



Bears Ears National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Meeting Notes

Wednesday, March 31, 2021 8:00 am to 3:00 pm

Meeting format: Zoom

In Attendance:

Monument Advisory Committee Members: Bruce Adams (Chairman/Local Elected Official), Ryan Benally (Vice Chair/Tribal Interest), Jared Berrett (Developed Recreation), Gail Johnson (Livestock Grazing), Lee Bennett (Archaeology), Jami Bayles (Public at Large), Danny “Scoot” Flannery (Dispersed Recreation), Dustin Randall (Developed Recreation), Zeb Dalton (Private Land Owner), Gordon Larsen (State Government), Brooks Britt (Paleontology), Adam Redd (Local Business Owner), Kelly Pehrson (Public at Large). MAC members not in attendance: Alfred Ben (Tribal Concerns), Vacant (Conservation).

BLM/USFS: Greg Sheehan (BLM Utah State Director), Gary Torres (BLM Canyon Country District Manager/Designated Federal Official), Amber Denton Johnson (BLM Field Manager), Jake Palma (BLM Bears Ears National Monument Manager), Kathryn Conant (USFS Director of Lands and Minerals-Intermountain Region), Darren Olson (Acting USFS Forest Supervisor), Michael Engelhart (USFS-Moab/Monticello District Ranger), Ted Neff (USFS Moab/Monticello Deputy District Ranger), Lisa Wilkolak (BLM Acting District Public Affairs Specialist), Claudia Merino (BLM Ethics Counselor), Kyle Beagley (USFS Forest Plan Lead), Daniel Luke (USFS Forest Engineer), Rachel Wootton (BLM Utah Public Affairs Specialist), and other BLM and USFS supporting staff.

Public/Media: There were about 18 other attendees including members of the public, non-governmental organizations and educational institutions.

Yellow Highlights in document show BENM MAC recommendations.

8:00 am – Meeting Logistics

Rachel Wootton- Quick technical support housekeeping items. Panelists and attendees have different platform views. Let her know if you have audio issues. Can call in if internet audio is not working. Can chime in or use raise hand. Public comment period starts at 12:30. Have 11 signed up currently.

Claudia Merino- DOI Ethics Office. Email was sent to each MAC member by Sara Sims regarding ethics responsibilities, if there are no changes, just respond no changes, only about half of MAC has responded. MAC members cannot have a direct financial interest in any decisions the MAC makes. Cannot participate in any matters pertaining to direct financial interest to you.

Gail Johnson (Livestock permittees)- I am concerned about not being able to talk about grazing permits, she represents livestock permittees, so anytime the MAC talks about grazing permits she would like to be able to give her viewpoint.

Amber: Charter requested grazing permittees, so it is clear we want you to participate, we are keeping things general, in this committee we will not be making any decisions that impacts one specific permit. If something comes up that has a direct financial impact, we will deal with that, but discussion should be general.

8:15 am – Leadership Welcome

Greg Sheehan, BLM Utah State Director. Thank you for participation and taking time to be here. Went over the nomination process for MAC members for new and reapplicants, will likely take several months, so prudent that we are meeting at this time. New administration and new DOI Secretary Haaland priorities- 1. Beating the pandemic. 2. Equity and Inclusion. 3. Climate crisis. 4. Build back better-infrastructure and workforce. Secretary Haaland is planning to visit Utah in April. We don't know what changes may occur so today we would like to focus on land management practices.

Bruce Adams- agree that we need to stick with the MMP as is and not speculate, keep focused on what charter says we need to be doing.

Greg- Please focus public comments on MMP we have, not in changes to monument that may occur.

Gary Torres- These issues are still important no matter what may happen with the monument boundaries. We are presenting somethings to give our perspective but are here to listen and would like feedback. We have previously talked about recreation quite a lot, this meeting we are focusing on other uses to give a larger picture of what occurs within the monument.

Darren Olsen (USFS-Acting Forest Supervisor)- Appreciates efforts that have been put into making and attending the meeting.

Kathryn Conant – Thank you to all involved, mostly here to listen and learn.

8:30 am – Agenda Review

Jake Palma- Welcomed reappointed MAC members. Appreciation expressed to those with expiring terms in April. Introductions of each MAC member. Programs that are being managed that will continue to exist no matter what happened with the Monument review. We would like to discuss the challenges and opportunities with management of these programs. One of the critical programs is the woodcutting program, would like to discuss what the opportunities may be for this program. Went over the agenda, agenda is on the Bears Ears MAC website and link to it posted in the chat.

As a sidenote- separate from this meeting, there is a focus group at 3:30 about recreation in the BENM and Cedar Mesa SRMA areas. You are invited to this if you would like to join.

Kelly Pehrson. How does this focus group fit in with the MAC?

Jake: We have been conducting visitor surveys and focus groups to better understand the recreation that is occurring. It is a public meeting that is separate from the MAC.

Kelly: Was BLM told they need to do this as part of the BENM planning?

Jake: In the MMP, we are to have recreation and cultural resource plans. It is helping inform us to help do these implementation plans.

Gary- It is really just data gathering, a tool to be able to gauge recreation experience.

Amber: Just wanted to make the invite to you as a member of the public as many of you likely have expertise that would help inform this group.

Kelly- So you will do different focus groups for grazing, etc, not just recreation?

Amber: Focus groups are specific for recreation data gathering.

Gary- Focus groups is a just an inventory tool, like other inventory tools, like vegetation sampling for example, but this tool is used specific to recreation. Helps us know what recreationist are experiencing and what they want to experience.

8:40 am to 11:22 – Review of October 2020 MAC meeting minutes and informal recommendations

Ted Neff- Slides about Doll House and Lewis Lodge (Presentation attached). Previous, ongoing and future work. Doll House- Installed some signage, traffic counter and closed parking lot to camping. Consideration of managing the increased visitation: increased signage, closing alcove to access, permits. Lewis Lodge- issues with visitors walking on the walls and kiva, collector's piles, erosion around the features (done some emergency work last year to address the erosion). Should this be public use site, limit visitation to overlook or ledge, require permits?

