RAC/RecRAC Meeting **10/3/14**
Aug. 13, 2014
Home2 Suites, Summit Room
Lehi, UT

BLM employees in attendance: Sherry Foot, Juan Palma, Quincy Bahr, Dave Kiel, Jimmy Tyree, Elizabeth Bughard, Lance Porter, Cory Roegner, Gus Warr, Randy Trujillo, Aaron Curtis

RAC Members in attendance: Frank White, Carl Albrecht, Chad Baker, Callee Butcher, Steve Slater, Porter Teegarden, Jim Allison, Steve Burr, JR Nelson, Bill Hopkin, John Harja, Cimarron Chacon (via phone)

RAC Members not in attendance: Brian Merrill, Rick Ellis

Members of the public: Gael Hill (Tourism Coordinator -Glen Canyon NRA) (on phone); Al Remley (FS), Dave Whittekiend (FS), Jon Stansfield (FS), Mathew Lane (FS), Charles Rosier (FS), Jeff Schramm (FS), Virginia Daniel (FS), Joe McFarlane (FS), Joanna Wilson (FS)

Sherry welcomed the RAC members and guests. Reviewed agenda.

Juan (State Director): Welcomed guests. Discussed the following topics:

Law enforcement: BLM's law enforcement authority has been codified within the Code of Federal Regulations, and is further defined through departmental and bureau policy. It really began in the California desert area –Southern California - where we saw the genesis of our law enforcement program. I'm going to start with the Washington Office branch of law enforcement. The acronym that we use for that is OLES (Office of Law Enforcement and Security). OLES is the part of the law enforcement program that is more of the non-uniformed type. We refer to these law enforcement officers as agents. They investigate all kinds of activities for the BLM. The agents report to the Office of Law Enforcement in the Washington D.C. Office.

They are physically located within states. In Utah, there are agents that are physically in our office. They don't report to us in the chain of command. They report to an individual back in Washington.

They also are organized a little different than us. We are organized by state. They're organized by Regions. Their region for Utah covers two states, Nevada and Utah--Region 3. They have a supervisor. The supervisor for both Utah and Nevada is physically located in our office but does not report to us.

OLES has a person who functions as a facilitator. The individual is the Chief Ranger. He/she is a translator, mediator, facilitator between our BLM law enforcement and OLES. He/she is physically located as well in every state. We have a Chief Ranger in Utah. OLES is organized this way in the BLM about five or six years ago. Prior to that time, they actually were located in the state.

Outside of law enforcement, we have four levels of command, which starts with the Director of the BLM, the State Director, the District Manager and the Field Manager. We're all authorized to sign documents are our level, to make decisions in the organization and they report in that structure.

I report to the Director of the BLM, the District Manager reports to myself and then the Field Manager reports to the specific District Manager. I'm able to and our District Managers are able to address topics and issues that are within our decision space; our delegated authority.

Inside of the structure, we have a uniformed law enforcement program. Our uniformed law Enforcement program is what you see on the ground. We have approximately 15 Law Enforcement Rangers for all of Utah BLM.

There's about a million-some acres that each one of them covers. There are two branches of the organization. This is what might have caused some of the confusion that you hear about, as to who has the authority for differing actions.

For example, one of those is, who gets to decide if we have a contract with the local sheriff's department or not? Do I get to decide? Does OLES get to decide? Does the District Manager get to decide? The convoluted complicated answer is that for whatever reasons when the structure was divided, five or six years ago, they left the authority of that question in OLES.

Obviously while we at the local level, the Field Managers, the District Manager's of the world know and deal with law enforcement all of the time it is not within their domain to decide whether law enforcement contracts will be signed or not. That is one of the dilemmas that we face. We need to study the policy and subdivide the authority where it is most appropriate. I personally believe that there is a role for OLES, more for the executive side.

They, the agents, work very close with that department and with our local U.S. Attorney's offices. Of course eventually they work with the Attorney General's office here in Utah as well.

Six to eight months ago, I began to have a conversation with our line managers; the District and Field Managers I mentioned earlier, to engage in a conversation about the law enforcement aspects we do have control over – the Rangers.

We put together a group - a law enforcement team comprised of two District Managers, two Field Managers, three Supervisory Rangers, the State Chief Ranger, and a Special Agent. We formed this team to study, analyze and offer recommendations on the law enforcement challenges, issues, dilemmas.

I personally have been meeting with the law enforcement group to further identify the areas needing attention.

Because of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA), you're the only private citizens group

that we can actually sit down with and discuss. Certainly, we can always meet with elected officials and other government officials, but when it come to a collection of private citizens who would like to advise us we cannot.

We may have one Ranger out there in the one desert and one over somewhere else by themselves pretty much all the time. This is very important that we have a strong and productive relationship with the local counties and the Sheriff departments . We thought about what is it that we need to do. Some of those law enforcement officers may report to a Field Manager or perhaps even a District Manager. It's really the Field Manager he'll report to who has to be up to speed with all the law enforcement rules and regulations and all of the things that need to go with law enforcement.

We made a decision within the Utah BLM that we need to have law enforcement supervisors who would supervise those individuals who can provide more technical solutions about law enforcement then the typical line manager.

Supervisors can also provide more connectivity to the local sheriff's office. Where the individuals may be more focused on law enforcement, we need somebody that can be more closely connected with the sheriff.

We divided the state into three regions, with one Supervisory Ranger for each. These supervisors will be a very closely connected to Law Enforcements Rangers. They aren't out there by themselves, being supervised by a line manager. Randy anything else you want to add to that?

Randy: No, I don't have anything to add, you covered the topic very well. We have three law enforcement zones covering the entire state, with a Supervisory Ranger for each. As you noted, each Ranger is responsible for very large areas of public land. For that reason it is critical that we work with and coordinate often with our partners at the local, state and federal levels. I am very proud of the partnerships we have at the community, county and state level. We are most definitely, better and stronger when we work together as partners with differing laws, responsibilities and capabilities.

FOIAs: We have several FOIA details coming out. One that is coming out this November that's controversial is the November oil and gas sale.

Helium: One of the commodities that is in very small percentages when it comes out of the ground. Even 2% of what comes out of the ground will operate natural gas. But that 2% is we consider a big find.

The work that is being done right now is the Eastern part of Emery County. Companies are working on the area. I think that will be one of the next things that you'll hear about is the full exploration of helium as it's a very rare commodity but it is critical in the United States.

Transmission lines: We have at least four major transmission lines in Utah. TransWest Express is one of those lines. The Mona to Oquirrh is one you approved – and it's actually constructed

now. It will be powered at the Mona Substation and will interconnect with an expanded system in the Nephi area up to probably the Wasatch Front.

We have the one that was just approved just in the, you know, the last little while that Elizabeth Burghard is working on the Cameron to Milford transmission line. That was approved August 2014.

So that's Cameron to Milford. It goes from Beaver, Utah over the Mineral Mountains, following Pass Road ending near Milford, Utah. This is the most recent transmission line that has been approved by the BLM. Thanks for the work that your staff has done, they have worked very hard on the project.

But the most controversial that we have are not those transmission lines that are serving Utah, per se, but the ones that are crossing Utah without providing a beneficial use to the state. I'm going to mention two.

One is the TransWest Express and the other one is Energy Gateway South. The TransWest Express is a transmission line proposal that would bring power from Wyoming from some of their proposed 1000 windmills that will bring power across Utah and drop it off at the hub south of Las Vegas. From there the line spreads out like a spider web to Los Angeles, Phoenix, and Las Vegas.

That particular proposal of TransWest Express will enter Utah along Highway 40 as it enters from Colorado right at the Colorado/Utah border.

The controversy is whether it will go through the northern portion of Duchesne County or the southern portion. That's where the big controversy is.

Man: So you had involved the Forest Service?

(Juan): Yes. I can tell you at this point in time that that particular line is all the way to the White House. So it's a very critical and important transmission line.

The other one is Energy Gateway South and that is a Rocky Mountain Power transmission line. Again, this line will come from Wyoming. It will follow almost exactly the same alignment as the one I just described, except that Energy Gateway South has a very good working relationship I think with the Rocky Mountain Power.

They're comfortable with the Southern Route coming across Utah. It enters Utah, comes to the South and then it'll come eventually through Salt Creek. It'll come out of there. It'll tie into the Mona Annex Clover Substation, and that's where it'll end.

I will say that TransWest Express is further ahead in the amount of work and Energy Gateway South is a little further behind. But they're basically all together.

Those are the two large 500, 600 kV lines that are coming to you in February.

Let me conclude by a discussion on this energy topic that as far as oil and gas we have probably in the neighborhood of 5000 proposed new wells that the Vernal Field Office is working on right now. And this is the Newfield project.

It is predominantly oil. Of all the wells that are being proposed on the Tribal Reservation, about 4000 of those are oil. In the East and the Western part of Duchesne County, just to the South of the city of Duchesne.

The other 1000 wells they are going to be deep gas. Deep gas wells. We are working on a couple of issues that should come out in a final here by either the end of this year - the end of this quarter, fourth quarter or early the first quarter of 2015. It'll come out in final form.

That's a tremendous amount of new wells that have been approved by the (EIS). And so we're working on that very hard. It's an infill project. So the infill project is already there. There are a number of existing wells there.

That'll be pretty significant when they approve that. In terms of moving some of that product to market for oil and as well as natural gas there's been some conversations going on outside of the BLM about how do you move that product to market.

The main argument there is what proposal of transportation will be used; trucking, pipelines, or rail. But now the refineries in Salt Lake City are at, or near capacity. Where and how to move some of this product, which would then finally be produced will involve you folks here in this room.

(Juan): BLM will have some rule when it comes to the rights-of-way for some of these proposals. But some of the transition occurs within the states and other entities right now.

Renewable energy: That tends to be a major resource here in Utah; wind energy as well as solar and geothermal.

We have a group of individuals from the states and will continue in the future to talk about all these projects.

Congress funded certain offices to be able to have the personnel and the resources to process all the permits and all the things that we're talking about.

That law expires soon. If it doesn't get renewed, a bill got introduced to renew it. It hasn't been acted upon yet. But if we lose that funding it will be fairly dramatic across the region.
I'm hopeful that this law will continue to be - still fund the Congress. I told some of our Congressional delegations that we need that funding.

One of the focuses that this administration has and I agree with it is that we need to do more inspections because inspections can enforce some of our wells, especially older wells. We need to make sure that they are updated.

Quincy Bahr (Sage Grouse Updates):

I want to provide some very brief background on the sage grouse planning efforts, information we're putting out for public comment, general information on what we've learned, and one of the exercises coming out of this.

Couple of the comments was a review of literature that was provided during this process. Want to run through the letter that we received from the RAC, some of the information and kind of what we have done with that where we are with the proposed plan.

Finally want to hit briefly on asset management, the principle and process.

In 2010, FWS determined that Greater Sage-Grouse (GRSG) warranted protection under Endangered species Act, but was precluded in order to address other, higher-priority species. The FWS determined that the GRSG warranted listing specifically due to two of the factors: Present or threatened destruction, modification, or curtailment of habitat or range; Inadequacy of existing regulatory mechanisms.

The principal regulatory mechanism for the BLM and FS are the goals, objectives, and management direction contained in LUPs.

In response to the FWS decision, the BLM and FS initiated a range-wide LUP effort that involves 98 LUPs. In the Utah sub-region, this includes considering amendments to 14 BLM and six FS LUPs.

The Utah Draft LUP Amendment/EIS was available for a 90-day public review and comment between 11-1-2013 and 1-29-2014. Preparation of the Final EIS is currently underway.

BLM and FS received 16,750 submissions, with 180 unique letters. From the letters, 1139 substantive comments were identified.

On March 13, the RAC provided a letter to Utah-BLM State Director with recommendations related to preparation of the proposed plan amendment and FEIS. Several changes have been incorporated into the FEIS. Recurring themes were the need for consensus, collaboration, compromise and consistency to reconcile differences between the state of Utah plan and the BLM/FS plan.

A major change between DEIS and FEIS is the addition of the proposed plan amendment. There will be separate proposed plans for the BLM and FS. It is being developed within the range of alternatives and base on the issues and analyses considered in the DEIS, as adjusted by input from the comment period. Consistency between GRSG regions and sub-regions is a significant

concern as the proposed plan is being developed.

Based on FWS policy to ensure certainty of protection, the GRSG planning efforts included an adaptive management strategy with soft and hard triggers and associated management if the triggers are tripped. There are triggers for both populations and for habitat. Population triggers are based on population dynamics and indicators measured on a series of trend leks. Habitat triggers are based on the percent loss of GRSG habitat, or of the identified crucial seasonal habitats.

Next steps: Complete the final EIS; release the proposed plan amendment/final EIS for the public protest process (30 days) and concurrently, the Governor's consistency review (60 days); resolve protests and consistency issues; prepare and issue the final plan amendment/ROD.

Carl: Asking Quincy to sendt the RAC a response to the RACs letter.

Jimmy/Dave (Planning Effort Updates Topic – Jimmy):
We're here to talk about resource management plans. The documents will be going out for cooperators to review for about a month or so. The focus today though is to touch on things that everybody's concerned about which is the travel plan process and specifically some of the software's we use, how it works, how the data is layered in there and how our decisions are made based on the software and I think that we're lucky today.

(Dave Kiel):

We're not the only office doing travel planning. You have city offices doing it, internal offices. We're all using the exact same process and it's a pretty fascinating process. I wanted to give you a brief overview on how we got to that point and talk about two major components. We have a manual and a handbook that we work off of, 1626 manual.

The Travel and Transportation Management Handbook is really the big one. That's where all the details are and that's where all the guidance is so it has a funny number, 8342. There are two major components to any travel plan. There's the vehicle area designation and the individual route designations.

I'm going to talk about the individual route designations and I've just got a couple of slides to go over the OHV area designation but what it comes down to is all those plans are required to have an off highway vehicle area designation. Every single acre is going to be classified as open and that's cross country travel permitted and you use little Sahara here in Washington County open OHV area or it could be closed. Think designated wilderness. We have 129,000 acres of designated wilderness now in Washington County.

The final one is where all the work is done and it's limited but for the longest time, when you looked at RMP's, it had that statement at the top. If you're looking at a map and there's a big polygon that says limited to existing roads and trails, you have to time that sign for that RMP where it was out there, it was in that polygon, and was limited to those existing roads of trails.

There's a problem with that and it should be pretty obvious. Someone decides to drive their four wheel drive or their ATV off road cross country, well, that's obviously a violation but is it a violation for the second person? What about the 22nd? What about the 122nd person? That road was already there.

What we're going to now that's in the manuals handbook is going to limit it to designated roads and trails. That in itself has a number of problems and it's just in the sheer volume of workload that that entails. This is a screen capture that I did from GIS and this is one of our alternatives in our RMP event and this is how it's going to be in the end but it's going to look something similar to this.
(powerpoint presentation): The green down there is the Sand Mountain open OHV area. The red area - that's open. The red areas are the designated wilderness areas that came from congress in the 2009 and the blue is limited to this. That's basically every acre in our field office and that's what every BLM office is eventually going to go to.

That's it for the area of designation. It's in route designation and so area designations are land decisions, individual route designations or implementation level decisions. We have a parallel track EA that's going right alongside of our RMP. What's the route assigned for the RMP? That's the EA right behind that. Those are implementation levels and what that means we have to evaluate every single route and give the designation across alternatives which is an enormous workload.

Every single route from highway down to ATV tracks and every non-motorized single track even if it's on that, it's going to be analyzed but how does that route fit into the grand scheme of things in that transportation network and how does it impact the environment? The first thing you have to do is to have a detailed inventory. We are really fortunate in that we have a small office. It's 629,000 acres of open land.

We did the inventory and I'm going to talk about each of these steps and then we go to route evaluation and alternative emails are done concurrently. This is where we're at right now. We went through and we evaluated every single route that's on public land, we've got the inventory, we evaluated it, we developed between draft alternatives and then we gave everything to the county. Washington County now has all of our maps, they have all of our data and as we said last week, I'm thrilled with their level of involvement because they're actually taking those maps and they're going out in the field and they're looking at these roads and of course they're saying, well, here you have this road closed, we want to take a closer look at that. That's where they're at right now.

