



# United States Department of the Interior

Bureau of Land Management  
3028 East Main Street  
Canon City, Colorado 81212



## FRONT RANGE RESOURCE ADVISORY COUNCIL (RAC) MINUTES Aug 18-19, 2016

### Category 1

Ed Neilsen  
Ashley Cocciolone  
Bill Dvorak  
Diana Leiker  
Kathryn Wadsworth

### Category 2

Julie Mach  
Scott Braden  
Kristin Ann Salamack  
Jara Johnson  
Jason Anderson

### Category 3

Arthur Koepsell  
Brett Ackerman  
Christopher "Kit" Shy  
Dean Sandoval

### ATTENDEES

Ruth Welch, BLM State Director; Tom Heinlein, Designated Federal Officer (Front Range District Manager); Melissa Garcia, Front Range Associate District Manager; Kyle Sullivan, Front Range RAC Coordinator; Keith Berger, Royal Gorge Field Office Manager; Deborah Blank, Assistant Field Manager - San Luis Valley Field Office; Kalem Lenard, Assistant Field Manager - Royal Gorge Field Office; Linda Skinner, Recreation Planner, Royal Gorge Field Office; Sean Noonan, Recreation Planner, San Luis Valley Field Office; Clayton Davey, Park Ranger, San Luis Valley Field Office; Stephanie Carter, Geologist, Royal Gorge Field Office.

### GUESTS

Jack Placchi, BLM Colorado Fee Program Lead; Allan Robinson, Friends of Fourmile; Fred Henderson, Mt. Princeton Geothermal; Cindy Peratt, The Rock Doc; Mike Brazzell, Park County Commissioner; Lewis Jones, Guffey Resident; Wanda Eppes, Guffey Resident.

### INTRODUCTION

Kit called the meeting to order at 9:10 AM

The RAC members introduced themselves.

### MANAGERS UPDATE

#### Tom Heinlein, Front Range District Manager

On Oct 2, the Front Range District will no longer exist, instead it will become the new Rocky Mountain District which will include the Gunnison Field Office. Tom talked about the manager of the Gunnison Field Office, Elijah Waters. Several BLM Front Range District employees have conducted details in the Gunnison Field Office (Andrew Archuleta and Melissa Garcia). The Gunnison Field Office boundary is changing to include all public lands in San Juan County (the Alpine Loop). This boundary change brings new challenges and opportunities, including

Silverton Mountain Ski Area, Gold King Mine Spill (new Superfund Site). Gunnison Field Office also brings with it Gunnison Sage Grouse. The GuSG planning effort is far along the draft was released in last few weeks. There are amazing recreation opportunities – the Alpine Loop, two large WSAs - Handies Peak, Red Cloud and Sunshine Peak, Hartman Rocks. It's a big deal to have Gunnison added!

Q: Will this change in the District add members to the RAC?

A: There are several members of the SW RAC that reside in Gunnison. Several categories had multiple applicants in our nomination period - they will be incorporated into our RAC. Some current members may not RAC members may not be able to come back. We will continue to recruit applicants from the Gunnison Field Office (and San Luis Valley and Royal Gorge Field Office).

Q: Will this change the Charter?

A: There are some high-level changes to the charters - we've seen some early red-line changes to the charter to incorporate the changes to the district.

Q: This could increase the costs of the RAC (charter currently says \$50,000)

A: We have options to do things differently, for example there is a BLM Bunk House in Lake City. We try to be cost effective.

Tom Heinlein – In conclusion, overall there is broad support of the district changes throughout BLM leadership in Colorado and up to Washington Office. We are increasing the knowledge base in the District due to more employees. I see this as a beneficial change for the District. This change balances resources, acreage and staff size.

## **FIELD MANAGERS UPDATES**

**Keith Berger, Manager – Royal Gorge Field Office:** I want to give some of my time to Alan Robinson to explain one of his projects. We have three of the governors 16 for 16 trail projects in the Field Office.