Bruce Adams- People are visiting more and still don't know how to visit these sites. Not sure how I feel about permitting, would need to know # of people and # at a time allowed. Stabilizing trails seems reasonable to do. Maybe we are at the point where we need to restrict where people can go, this is happening all over BENM. Would rather go with interpretive signs and educating the public rather than being restrictive. Do we have interpretive and educational signs at these sites?

Ted- We would like to increase signage but need to provide the proper message. Would like consensus with the stakeholders involved.

Bruce: MAC has been supportive of more information and getting people educated about how to visit the sites. Critical to get information for self-training so people can do the right thing.

Jared Barret- Education is key, there is a lot of interest. Not in favor of closing, as a last resort, would consider guided tours for some sites.

Kelly- What are the increases we have seen?

Ted: We have the data, will go get that information and share the numbers.

Lee Bennet- People expect to be able to visit and touch these sites that were named in the proclamations, but this expectation can lead to damage. It is a difficult conundrum, most people do want to do the right thing but don't know what that is, so it is up to the federal

agencies to increase education efforts whether thru signs, rangers or it could lead to closures of sites. For some sites, maybe enough for some to just see from an overlook, but others will still want to visit the site up close. We need to move forward with it asap. Jared-Out in the backcountry a lot and the permit processes makes it harder to go visit sites spontaneously, but if the permit process isn't competitive and easy to obtain online, that could work and be across the board for BENM. As part of the process require that they certify that you watched or read guidelines about how to visit cultural sites. Need a holistic approach, how do we want this to be visited, want it to be different than a Mesa Verde experience. Using a Grand Gulch model, permit to inform visitors rather than to restrict. Ted- To summarize, Education is the key and what we'd like to be focused on and done now, permitting should be more of a last resort and don't want to see sites closed to visitation. We have seen a ten-fold increase in visitation to answer the question Kelly asked.

Bruce: We still need to do a formal vote on some of these recommendations. Let's go through the rest of the informal recommendations, then decide whether to do formal votes on recommendations.

Bears Ears Road: Jake: MAC expressed some concern about the use on this road, people driving too fast.

Kelly- Would the county do this of the FS?

Ted: We work with the county to accomplish work done on the road.

Lee: This road was constructed by the FS for the State as part of route of old highway 95. Does the State retain any jurisdiction on this road?

Bruce: Any road the county claims, they share ownership interest with the State.

Lee: If it is to be signed or graveled would be a cost to the County.

Impacts due to the monument, include law enforcement, search and rescue, trash and human waste are all concerns to the cities and counties. Agencies are underfunded, hopefully there is legislation to help take care of these impacts.

Ryan: Is this a recommendation that we are all voting on?

Bruce: We have a responsibility to make recommendations and if these are still one we would like to make, then yes, I would like the committee to vote on it.

Ryan: Yes, I recommend that we vote on this. People are walking along this road as well, so improving the road will help with safety and access to the area.

Bruce: Let's go through the highlights of the rest of them and decide on voting.

Jared: Trail from the Natural Bridge road up to the Bear Ears Buttes may be a good hiking trail.

Jake: Dispersed camping and developed camping. Including spur road in a TMP. If we have to close dispersed camping in some areas, where would we be shift camping. Potential locations of campgrounds. Designated dispersed site, group size limits, focus on meadows.

Bruce: Concern about closing dispersed camping because of hunting in the fall.

Scot Flannery- Education rather than closing to dispersed camping.

Kelly- Will a fee be charged?

Jake: At developed campgrounds, yes, with designated dispersed camping, no, not generally fees. We also thought if there are opportunities outside of public lands for camping.

Bruce: There are businesses that provide camping, just want to make sure we don't impact them, but what we are discussing here should not really compete with that type of camping.

Jake: We also talked last meeting about potential locations for new campgrounds where we will also have information portals, meant to capture people and informing them about how to visit this area and cultural sites correctly. What types of amenities should these campgrounds have?

Gordon Larsen: Can you talk about the way you are looking at this decision, when you create a campground, will it become a magnet and draw more people rather than just providing amenities as the need has increased?

Jake: There isn't a lot of developed camping right now within BENM, the only one in BENM is Superbowl CG. We have concerns about where people camp, we would still have dispersed too but direct where to protect cultural and natural resources. .

Gary: Camping is a partnership opportunity. Private industry should accommodate campers who want to be close to town if there is support for that. I don't think having new campgrounds will draw people more as BENM is becoming a destination, they will be a response to the increase of visitation that is occurring.

Gordon: We don't need to solve a problem that we don't have yet, having another Moab is what terrifies some people, not likely a model that we would like to follow.

Bruce: Superbowl CG, Hamburger Rock and the Falls areas – those types of campgrounds have been helpful to the public.

Amber: We have a lot of people asking where they can go to camp, and when the answer is there is 1 campground or none in the area they are asking about, they are confused by that. We need a range of opportunities, provide developed campgrounds but also continue to allow for dispersed camping in areas where we are not impacting resources.

Jake: Concept of focal areas, concentrating use along the Highway 95 corridor. ID a handful of sites where to direct most users.

Bruce: I think as a committee we should take a vote, do we vote on each individually or vote on them all at once time.

Kelly: Would be good to go through each one.

(See Attachment D)

Topic: **Doll House Management**

Recommendation number: 1

Notes	Yes	No
We do not want a rope or fence in front of the structure because it will change the feel of the place and impede photo ops.		

Non-lottery, unlimited, permit system to instill accountability on users/visitors. It should include educational messaging on how to visit.		
Parking area may need to be moved in order to accommodate more vehicles.		

Motion to adopt the recommendation as is, this was followed by a discussion about if permitting was already occurring, it was clarified that it was not, and motion was changed to only include parts 1 and 3 of the recommendation. More discussion ensued as a MAC member felt that the education of part 2 needed to be included, just not through a permit system, motion to adopt recommendation as described below.

Recommendation 1- Doll House Management:

- We do not want a rope or fence in front of the structure because it will change the feel of the place and impede photo ops.
- More educational messaging on how to visit the site, either through kiosk at sites or ranger stations.
- Parking area may need to be moved in order to accommodate more vehicles.