Man: So is the county your only cooperating agency?

(Dave): No. Everybody gets a crack at it but we just gave it out. The county got it first because they're the ones that are the most important but all the other cooperatives are getting it. When the county comes back to us, we gave them forms to fill out saying disagree with this and here's why and they were going to reevaluate that, we'll make the appropriate edits and then once

those edits are done, then we'll be ready to go out to the public with the graph.

The public is going to come back which we anticipate 10 to 12,000 comments on it and they will weigh in and then we will reevaluate again. We will make those edits and then hopefully in the end, we will come up with the final route designation and a record of decision.

Man: Do these include a single track?

(Dave): They absolutely do. We're going to get into that in detail here because that was a really big part of our plan. When we started out, we thought we had pretty good inventory of all roads and trails that were out there but for public, but we didn't. We actually did our scoping being concurrently with our NCA RMP. So the room was divided up and which part of the room do you think was most proud? Yes. It was the travel plan, but we had two live stations so people could pan, zoom and look at individual trails and we had two big maps that people could actually draw on and people were engaged. They were intensely interested in this process and they had a lot to say and they pointed out that we had missed a bunch out there and so we went out and we captured them. They had a lot of things to say. The comment tables were filled. We got a lot of comments.

(Dave):
We had a four pillar scope. As we were going through this, we thought this route designation process is really targeted at the existing network and we were thinking what did we want to to build new trails. Why don't we include proposed trails in this evaluation and so, ironically enough, at that time, the Dixie Mountain Bike Trails Association approached us and said, hey, can we do proposed trails in this travel plan? We said, that's a great idea. Let's do that.

They actually had a couple extra meetings. They produced some digital data. They gave us that digital data of proposed trails and we think single tracks would go great in these locations, we incorporated it in our plan and we are evaluating those proposed trails. We also reached out to climbers, equestrian, ATVer's and the 4x4s and they all had things to say and they all had input. We have 210 miles of proposed trails in our travel plans that don't exist on the ground today but we didn't stop there.

Washington County is a pretty urban county for Utah and a lot of our communities are in the urban interface. Those nine cities, in the left hand column right there, all had input and they all wanted to work with us. The nine entities or agencies on the right hand side had input also and we had things like we had to meet up with the transportation plan for the areas south and for the National Forest north and it got really complicated.

The city of St. George has a road master plan and they have a trail master plan. We sat down with them and they said, we have this Cave Urban Trail Network and we would love it if people could ride off of the pavement, ride off of our paved trailed right onto your national park service street… Let's work together on it. We worked with St. George. Washington City said the same thing, so we incorporated their data. We worked with Washington County for all the unincorporated areas but we as of yet, tons of input from a lot of different entities and then what

came out of it was basically, a really high quality entity. In the field and transportation process, there are three types of routes.

Roads, dirt roads and trails. We don't have to be limited to those so we have those three in our data. We have those three classifications but we took it apart. We have two classifications for paved roads, three classifications for dirt roads that's comparing qualities and width and then we have three classifications for trails. What came out of that was a fairly robust set of data. Next one and then on top of that, we threw in our proposed trails. Next one and when we got ready to start developing our alternatives, when you realized that only on the yellow we have decisions and then it gets really complicated and that's where all that work with all those municipalities and counties actually come into play.

That's what we started with. Total number of routes on public land and when I say one route, that means this route starts at point A and ends at point B. 2,817 of those and that totaled 2,298 miles per average length per route, 0.795. You think that sounds pretty short. That's actually pretty long. The typical route is typically a half mile or less on average because there's a lot of little spurs that are out there.

We also had some things that came to us from the landfill so we had a number of miles that were closed by congress in the designated wilderness. We had 29 when they closed some areas in the Beaver Dam and then 51 miles we have closed.We found 42 miles that were heavily overgrown but the ATV folks wanted to open some of them back up.

Man: Were these 30 miles in the wilderness area open before your Wilderness Bill?

(Dave): No. Not all of these because, before the Land Bill, we had 90,000 acres of wilderness study here. After the Land Bill, we had 129,000 acres of wilderness. So Congress can do whatever they want. So they gave us 39,000 more acres of wilderness than we had in wilderness study areas. Correct. Yes. That's a typical reaction.

Man: Those overlap? Were all of the wilderness study areas included in this?

(Dave): Yes. With a few acres where they treat the boundaries but for the most part, yes and then they added in some others.

Man: But the routes, were already pulled by wilderness study areas?

(Dave): No. Not entirely.

Man: Okay. I really mean routes really. Not necessarily roads.

(Dave): The vast majority which I think was like 26 or 27 miles were in those areas but there were a few in there but they were technically closed, but they were still getting used. It was one of those things where it was a difficult one to enforce.

2,817 of those is a daunting number. So you spread that across three action alternatives, that's a lot of designations and how do you break that down? How do you chunk it up? Obviously we don't have any say in National Forest reservation so that's left us with 12 sub regions. Now those are divided along either along major highways or major routing features that routes don't cross. So as we would go through, we typically start with the major trunk line that's inside and then you work out to the secondary roads and then to the ATV tracks and then down to the dirt tracks. Before we did that, we thought, okay, what are the real drivers in our office?

We had some mineral potential there but there's not a whole lot of activity. We have some livestock grazing but it's nothing compared to the other offices in Utah. Land realty? Yes. We have lots of land realty actions, right of ways, power lines, fiber optic lines, but 95% of the public comments were about recreation, so recreation is the number one driver. Washington County has been one of the fastest growing counties in the country for a long time because of the recreation opportunities.

We said, okay, we will concede that recreation is a major driver. So we came up with four alternatives. Alternative A no action, anything that's open, currently open will remain open, anything that's current closed would remain closed and then we had our conservation alternative which is the most protective. It contains the highest number of wooden trails and it does have a limited number of those proposed trails that I talked about which are targeted at mitigating there.

Alternative B we're calling our recreation alternative because it spans the current recreation opportunities but still provides prudent protection for natural culture resources and it has a significant number of those proposed trails. Alternative B we're calling enhanced recreation. We have all the proposed trails. We think that it still provides more than adequate protection for the Natural Culture Resources Center. So any of those alternatives are fine and it's brand new.

Was pleased when this came out because it really jives closely with our alternative B and D. When I was talking about working with those municipalities, that's really what this is all about. Those are the community network service providers that are out there so that's what it's all about. I was pleased.

How many people remember just a couple months ago when Governor Herbert, Secretary Jewell signed that MOU for tourism on the importance of tourism on federal land and waters? How travel plan meets this.

This isn't something that you really want to do in house and there are some specialist/contractors out there and so we hired one and they're called advance resource solutions. They're a phenomenal company. This is the position last year. Travel management planning utilizing the unique graph evaluation process. They have software that is copyrighted and it is designed to do exactly what we want to do.

There's that number, 8342, because this is what individual route designations to travel planning is all about. For the court cases, it's because of this right here. The authorized officer shall

designate all public land as either open, limited or closed to off road vehicles. Those were your area designations.

All designations should be based on the protection of the resources of public land, promotion and safety and the minimization of conflicts. According to the following criteria, areas and trails located to minimize damaged soil, watershed and vegetation, minimize conflict between off road users and other users. You have to address those in your individual route designations and that's what the contracted software does. So how does it work.

Picture a room like this, a resource specialist sitting in it, all the range and recreation people. You have two screens. One screen with your GI data and we've got 150, 160 data sets that we evaluated as part of this process and you've got the next screen with the contracted software on it. Every single route has to have a unique ID. When you go into those sub regions and this sub region is the veil sub region so it starts out VE and you start 001 as the main route and 002. Here is VE235. You can see it comes off of private land.

You select that and while our GIS specialist is doing this big selection set against all these other resource data sets, we're going to populate the contractor .We're in the veil sub region here and these are all of our different sub regions. The route type, you can see that one's a connector because we know it comes on BLM and then off BLM, 42 miles long, the dual track road levels low, maintained and outcome. The origin, it was from utility and it was constructed. The ownership is BLM.

This is where the meat of the project comes in. There are three tabs across the top and then on each tab, you find these buttons. Every time you push one of these buttons, this list changes. The jurisdiction over there says they would have BLM if they had private on there, whether or not they're an agency facility, if there are any rights of ways on it and those will get populated on here. So what this means is primary alternate or link. Is that a primary access? Is that route a primary access? Is that active and yes it is or is there an alternate access or does it provide a link to that area and it goes for - so each one of these buttons gets pushed and then you have to populate this list.

When we turn on the master title class, we can see that there was a right of way on that. The next one is public usage and this is where all the recreation components come in. So what are the modes of transportation that are being used there? So all that gets populated and these are the public use activities and you can see that this list doesn't end because you've got to scroll down and then right here, is that a primary use there? Is it on that route? Is it a secondary use or is it an infrequent use? You really need to have that input from the stats for what's going on and as you go into recreational facilities, you hit that button there and the final one, professional resources concerned.

These lists get populated by our biologists before we ever started this process. So what is it? Is it up in the PJ? Animals? Is it safe sensitive, is it PLM sensitive, (unintelligible) and then you do the same thing for the plant. Is that route in that habitat? Does it lead to it? Does it cross it or is it just approximate to it and if it's approximate, how close is it? Then we would do the same

for special status plan, same for managed species, then we would look at the visual resources and the water resources. So think about that. Remember 2,817 routes.

If you have a bunch of routes that are all in the same area, they have all the same resources issues, you can actually just clone the routes we did previously and all those things will get carried forward. It actually eases the process up quite a bit. Then it comes to this screen and there's that 8342.1 number again and there's our alternatives by tab. So under this one, you would pick what's the designation going to be and then there's those four. Environmental damage, minimize wildlife, conflict between users and then we actually have a whole list of different statements that apply to either an open, a limited or a closed designation.

There are five choices and they're similar to the air designation. It's open, limited and closed but we have two intermediate. Open with management and limited with management. We have most of our routes in St. George right now are open with management. That means that there's some form of management on that route. It could be as simple as a directional sign. It could be a regulatory sign. It could be more frequent LEO patrols. We could do periodic monitoring in that area.

This is an example of some of the rationale statements. When you're addressing the minimization criteria our there for 8342, we would typically populate one or more of these and most of these, myself and the contractor wrote in advance. So for instance, if we had an open designation, we might say, well, it's a two track so the low volume and feet on this route have minimal impact on soil and vegetation than wildlife has and we're going to need both. If we limited it, this was written directly for the conservation. Designation would ensure the compatibility of heavy foot traffic from) urban interfaces critical to the first by providing a well-designed trail that inimizes the risk of off trail travel. That was for one of our proposed trails.

That addressed the minimization criteria because we thought that having more trails that give people the recreation experience that they're looking for was a better way to protect habitat than to try to limit people to a smaller set of trails that don't provide that experience. If you don't provide that recreation experience, they're going to go out and get it anyway.

So finally for closed. Closing this route would directly enhance desert tortoise habitat by reducing prior mutation. That's an easy ride. These two are not so easy. If you're going to choose management, we have another screen that default to and so is it going to be some kind of maintenance in terms of size. Is it going to be mitigation or are we going to fence adjacent sensitive resources and we're going to do regulatory sightings. You could also have monitoring and other choices in there.

If we're going to limit it to a specific group like we're going to limit it to mountain bikers and hikers or limit it to equestrian and hikers or to ATV's less than 50 inches in width. We put that under this transportation tab and this one, we're going to say administrative use for federal, state and local for emergency regulatory enforcement and to the ranching permeate and to the utility riders. Two of our public land users who are obviously very engaged in the process and they were actually writing us comments.

How is the public supposed to post a comment on this? We had 12 sub regions, four alternatives. So we gave the county 48 maps and we gave them all of our digital GIS data. So how is the public supposed to do that? We're going to make those same maps available in two different ways and the first way is traditional. It's going to be in PDF format, someone can download any one of those alternatives and they can pan and zoom and they can look at the actual labels on it.

Man: Very good. That's some interesting software.

(Dave): Yes. It's pretty fascinating and I've got to tell you, this process was incredibly tedious. It was absolutely brutal and it's not going to get any easier because I'm sure the county is going to come back with hundreds of edits. They're going to want to change it. Some of them are going to be valid because there's no way we can make 7,000 designations without making a mistake. I know we've made mistakes. Hopefully they'll catch a bunch. The public will catch the rest and we'll come out the back end with something worthwhile.

(Dave): Having the plan is great. What about implementation? How are we going to do that and how much is it going to cost and how much is it going to cost over time like you said? Well, if you remember in there, if you're going to close a road or if you're going to mitigate the fact that you're keeping it open, it says, well, what are you going to do? Are you going to close a road or you're going to rip and burn? Are you going to secure it to the visual horizon? Are you going to fence adjacent resources if you're going to leave it open?

All of that is captured. We have cost estimates associated with that. If we come in out the backend and we say, well, we want to close 118 miles of roads and this is how we're going to do it, we can plug the cost right into that and say, why? We need $150,000 to take care of this.

Man: We have a lot of people that want to volunteer. I've got people all the time saying I want to help.

(Dave): The most intensive part of this is the inventory.

Elizabeth Burghard: (Cedar City Planning Topic):

We have approximately 8,000 miles of roads in Iron and Beaver County so it's a laborious process. Also spend about a year with our team going through each and every route. It is quite intensive.

(Powerpoint presentation): Here's the field office management area. It's Iron and Beaver Counties. Approximately 2.1 million acres. We have things that we are evaluating at this time; lands, wilderness and characteristics.

We have 159 allotments that are under permit on just over 2 million acres. We have tremendous OHV opportunities. Some things industry are calling world class rock crawling areas, that they're discovering, and what we're finding is that as technology advances, folks are getting out to more

and more areas. As the vehicles become more capable of getting out, the community is really looking for new areas in these challenges.

We have tremendous available resource opportunities in Cedar City. We've got wind energy, solar, geothermal and also a tremendous opportunity for biomass development depending on the technology updates. We have great opportunities to maintain and enhance wildlife habitat.

For special designations, we received 20 nominations for ACEC that we evaluated. That record is actually available on our planning. We were looking at sensitive species, state trails. A lot of the species have some overlapping habitats so there are areas where we had concentrations of these species. Special recreation management areas to accommodate the increase in recreation desires.

This is Kanarra Creek where we are getting 50,000 visitors a year and this is actually on state land so the habitat is approaching the state threshold and that creates tremendously used area. The Old Spanish National Historic Trail is another of our resources that we are working on.

Timeline: Public scoping (analysis of the management situation (Feb. 2013), alternative development (Spring 2013); Draft EIS: Sept. 2014, 90-day comment period: winter 2014; comment analysis and plan development; Proposed RMP/Final EIS: Sept. 2015, 30-day protest period; 60-day Governor's consistency review; ROD;Winter 2016

Man: You had a big vehicle event. How did that go?

Elizabeth: That went really well. We had covered, 30 miles of track that they needed and so we utilized the facilities at the Three Peaks recreation area which actually is a recreation area for off road vehicles. It's also for mountain biking, hiking, camping, horseback riding and it's a little micro cosmic all full use right there on site. So we worked with the county partners. In working with them, we were able to have a safe, fun, big event.

We were concerned about how it's going to affect all of the other users out there. We had some concerns for safety and vehicles get up to 70 or 80 miles per hour. So we obviously had to close areas or portions of the recreation area for the two days that they were involved in the race and that went really well. With the early outreach, they [user groups] seemed to appreciate the desire. I actually talked to some mountain bikers who happened to be out there and they told me it was very unique and it was like cycling a NASCAR race and they had a good time. We had some bike trails that we had to also closed that day but in fact, we were still able to accommodate uses. So I thought it went really well.

Lance Porter: (Master Leasing Plan – Moab Topic) I came out of Rock Springs Wyoming and have been in Moab for a year. I was raised on a cattle ranch in Star Valley or Afton area in Wyoming. I attended Utah State University and have a degree in range science. I spent some time in Nevada with the BLM in Tonopah before moving to Wyoming.

