

**Canyons of the Ancients National Monument  
SWRAC Subgroup Meeting  
October 19, 2007**

**Subgroup Attendees**

Kelly Wilson	Chuck McAfee	Chris Majors	Mark Varien
Bud Poe	Bill Lipe	Cliff Bankston	Bob Clayton
Liz Tozer	Gerald Koppenhafer	Al Heaton	

**Bureau of Land Management Attendees**

LouAnn Jacobson, Monument Manager  
Heather Musclow, Planner  
Victoria Atkins, Interpretation and Education (note taker)

**Public Attendees**

Amber Clark  
Peter Ortego  
Tom Rice

**Agenda**

1:00pm – 1:15pm	Introductions
1:15pm – 1:30pm	Manager's Update
1:30pm – 1:40pm	Plan Organization
1:40pm – 2:00pm	Subgroup Role During Public Review Comment Process
2:00pm – 2:05pm	Break
2:05pm – 2:15pm	Steps/Timeframe To Completion
2:15pm – 2:30pm	Questions? Comments?
2:30pm – 3:00pm	• Public Comment
3:00pm – 3:30pm	Curation Tour (optional) or More Questions/Discussion

**Introductions**

**Manager Update**

LouAnn talked about work accomplished by Bob Salter, our fluid mineral specialist, before he resigned. Each oil and gas location on the Monument was visited and monitored for compliance. Major improvements were accomplished while other work is still needed. We will be rewriting this position and combining it with a SJPLC position.

Several employees of the Heritage Center flew back to St. Paul, Minnesota to receive a very prestigious award from the National Trust for Historic Places and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. The award focused on the numerous partnerships and volunteers involved in both the Heritage Center and the Monument.

The National Public Lands Day project this year was accomplished in mid-September and involved reclaiming a user-created road on Cannonball Mesa. Thirty people were involved in this project.

The Advisory Committee is now a subgroup of the Southwest Colorado Resource Advisory Council (SWRAC). Barb Sharrow is the designated federal officer for this group. The next SWRAC meeting is November 16, 2007 in Delta, CO.

LouAnn said that since this is a new group, we need to elect a chairman. Bud Poe nominated Kelly Wilson, Bill Lipe seconded the motion, Kelly was willing, and no other nominations were presented. Kelly Wilson was unanimously elected.

Kelly took over the meeting and asked the group how many have had time to review the draft plan this week? Most everyone had skimmed the document but nothing in depth yet.

### **Plan Organization**

Heather reviewed the organization of the hard copy plan and the CD version. Appreciation was given to Chris Kantner for her design work. Heather pointed out the Executive Summary was a good place to start, maps in Volume II, and acronyms which will be important for reference. LouAnn focused attention on Chapters 2 and 4 and stated that none of the document is “boiler plate” text.

### **Initial Reaction to the Plan**

Kelly expressed concern for the statement “streams ¼ mile either side is viewshed”. Viewshed definition is needed because in some cases, that includes Utah. Heather explained that there are usually three levels of viewshed immediate, middle and long. Kelly was concerned about lawsuit precedents in other states for viewsheds.

Kelly also expressed concern over the “community” concept in managing cultural resources. LouAnn explained that we weren’t looking at large block protection but rather, smaller chunks of ground. Not the 165,000 landscape but rather smaller cultural landscapes. Bob was also concerned about the “community” concept fearing multiple use “can be handcuffed”.

Mark asked how we understand what a “community” is in this document.

LouAnn explained that within the area of potential affect, we would look at a larger area of inventory to determine if the impact area is within the boundary of a community.

Bill stated that communities can vary through time. LouAnn explained that a community for our purposes involves sites that were occupied at the same time in proximity to each other. Sites that are not part of the same time period but in close proximity to each other do not constitute a community.

Mark was not sure how this concept will work on the ground with other resources. It has to work in reality and not just be theoretical. LouAnn said Bob may disagree, but we are using this approach with the Goodman Point project, where we mitigate impacts in an area of high cultural resource density.

Heather referred the group to Page 26 in Chapter II, to read the process description for protecting communities.

Bill asked for a definition of isolated artifacts and LouAnn described them as being typically 15-20 artifacts or less with no other surface or subsurface features or architecture.

Bob asked if chaining affects cultural resources? Mark said “sure”.

Bill agreed with LouAnn’s definition of isolated finds and stated that research and heritage values can be acquired easily by documenting isolated finds. Bill suggested isolated finds be defined in the glossary.

Bud was surprised to see isolated finds on our cultural resource map. LouAnn explained that the map was generated from the OAH database (Office of Archaeology and Historic Preservation) which includes everything documented (now Monument GIS database).

Mark reiterated that the process is to survey and determine if artifact density is below a threshold to be defined as isolated finds.

Chris said there was some dangerous language in the grazing section. Take the word "rapid" out since no change as a result of livestock grazing will be "rapid". The word rapid sets up unrealistic expectations.

Mark asked about the procedures for implementation of the plan. Implementation of the plan comes later. However, if we need to increase our understanding or comfort level, we can move to that level for explanation purposes. This is a DRAFT document for public comment and gathering reactions.

Mark stated that he was more interested in the procedural part...if concepts are actually do-able? He felt this would be most helpful for understanding the impacts of these concepts.

LouAnn stated that her greatest challenge is to address oil and gas, cultural resources and tribal concerns given the mandate of the proclamation.

Bill asked about specific Archaeological Resource Protection Act (ARPA) permits and if they were addressed in the plan? LouAnn answered by saying that a specific permitting system would be defined during implementation. And that this document provides big picture guidance. Bill then asked if under the preferred alternative there is a role for an advisory committee for permit/research approval. LouAnn said yes. She also clarified that if we were to include all specific implementation actions in this document it would have been 6 volumes.