MAC members voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

Topic: **Lewis Lodge Protection**

Recommendation number: 2

Notes	Yes	No
Keep the site as pristine as possible.		
Do not close the site.		
Designate it as a Public Use Site?		
Allow people to go to the overlook but then require a permit/permission to go to the lodge.		
Continue partner engagement/tribal consultation for stabilization work, protective projects, and ongoing management.		
Increase Law Enforcement presence.		
Place interp signage at the overlook so people feel a sense of been-there-done-that and feel like they don't need to go all the way to the site.		
Non-lottery, unlimited, permit system to instill accountability on users/visitors. It should include educational messaging on how to visit.		
Create bike access to the overlook.		
Take action sooner rather than later to avoid people feeling entitled to enter.		

MAC member asked how the increased law enforcement would be provided, by the county or the agencies.

Ted: The FS would increase law enforcement, but also work with county. Also clarified what a Public Use Site means. They can come visit but we don't "advertise" them. Public Use designation would make it more of a "Front country site".

MAC members discussed eliminating these parts of the recommendation: designating as a Public Use Site and the parts of the recommendation about a non-lottery permitting system. More discussion ensued about requiring a permit system after the overlook due to concerns of safety. MAC member asked if there have currently been any safety incidents.

Ted: There haven't been any incidents as far as health and safety but do have people impacting the site. Possible solution is to just ask people to hold at the overlook while another group is on the ledge.

Gary: Agencies can monitor and adjust, but just having an overlook will meet the needs of many visitors.

MAC member: We need to be aware that what we do with this recommendation will also impact the next recommendation coming up.

Motion to adopt recommendation as modified below.

Recommendation 2: Lewis Lodge Protection

- Keep the site as pristine as possible.
- Do not close the site.
- Continue partner engagement/tribal consultation for stabilization work, protective projects, and ongoing management.
- Increase Law Enforcement presence.
- Place interp signage at the overlook so people feel a sense of been-there-done-that and feel like they don't need to go all the way to the site.
- Include educational messaging on how to visit.
- Create bike access to the overlook.
- Take action sooner rather than later to avoid people feeling entitled to enter.

MAC members voted: Approved, two voted no. One no to the increase in law enforcement and one no because would like to see some access control to the ledge/lodge itself.

Topic: **Lewis Lodge Safety**

Recommendation number: 3

Notes	Yes	No
Assume liability by putting up signs? Do nothing?		
Prohibit entrance to the ledge and site?		
Place interp signage at the overlook so people feel a sense of been-there-done-that and feel like they don't need to go all the way to the site.		
Limit the number of people allowed on the edge at one time.		

MAC member asked for clarification on the first item, remembers it being a question that the MAC needed answered, not really a recommendation.

Ted: Will consult with the Office of General Counsel about this liability question.

Gary: Solicitors in the past have said, once you start putting up signs, there is a higher risk of liability, we can't mark every hazard out there, so to mark some and not others may create liability in other places that aren't marked.

Motion to strike all 3 items of recommendation 3.

MAC members voted: Yes except Lee – We should be limiting the # of people at any one time, but fine with eliminating the other 2. Could be dangerous to have an unlimited number of people but also with more people more likely to damage structure.

Gail: Maybe it can be addressed in signage at the overlook, something like please stay at overlook until a group that is at the site back at the overlook, put it on the visitors to make the right choice. Gordon: We shouldn't suggest restrictions that we have no authority to enforce. Best thing to do is signage and education to encourage limited use.

Kelly: Maybe to address this we recommend creating signage that will encourage and educate so that people self-limit numbers that go out on the ledge part.

Gordon: Develop signage that encourages caution and encourages small groups out on the ledge and site.

Motion to adapt the recommendation as follows:

Recommendation 3: Lewis Lodge Safety

- **Develop signage that encourages caution and encourages small groups to the ledge/site.**

MAC members voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

Topic: **Bears Ears Road**

Recommendation number: 4

Notes	Yes	No
Increase signage to slow drivers down, and other safety signs (such as Narrow Road with Two-way Traffic)		
Continue and/or increase road maintenance (gravel).		

Zeb would like to add to this recommendation that the road be widened. Discussion on if this would be an issue with existing right-of-ways. Support expressed for widening the road as a safety solution for people who hike along the road.

Motion to adopt recommendation as is plus widening the road.

Recommendation 4: Bears Ears Road

- Increase signage to slow drivers down, and other safety signs (such as Narrow Road with Two-way Traffic)
- Continue and/or increase road maintenance (gravel).
- Widen the road.

Approved-MAC members voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

Topic: **Dispersed Camping on Bears Ears Road/ Meadows**

Recommendation number: 5

Notes	Yes	No
Include the spur roads on the Travel Management Plan. This will allow for maintenance like possible hardening of the spurs.		
If some sites get closed then provide other places to camp (for example: Grand Flats Campground).		
Create designated dispersed sites. Develop some primitive campsites		
Make parking areas near the road delineating it with something like logs, and add a trail to the camp spot.		
Implement group size restrictions?		
Do not close dispersed camping.		
Grand Flats is great place for a campground.		
Rotate meadow closures with signs about restoring the vegetation.		

Scout- Creation of designated dispersed sites is oxymoronic. Instead, just ID the sites that are being impacted and close those, also doesn't want group size limits.

Amber: This is the basic process we use, inventory dispersed sites, ID the ones that have resource issues and close/rehab and we also find a better spot for the dispersed campsite and designate that this is a good spot to direct the public to.

Scout: Still thinks better to instead of having a list of designated sites, just find the ones that shouldn't be used and close those and leave everything else open.

Amber: Issue with that is there can be inadvertent issues if we leave everything else open. Some areas we may need to have place where you can only disperse camp in certain areas, site specific.

Gary: There's a gradation of what is available for camping, also we don't want to necessarily mark arch sites by closing dispersed camps. More localized then general. For example, on a meadow, maybe can only handle 3 sites.

Amber: When people ask about where to camp, that solves most of the issue. Superbowl is in BENM. Hamburger Rock outside BENM. On way to the Falls site there are lot of dispersed camping, we have signed some areas. We are aiming for a mix of Developed, Designated and Open Dispersed.

Dustin: Mainly concerning Elk Ridge, what about just cutting access off to vehicles to these sites, but still allow walk-in camping sites.

