United States Department of the Interior

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
Uncompahgre Field Office
2465 S. Townsend Avenue
Montrose, CO 81401

RESOURCE ADVISORY COUNCIL SUBGROUP MEETING #1

Thursday, May 27, 2010 (9:00 AM – 12:00 PM)

Meeting Location:

Holiday Inn – Jordan Room A
1391 S. Townsend Avenue, Montrose, CO

Attendees: Angie Adams (EMPSi), Lori Armstrong (BLM Southwest Colorado District Manager), Shelby Bear, Robbie Baird-LeValley, Walt Blackburn, Bill Day, Richard Durnan, William Ela, Bruce Krickbaum (BLM Uncompahgre Field Office), John Reams, Barb Sharrow (BLM Uncompahgre Field Office), Steven Weist, Kate Wynant (EMPSi)

Handouts: Agenda, Uncompahgre RMP Planning Units map, Microsoft PowerPoint presentation slides, Functioning of the Cooperating Agencies and Resource Advisory Council Subgroup, Planning Issue Statements, Highlights of the Resource Management Planning Process to Date, Preliminary Summary of Scoping Results, Uncompahgre RMP Newsletter #1 (December 2009)

---

1. **Welcome** (Barb Sharrow, Bruce Krickbaum, Angie Adams)
    - Barb Sharrow welcomed everyone and thanked them for coming. Angie Adams mentioned housekeeping items (restroom locations, put cell phones on vibrate, brief breaks, snacks).
    - This is a subgroup of the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) Southwest Resource Advisory Council (RAC). Two members of this RAC Subgroup sit on the RAC. The subgroup essentially does the work for the RAC and the RAC itself advises the BLM.
    - We are excited about this plan. Since 1984 and 1989 when the current plans were written, there are a lot of things in the landscape that have changed. There are many things that have been put off and restrict us from making decisions and moving forward on projects. Thank you for your time and your passion for the public lands. There are a number of Resource Management Plans (RMPs) in progress in Colorado right now for BLM, and we are starting after them. Other plans are Craig (nearly winding up), San Juan (on the tail end), and Colorado River Valley (formerly Glenwood Springs) and Kremmling, which are working on a plan together and should publish a draft soon. Grand Junction is also working on their plan. Hopefully we can learn from these plans.
    - We just finished our scoping period, and based on the input that other plans have received, we expected about 600 unique substantive comments. We ended up getting over 2,000 unique comments, which does not count more than once the comments repeated in form letters. We know that we have a lot of interested people in what we do on public lands. You are representing a lot of those people and those groups.
    - Your role is primarily to help the BLM develop a reasonable range of alternatives to consider in the RMP. You [RAC Subgroup] want to make sure that we [BLM] did not miss anything. We tried to get a regional diversity on the RAC Subgroup. There are some folks from the North Fork, but some from the West End and also around here [Montrose].

- The RAC members' role is to help participate in dialogue and bring information from the RAC to the subgroup and vice-versa. The RAC will make a formal recommendation to the BLM.

2. Introductions (all)

- Barb Sharrow introduced Bruce Krickbaum. He is the planner and can be contacted with any questions. Bruce thanked everyone for coming and their continued interest in the process.
- Bruce Krickbaum introduced Angie Adams and Kate Wynant, contractors with Environmental Management and Planning Solutions, Inc. (EMPSi), the contractor firm hired to help the BLM with the plan. The BLM is involved in reviewing and revising, as needed, all reports or studies done by EMPSi. All work, reports, and studies done by EMPSi are ultimately the BLM's products.
- Attendees introduced themselves and the interests they represent.

