

**CANYONS OF THE ANCIENTS NATIONAL MONUMENT**  
**Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes**  
**May 19, 2004**

**Advisory Committee Attendees:**

Bob Clayton   Chris Majors   Mark Varien   Duane Gerren  
Bud Poe   Chuck McAfee   Kelly Wilson   Selwyn Whiteskunk (arrived at 12:45pm)  
Liz Tozer   Chris Majors   Bill Lipe

**Bureau of Land Management Attendees:**

LouAnn Jacobson, Monument Manager  
  
Steve Kandell, Monument Land Use Planner  
  
Victoria Atkins, Anasazi Heritage Center Interpretive Specialist  
  
Laura Kochanski, Monument Archaeologist

**Public Attendees:**

Dewayne Findley, Amber Clark, Gala Pock, Tony Schetzslle, Dani Gregory, Nate Thompson, Ruth Lambert, Carl Knight, Walt Heikes, Miscelle Allison, Corky Hays

**Agenda**

9:00am - 9:10am	Greetings and Introductions
9:10am - 9:20am	Approval of Minutes from the April 13 <sup>th</sup> Meeting
9:20am - 9:30am	Planning and Monument Manager Update
9:30am – 10:00am	Discussion on all Alternatives Development Recommendations
10:00am - 10:10am	Break
10:10am - 11:10am	Discussion on all Alternatives Development Recommendations
11:10am - 11:30pm	Public Comment
11:30am – 12:00pm	Vote on all Alternatives Development Recommendations
12:00pm – 1:00pm	Lunch at Anasazi Heritage Center
1:00pm - 2:00pm	Vision Statement Development

2:00pm – 2:30pm	Discussion on Future Field Trip Opportunities, Discussion Topics and Guest Speakers
2:30pm - 3:00pm	Public Comment
3:00pm - 3:15pm	Next Agenda

**Note, the remainder of these minutes describes the discussion associated with each agenda topic.**

### **Greetings and Introductions**

Kelly Wilson welcomed all participants. He addressed the Committee and stated that we had a quorum (i.e., at least seven members present). Kelly asked everyone (i.e., Committee members and the public) to introduce themselves.

### **Approval of Minutes from the March 9th Meeting**

Kelly Wilson asked the Committee if there were any requested changes to the minutes from the April 13, 2004 meeting. No changes to the minutes were identified. Bud Poe made a motion to approve the minutes. Liz Tozer seconded the motion. The motion carried.

### **Planning and Monument Manager Update**

LouAnn Jacobson provided a brief update by identifying some of the key points from the May 18, 2004 Bureau of Land Management/Forest Service Leadership (BLM/FS) Team Meeting. Key points from the meeting included 13,500 acres of fuels reduction treatments have been completed. This was only 50 percent of the targeted amount of fuels the BLM/FS wanted to reduce. Second, a categorical exclusion was recently signed allowing for 740 acres of public land adjacent to the Indian Camp Ranch subdivision to be treated for fuels reduction. This area has about 80 cultural sites, which will be mitigated for as part of the treatment. Third, about 600 pinyon pine seedlings were planted at the Anasazi Heritage Center (AHC) by the Service Learning Project in Dolores, Colorado. Last, spraying of herbicides for the Ips Beetle continues at the AHC, Sand Canyon Pueblo and Lowry Pueblo. Fourth, a Historic American Building Survey is currently in progress at Cannonball Pueblo. Later this year backfilling will occur at this site. Last, the BLM has a national steering committee focusing on the 2006 centennial celebration for the Antiquities Act.

Steve Kandell provided a planning update by first stating that internal, alternatives development workshops are scheduled in May and June. These workshops will serve to develop the initial range of alternatives for the Plan. As part of these workshops, the alternatives recommendations developed by the Committee will be incorporated. Steve noted that when the range of alternatives is presented to the Committee, he will account for how the Committee's recommendations were addressed. Steve then reminded the Committee that this meeting was the last opportunity for edits to be made to the alternatives recommendations.