Gail- Group size restrictions may be necessary to not kill the meadows- gets too crazy sometimes of the year have up to 20 vehicles. I don't like restrictions, but feel need to have something to address group size as it can get to be too much.

Kelly- At the county we tried to do permitting for large groups and there was a lot of heat given for that, it would be controversial to limit group sizes.

Gary- This has been struggle and is contentious, there will be an impact with large groups. Maybe the recommendation can be that the agencies come up with some recommendations to come back to the MAC with.

Scoot: Need to enforce not driving OHVs all over meadows. That type of camping with campers only impacts areas near roads, everywhere else has more primitive camping.

Motion to strike all except Do not close to dispersed camping.

Dustin: Limited vehicle access, but not wanting to close dispersed camping.

Gail: Don't want to just recommend don't close dispersed camping, may need to develop some primitive camp site, and trails from parking, but don't want to leave it willy-nilly with no direction.

Dustin: For groups larger than 75 on USFS, need a permit anyways, maybe improve some areas and designate as larger group sites that are already impacted?

Gail: Recommend for signage to educate public about dispersed camping about impacts on meadows.

Motion to adopt recommendation as follows:

Recommendation 5: Dispersed Camping on Bears Ears Road/ Meadows

- Do not close dispersed camping
- Signage and other information to educate public about dispersed camping about impacts on meadows.

Approved, 1 no vote. No vote because we need #1 about spur roads, also suggest, close spur roads crossing meadows, but provide for alternative route, provide a mix of single and group areas. Rehab areas and sign it so public better understands why.

Topic: Economic Development of Local Campgrounds

Recommendation number: 6

Notes	Yes	No
Locals should not have to create campgrounds. There is not enough private land outside of towns that would be conducive to locally owned campgrounds and it would take too much infrastructure to utilize private land.		
We don't want public campgrounds to compete with private ones.		

Discussed the reason for this recommendation. Just a concern raised that we don't compete with private businesses the provide camping.

Motion to strike all of the recommendation as difficult to to know if there's an infringement.

Recommendation 6: Economic Development of Local Campgrounds

- **Strike the recommendation in whole.**

Approved-MAC members voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

Topic: **Potential Developed Campgrounds**

Recommendation number: 7

Notes	Yes	No
MAC members like the three suggested locations: Grand Flats, Comb Wash, and Shay Mountain Vista.		
Place kiosks and other signs at these campgrounds to create informational “portals”		
Texas Flat/Mule Canyon and Muley Point (even though it is outside the Monument boundaries) could be other potential sites.		
Amenities should include: toilet facilities, defined parking, fire ring, picnic tables, trash receptacles, all-weather road, kiosks/information panels, fencing, and fees. Some spaces closer together, some further apart.		

Question about where Shay Vista would be located, answer at the junction of 211 and the Harts Draw Road.

Motion to adopt recommendation as is.

Recommendation 7: Potential Developed Campgrounds

- **MAC members like the three suggested locations: Grand Flats, Comb Wash, and Shay Mountain Vista.**
- **Place kiosks and other signs at these campgrounds to create informational “portals”**
- **Texas Flat/Mule Canyon and Muley Point (even though it is outside the Monument boundaries) could be other potential sites.**
- **Amenities should include: toilet facilities, defined parking, fire ring, picnic tables, trash receptacles, all-weather road, kiosks/information panels, fencing, and fees. Some spaces closer together, some further apart.**

Approved- MAC members voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

Topic: **Dispersed Camping**

Recommendation number: 8

Notes	Yes	No
Visual resources need to be examined, especially in overcrowded areas.		
Protection of cultural sites needs to be addressed.		

Discussion of if this is already standard procedure to protect cultural resources. The agencies consider this with NEPA and as part of our process but if MAC wants to make a recommendation, could add an additional focus to it.

Motion to adopt recommendation as is.

Recommendation 8:

- Visual resources need to be examined, especially in overcrowded areas.
- Protection of cultural sites needs to be addressed.

MAC members voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

Topic: **Focal Areas**

Recommendation number: 9

Notes	Yes	No
Focal Areas are necessary.		
Mule Canyon needs more development.		
Cave Towers is ripe for protective development.		
Focal Areas should be used to educate the public.		
Arch Canyon and Arch Canyon Overlook could be Focal Points.		
The Hwy 95 corridor is a primary spot for Focal Areas.		
Developing a tiered category type thing for accessibility could be helpful. Tier 1 for easily accessible sites with parking areas, toilets, etc. all the way to Tier 4 for having to backpack into the wilderness. This will help address the diversity of users.		

Motion to approve recommendation as follows:

Recommendation 9:

- Focal Areas are necessary.
- Mule Canyon needs more development.
- Cave Towers is ripe for protective development.
- Focal Areas should be used to educate the public.
- Arch Canyon and Arch Canyon Overlook could be Focal Points.
- The Hwy 95 corridor is a primary spot for Focal Areas
- Developing a tiered category type thing for accessibility could be helpful. Tier 1 for easily accessible sites with parking areas, toilets, etc. all the way to Tier 4 for having to backpack into the wilderness. This will help address the diversity of users.

MAC members voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

11:30 am – Lunch

12:30 pm – Public comment period

Curtis Yanito- "Good afternoon. I want to make some comments on what you guys discussed this morning, over Bears Ears area and all the opening up new doors to new developments over some ancient grave sites. You guys talked about developing new campgrounds and hiking trails and the roads and hunting and all those privileges. My concerns over these things like campgrounds is they open doors to new avenues towards destruction and looting, that is my main concern. As far as looting, the trail, like a hidden trail can create that as well, and anybody that visits in the area, they won't stay on the trail, they'll make their own trail, once they go over a hill or something like that, and same thing with the ATV. You guys talk about widening the roads, and things like that and do that, that increases people, population coming in and going fast, driving fast, making dust and shaking up ruins and more destruction. I think the way it is right now, I think it should be left as it is and to really considered a lot of these things that to go forward because of the looting concern because we have a history of looting in the past by our own community here and some people from out of state coming in here and getting involved in some, a lot of these activities like that. But as far as widening the roads, I don't think we should be increasing traffic and allowing more people to have access into the area because we don't have enough law enforcement it sounds like. What I am thinking about all these things, even with hunting privileges, you see bullets holes along on petrified writings and so forth and same with looting, people go out and hunt and with my experience, I've been out there hunting (interrupted by moderator to let him know he had 25 seconds left). Ok, so what I think should happen is have law enforcement on these, because of the artifacts and anybody that goes in, whoever is coming back out should be searched, whatever, their vehicles for artifacts, I think that should be some kind of law that be enforced. Thank you."

