

CANYONS OF THE ANCIENTS NATIONAL MONUMENT Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes

Date: January 27, 2004

Location: Anasazi Heritage Center

Time: 9:00 – 3:30

Advisory Committee Attendees:

Bob Clayton	Chris Majors	Liz Tozer	Kelly Wilson
Bud Poe	Chuck McAfee	Mark Varien	

Bureau of Land Management Attendees:

LouAnn Jacobson	Victoria Atkins	Mike Jensen
Steve Kandell	Laura Kochanski	

Public Attendees:

see attached

Agenda

9:00am - 9:10am	Greetings and Introductions
9:10am - 9:20am	Approval of Minutes from the January 6 th Meeting
9:20am - 9:30am	Planning and Monument Manager Update
9:30am - 10:00am	Overview of Monument Grazing Program
10:00am - 10:30am	Grazing Working Group Report
10:30am - 11:30pm	Discussion on Grazing
11:30am - 11:50pm	Public Comment
11:50am - 12:15pm	Vote on Grazing Resolution
12:15pm - 1:00pm	Lunch at Anasazi Heritage Center <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Overview of Monument Recreation Activities
1:00pm - 1:30pm	Recreation Activities Working Group Report
1:30pm - 3:00pm	Discussion on Recreation Activities
3:00pm - 3:20pm	Public Comment
3:20pm - 3:30pm	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. Amber Clark of the San Juan Citizens Alliance introduced herself and asked if she could hand out a list of public comments on grazing issues (see attached). The Committee agreed and the comments were handed out.

Approval of Minutes from the January 27th Meeting

Kelly Wilson asked the Committee if there were any requested changes to the minutes from the January 27, 2003 meeting. Bud Poe noted that the minutes were not provided to the Committee prior to the meeting for their review. Kelly stated that since the Committee has not had an opportunity to review the minutes in detail that the Committee would delay approving them until the February 17, 2003 meeting. Steve Kandell stated that meeting minutes would be sent out prior to the actual meetings in the future.

Planning and Monument Manager Update

Steve Kandell gave a Monument planning update. He stated that work continues toward the development of the Analysis of the Management Situation document. Also, BLM is working with Jones and Stokes to address internal comments on the Draft Scoping Report. This report should be completed within the next month. An internal review version of the Reasonable Foreseeable Development Scenario for oil and gas resources was just completed and is being reviewed. Last, the grazing subcontractor has been meeting with grazing stakeholders (e.g., permittees, conservation groups) to identify issues and possible solutions, and the Monument is making another attempt at consultation with the Native Americans. The initial intertribal meeting to discuss planning issues was not well attended; therefore the Monument is contacting the tribes individually to set up meetings.

LouAnn Jacobson thanked the Montezuma County Commissioners for providing funding to pay for Committee lunches.

Overview of Monument Grazing Program

Steve Kandell and Mike Jensen provided a short overview of the Monument's grazing program. Steve started with a discussion of how grazing is managed under the 1985 San Juan/San Miguel Resource Management Plan (RMP). Under this RMP, about 95 percent of the Monument is allotted for livestock grazing. In addition, animal unit months (AUMs) are identified for each allotment and specific goals and objectives for livestock grazing are listed. In 1997, the RMP was amended to include the BLM Standards for Public Land Health and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management in Colorado (standards and guidelines) (see attached). Steve noted that these standards and guidelines were developed by the three Colorado BLM Resource Advisory Committees. In addition, compliance with these standards and guidelines is mandated under the grazing regulations.

Mike Jensen then addressed the Committee. He handed out an example of a grazing permit (see attached). He noted that grazing permits cannot be authorized for more than ten years. Also, each grazing permit has mandatory terms and conditions (e.g., season of use). Some of these terms and conditions address management issues specific to an allotment. Mike then explained that a monitoring program for grazing was established under the 1985 RMP. This program includes both long term and short term monitoring. Long term monitoring looks at transects once every five years to determine changes in vegetation conditions (e.g., structure and composition of vegetation). Short term monitoring looks at utilization levels and helps determine if grazing guidelines are being met.

Mike then discussed how he interacts and communicates with grazing permittees. He stated that most interaction is done informally either through phone calls or spending time with a

permittee on their allotment. A more formal permittee meeting is also scheduled each year, if possible, to discuss range issues and to develop an annual operation plan. Darrell Veach, a permittee with the Monument, stated that he did not have any communication with the BLM last year. Mike Jensen stated that this was not correct.

