would really enjoy seeing a broadcast burn of juniper much more than pile burning. If we were to get our science down to prescribe burn, especially in these juniper treatment areas, we would return more nutrients to the soil than we're burning up in the atmosphere. That's why I have full support on projects like Autumn is recommending because it sets precedent. It's that precedent that we can indeed do this for not only economic and social benefit, but for ecological benefit, and I'm really hoping we continue with the scale of juniper removal and return the bulk of it back into the soil as carbon sequestration and nutrient retention.

Bill Wilkins: You got big old monster sterilized rings in the soil that will never come back in our lifetimes. And they're seed beds for every thistle you can imagine. It's just unbelievable. Piles are the best we have right now, but we need to evolve away from them from my viewpoint, and that's taking these steps like Autumn and her partners are doing, the Chiloquin area is doing, the Chemult area is doing. We need to get our prescribed burning down to a science where we can take care of the slash in a responsible, ecologically good way.

Todd Kepple: Oh, you guys said it much better than I did. That sounds really good. If our field trip could include a stop at one of Autumn's projects, especially I'd like to see some of the land treatment projects that she was discussing. I also wanted to make a suggestion on these projects that we didn't fund fully, that we provide some kind of feedback to the project proponent, so that they understand.

I've been on both sides of this grant game, both as a reviewer and as an applicant, and when you don't get your funding with no comment it's really frustrating.

Lani Hickey: Very good point and I would highly suggest that the comments in the minutes are shared. I highly recommend that those projects come back because they're important every you know, all of them, and we'd like to see them.

So, Avery, do you have enough notes to conjure up some kind of feedback for those guys?

Avery Kool: I will review the notes and put something together for you and Todd to review. After your review, I can send it to the projects that were not fully funded.

Todd Kepple: Well, would like somebody like to adjourn this meeting? I move to adjourn.

Bill Wilkins: Second.

Lani Hickey: Okay, Bill, you got it as adjourned. Thank you, everybody. Thank you all.

Motion by Todd Kepple, seconded by Bill Wilkins, all members in attendance voted to pass the motion. Members in attendance: Reid Sherwin (Category A), Betty Riley (Category A), Jan Murphy (Category A), Lani Hickey (Category B), Daniel Leavell (Category B), Todd Kepple (Category B), Bill Wilkins (Category C), Bill Ganong (Category C), Nick Kimbol (Category C), Kelley Minty Morris (Category C)

I certify that meeting minutes have been reviewed and approved by Designated Federal Officer (DFO) Mike Ramsey and Chairperson Lani Hickey. Confirmation of approval of minutes was received via e-mail. PDF of e-mails are saved to the Fremont and Winema Resource Advisory Committee BOX folder.

Avery Kool, Resource Advisory Committee Coordinator