



Rocky Mountain Resource Advisory Council Meeting Minutes

09:00 a.m., April 3, 2025

(All notes and conversations are paraphrased for clarity and brevity)

Members Present

Category 1

In-Person	Virtual
	Preston Larimer
	Josh Gillespie
	Curt Howell
	Pete Stagner

Category 2

In-Person	Virtual
	Mick Daniel
	Irene Shonle
	John Sztukowski
	Loretta Mitson

Category 3

In-Person	Virtual
	Kent Wood
	Arther Koepsell
	April Estep
	Gina Lucrezi

BLM Employees Present

In-Person	Virtual
	Levi Spellman
	Dale Culver
	Doug Mayes
	Christopher Ziegler
	Kirby Shedlowski
	Kalem Lenard

Public Present

In-Person	Virtual
	Janelle Giorso
	Nathan Bennett
	Tom Metsa- ONHCC
	Patrick Ortiz- Sen. Hickenlooper's office
	Michael Clancy

Welcome, Introductions, and Housekeeping

Chris Zieger: Introduction as DM

Levi Spellman: Roll call, agenda

Agenda Item 1: District Updates

Chris Ziegler: Introduction of all participants

District updates

- Leadership transitions
- Executive and Secretarial Orders
 - BLM has the bandwidth to continue doing within our current footprint
- Staffing
 - 7.3 million congressionally allocated funding
 - 25%> vacancy rate

Mick Daniel: How is the loss of staff impacting RMD?

Chris Ziegler: We are still paying for the folks, although they left, they are still getting paid through the end of the fiscal year.

- Major upcoming projects
 - Work is continuing and leveraging resources and organizing work-planning strategically.

Agenda Item 2: Field Office Updates

Doug Mayes- Royal Gorge

- Onboarded 2 career seasonals
- Turtle Rock available through Rec.gov
- AHRA - Funding for OHV sent directly to them rather than filtered through BLM
- 80 special recreation permits issued last year
- Projects
 - Hand thinning project
 - Creek restoration project
 - Twin Lakes vegetation project 200 acres starting this summer working with Forest Service
 - Mexican spotted owl surveys

- Grazing - Notable issues
 - Working to get seasonal onboard to assist on workload and help maintain relationships
 - Purchasing constraints
 - Presence of wolves - working to get conference on that in dealing with NEPA. Working at state level on long term solutions.
- Geologist workload getting back up now that positions are filled
- Lease re-instatement packages
 - Already processed 44 and 62 pending
- Realty
 - Added specialist
 - Right-of-way backlog
 - Xcel transmission line rebuild
 - Wild Horse Reservoir work continues
- Admin
 - 1039 seasonals onboarded (4/5 positions)
 - Spending authority limited and have new approval process with constraints on what funds can be spent on.
- Initiatives
 - NEPA - Streamline NEPA prioritization process (21 active projects)
 - Sentinel landscape - Cooperative project with Department Of Defense (DOD), Department Of Interior (DOI), United States Department of Agriculture. Holistic approach to support ecosystem, agriculture, and military practices. Expression of interest being worked on.
 - Challenger Ranch - 320-acre ranch

Dale Culver- San Luis Valley Office

- South San Juan Project
 - Water proposal still being worked through. Still on track for purchase.
- Grazing
 - 115 permits and 89 permittees
 - Position vacancy and may have lateral candidate coming on
 - Uptick in general overall land health
 - Environmental assessments being worked on
- Lobatos Bridge
 - Great Outdoors fund
 - Started work on the project: installing cattleguard, toilets, fencing.
 - Dedication in conjunction with public lands days, September 26th. More will be coming out
- AFM
 - Still vacant
- Fuels work
 - Rock Creek fuels in conjunction with the Colorado Forest Service through the Farm Bill and Good Neighbor Authority
- Restoration landscapes
 - Blanca Wetlands: redrilling wells that have collapsed or no longer working. Work to stop soon for bird nesting.

Questions:

Loretta Mitson: Issues regarding too much narrative. There are concerns and federal guidelines on how much can be put on a sign in terms of words/language. Are those of us that designed the narrative are going to have any final say-so in that?

Dale Culver: I will follow up with you. I have not chatted with Sean on this, but I will find out and get back to you.

Loretta Mitson: It concerns me, there are huge stories to be told. If we are going to do it, it should be right. The regulations should be flexible. I am happy to help any way that I can and look forward to finishing those up when appropriate.