We will discuss the Moab Master Leasing plan. So I'll talk a little bit about that and hopefully answer some of your questions and tell you where we're at. We are doing an Environmental Impact Statement - master leasing plan that is getting a lot of attention. One of the things that's a little bit different about the Moab Master Leasing Plan is this is a standalone master leasing plan where other Master Leasing plans are being combined with a Land Use Plan. The Moab Master Leasing Plan is a land use plan amendment for the Monticello and the Moab Field Office. The Moab and Monticello Field Office Resource Management plans were completed in 2008

The Washington Office Instruction Memorandum 2010-117, provides the policy for Oil and Gas Leasing Reform which includes the Master Leasing Plan (MLP) process. The Moab MLP area meets the criteria established in the policy for preparing a Master Leasing Plan. The criteria are also applicable to potash leasing.

We're going to modify the current land use plans for both the Moab Field Office and the Monticello Field Office in that EIS amendment. The MLP will only amend oil and gas Land use planning decisions made in the RMP. We have also included Potash leasing in the MLP and in that amendment process so that as we move forward, we can address Potash development in the future and in this planning effort. The Environmental Impact Statement will analyze development scenarios and alternatives for mineral leasing. There are many the types of leases stipulations that will be analyzed throughout the alternatives.

The leasing stipulations that are being considered are:

Controlled surface use (CSU) stipulations are open to mineral leasing but identified resource values require special operation constraints.

Timing limitation (TL) stipulations are open to mineral leasing but surface use during specified time periods is prohibited to protect identified resource values.

No surface occupancy (NSO) stipulations are open to mineral leasing but use or occupancy of the surface for exploration and mineral development is prohibited in order to protect identified resource values. The minerals under NSO lands may potentially be developed by directionally or horizontally drilling from nearby lands that do not have the NSO limitation.

Areas open to mineral leasing are subject to existing laws, regulations, and formal orders; and the terms and conditions of the standard lease form.

Closed are not open to mineral leasing.

The timing lease stipulations - those areas are also open to oil and gas leasing. These are usually applied more with timing concerns with habitat. Drilling activates would be limited during these time periods to protect wildlife habitat concerns.

Lease stipulations can overlap and quite often there are other lease stipulations on top of the

controlled service use as well. No surface occupancy (NSO) stipulations are open to mineral leasing but use or occupancy of the surface for exploration and mineral development is prohibited in order to protect identified resource values. The minerals under NSO lands may potentially be developed by directionally or horizontally drilling from nearby lands that do not have the NSO limitation.

Then, of course, closed is one of the other options that the master leasing plan may consider and in those cases, we identify those resources and values which are both critical in the planning process.

Here is the map of the boundary for the Moab master leasing plan. This is highway 70 right at the very tip of the map and then 191 coming down. Moab sits right here and then it runs on south of Moab. (Arches) National Park right here in the center, and Canyon Lands ational Park on the south and southwest and the - the southern boundary is near Indian Creek.

These are just some stats for you so you can see how many acres are in the MLP boundary for federal, state, and private land. The MLP contains a significant amount of state land. The scoping analysis helped to identify planning issues. There were several major planning issues. The recreation in Moab is high and there's a lot of interest in the MLP area and the amount development in close proximity to the National Parks.

So we received a lot of comments from folks not wanting to see development while they're traveling and visiting those areas. A lot of the area is currently leased and drilling actives are ongoing.

Fidelity oil and gas has the majority of the existing leases. They have been working under the current RMP and does a great job in helping us minimize the casual observer's view of those production facilities and locate them where it doesn't catch the eye of most visitors. I think they've done a great job of doing this. The development scenario for this EIS shows that we've had 227 wells drilled in that area. The bulk of them have been plugged. Currently there are 29 active wells within the (MLP) area.

So the future development for the next 15 years is 8-1/2 well pads per year for a total of 128 well pads. Now that does not equate to a number of wells. They could have more wells on the same pad. Fidelity has actually been doing that today and placing multiple wells on a pad and doing a great job decreasing surface disturbance without having the amount of disturbance it would take by having a pad for every well.

Most of the MLP area is moderate to high potential for the development of Potash. Potash development would entail solution mining and processing methods utilizing evaporation and crystallization processing Future potash projection is 2.4 million tons. Out of this amount, 2 million tons would be processed by crystallization methods and 400,000 tons would be processed by solar evaporation methods.

Projections assume that all potentially productive areas are open for leasing under standard terms

and conditions. The projections are modified according to the various mitigation levels provided in each alternative.

We want public involvement in the MLP. We want the public to be more involved so we went out to the public earlier this spring and actually showed a preliminary range of alternatives that we're looking at so far. This open house meeting was very well received. A lot of the comments we got were more of the comments that we liked this alternative or that alternative rather than a comment about the range of alternatives. The public open house helped us educated the public and help them be more informed on the issues. We had great dialogue and questions during the meeting. Based on the public feedback we are adjusting the alternatives.

The MLP area includes important habitat for desert bighorn sheep, pronghorn antelope, deer, and elk. The MLP will consider floodplains, riparian areas, public water reserves, and springs.

Currently, we are at the alternative development phase of the process. We're preparing to send the alternatives to the contractor who will complete the analysis. We're hoping here within the next few weeks we'll be working on the analysis with the contractors and in the January timeframe, the draft EIS is scheduled to be available. There will be 90-day public comment period and public meetings. The final Record of Decision is scheduled for the spring 2016.

The MLP information can be obtained from the following website:
http://www.blm.gov/ut/st/en/fo/moab/MLP.html
On that website you'll find the scoping report, reasonable foreseeable development scenarios, and preliminary range of alternatives that was shared with the public. Those alternatives have changed today based on that feedback we've received from the public. The web site also contains a lot of information and data about the MLP.

After the MLP process, current existing lease terms and conditions will not change, but conditions of approval could be reviewed when an application to drill is received. We are continuing to receive a lot of concerns regarding the level of development and the gas gathering pipelines that have been constructed this year.

Cory Roegner: (Special Recreation Permit Application Fee Proposal Topic). My name is Cory Roegner, Recreation Program Lead for the Branch of Outdoor and Heritage Resources at the BLM Utah State Office.

Joanna Wilson: I work for the Forest Service and the Region Office as the Recreation Fees Regional Coordinator.

Cory: One of our duties is to coordinate all of the recreation fee proposals that are presented to the Utah Recreation RAC for its consideration. Because we have several new members with us today, we thought that this would be a great opportunity to provide you with a brief overview of how the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act or FLREA defines your role as members of the Utah Recreation RAC. As we'll discuss throughout this morning's presentation, one of your

primary responsibilities is to provide the agencies with recommendations on our recreation fee programs here in Utah.

Joanna: We're going to summarize the Recreation Enhancement Act or REA. We're going to do a quick overview of REA and then we're also going to talk about what your role is as recreation RAC). So an overview of the Forest Service we have 8.1 billion acres. We have five national.

We get over $2 million of revenue from fees every year. We have several fee sites, several non-fee sites. How we manage recreation is ever changing and our agencies have to adapt to those changes to better serve the public. One of them is the bicycle. Now we have these fat tire bikes and that can access winter groomed trails. How can we manage this change in recreation? We use to have these tiny camp trailers with single axels and now we went to double axils, now triple axils and now we have toy haulers and everything is getting bigger and better.

So how do we manage for these changes? This is huge. Our campgrounds are not big enough to handle these large trailers with ATVs. A lot of our campgrounds still do not let you ride ATVs out of the campground. How do we manage this? What do we do? Then our last example is there are motorcycles. Then we had ATVs and now side-by-sides. Bigger, better, more power, more families can go into it; they are a family oriented type of opportunity. I have one. The trails cannot handle these larger OHVs. How do we do this? How are we constantly changing and evolving?

Man: The manufactures, we're having discussions on how to deal with this as well.

Joanna: But it's good. Recreation is always changing. Always evolving.

Cory: Utah has some of the most outstanding recreation opportunities and stunning landscapes in all the world. People visit BLM-Utah public lands to participate in a wide variety of recreational opportunities from traditional activities such as hiking, biking, river running and OHV riding, to newer and nontraditional activities such as base jumping, rope swinging, and high lining. In 2013, American and foreign visitors made nearly 6.8 million visits for recreational pursuits. These visits contributed approximately $324 million in economic activity and directly supported 4,000 jobs. In the same year, BLM-Utah collected over $3.2 million in recreation fee revenues from our developed recreation fee sites as well as our special recreation permit programs.

Man: So if you're charging the campground fee at a BLM site, do you pay a (TRT) tax to the state, to that county?

(Cory): We do not. No.

Man: State parks do.

Cory: We currently manage about 70 developed recreation sites and areas. We also proudly manage 55 other developed recreation sites where no recreation fees are charged and thousands of miles of recreation trails at no cost to the recreating public. The Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act was signed into law by President George W. Bush in December of 2004 and is currently set to expire in December of 2015. So we have about another year and a half to operate under the Act.

Up until the signing of the act, all agencies had been operating under the provisions of the Recreation Fee Demonstration Program which expired upon the signing of REA in 2004. REA enables the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture to establish, collect, charge and modify recreation fees at federal recreational lands and waters, at sites such as campgrounds, day-use areas and rental cabins.

It helped to establish criteria on where recreation fees may be collected based on the amount and type of amenities that we offer and it identified eligible and ineligible expenditures of collected recreation fees. One of the great things about the Recreation Enhancement Act was that it established a system of checks and balances where it requires the agencies to go out for extensive public outreach and involve the public in every step of the way. REA also established the Recreation RACs and defined their role as providing agencies with recommendations on whether we should move forward with fee proposals or whether we should withdraw them from further consideration.

We need to clearly document that we have general public support before our fee proposals are brought forward to the Recreation RAC for your consideration. Again, one of your responsibilities is to ensure that the agencies are doing their best to notify the public, get them involved, and answer any questions that they may have before you give the go ahead on whether or not we should proceed.

Joanna: The Forest Service is here at the BLM RAC. When this was established they left it up to the Governor as to how they would like to and obviously they worked with the Governor's office to see how we want to do that. Do we want to create them for every geographic area. Do we want to go with what the BLM has?

The Governor's office and the agencies decided to go with the BLM RAC because you have already established your organization. So that's why the Forest Service went with the BLM.

Cory: One of the last things that REA did was establish a suite of interagency passes called America the Beautiful National Parks and Federal Recreation Lands Passes. I think that Joanna passed out a pamphlet that describes the passes a bit further for you. Again it's a suite of passes that provide participating members with free entrance or a discounted entrance to our Federal Recreation Land and Waterways.

REA was very clear of when we're allowed to establish recreation fees. I'm going to let you take a look at this while I read it. Basically, we need to ensure that the fees are appropriate for the

type of amenities and amount of amenities that we're providing to the public. It also asks us as an agency to consider the fees that others are charging both in public and private sectors.

We also have to ensure that they're in compliance with our agency's policies and the management objectives within our land use planning documents. And of course we need to receive input from the Recreation RAC.

Joanna: Standard amenities are Designated Interpretive Centers, Day Use Sites or Recreation Areas. Expanded amenity sites are campgrounds, boat launches, swimming areas, cabin rentals, day-use or overnight group sites, dump stations, interpretative programs, reservation services, or transportation services. Special recreation permits the BLM has7 "special areas" where a permit system is needed to address: resource protection concerns, user conflicts, or public health and safety needs. The Forest Service requires Special Recreation Permits for Christmas tree cutting and can use this permit for snowmobiling/snowshoeing groomed and OHV trails.

Where fees cannot be collected are entrance stations, for people who are 16 and under you can't collect a fee. For parking along roads and trials, for overloads and also for just passing traffic, you can't charge.

I wanted to give you an example of the Forest Service fee tool program. This helps us determine what we could charge at sites.
What the amenities are the amenities at this site? And other individual amenities such as solitude, do they have a view, and the lakeside, are they next to an OHV or a horse trail? What are the other amenities?

All this adds to a numbers that can tell us what we can charge with those amenities

And then we do comparables. Just like with your home. If you wanted to go sell your home, you want to know what your home's worth. Well we want to know what the site is really worth. What are the other agencies or private sector are charging for something similar?
And then we look at all of this and we go with a number, for example$65 for the night. Then we go out for public involvement which Cory will go into a little bit more. We get those comments and review them. Are people willing to pay $65 for a night?

So how can the money be used? REA is very specific in identifying how we can use the funds. It can be used for visitor services, habitat restoration, erosion control, repair, maintenance and facility enhancement, visitor reservation services, law enforcement, and costs of collection. These funds CANNOT be used on a non-fee site.

The other thing I wanted to mention is for the BLM - there goal is to have 100% of that money that is collected go to the ground. The Forest Service - 95% of those funds go back to that location, 5% goes into a regional fund. The regional funds have a regional fee board.

Cory: Before the BLM and the Forest Service bring a fee proposal to the Recreation RAC for its consideration, we go through a lot of steps. The first thing that the BLM and Forest Service do is develop a publicly-reviewed draft business plan that spells out exactly how much the fees will be, how they will be collected, and how they will be utilized.

Before a business plan is released for public comment, it is reviewed internally; the Forest Service submits it to the Regional Office, Washington Office, and to the Forest Service's Regional (Fee) Board for additional review. The BLM submits it to the State Office and the Washington Office. Once it's been reviewed internally, we at that point send it out for public comment for no less than 30 days and, depending on the extent of the proposal, we may provide a comment period of up to 60 days.

Concurrent with the public review period occurring we also share it with Dr. Steven Burr who is the Utah Recreation RAC REA Work Coordinator. He reviews it and reports any concerns to the local office to ensure that any questions have been answered that it's prepared for the full Recreation RACs consideration.

It's only then, after extended review, that a recreation fee proposal comes to your attention. If you give us the go ahead regarding a new fee, we would draft what's called a Notice of Intent to Collect Recreation Fees in our *Federal Register*. It has to be published in the *Federal Register* for a period of six months before we can establish any new recreation fee.

For modifications to existing recreation fees, once the business plan is finalized we can immediately begin implementing the fees.

Now, we'd like to spend just a little bit of time discussing what the Recreation RACs s duties and responsibilities are. REA asks the Recreation RACs to make recommendations to the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture regarding the recreation fee proposals that the agencies present to you. But you actually provide your recommendations to the BLM Utah State Director or the various Forest Supervisors.

REA has specifically tasked you with making recommendations on establishing or eliminating recreation fees, modifying fees, or expanding or limiting the recreation fee programs.

Recommendations can only be made by the Recreation RAC if it is approved by the majority of the committee and general public support for the proposal has been documented.

The RAC does not have the authority to make recommendations concerning sites operated by contractors or concessionaires, or permitted activities such as commercial, organized group, or competitive events or activities. The reason being is that these fees are set by the agencies through a national fee schedule.

Man: So what's your last point Cory?

Cory: Under that scenario we would be expanding or eliminating our recreation fee program; therefore, we would be asking for your input.

Man We will not be able to make a recommendation on that because we are expanding our recreation fee program to that.

Cory: Right. So there are different types of SRPs. There are some SRP fees that are set by the BLM Director which include minimum annual fees and use fees. At the same time, the individual states through the State Director have the authority to adjust certain fees and create new types of SRP fees including application fees, transfer fees, or renewal fees. Because we're expanding our recreation fee program we will be asking you to make a recommendation on those fees.

You may recommend that we move forward with the proposal as presented, modify the proposal, or even withdraw the proposal from further consideration.

Aaron: I think the options we have to honor that intention to move forward without your blessings more or less - he has to take that to the Secretary of the Interior.

I think it's my understanding that in the history of the committee that' s only happened once for a proposal down in (Moab) (where a proposal was not approved). We went back to the drawing board, came back here and had some meetings. And incorporated some of your concerns into a proposal and everybody was good with it.

So by all means it's in our best interests as well to make sure that we have your support on these proposals.

Joanna: We had Forest in Idaho come to the RRAC but the RAC did not see that the proposal was sound enough so they sked the Forest to come back and present again with some guidelines they gave them. And that’s what they did.