Alan Robinson - Rails to Trails project is part of the Governor's 16 for 16 trails - 64 miles from Salida to Leadville. This project will be long term, we are early on in implementation. We got a grant to start the project - hired Kathryn Wadsworth as program manager. Coordinating with two counties, three towns, BLM, USFS and CPW (and AHRA) - cooperative effort. Working on formal designation on the trail - public lands and county/municipal lands. Trail will most likely be opened in bits and pieces - there is some low-hanging fruit that can be signed soon - other locations are more complex and have unique management challenges. By second year of implementation, there will be some trails open, mapping conducted, website, etc. A large portion of this trail is along existing rights-of-ways and will not require any changes to the surface - most of not all trail will be narrow natural surface - not big paved sidewalks type trails.

Jack Placchi - Federal Lands Access Program funded Copper Mountain to Top of Fremont Pass - want to drop down to your trail at some point.

Keith - Three of 16 trails in RGFO - Stage Route, Fremont Pass and Ring the Peak (around Pike's Peak).

**Keith's Update Continued** – The Big Three Planning Efforts (BCNM Monument Plan, ECRMP Plan, AHRA River Plan)

We are in the perfect planning storm - our office is infinitely more busy than I've ever seen. Lots of important users, partners, stakeholders on recreation projects - South Canon Trails, Buena Vista mountain bike trails, Salida trails. We are staying really busy on the recreation end. Oil Well Flats in Canon City exploded with use this winter. It's been called one of the top ten trails in the state. Hayden Pass Fire BAER work. Oil and Gas Lease Sale - normally in November - moving towards an August Lease Sale. This year there will be two lease sales - Nov. and Aug. 2017. Changes at National level on O+G leasing - 30 Act leases (RR and reservoir ROWs) - lots of RR ROW in North Eastern Colorado. 30 act has its own lease sale, bringing it to 3 sales this year. Tezak Quarry east of Canon City - one of the biggest leases in the BLM - working on innovative approaches to production verification and estimation using aerial imagery. Not to mention normal business like grazing permits, etc. Turns out we are super busy - a message we have been communicating with partners/externals. We need the RAC's help to explain our situation to partners to help ease pressure on BLM. It's not that we don't want to do something, it's just we need to think about how and when we do it. Our partners are very important to us and we greatly appreciate any help you can provide to share this message with your constituents.

Eastern Colorado Resource Management Plan:

We have developed the preliminary draft alternatives - we are working towards sharing these with the public before we conduct analysis on the alternatives. Our next step is to share the alternatives with cooperating agencies and the RAC. We were hoping for August - we are working under new direction of Planning 2.0 where the process isn't fully fleshed out. We are engaging the State Office to review alternatives. Three Alternatives - 1) enhance and benefit ecosystem functions, 2) responsive to current demands for resources and resource use (less additional restrictions/regulations) 3) Community alternative based on comments from scoping and envisioning meetings. Each alternative has differences based on location and communities.

Q: Will Realignment affect RMP?

A: No - RMP is really field office focused.

Q: Do you have a date when we (RAC) will see alternatives and how will that meeting be handled?

A: We will likely have a combination of email and in-person meetings for RAC. Timeframe is hopefully later this fall - depends on how cooperators and RAC respond to alternatives (minor tweaks vs major changes). Still working on format for public meetings.

Tom - Planning 2.0 is a big ticket item in WO, which adds time to the planning effort. WO review adds additional time to process.

Q: Does change in administration change planning processes?

A: Keith - hard to tell the future. Where we are at in the process helps us move forward because we have already started. Tom - probably changes in DOI that can impact timeframes.

## AHRA Recreation Management Plan

Have alternatives roughed out. We have shared those with the public and have gotten comments back. Working on incorporating comments in the impacts analysis of the alternatives. Smaller scale than RMP allows us to move quicker. Still hoping to have draft out this fall - finalize by the end of the year. Good public input so far, hope to keep that going.

Salida East - BLM land within the cooperative management area (AHRA) so CPW manages the area. Lots of management challenges - homeless, drugs, resource impacts, user conflicts, enforcement. CPW would like to manage under Recreation and Public Purposes Act - similar to Hecla Junction/Ruby Mountain and other R+PP Sites. Currently under dispersed camping rules. Starting an Environmental Assessment for Salida East, expect it to be highly controversial. Received 200+ comments on just the Realty Notice. Kyle - BLM is looking for the RAC's help to communicate with users of Salida East - what kind of communication technologies can we use to reach site users that may live in the area? Tom - we are aware that housing costs are expensive in Salida and that feeing the area can push current use to the fringes of town on other public lands.