Dale Culver: There are so many important stories down there, it's about balancing is there too much information, not enough information, and what all is there. There are so many stories down there and how we tell it on the local level and global level. It is a challenge they are working through. I will find out and touch base with you.

Dale Culver: BLM is not a huge interpretation agency like NPS. There is still a lot for us as an agency to learn how to tell our story and that is one of our state director's priorities.

Chris Ziegler: Park Service has a different scope of interpretation. You have to say this is the story we are going to tell, and this is how we are going to tell that. Loretta, I honestly and earnestly appreciate that feedback and look forward to the conversations you, Dale, and Sean have going forward.

Levi Spellman: I have to review the signs before they go out and there are a lot of specs to follow (how much time people spend, appropriate venue for conveying certain information, etc.). If you have any questions, you can contact me.

Kent Wood: Questions for Doug

In the uptick in applications for APD's, are there any change in geographical distribution?

NEPA- Undoing a lot of the implementation rules for how EPA is implemented, do you have any comment how that will change things for you or is that too soon to understand what is happening.

Doug Mayes: APD: Basin, Weld County centric area.

NEPA front- operating the same as we have been operating. Our attempt to streamline is in terms of workload here. I don't know what the changes will mean to our implementation on the ground but for now we are moving forward with local prioritization to help specialists get work done a little quicker.

John Sztukowski: Royal Gorge Resource Management Plan (RMP)- Timetable of when that will be beginning

Doug Mayes: Working on draft internally right now. That is one of the NEPA processes that we are trying to figure out how it best fits in. Discretionary vs non- discretionary I would say soon within the next few months that we are looking forward to input on that.

John Sztukowski: Appreciation for efforts put into that.

John Sztukowski: Would that affect this area?

Doug Mayes: I don't know the answer to that. It's a good question and it will be the future that holds the answer. We will move forward depending on the bill that was introduced.

John Sztukowski- did Rep Hurd contact or work with BLM about this proposal that would reverse 10 years of BLM and local planning?

Doug Mayes: not that I am aware of

Christopher Ziegler: Not that I am aware of

Kirby Shedlowski: Not that I am aware of or any pending legislation that has been introduced.

John Sztukowski – Doug mentioned hoping to get two technicians for Mexican spotted owl surveys, are you still able to get those if you are able to add 5 seasonals?

Doug Mayes: I don't know if their timing will be good for the Mexican spotted owls per se. Two wildlife seasonals in the works.

Preston Larimer: With limited seasonals do you ever use volunteers for those types of surveys?

Doug Mayes: that is a good question, that thought has been in my mind for other things as well. This is my first spring season, and I don't know to what extent we have leveraged volunteer labor for that. It is something we will be exploring.

Agenda Item 3: State-wide RAC After Action Review

Kirby Shedlowski: While you still have quorum if you would like to provide any recommendations through state director, today would be great to do so. Your resolutions or recommendations can be formal, but you can also make recommendations via the meeting minutes with notation of how many people votes yay or nay. Opportunities provided to give the Bureau and State Director your thoughts and considerations as we move forward. Does not mean you have to, but it is always nice as a RAC at an advisory capacity if you feel inclined or moved.

-Explanation of process for formal resolution

-Template shared via chat

Chris Ziegler: opening remarks to open discussion

Gina Lucrezi: When they were talking about fuels and the new executive orders for timber production, I am wondering if there is more of this within our region, will any of the funds that come from it stay local or will that be sent back to general bucket for fed? If more of this production turns up all over the state, can it be utilized and how does that shake out? Is there any more information about that? Is there any compensation that comes back to those counties or those local communities?

Chris Ziegler: Your analysis is accurate, a general emphasis on increasing US based timber production for local economies. As far as mechanical or directive for local communities. It's a force multiplier. BLM gets 5900 forestry money. Non-MLR comes from salvage of timber sales, but I don't know of all the rules and mechanisms and how it will relate to the new executive order.

Doug Mayes: Bottom line is we apply for that money locally through the 5900. Its not necessarily a direct application. We can apply for the 5900 funds for it to go back to those projects. It cannot be utilized for other programs. It has to go back to the place it came from.

Chris Ziegler: It is typically salvaging work of forestry. There are sidebars on how far in forestry it can be used for.