Man: Well you’re going to actually present on the Forest Service proposal.

Steve B: I just wanted to at this point, you know, now that everybody has had a review of REA that it might be appropriate to bring up this other issue. And I asked - I think I copied that to all of you - the RAC members this other issue that came up.

We had a MAC- Monument Advisory Committee meeting about two weeks ago. Joanna said about the Forest Service trying to keep 95% of the funds collected at the site, 5% goes into the regional fund where Forests can do project proposals. The BLM in Utah tries to keep 100% but REA says it will be an 80/20 split. So in other words by law 80% of the fees collected needs to stay at that site; 20% can go elsewhere.

There's flexibility above that. So this issue came up and they said at our recent MAC meeting and it was brought up. I wanted your advice from the committee meeting.

Apparently because of sequestration an additional 7.23% of the 80% is being withheld. In fact it's being taken away from Grand Staircase National Monument every two weeks. The staff down there doesn't know where this money is going or why. You might think that 7.23% isn't really that much. But keep in mind that the staff gave me an example and they think two major fee sites on their mind.

This additional 7.23% because of sequester being taken away represented $13,000 that could no longer go to the operation, the upkeep and the maintenance and the staffing of the site. And they're a feisty-minded staff that, you know, they were upset about this because, you know, the budget is tight.

So Colorado Riverway, the Red Cliffs Recreation Area down in Washington County and there's probably others there too. So at any rate, I would say actually charge because I told everybody we're having this RAC meeting.

He actually wrote a letter to the Utah delegation that basically copied what I had said all along to you on this.

Cory: Well I heard a couple of questions in there Steve; one question was whether this is happening to other agencies and whether it's happening statewide for BLM. First let me back up to the very beginning. Let me address the question, is it legal? We were provided with some information here yesterday and I can read this portion of it to help clarify some of those questions. And I'd be happy to answer any additional questions that the group may have.

The Budget Control Act of 2011 is the legal authority that allows non-appropriated revenues like recreation fees or contributed funds to be sequestered. Because it is the newer of the two legislations (FLREA was passed in 2004, the Budget Control Act was passed in 2011) it's legal.

The BLM was advised that other agencies within the Department of the Interior as well as the Forest Service are required to sequester their recreation fees, as well. I had a chance to speak to my counterparts at the Forest Service and the Park Service and it doesn't appear that they're sequestering their recreation fees at this time, but we were also told that the agencies have the discretion on how to implement the order.

BLM Utah started to have their recreation fees sequestered on June 4 of this year for all recreation fee revenues that have been collected so far this fiscal year. This is occurring consistently across the BLM.

The most up-to-date report I have right now is as of July 16 of this year. So far we've had $205,000 sequestered of our recreation fees. This includes both special recreation permit fees as well as standard and expanded amenity fees.

(Steve B): Pretty significant.

Cory It is. Currently the funds are being put into what we call a suspense account. It's just being held temporarily until they (OMB) decide what to do with it.

It trickles down from Congress to OMB to the state agencies. So, until the BLM is told what to do with it, it will stay in that suspense account. We've been told that there's a possibility that we may be receiving it back in FY15 but at this point we don't know what's going to happen.

We're operating under the assumption that we're going to continue to see these funds sequestered into the immediate future.

Carl: We need to write a letter to both Neil Kornze and Secretary Jewell explaining our understanding of this issue and expressing our frustration and discontent and don't really like this change. Because again it's affecting the BLM Utah's ability to provide a quality recreation experiences for people.

We have a motion, will be seconded now by JR. Further discussion?

Man: I have one discussion.

Man: We should cc our Congressional delegation.

Man: Yes. I'd say that makes a lot of sense.

Man: I make that motion.

Man: I highly recommend that.

Man: Okay include that in your motion.

Cory: I plan to give you an overview of BLM Utah's proposal to implement statewide application transfer and renewal fee for special recreation permits.

At the end of the presentation today, I'm going to be asking the Recreation RAC to provide a recommendation to BLM Utah State Director, Juan Palma, whether you'd like us to accept the proposal as presented, modify it, or withdraw it from consideration.

But before I get to that point I would like to spend just a few minutes talking about the different types of SRP fees that we currently charge, explain to you what the application transfer and renewal fee entail, and explain how we would go about establishing those fees if its recommended that we do so.

Historically, BLM Utah has had a very high workload associated with SRP administration. In 2013, we issued a total of 624 permits for commercial, competitive, and organized group activities and events, which is more than any other state in the bureau.

Currently our offices require a combination of SRP fees based upon the type of use and the amount of time that it takes BLM staff to administer and issue a permit. For starters, every permit requires a minimum annual fee of $105; which is typically paid at the time the application is submitted to the BLM.

Historically there's been a lot of confusion about the minimum annual fee. Some people refer to it as an application fee when it actually is not.

Next we access what's called a use fee based upon the type of use and permit that we're issuing. So for commercial or (vending) permits we require the permittees to pay us 3% of their adjusted gross revenue that they generate from the authorized activity.

For competitive events, they are required to pay us 3% of their adjusted gross revenue or a per person per day fee of $5; whichever of the two is greatest. For organized group events, permittees would pay a per person per day fee of $5 as well.

I do want to note that the use fees are paid in excess of the minimum annual fee. For example, if at the end of an activity the use fees for a permittee total $250 we would subtract the $105 minimum annual fee that they paid when they applied for the SRP and they would subsequently owe us $145. Even though they are two different fees, the annual fees count towards the use fee.

Last but not least, our policy also requires us to charge cost recovery if it takes more than 50 hours of staff time to process a permit. Cost recovery is basically BLM having the permittee pay all of our direct and indirect costs associated with processing that permit. So that could include environmental documentation; staff time for doing onsite monitoring; and any sort of expense that we incur while processing that permit.

In 43 CFR 2932.31, the individual states are given the discretion to create new types of fees; that may include application, transfer, and renewal fees. Basically, the application fee is a fee that helps the BLM offset our costs of processing a permit. It's paid in addition to the three different types of fees that I mentioned in the first slide.

Fees can also be assessed for the renewal of existing permits that are about to expire. We can also charge a fee for transferring a permit from one individual to another, or really any other type of special service rendered for processing a permit.

We believe that if we were to establish these different types of fees we would recognize a number of benefits which would include helping to offset our costs of processing a permit. An example of that is if we don't spend more than 50 hours of staff time processing a permit we're not going to charge cost recovery. The only fees that we would collect would be the minimum annual fee and use fee.

Now sometimes we have a lot of permits where the BLM may spend 20, 30 maybe even 40 hours of staff time to process that permit. Because of the small nature of the event or activity, or because of the small amount of revenue generated by the permittee, it could be that the total fee for the permit would not exceed $105 for a permit where the BLM spent 40 hours to administrate it.

Obviously we are spending a lot of our appropriated dollars to process a permit that directly benefits a permittee. It's also going to help to promote serious applicants by ensuring that the applicant is paying a small portion of the cost recovery for us issuing the permit. Last but not least, it's going to help to increase clarity between the minimum annual fee and application fee.

Most importantly for the BLM, it's going to put fee dollars spent on processing a permit back into the hands of the field offices which could be used for staffing or on-the-ground improvements that will directly benefit the permittee, their clients and constituents.

I'd like to spend a little bit of time talking about what we're proposing here in terms of fee rates. This proposal was originally developed by the BLM Utah Special Recreation Permit Team which is composed of myself and one or more recreation staff members from each of our 12 field offices.

At the time we were really struggling with determining what the fee rates would be if we were to propose this. The deeper we dug, we discovered that BLM Colorado is currently doing this very thing. Back in 2007, they developed their own application, transfer, and renewal fee. It worked out quite well for them; because they are the only state to date to actually implement these types of fees, we viewed them as our best source of advice for proposing our own fee rates. Back in 2007, BLM Colorado set up a one-time $100 application fee which is paid when a new permittee applies for a SRP.

They also set a $50 renewal fee. If a permittee were given a five year permit, at the end of that five years they may request a renewal on the sixth year. They would, at that time, pay the $50 renewal fee.

They also implemented a $100 transfer fee that applies when a permittee wants to transfer their permit from one individual to another – perhaps they sold their business and they want to transfer the permit with it.

Two years after BLM Colorado implemented their new fees (2009), their one comment was that they wished they would have doubled the fees that were originally set.

It's based upon this recommendation that we are proposing the following fee rates: $200 for an application fee, $100 for a renewal, and $200 for a transfer. The (SRP) Team presented this to the Utah Leadership Team this past spring, and they agreed with our proposed fee rates.

They did offer one excellent point. They suggested that we waive all three of these fees if a permittee were to fall under cost recovery, as the permittee would already be paying all of our direct and indirect costs of administering that permit. So it doesn't make sense for us to charge these fees that help offset our costs. They're already paying for that.

(Steve B): What would be an example of that?

Cory: An example would be an off highway vehicle race where it takes 75 hours of BLM time to process that permit. Let's say they're a new applicant. They're coming to us for the first time. We would waive the application fee in that situation and cost recovery would apply because we're exceeding the 50 hours of staff hours to process that permit.

(Steve B): How does that work in practice though? So you collect from the application fee up front? You don't know it's going to take 75 hours to process.

Cory Often times we'll have sit down meetings with our applicant prior to them actually submitting the application. It gives us an opportunity to make sure that the application is complete, that we've had a chance to discuss with them how to draft their operating plan. We've already had a chance to communicate with them and we would have a sense of how much staff time it would take to administer the permit.

(Steve B): Wouldn't it make sense to go ahead and charge them the fee but then deduct it?

Bill: I think most of the motorcycle races dip into the cost recovery. I know your Fillmore office is actually trying to with clubs and said do this and this will reduce your costs to do that.

Cory: That's an excellent point Bill. I think that's something that we could incorporate it.

Frank: The one thing with the cost recovery, there's a lot of these organizations are spending quite a bit of time out cleaning up and building things and some of that could go towards reducing some of cost recovery.

Cory: I agree Frank. I think that would be a great thing if we could do it. Unfortunately our handbook and our policy are very clear that you can't reduce a permittee's fees based upon volunteer labor. But we can work with them to reduce their cost recovery fees if they are willing to provide us work that we would otherwise have to do – such as (GIS) work.

(Frank): So what do you do about something like the Tour of Utah last week that went through the Forest, BLM. Do you prorate all of that?

Cory: We have worked with the Tour of Utah. I have a long answer for that and I'd be happy to talk to you afterwards. We did not issue a permit for that. The BLM issued what's

called a Letter of Agreement where we provided them with suggestions on how to have a safe and successful event while protecting public lands and visitor safety.

(Frank): So there was some administrative give and take.

Cory: Yes. We did run some initial projections based upon permits that we currently issue. These were based upon FY13 figures and we anticipate if this were to be implemented we would generate statewide approximately $30,000 a year, based upon our current SRP workload.

If the Utah Recreation RAC recommends that we move forward with this proposal we would draft and publish in the *Federal Register* what's called a Proposed Supplementary Rule to Establish an Application Fee. That would give the public a 60-day opportunity to comment on the proposal and we would use that time to reach out to any interested and affected parties and answer any questions that they might have.

At the end of that time, we would take the comments that we received, review them, and incorporate any substantive feedback/changes into our final proposal. We would publish what's called the Final Supplementary Rule and 30 days after that is published, we could start charging the application, transfer and renewal fees.

Man: Will there ever be anybody even bringing that back to the RAC? How to do that?

Man: One of the things that's really interesting in the Forest Service for me at least is really what the public says and I'm not saying it's easy to do that I'm just asking.

Cory: I think there would be value, yes. I - but I may have (Juan) or (Aaron) weigh in on it, but I think it wouldn't hurt and that would be useful for you to hear what the public commented after that 30 days.

Back up a little bit. Current with the proposed supplementary rule being published we would use that time to conduct extensive public outreach as I mentioned. Notify all interested and affected parties. Our public outreach plan would include a press release, social media posts, and a frequently asked questions document that would be posted on our Website.

We'd send letters to current permit holders and let them know what we're considering, request comments back. We'd also be engaged with interested parties that we're aware of currently which would include the Utah Division of Occupational and Professional Licensing; which is the State of Utah's outfitter guide license board. We'd also reach out to the Utah Guide and Outfitters Association and any other groups that come to us at that time and express an interest in the proposal.

(Steve B): You guys are so much better than that from the way it used to be.

Man: Yes, it's really pretty good.

(Steve B): It used to be terrible.

Man: It's really good to know they're doing a good job.

(Cory): Well at this point I'd be happy to answer any questions that you may have before I make a formal request for a recommendation. So are there any other questions?

Man: Just curious for the reasoning for the two times the rate in Colorado?

Cory I had mentioned that a couple of years after they had implemented the fee rates, Colorado said that they wished they would have doubled the rates, put it more in line with offsetting the costs of issuing the permit. Based upon their advice, we are proposing the doubling of BLM Colorado's rates. It should also be noted that their fees were set in 2007 (8 years ago) - we have inflation to consider.

At this time, I would like to request that the Utah Recreation RAC make a recommendation to Juan Palma, BLM Utah State Director as to whether we should move forward with the proposal that I've presented to you today which includes a $200 application fee, $100 renewal fee and $200 transfer fee. You could also recommend that we modify the proposal withdraw the proposal from consideration.

While you're thinking about that if you have any ideas on additional stakeholders that we may want to consider reaching out to if you recommend it to the board that would be great also.

(Steve B): Let's play to the RAC, do you want to act on this now or should we wait until after we've had these other presentations and we can talk about it a little later in the evening.

Man: So to me it makes sense to move forward this proposal.

Man: And in order to make motion as it stands/

(Carl): And the motion is seconded. Is that right (Steve)? That's to you I guess.

(Steve B): Yes.

David Whittekiend (FS): I'm the Forest Supervisor on the Uinta-Wasatch-Cache National Forest.

We have (Al Remley) who is our Fee Program Manager from our Washington office; (Jon Stansfield) who is the District Ranger in Pleasant Grove, (Matt Lane) who is the Rec Fee Program Manager on the Pleasant Grove Ranger District. We have (Charlie Rosier) who's a Rec Fee Program Manager in our supervisor's office along with Special Uses.

(Virginia Daniel) who is a Rec Fee Program Manager and Recreation Manager on the Heber-Kamas Ranger District; (Jeff Schramm), Ranger on the Heber-Kamas Ranger District and (Joe McFarland) who's a Recreation Program Manager on the Evanston Mountain View Ranger District.

Real quick about Uinta-Wasatch-Cache National Forest - some key points I think that are important for you. First off on the station - this is a 2.1 million acre forest. As you look out to the East on the Wasatch Range that the Uinta-Wasatch-Cache National Forest from (Ely) across the Wasatch front up to Logan, around to Evanston Mountain View back around to the (Strawberry) Valley. We have seven ranger districts; 2.1 million acres. Annually, we get about nine million visitors a year alone on Uinta-Wasatch-Cache.

Now if you add up the mighty five, that the state talks about. The five (favorite) parks in the state, that's more visitors than all those parks combined. So we get a lot of recreation use. With two million people on the Wasatch Front they tend to use this area very heavily.

We get a lot of interest in the forest as well. We get annually 12,000 individual volunteers on the Uinta-Wasatch-Cache National Forest. We are the most volunteered on National Forest in the whole National Forest system.

And again to give you some perspective on that in the intermountain region of the Forest Service; which is Utah, Nevada, Southern Idaho and the Greater Teton in Wyoming, the next closed forest to us in volunteers had 1400. So we're leading the pack on that.

Our recreation program is very big. It's very strong. And we're very happy with what we've been able to do. And we have a couple of proposals for you. We're going to be talking about adding some cabins to our system that the public can rent. And if you've ever been around any of our old guard stations or cabins, they're wonderful both places, they're nice historic buildings and they provide great opportunities for the public.

We're looking at making some changes along the - or in the American Fork Canyon. It's an alpine loop area. And what we do with our recreation program and also along the Mirror Lake Highway.