Kelly Wilson asked what the term “actual use” meant on the example permit and if all permittees have a copy of the standards and guidelines. Mike stated that actual use is the amount of forage the permittee uses during a grazing season and that all permittees who requested a copy of the standards and guidelines were provided with one. Kelly suggested that all permittees be provided a copy of them during their next formal meeting with BLM. Bud Poe asked if the rangeland was in good health. Mike noted that the conditions vary. Some of the standards are being met others not. Also, management changes have not been made to address all allotments that are not meeting their standards. However, progress is being made to make these changes through individual grazing permit renewal environmental assessments. Bud then asked if Mike had any ideas of how to resolve grazing issues on a Monument scale. Mike stated that most grazing problems are allotment specific and therefore solutions need to be developed on a case by case basis.

Mark Varien asked how Mike’s working relationships with the permittees are. Mike said his relationships cover a wide range and that resolving grazing issues is highly dependent on having a good relationship with a permittee. Other Committee questions to Mike included how long has he held this job, what his workload is, if the BLM requires range specialists to move around and do other BLM offices have more range specialists? Mike replied that he’s been in his current position with the Monument for about three years, and he manages all 28 of the Monument’s allotments, eight Forest Service allotments and a wild horse and burrow program. Furthermore, the BLM does not require employees to move and the number of range specialists in each office varies.

Bud asked Chris Majors if management of his allotment changes when a new range specialist is hired. Chris said each range specialist interprets what is happening on the ground a little different. However, the standards should be written in such a way that each specialist interprets and applies them consistently. Kelly then thanked Mike and Steve for their presentation and called for a 15 minute break.

Grazing Working Group Report

Kelly Wilson asked new members of public who had joined the meeting to introduce themselves. Chris Majors then handed out a revised list of Range Planning Issues (see attached). Kelly stated that Chris would make his report to the Committee, public comment would be taken and then the Committee would vote to approve the Range Planning Issues.

Chris noted that he attended the San Juan Citizens Alliance’s community meeting on grazing and received input on his Range Planning Issues write-up. Chris then walked through his write-up and identified revisions made since the last meeting (see attached). Chris read Objective 1 and its management action. Small changes in wording were suggested by both Chuck McAfee and Mark Varien (see attached). Bud Poe agreed with the edit to Objective 1, which added the phrase “and the general public.” He felt that the public has a lot of interest

and misinformation about grazing. Chris stated that having a range advisory committee would help resolve conflicts and bridge the science gap between permittees and the BLM. Under Objective 2, Chris referred to comments submitted by the San Juan Citizen Alliance concerning the second management action. After some discussion and suggested edits the management action was amended (see attached). Chris identified other new management actions that were suggested by the San Juan Citizens Alliance and added to document. They include the fourth and seventh management actions under Objective 4 (see attached). Committee members agreed with these additions. Management actions five and six were also added under this objective. Chris then noted that Objective 7 was new and had been adopted from the Cultural Resource document developed by Bill Lipe and Mark Varien. Also new was the addition of Appendix A, which identified the objectives of the range advisory board.

Chris then asked the Committee members for questions and comments on the recommendations. Committee members asked how the range advisory board could be established. Steve Kandell said he would research this question and present options at the next meeting. The Committee also commented that the board would need to be permanent and that it should be established in the near future, instead of waiting until the completion of the new management plan. Mark suggested that for the “independent range specialist” to be truly independent as required under Objective 1, that they should be chosen by both the permittees and BLM. The Committee agreed to make this edit.

Chuck suggested a new management action under Objective 1. Steve Kandell wrote it on the flip chart for discussion. It read “Develop an ongoing process to assure there is common understanding of and agreement on research methods, data interpretation and interpretation of rules and regulations. Involve key Interested parties in this.” Chris questioned whether this management action was redundant to the existing management action, under Objective 1, asking for the development of a range advisory committee. Mark Varien thought it highlighted the need for better communication concerning research methods and data interpretation. Furthermore, he felt the management action complimented the board’s functions. Mark also felt Chuck’s new management action should be placed before the existing action under Objective 1.

Bud suggested that it would be a good idea for the Committee to provide BLM with a list of interim guidance suggestions, to address some issues before the management plan is completed. LouAnn stated that if the Committee does develop such a list they should prioritize the recommendations. Chris asked if he and other grazing constituents could develop a list of individuals to serve on the grazing advisory board now. Steve Kandell noted that it all depends on what approach is used to develop the board. If it’s decided to form a “working group” under the existing Monument Advisory Committee, then the Committee could choose people to serve in this role immediately. Chris reiterated that he envisions this group having a permanent role in grazing management, and that we should find an approach that would keep them functioning indefinitely.

