

CANYONS OF THE ANCIENTS NATIONAL MONUMENT

Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes

Date: November, 14, 2003

Location: Anasazi Heritage Center

Time: 9:00 – 3:30

Advisory Committee Attendees:

Bob Clayton Chris Majors Liz Tozer

Chuck McAfee Mark Varien Kelly Wilson

Bill Lipe Bud Poe

Bureau of Land Management Attendees:

LouAnn Jacobson, Monument Manager

Steve Kandell, Monument Land Use Planner

Tamara Sadoo, BLM National Landscape Conservation Service Office

Jones & Stokes Attendees:

Steve Daus

Jennifer Zakrowski

Public Attendees:

Gala Pock, Monument adjacent private landowner

Nate Thompson, Cortez Journal Reporter

Walt Heikes

Derek Wagner, Senator Wayne Allard staff member

Katie Aggeler, Senator Ben Nighthorse Campbell staff member

Dave Allen

Agenda

9:00am - 9:10am Greetings and Introductions

9:10am - 9:20am Approval of Minutes from the October 21st Meeting

9:20am – 9:30am Planning Update

9:30am – 10:30am Review and Development of Planning Issues and Management Concerns

10:30am – 10:40am Break

10:40am – 12:00pm Prioritization of Planning Issues and Management Concerns

12:00pm – 1:00pm Lunch at Anasazi Heritage Center

- Overview of the Role and Function Alternatives Play in the Planning Process

- Review of Draft Work Plan for Addressing Issues and Management Concerns

1:00pm – 2:30pm Discussion on Planning Issue #1

2:30pm - 3:00pm Public Comment

3:00pm – 3:30pm Next Agenda

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

Greetings and Introductions

Kelly Wilson began the meeting with the “rules of voting”

- Thumbs up – yes,
- To the side – abstain, and
- Thumbs down – no.

Kelly Wilson welcomed all participants and asked them to introduce themselves. He then reviewed the meeting minutes from the October 21, 2003 meeting. Bud Poe requested the minutes be distributed before the meeting next time. Steve Daus indicated that the minutes stated Kelly Wilson was nominated for chairperson and Chuck McAfee for vice chairperson, but that they were not approved. Steve Daus suggested the minutes be changed to reflect that both Kelly and Chuck were nominated and then elected to their respective positions.

Planning Update

Steve Kandell provided an update on the planning process. Since the October 21, 2003 advisory committee meeting, BLM hosted a Cortez public scoping workshop attended by approximately 65 people. There was no vocal opposition to the planning process at workshop and the public interests represented were well balanced. The Durango public scoping workshop occurred the following night and the Denver public scoping workshop on October 29, 2003. Both the Durango and Denver workshops had fewer attendees, but were still productive meetings. The same day as Denver’s scoping workshop, Monument personnel met with the Colorado BLM State Office to update them on the planning process (e.g., schedule, planning issues).

On November 3-5, 2003 BLM hosted a Native American consultation workshop. Two members from each of the 25 culturally affiliated tribes were invited. Only a handful of tribal members attended. BLM will examine other opportunities to engage the tribes in the future. Bud Poe asked why more tribal members didn’t participate? LouAnn Jacobson responded that some had schedule conflicts. BLM received several responses from tribal members that they were planning to attend, but the actual numbers were significantly lower. LouAnn noted that BLM is very determined to follow-up with the tribes. The tribes represented at the consultation workshop include the Southern Ute, Hopi, and Ute Mountain Ute.

Chris Majors stated he is concerned that too much time and resources could be expended on getting tribal participation in the planning process. Bill Lipe noted the legal requirements

BLM must follow regarding Native American consultation. LouAnn Jacobson affirmed these requirements. Mark Varien asked if anyone was speaking to members of the public that are opposed to the Monument? Liz Tozer mentioned that she addressed a group of people at the Sale Barn in Cortez. Liz told the group that she was on the advisory committee and wanted to hear from anyone that had ideas, concerns or questions concerning the Monument planning process. Liz said she would continue speaking with the people who frequent the Sale Barn. Liz then asked what steps the committee could take to include more people in the planning process and to subsequently prevent opposition near the end of the planning process.

Chuck McAfee asked Kelly Wilson if the Montezuma Rangeland Stewardship Committee was still active? Kelly Wilson responded that the committee hasn't completely fallen apart, and that the Monument advisory committee could ask them to provide comments before the public scoping period ends on November 28, 2003. He continued to explain that the Montezuma County Commissioners formed the Rangeland Stewardship Committee to get the public involved in addressing grazing issues. Steve Kandell added that BLM hired a grazing sub-contractor to do more outreach work. In the near future, an outreach strategy will be developed to identify how the grazing sub-contractor can function within the planning process. Chris Majors will get Steve Kandell a list of individuals the sub-contractor should speak with. Steve Kandell continued to discuss the scoping process, its conclusion on November 28, 2003 and the development a scoping report.