So what I'd like to do first is let Al take a few comments on our recreation program from a national perspective. Then I'll have (Charlie Rosier) talk about the proposal for the cabins. And then we'll move through to talk about American Fork Canyon and then the Mirror Lake Highway.

Al Remley: On behalf of the Forest Service and our Washington Office, I want to express our gratitude to this RAC for really taking us under your wing and helping us out specific to these recreation programs.

I don't think we would deliver as good a quality of recreation services as we can. So what I'd like to do on behalf of Washington office we really do appreciate all the work you're doing; the

service you're providing and again we just can't really have a good, effective recreation program without your input, help and support.

Charlie Rosier: I'm going to be presenting the cabin fee proposals. We have cabins present throughout the entire forest. There's 11 new cabin rentals, they all be placed on the nationalrecreation.gov Website.

You should all have copies of this. Here's an overview map of the state and where those cabins are located, Tony Grove, Card and Blacksmith Fork Guard Stations. Monte Cristo is on the Ogden Ranger District. Rice Creek in the Salt Lake Ranger District up Farmington Canyon. We have Mirror Lake, Ledgefork, Mill Hollow, Currant Creek Work Center all on Heber-Kamas; .

We have Diamond Fork and Payson Lakes on the Spanish ForkRanger District.

These are all nationally eligible historic cabins. That's one thing we're also working on. It's going to generate new recreation opportunities, but it's also preserving and historically restoring so that's a big part of why we're trying to preserve these cabins.

This is Card Guard Station. It's not too far off Logan. The cabin will be open from June 1 to October 14. It's $100 per night, accommodates 10 people. Has great amenities; running water, flush toilet, shower, electricity, modern appliances.

This is one of those cabins we reduced the fee due to public feedback.

This is the Tony Grove Guard Station, built in 1907. This one will be open year round at $85 per night, accommodates 10 people. They have water in the summer only. But has good propane and there's lots of extra space for camping and horse trailer, things like that.

That's the Blacksmith Fork Guard Station. Year round $75 per night and accommodates six people; vault toilet with stove, propane, appliances, horse corral with other (space) for RV.

Ogden Ranger District, Monte Cristo Guard Station, accorss from a popular campground. This cabin will be open year round at $85 a night, accommodates eight people, has lots of amenities in the summer, not too many in the winter.

Rice Creek Field Station on Salt Lake District. This is in Farmington Canyon. This is open June to September 30, $100 a night. It accommodates 10 people has lots of great amenities, running water, flush toilets, everything you can see there. This is a great cabin as you can see, it can sleep up to 20 people in bunk beds.

Ledgefork and Mirror Lake Guard Station on the Kamas Ranger District. Ledgefork Guard Station is right outside the campground - really popular spot - June 1 to September 30, also $85 a night and accommodates about six people.

Most of our cabins have the same amenities inside. It's either water and electricity or by a generator or propane.

Mirror Lake Guard Station - open July 1 to September 15, it's $85 a night. It accommodates about four people; running water, flush toilet, shower, propane, paved road. It's right by the lake - beautiful spot.

Mill Hollow and Current Creek on the Heber District. These are cabins. This is Mill Hollow. It's $100 per night; accommodates eight people, has running water, electricity, flush toilet, shower, wood stove. Great spot - very close to the reservoir as well.

Current Creek this is a little cabin that was built by the Bureau of Reclamation when they built the Current Creek dam. It's open June 1 to October 14, $175 a night. It accommodates 20 people - it's a little kind of a duplex. It also has trailer hookup sites, water, electricity - 10 people each side. Very close to the reservoir.

Spanish Fork Ranger District. We have Diamond Fork and Payson Lakes Guard Stations. Open June 1 to November 30 on Payson Lakes is $100 per night, accommodates 10 people, running water, flush toilets. It accommodates people in the house and then has a garage that we converted to a bunk house that has a little kitchenette and shower facility. Great spot. You can walk to the lake about 1/4 mile away.

Diamond Fork - year round, $50 per night. Accommodates eight people. This is probably one of our more rustic sites. It doesn't have any electricity or running water, just wood stove, vault toilet and propane appliances and lights.

Major visitors to our area obviously are from the Wasatch Front although we do get many people from Logan and Idaho, Ogden, Utah County, Heber. As I talked about before the reason for the fees is 11 new recreation opportunities. These are comparable to other sites as we requested early on in the BLM presentation, how we come up with those fees that pertain to those cabins.

The fees go directly to the maintenance and operation of cabins, going to operational improved services. We will continue to update the cabins and crews to clean them. That 5% that Joanna)talked about -- our Regional office has given us quite a bit of money actually to get these 11 cabins up to standards and ready to rent.

Public involvement actions is *Federal Register* to November 22, 2013 is posted on our Website. News releases were distributed to local media outlets on the 2013.

We get interest from the local newspapers and the public in general. We briefed our elected officials, the county commissioners on March 2013, Wasatch County Lands Group in 2014; Davis County Commissioners.

The Davis County Commissioners were supportive of the Rice Creek Field Station in Farmington Canyon, but they do use it under Special Use Authorization for they have Boy Scouting events that they base out of that cabin.

Pretty much everyone was supportive of the proposal so far. We notified the Federal Legislators in November 2013; Representatives Bishop, Matheson, Stewart and Chaffetz and Senators Lee and Hatch.

The five public comments that we received, the public was overall favorable of the proposed cabin rentals. There were comments about asking us to reduce some of the cabin fees, so we reduced the fees, as you can see we reduced Payson Lakes from $125 to $100, Current Creek from $200 to $175, Card from $125 to $100 and Mirror Lake from $100 to $85.

Does anybody have any questions about the cabins?

Man: So you mentioned I think it was maybe some of the space for camping around it. So I'm assuming that you go and rent the buildings, if there are hookups you also have those?

Charlie: Yes. The only site that has hookups was Current Creek Work Center. It has three standard hookups. The other ones there are areas to park a trailer, you know, a trailer or two. All that will be spelled out on the Website when we you rent the cabin, trailers can be accommodated, and if there's hookups or not.

Man: So I have a question on Current Creek. Is there an option to rent one side or the other with separate groups?

(Charlie): We made the determination that the people have to rent the whole thing.

(Steve B): Charlie, I received these in my email from Joanna and just got around to reviewing them just last week actually , and on this particular one I stated back to Joanna that I thought that these proposals were all pretty straightforward. You know, new cabins and providing recreational opportunities for the public that is not available currently in these different areas.

You just pointed out how five comments were received on this proposal and you changed your proposal on four cabins to accommodate those comments, I would suggest though that we don't vote on this until we hear the other two proposals just in case public comment.

Man: I had one more question. Do you limit the length of time that a single individual or group. Like can somebody come in and say I want it the month of July?

Charlie: No we're going to limit that. Now (Jeff) or (Joanna) can better answer that question than I could.

Joanna: Now we handle cabins just like we do for a campsite. You can only stay 14 days at that one campsite or however long the Forest's window is and that's all filled out recreation.gov, they won't let you reserve for longer than the Forest's stay limit.

Man: I have a question about the historical eligibility. Are all historic cabins and they're on the National Register?

(Joanna): Everything except Current Creek.

Man: What are you doing to to make sure people treat them carefully?

(Charlie: Yes we're planning on having some kind of education inside the cabins . It retains - to create interpretive panels for each of the cabins. You know, the panel would be outside of the compound.

Most of them were constructed by the Civilian Conservation Corps in the 1930s .

Woman: I'm just wondering about what the methodology was in retaining these specific cabins? If there are other cabins you can integrate in the future?

Charlie: There will be other cabins in consideration for future. We actually are talking to a district ranger and he might have one . Look out from cabins in general and it's a good way for us to keep them updated and then also to keep that building because it's historic and we still use it for some administrative purposes. So it provides great opportunity for the public.

(Joanna): Yesterday I was at American Fork Canyon and they have some beautiful cabins up there. They're just wonderful and I told them we need to get these in the system. But the Forest uses them for our seasonal and people to stay in during the summer.

(Charlie Rosier): These are just the first group of that kind I have identified. You know, they're underutilized but we want to keep that facility. How can we start generating some revenue to keep the cabin?

(Woman): Yes and when I see them of course I want to start linking them all together. So that's why I'm wondering if a trail opens then you're looking at cabins with an overview where you can go stay in one one night and one the next night and one the next night....

Man: Yes.

(Woman): Or I'm just wondering how you can shoot things...

(Charlie Rosier): Mostly it was based on my familiarity with the buildings we have in our forest that were underutilized.

Man: I just have a couple of questions for you. I was hoping maybe you could make a point to talk to us about the financial information) on the cabins, specifically predicted revenue and deferred maintenance. The document states

(Charlie Rosier): I'm not familiar with the predicted revenue, the fee tool helps us create some of these numbers. But like the deferred maintenance number if you're looking at the Blacksmith Fork cabin that comes from our INFRA database and it's maintained by our engineering department.

They go around and look at these buildings or bridges or roads or whatever they are and they determine how much maintenance - or what's the cost of deferred payments on this building, on this structure. And that's what was in there and it was automatically brought into this program.

Obviously with all the work we've been putting into these cabins to get them ready for the rental program that number is not correct anymore. Do you know, Joanna?

(Joanna): I can talk about the predictive revenue we look at how much other cabins of its type are bring in and this gives us an idea of how revenue we could see every year according to the timeline that it will be open.

Man: We're just really trying to look at the numbers and if it's a per year, it looks like you're estimating a $1500 - you guys are rent positive revenue with these but then deferred maintenance - trying to evaluate what's the - are these going to be net positive...

(Charlie Rosier): That's the goal. We have to net positive and be able to create sort of a pot of money to brining other cabins on the rental system and to continue to do that maintenance on the building.

(Steve B): Well at $95 to $100 - $75 dollars a night. That's 126 times your deferred maintenance costs.

Joanna: I think a lot of these are going to be very popular.

(Charlie Rosier): We kind of tried to lowball our numbers so that we wouldn't over predict our revenue.

Joanna: Yes again.

(Frank): No I just wanted to mention these recreation cabins they still serve administrative purpose for the Forest at other times during the year so there's some appropriated dollars that you're obligated to spend on these resources regardless.

Man: Yes. To follow up with that really applaud this because my perspective right

or wrong is that we've got these cabins up there, they're owned by the public. The Forest Service, they're older structures, you're putting money into them anyway and you should be to protect them. Why not try to recover the cost. And that's (unintelligible).

Woman: Absolutely

Man: Cabins were made available for the public.

(Steve B): I also - the guy's name is Dr. Ken Baldridge and I would highly recommend contacting him. I can even give you a phone number. You'll have pictures of these cabins being built. Remarkable.

(John Stansfield): I'm the District Ranger out in Pleasant Grove and my responsibility is American Fork Recreation Program. I'd like to talk to you about a proposal we're bringing before you for a few proposed cabins in the canyon down there.

As you probably are aware American Fork Canyon and our Recreation Program there offers year round recreation opportunities.

There's a whole lot that's stands out two million of us but even more specifically down there we can get about 1.2 million visitors a year. That was in 2011. With counts of over 400,000 cars the 2011 numbers since then we know that we're sitting at all-time highs with even just vehicle counts this year.

American Fork Program is very unique down there in that we share an excellent partnership with Timpanogos Cave National Monument which is located in the middle of the canyon.

Also UDOT which help maintain the roads there on the alpine loop. Wasatch Mountain State Park which is adjacent to us right on the backside, Timpanogos Emergency Response Team and Utah County Sheriff's Search and Rescue - the list goes on. So we're real fortunate in that respect.

Okay so our fee proposals - that pretty much sums it up right here. Now what we're proposing to do is to eliminate the American Fork Canyon Alpine Loop fee area or I should say fee areas of the Nation. What we will be doing or what we propose to do is repaint 20 standard amenity fee sites.

For clarification visitors that are staying at one of our developed campgrounds or concessionaire-operated campgrounds are not subject to the standard amenity fee unless they've used the campgrounds and come out into the canyon and utilized our amenities out there.

Another clarifying piece here is visitors to Timpanogos Cave are not required to pay the fee for the Canyon unless of course they come out of the cave and choose to utilize one of our many amenities of the canyon.

As you know if you've been down there, it's extensive as far as the developments we have. Sizeable campgrounds, one designated campground, six trailheads and winter staging areas, seven picnic areas, four day-use areas, a horse camp per station and a historical amphitheater build by the Triple C's in the 1930s and the theater in the pines.

I think it definitely speaks to the density of our sites there. This again kind of covers those 20 amenities - standard amenity sites that we are retaining. A little bit more - just some pictures covering the type of facilities folks have historically and will continue to receive services received in the canyon.

Currently we've got a number of fee payment methods up there. Eleven self-serve fee stations and two visitor information stations. Those information stations will be critical and provide any type of clarification that we might need to provide for visitors.

Forest Service National Park offices and then of course off-site purchase, interagency and local passes are accepted in the canyon. And that's the way it will continue to be.

Went through the extensive public involvement period as (Joanna) was talking to us earlier about. Started with posting notice of what our intent was and the elements of this proposal at all of our sites in the canyon, this is an example of the signs we put up at kiosks.

Federal legislators were notified in the fall of 2012. The Congressional delegations there. You've got county commissioners also in the fall of 2012. And then we sent a letter to all of the affected which just even in the general area, you know, eight mayors at a minimum but all the affected local elected officials there.

No comments received from those individuals. We published in the *Federal Register* the notice.

Received 32 comments and this was pretty good. Ten comments came back in full support of the fee area, folks that are very familiar with what it is we do up there and what things might look like if we didn't continue to charge those fees.

Also five comments against the fee selected. Nine questions just in general about the proposal, clarification which we provided. Then nine questions are asking the Forest Service to initiate a one-day pass. With regard to the one-day pass, noted but not part of this proposal.

Seemed pretty easy to get some news coverage around here when you start talking about the canyon, we covered that base as well.

This is just a kind of a covering of the venues we used to get the message out.

Man: So you do away with fee area, you're retaining picnic sites where the fees are applied. Is it going to work more or less the same though where one pays one fee and and they get into all the other sites?

(John): That's correct.

Man: Okay so you've got one site here that now not a fee area…

(John): Right. And that is a standard amenity the fee site - that will be subject to fees here in September.

Man: I'm still confused, there is a one day versus three days. And I wonder if it's an advertising tool. Maybe you should tell everybody that the one day fee could have taken you up to three days for the same price.

John: We did receive a few comments on it. But you know, specific to this proposal just wasn't part of it. We hear those folks with the comments and perhaps someday down the road that we would look at.

Man: Yes. I know at times when I pay the three day fee and I've thought okay I've got to get back up there tomorrow to at least get your money's worth, but it never happens. I don't think I've ever made it up there three days in a row. I mean it just doesn't make a lot of sense.

Man: My understanding is if you park there, you know within the picnic sites or near the trailheads and practically anywhere you can get off the road you can park. My understanding is previously that we're supposed to pay the fee. Is that still going to be true?

John So it's designated as an area, right? It was a big circle around it - that was the case. With this proposal those fees would remain to the standard amenity sites

Man: I'm just curious about, you know, that their proposal didn't seem to create that much cost compared to the change.

John: You know we started to consider it. We were kind of uncertain as the proposal's supposed to be done we thought and thought we would see a slight decrease. But I would submit based on my first point earlier how see among this year we already have a 20% increase in vehicles just in the sheer volume of people coming into the canyon.

Some years we won't see a slight decrease but I'm thinking that it might be offset some by just continuing a growing number of folks visiting the canyon and our numbers are speaking to that.

Man: But they will still have to pay again.

(John) Yes the standard amenities. Yes you know, some might be dissatisfied but I think a lot of people like to spend their time there so I think the cabins are offsetting that.

(Steve B): That's what I've noticed in your reviewing this is the state and the Forest Service anticipates and figures out and may decrease.

This is kind of an unusual case where we're really asking to approve taking a fee away. Usually looking at the site fees are increased and I'm assuming this is coming from (D.C.)?

(John: The fee proposal is in response to directions received from the Washington Office and a review they did on fee areas.