Under Objective 3, Chuck asked what the term “attainable potential” refers to. Chris replied that the wording recognizes that each allotment has it own potential for grazing. Also, he stated that the management goals for each allotment need to be realistic and attainable. Chuck

suggested replacing “attainable potential” with “agreed upon rangeland health potential.” The Committee members approved this edit.

Mark Varien asked if BLM recognizes the problems associated with chained areas. LouAnn said BLM does recognize these problems. She stated that controlled burns could be applied to these areas; however, the fuel loading in these areas is high and there are several archaeological sites that could be impacted. Another option for thinning out these areas is to use a hydro mower or do hand thinning. Chris asked if there was any funding to study and control tamarisk. LouAnn replied that BLM recognizes that tamarisk is a problem, but there is very little funding available to management it. She noted that a challenge, cost share project could be pursued with permittees to control tamarisk.

Under Objective 6, Chuck suggested replacing the word “grazing” with “rangeland management”. In the second management action, under Objective 6, Kelly suggested replacing “outside parties” with “other interested parties.” The Committee agreed with these edits.

Mark Varien brought up Bill Lipe’s letter concerning impacts from grazing on archaeological sites (see attached). Ultimately, Bill’s letter stated that grazing is compatible with cultural resources, but that approaches should be taken to mitigate some impacts. Mark questioned if objectives and management actions addressing impacts from grazing on archaeology should be identified in the grazing or cultural write-ups. Chris felt that all the resource recommendations need to be looked at together when they are completed. This will allow the Committee to determine what hasn’t been addressed, or if there is redundancy between them. Steve Kandell identified three different action statements in Bill’s write-up that dealt with grazing. The Committee reviewed them and agreed that they adequately addressed potential grazing impacts to archaeology.

Steve Kandell reminded the Committee that the “work plan” stated that the issues of natural resources, socioeconomics and community-based stewardship should be addressed under each of the core issues.

Public Comment

Kelly opened up the meeting to public comment. Patty Trap, Acting Superintendent of Hovenweep National Monument addressed the Committee. She stated that Hovenweep National Monument wanted to work closely with the BLM and the Committee during the development of the management plan. She also asked what type of grazing decisions are projected to be made in the management plan. Steve Kandell stated that the BLM Planning Handbook identifies “land use level planning decisions” that should be made under each resource program. Some of those include determining areas of the Monument that should be allotted or unallotted to grazing, identifying grazing levels (e.g., AUMs) and seasons of use. Patty asked what the proclamation stated about grazing in the Monument. Steve responded that the proclamation stated that grazing would be managed under existing laws and regulations. Patty then read a management action she felt the board should consider adding to their list.

Gayle Alexander of the National Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) stated that their agency has three range specialists that are available to work with BLM and their permittees. She also noted that the NRCS is working on developing a cost share mechanism for the control of tamarisk. This program could involve both BLM and their permittees to work collaboratively on tamarisk reduction. Gayle also stated that she hopes the BLM fire management plan does not follow the approach Mesa Verde National Park used and that BLM should try to learn from the NRCS about range management.

Bob Wright then stated that there are a lot of opportunities for challenge cost share with NRCS on water development projects. He also inquired if there are any conflicts with riparian and threatened and endangered species that need to be addressed? Mike Jensen stated that a studying looking at the proper functioning condition of riparian areas was recently completed. This study did find some areas (i.e., streams and springs) that were rated as non-functioning. In addition, the causal factors for these non-functioning ratings are not just one thing. Some are grazing, while others are from agricultural practices on adjacent private property.

Miscelle Allison handed out written comments to the Committee members (see attached). She also stated that the standards for livestock grazing are not realistic and are unattainable. She also stated that she resented cultural resources being using against grazing.

Glenna Harris asked if the Committee would be discussing private property issues during one of their meetings. Steve Kandell noted that private property would be discussed during two meetings on March 9th and 30th 2004. Glenna also stated that the Committee needs to define what a cultural site is and that the Anasazi Heritage Center should develop educational material on the history of ranching and agriculture in the area.

Amber Clark thanked Chris Majors for taking the San Juan Citizens Alliance's comments on grazing into consideration. She also noted that wildlife management was not addressed at all in the range write-up.

Darrel Veach stated that there used to be a grazing advisory board years ago and that it was a good mechanism for resolving problems.