Holly Adams- "I hope my question isn't off-base, based on what Commissioner Adams said. My question was based upon the recent passing of funding for a study for a visitor center. Will this board have purview in helping direct that visitor center?"

Ben Burr – "I included this on my registration screen so you will have this in writing. I represent the Blue Ribbon Coalition, I'm the policy director, this is a non-profit organization that advocates for recreation and public access to public lands. We have been paying close attention to the Executive Order on advancing racial equality and support for underserved communities through the Federal Government that was issued by President Joe Biden. This Executive Order mandates a comprehensive approach to advancing equity for all, including people of color and others who have been historically underserved, marginalized and adversely affected by persistent poverty and inequality. This Executive Order applies to persons with disabilities. There has no been group more greatly marginalized and excluded by public land management polices than people with disabilities. In many cases, management policies focused on minimizing environmental impacts of motorized travel and recreation result in dramatic decrease in recreation opportunities that disproportionately impact persons with disabilities. The Biden Administration's focus on equity in this Executive Order, changes the equation of Americans with Disabilities Act, which focuses only on equality of opportunity. By shifting the focus to equity, the Biden Executive Order focuses on equality of outcome and what we are trying to find out is how bodies, such as

this one, the Monument Advisory Committee, the BLM in general and other Executive Branch agencies, what they are going to do to ensure that management plans and practices are in compliance with this Executive Order as it pertains to persons with disabilities and specifically, what will you do to ensure that there are equity of outcomes and ensure that those who are mobility impaired and have disabilities are able to enjoy our public lands at the same level as other Americans. If we could get a response to that in some form, I would really appreciate that, I know we probably don't have time for that on the meeting but hope there's a time we can connect in the future and discuss this more at length. That's all I have."

Mark Boshell- "I appreciate this opportunity, I won't need much time here. I just wanted to congratulate the committee on their good work that they're doing. Access to public lands and protection of those public lands are important to the state of Utah, so I just wanted to congratulate them on their good work for trying to balance these two important tasks. The Bears Ears region is an asset to the State of Utah and we want to make sure that it's managed properly, I just wanted to thank everybody for their good work and that's really all I had to say today. Thank you."

Leland Grass- I'd like to state about these meetings. I think I have attended these meetings before, it was a couple of years ago. I got a message from one of your groups there but it didn't really state the details of when the meeting was going to be, it just said something about 12 o'clock. When I got on, there was nobody there and I stayed on till right now, they told me it was 12:30 comment. I don't really know what has been said from this morning, I don't know when you guys met, I'm kind of dumbfounded here and I have mentioned about these kinds of communications, miscommunications, way back when I was attending you meetings and I would like to have that information submitted to me informally, so I won't be missing what's all these talks are about. It is very important to the Navajo people, the Diné people and even the Navajo government. We are traditional, we still have traditional people here that lives off these lands, whatever you think or say about those lands, that we know about, that we live there, we don't want no government to just kind of take a lot of information for themselves away from us. And I would like to have that information and communication open at all costs, that's most important. I think that is the very most important, right now I don't want to talk about what you guys have been talking about and that I don't even know of and so I am just kind of getting here last minute, talking to myself, it shouldn't be like that. I would like to get my information to you guys so I for future meetings you can get me the messages and information. I also I would like to have the meetings forwarded to me as well and then maybe we can do another meeting but this time formally. That's all I have to say, Thank you.

1:00 pm – BENM Updates and General Program Discussion

Michael Engelhart (USFS)- FS COVID updates and other FS updates.
Kyle Beagley- FS Forest Planning updates.

Daniel Luke- Great American Outdoors Act – Gooseberry Renovation and Devil Canyon CG, near monument. Road signage included in the monument. Does MAC have information on projects or partners this money can be used for?

Kelly- Is the Bears Ears road a Schedule A road?

Daniel – yes, allows us to let county to help maintain and collect State gas tax funds, FS has been providing fund as well, have put about \$120,000 into that road so far. The road is still and FS road, we would have to do NEPA to widen the road, it is not under an ROW. We can continue to harden it, but to widen it would take NEPA.

Amber- Updates- Have opened Kane Gulch and Sand Island, have seen a large increase in visitation, we do have people out there to be present and interact with visitors. COVID updates.

1:45 pm – Discussion of grazing, lands and realty, woodcutting programs

Jed Carling – Presentation- grazing recognized as a use and a value. What allotments are in BENM, what areas are unavailable to grazing.

Nephi Noyes- Discussed monitoring tools BLM uses. Drought and impacts.

Bruce- How do you mitigate for wildlife when you reduce the producer but not wildlife numbers. Gary: Should account for allocation to wildlife in the RMPs.

Cory- USFS- weeds, 3 allotments with BENM and what is going on currently and future projects.

Bruce expressed appreciation for Jed and Nephi. Supportive of developing water or other range improvements.

Norbert- Projects occurring in BENM. Fiber optic lines to bring internet to underserved communities.

Jake: Any thoughts for discussion from MAC? No comments.

Wildlife- Tom Plank (BLM) – Golden Eagles and Peregrine falcons named in the Proclamations. Avoidance areas in Indian Creek for climbing. Phase 1 – Mar1 to May, closed areas. Phase 2- narrow down to nests that are still active. Phase 3 releases all areas from restrictions.

Jake Palma- Woodcutting - Many local communities depend on wood for heat and cooking food. Need a sustainable program that will continue to meet demands while protection the woodland resource. Demand increased in 2021 by about four-fold, partially because Free Use Permits were temporarily offered due to COVID19. Challenges: Off road OHV use, availability of wood resource, cutting outside seasons (USFS) and methods of providing permits. Opportunities: develop internal BLM committee, partnerships with chapters houses and others, standard operating procedures for BLM to rehab off road incursions. Online permits.