Al: We're trying to make sure our areas are standard across the nation. And again how realistically that area is managed and how it's historically managed a real distinction in how they interact in the canyon.

Man: Did it change how people interact with the people at the information stations.

(John We kind of just let them bypass - you know we have the stop signs. They're not just for stop ,so we can talk to you but because of safety concerns with all the commotion going on there.

I think what you will see, there's going to be a bit more interaction there as far as information being between the visitors and our folks. And that's really how I see his just having to provide some clarification and get some clarity from folks that wish to pay the fee at the information station. Kind of get a feel for what they're doing and then let them know what they're on the hook for.

Man: So that would say what the additional fee - alternate fee station

(John Yes and then they've got those little protocols where you get them out there and about and we try to get people through as quickly as we can and answer questions.

Carl: Okay, let's do our public comment period. I assume you want to vote on this one later as well?

Sherry: Are there any members of the public on the phone that would like to address the council right now? Is there anyone on the phone right now?

Sherry: Okay, hearing none? Chairperson I'll let you go ahead and continue.

Carl: Okay hearing none, we'll end the public comment period.

Chairperson: Mirror Lake?

Man: Mirror Lake. I don't have a comment but I'm supposed to do 20 minutes of information. We're in the final stages of finalizing a visitor use study in the Blanco Ranger District similar to what we're currently doing in the Salt Lake Ranger District at the Wasatch Mountains.

Up there this is part of that mountain accord, you know, which is a land initiative that's looking to the future and (planning) what if our population doubles in the Salt Lake Valley. How are we still going to protect the beautiful mountains and the watershed and still have access to all the recreation opportunities.

So (John) was aware of that and so he approached me and (unintelligible) and we're going to do pretty much the same thing as was done down at the (pleasure cove). We surveyed what we (unintelligible) coming down this (unintelligible) we're asked the next day just to look out for us towards the (unintelligible) population north of the (unintelligible) they key (unintelligible) we can't.

(Jeff Schram): I'm the District Ranger on the Heber/Kamas Ranger District. So I'm going to present as far as what Mirror Lake has proposed.

Is everyone pretty much familiar with where Mirror Lake is located? It starts more or less Kamas and you can go all the way over to Wyoming. It's that corridor along Highway 150.

So as (John) had mentioned and (Dave), we have a lot of folks that come up to recreate on it. But at Mirror Lake we're halfway and be up to 10,000 feet and it's about an hour and a half from beginning to end. We've pulled a lot of people up there. It's pretty much year-round.

Probably our slowest time is in the spring. Fall, we get a lot of hunting and a lot of other activities. In spring we have a period of time that we come out of the snowmobiling and we have a little bit of a slow time. But outside of that we're pretty well booked year round.

But we estimate a million that coming up to that area every year.

With our proposal we were also one of those high impact areas and we showed 200,000 - that's originally what we were looking at.

Since then we've evaluated it and came up that we will have 18 standard amenities fee sites and we will retain 7 expanded amenities fee sites and then we're also going to continue with some special recreation permit areas which will be for OHV and also special recreation permits for the winter time in which we did snowmobiling and skiing.

So we have two ranger districts that run there.

One thing that's a little bit different with Mirror Lake is you could drive the corridor, it's along Mirror Lake highway, we did have sites where you didn't need to pay a fee and those were our view areas.

We were a little bit different in that regard, we're spread out a little bit more and have some view areas.

We have our standard vending sites. We're starting on the north and I'm trying to recall, I think on the Highway we re-estimated that the Mirror Lake Highway which was right around 43 miles. We're a little more spread out than on the American Fork side.

You're coming up from the north where you hit the Forest and we have a lot of stuff that takes place up on top. We're definitely sought after. In the summertime when it's hot down here in the valley we go up there and put a coat on.

It's roughly 10,000 feet up there. This is a picture of Beaver Creek Picnic Area which is located down closer to Kamas when you first come into the Mirror Lake Highway side; showing what we have available there - there's fire rings, there's toilets, picnic table. Everything's going to stay pretty much the same.

We'll change the way in which people have to pay this fee. That's about it.

Woman: It was in the summer.

Man: Yes I bet it was probably the summer looking at the grass. And do you allow camping in these picnic areas?

(Jeff Schram): We don't allow camping in the picnic areas. We do have an area that further on we'll talk about similar where we're looking at our expanded amenities where we do - we provide gravel, picnic tables, fire rings everywhere they can do that, just have to pay.

These are the four camps by where you're talking a little bit more where you first come up and come in and we've got roads and a gravel site. Some of them have a table, some have fire rings.

This is similar to some of the sites I think we were talking about with the camping. But we do have a mixture of them. Because we have these areas where we've developed them and put in fire rings, graveled some of the sites, some of them have water available.

Outside of those areas we also have areas where people can just go out and disperse camp and they don't pay the fee is what our proposal is. So we'll have a complete mixture up there of what you could and couldn't do. So that will require us to really educate the public when they come through our information booth; kind of asking them specifically where do you plan on staying. We did that last year.

I think we can work through that and educate the public as to where you're staying and where you need to pay that fee.

Now this is something that will be new to us. Where we in the past had this large area. So now without these special recreation permit areas. So an example is say Spring Creek - most of these are - well they are OHV. We'll talk about the snowmobiling in a bit.

So these areas in Spring Canyon; on your map you'll see there's a little more detail. If you look on these areas where it's in yellow, down here on - this is on the Kamas side.

These are all areas where folks are riding their OHVs and then up on the Evanston side some of those areas also have trails in them and they're not just roads where you're allowed to ride your OHV. In these areas you'd be required to pay the fee. Those fees will go back to help with maintaining up those roads and the amenities that are within those particular areas.

This is the Murdock Basin on over on the Kamas side of the hill. And we have one over on Whitney Reservoir. I have never been to Whitney Reservoir, it's on the Evanston Mountain View side but what I've been told is it is very much high-use recreation area with OHV.

In the winter time we have the Beaver Creek Ski Trails that more or less starts right from where you hit the information booth and goes up to where the snowmobiling starts up on the North Fork Trail.

You have the Beaver Creek side Where we have parking lots that are plowed in the winter time. That allows for the public to come up to ski, snowshoe and then they get further up Soapstone Basin that's where the gate is closed in the wintertime. We plow out a parking lot. We start over on the Wyoming side.

This is on the North Slope winter trailhead. The next slide is showing Soapstone where we pay UDOT to come in a plow those areas for us. The fees that are generated for parking in this area, a lot of them go back to the plowing of these parking lots, all along the highway for snowmobiling; and then also for the skiing, snowshoeing.

Now the fee. As far as collecting fees - pretty similar to American Fork. We have Iron Rangers. There's these metal boxes that are out there - don't know if that's a political term or not, we use. It's just a self-service fee where you go in, pay your fee, put it the box, put the sticker on your windshield so we can tell you've paid the fee.

We also have vendors –including the Chevron in Kamas. I'm not sure on the Wyoming side. I know I've seen a few - I know they're over there in the deeper side of the pass; Bear River Lodge is off on one of our other sites. If you're coming into town you can pick up your fee at those locations - or pay your fee at those locations and then go up on the Forest and don't have to worry about self-service or any of that.

Because we try to provide as much opportunity for people to be able to pay their fee and not have to be at the Forest Service office during the week or at the information stations.

Public involvement. So we started the same time, we went together as a group of Mirror Lake, American Fork that was last year in 2013. We put information up on our kiosk at the office saying the Forest Service is where we're asking for comments. We received 41 comments.

We met with all of our legislators, discussed it with them. Met with the commissioner and seven counties and then also met with council representatives in Wasatch County, other comments. You know they didn't provide any comments to us but very supportive of our program.

It's been ongoing for quite a few, 10 - 20, how many years now? Fifteen years? And very supportive of the program.

We did meet with the Friends of the Western Uintas. This is a group out of (Kamas). They're very supportive of us. One of their concerns is that we go to this one day pass.

In our comments we had 18 comments supportive of it, nine were against it, three were just questions about it; which we answered their questions. And then we definitely were back to the one-day pass we discussed. With our thought this wasn't part of the proposal. I think that's something we should evaluate at a little later time.

Had a lot of comments with fees - I think bringing out a lot more comments and we felt that then we should stay with what our proposal was and not go into are we going to raise the fee, how much would the one-day fee pass be, we're going to postpone that until a later time.

Man: But the public could still purchase an annual pass? You will allow them to...

(Jeff Schram): Yes you can purchase America the Beautiful. It's an interagency pass. That is valid both at Mirror Lake and American Fork. Or if you have any of the others - a senior pass – those are also good on both of these locations.

We got into the same newspapers as you would expect. We put it together as a group, take comments. I think this (John) already discussed this, any questions?

Man I've got a question. In American Fork Canyon information station, right now the traffic backs up quite often.

John: Right.

Man: With all these questions are they going to back up even further? That's one question. The second question is how will you - if you're just going to park and go hiking is that one particular fee? If I'm going to go have a picnic then I have a picnic fee or is it just one fee across when you go park and hike or you just park and rest and have a picnic?

(John): Just one - the first question with regard to the information, (Jason) I don't think you'll see the lines get any longer than what you've maybe experienced. You know, we try to get them through there as quickly as possible but it truly does function like the information

station. And people have a lot of questions and some of it around fees and other just, you know, what all can we do given that huge assortment in the canyon.

You know, perhaps somewhere down the line we'll look at how we might be more efficient, what we could do design-wise or something there to help so they'd be more (unintelligible).

With regard to your second question. You wanted to talk about conflict. It's just one fee for any activity you might be doing where you're using the amenities. And then what's that $6 for a three-day pass or the real deal is the $45 for the season pass which is good in both Alpine Loop and Mirror Lake.

Joanna: I want to clarify a little bit better even and say you go up to American Fork Canyon. I want to go picnicking so I pay a fee. I go picnicking and then I decide to go a little way down from the trailhead. Well I don't have to pay the fee again. I just pay one fee for three days.

And then say the second day I decide okay first I was at American Fork and now, you want to go up to Mirror Lake. I don't have to pay any more money.

Man: For example if you go up right past Tibble Fork and get that gravel road. You go a quarter mile or half a mile up to the trailhead there. It's not one of those fee areas, right? So if you went up there now you'd have to pay - you park your car there and go hiking. You know it's been like that forever.

You're not using anything just walking on the trail, get on the trail. Now when you go up there, park on that gravel road, do a little hiking, you also have a fee.

(John): No. And they're not going to in that regard. Again it's more of a policy issue in terms of stay and make sure we're following REA. If you're going to use an amenity, you need to pay for that amenity. If you're not going to use an amenity you shouldn't have to pay for something you're not using.

We're just trying to keeping in line with the big, broader recreation area then we should, if you were getting that area you have to pay. And so again we're just trying to bring it back in line with National policy. They may require a reduction in fees but I guess we're trying to get things, you know, Forest-wide. Hopefully the volume's going to make up for temporary shortages.

Man: I read all those public comments. So it's interesting to me that - if you don't have a majority of people that make comments that are supporting, but your largest numbers are people who are for keeping the same fee rate. And part of the rationale is the idea that being able to recreate in a National Forest has had that the fees go towards those facilities and to keep things safer, we appreciate it.

But the other item that people brought up the idea that when you pay the fee for something because you've providing interpretation and educational method and then there was riff raff

going to come up and it will get over-used and worn down.

Man: I guess one of the questions I had is so totally going to reduce your overall funding you've got it a little bit maybe. But will this change with Forest Service in its administrative costs.

(Steve B): I don't think it will change much as our administrative costs because we're still collecting - it could have lumped it because when we collected a fee envelope that's where your costs really go up. Someone in the booth collecting fees is a lot cheaper because we're not spending the time to open envelopes and all of that.

Man: So you have campgrounds but there are still separate camping fees I believe. These are included in standard areas for people who just use the associated picnic areas.

Man: If you stay at one of the concessionaire sites and you elave those sites and coe visit one of the other fee sites, then you will need to pay a fee.

(John): Granite Flats those are our developed campgrounds. Those are our concessionaire operated campgrounds.

Man: So they are separate?

Man: Yes so certain trailheads that's the standard administrative site but the campground is separate from that.

Man: Okay. But if you just go to the campground and you don't go into the trailhead you don't have to pay the fee.

(John): Again and with Granite Falls we were thinking exactly what you were saying. It's the standard amenity site. If you're coming to Granite Falls for a day use trail, that sort of thing. Then the fee would apply. But if you're paying with recreation.gov or with concessionaires then camping there you will not be subject to a fee at non-fee sites.

Man: Oh, where the two were intermixed.

Man: It's showing like the campground

Man: Correct.

Man: I think what this is is this is just the ledger showing the camp.

Man: The other side is where there's that paved parking area with the trails.

Man: So I have a curiosity question about the groomed trails. Is the Forest Service

responsible for grooming those trails?

(Jeff Schram): No, but you have a pretty good mixture of that. So then on the lower end where it's a seed on the Kamas side, Forest Service does all the grooming for the cross-country skiing. But then we get further up where there's snowmobiling, that's partnership with the State and they do grooming at the highways.

And then they get further over onto (Joe)'s side on the Evanston side then we go out to - what we've done in the past is you take in fee dollars so that's for Granite.

Man: Is it similar.

(Jeff Schram): But we do the grooming on the other side.

(John): In American Fork Canyon similar in that we have a partnership with the State, with Wasatch Mountain State Park and we help fund the groom run outside and then we also use one of our operators to help them haul it around so that we can get the entirety of the loop we share with Wasatch Mountain.

(Steve Burr): I would move that yes, Recreation RAC approve the three fee proposals to include 11 new cabinet rentals, Mirror Lake Scenic Byway Recreation Area proposal and the American Forks Recreation Area proposal.

JR: And I'll second it.

(Carl): Okay we have a motion and a second. Further discussion then on the motion? If not, all in favor say aye.

Group: Aye.

Carl: Opposed? Thank you for voting unanimously.

Sherry: Thank you Forest Service.

Gus Warr: (WH/B topic) – powerpoint presentation. This is about one of the smallest groups I've ever given a presentation to. I'm used to dozens or hundreds of people but, hey, this works. I appreciate the opportunity to talk about our program. I was sitting back in the back, you know, I was actually reviewing some applications for some horses going to Alaska believe it or not. And I'm thinking okay is this just recreation?

But then I realized that it's kind of a little difference in Utah versus other states. I'm going to give you an overview of the Wild Horse and Burro Program and then we can get into as specific as you want. I know I talked to Mr. Nelson about some specific issues but am anybody very familiar or who's familiar with the Wild Horse and Burro program. Other than what they read in the newspaper.

JR: I am a National Public Radio designated speaker for the San Rafael area. In fact we were just on a television show, the two of us, (Gus) and me. Not at the same time but we were talking about the issues. So anyway very interesting program.

Gus: When I hear about getting 40 something comments with the recreation program; I'm envious because I'm used to working with 30,000 comments in the horse program.

Gus: We've got lots of things that occur on public land. Lots of different activities. We have a lot of other resources that we deal with on public land as you all know. I'll talk to you about today is Wild Horses and Burros.

It's a little bit unique and that it's a program that we talk about managing of the habitat, management of different uses. This is really the only program the Federal Government deals with in dealing with live animals. That we're actually managing.

I'm going to take you back in time real quickly. Some of you might remember - who can tell me the last movie that Marilyn Monroe and Clark Gable were in? They were in it together. I'm taking you back in time.

Man: Wasn't it the movie the Misfits?

Gus The Misfits - yes. Anybody ever seen the movie, the Misfits movie? I'm taking some of you probably way before time, but the Misfits was 1952 I believe. Last movie both actors were actually in - the very last movie they did. That was right at the heightened era of this 1940s - 1950s debate about wild horses.

A woman by the name of (Thelma Johnson) was kind of the spearhead of bringing national notoriety to the program; because she was actually a rancher's wife. And she was following a truck into Reno, Nevada and it was a stock truck. And she noticed that there were horses in there but she also noticed that there was a large amount of blood - literally blood - draining out of the truck.

