

May 15, 2017 Recreation Project Advisory Council Meeting

Present: Brad Shoemaker, John Moorhouse, Gary Connelley, Ken Olsen, Ted Lovec, Jim Ronquillo, Chuck Aragon (Chuck Aragon sat in for Kathy Aragon until she arrived around 7:30 PM)

NRDP Staff: Alicia Stickney, Doug Martin
Public: Fourteen members of the public attended.

First meeting. Alicia Stickney began the meeting.

Introductions: Committee members were asked to briefly state their interest in serving on the committee

Brad: Avid fisherman

John: Yellowstone CD Council, property owner, river user

Gary: River user – all types

Ken Olsen: Former Laurel mayor, lifetime river user

Ted: Avid outdoorsman/recreationalist

Jim: Local park user

Chuck A.: Health and wellness advocate, loves river and recreational opportunities

NRDP gave a presentation on the oil spill, natural resource damage assessment, and the restoration plan.

Chuck: How was the amount determined?

Response: In negotiations with ExxonMobil.

Ted: How much was spent on cleanup?

Response: Jim – \$144 million

John M.: List of project examples

Brad: Other pots, how are these funds being spent?

Response: Funds for other resources will be spent according to recommendations of resource managers and others.

Ken: Will we be receiving meeting minutes?

Response: Yes.

John: Public asked if minutes will be available.

Response: What level of minutes does the Council want? Motion/votes/questions.

Ken: Wants motions/votes, etc.

John: Some.

Chuck: Can't vote in absentee?

Response: No proxies, but can vote via phone.

Gary: Will there be audio minutes?

Response: if the committee decides that is necessary it is an option. Will be used for important votes.

Restoration Plan Criteria/Restoration Plan Development

Chuck: Question on use of money for engineering/development etc. This can use a lot of money? Is any other funding available?

Response: Yes, development can use a lot of money. Money allocated is what is available.

Ken: Presentations

John: Could the committee consider a multi-stage application process rather than one full proposal?

Response: Yes

Ted: To what extent is the application completed, do we have to write one?

Response: We have drafts of two types, a planning grant and a full application

Alicia also proposes a planning grant process that could be used.

Gary: What was the UCFRB process? Asked if they could use similar process that has already been developed and used.

Response: The UCFRB grant process was explained, the pros and cons of longer and shorter applications.

Chuck: Likes John's multi-stage approach.

Gary: What about planning grants?

Response: Result in more work by the Council. Alicia recommends a limit on "planning" amount – 10%.

John: Suggested a screening process – planning grant – a one page abstract may work.

Ken: Haven't some projects already been submitted?

Response: Yes. Darrell's at Dover Island is the only one really developed.

Ken: An executive summary might help screen projects.

Kathy Aragon joins the group after a break.

Alicia: Proposal in the restoration plan lets the Council set aside \$300,000 for fishing access sites.

Kathy: Ten percent for planning?

Response: Ten percent to planning grants so the money goes to the projects.

Kathy: Were projects submitted that had plans?

Response: Yes, Dover Park and possibly the City of Billings.

Jim: If we set aside \$400,000 for FWP, will FWP tell the committee where it will be used?

Response: It could work that way, but since fishing access site development takes time to find a location, purchase property etc. FWP may not know while the Council exists.

Gary: Could FWP funding push projects over the top?

Response: for purchases, appraised value only.

Ken: Why allocation to FWP?

Response: NRDP recommends set aside for fishing access.

Gary: Any reason why FWP set aside needed more than the other projects?

Response: Access to the river was the most common comment on the restoration plan.

Chairman Proposal:

Ted motioned for Brad to be the Chairman and Kathy seconded. There was no public comment. John modified the motion for the Chairman position to last for one year. Jim seconded. There was no public comment on the modification. The motion carried unanimously.

Jim voted in as the Vice Chairman. Ken made the motion and Kathy seconded. There was no public comment and the motion carried unanimously.

Ken: More comfortable if the next meeting had the application process on the agenda.

John: Wise to wait to look at the forms and discuss.

Ted: Would like this process done by end of summer next year.

Alicia will put together ideas for applications, dollar amounts, timelines for projects, schedules, etc.

Adjourn