Kelly Wilson asked how planning with the Utah BLM Monticello field office was coming? Steve Kandell noted that he sat down with them and discussed planning issues (e.g., allotments jurisdictional boundaries). BLM has invited them to attend internal planning meetings to discuss grazing and transportation. Hovenweep National Monument is also starting their planning effort. LouAnn Jacobson stated that the San Juan Public Land Center now has its own planning process that will include the San Juan National Forest and all BLM land outside of Monument.

Steve Kandell provided an update on the Economic Profile System workshop held on November 13, 2003. He noted that a good dialogue on socioeconomic issues was started at the workshop. Last, Steve noted that BLM has started to develop a reasonable foreseeable development scenario for oil and gas resources. This study will predict the level and type of oil and gas development that will occur on the Monument over the next 20 years.

Review and Development of Planning Issues and Management Concerns

Steve Daus introduced himself and began providing an overview of the planning process. He explained that a goal of the meeting is to identify six to eight major issues to discuss over the next few months. There are two types of issues: resource use issues and planning process issues. An issue is something BLM can address. He continued to describe the difference between positions and interests.

Prioritization of Planning Issues and Management Concerns

Kelly Wilson informed the Committee that he feels all the issues listed on the Proclamation should be identified as core planning issues. Mark Varien added that the Committee needs to develop a work plan and asked what role the Committee has in the public scoping process? Steve Kandell informed the Committee that the scoping report would not be generated until

after February, but that the Committee should be able to get a laundry list of comments and developed issues prior to it being released to the public. Chris Majors suggested they start with the issues they know and then discuss other issues as they are developed. He is concerned that they'll be too far behind if the Committee waits until the scoping report is completed, and that they already know what the general issues are.

The Committee went around the table and each Committee member identified one core issue they thought should be discussed over the next few months.

Issues:

Liz Tozer: How will transportation management be addressed? (Added by Steve Daus) What is an existing road? What is access?

Kelly Wilson: How will adequate infrastructure be developed, including a transportation system, water developments, search and rescue, law enforcement, etc. Steve Daus asked how do we develop management actions to address these issues?

Bill Lipe: Archaeology: How will research associated with the Monument be managed? How will education in the Monument be addressed?

Mark Varien: How will cultural values in the Monument be protected?

Chuck McAcfee: How will uses be allocated within the Monument? Chuck noted that the use of management zones should be considered as a tool in managing visitors to the Monument.

Bud Poe: How will public uses be managed?

Liz Tozer: Her issues were covered under "How will public uses be managed" (e.g., horses, OHV).

Chris Majors: How will viable grazing activities be maintained? Chris noted that Monument designation may make WSA restrictions unnecessary. Feels there is redundancy. How will the restrictive aspects of the WSAs be managed in the Plan? How to resolve conflicts between WSAs and grazing leases? He continued to ask if BLM could look at removing the WSAs. Steve Kandell noted that it takes an act of Congress, but BLM could make recommendations in the plan concerning WSAs.

Bob Clayton: How will valid existing rights for oil and gas (including CO2) be managed?

Dave Allen: How are existing and future commercial interests in and around the Monument addressed? What inter-governmental agreements would be required to implement the Monument Plan (e.g., fire agreements, search and rescue agreements).

Bill Lipe noted he'd like to clarify that research is not limited to archaeology, but includes all the sciences (e.g., paleontology, ecology) Bill also wanted to add to his issue "How will scientific and historic values be protected?"

Chris Majors added how would impacts of Monument management affect private land in-holders and edge holders? He was also concerned with documenting more of the historical ranching and farming aspects in the Monument.

Kelly Wilson asked additional spectators to introduce themselves. **Katie Aggeler and Derek Wagner** introduced themselves.

Steve Daus passed out Internal Scoping Issues developed by agency personnel and advisory committee members and discussed possible additions to the list. He clarified that the public needs to understand how we arrived at our decisions.

Kelly Wilson asked if the committee had any questions and then requested a break for lunch.

Bill Lipe presented maps he brought explaining an ongoing research project headed up by the National Science Foundation. In brief, soils, hydrology, and weather data are being used to predict how people used the area in and around the Monument in the past.

Overview of the Role and Function Alternatives Play in the Planning Process

Steve Daus explained to the committee the role and function of alternatives in the planning process, and how they are developed. He continued to explain that the range of proposed actions would become our alternatives. The issues are the planning framework. Under the umbrella – we have standards and guidelines – developing desired conditions, goals and objectives.

Alternatives are composed of land use allocation and management actions. A land use allocation is a name and an associated area that includes a list of management actions with permitted and excluded uses. Then what we need to do as a management agency is to make sure those decisions can be implemented on the ground. So we develop columns of alternatives with resources across in rows. (e.g., hunting, grazing, wildlife species). The full range of alternatives would be across the resource row with a different use under each alternative.