MAC discussion ideas - Anything that can be done to simplify the process for those that use wood to heat their home and cook food is welcomed.

Lee- If you put together a committee, do something to engage with local chapters of Navajo Nation and White Mesa Ute tribe. They may have ideas of where is appropriate to gather wood, how far to drive to get wood, how far from vehicle.

Jake- We plan to have Shirley Cloud-Lane involved in the BLM committee to facilitate conversations with Tribes and Tribal communities, including Chapter Houses.

Ryan- Jake and Shirley have been getting ahold of the chapters and been part of chapter meetings. Woodcutting program is of high importance. Arizona Navajos also use this area for woodgathering. I ask that we emphasize how individuals can get permits, in addition to working with the local chapters.

Amber- As we do fuels projects, we incorporate woodgathering, incorporating design to meet local needs. For example, having contractors doing the work, piling wood near roads where it can be collected and not have to go off road.

2:45 pm – Final thoughts

Bruce: Appreciate everybody's willingness to adjust to taking time to go over and vote on recommendations. Get applications out to those who have seats that are expiring so they can work on reapplying.

3 pm – Adjourn for the day

ATTACHMENTS

A. Federal Register Notice

B. Agenda

C. PowerPoint Presentations

D. Informal Recommendations from October 2020 BENM MAC Meeting

A. Federal Register Notice



SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This notice informs the public that HUD has submitted to OMB a request for approval of the information collection described in Section A. The **Federal Register** notice that solicited public comment on the information collection for a period of 60 days was published on September 17, 2020 at 85 FR 58067.

A. Overview of Information Collection

Title of Information Collection: HUD Loan Sale Bidder Qualification Statement.

OMB Approval Number: 2502-0576.
OMB Expiration Date: January 31, 2021.

Type of Request: Revision of a currently approved collection.

Form Numbers: HUD-90092; HUD-9611; and HUD-9612.

Description of the need for the information and proposed use: The Qualification Statement solicits from Prospective bidders to the HUD Loan Sales the basic qualifications required for bidding including but not limited to, Purchaser Information (Name of Purchaser, Corporate Entity, Address, Tax ID), Business Type, Net Worth, Equity Size, Prior History with HUD Loans and prior sales participation. By executing the Qualification Statement, the purchaser certifies, represents and warrants to HUD that each of the statements included are true and correct as to the purchaser and thereby qualifies them to bid.

Respondents (i.e. affected public): Business or other for-profit; Not-for-profit institutions.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 320.

Estimated Number of Responses: 640.

Frequency of Response: On occasion.

Average Hours per Response: 0.5 hours.

Total Estimated Burden: 160.

B. Solicitation of Public Comment

This notice is soliciting comments from members of the public and affected parties concerning the collection of information described in Section A on the following:

(1) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility;

(2) The accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information;

(3) Ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and

(4) Ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond; including through

the use of appropriate automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology, e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses.

(5) Ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

HUD encourages interested parties to submit comment in response to these questions.

Authority: Section 3507 of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, 44 U.S.C. Chapter 35.

Colette Pollard,

*Department Reports Management Officer,
Office of the Chief Information Officer.*

[FR Doc. 2021-00852 Filed 1-14-21; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4210-67-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Indian Affairs

[212A2100DD/AAKC001030/
A0A501010.999900253G]

Indian Gaming; Extension of Tribal-State Class III Gaming Compact (Rosebud Sioux Tribe and the State of South Dakota)

AGENCY: Bureau of Indian Affairs, Interior.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: This notice announces the extension of the Class III gaming compact between the Rosebud Sioux Tribe and the State of South Dakota.

DATES: The extension takes effect on January 15, 2021.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Paula L. Hart, Director, Office of Indian Gaming, Office of the Assistant Secretary—Indian Affairs, Washington, DC 20240, (202) 219-4066.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: An extension to an existing Tribal-State Class III gaming compact does not require approval by the Secretary if the extension does not modify any other terms of the compact. 25 CFR 293.5. The Rosebud Sioux Tribe and the State of South Dakota have reached an agreement to extend the expiration date of their existing Tribal-State Class III gaming compact to April 26, 2021. This publication provides notice of the new expiration date of the compact.

Tara Sweeney,

Assistant Secretary—Indian Affairs.

[FR Doc. 2021-00778 Filed 1-14-21; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Land Management

[212 LLUTY02000 L17110000.PN0000
LXSSJ0650000]

Notice of Public Meeting, Bears Ears National Monument Advisory Committee, Utah

AGENCY: Bureau of Land Management, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of public meeting.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Federal Land Policy and Management Act, as amended, the Federal Advisory Committee Act, and the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act, the U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management's (BLM) Bears Ears National Monument Advisory Committee (BENM MAC) will meet as indicated below.

DATES: The BENM MAC will hold a virtual meeting on March 31, 2021, from 8 a.m. to 3 p.m. The meeting is open to the public.

ADDRESSES: The agenda and meeting access information (including how to log in and participate) will be announced on the BENM MAC web page 30 days before the meeting at <https://www.blm.gov/get-involved/rac-near-you/utah/benm-mac>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jake Palma, Bears Ears National Monument Manager, P.O. Box 7, Monticello, Utah 84535, via email with the subject line "BENM MAC" to blm_ut_mt_mail@blm.gov, or by calling the Monticello Field Office at 435-587-1500. Persons who use a telecommunications device for the deaf may call the Federal Relay Service (FRS) at 1-800-877-8339 to leave a message or question for the above individual. The FRS is available 24 hours a day, seven days a week. Replies are provided during normal business hours.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Presidential Proclamation 9558, as modified by Presidential Proclamation 9681, established the BENM MAC to provide advice and information to the Secretary of the Interior through the Director of the BLM, and to the Secretary of Agriculture through the Chief of the U.S. Forest Service, to consider for managing the Bears Ears National Monument. The 15-member committee represents a wide range of interests including local and state government, paleontological and archaeological expertise, conservation community, livestock grazing permittees, tribal, developed and dispersed recreation, private

landowners, local business owners, and the public at large. More information can be found on the BENM MAC web page at <https://www.blm.gov/get-involved/rac-near-you/utah/benm-mac>.