3. Project Overview (Angie Adams) *(note: Project Overview information was relayed via a Microsoft PowerPoint slideshow which was also included as a handout. Information here builds on information in the slideshow and does not include the slideshow itself.)*

- This RMP revision will replace the San Juan/San Miguel RMP (1985) and the Uncompahgre Basin RMP (1989) and their subsequent amendments. The San Juan/San Miguel RMP covers the Dallas Divide and west. Portions of the RMP also include lands now managed by the San Juan Public Lands Center. The Uncompahgre Basin RMP covers the Dallas Divide and east.
  - *Question:* Why do two RMPs encompass this area? *Answer:* there have been boundary changes. We used to be the Uncompahgre District and the San Juan/San Miguel District. Now districts are broken down into field offices.
- Per the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA):
  - This plan will establish criteria for when disposal will be appropriate.
  - The mandate of multiple use and sustained yield is one of the BLM's biggest mandates or missions.
  - *Comment:* It does not look like there is anything about recreation in FLPMA. *Answer:* It is in Section 102.8.
  - This plan will evaluate areas of critical environmental concern (ACEC). There are some in the field office already and they are being reviewed again for the presence of relevance and importance criteria. The BLM is also considering other areas as ACECs.
  - Multiple Use: this is not a black and white process, and the multiple use mandate adds to the gray area.
- RMP Planning area: Includes all acres regardless of ownership (approximately 3.1 million acres).
- RMP Decision area: Includes BLM surface (675,700) and federal mineral estate (2.2 million acres). Excludes the Gunnison Gorge and Dominguez-Escalante National Conservation Areas. A separate RMP will be written for the Dominguez-Escalante National Conservation Area. An RMP for the Gunnison Gorge National Conservation Area was signed in 2004.

4. RMP Planning Effort (Angie Adams) *(note: RMP Planning Effort information was relayed via a PowerPoint slideshow which was also included as a handout. Information here builds on information in the slideshow and does not include the slideshow itself.)*

- Why do we plan? The RMP speaks to desired outcomes for the landscape, not on-the-ground decisions (implementation level).
- What decisions will be made in the RMP?
  - Decisions identify lands that are open or closed to certain uses (e.g., livestock grazing, energy development).
  - Broad-scale planning effort that sets the stage for future projects.

- Conceptual planning process and BLM documents
  - Frame the problem and gather information
    - Pre-plan: What are we going to do, what are some issues, etc. completed by BLM.
    - Analysis of the Management Situation: Underway and will be on website in June 2010. Documents what is out there now, what are the trends, problems, issues, ideas for solving issues, and opportunities for management changes. It sets the stage for alternatives and existing conditions.
    - Scoping report: Will be available in July 2010. We have an internal draft that has the numbers break-down of comments received.
  - Develop possible solutions
    - Draft RMP/ Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS): Will be published for 90-day public review and then revised.
    - Proposed RMP/Final EIS: Will be published for 30-day public review and protest.
  - Make decisions
    - Approved RMP/Record of Decision (ROD).
    - Implementation and monitoring occur after the ROD is issued. The current (1985 and 1989) RMPs are in place until the ROD for the revised RMP is signed.
- RMP Guts and Goo
  - RMP is framed by the vision and the planning criteria. Planning criteria are open for comment during scoping. They set the ground rules and define a decision space but are mostly things that tell the BLM to follow the law.
    - Action: BLM (Bruce Krickbaum) to send the group the planning issues.
  - Planning Issues: we are very close to finalizing the planning issues. Handout (Planning Issue Statements) describes questions to be address, management concerns, etc.
    - Planning issues drive the alternatives and dictate how alternatives are shaped. If it is not broken, do not fix it.
    - Identification of planning issues. Internal BLM, scoping, stakeholders, cooperating agencies, tribes, etc. Comments received during scoping are categorized by planning issues, policy or administrative issues, issues outside the scope of the RMP, and issues that have already been addressed but need to be better communicated (for example, the Dry Creek travel management plan has been completed although commenters may not know). Only those planning issues are carried forward for consideration during the RMP process.
    - Scoping Results:
      - Most comments had to do with Issue #1, then Issue #3, then Issue #2 (see PowerPoint handout for details).
      - Top resource categories of concern are special designation areas, energy and minerals, and recreation.
      - *Question:* Where do form letters fit in? *Answer:* They are acknowledged in the scoping report where the report indicates the number of each form letter that was received. The numbers of form letters received are not counted more than once in the total number of letters reported. Specific comments repeated in form letters are not counted more than once in the number of unique comments reported. However, where a form letter submitter adds unique comments to the form letter that are different in content and meaning from the form letter comments, those unique comments are counted in the number of unique comments reported in the scoping report.
  - Planning Units (also see Uncompahgre RMP Planning Units map handout). These are draft. It acknowledges that resources and community interests are different in different parts of the planning area. Once we get into alternatives development, we may realize that the planning units need to be adjusted.