Bill then asked about the statement in the plan in regard to research, where some methods and approaches would be "encouraged"...what does that mean? How will this be interpreted by future Monument managers? LouAnn said the statement was left vague on purpose to build flexibility into the plan, we didn't want to get too specific. Bill understands the value of conducting public research to find the most information while making the least impact. But terms can get in the way of this, e.g. focus on vandalized sites seems contrary to ARPA, Antiquities Act of 1906 and research in general. This does not necessarily allow for maximum public benefit. Bill would like to see research that results in the most information return.

### **Subgroup Role During Public Review**

Heather suggested the group look at the newsletter first so they would know where to direct people to the document and how to comment. People are encouraged to first access the plan via the internet. If that doesn't meet their need then they can obtain a CD. If they need to look at a hard copy, there are locations listed in the newsletter where hard copies are found, i.e., libraries, the Heritage Center, Dolores and Durango Public Lands Centers, etc.

### **Comment Process**

Heather emphasized information in the newsletter regarding what makes a substantive comment and pointed out the actual comment form...which is also on the website. Submitting comments electronically was encouraged.

Dates for upcoming open houses were emphasized. The format for open houses is work stations focusing on the five primary topics. Subgroup member's help was solicited. LouAnn reviewed the list of resource specialists that are planning to be at each table and other roles for people.

Heather talked about the federal notice coming out next Friday October 26<sup>th</sup> which would begin the 90-day public comment period. She also emphasized this as being a crucial time to meet with constituents and getting comments in. She also mentioned the important role of the Subgroup to help us move from the Draft to the Final. The document and federal register notice are planned for posting on the website next Thursday. LouAnn said the press release will be released October 25, 2007.

Mark asked what would need to happen for a 30-day extension option. LouAnn said if we get a lot of legitimate requests, it will be considered. Bill asked who would make that decision. LouAnn said that she would, along with the State Director. But, LouAnn hopes there will not be a need to extend the comment period in order to meet serious deadlines. Having a completed RMP is on the state director's performance as a target for this year.

Mark asked if there was a vehicle for a collective group comment or are they to just comment like the rest of the public. LouAnn clarified that as a Subgroup, all comments must go through the SWRAC. She stated that if at some point you want to meet as a group to develop formal comments, we can do that.

Bill Lipe asked if we are locked into the 90-day period? LouAnn said that comment analysis will begin at the end of the 90-day period. It's a separate process but it is important to get your comments in to that process.

Gerald suggested the group submit comments to the SWRAC. LouAnn pointed out that the SWRAC meets every 2 months. The pattern is to have a meeting mid January for the next SWRAC meeting.

Chris stated that if we don't advise in any capacity beyond the general public, then we've been wasting our time. We have been stripped of our standing if we don't come together and comment as an official voice. Gerald said that is what the SWRAC is looking for.

LouAnn suggested that the SWRAC could meet at the AHC in January.

Chris suggested the group schedule a meeting in mid-December and possibly a follow up meeting.

Kelly said that this is how this group originally started was as a subgroup to the RAC.

Chris suggested each group member do their own review of their special area. LouAnn said the group could do a conference call to include Bill.

Bill and Bob reinforced they were committed to finishing this process and seeing it through.

Bill then asked what happens when their comments are submitted to the SWRAC? Gerald answered saying the SWRAC will vote on the recommendations and then forward to the State Director and other Colorado RACs. Bill clarified, however, that BLM was still the decision maker, with the RAC having substantial influence.

The group then proceeded to pick dates for meetings. November 30<sup>th</sup>, Friday, from 9:00 to 4:00 was decided with another backup meeting December 7<sup>th</sup>. All subgroup meetings are open to the public and must be published in the federal register.

Heather encouraged participation and comment gathering between now and these meetings.

LouAnn said she would check with Mel Lloyd on the January SWRAC meeting.

Bill asked if the Plan would be discussed at the Nov. 16<sup>th</sup> SWRAC meeting and LouAnn said the only business proposed from us for that meeting was to submit Peter Ortego's name as an alternate for Carl Knight.

### **Public Comment**

Al Heaton expressed concern for the community concept thinking it might exclude multiple use. He has not reviewed enough of the document to comment further.

Amber Clark looks forward to reviewing the document. Her biggest concerns were the definition of a road and how oil and gas will be managed in relation to cultural resources.

Peter Ortego introduced himself as representing the General Council of the Ute Mountain Ute Tribe. Their primary concern is the southeast corner of the Monument and the overlaying Brunot Hunting Agreement. Peter then asked LouAnn if she had information on historic Native American uses in the Monument and LouAnn said yes, Tribal interests were specifically addressed in Table 2.1.

Tom Rice is also with the Tribe and will coordinate his comments with Peter's.

Chris Majors expressed concern with the powerpoint language on page 8 that states reducing AUMs would help meet land health standards. LouAnn said she can take the line out of the notes stating "Currently 17 allotments ..."

### **Steps/Timeframe To Completion**

Heather outlined the timeline and steps we have ahead. Bill asked what it means to "respond to public comment"...Heather explained it was a formal process at this point. Then Bill asked what an NOA was. Heather said it was a Notice of Availability.

Bill clarified that we respond to comments and then go two more rounds with the Washington Office and State Office but no other public comment periods right? Heather said yes, only a protest period for the public exists after this comment period, which is why this public comment period is so important. LouAnn stated that the document has already been reviewed once by the Washington Office, State Office and multiple solicitors.

Kelly then asked the group if there were any further questions and there were none.

LouAnn closed the meeting by telling the group she hoped they would find what they provided in one form or another.

There was no interest in the curation tour.

**Meeting was adjourned at 2:45 pm.**