### **Discussion on all Alternatives Development Recommendations**

Bud Poe emphasized the need to promote education within each set of alternatives recommendations. Bud noted that a separate alternatives recommendations document could be

useful that summarizes all of the education goals, objectives and management actions identified in the individual recommendation write-ups. Victoria Atkins noted that she is responsible for the education component of the Plan and that she has already gone through all the individual recommendations and pulled out all the items dealing with education. Bill Lipe agreed that education should be an integral part of the Monument Plan and not just an after thought. Chris Majors noted that part of the educational message to visitors should be that multiple-use activities are part of the landscape (e.g., fluid mineral development, livestock grazing). LouAnn Jacobson responded that the existing Monument brochure has a section on “what to expect” when visiting the Monument. Steve Kandell reminded the Committee that the Fluid Minerals recommendations have an action item to educate visitors on multiple-use activities within the Monument. Bill Lipe noted that the cultural resources and scenery attract visitors to the Monument, which provides a great opportunity to educate them about other resources (e.g., biology) and the role multiple-use activities have had on development in the western states. Duane Gerren suggested that part of the multiple-use educational message should be the financial relationship between the fluid mineral industry and Dolores and Montezuma Counties.

Kelly Wilson then asked Steve Kandell to provide a brief overview of the Monument Proclamation and interim guidance. Key points that Steve shared with the Committee from the Proclamation include 1) first and foremost the objects identified within the Proclamation must be protected (i.e., cultural, geological and biological resources); 2) Federal lands within the boundary of the Monument are withdrawn from all forms of entry, location, selection, sale or other disposition; 3) fluid mineral exploration and extraction activities can continue, subject to valid existing rights as long as these activities don’t interfere with the proper care and management of the objects; 4) new fluid mineral leasing can only occur to protect against drainage and/or promoting conservation of oil and gas resources; 5) the State of Colorado maintains their jurisdiction to manage fish and wildlife; 6) no new water rights are reserved as part of the Monument designation; 7) laws, regulations, and policies followed by the BLM in issuing and administering grazing permits or leases on public lands under its jurisdiction shall continue to apply; and 8) management of Hovenweep National Monument is not affected by the Proclamation.

Steve then quickly addressed the Monument’ interim guidance by stating that the overriding theme of the interim guidance is that current management can continue as long as it doesn’t impact the objects identified within the Proclamation. Bill Lipe commented that how this language is interpreted is very important. Steve Kandell agreed, stating that “protecting objects” is a very subjective term. Bill Lipe noted that the authority to designate that Monument came from the Antiquities Act. More specifically, Section 2 of the Act authorizes executive power to designate historic landmarks, historic and prehistoric structures, and objects of historic or scientific interest as national monuments. Also, the Act supports academic study of the objects located on public lands.

## **Break**

Kelly Wilson called for a break.

## **Discussion on all Alternatives Development Recommendations**

Steve Kandell suggested that the Committee may want to develop an over arching objective statement. Throughout all of the individual recommendations developed by the Committee there are several common themes (e.g., education, interpretation, not damaging resources). Steve then shared with the Committee an example objective. Chris Majors suggested adding a statement to minimize or eliminate impacts on the local economy and culture when developing management actions. Bill Lipe suggested adding ecological and paleontology to the resources listed. Bob Clayton suggested that the “local economy and culture” statement should be captured as a separate bullet. Mark Varien agreed with Bob. Steve Kandell asked if the Committee wanted to pursue developing this over arching objective statement. The Committee responded yes. The draft objective statement, including edits, reads as follows:

Overall objective for geology, archaeology, historic, paleontology, biological (soils, vegetation, fish and wildlife), ecological, water, air and multiple-uses (e.g., livestock grazing, fluid mineral exploration and development, recreation) would be to:

- manage uses to prevent damage to resources listed above;
- increase public education and appreciation of such resources through interpretation;
- facilitate appropriate research to improve understanding of such resources and to improve methods of protecting these resources;
- manage uses considering the affects on local economy and culture; and
- manage uses and resources applying the principles of community-based stewardship.

The Committee then turned to reviewing the individual alternative recommendations. Starting with the fluid minerals write-up, Bob Clayton suggested replacing the term “issues” in management action 1-3 with “precautions”. Also under management action 2-5, Bob suggested replacing the term “elimination” of hazards to wildlife with “mitigate”. The Committee agreed to these changes. Bud Poe noted that in the goal statement the term “objects” is used instead of “resources”. Bud felt that either the term “objects” or “resources” needs to be used consistently throughout all the write-ups.