  - Goals are broad scale and apply to all alternatives because there are different ways of getting to that goal. We will have different goals between resource programs, but they will be the same across alternatives.
  - Objectives are specific (tier) to the goals. They do not have to be common to all alternatives. Objectives are SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, realistic, time-fixed).
  - Actions tier to the objectives. "Actions" are allocations, management actions, and monitoring actions.
- BLM 9-step Planning Process. We are at Step 4 (Analysis of the Management Situation), but we are not nearly half-way through. The preferred alternative may be selected at the Draft RMP stage (Step 7). Step 7 also includes the publication and revision of the Draft RMP/Draft EIS and the Proposed RMP/Final EIS.
- Planning process to date (also see Highlights of the Resource Management Planning Process to Date handout)
  - Community Assessment (2008-2009): BLM went to 22 communities in planning area and invited community leaders to talk with BLM about their relationship with public lands and what they hope to see in the RMP. We will continually refer back to this.
  - Tribal consultation has been underway for a couple of years and is ongoing.
  - Scoping
  - Visual resource inventory was completed in 2009.
  - Economic workshops: BLM invited comminutes to talk with BLM about public lands from an economic perspective
  - Recreation focus groups: Held in spring 2010, they asked folks about the current recreation conditions and desired future conditions in planning area.
  - Class I paleontological resources overview and class I cultural overview
  - Coal potential report: Discusses the current condition and potential. It will be posted on the Web site in June.
  - Renewable energy potential report: Similar to the coal report it discusses the current condition and potential for renewable energy. It will be posted on the Web site in June.
  - Wild and Scenic Rivers eligibility report: It will be available on the Web site in June. Following eligibility the BLM will conduct suitability which is a different level of decision making.
  - ACEC evaluation report: It is underway and expected to wrapped up in June.
  - None of these documents make any decisions; we are just gathering data.
  - *Question:* Are these things you (EMPSi) are doing or that the BLM is doing? *Answer:* We (EMPSi) are responsible for the coal and renewable energy reports, scoping report, and economic workshops. The BLM is doing some things in-house (ACEC report, tribal consultation, and recreation focus groups). Other reports the BLM has contracted to other firms. The BLM is involved in reviewing and revising, as needed, all reports or studies done by other firms, including EMPSi. All work, reports, and studies done by any contractors/firms are ultimately the BLM's products.
- Alternatives Development
  - What are the issues? Is there a need for change? If there is not a need for change, current management can be carried forward. Just because an RMP is being revised does not mean that everything needs to change. If there is a need for change, we can create a range of alternatives.
  - The RAC Subgroup should help the BLM think outside the box and make sure we [BLM] are not missing anything in the alternatives development process. If there is a need for change, we can create a range of alternatives to address options.
- National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)

  - NEPA tell us that we must look at a range of alternatives so that the decision-maker can make informed decisions. It does not tell us what decision to make, but gives us procedures for coming to those decisions.
  - The EIS provides the analysis of the impacts of what would happen if a set of actions are implemented.
  - *Question:* Why are we (RAC Subgroup) developing a range of alternatives if the BLM is developing alternatives? *Answer:* It is all interconnected. The BLM will start meeting to develop alternatives and bring ideas and drafts to the group throughout the process. The RAC Subgroup is not going to develop alternatives separately from BLM. The BLM will bring the group highlights to see what the BLM is missing from the alternatives throughout the process. The group will have the opportunity to contribute to the alternatives.
- Planning Challenges (Bruce Krickbaum)
  - Diverse landscape and human uses. Some use the land more for recreation versus energy development. Different vegetation structures and land forms.
  - Lack of information. Someone will always think we need more info. As mentioned, we have done lots of reports in preparation for this RMP so that we can make the right decisions. There might be data that we wish we had and that will have to be an issue we have to overcome.
  - Competing interests and values: off-highway vehicle use versus no off-highway vehicle use; energy development versus no energy development.
  - Multiple jurisdictions: multiple counties, multiple agencies to contend with.
  - Growing urban interface: fire and how we deal with that, also growing demand for recreation. Lots of private land leads to lots of urban interface challenges.
  - Rising recreation: competing recreation uses throughout the field offices. Seems like each year there is a new use and a new area getting use.
  - Changing demographics: new ideas, new values, new expectations.
- How long will it take to complete the plan?
  - The goal is to have the ROD complete in the summer or fall of 2013.
  - Draft RMP/EIS will be released to the public in spring of 2012, but this group will see it before then. You will also see bits and pieces throughout the process.
- *Question:* Will there be continuity between the Grand Junction Field Office? *Answer:* Yes, we hope so. We will be looking at their plan to make sure decisions are compatible.

