

2015 Current Fiscal Year Report: Medford District Resource Advisory Committee

Report Run Date: 02/04/2023 08:26:17 AM

1. Department or Agency

Department of the Interior

2. Fiscal Year

2015

3. Committee or Subcommittee

Medford District Resource Advisory Committee

3b. GSA

Committee No.

12156

4. Is this New During Fiscal Year?

No

5. Current Charter

08/07/2012

6. Expected Renewal Date

7. Expected Term Date

8a. Was Terminated During Fiscal Year?

Yes

8b. Specific Termination Authority

Public Law 112-141

8c. Actual Term Date

08/07/2014

9. Agency Recommendation for Next Fiscal Year

Terminate

10a. Legislation Req to Terminate?

Yes

10b. Legislation Pending?

Enacted

11. Establishment Authority

Statutory (Congress Created)

12. Specific Establishment Authority

The Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (Public Law 106-393)

13. Effective Date

10/06/2000

14. Committee Type

Continuing

14c. Presidential?

No

15. Description of Committee

Non Scientific Program Advisory Board

16a. Total Number of Reports

No Reports for this Fiscal Year

17a. Open

0

17b. Closed

0

17c. Partially Closed

0

Other Activities

0

17d. Total

0

Meetings and Dates

No Meetings

	Current	Next
	FY	FY
18a(1). Personnel Pmts to Non-Federal Members	\$0.00	\$0.00
18a(2). Personnel Pmts to Federal Members	\$0.00	\$0.00
18a(3). Personnel Pmts to Federal Staff	\$0.00	\$0.00
18a(4). Personnel Pmts to Non-Member Consultants	\$0.00	\$0.00
18b(1). Travel and Per Diem to Non-Federal Members	\$0.00	\$0.00
18b(2). Travel and Per Diem to Federal Members	\$0.00	\$0.00
18b(3). Travel and Per Diem to Federal Staff	\$0.00	\$0.00
18b(4). Travel and Per Diem to Non-member Consultants	\$0.00	\$0.00
18c. Other(rents,user charges, graphics, printing, mail, etc.)	\$0.00	\$0.00
18d. Total	\$0.00	\$0.00
19. Federal Staff Support Years (FTE)	0.00	0.00

20a. How does the Committee accomplish its purpose?

The BLM Medford District requests project proposals from the community, businesses, civic groups, and local government entities that can be funded with Title II monies. The RAC evaluates and prioritizes the proposals based on funds available, highest community priorities, resource health needs, and local economic benefit.

20b. How does the Committee balance its membership?

The Medford Resource Advisory Committee is

composed of 15 members distributed in a balanced fashion among the following groups and within those groups: commercial, conservation, and civic interests. Representation comes from organized labor, off-highway vehicle interests, energy and minerals interests, the commercial timber industry, regional environmental organizations, historical interests, local elected officials, local tribal representatives, dispersed recreation interests, and the affected public-at-large.

20c. How frequent and relevant are the Committee Meetings?

When authorized, the RAC meets approximately one-to-four times annually each fiscal year to receive and review proposals and build a consensus priority list of projects. Meetings are focused entirely on meeting the mandate of the Secure Rural Schools Act.

20d. Why can't the advice or information this committee provides be obtained elsewhere?

The Committee has specific statutory duties to accomplish, but also provides an avenue for building consensus in the community on natural resource issues. They consider projects in light of resource health, community infrastructure, and long-term economic stability. Selected projects typically have multiple benefits and strong backing with funds or in-kind support.

20e. Why is it necessary to close and/or partially closed committee meetings?

All meetings are open to the public. Notices of the meetings are published in the Federal Register, posted on the BLM Oregon website, and distributed to local newspapers.

21. Remarks

The Department of the Interior replaced the five current, single-issue Secure Rural School RACs in western Oregon with three new, all-encompassing RACs with the authority to handle all of these advisory tasks and responsibilities to include Secure Rural Schools recommendations when legislation is in effect, satisfy regulatory requirements and review recreation fee proposals. The new RACS (Coastal, Northwest, and Southwest Oregon) were established on July 29, 2015.

Designated Federal Officer

Dayne Barron BLM Medford District Manager

Narrative Description

The Department of the Interior replaced the five current, single-issue Secure Rural School RACs in western Oregon with three new, all-encompassing RACs with the authority to handle all of these advisory tasks and responsibilities to include Secure Rural Schools recommendations when legislation is in effect, satisfy regulatory requirements and review recreation fee proposals. The new RACS (Coastal, Northwest, and Southwest Oregon) were established on July 29, 2015. The BLM's Medford District Resource Advisory Committee recommends projects that help the BLM restore at-risk resources, protect natural and cultural heritage resources, provide environmentally-responsible recreation opportunities, and protect public safety and property.

What are the most significant program outcomes associated with this committee?

Checked if
Applies

Improvements to health or safety



Trust in government



Major policy changes



- Advance in scientific research
- Effective grant making
- Improved service delivery
- Increased customer satisfaction
- Implementation of laws or regulatory requirements
- Other

Outcome Comments

Citizens submit projects and participate directly, or through their representatives, in prioritizing the funding choices. This collaborative stewardship has improved resource health, generated youth employment, and fostered strong working relationships between the agency and the community.

What are the cost savings associated with this committee?

Checked if Applies

- None
- Unable to Determine
- Under \$100,000
- \$100,000 - \$500,000
- \$500,001 - \$1,000,000
- \$1,000,001 - \$5,000,000
- \$5,000,001 - \$10,000,000
- Over \$10,000,000
- Cost Savings Other

Cost Savings Comments

An in-depth analysis has not been done to determine cost savings associated with the Medford District RAC. However, the contributions of the RAC are of great benefit to the BLM.

What is the approximate Number of recommendations produced by this committee for the life of the committee?

16

Number of Recommendations Comments

A prioritized list of projects is recommended for funding under Title II of the reauthorized Secure Rural Schools Act. In FY 2014, the RAC made one recommendation which

included their recommended projects.

What is the approximate Percentage of these recommendations that have been or will be Fully implemented by the agency?

100%

% of Recommendations Fully Implemented Comments

Projects are selected based on their feasibility, community support, partnership funding, resource benefit, and other criteria. They are implemented as soon as possible.

What is the approximate Percentage of these recommendations that have been or will be Partially implemented by the agency?

0%

% of Recommendations Partially Implemented Comments

Funding priorities are agreed upon by consensus. They have been implemented as approved. All recommended projects are expected to be implemented.

Does the agency provide the committee with feedback regarding actions taken to implement recommendations or advice offered?

Yes No Not Applicable

Agency Feedback Comments

The BLM presents a status report of previously approved projects, often depicting the work that has already been accomplished. The District implements the projects through partnership or contract work. Information is then conveyed to the public on the BLM website.

What other actions has the agency taken as a result of the committee's advice or recommendation?

Checked if Applies

Reorganized Priorities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Reallocated resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Issued new regulation	<input type="checkbox"/>
Proposed legislation	<input type="checkbox"/>
Approved grants or other payments	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>

Action Comments

N/A

Is the Committee engaged in the review of applications for grants?

No

Grant Review Comments

N/A

How is access provided to the information for the Committee's documentation?

Checked if Applies

- | | |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Contact DFO | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Online Agency Web Site | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Online Committee Web Site | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Online GSA FACA Web Site | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Publications | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Other | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Access Comments

The BLM uses many communication tools to convey the RAC's mission and assure transparency in their efforts. All records of RAC meetings are archived in accordance with established BLM recordkeeping procedures.