Dale Culver: We don't deal with 5900 money because we don't do timber work. all the woods from there are going to the mills in the valley. There are significant mills in the valley and all the wood that is coming from the Poncha Pass Project, and the Rock Creek Project and other ones are going to those products. Not directly supported but going back into the community. Looking at a timber/fuels tech position to deal with fuel mitigation work.

Gina Lucrezi: With executive orders that it has those end goals to support the local agencies and communities. That it isn't just a total extraction from the area but local support for the areas.

Chris Ziegler: We the BLM are beginning to look at what it will look like for staffing.

Doug Mayes: Demonstrate success you get funded. We have demonstrated success between fuels management in the fire program and in cooperation with our Forester.

We have been successful with implementing the projects and retrieving those funds to fund more projects.

Chris Ziegler: 5900-Money comes from salvage and sales - not congress. It is self-perpetuating has specific uses but can be used to operate outside of what congress appropriates. Colorado has the forest health emphasis over industry. BLM not the heaviest forested lands like Forest Service is.

Loretta Mitson: I am interested in the virtual fencing, and I am wondering if that is being used in the San Luis Valley.

Dale Culver: We do have it on the North end of the valley. Pete has used it with success. We are looking at how we can incorporate on the south end where we have more open space. The downfall is the cost and how we can get it more reasonable for permittees.

Pete Stagner: They are talking to a lot of the grazers. It is a very good tool. It isn't a fix all but there are a lot of things that can be done for range land health and fire mitigation and it's doing a good job of that. The biggest hold up is the price of getting the towers put up. Chaffee County in a unique situation, they have come up with grants and have from the upper Arkansas from Salida north is covered with towers. That is the area that is seeing the difference. It has made a big difference on the BLM even on dry years.

Gina Lucrezi: Oil and gas is the biggest output for the region a lot of these areas are mixed, is that going to affect grazing areas or potentially take from that important sector within the region. Are there more oil and gas permits coming down the road? Will that make an impact to offer grazing permits?

Doug Mayes: There are not too many issues or conflicts between grazing and oil and gas. There are limited areas with overlap.

Virtual Fencing:

Josh Gillespie: I think the virtual fencing is a good idea. My only comment is you still have to have hard perimeter fences. But border fences with private property must be maintained. It's a great tool but it doesn't fix everything. It's just another tool to be used. It's not for everyone. It's not going to benefit small producers at all. If it works for you, great. Don't push it on everyone because it won't solve all the problems.

Doug Mayes: Does not eliminate the need for actual fences. I appreciate your comment

John Sztukowski: Josh, are towers feasible in your area?

Josh Gillespie: Towers are feasible, and one was set via helicopter and a lot of them are portable and do work and can be retrieved when your cattle are not on an allotment. I don't think the tower placement is as much of an issue as the cost is. Funding is huge. It must be put into numbers to see if it will work.

Pete Stagner: The collars work off GPS. The signal can disappear, but the information is already in the collar whether the cell phone works or not. The cell phone is easy to use to track the cattle. The tower isn't a limiting factor in it. If you do it yourself its 10k. We have 2 towers in north end of the valley, and they do a good job covering everyone utilizing it at this time.

The tower communicates between the satellite and the collars. The boundary fences on these allotments are going to have to stay. The divisionary inside stuff is possible to get rid of.

Kent Wood: The difference between fencing in and fencing out. Wild horses and wolves, could you collar them and fence them out? Is there some kind of sign sensitivities to know if they are on the inside getting out or the outside getting in.

Pete Stagner: One way gate, if the animal gets through the fence, they can come back through it without notice.

Kent Wood: Hypothetically can you fence out the wild horses?

Pete Stagner: problem is battery life on collars. It is about 1 year. The more you ask it to do, the shorter the battery lasts. You can put an exclusionary inside where you don't want animals into. The horses and wolves the big deal is battery life. It isn't feasible.

Timber and Forestry Sales Continued

Kent Wood: Impression is that every dollar raised in fees by BLM goes back to Washington and you can apply to get it back from the pool. Maybe the recreation fees are an exception. Do they stay locally within the recreation category?

Chris Ziegler: Yeah, the funds collected through Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act (FLREA) (1232 dollars) stay within the location they were collected from. Not all money goes back with treasury some does stay within BLM. Depending on the fund source they stay local or go back to national level and gets allocated.

Kent Wood: If you have summary of it to share with RAC it would help.

Kent Wood: Once we understand funding lines and are clear. The worry I have to harvest more timber we can entertain a resolution as statement of support to district and field office that we hold they have the discretion to manage the new regulation for total forest health. Harvest of timber would be integrated with forest mitigation.