5. Public Outreach

- Scoping Summary (Kate Wynant) (see Preliminary Summary of Scoping Results handout)
  - *Question:* How does the meeting attendance play into the planning units? *Answer:* The planning units were developed prior to scoping and were based on issues identified during community assessment.
  - *Question:* Will we be told what the issues are to get that kind of attendance? *Answer:* Yes. There are also some hot-button issues going on in January 2010 that brought a lot of people out to the scoping meetings. There are lots of things going on in the North Fork such as oil and gas and coal.
  - In Hotchkiss, there were a lot of people at that meeting about one issue (Jumbo Mountain). Also, a citizens group that has formed over concerns of oil and gas development affecting drinking water.
  - Angie Adams: I would encourage folks to look at the community assessment, which is available at www.uformp.com. It gives details on issues identified in the various communities. This helped form the planning units.
  - *Comment:* There should be some coordination with the Forest Service on what is going on. There should not be a road on BLM that is gated when you get to Forest Service. *Response:* There will be coordination, as the Forest Service is a Cooperating Agency.

However travel management decisions will be made in a travel management plan [not part of this RMP].
  - *Question:* Will the BLM Washington office review this? *Answer:* Yes. Each of the three phases [Draft RMP/Draft EIS, Proposed RMP/Final EIS, and ROD/RMP] will be reviewed by Washington. They will all first be reviewed by the field office, then the Colorado State Office, and then the Washington Office.

-- Public Comments / Questions --

- The Public Outreach discussion was paused for public comments and questions at 11:00am. No members of the public were present.
- As a reminder to the RAC Subgroup, you represent the public, and these meetings are advertised and are open to the public.

5. Public Outreach *(continued)*

- Cooperating Agencies (Angie Adams)
  - Federal, state, county, local, and tribal agencies with special expertise or jurisdiction in the planning area and have interest in cooperating signed memorandums of understanding with the BLM. More than 40 agencies were invited. To date 19 have accepted: 3 federal (US Fish and Wildlife Service, Bureau of Reclamation, and National Park Service), 1 state (Colorado Department of Natural Resources, which includes Colorado Division of Wildlife, state parks, Colorado Natural Heritage Program, state forest service, reclamation division, and mining and safety), 5 counties (Delta, Gunnison, Montrose, Ouray, and San Miguel), and 10 cities and towns (Montrose, Cedaredge, Hotchkiss, Mountain Village, Norwood, Nucla, Olathe, Orchard City, Paonia, and Ridgway). The Colorado Water Conservation Board has verbally accepted, but a Memorandum of Understanding has not been signed. No tribes have signed on as cooperators but consultation sometimes satisfies their need. Barb: we have been consulting with them for two years on this project. We have taken field trips to get their input.
  - The Cooperating Agencies are meeting this afternoon and we will tell them about you. We will take your and the Cooperating Agencies' input, and there will be transfer back-and-forth between the two groups and the BLM.