Q: Will the site have fees and similar rules?

A: CPW will include information on fees and regulations in their proposal. Brett - It would likely be treated the same as other sites along the river.

Q: How are county and city interacting with the proposal?

A: Keith - we are just now kicking off the process and seeking input from the city. Local law enforcement is supportive because improved management could reduce strain on law enforcement as CPW takes a more active role in LE activities. Brett - big question is about displacement.

Kalem - we are trying to formulate a variety of alternatives based on public comments- lower development vs high development, fee some or all, etc.

Bill - popular location for fishing put-ins, it's a serious traffic issue.

## **Browns Canyon National Monument Plan - Melissa Garcia**

We are on the same path as last time we discussed the Monument plan - working on MOU with USFS and CPW. Meeting with County Commissioners on Sept. 12 to discuss cooperating agency, provide update. Working on defining roles and responsibilities, potential contracts, etc. Joe Vieira, Project manager, working on pre-planning information gathering. Bio-blitz to understand resources in monument, keeping it internal while we develop monitoring plan and needs for additional inventory. Aquatic and Riparian resource next week. Working with USFS NW Region and University of Colorado, Colorado Springs, BLM's Collaborative Dispute Resolution Center to conduct human ecology mapping - understand the intrinsic values behind the monument (sense of place). Working to incorporate information gathered in ECRMP envisioning and scoping process. Working with lots of partners - GARNA, Friends of Fourmile, Friends of Browns Canyon. We are working on parking at Ruby Mountain to improve parking and access - trying to move parking lot to a more sustainable location.

Action Item: Keith will send info on meeting with commissioners to RAC (time and location).

## **Deborah Blank – Assistant Field Manager, San Luis Valley Field Office**

Andrew Archuleta is on Beaver Creek fire as Agency Administrator

LWCF Sportsmen's access - ~500 acres near Del Norte providing access to the Rio Grande River - about 90% there, waiting for appraisal.

Feral Horses in RGNA - had to pick up foals recently. Hoping to impound horses later this winter.

AIM - Assessment Inventory Monitor program

Solar energy data and mitigation zones in preparation for future RMP and lease potential

Rio Grand Natural Area citizen's plan is complete so now the BLM is working on our plan.

Solar Regional Draft mitigation strategy submitted to Washington this week.

De-allocation of Blanca area

Recreation- Zapata Falls fee area was established and has been critical to management. Overflow of visitors come from Sand Dunes NP. BLM and State Land cooperatively manages this area.

## **FEDERAL LANDS RECREATION ENHANCEMENT ACT PROCESS**

Jack Placchi, Travel Management and Trails Program Manager, BLM Colorado State Office

Note: See PowerPoint on BLM RAC Website. These notes will capture questions from RAC.

REA could potentially end Sept. 30, 2017

Q: What is substantial federal investment?

A: It could include staff time for planning efforts, law enforcement or developed infrastructure (trash collection, picnic table, parking lot, etc.)

Q: Do we have recent examples of non-campground fees?

A: Ruby Horsethief is an Individual special recreation permit fee.

Q: Individuals vs vehicles?

A: somewhat subjective - some places charge by the individual while some places charge by the carload.

Q: Fees may not be charged for general admission - what does that really mean?

A: Some people will argue that we are trying to use general admission. However, fees are often used to provide services, like restrooms, parking and law enforcement. The Parking Lot at Guffey Gorge is one of the services that people would use.

