

**Canyons of the Ancients National Monument
Advisory Committee Meeting
September 29, 2006**

Advisory Committee Attendees

Kelly Wilson	Chuck McAfee	Chris Majors	Mark Varien
Bud Poe	Bill Lipe	Cliff Bankston (pm)	Bob Clayton
(pm)			
Liz Tozer (pm)			

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
Amber Clark, San Juan Citizens Alliance
Carl Knight, Ute Mountain Ute Tribe

Agenda

08:30am - 10:00 am Advisory Committee members reviewed alternatives individually.
10:00am Kelly Wilson called the meeting to order and began alternatives discussion.

Cultural Resources

Bill stated that he thought things were coming together well but wanted clarification on some things.

Allocations (All sites to all uses): “Public Use D” needs to show a distinction between *developed* and *undeveloped* sites and be consistent through-out the document.

It’s important we remain open to research and education proposals coming in. We don’t want to establish too many criteria or research may become limited. Don’t discriminate against groups visiting sites-give fair consideration. Need to build in flexibility. Concern for the statement on page A-14:

“Limit and focus invasive research methods to mitigate unavoidable impacts to sites, to recover information from sites that have been vandalized, or yield information that addresses broad environmental approaches.”

Looking at page A-13, we show a range in alternatives but Alternative C may be untenable. Instead, we may want to spread out Alternative B to show a range (ie. standing committee – ad hoc).

Research goals for the Monument need to be broad. Clarify what kind of research proposals would require outside review and keep internal reviews for the mitigation of projects. CANM staff can function as stewards of the resource while recognizing national and international research interests

Education matrix/appendix needs to be cleaned up, contains a lot of cultural resource recommendations.

We then discussed what role the Committee had in officially validating comments? Probably most important that group members with expertise in certain areas communicate their concerns to the group and determine if group is ok with their comments. Some felt it was important that comments get group sign-off or documentation. Comments will be included in meeting minutes which is why it is important to review minutes to insure accurately recorded. Any written submissions will also be included with minutes.

We then discussed whether the alternatives protect cultural resources while allowing for adequate public use or do the alternatives go too heavy in locking up the Monument to the public? It's a fine line and difficult to strike a balance between all publics who use the Monument and protection of the resources. The difficulty comes in implementation. What is unknown is how people who manage the Monument in the future will follow the plan. This is why we want the language to be clear.

Chris Majors expressed concerned about letting sites fall down, doesn't seem like we're "protecting the resources". We discussed the symbolic values of structures for Native Americans. Funding remains a concern. It takes a lot of money to maintain structures and it's not a one-time event. Once you've invested your original money, you need to keep investing to maintain what you've already done. Standing archaeological structures are important for research. Need to consider structures on a case by case basis. It may be a matter of scale. For example, if a small investment of replacing a few rocks would result in a structure standing for a much longer period of time, then maybe it is worth it.

Grazing

Chris reflected on existing conditions and prehistoric and historic uses. Thinks it's important to start with what conditions are today. Utilization on grasses should be measured on an allotment by allotment basis, instead of making across the Monument adjustments. "Herbaceous" needs defining. Minimum stubble height should not be measured after grazing, but rather, after the growing season. Spring grazing is important to livestock permittees. Alternative A where AUMs are reduced will undoubtedly bring a protest from the County commissioners. Drought should be handled on an allotment by allotment basis since it can be so variable, even within a single allotment. Appendix X, Range Improvements, referenced in the grazing alternative, was not provided. Developing water on benches above stream bottoms can be beneficial to land Health and yet it is not allowed in WSAs. Page A-8, Alternative A- revise to "unallotted acres"

It's difficult to apply to such a broad area as the entire Monument when there is so much variability. Range Health really needs to look at each individual allotment. The Village study illustrates variability of environment. Ecological variability (variable time and

space) makes managing the Monument on a broad scale difficult. It is also important for the Monument to preserve agriculture. There is also a lot of variation among ranchers and one rancher can be a good example for many others.