6. RAC Subgroup Functions, Charter, and Role (Angie Adams) (see Functioning of the Cooperating Agencies and Resource Advisory Council Subgroup handout)

- We take input from both groups and the public, but the BLM is ultimately responsible for making decisions.
- The Southwest RAC advises the BLM on a variety of issues in southwestern Colorado. The RAC Subgroup is a sanctioned group that advises the BLM via the Southwest RAC. The RAC Subgroup represents a broad range of issues. The RAC Subgroup takes info back to the Southwest RAC to make recommendations to the BLM.
- Some topics at some meetings might not be as personally interesting to you, but it is important that you are here and learn so that in the end the recommendations are sound. There will be an education component so that everyone can understand the resource topics.
- As participants in the RAC Subgroup you are formally recognized under the Federal Advisory Committee Act. You cannot send a replacement to sit in your place because you have been appointed by the Southwest RAC. The public may attend meetings and are encouraged to do so, but the discussion and voting only occurs among subgroup members. The public can ask questions and make comments during the specific public comment period during the meeting (11:00am).
- You need to decide if you want to hold formal meetings with a quorum or not.

- Action (RAC Subgroup members): Think about the level of meeting formality for the next meeting.
- Southwest RAC members on the RAC Subgroup report to the Southwest RAC to ensure that the BLM has adequately addressed the concerns of the members and that your interest is somewhere in the range of alternatives.
- Page 3 of handout (Functioning of the Cooperating Agencies and Resource Advisory Council Subgroup) lists the dates for the first five meetings. Meetings are scheduled for Friday mornings. Need to make sure this is okay with everyone.
  - Friday mornings are fine for everyone.
- Bruce: The June, July, August, and October 2010 meetings follow the alternatives development workshops that will be held internally by the BLM.
- If a member has a scheduling conflict, then they do not attend that meeting and do not represent the interests of the group at that meeting. If you are unable to attend, please notify Bruce Krickbaum.
- We expect to meet with the group 13 or 14 times throughout a two-year period. After January 2011, we are tentatively scheduled to meet in March, May, June, July, and October 2011, and then in January, March, and April 2012.
- Issues of interest to Cooperating Agencies: There is a list of approximately 26 resource topics that the BLM considers in the RMP revision. We want to focus our efforts on the expertise of this group. Some resources have less decision space than others, for example, cultural resources are generally protected by federal laws so the space for making decisions and range of alternatives is small. The group preliminarily identified the following issues:
  - Transmission lines (growth in residential): how to incorporate those issues into a plan
  - Travel management/off-highway vehicle use
  - Recreation/quiet use
  - Special designation areas
  - Oil and gas
  - Mining
  - Lands and realty
  - Special status species
  - Weeds
  - Livestock grazing
- *Comment:* It would be helpful to see the scoping comments because we are supposed to be representing the public and not only our own personal interests. Access to summary information, similar to summary of livestock grazing comments, would be helpful to direct discussion.
  - Action (Bruce Krickbaum): Submit summary of comments received on each resource to RAC Subgroup members.
  - Action (Bruce Krickbaum): Send link to community assessment to RAC Subgroup members.
- *Question:* Do you (BLM) already have an agenda for what will be discussed at the alternatives workshops? *Answer:* No, not yet. But there are resources that need to be addressed before others as these are resources that others react to (such as special management areas).
- *Comment:* It would also help to know about other pending decisions that might impact this plan. *Answer:* These might include sage-grouse and other threatened and endangered species decisions (prairie dogs); perhaps oil and gas as a reaction to the Gulf Coast oil spill; and air quality (regarding air quality, we do not have concrete direction from either the BLM or the US Environmental Protection Agency on what to do to address impacts. The issue is how to model the impacts from certain resource uses, especially coal, oil and gas, and uranium).
- *Question:* What are visual resources? *Answer:* This is related to viewshed, which is becoming more of an issue as people move into certain areas and value visual resources.

