

**Canyons of the Ancients National Monument**  
**Advisory Committee Meeting**  
**October 10, 2006**

**Advisory Committee Attendees**

Kelly Wilson	Chuck McAfee	Mark Varien	Liz Tozer
Bud Poe	Cliff Bankston	Bob Clayton	

**Bureau of Land Management Attendees**

LouAnn Jacobson, Monument Manager  
Heather Musclow, Planner  
Linda Farnsworth, Monument archaeologist, note taker

**SWCA Consultant**

Steve Kandell

**Public Attendees**

Gala Pock, Citizen

**Agenda**

9:00am - 9:15am	Greetings, Refresher, Vote on Meeting Minutes
9:15am - 09:45am	Presentation of Recreation Alternative
9:45am - 10:30am	Study Time
10:30am - 10:45am	• Public Comment
10:45am - 12:00pm	Additional Study Time (if needed)

**Greetings, Refresher, Vote on Meeting Minutes**

Kelly Wilson called the meeting to order at 09:10am. LouAnn talked about the process for distributing meeting minutes (they are to be approved within 90 days of the meeting), placing minutes on the website, outcome of National Public Lands Day Sept. 30, 2006, and committee members were given Public Lands Day t-shirts. The committee was advised of a survey that will be coming out in the next few months from the Federal Advisory Committee Coordinator in Washington D.C.

Bob Clayton asked, as a follow-up to our last meeting, what would happen to hikers using the Sand Canyon Trail should a T&E wildlife species be found there? We discussed how the use of seasonal closures for critical periods of use such as spring nesting or on elk wintering grounds can and have been implemented.

Since a quorum was not present, meeting minutes approval was postponed

**Presentation of Recreation Alternative**

Steve gave an overview of the benefits-based approach to recreation. This approach is required by the new planning regulations. The old regulations focused on projects and programs that addressed issues. It focused on the means to get to the end (i.e. toilets, trails, what infrastructure we want to see on the ground). The new approach first asks users what they want to experience (i.e. setting, degree of development, available activities), starting with the end and then developing the means to get there.

The Monument was mapped at the landscape level according to areas of common use, access, activities, issues, resources, topography, etc. These areas were grouped into Recreation Management Zones (RMZ). Each zone offers a unique product in the form of experience, benefits, activities, and niche. There are 10 zones on the Monument, including the Anasazi Heritage Center. 100% of the Monument falls within one of the 10 Recreation Management Zones.

Heather then explained how to use the materials the committee was given in order to understand the benefits-based recreation analysis of alternatives. Three maps were provided that show Alternatives A, B and C. The size of the most popular management zones increases with each alternative. Special Recreation Management Areas (6 total) are further divided into RMZs (10 total).

There are four alternatives. Current Management (No Action) continues to be one of the alternatives but is not on the recreation matrix because it describes recreation under old planning rules, which cannot be compared with alternatives described under new planning rules.

There are two types of Planning Decisions made for recreation:

1-Implementation

2-Use Allocation

Both are described in detail for each RMZ for each alternative.

We discussed the setting descriptions; i.e., front country, back country, rural, etc. There was concern that each area will be defined too rigidly so that, for example, we won't allow certain group sizes in certain zones. The intent of this analysis, however, is to establish a general setting for an area and manage for certain experiences knowing that there will be variation. In general, for example, Wilderness Study Areas (WSAs) will be managed for a back country experience where you will likely not run into large groups of people. On the other hand, you can expect to see large groups of people in portions of the Sand Canyon area at certain times of the year. Therefore the setting for this zone varies among back country, middle country and front country. Settings are tied to their proximity to roads.

The way group size is discussed in the setting matrix focuses strictly on tourism and not necessarily on educational or interpretive groups. The analysis guides the level of infrastructure development. Alternative A focuses on local involvement yet this is a National Monument. The designation of the Monument may negate the strategy of "no marketing".

Day use is the focus of Alternative A. This does not preclude camping, but generally defines what we would typically see as the use of the area. Therefore, we are not planning to develop facilities or market these areas as overnight destination points. Specific modes of travel while recreating are addressed in the transportation section of each alternative.

There are two major aspects being analyzed:

The size/boundary of each recreation zone

How each zone is managed

Cliff Bankston arrived and a quorum was now present.

**Meeting minutes for 9/28 & 29 were approved**

Cliff shared that he is pleased to see a good faith effort to develop a plan based on public input. He also realizes the difficulty in doing this.

Comments on the recreation alternative are due to Heather by Friday, October 13<sup>th</sup>. The next opportunity for committee involvement/review will be the end of the October to see the draft version of Chapters 1-3. Heather will contact members when the draft is available. The draft to include Chapter 4 will be available sometime in February.

**Public Comment**

No public comments were given.

**Meeting adjourned 12:15pm**