Steve Kandell noted that a member of public had commented that an action to “require an archaeologist to follow vibroseis buggies in the field to monitor impacts to cultural resources,” should be added. Bob Clayton asked if this stipulation wouldn’t already be added as part of the permitting process. LouAnn Jacobson responded it would likely become a “condition of approval;” however, if it was added to the Plan it would be a requirement and not just an option. The Committee agreed to add the action to the write-up.

Referring to management action 2.5, Bill Lipe suggested changing “use of archaeological surveys” to “conducting archaeological surveys in compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act”. Bill then suggested adding the word “by” to the end of the last two BMP statements. Bill Lipe and Mark Varien then suggested changing the statement “location of roads and wells pads” to read “appropriate location of roads and well pads”. The Committee agreed with all of these changes.

The Committee then began reviewing the recreation write-up. Referring to objective four, Bill Lipe asked if there was an opportunity to educate the public through outfitters and guides. Steve Kandell responded that in other BLM planning efforts there have been requirements for outfitters and guides to educate their clients about resources. The Committee agreed to add 4.1.f which reads “Educate commercial outfitters and guides on research and education activities in the Monument and resource stewardship opportunities through an annual workshop and other appropriate mediums (e.g., letters, permit stipulations)”. Chris Majors added that the education should not be limited to just resources, but should also include multiple-uses.

Duane Gerren suggested removing the term “existing” from 4.1.e. The Committee agreed to this change. Liz Tozer questioned how new permits are issued in the Monument. LouAnn Jacobson responded that currently there is a moratorium on issuing new permits. Once the Plan is completed and the moratorium is lifted, there is the potential for new permits to be issued.

Chris Majors noted that the terms frontcountry, passage, outback and primitive are still used on page one of the recreation recommendations. He asked that they be removed, as was agreed upon during the initial review of this section. The Committee agreed to remove all mention of these terms.

The Committee then reviewed the cultural resources recommendations. Mark Varien questioned whether an exact group size should be specified under management action 4-3-c. Mark suggested removing the group size of 15 and replacing it with more general criteria. Steve Kandell suggested changing 4-3-c to read “Limit the size of archaeologically-oriented groups to ensure the resources (e.g., archaeology) in the area(s) they are visiting are not impaired.” The Committee agreed with the suggested change.

Chuck McAfee noted that in several management actions (i.e., 4-3, 4-3-b, 4-3-d, 4-3-e, 4-3-f) the term “backcountry” is still being used. To be consistent with the recreation write-up the use of this term should be deleted. The Committee agreed to this suggestion. Bud Poe questioned if Objective Six was redundant to recommendations in other sections. Chuck McAfee felt that stating this objective twice wasn’t a problem. The Committee agreed to leave the objective and to rely on the Monument Planning Team to resolve any redundant recommendations in the write-ups.

### **Public Comment**

Ruth Lambert, of the San Juan Mountain Association, offered to provide the Committee with an overview of the cultural site stewardship program in the field. She also stated she could provide the Committee with a short write-up explaining the stewardship program.

Miscelle Allison questioned who the Committee was referring to in 1-1-e of the cultural recommendations as “others.” Bill Lipe responded that “others” referred to Anglo cultural heritage. Bill noted that management action 5-3 in this write-up focused more heavily on Anglo cultural heritage. Miscelle then pointed out several management actions (e.g., 2-3-i, 2-4-d) that used the term “groups.” Miscelle noted that Native Americans should not be referred to as “groups,” but as sovereign nations. Bill Lipe noted that the term “groups” was being used to include several other entities and not just Native Americans. Referring to several other

management actions (e.g., 5-1-a, 5-1-b), Miscelle asked how the BLM can guarantee that sacred sites are not interfered with by visitors. Miscelle further stated that she wanted to go on record that these management actions are in violation of the Law of Nations.

Amber Clark of the San Juan Citizens Alliance thanked the Committee members for participating in her public meetings over the last several months.