## **THE RAC BROKE FOR LUNCH AT 11:55 AM**

### **PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD**

**Wanda Eppes** - Landowner adjacent to Guffey Gorge. Purchased land in 1998 - Guffey Gorge was paradise cove and was mostly unknown except by local residents. She is concerned about

human waste in area. BLM reacted and placed porta potties and dumpsters recently -too late. Pleading with BLM to manage this resource instead of study and analyze. Looks like large parcel on map, on the ground it is a small area. From a safety standpoint there are many concerns, for example cliff diving into small pool with numerous injuries. We often see flight for life and ambulances. Other safety issues impact us as neighbors - despite signs to contrary, we often see grills and campfires. Four to five neighbors share property lines and one mistake could ruin our investments and lives. Safety issues for children and families that are crossing the road. The parking lot looks like it holds 15-17 cars - well over 100 people in tiny area. I charge you with this - you knew we had problems years ago (safety crossing road) - people forced the issue and started parking in area that used to be beautiful natural habitat and now it's barren and nasty looking. BLM should have installed boulders to stop parking there. We thought about installing boulders, but it's not ours to decide. As a part owner and neighbor of property, we feel let down by BLM for not being proactive. We are now stuck in a situation to be reactive. Now BLM thinks we need to make it a parking lot. I disagree vehemently that parking should not be allowed there. BLM has not managed and we are angry. We feel taken advantage of, feel like there is a move on the part of BLM to make it an even bigger attraction, which is not safe for the people or resources. I heard yesterday that it takes money to manage, because it takes money and we seem to be going into a direction I don't agree with, I want to have a voice in helping you decide how to manage the property. I advocate for the highest possible fee, parking fee and per-head fee due to the amount of resources needed to properly manage the property. Steve has done a good job working in the area. People ignore the sign about trash. If going to improve/maintain/contain parking, it takes money. The government is supposed to work on our behalf - however once the government has made a decision to do something, it's one small step down the slippery slope. If the BLM paves parking lot with an attendant there, you missed the spot.

**Lewis Jones** - husband of pervious commenter. Moved in 1998. Worked hard to buy property and build house. BLM is content to allow anyone to defile the area. They don't care about what people do. Yesterday there was a dog running loose, and a man set down trash by dumpster. He told visitors to correct behavior. It would look like a trash pit if local volunteer didn't clean up. The government grabs and grabs in little increments. We are tired of all of the crap we see there. We live there and you've never been there on the weekend to see what we contend with. Come on a Saturday before you vote. The yellow forests of signs don't work - it means nothing to these people. He piled dirt up in front of and behind those cars. I don't want those people there. 30-40 cars on south side of road, then park on north side, then all over the road. They do whatever they want to do. I want something done! It's been four years and not one thing has been done to control it, except Steve. He's only one guy. Talked to Fred Wagner (Sheriff) to be meter maid and tow vehicles. No one takes him up on offer. You need to cut back usage, the government does it all the time. Do it at Guffey Gorge.

**Keith** - we appreciate Lewis and Wanda's comments today. We've come up with a management that is in place. To implement it fully, we are here to day for the fee increase.

**Lewis** - there is no respect by the people visiting there. It's not our job to instill stewardship in visitors, that is the BLMs job. Every neighbor that lives within ten miles feels the same way.

**Mike Brazzell, Park County Commissioner**

Coming from private sector into government job, the time table is really frustrating. What I've seen in the last three years, is the project is stronger due to the length of time put in. The larger the group extends the timeline. I've seen a lot of work done on this. You're right there are lots of meetings. Things don't get done by letting citizens take over what the local government should do because there are liability issues. I see the light at the end of the tunnel. Keith is doing good work and listening to locals. We met two years ago and I didn't think anything would happen. I'm impressed with what the BLM has done.

**Lewis** - ask Fred to let me be a meter maid, deputize me!

**Mike** - we have trained law enforcement. What you will see in the plan that is going to be presented is in the right direction. More important is the message going out about rules against drugs and alcohol. Social media will spread the word about tickets and fines, reducing the number of incidents we will see there.

**Wanda** - in order to restrict human use, we need to contain vehicle space. People made their own spaces on the road right-of-way and our driveways. Seen vehicle parked with wheels on boulders with part sticking out in road. Manage parking requires people on the group, which requires money. I'm in favor of fees, high fees, and someone there supervising it.