Nan Carman noted that under Objective 6, of the range write-up, that an action requiring educational material be developed about the history of grazing should be added. She also noted that impacts from deer and elk on the landscape should be considered and factored into decisions concerning grazing management.

MB McAfee stated that the Southwest Youth Corps and Canyon Country Youth Corps could be helpful in the effort to remove tamarisk.

Phil Weiser stated that at the last advisory committee meeting Mike Jensen said that there were 40 to 60 comments submitted on the cancelled Wesley Wallace EA. Phil visited the Anasazi Heritage Center and found that there were only 13 letters submitting comments on the EA. Phil asked Kelly Wilson what happened to the other 40 or so comments not on file at the Anasazi Heritage Center. Phil stated that Kelly told him they were in court. Mike Jensen and Steve Kandell clarified the use of the terms "letters" and "comments". There were 13 letters

submitted by public for the Wesley Wallace EA. Within each of those letters there could be several individual comments made. Mike also clarified that court issues concerning Wesley Wallace are not related to the cancelled EA.

George Greenbank stated that he has owned private property adjacent to the Monument for seven years and supports livestock grazing on public lands. He also noted that cattle on the Monument accessed his private property and consumed a large portion of his straw bale home once. He asked if private landowners should be required to fence the property to keep cattle and recreationists out. Liz Tozer stated that the Committee would discuss these issues at their meetings on March 9th and 30th 2004. Miscelle Allison stated that she didn't agree with the idea of the Committee forming a grazing advisory board to tell the permittees how to manage their allotments. She also noted that state law requires private property owners to fence out cattle.

Kelly Wilson closed the public comment period.

Steve Kandell wrote Patty Trap's suggested management action on the flip chart for the Committee to consider. It read "Work with adjacent landowners, specialists and other stakeholders to develop objectives and mitigate conflicts related to grazing." Chris noted that his recommendations were develop to address specific range issues and that the proposed management action could happen within the existing planning process. The Committee agreed not to add the suggested management action.

Bud Poe stated that he was concerned about voting on issue recommendations. He feels that these recommendations could change as the process goes forward and additional recommendations are identified. Mark Varien stated that once all the issue recommendations are completed, the Committee should revisit them all to determine if there should be additional edits. Steve Kandell stated that the Committee has been voting on the issue recommendations, but that it doesn't prevent them from revisiting them and making changes.

Chuck McAfee suggested adding a management action under Objective 2 to address wildlife concerns. Chris Majors stated that existing laws already address wildlife and that Objective 4, management action four already recognizes that range improvements can be developed to improve wildlife habitat. Chuck then suggested adding the term "wildlife" under the third management action of Objective 2 so it reads "Non-grazing factors (i.e., tamarisk, flooding, wildlife, etc.)..." The Committee agreed to make the change.

Vote on Grazing Resolution

Kelly Wilson called for a vote. Chuck McAfee made the motion to accept the grazing recommendations as amended and Liz Tozer seconded the motion. Kelly Wilson asked if there was any discussion. He then asked the Committee, "all in favor say aye" all seven members present responded.

Glenna Harris asked if the grazing allotment map on the wall was correct. Steve Kandell said he would review it with Glenna over lunch to discuss any mistakes.

Lunch at Anasazi Heritage Center (Overview of Monument Recreation Activities)

New members of the public that had joined the meeting were asked to introduce themselves. Chuck McAfee then handed out a copy of his Power Point presentation. Chuck then went through his presentation (see attached). During Chuck's presentation Liz Tozer addressed the Committee concerning the proliferation of new roads and vehicle tracks off road. She stated that in the last three to four years new roads have developed in the Cannonball Mesa area of the Monument. The reservoir near Risley Canyon is used by off highway vehicles and trash is often dumped along the road accessing Cannonball Mesa. Liz then handed out photographs of these problems.

Recreation Activities Working Group Report and Discussion on Recreation Activities

Referring to his Recreation recommendations (see attached), Chuck noted that he wants BLM to develop maps with overlays depicting resources at the next meeting. These maps would be used to address recreation issues and the possible development of management zones.

Referring to management action 2.1.h, Chris Majors questioned if the Committee would want to suggest making changes to the Proclamation. Steve Kandell noted that making a change to the Proclamation would require another executive order from the President or a new law from Congress. Chris thought opening up the Proclamation to such changes would be a bad idea. It could result in more than one change.