She loved horses but she just hated the fact that she saw that and realized that the horses were being treated as such. And back then there was no legislation to actually protect them.

You know people ran them down and they roped them. In the Misfits, those of you that have seen that movie, they actually drive around on some of those Nevada desert playas in the back of the pickup. They throw a lariat around the horse and at the other end of the rope is attached a tire. Then they throw the tire out. Once the horse gets tired of dragging that tire around they go load them up and then they take them to slaughter.

There was a lot of death and starvation to address because of certain things going on back then. And so subsequently (Thelma Johnson) had a campaign that actually incorporated students

writing to Congress. And as a legislative person, if you're getting students writing to congress, they're going to listen.

If you want to get re-elected you're going to have to take note of what's being said. That was actually one of the Wild Horse and Burro Act, I mean the Wild Horse Annie Act was actually and practically the precursor to what we administer today. It actually just eliminated the use of aircraft. It didn't allow those fixed-wing aircraft to go down and chase horses or being chased in a vehicle like we see in the movie the Misfits.

It also prohibited a lot of what used to be done - it's called poisoning of waterholes. People that didn't want the horses out on the range they would actually go out and poison the waterholes. If you have a large number of horses but also you were killing wildlife species and other things at the same time.

It did not do anything as far as protection of the animals, or management, or any kind of population control. What did this though was the 1971 act which is the act that we as an agency administer - the Wild Horse and Burro Act. That is what legally is referred to as the Free-roaming Wild Horses and Burros Act of 1971.

It declared that wild horses and burros are living symbols of the West that contributed to the diversity of the nation. Also in the picture was at that point in time, it was not okay that these animals are disappearing. Because more and more people were realizing back then that they could actually make that a living off of going out, gathering up horses, sending them to slaughter and it was a business.

That was the thought process back then. It's interesting to me. We had the Forest Service presenters here and I guess if they were still here we could ask them. I actually have talked to some individuals that worked with the Forest Service back then. They were being administered firearms and cartridges to eliminate horses on public land in the late 1960s.

To actually go from that mindset, to okay now we have complete horse protection in '71. What an about face that would have been! But this was actually legally.

What we administered today in the 1971 Act is completely different. What it does is it protects them from illegal capture, branding, harassment, and killing. There is also some penalties involved.

This is really important. It places the management of wild horses and burros under the Secretary of Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture. So you know what this doesn't say - Park Service. So if animals are like on Park Service, they do not fall within Wild Horses and Burros Act. So you'll see things like Grand Canyon and places where animals were removed because legally they don't fall under this same legislation. That's really important.

So here's where we have a new challenge in the management of wild horses and burros and like I said previously, for the most part the BLM lands to this point - all we've been doing is managing habitat. Now, we've got to be managing animals.

As an agency we are to manage horses. We've got not only livestock and wildlife, we've got wild horses in the middle here to balance that use on public lands. Very challenging position!

How do we control, how do we manage and preserve them all at the same time? It's a balancing act that we are doing right now.

I want to give you a big picture. Now our focusing on Utah because this is the Utah RAC. So located across the ten western states there's what we call Herd Areas and the Herd Management Areas. I'll give you a short definition of the difference.

So let's say this right here was a Herd Area; 1971 Wild Horse and Burro Act says go out and map where wild horses and burros are found. We go out there in aircraft and we look down and start to do an inventory. This is our Herd Area right there.

Through our land use planning process; which you heard about earlier today right? Elizabeth (in the audience) can talk about that? Through those planning processes we have, as an agency, after we inventory when you would go in to say okay, this is your Herd Area. But within this Herd Area where can BLM manage horses? Where can you manage them for proper forage, proper water, land ownership, etc.

In some areas the Herd Area and the Herd Management Area is exactly the same. Other areas maybe up here there's not enough forage or water to sustain a population. Maybe there's a big loss of private land or state land. Maybe there's a railroad that cuts through here and so the original Herd Areas were narrowed down to specific Herd Management Areas.

We went from 347 Herd Areas when the act was passed; down to currently BLM's managing 179 Herd Management Areas with populations currently. These are some numbers. They're probably going to be surprising to some of you.

Right now the current national population as of March of 2014 is (pointing to power point), that's not counting this year's foal crop. This year's foal crop is going to add about 20% on average through any given population. So we have just under 50,000 animals, 49,200. Again these are estimates. I would say 10 to 20% high or lower on them is easily reasonable.

So let's say we have 50,000 animals. Our appropriate management level right now bureau wide is for roughly 24,000 horses and about 3000 burros. So you can see we're a little bit off kilter on our current management of where we should be. We're not double, but we're approaching that, okay?

So this will give you a map - it gives you a good idea. I guess these are red.

These red circles or boxes - these are the Herd Areas. And this whatever flavor this is, purple, blue - those are Herd Management Areas. So if you look Nevada is the big player in this program. Of course if you're a BLM. There is a number of areas that intersect with Forest Service.

If you can pick out the Forest Service land on the map, Utah is a small player in this area regarding FS wild horse territories. We're right now about the third highest as far populations numbers, the next highest would probably by Wyoming with Utah followed up by Oregon. But Nevada has the largest concentration of Herd Management Areas and Herd Areas.

So right now we'll review the state of Utah map and talk about that specifically a little more. One note on here is in the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument. We've got two Herd Areas located there. These Herd Areas aren't managed for horses.

We have a lot of Herd Areas. Everywhere across the nation, and across the West that have horses on them. So don't think that all of these areas (pointing at the map), like up here in Wyoming especially, you're dealing with some areas not managed for horses. Some of these areas have horses on them, even though they're a herd area - they're not being managed and BLM is trying to methodically go fast and try to remove those animals.

That red circle (point at map), in the middle of the San Rafael Swell is the Robber's Roost Herd Area. And the numbers are supposed to be zero. No horses. And I've said that might be accurate but there are probably at least 25 to 30 horses there.

So now you've got the picture of Management Areas and Herd Areas. I wanted to talk Animal Holding. We have two different categories - what we call - short term facilities and long-term pastures. This slide is what short-term facilities would be like, more like a feedlot type situation. Where you're feeding them hay. You're typical livestock holding type facility. Long term pastures - these are actually what you're looking at in this picture, in the background. Oklahoma, Kansas, South Dakota - most of them are in Oklahoma and Kansas, some in South Dakota, one in Montana, one in Iowa.

The BLM has long-term pastures - some people call them sanctuaries, some people call them lots of different names but we refer to them as long-term pastures. And so these are animals that have been removed from the range. They have not been adopted and BLM's place them in holdings - more or less for the rest of their life is what it is.

These are some numbers for you. Roughly 16,000 in short-term holding, 31,000 plus in long-term. So we have 47,000 plus wild horses and burros off the range. So compare that to what we have on the range. I always tell people, you know, the Federal Government is BLM. We're one of the largest equine operators in the country. I mean we've got 100,000 animals roughly that we're managing either off the range or on the range. Pretty challenging!

So let's focus in on Utah. Utah has 19 Herd Management Areas; 17 of those are wild horses, and two are wild burros. The two wild burro herds are both down in Emery County. I think they are both in Emery County.

JR: They are.

Gus: Here are our current populations. We have roughly 4,000 wild horses and 300 burros in the state. About 4,300 animals. Where we're trying to be at management-wise are around 2,000 animals. So here in Utah we are kind of in the same boat as we are nationally, we're about two times the number that we should be. And you're asking, why are the numbers so high? And we can get into those discussions here in a minute.

Here's a slide with a closer look at Utah. These are the two Herd Areas that I referred to as being down in the Grand Staircase National Monument, or just outside of it. Actually the Grand Staircase boundary's right here. This is actually part of the park. This would be your stuff that we were talking about. This is a burro herd area right here.

This is the other wild burro herd management area, so these two right here are your burro areas, the rest are wild horses.

You notice we have a number of Herd Areas. Over here in the Uinta Basin we have a number of Herd Areas. All of those Herd Areas have horses on them. One of the biggest challenges that we have is this block of land right here which is the Uintah-Ouray Indian Reservation property. I would guess this property right here alone has between 1,500 and 2,000 horses on it.

And it's a challenge for us to try to manage areas on the boundary when you have horses going back and forth from Tribal to BLM - like this. That is one of the biggest challenges we have over there. Probably our largest concentration of animals is down here on the West desert. Everywhere from Millard, Beaver, and Iron Counties.

We actually just did a gather here recently, down here in the BlawnWash area. But that gives you a focus of the State of Utah. I don't know where you're all from but that will kind of give you a feel for where we're at in regards to Utah layout.

I wanted to focus in on this one because one of the primary reasons we gathered on the Blawn Wash area is this large block of land right here is primarily owned by the State of Utah. That's actually a block of state land that was transferred by the stroke of a pen by Congress back in 2000. And that was the emphasis of us trying to remove the animals off. We consider private land and State of Utah land - both in the same category.

We also have some current active bait trapping going on in an area we refer to as the Bible Springs Complex. And down here on the peripheral you'll see a bar of private land, all this white down here. But we have - because it's like relations are so high in here horses are venturing out onto the private land and thus we have some private land removals trying to move those animals off of private land.

In regard to our overall Wild Horse and Burro management - you know my background is rangeland management. And any time it rains you're a good range manager because it makes the grass grow. Any time you're dealing with a drought situation it makes it a challenge.

We are in a drought situation, so I've left a slide in from an earlier presentation. So I want you to see - this is June. Now there's not a huge change in Utah and we'll focus in on Utah in a minute. But drought really directs where we're going.

If you look at right over here, especially watch Oregon and watch this block in California. The next slide actually is about two months later. Here we are in August 5. This is our drought monitor. Everybody's talking about the drought in California. Look at how huge this exceptional drought category is in California.

And then you have the drought constraints category moving up into Oregon where they've been having some wildfires. And I just got off the phone call today; they're hauling water to horses in Oregon. They had some Herd Management areas that have large wildfires occurring in them. Nevada also - the eastern part of Nevada is really feeling the impacts of this drought.

Utah we are in a drought. Definitely! There's a small area over here and I guess this is Duchesne County. That is still really extremely dry right now. This is an area of concern for me as a Wild Horse and Burro Manager because we have two large management areas right here, that's still in a severe drought category.

You can see there's other areas where we still have areas of concern, even though we've been getting summer monsoons we're not anywhere out of the woods because with drought we have poor conditions.

We're managing wild horses; we're managing the habitat, the forage. This overlaps with our grazing allotments. This gives you an idea of where we're managing, you know, livestock grazing and other public land use in regards to the horses.

So pretty much everywhere you see our horse areas, there is a livestock grazing allotment associated with it. The colored-in ones are our Herd Management Areas. The ones that don't have color are technically our Herd Areas but many of them still have horses on them. So you can see this is the area down here that we discussed, you know we've got livestock grazing in this San Rafael desert country.

This just kind of gives you a snapshot--it's not just horses we're managing out there. It's also other public land uses. This is what we don't want to get into. This is what we lived through. This is a photo taken when actually we had a severe drought period in roughly 1999 to about 2004 that was pretty harsh.

Our populations at that point were in the state we were approaching 5,000 animals. In about a three-year period we removed almost 3000 animals in the State of Utah primarily because of

drought. This is a classic example of drought combined with high populations of horses. Horses going into a water source looking for something to drink and what do you have, you have large impacted area with compaction from hoof action to overgrazing to just horses standing around looking for a drink.

And what do we end up doing? We're charged by law to manage the animals. We're managing them so that they're not out there dying from dehydration and starvation. So we immediately went in to hauling water.

JR: I want you to count the ribs on these wild horses here - look at their thin bones. These animals are starving to death and over large numbers is my contention.

Gus: Yes, this is an animal we would categorize into a poor body condition. This animal right here would be a condition class one, or I may call it a condition class two. That animal again in really tough - it goes based on their body fat and this animal is struggling to survive right here. I don't know if this is a mare, this could be a foal on her side that's just pulling her down. Usually our wet-mares (lactating) that have foals on their side they're going to be doing a whole lot worse than some of your others.

At times our management is okay, so we don't have to haul water. You notice we backed this trailer in there. These horses are so thirsty they're not leaving.

This is what definitely don't want the horses look like regarding body condition, and not only the condition of the horse which is obvious, but look at the range around it. Even the sage brush is being utilized by these horses to stay alive. Those are conditions due to drought and high population numbers. We as an agency and nation should want to avoid this scenario.

JR: Look at that body condition. What is it?

Gus: That's pushing a class one – or very poor! That horse is going to have a hard time coming back to good body flesh because at that point their organs are actually starting to shut down because of toxins in their liver and a whole variety of things. That animal is in somewhere between a one and a two, 1.5 type I'd put it at. So a pretty tough condition!

As an agency we're charged to manage for not just numbers but we're actually looking at age distribution of the animals out there. Do we have a proper age distribution? Sex ratios - what is your male to female ratios. You know, this is kind of a controversial subject - color. We get kind of chastised if we're managing for color. But the way I look at it is if we get the animal adopted we need to be looking at not only the confirmation but the pheno-type or the color.

I can adopt a pinto or a buckskin or a palomino a lot easier than I can a bay or brown horse. So we do look at color. If we have the option of putting back an animal with good confirmation that's got some color of chrome on it, we're going to do it because the adoptability down the road is going to be a lot higher. And also we're looking at genetic diversity.

A lot of people try to tell us that these horses are inbred and this and that. In reality there's very few of these herds that are to that stage. We have had a couple in the Bureau that we've noticed that have had some genetic problems, but most of the genetic diversity in these herds is actually pretty wide because part of it has to do with BLM management. When we are in their areas gathering them up, every time you gather them we're actually stirring the pot, getting a new band put together.

Get new genetic interchange. And so the genetic diversity is seldom an issue. But this is one point on the slide that is a key factor. Maintaining or improving our rangeland values, and that includes not only for the horses but our other uses.

Management of these populations is not just how many horses do you have. We have to look at all of these and then some different things too as far as management.

Now wild horse gathers are very controversial. Especially over the last five years. Our gathers are scrutinized by a lot of individuals. But our gathers are needed to deal with the population increase. Like I told you earlier the average population increases about 20% a year. If you think about that, we need to be going into our 19 Herd Management Areas - every three years to stay on top of that population increase.

That's by not using any kind of fertility control or anything like that. So I can talk about that in a little bit. So gathers are needed every three to four years. Sometimes you go in like this slide and water trap horses. This only works in areas with limited water sources. We go out and we'll actually build a corral around a deal like this water trough so that the animals come in, take a drink, close the gate on them so they're captured.

So that's water trapping and/or bait trapping.

The other way we use to gather the horses is with a helicopter. That is simply done by taking a helicopter out and gathering animals, funneling them into a portable corral. These are just green steel posts and like some jute burlap material on them. And if you notice, this horse right here has a halter on it.

What we'll do, in fact I think this horse right here does too. We'll actually have these horses - we call them guide horses, prodder horses, Judas horses; we have lots of names for them. But we actually release this horse out here and they literally want to run into here because back here that's where the horse buddy is tied up and that's where the grain bucket is.

These horses actually lead the while horses into the trap. It makes it a whole lot easier for the helicopter. They don't have to put the pressure on the animals. This is a very humane way to gather horses.

The next option would be, go back to the old days of cowboying the horses in using a lariat and choking horses down and dragging them into a trailer. You don't see that very often at all.

Post gathering - what do we do after we get them into the corral? Obviously we have to remove them from our temporary trap that we have here. And then they're going to be hauled to one of our holding facilities.

We have several short -term holding facilities in the state. This is an example of a short-term holding facility like the Delta corrals. It's more or less a feed lot. We have bunks here where we're putting hay into it and they're fed daily and they're looked at by a veterinarian regularly.

When we are preparing horses at a facility, what we're actually doing is we have a veterinarian working with us daily. Not only ourselves but a veterinarian who's going to age them, we're going to sort them by gender but keep the studs over here, the mares over there.

They all get their vaccination shots. With these horses, because we don't know if they're going to be adopted in Utah versus in Alabama they get vaccinated for all unique equine diseases nationwide. So they are getting the best care possible.