Chris Ziegler: our normal operations and management, the new emphasis doesn't take away our regulatory process.

Doug Mayes: Our capacity is our capacity. I don't think we could double or triple our work on the ground in terms of adjustment to the executive order and every action goes through that process. We have a collaborative approach.

Kent Wood: Curt put a formulation into chat along the lines of what I was thinking. Maybe we could enter an opinion we would like to see continued to focus on forest health.

Mick Daniel: Do we want to cover the topics first or do we want to tackle it one at a time for resolution?

Loretta Mitson: In keeping with Kent's idea. All the issues that BLM deals with my concern is what is the point of a management plan if an executive order can come in and cut it off at the knees? Doesn't seem that anyone has the power to stop that. Given John's question about representative office contacting BLM about proposed legislation. It goes around any management plan and it's assumed they know how to manage BLM land from a Washington D.C. office. We need a resolution that covers all BLM. "We as a RAC are requesting our representatives contact BLM before they formulate legislation". I think everyone's ideas are good, but I think it needs to be broad based asking our representatives to include BLM experts in their proposed legislation

Preston Larimer: For years the opponents of public lands have complained about bureaucrats of Washington telling them what they need to do with their land out here. It is an interesting change we are seeing

Levi Spellman: We are only able to operate in our lane. We can't make any resolutions on what congress does, just resolutions on what BLM does. The RAC has to focus on what BLM does. The RAC resolutions are recommendations you make to us that we then present to the Secretary of the Interior. It has to focus on what we do. To settle some questions about orders, at the end of the day, if there is a law we have to follow the law. If there is any issue where an order is up against the law, that goes to attorneys. We go through proper channels to handle that. For the purpose of this discussion, we are going to focus on what BLM can do because that is where we have the power to make a difference.

Chris Ziegler: The chat has the link to the presentations from yesterday. It lays out timeframes. Before going further down the line of discussion going through the presentation may help with that.

Kent Wood: there is still BLM in Colorado and BLM in Washington. If BLM in Washington gets direction to support enhanced timber production and they hand that down to BLM Colorado is that in or out of the lane for the RAC to recommend on behalf of BLM Colorado that BLM Washington not micromanage and leave latitude to the local BLM offices manage the forestry for the benefit of the forest and the public? Is there any space for us to recommend staying within BLM that Washington not over manage the situation but delegate to the regions some ability to maintain resources with an eye to local interest?

Kirby Shedlowski: RMD RAC Definition. Advice and recommendations are valuable, and we want to make sure they stay within what can be implemented or can be taken into consideration at the local level and stay within the bounds of your charter.

Mick Daniel: Our influence here is the Rocky Mountain Region that goes to the state director and potentially the secretary of interior.

Levi Spellman: The power we have as the BLM is delegated to us.

Loretta Mitson: The suggestion is if we have to go through channels, that we make a resolution that goes to Doug Vilsack, requesting that our representatives engage with BLM staff before they make changing legislation that effects a region that they haven't even asked about. It may invite them to engage one-on-one with the directors on the ground to see if the legislation they are proposing is even workable.

Kent Wood: We could do that as individuals.

Mick Daniel: We do those things individually. We need to touch these topics within 30 minutes for resolutions. I want to get us to a place for resolutions to vote on it if possible.

Kirby Shedlowski: Don't feel like you are pushed to make resolutions. If the discussion is not to the point where the RAC doesn't feel they can make a resolution, the comments and points can be captured in the notes.

Mick Daniel:

Colorado River Water Plan

-Nothing to add

Oil & Gas Leasing Fluid minerals/ Solid Minerals

-Nothing to add

Levi Spellman: Fluid minerals in RG only, very little mining in the valley. Solid minerals minimized to two gravel pits in the SLV.

Mick Daniel:

Summarizes what the conversations centered on with fee collection for timber sales, rec fees, and virtual fencing.

Economic impact of recreation on communities.

Is there a resolution in those three areas that this RAC has talked about that would be beneficial for the State Director or the Secretary of Interior?

Kent Wood: Resolution in scope would be that the RAC supports the retention of local discretion in the management of forestry to the full extent possible. At the local level that we hope they will continue within their latitude to manage the forest to the benefit of the forest and the local public. Delegate latitude to the state level and phase as request not a demand. We are advocates of local discretion. Is that staying within our limits of authority as RAC and would it do any good?