- *Question:* How much detail will we be getting into in the alternatives? *Answer:* Some RAC subgroups on other BLM RMPs have focused only on one thing and have gotten very detailed. Others want more of a variety and might spend less time in order to cover what is of interest.
- Barb Sharrow: We already know that wild and scenic rivers is a big issue. People have asked if there can be a separate stakeholder group for wild and scenic rivers (one for the San Miguel River and one for the Dolores River). What we will probably do is have the stakeholder group work and then present their findings and progress to this RAC Subgroup.
- The range of alternatives can vary by resource. For example, the decision space for cultural resources is smaller than for recreation so the range of alternatives is not as large. The goal is to make the range of alternatives wide enough (reasonably), and the BLM will identify the agency-preferred alternative. That does not mean that the preferred alternative will be the proposed RMP. The proposed RMP will likely be a combination of various components from each alternative for each resource.

7. Other Items Not on the Agenda

- None.

8. Action Items / Next Meeting

- Next meeting is Friday, June 25, 2010, from 9:00am to Noon at the BLM UFO, 2505 South Townsend Avenue, Montrose, Colorado.
- Contact Bruce Krickbaum with questions.
- Bruce will email the group when pertinent reports are posted on the Web site.
- ☐ Action: BLM (Bruce Krickbaum) will email the group the planning issues.
- ☐ Action (RAC Subgroup members): Think about the level of meeting formality for next time (e.g., should a quorum be used?).
- ☐ Action (Bruce Krickbaum): Submit summary of comments received on each resource to RAC Subgroup members.
- ☐ Action (Bruce Krickbaum): Send website link for community assessment to group.

United States Department of the Interior

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
Uncompahgre Field Office
Montrose, Colorado

TAKE PRIDE IN AMERICA

RESOURCE ADVISORY COUNCIL SUBGROUP MEETING #1

Thursday, May 27, 2010 (9:00 AM – 12:00 PM)

Meeting Location:
BLM Uncompahgre Field Office
2465 S. Townsend Avenue, Montrose, CO

Last Name	First Name	Initial	Address	E-Mail	Phone
Adams	Angie		EMPSi 3775 Iris Ave, Ste 1A Boulder, CO 80301	angie.adams@empsi.com	303-446-7160
Bear	Shelby		DMEA PO Box 910 Montrose, CO 81402	sbear@dmea.com	w: 970-240-1238 h: 970-874-1264
Baird-LeValley	Robbie		Colorado State Univ. Extension 525 Dodge Street Delta, CO 81416	robbie.levalley@colostate.edu	w: 970-874-2195 h: 970-872-3280
Blackburn	Walt		1751 Clearview Drive Delta, CO 81416	wblack8709@msn.com	h: 970-874-8709 c: 970-260-4181
Day	Bill		28478 Highway 92 Hotchkiss, CO 81419	billday@paonia.com	970-872-3216
Durnan	Richard		PO Box 2065 Ridgway, CO 81432	rich@richdurnanphoto.com	w: 970-316-2580 h: 970-318-0231
Kauffman	Dave		BLM, Uncompahgre Field Office 2465 S. Townsend Ave. Montrose, CO 81401	dave_kauffman@blm.gov	970-240-5340
Krickbaum	Bruce		BLM, Uncompahgre Field Office 2465 S. Townsend Ave. Montrose, CO 81401	bruce_krickbaum@blm.gov	970-240-5384
Mueller	Peter		PO Box 3140 Telluride, CO 81435	pmueller@tnc.org	w: 970-728-5291 h: 970-369-4348
Reams	John		Western Small Miner's Assoc. 31527 Hwy 141 PO Box 644 Naturita, CO 81422	john@reams-construction.com	w: 970-865-2886 h: 970-865-2397
Sharrow	Barb		BLM, Uncompahgre Field Office 2465 S. Townsend Ave. Montrose, CO 81401	barbara_sharrow@blm.gov	970-240-5315
Weist	Steven D.		Oxbow Mining 3737 Hwy 133 PO Box 535 Somerset, CO 81434	steve.weist@oxbow.com	w: 970-929-6461 h: 970-856-3777

Last Name	First Name	Initial	Address	E-Mail	Phone
William	Ela	WME	30507 L Road Hotchkiss, CO 81419	silvers1@tds.net	h: 970-872-3334
Wynant	Kate	KW	EMPSi 3775 Iris Ave, Ste 1A Boulder, CO 80301	kate.wynant@empsi.com	303-446-7160