Bud Poe asked if the Proclamation language concerning "prohibiting off road travel by motorized and mechanized vehicles" is common to all national monuments. Steve Kandell stated that this language was used in all 15 Proclamations designating national monuments during the last administration, except for one. Grand Staircase National Monument, the first national monument designated under the Clinton administration, did not have this language though did include it within their management plan.

Mark Varien ask how LouAnn Jacobson interpreted the Proclamation language "prohibiting off road travel by motorized and mechanized vehicles? LouAnn stated that she was not interpreting anything. Instead she is waiting on clarification from the Colorado BLM State Office and the solicitor.

Chris Majors asked if the management areas identified under 2.1.a would be used solely for recreation management. If so he suggested changing the term "management areas" to "recreation management area boundaries." Chris Majors and Bob Clayton expressed a concern over the term "primitive zone". They asked if this designation would impact multiple uses occurring in these areas such as grazing and oil and gas development. Steve Kandell noted that the terms don't have any meaning and that if the Committee wants to clarify the intent of the zones they should determine what type of management prescriptions fall under each of them (e.g., visitor group size limits, facility development).

Chris Majors thought that controlling access would be the biggest focus of management zones/recreation management area boundaries. With that said he suggested calling the zones

“access management areas”. Chuck McAfee said he would work on a new term to replace “management area boundaries” used in 2.1.a.

Chuck McAfee asked if the western boundary of the Monument takes in part of Utah. LouAnn Jacobson stated that the Monument stops at the Colorado state boundary.

Bob Clayton suggested adding the phrase ...”on public lands.” to the end of management action 4.1.d. This would clarify that the action doesn’t apply to private land within the Monument. The Committee agreed to this change.

Referring to management action 3.2.e Chris Majors noted that a sign is needed in Squaw Canyon to inform hunters where the Colorado, Utah state line is.

Public Comment

Bob Wright asked what prompted getting a solicitor’s opinion on language in the Proclamation. LouAnn Jacobson said it was a letter from an organization pointing out discrepancies between the Proclamation and the Colorado BLM State Director’s Interim Management Guidance.

Chester Tozer stated that a contributing factor to the proliferation of unauthorized roads and trails in the Monument is the lack of law enforcement. Chester Tozer then read from an old environmental assessment for the Rock Creek Allotment, which identifies impacts from grazing on archaeology and recreation. He doesn’t believe these impacts are valid and that they are being used to end grazing. He stated that the same thing is happening in Grand Staircase Escalante National Monument.

Amber Clark announced that the next San Juan Citizens Alliance Monument meeting will be at the Magpie Coffee House in Cortez at 6:00pm on February 3rd.

Jim Colleran stated that the term “backcountry” should not be used because it has a legal connotation. He also noted that the public needs to know the difference between “road” and “off road”. He felt that the use of management areas should be developed from the bottom up (i.e., grassroots approach). Last, he asked the Committee to address access onto the Monument across private property. Currently, much of the Monument cannot be accessed due to locked gates.

Phil Weiser requested that the Montezuma County Commissioners identify all county roads in preparation for dealing with RS2477 issues on the Monument. Both Kelly Wilson and Dwayne Findley stated that the county has done an extensive inventory of roads. Duane further added that resolving the RS2477 issue needs to be done on a state level.

Scott with the Kokopelli Bike Club noted that mountain bikers don’t have a problem with sharing the Monument with other uses (e.g., grazing). Also, while attending a pre-planning meeting for the Monument he made an official comment stating that “mountain bikers don’t have an impact on cultural resources.” He stated that several people supported this comment

and wanted to know what ever happened to this comment. He stated that mountain bikers are not out to vandalize cultural resources and that there needs to be a number to report vandalism.

Sean Gregory stated that he also doesn't feel that mountain bike use impacts cultural resources. He also stated that his interpretation of off road doesn't apply to trails. Last, he noted that he supports the management zoning system and doesn't believe mountain biking should occur everywhere in the Monument.

Glenna Harris asked Jim Colleran whose private property he used to access Yellow Jacket Canyon. She also stated that vandalism of cultural resources has gotten worse and there needs to be a number to call to report vandalism. LouAnn Jacobson stated that the Anasazi Heritage Center is the place to call. It's open seven days a week.

Next Meeting

Kelly Wilson noted that at the next meeting the Committee would review Recreation recommendations again and take a first look at oil and gas resources. He also requested that the Committee wait until the next meeting to approve the meeting minutes. This would give them sufficient time to review and comment on them.

Meeting adjourned at 3:27pm