Levi Spellman: You can advocate for how we manage and advocating for management to reside in local level. It is within bounds of what you can ask for. I would encourage consideration of the environment of how things are operating and search your heart to see if it would be useful.

Gina Lucrezi: Don't know if we have authority but recommendation that the RMD RAC is informed of any sell-off of any land within the RGFO and SLVFO land jurisdictions. I know undesirable spots in Chaffee. It would be nice for the RAC to have conversations and be at the table would be great. Because of discussion at a higher level, I think it would be nice to participate in those conversations early on.

Mick Daniel: That is within the charter, to have that we would have to have a quorum.

Gina Lucrezi: Do we need to have a quorum to have the conversation?

Mick Daniel: No, we just wouldn't be able to make a resolution on it.

Loretta Mitson: In all the years on the RAC we have produced one resolution. What is the worth of what we are doing here if we can't push a few values, we see worth addressing. We at the RAC are in the position to diplomatically say, "there are local concerns that need to be looked at".

Preston Larimer: Those of us on the RAC recognize the value of BLM lands and promoting the local economies within these two districts and any deviation away from the resource management plans need to be looked at carefully so that the local economy is not hurt.

Kent Wood: A narrow resolution: The RAC requests review of the applications for the RAC to maintain a quorum.

Mick Daniel: We are cut at the knees immediately if there isn't a quorum and cannot participate in the review of a potential sell off. Maybe our strongest move is the encouragement of filling these RAC pieces.

Preston Larimer: That is the frustrating thing of being a part of the RAC. That is why not many things have been accomplished because you barely get off the ground and crash again.

Chris Ziegler: Don't think that without official resolutions that you are powerless. It takes away the structured format, but the Rocky Mountain District and Field Managers are refining our agenda topics to get consultation on and seek advisement and council regardless of resolutions. It is still important even if informal.
Shared stewardship: collaboration with partners resonated with me.

Mick Daniel: Do people have comments on that?

April Estep: I think its important that we are recognizing our shared stewardship. All agencies and organizations are critical to managing the lands.

Preston Larimer: Chris, I want to thank you for you saying we make a difference even if we don't make a resolution there is such a learning curve here and, in my experience, it's difficult to draw up a resolution in a meeting so I think we are in a good place right now.

Lunch Break: 11:55

Return: 1:05

Agenda Item 4: Drafting Resolutions

Mick Daniel: crafted a resolution that is linked in the chat.
Used language from charter specifically addressing the disposal of public lands. It addresses the issue that none of the RAC's are being filled. It is specific to the Rocky Mountain Region.

Irene Shonle, Curt Howell, Mick Daniel, Gina Lucrezi, Preston Larimer, Kent Wood, Josh Gillespie: Discussion on language and formatting of Mick's crafted resolution.

Mick Daniel: Requested everyone to review to take vote

Further conversation on language and formatting

Mick Daniel: Request to take vote

VOTE: TO SEND RESOLUTION REGARDING VACANT RESOURCE ADVISORY COUNCIL SEATS

12 in favor, none apposed

Resolution passes: 1:41 pm on 4/3/2025

Levi Spellman: Were there other resolutions to be drafted and voted on?

April Estep: I think a resolution showing our support of current management practices of BLM and following MOUs already erected with state and local agencies. I don't know what the ask is or what we expect the response to be to the resolution.

Gina Lucrezi: I support what April is asking, I think its important that we have something showing the support.

Levi Spellman: there are informal resolutions and Kirby provided an example.

Irene Shonle: We are asking that decisions we have made before are not overturned? Is that what we are asking?

Curt Howell: Could be an emphasis on direction that staff feel compelled to take against their better judgement based on current practices.

Irene Shonle: There are ten years of collaboration and decision making, things should not be overturned lightly. Maybe we should do a quick one while we still have a quorum.

Mick Daniel: Operations have to be under the law as federal agency, and we can make the point to the state director and the secretary of interior, but they are under congress' control.

Irene Shonle: Can we request that discussion with RAC's happen before it goes to vote on?

April Estep: Draft Resolution presented in chat supporting BLM efforts. Important to show support of BLM staff and their management and our access to public lands.

Gina Lucrezi: If nothing more it's a show of support, the more that shows our support and how we want to collaborate, it is good for them to see that. There is a lot of value in that.