Carl Knight of the Ute Mountain Ute Tribe stated that two executive orders are not being complied with during this planning process. Carl noted that one of those executive orders requires BLM to work with the tribe early and often in the planning process. Carl noted that this executive order is identified in the Monument Pre-Plan; however, it is not being complied with. Miscelle Allison stated that several of the Committee members do not have a cultural understanding of the Ute Mountain Utes. LouAnn Jacobson responded that the BLM has worked very hard to involve Native Americans in the planning process and the day to day work of the Monument and Anasazi Heritage Center. LouAnn asked Carl Knight to get her on the Ute Mountain Ute Council's agenda to speak about the planning process and other topics. Carl responded that LouAnn must write a letter to the council requesting to be on the agenda. LouAnn agreed to write a letter to the tribal council. Kelly Wilson reminded Carl that the Ute Mountain Ute Tribe has a position on the Committee.

Duane Gerren requested that the demonstration of the cultural site steward program be included into a future field trip.

### **Discussion on all Alternatives Development Recommendations (continued)**

The Committee continued their review of the recommendations with private lands. Chris Majors questioned whether Objective Four was relevant to private land ownership. Steve Kandell noted that the objective is attempting to identify an opportunity for "stewardship" between the Monument and private landowners. Chris further noted that management action 4.2.6 makes him fearful that these recommendations are being imposed on private land owners. LouAnn Jacobson suggested that to address this concern Objective Four should use the term "willing landowners." Also referring to Objective Four, Chris Majors suggested deleting the phrase "and on their private land." The Committee agreed to this edit.

The Committee then began their review of the transportation recommendations. Chris Majors suggested that the exact number of access points identified in the fourth goal should be removed. Instead, the phrase "an appropriate number of access points" should be added.

Bill Lipe questioned if the Committee had adequately addressed the proliferation of user made routes from cross country travel. Chris Majors stated he was in strong support of taking action to curtail the expansion of user made trails. Kelly Wilson noted that goal seven identifies a stewardship approach for developing a transportation system as part of the planning process. Chris Majors noted that the Committee should still make a statement that specifically addresses the problem of cross country travel. LouAnn Jacobson suggested that adding a goal statement would be a good start in addressing this issue.

The Committee made several suggestions to be included in a new goal statement to address cross country travel. These include 1) increasing law enforcement in high cross country travel areas; 2) distributing educational materials (e.g., maps); 3) install additional signage; 4) encourage stewardship; and 5) providing the public with a number to call to report cross country travel. Steve Kandell agreed to take these ideas and develop a new goal statement with them. Under Objective One of the grazing recommendations, Bill Lipe suggested removing the phrase “will be formed.” Bud Poe questioned whether the use of the term “protect” in the goal statement was appropriate. Chris Majors stated that if the supporting objectives are followed, then grazing should be protected. Bill Lipe suggested using the phrase “provide for the continuation of grazing” instead of “protect grazing.” The Committee agreed to this change.

Referring to the second bullet under Objective Five, Bud Poe questioned what the term “outcome neutral” referred to. Chris Majors responded that it meant monitoring should be easily understood by all parties and that an accurate portrayal of the on-the-ground situation is provided. Steve Kandell suggested changing the management action to read “The monitoring system should be devised to be objective and easily understood and applied by all interested parties.” The Committee agreed with the edit.

Bill Lipe noted that the other recommendations have language about minimizing impacts to cultural resources and wildlife, but grazing does not. He questioned if similar language from these other sections should be incorporated into the grazing write-up. Steve Kandell noted that mitigation language for all uses will be incorporated into the draft alternatives developed by BLM. Furthermore, the Committee will have an opportunity to review and comment on them. The Committee agreed to wait until the review of the draft alternatives to possibly add mitigation language to grazing.

### **Vote on all Alternatives Development Recommendations**

Kelly Wilson asked if the Committee needed to take another vote on the revised alternatives recommendations. Chris Majors responded that some changes had been made to the recommendations and therefore, another vote should be taken.

Chris Majors moved to accept the revised alternatives recommendations. Bill Lipe seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Chuck McAfee asked if the Committee could get copies of the revised recommendations. Steve Kandell said he would make copies available to them. Kelly Wilson asked how the recommendations would be used next. Steve Kandell noted that the recommendations would be used by the planning team in the development of the draft, range of alternatives. Steve also stated that once the draft alternatives are developed, and ready for the Committee’s review, that he would update them on how each recommendation was used or not used.