Impacts look at context and intensity. Context set up by acreage. Amount of acreage helps determine significance. Intensity looks at direct impacts to a particular resource. Then we decide which alternative we are going to choose to implement. There are also alternatives considered but not analyzed in detail. Things brought to our attention but that are not within our decision space. Steve Daus continued to address the Committee, and explained that they need to develop issues and then come up with management actions to address those issues.

Kelly Wilson interjected that he was concerned about cost-benefit analysis. Steve Kandell assured him that BLM would have a socioeconomic impact analysis before they choose an alternative. Steve Daus added that it isn't a resource with an allocation, it is more along the lines of how other management actions would impact socioeconomics. Bud Poe noted that it doesn't seem that socio & economics should be put together. Impacts could be cultural rather than monetary.

Steve Kandell referenced planning issues identified during the Grand Staircase Escalante National Monument planning process and alternative strategies they developed to address them. Steve Kandell asked the Committee what level of detail they want to be involved in the development of planning alternatives? Should the Committee give general recommendations and then have BLM consider them while developing specific alternatives, or do they want to provide more detailed recommendations (e.g., land allocations)? LouAnn Jacobson continued to add that it is the Committee's choice to determine their level of involvement. They can develop specific land allocations or can provide more general criteria and/or standards for BLM to use in developing alternatives.

Steve Kandell continued to explain that the purpose of today's meeting was to come up with six or seven core issues. LouAnn Jacobson suggested only five or six core issues, leaving room for an additional hot topic if one should develop. She felt the subjects of grazing and recreation were major issues.

Kelly Wilson informed the committee members that this would be the list:

Key Words - Grazing
Transportation and Access
Infrastructure (e.g., facilities, water development)
Recreational activities
Oil and Gas
Private Property
Cultural and Historic Resources

Committee members voiced concern with economic issues and debated if it should be its own subject line, or should it be looked at under each individual resource? Committee members also debated if community involvement should be its own subject line, or covered under all of the core issues.

Steve Kandell noted that socioeconomics, community-stewardship and natural resources should be addressed under each resource, and asked the Committee if they agreed. The Committee did.

The Committee continued discussing what resources should go first and how sub-issues should be divided. Natural resources will be the foundation of all discussions.

Kelly Wilson identified this as the Committee's list of issue to address under the alternatives development phase of the planning process.

Review of Draft Work Plan for Addressing Issues and Management Concerns

Steve Kandell informed the Committee that he developed a draft work plan to address the core planning issues. This work plan includes one meeting every three weeks between December and April of 2004. At each meeting two planning issues will be discussed. Each issue will be discussed during two meetings.

Chris Majors added that for the grazing issue, he would likely develop a working group to assist him. This working group would develop ideas of how to address the grazing issue for the full Committee's consideration. The working group would include BLM employees as well as private ranchers and other interests.

Kelly Wilson asked Bill Lipe to take the first cut on the archaeology issue on December 9, 2003.

The Committee continued to address the proposed agenda and determined which issue would be discussed at each meeting. The first meeting would also organize the structure for future

meetings, so only one issue would be discussed on December 9, 2003 (see completed work plan attached)

The Committee discussed how to accommodate for an absence? LouAnn Jacobson advised the Committee that a proxy couldn't vote for you. Steve Kandell added that seven members must be present for a quorum, to recommend a decision to the Designated Federal Officer (i.e., LouAnn Jacobson).

Kelly Wilson asked Committee members if there were any other questions?

Public Comment

Kelly Wilson asked if the public had any comments they would like to add. The public did not.

Next Agenda

Steve Kandell informed the Committee that they have already identified the next agenda items. Kelly Wilson asked the Committee if anyone had anything to add. The Committees response was no.

The meeting ended at 3:00pm.

Monument Advisory Committee Alternatives Development Work Plan

Month	Meeting Number and Date	*Planning Issue
December	Meeting #1 on Tuesday the 9th	#1 (cultural and historic resources), first cut
January	Meeting #2 on Tuesday the 6th	#1 (cultural and historic resources), second cut #2 (livestock grazing), first cut
	Meeting #3 on Tuesday the 27th	#2 (livestock grazing), second cut #3 (recreation activities), first cut
February	Meeting #4 on Tuesday the 17th	#3 (recreation activities), second cut #4 (oil and gas resources), first cut
March	Meeting #5 on Tuesday the 9th	#4 (oil and gas resources), second cut #5 (private land), first cut
	Meeting #6 on Tuesday the 30th	#5 (private land), second cut #6 (transportation and infrastructure), first cut
April	Meeting #7 on Tuesday the 13th	#6 (transportation and infrastructure), second cut

First Cut - through open discussion list strategies for addressing the issues (e.g., restrict access where needed to protect archaeological sites)

Second Cut - discuss strategies for addressing the issue again, after gathering input from informal contacts then prioritize and/or vote on them

***Assumptions** - the issues of natural resources (e.g., soils), socioeconomics and community-stewardship will be addressed under each of the six planning issues