They're tested for diseases including West Nile and other types of things that we test them for. We Coggins test, which tests for Equine Infectious Anemia.

By law we have to put a freezemark on their neck. That's a regulatory requirement so that we know where the horse came from and we can actually track that number for identification purposes.

And then a lot of times you see a necklace around them - that's what's around their neck – around their neck right here is a neck tag and that helps us more easily identify them.

After they are gathered up we take them to an adoption event. This is an older picture because you can notice the large crowds we have here. Occasionally we get crowds like that but not quite as much anymore. If we don't' have budget demand and we'll talk about that in just a minute. But we take them out to an adoption. We try to get them adopted.

Honestly I've seen all of these wild horses and burros - these are photos from a show that we do every year. They're some amazing animals. There some beautiful animals. They make great companions for people; even the burros are very popular. But our demand is going down and I'll get into that right now.

JR: So if I tell you to lead a steer around at a stock show, how you do train a steer to lead?

You put a halter on it. Tie the other end of the halter onto that burro and that burro teaches the steer to lead. If that steer doesn't come, it will eventually, and it's broke.

Gus: I want to show you some graphs now and some more numbers, because this kind of tells a little bit of a story here. So the bars are the number of animals adopted. I know I could have taken this back and I didn't have time to add the last couple of years, but it just

follows suit.

So you can see the number of animals adopted. We were approaching 8,000 back in 2003 and if you go back here into the mid-90's there were some years we were at 10,000, animals adopted out to the public.

Man: That's just Utah?

Gus No, no that's nationwide. I wish it was just Utah. But - so here's the year 2012 and we're at about 2,500 animals adopted. Now in 2014 I just heard the numbers that we are at currently, and we are going to be challenged to reach 2,000 animals adopted nationwide this fiscal year.

Man: Why the trend?

Gus Good, good question, why the trend? And there's not one answer. I can say directly that the price of hay, fuel, and the economy directly influence our adoptions. You know if the economy has taken a huge plunge, that's not going to help. And I'd like to also point out that personally I think there's a culture shift. It used to be everybody in these rural towns had a horse in their backyard. Now you look at their backyard and they might have a four-wheeler, but how many people have horses?

Whether it is economic reasons or whatever I think that whole culture shift is happening across the United States. Now it doesn't occur everywhere. But I think that plays into part of our adoption market drop. The other thing is when you throw in the influence of domestic horse prices. If you look at our adoption success in a graph, then if the domestic horse prices are down our adoptions are down.

Right now the equine industry is what I would call very depressed, especially your mid-range or low-range price horses. If that price demand for horses would go up I guarantee you would see an increase in our adoption and it would possibly balance out.

If a person can go to a livestock sale barn and buy a papered (registered) quarter horse for $100, then you have to pay $125 to get a wild horse or a mustang, we're going to have a hard time getting that part of the horse market niche where people can go out and get these domestic horses at lower prices.

(Steve B): So if heard about the sales over at the Delta Facility - they're advertising on the radio and stuff - how many horses do you have over there?

(Gus): At our Delta facility we can hold as many as 300 horses there.

(Steve B): And how many do you sell?

(Gus): On a weekend like what we just advertised recently - two or three horses will

be adopted. And that's what we've seen in just recent years. It wasn't very long ago when BLM could go to Springville or Spanish Fork, bring 40 horses in and adopt most them all. I've been in this program since 1990 and witnessed where we went through a period of 10-15 years we'd take 40 horses to satellite events across the state, and if we were lucky, only take one or two back home. Almost everything would go and get adopted.

In fact I remember an adoption in Spanish Fork (I think it was 1997) we brought 87 horses, adopted all them, we brought some trucks in and had another event on Monday and adopted another 40. I mean it was fabulous. We just don't have that demand anymore.

(Steve B): So you're pasture holding facilities in Oklahoma and Kansas are growing?

(Gus): Yes. The adoption line on the graph is going down, and see this line is the animals removed is also going down. So last year our numbers removed were way down because the problem is we're running out of space to keep animals.

We are running out of space put them in short-term holding, also running out of space to put them in long-term holding.

(Steve B): Well you actually pointed out earlier that you should really be removing many more animals than you currently are doing.

(Gus): Our appropriate management level, yes, AML. Let's go to the next slide because it actually tells the other side of the story. Our holding costs – meaning the costs for us to hold animals – and so the animals that are in our holding facilities – here's the cost of what it is. Here we are holding fewer animals in 2002. Here we were spending $13-14 million in 2002, and we're now in 2012 here, and the cost is at $42 million.

(Steve B): That's millions!

(Gus): That's not thousands, this is millions. Yes.

Gus: We're looking at about $42 million roughly that was spent in 2012 on holding costs. You think about it, that's kind of staggering, and what is that taking away from?

And our appropriations have gone up and up but now what we're seeing is our appropriations have kind of flattening out. So we're being told we're not going to get much more money. You've got to figure this program out.

And now we'll open it up for questions. But one of the things that we're recognizing at the Bureau is what can we do?

One of the things we're looking at doing is increasing fertility control and other measures to help reduce populations on the open range, thus reducing animals that have to come off the range

with. There is a big push for this fertility control program that we can do now. But there are many, many challenges with that fertility control program.

I would have never said this about three or four years ago but we're looking at implementing things like spaying mares and non-reproducing herds, or portions of herds that are non-reproducing. Which is a total mind shift and it really boils down to having fewer animals that have to be removed off the range. It's because we don't have the adoption demand and we're trying to get away from long-term holding animals and associated extreme costs.

(Steve B): If you're a landowner in Kansas or Oklahoma and you've got land, you might want to contact BLM.

Gus: This brings up a good point. Because there's actually a number of solicitations out there right now. There's one on the street right now for holding areas in the West and the East for long-term pastures. There was no short-term holding bids in the East for a recent solicitation. But people do ask me "why is all the long-term holding only in the East?"

Well when you can grow grass with Mother Nature's help (rain) in the plains states versus in the West where you have to feed animals for four to five months out of the year due to snow and winter. When your base price breakdown comes in and you're in the West, you're usually a lot higher than a guy in Kansas. And so that's why they're there.

Man: How much money per horse per day are you spending? I call this warehousing.

Gus Good question. If you're talking about long-term pastures?

Man: Yes.

Gus In Kansas and Oklahoma it's currently about $1.35 a day, so roughly $500 a year. If you're looking at the price of our short term holding facility or contract facilities; it's going to be three times or four times that amount, so we are talking about $5 plus a day.

Man: I was told it was about seven or eight dollars?

Man: That actual number may have been wrong. But I could make more money feeding wild horses than feeding cows.

Gus Well that is an interesting point you brought that up because that used to be the case, but grass has gotten to be such a commodity in the mid-west now. We've got people that are housing horses that are actually trying to get out of the government contract because they can make more money on cattle right now because the price of beef is higher than it's ever been.

In 2004 there was an amendment (sale) to the free roaming wild horse and burro act that actually allowed BLM to look at the category of horses or burros that are over the age of 10. Also, if

they've been through multiple adoption events we have to sell them - so we don't adopt them we have to sell them.

That really hasn't been a big game-changer for the Bureau. Primarily because we have what we call an Appropriations Rider, that pertains to how we spend funding. It's more like a paragraph within our annual appropriations language that says as Federal government we will not expend Federal dollars for the sale or commercial exploitation of wild horse or burros.

With that language in place we can't allow these horses to go to slaughter legally even if we wanted to, which we don't. That's something that we as a government we don't do. You hear it all the time about change, you know on the internet or in media BLM changed the course of the slaughter and it's just not true. Legally we can't do it. We have 50,000 in holding, so we obviously don't sale animals illegally.

Again, I'm going to open it up for more questions.

Steve S: Did you have a perspective on "letting nature take its course?" I know it's a real controversial issue and there are a lot of interest groups that feel really strongly. I represent environmental but I'm actually, you know, more of a in the middle type person. I look at it from a practical standpoint you know.

You're kind of stuck in a hard place of having to do - try to get these numbers down but yet we're supporting them unofficially by providing water - not just as a rescue – but understand exactly so that they're not suffering. I've been going to a lot of these wild and exciting conferences and I see, you know, hundreds if not thousands of water resources have been (drilled) on public lands and private lands in the state.

And I've seen where they had to be camera trapped for photographing animals and you know, you're getting more horses than anything. But I think these come over artificially, and when boarding these animals there should be water shortages allowed to occur naturally. It just seems like it really is a mute comment point and you're spending all this money to capture and house the animals that were not capable of living on a landscape. Would you like to comment on that.

JR: Do you mind if I comment on that?

Gus: No go ahead.

JR: A public relations nightmare of dealing with wild horses the way we deal with other wildlife. I mean if we have a horse draw, just like we do for an elk tag. You'd hear the same thing. We saw starving horses there. If somebody goes down and sees it's laying down, in the snow, starving to death. The public relations nightmare will create an instant action and who pays for it?

I met with the one activist and tabloid from out of state who were really concerned about the horse trappers and his words were, "did we know we we're in trouble?" He gets it. He knows

we're in trouble. There is just a finite amount of money and that's the whole problem. We're warehousing them whereas other wildlife - okay I'll admit it when he was on the TV program I came on after him. I quoted Shakespeare or Born to Die. The Wild Horse and Burro Act that literally says they can't be adopted they are destroyed in the most humane way possible. Public relations would never allow it.

Gus: We do have a policy that we deal with using frank terms, it is our euthanasia policy. So if we had an animal like you saw there that wasn't walking around, but if we know it was down we would actually go put that animal down. We would destroy or euthanize it. Just for the humane reasons.

We haul water but we don't supply forage. In the winter times we actually have some winter die off or deaths out there in the winter. Are people out there observing them in the winter? No, not as much. Are they out in the summertime when we've got more light and better conditions - yes, they've got more and better access.

So yes, we've some instances of death loss around the country with some winter loss. And that's a little easier acceptable than horses that are, you know, dying from dehydration. But it's, yes, it's definitely a challenge. When you have a law, then you have policy or case law that maybe trumps that. Yes, but the Free roaming Wild Horse and Burro Act does say that when there's not an adoption demand, you know, that we're actually directed to get rid of them.

Then we have appropriations rider that tells us the Federal Agency how we manage those funded dollars and we can't go against them.

Man: In other words you can say that they need to be euthanized, but you cannot fund the euthanizing. You're funding the warehousing instead

Gus: Good question. We have different population growth suppression ideas, such as what we call our gelding policy. Pretty much every male animal; all of our stud horses are gelded.

Man: Oh yes, that's something that we would never push out there. So maybe, you know, if I said that a bunch of times and didn't take offence to it.

Man: You know, if people of America knew what NEPA was costing them they'd be marching in the street. And really the Wild Horse and Burro thing is really kind of the same thing.

Gus: They are. But what people don't realize is you can move the cattle. You can manage the wildlife. But wild horse population they're around 365 days a year and so it is a challenge that, you know, to meet that vegetative response of when to tout animals off of that grazing so plants can recover from that grazing impact.

Man: And a horse will graze that grass right down to the dirt. They're going to. And

unless you work on that it will not come back the way it was. You can move the cows out, but you leave the horses in there (removing the cows) they will literally destroy the grazing area.

Gus: I'm reminded of one of the worst situations I've ever been put in – was in 1999 right close to your country down there, you know where the air strip is down there off of Copper Globe. We had to go in and rescue some horses and when we got in there he had about 25 horses that had died from dehydration down in canyon. We literally were on horseback and had to push them down a canyon, and some of them were trying to get away, we had to rope them to keep them in check. I dallied up this horse next to me and that horse was so sand impacted from infection, it was like I had a dead animal on the end of the rope, and he could have just died right there.

And you know, many of the animal died two hours later. What a horrible, horrible death for those animals to die from dehydration. It still sticks with me vividly to this day. What a horrible way for an animal to die.

Man: In my opinion I think the key is to educate people on what's best for the horses. You see all these things on TV and they're just - some of them are just so lunatic. And I think it's the way that you're going to educate a lot of people is economically. With economics. I mean $800 million for three minutes? You're talking about so much money.

And then if people really knew what was best for the horses they would go along with it. And I think then you've got to deal with the public relations disaster that I know I've talked to (Megan) who had all these people wanting these groups that want to sue you all the time.

And so you just have to get public perception behind you, research and you know what let them bring their lawyers on, weigh emotions.

Man: Emotions are very touchy - and they are so good.

Gus: You know I've accepted people say that dogs are a man's best friend. In my opinion there's a large portion of the American public is actually elevated horse above the dog. The horse is the icon of so many people anymore.

Man: So how can you change public perception?

Man: Two thirds of this wild horse budget I've heard goes to feeding horses. He said the money allotted to him to take care of wild horses without having to spend it on warehousing them - he'd have things under control.

Gus: We need to eliminate the dependency on the adoption program; I mean we need a stronger fertility control. A lot of the horse advocates think that's part of the solution. Right now fertility control would only last a year and you can only apply three or four months, especially the winter months.

And then these horses are getting so smart. We use to be only capturing them every four to five years. Because we are now capturing them more frequently, then they're much more challenging to catch. So there is a need with the fertility ability that we have that if we could even take the edge off of the horse from their normal 20% growth.

Man: There is, yes there is.

Gus In the event that we begin sterilizing mares, doing it in compliance with the veterinary worlds standards. And do that in a field study with all the complications, you know. Is the public going to accept a 30% death loss?

Man: That means we'd maybe have about a 20 to 30% death losses if we performed that in a field situation and again would that horse be adoptable in the future?

Woman: Then if you begin to look at gelding all the stallions. We are sure that will work, but any stallion you leave behind are going to take their mares.

Man: There are always males out there that will be missed.

Man: And any pregnant mare that has an unborn foal is being affected.

Gus: If I may, I mean we talk about this and if I was king for a day, if (Juan) would say okay you're king for a day, you can do whatever you want. You know just saying, it would have to be for more than one day.

But I think we can help effectively manage populations out on our public lands if we were allowed to gather enough and, you know, on a regular basis I would implement fertility control in some areas. I would have some non-reproducing herds. I would have maybe a few select herds that we would continue removing animals from. A large number of the HMAs would be non-reproducing.

But then you would have an opportunity for the animals to come off, they're up for adoption. If they weren't adopted after six months, or a year, we would sell them. Whatever happens to them that's a private individuals privy, you know, their responsibility.

JR: I live on about a quarter of my grandfather's homestead. San Rafael Swell was my uncle's source of horses. They controlled the stock. The Swasey brothers went to Palouse Valley, Idaho which they tell me is really in Washington.

Gus: Yes it is.

JR: They bought a thoroughbred stallion - so he's down there - they controlled the horses. They could make big gathers. They were short on horses; all the horses belonged to them. They'd go through the community, sell what they could, and also do some horse trading. And when they got done they went to Wayne County. And guess what Wayne County did with the

horses - fish hatcheries. They were fish food and they made a living. It's all my fault.

Man: I agree with a whole bunch of these issues. Our biggest problem is being able to compete in the press.

Gus: Juan's trying to fight a battle where you have in the state of Nevada alone there's over 25,000 horses in that state. Then Wyoming you have a court-ordered gathers that they do and do this. And so we should submit request to do gathers and try to do management and we're told no. We can't because this is a higher priority here and then a higher priority here.

We've already gotten to 50,000 animals in holding. We watch the population decrease a little and so it's a challenge within the agency itself of who can stay on the approval line first to get the job done, or approval for gathers.

Man: Congress has to point at the enemy. Which direction is it the American public wants to go?

Gus: And that's why it's almost out of our hands as an agency. Congress has to (if they're not going to give us more money then) tell us where we're going to go with this program. Because they could turn around and say okay here's $30 million more dollars, go gather horses and stick them in holding. And if that's what the public wants we will do it as an agency.

Man: Excellent presentation.

Sherry: November 12 and 13, two day meeting with one of those being a field trip day to Little Sahara. I'll find lodging for us - either Fillmore or Delta.

Meeting adjourned.

END

Approved: _____Carl R Albrecht_____
RAC Chairman

Date: _____10/3/14_____