LouAnn Jacobson stated that she would like to start getting the Committee into the field. She suggested that the Committee members provide Steve Kandell with ideas of places to visit. Steve Kandell noted that there wasn’t a Committee meeting planned for June, but that one should be scheduled for July and August. The Committee agreed to hold a meeting on July 6<sup>th</sup>, August 10<sup>th</sup> and September 14<sup>th</sup>.

## **Vision Statement Development**

Steve Kandell reminded the Committee that at the previous meeting they had expressed an interest in developing a vision statement for the Monument. Steve provided the Committee with examples of two other vision statements from other BLM planning efforts. Chris Majors stated that the items the Committee had identified on the flip chart earlier in the meeting would be a good starting point for a vision statement. Mark Varien suggested using the ideas from the flip chart and drafting a short vision statement for the Committee's review. Chuck McAfee questioned if the reference to cultural resources on the flip referred to both prehistoric and historic. Bill Lipe responded that the term cultural resources includes both of these time periods. Steve Kandell agreed to draft a vision statement for discussion at the next Committee meeting.

## **Discussion on Future Field Trip Opportunities, Discussion Topics and Guest Speakers**

The Committee identified potential field trip locations. Mark Varien suggested that cultural resources and the site stewardship discussion be combined. Chris Majors wanted to visit a broad spectrum of less used areas in the Monument (e.g., Cannonball Mesa). Bill Lipe suggested viewing the excavations at Porter.

## **Public Comment**

Tony Schetzle of the National Park Service stated that he was meeting with a congressional delegation next week and is planning to pass along the information he learned today. Some of the items he heard at the meeting today include 1) concern about education of users and protection of resources; 2) strong sense of place and connection to human history; and 3) opportunity for cooperation between Hovenweep National Monument and Canyons of the Ancients. Tony then introduced the new superintendent of Hovenweep National Monument, Corky Hays. Bud Poe asked Corky where she would be headquartered out of. Corky responded it would be either Monticello or Moab, Utah.

Dani Gregory stated that if the Committee would like to visit areas of the Monument via mountain bikes, she would be happy to organize the trip.

Walt Heikes distributed a letter to the Committee concerning an archaeological site adjacent to the Monument. Mr. Heikes noted that at the Western Heritage Festival, the Ute Mountain Ute Tribe will be touring sun calendar sites. He suggested that the Committee may be interested in touring these sites.

Dewayne Findley, Montezuma County Commissioner stated that he would like to see Kelly Wilson continue in his present Committee duties after he is no longer a county commissioner. Dewayne asked if this was possible. LouAnn Jacobson responded that it's up to the Montezuma County Commissioners. Steve Kandell clarified that Kelly's position doesn't have to be held by a county commissioner, but only has to be appointed by the Montezuma County Commissioners.

## **Next Agenda**

Chris Majors stated that he wanted to develop a grazing subcommittee in the near future. This subcommittee would be an informal means of resolving problems and increasing communication

on grazing issues. Chris stated that he wanted to get the Committee's approval to move forward with developing this subcommittee. LouAnn Jacobson stated that the subcommittee would be made up of grazing permittees, Chris Majors and an additional member of the Committee. Bud Poe commented that he wanted to know more about the ground rules for subcommittees. LouAnn Jacobson stated that Steve Kandell would draft up a purpose statement for the subcommittee and lay out the policy governing them. LouAnn also asked Chris Majors to draft up a list of potential subcommittee members for the next meeting. Mark Varien commented that it would be important for the subcommittee to build a working relationship with Mike Jensen, BLM range specialist. The Committee agreed to wait until the next meeting to further discuss approving the subcommittee.

Chris Majors commented that he is glad he had the opportunity to serve on the Committee and feels good about the work they have completed to date.

Steve Kandell informed the Committee members that he has copies of a document entitled "Politically Motivated, Technically Flawed, A Review of the BLM Wilderness Re-inventory in the State of Utah." Mr. Phil Weiser had provided copies of this document to Steve Kandell to offer to the Committee.

Kelly Wilson asked the Committee if they had any other items to discuss. The Committee responded no.

**Meeting was adjourned**