Fluid Minerals

Bob Clayton wondered why alternatives lock-in acres for leasing without taking into account new technology. Also concerned that time restrictions for wildlife, if all added up, leaves only 1 month/year when development can occur. Wildlife restrictions are based on surveys and occurrences. Not all species usually occur at the same place at the same time. Not usually an issue. These wildlife restrictions have the potential to impact operations. Now they want to reintroduce big horn sheep. Were they even here historically? Sheep bones rarely found, but prevalent on rock art

No Surface Occupancy stipulations are not carried forward into alternatives, why not? These have not been fleshed out yet. New terms and conditions only apply to new leases, not retroactive to existing leases. Since most of the Monument is already leased, these stipulations would only affect a small portion of the Monument. Big areas are designated for No Surface Occupancy. Cultural resource protection doesn't usually need that big of area. Discussion followed of why landscape protection of cultural resources requires large area so that connections between sites, movements and occupancy at the landscape scale can be studied. Once again, most leases pre-date the Monument and come with stipulations, if any, that they received at the time the lease was granted. These can not be updated or changed. So areas already leased are not covered by these stipulations, only the Section 106 process would govern locatable wells and protect archaeological sites.

Private Property

Liz Tozer expressed concerned with objective (3-4-2) concerning boundaries-

“Conduct a cadastral survey of the Monument boundary in cooperation with affected landowners. Upon completion, clearly identify the Monument boundary to address ingress/egress issues, and to reduce the potential for trespass on to private land.”

Alternatives A-C pursue cost-share with landowners and Liz doesn't think private landowners will be willing to work with Monument since they opposed the Monument to start with. If Federal funding improves, maybe surveys can be done. It may take a congressional delegate taking up the cause. How we resolve problems with encroachments needs to be included in the alternatives. It would take several million dollars to survey the entire Monument and there may be quite a bit of opposition to this since there is a fair amount of encroachment already. It's important to have a goal we can work towards.

We discussed the prohibition of commercial filming in the Monument listed under the Land and Realty Section. LouAnn asked “Do we want to allow commercial filming in the Monument?” We talked about working with companies to avoid impacts and allowing this as one of the multiple uses. The Monument is only 164,000 acres and this use is still

permitted on surrounding public lands. Maybe we are looking at it strictly from the worse case scenario. What about educational filming even if done commercially? In general, the Committee had an issue with “prohibiting” filming as currently written, may want to allow filming with a permit.

Same concern with prohibiting special events. Need to define “Special Events”. The BLM permits for other types of uses like oil and gas but oil and gas pays up front with a lease.

Transportation

Kelly wants to see the mileages of roads/trails for the Current Management Alternative. Kelly Wilson noted that the Transportation alternative targets Sand and East Rock canyons for route restoration first. ROS (Recreation Opportunity Spectrum) is hard to figure out. What is included in “Administration” as opposed to “Community”? County Plan and Monument ROS need to be coordinated.

BLM tries to insure every private landowner has access into their private lands. Does not give landowner authority to improve or maintain the road unless they are given a formal easement. Montezuma County has no right-of-way on roads in the Monument- a need to pursue. Kinder Morgan’s permit covers maintenance on their roads. The importance of private landowners to look at the Plan was stressed. Cliff and Kelly could help to make sure private landowners look carefully at the transportation plan when the draft RMP comes out.

The discussion over interpreting proclamation language about “motorized and mechanized vehicles being prohibited off-road” will be cleared up once the Solicitors Office reviews the draft RMP. Steve can provide the methodology used for developing the transportation alternative. Administrative routes are not open to the public. We do not anticipate pressure from off-road groups since cross-country travel is already restricted. Historic county roads, RS2477, have not been a problem to date. Gala Pock, citizen, told the group about a historic road, the Old Bluff Road, that runs across her property that could be an issue. From Ackmen – County Road BB-NW to Lowry-SW thru McClean Basin and into Utah (Rd 213). It is an 1891 road from Bluff to Dolores used for moving freight to the railroad. Probably has historic significance.

Chuck questioned if Alternative C was at odds with the proclamation. Seems Alternative C becomes too permissive for Visual Resource Management with 115,000 acres identified as Class 4 visuals. We need to check again and see if Alternative C on visuals fits within an appropriate range.

Public Comments

Amber Clark- When can you make the methodology process developed for the transportation alternative available to the public? We will look it over again and get it to you as soon as we can.

Meeting adjourned 12:00 noon