Planned agenda items for the meeting include discussing and receiving input on Bears Ears National Monument management planning efforts, wood-cutting and harvesting, and other issues as appropriate.

A public comment period will be offered during the meeting. Depending on the number of people wishing to comment and the time available, the time for individual comments may be limited. Written comments may also be sent to the Monticello Field Office at the address listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section of this notice. All comments received prior to the meeting will be provided to the BENM MAC.

Before including your address, phone number, email address, or other personal identifying information in your comment, you should be aware that your entire comment—including your personal identifying information—may be made publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

Detailed meeting minutes for the BENM MAC meeting will be maintained in the Canyon Country District Office and will be available for public inspection and reproduction during regular business hours within 90 days following the meeting. Minutes will also be posted to the BENM MAC web page.

Authority: 43 CFR 1784.4–2.

Gregory Sheehan,

State Director.

[FR Doc. 2021–00790 Filed 1–14–21; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-00-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Land Management

[212 LLUT912000 L13140000.PP0000]

Notice of Public Meeting, Utah Resource Advisory Council, Utah

AGENCY: Bureau of Land Management, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of public meeting.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Federal Land Policy and Management Act, the Federal Advisory Committee Act, and the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act, the U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land

Management's (BLM) Utah Resource Advisory Council (RAC) will meet as indicated below.

DATES: The Utah RAC will hold an online meeting on March 2, 2021, from 8 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. The meeting is open to the public.

ADDRESSES: The agenda and meeting registration information will be posted on the Utah RAC web page 30 days before the meeting at <https://www.blm.gov/get-involved/resource-advisory-council/near-you/utah/rac>. Written comments to address the Utah RAC may be sent to the BLM Utah State Office, 440 West 200 South, Suite 500, Salt Lake City, Utah 84101, or via email to BLM_UT_External_Affairs@blm.gov with the subject line "Utah RAC Meeting."

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Lola Bird, Public Affairs Specialist, BLM Utah State Office, 440 West 200 South, Suite 500, Salt Lake City, Utah 84101; phone (801) 539–4033; or email lbird@blm.gov. Persons who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) may call the Federal Relay Service (FRS) at (800) 877–8339 to leave a message or question for Ms. Bird. The FRS is available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. Replies are provided during normal business hours.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Utah RAC provides recommendations to the Secretary of the Interior, through the BLM, on a variety of public lands issues. Agenda topics will include: BLM Utah priorities, statewide resource management planning, travel management planning overview and current status, Color Country District project planning, Dingell Act implementation, Wild Horse and Burro Program, Great American Outdoors Act update, fuels management update, Draft Business Plan for the Kanab Field Office Campground Program, and other issues as appropriate. The Utah RAC will offer a 30-minute public comment period. Depending on the number of people wishing to comment and the time available, the amount of time for individual oral comments may be limited. Written comments may also be sent to the BLM Utah State Office at the address listed in the **ADDRESSES** section of this notice. All comments received will be provided to the Utah RAC.

Public Disclosure of Comments: Before including your address, phone number, email address, or other personal identifying information in your comment, you should be aware that your entire comment—including your personal identifying information—may be made publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your comment

to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

Detailed meeting minutes for the Utah RAC meeting will be maintained in the BLM Utah State Office and will be available for public inspection and reproduction during regular business hours within 90 days following the meeting. Minutes will also be posted to the Utah RAC web page.

(Authority: 43 CFR 1784.4–2)

Gregory Sheehan,

State Director.

[FR Doc. 2021–00791 Filed 1–14–21; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-00-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Land Management

[212 LLUTG02000 L17110000.PN0000]

Notice of Public Meetings, San Rafael Swell Recreation Area Advisory Council, Utah

AGENCY: Bureau of Land Management, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of Public Meetings.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Federal Land Policy and Management Act, the Federal Advisory Committee Act, and the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act, the U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management's (BLM) San Rafael Swell Recreation Area Advisory Council (Council) will meet as indicated below.

DATES: The Council is scheduled to meet on February 17, 2021, from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. The Council is also scheduled to meet on April 7, 2021, from 12 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. and on April 8, 2021, from 8:30 a.m. to 12 p.m. A virtual meeting platform and/or teleconference may substitute an in-person meeting if public health restrictions are in place.

ADDRESSES: The meetings will be held at the Emery County Courthouse, 75 East Main Street, Castle Dale, Utah 84513. Written comments to address the Council may be sent to Lance Porter, Green River District Manager, 170 South 500 West, Vernal, Utah 84078, or via email with the subject line "San Rafael Swell Advisory Council meeting" to utprmail@blm.gov.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Lance Porter, Green River District Manager, 170 South 500 West, Vernal, Utah 84078; phone (435) 781–4400; or email l50porte@blm.gov. Persons who use a telecommunications device for the deaf may call the Federal Relay Service

B. Agenda

Bears Ears National Monument Advisory Committee Virtual Meeting Agenda March 31, 2021		
TIME	TOPIC	PRESENTER
8:00 a.m.	Online meeting logistics	BLM Public Affairs Specialist
8:15 a.m.	Welcome	Bruce Adams – MAC Chairperson Greg Sheehan – BLM Utah State Director Gary Torres – BLM Canyon Country District Manager Darren Olsen – Acting Manti- La Sal National Forest Supervisor
8:30 a.m.	Agenda review	Jake Palma – BLM Monument Manager
8:40 a.m.	Review of October 2020 MAC meeting minutes and informal recommendations Purpose: Review previous meeting’s informal recommendations and MAC members can formally vote.	Jake Palma – Bears Ears National Monument Manager Ted Neff – USFS Deputy District Ranger
9:45 a.m.	Break	
10:00 a.m.	BENM Updates and General Discussion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recreation • Grazing • Lands and Realty • Wildlife Purpose: Provide updates to the MAC on ongoing projects and provide opportunity to MAC members general discussion time.	Various BLM and USFS staff