Kent Wood: We can say the RMP that was produced is a good thing. Starting with what is here, the RAC endorses the RMP that was produced and takes note of the years of work and thinking that went into it. Giving it our endorsement.

Even though we cannot direct congress what to consider, we can ask that BLM continue to consider XYZ to the best of its ability consistent with guidance. Neither of those take us out of our lane but makes our sentiment clear.

Chris Ziegler: The RAC can also make a verbal recommendation that is accounted for in the notes. Something to think of and offering notes.

Irene Shonle: Likes Kent's comment on the endorsement.

Pete Stagner: When did we decide that the RAC agreed with the resource management plans or with or against Representative Hurd's bill?

Mick Daniel: We were trying to write language that supported BLM in shared stewardship and sustainable land piece without taking on congress.

Pete Stagner: Okay, but it seems like the decision for the RAC has been made that we are for or against.

Mick Daniel: I think we tried to steer away from that because we do not have any influence there.

Levi Spellman: Great point and that is what the vote is for is to support or not support it.

Mick Daniel: The resolution that April put together does not directly address Congressman Hurd's bill.

April Estep: Support of management of BLM and continued stewardship of the land.

Pete Stagner: I have had issues with the way things have gone within the last few years.

Levi Spellman: This is a great example of how the RAC should be and how it should go. It's a representative of the interest you represent.

Kent Wood: Is there a way to incorporate what Pete is saying by softening what I originally said?

Acknowledge the effort and may not satisfy everyone and all respects we endorse the process, and the product is a reasonable compromise, and any interests not fully dealt with could still be dealt with at a local level with input from neighbors resolving their differences.

Agenda Item 5: RAC Chair Vote

Mick Daniel: Is anyone interested in the chair position? Do we have nominations from the RAC committee?

Levi Spellman- posted eligible people in chat. Because the RAC chair has to certify minutes, it becomes imperative that you are here or that in advance the RAC votes to delegate that task to somebody else.

Pete Stagner: Is everyone there have a year left?

Levi Spellman: Everyone has about the same amount of time.

Preston Larimer: Is my term ending in 2026?

Levi Spellman: Will check appointment documentation. Three RAC members whose terms expire in 2027. Everyone else is around June of 2026.

April Estep: I can set up into that role if someone can walk me through the process.

VOTE: APRIL ESTEP ELECTED RAC CHAIR

12 in favor, none apposed

Resolution passes: 2:08 pm on 4/3/2025

Agenda Item 4: Drafting Resolutions CONTINUES

Continue conversation about Resolution draft.

VOTE: RESOLUTION COMMITMENT TO SHARED STEWARDSHIP AND SUSTAINABLE LAND MANAGEMENT

12 in favor, none apposed

Resolution passes: 2:26 pm on 4/3/2025

Public Comment

Levi Spellman: opened for public comment- 2:30pm

Patrick Ortiz: Appreciation for conversation. Thankful for representing all the interests.

Kathleen Sgamma- Hearing next week, requesting questions for the record.

Seeing the resolutions and recommendations come through, can be communicated with Senator Hickenlooper and he can share those with the entire Colorado Congressional Delegation. Public lands act- house version that Representative Hurd is sponsoring but to get it fully passed, there as to be a senate version so there will be more opportunity for feedback and helping tailor what the senate version can look like.

Reminder that Senator Hickenlooper's office can uplift concerns to the Secretary of Interior at any point.

Chris Ziegler: Appreciation

Presentation Materials

- BLM presentation slides
- Sample resolutions
- Resolutions

- Links provided in meeting chat

Closing Remarks

Chris Ziegler: Closing remarks and appreciation. Commend Mick Daniel for his time and efforts as RAC chair and welcomed April as the new RAC chair.

Kent Wood: As one whose term is expiring, thanking BLM for the education he has received attending the meetings.

Chris Ziegler: Thanked all departing RAC members

Irene Shonle: how will we know? Do we receive a letter or how does that work?

Levi Spellman: We receive notification once we have the RAC. Once we are notified, we reach out to those that are appointed and let them know

Irene Shonle: Will you reach out to those of us not appointed?

Chris Ziegler: We can reach out to everyone who applied and let them know. Also extend if you have questions or want to keep conversation going, you can reach out to anyone of us in BLM.

Preston Larimer: If we wish to continue, when should we reapply?

Levi Spellman: During a call for nomination. Coordination with state office for those to go out.

Meeting closed: 2:46pm