11:30 a.m.	Lunch	
12:30 p.m.	Public comment period	Members of the public, sign up will be required for oral comments
1:15 p.m.	Break	
1:45 p.m.	<p>Discussion of wood cutting program and the associated monitoring, community outreach/education, and partnership opportunities</p> <p>Purpose: Present challenges and solutions related to woodland resources and get recommendations from the MAC.</p>	Various BLM and USFS staff
2:45 p.m.	<p>Final thoughts/wrap up</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other MAC member discussion topics • Dates and topics for next meeting 	<p>Bruce Adams – MAC Chairperson</p> <p>Greg Sheehan – BLM Utah State Director</p> <p>Gary Torres – BLM Canyon Country District Manager</p> <p>Darren Olsen – Acting Manti-La Sal National Forest Supervisor</p>
3:00 p.m.	Adjourn	All

C. PowerPoint Presentations

(Double-click each image to access the presentations)



Manti – La Sal NF, Friends of Cedar Mesa, and Woods Canyon Archaeology Sign a MOA

“The idea for this signing comes from two places,” said Louis (Ted) Neff, Moab/Monticello Deputy District Ranger. “First, it comes from the ongoing relationship between descendant communities, such as Native American Nations/Pueblos/Tribes and Pioneer Groups with the Manti – La Sal National Forest and the Friends of Cedar Mesa group. Second, it’s an extension of cultural resources shared stewardship efforts that these groups are working on.”



Bears Ears National Monument Forest Service Updates

- District Ranger Update and Evolving Agency Pandemic Posture/Policies (Michael Engelhart)
- Forest Plan Revision (Kyle Beagley)
- Great American Outdoors Act (Daniel Luke)



U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management

Rangeland Management

Bears Ears National Monument

March 31, 2021



Rangeland Management BENM

BY CORY FARNSWORTH (USFS RANGELAND MANAGEMENT SPECIALIST)



Tim D. Peterson



U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management

Bear Ears National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Meeting

Lands and Realty

March 31, 2021



U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management

U.S. Department of Agriculture
United States Forest Service



Bears Ears National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Meeting – Wildlife – March 31, 2021





U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management

U.S. Department of Agriculture
United States Forest Service



Bears Ears National Monument

Woodcutting Program – March 31, 2021



D. Informal Recommendations from October 2020 BENM MAC Meeting



Bears Ears National Monument Advisory Committee

Informal Recommendations – October 16, 2021

The Bears Ears National Monument Advisory Committee (BENM MAC) met on October 16, 2020; however, there was not a quorum of at least 9 members present for most of the meeting. With no quorum, a formal vote on recommendations could not occur. Below is a summary of the informal recommendations to be considered at the next BENM MAC meeting. For more background information regarding each of these informal recommendations, please [click here for the approved notes from the meeting](#).

Recommendation 1: Doll House Management

Notes	Yes	No
We do not want a rope or fence in front of the structure because it will change the feel of the place and impede photo ops.		
Institute a non-lottery, unlimited permit system to visit the site with the purpose of instilling accountability on users/visitors. It should include educational messaging on how to visit.		
The parking area may need to be modified to accommodate more vehicles.		

Recommendation 2: Lewis Lodge Protection

Notes	Yes	No
Keep the site as pristine as possible.		
Do not close the site.		
Designate it as a Public Use Site?		
Allow people to go to the overlook but then require a permit/permission to go to the lodge.		
Continue partner engagement/tribal consultation for stabilization work, protective projects, and ongoing management.		
Increase Law Enforcement presence.		
Place interpretation signage at the overlook so people feel a sense of been-there-done-that and thus they feel like they don't need to go all the way to the site.		
Institute a non-lottery, unlimited permit system to visit the site with the purpose of instilling accountability on users/visitors. It should include educational messaging on how to visit.		
Create bike access to the overlook.		
Take action sooner rather than later to avoid people feeling entitled to enter.		

Recommendation 3: Lewis Lodge Safety

Notes	Yes	No
Assume liability by putting up warning signs?		
Prohibit access to the ledge/site?		
Limit the number of people allowed on the edge at one time.		

Recommendation 4: Bears Ears Road

Notes	Yes	No
Increase signage to slow drivers down, and other safety signs (such as Narrow Road with Two-way Traffic)		
Continue and/or increase road maintenance (gravel).		

Recommendation 5: Dispersed Camping on Bears Ears Road/ Meadows

Notes	Yes	No
Include the spur roads on the Travel Management Plan. This will allow for maintenance like possible hardening of the spurs.		
If some sites get closed, then provide other places to camp (for example: Grand Flats Campground).		
Create designated dispersed sites. Develop some primitive campsites		
Make delineated parking areas near the road and add trails from them to a designated camp spot.		
Implement group size restrictions?		
Do not close dispersed camping.		
Rotate meadow closures with signs about restoring the vegetation.		

Recommendation 6: Economic Development of Local Campgrounds

Notes	Yes	No
We don't want public campgrounds to compete with private ones.		

Recommendation 7: Potential Developed Campgrounds

Notes	Yes	No
MAC members like the three suggested locations: Grand Flats, Comb Wash, and Shay Mountain Vista.		
Place kiosks and other signs at any developed campgrounds to create informational "portals"		

Texas Flat/Mule Canyon and Muley Point (even though it is outside the Monument boundaries) could be other potential sites.		
Amenities at developed campgrounds should include: toilet facilities, defined parking, fire ring, picnic tables, trash receptacles, all-weather road, kiosks/information panels, fencing, and fees. Some spaces closer together, some further apart.		

Recommendation 8: Dispersed Camping

Notes	Yes	No
Visual resources need to be examined, especially in overcrowded areas.		
Protection of cultural sites needs to be addressed.		

Recommendation 9: Focal Areas

Notes	Yes	No
Focal Areas are necessary.		
Mule Canyon needs more development.		
Cave Towers is ripe for protective development.		
Focal Areas should be used to educate the public.		
Arch Canyon Overlook could be Focal Points (BLM and/or USFS overlooks)		
The Hwy 95 corridor is a primary spot for Focal Areas.		
Developing a tiered category type for accessibility could be helpful. Tier 1 for easily accessible sites with parking areas, toilets, etc. all the way to Tier 4 for having to backpack into the wilderness. This will help address the diversity of users.		