**Lewis** - why can't you charge children under 16? Make it hurt financially.

**Jack** - the law specifically says you can't charge anyone under 16.

**Keith** - We have a partnership with Park County Sheriff. We understand this year was rough for Park County Sheriff and we have all the appreciation in the world for them.

**Kit** - do you see limiting alcohol as a positive step?

**Mike** - yes, absolutely. The question of someone there requires concessionaire. Nobody wanted to do that. The proposal you see from BLM is the best of the alternatives we've considered.

**Lewis** - I'm changing my mind - if fees require paved parking and bathrooms, then I don't agree with it. Nobody who lives there wants that. Parking lots are in blind spots on the highway.

**Mike** - I've heard support from other people that disagree and believe that BLM's plan is the best way to go. They want to regulate the area and in order to that you need to develop.

**Lewis** - Why can't you close the north parking lot?

**Keith** - You are making some of the issues we deal with really apparent. I can't control social media. I can't control the amount of people hearing about it and going there. We realized really quickly that it was exceeding the capacity of that parking lot. You can argue that we could limit the places that park. We did that and put up signs. BLM has no jurisdiction over the highway. Park County was really helpful in working with us and putting up signs. That was ignored really quickly. People were then parking right on the highway. We started looking into tow companies, there were none in the area. Closest wrecker is Divide. We tried to alleviate danger of parking on road by having parking on north side of road. There are limits to how close you can put an obstruction, which allows room for people to park on the side of the road. It was the least worst decision to park on the north side of the road.

## **DISTRICT REALIGNMENT**

Ruth Welch, BLM Colorado State Director

See PowerPoint posted to BLM Front Range RAC Website.

Q: Was mineral extraction a decision point?

A: NW has a consolidated O+G program. Most Abandoned Mine Land in our District.

Brett Ackerman: Want to commend the BLM for making this move to be more efficient.

Q: Maybe one more meeting per year given the location of Gunnison. Last time we looked at charter, the budget increased - may need to look at budget situation and consider it. Did shared disciplines play into this and are they still available?

A: Yes, we are very good about sharing resources beyond field office and district boundaries.

Q: Does this change promote any additional interaction between BLM and USFS RACs?

A: Can't answer questions about what their RACs are doing. Question came up last year about using BLM RAC to approve fees for USFS. I like the idea of more collaborative partnerships with the USFS.

Q: Jason.- I look at our RAC like our county - dispersed with pockets all over. What kind of challenges do you see transportation wise?

A: Tom has no problem driving to different destinations to take care of business in the District.

## **FEE PROPOSAL DISCUSSION – GUFFEY GORGE**

Linda Skinner, Outdoor Recreation Planner, Royal Gorge Field Office

See PowerPoint on BLM's Front Range RAC webpage. These notes will focus on questions and content not contained in the slide.

2016 dates on anticipated costs are off a year. So 2016 is anticipated for 2017.

Comment: Four day school week could change use numbers.

Q: Is there room in the budget to increase funds if law enforcement isn't as effective as you hope?

A: If it takes longer than we hope, we would fund law enforcement out of normal budget.

Q: What will the cadastral budget be used for in the business plan?

A: Identifying corners and marking boundaries, signing access to public land and private land.

Q: Does this include any budget for Search and Rescue funding?

A: There are some opportunities to share costs.

Q: What is the capacity of the parking lot?

A: Shooting for 30-35 vehicles. Preliminary drawings were for 33 vehicles. The southern lot could add 15 more vehicles.

Q: Is there any way to recoup the capital investment?

A: No, we can only base fees on existing infrastructure.



Q: Where do fees go?

A: Parking fees for BLM go to victims assistance fund.

Q: If we propose a different fee amount, how does that impact next steps?

A: It will require us to go to the public for additional scoping.

Keith: We will commit to updating the RAC with an annual operating review.

Q: Why go forward with fees and supplemental rules at the same time?

A: Rule making part will take an increased amount of enforcement which has increased costs. Enforcement costs skyrocket first several years. We don't have the funding to make that part happen without fee proposal.

The RAC called for a vote.

13 RAC members voted in favor of the proposed fee, one RAC member opposed and one RAC member was not present. After the vote, RAC members were asked to explain the rationale behind their vote.

Brett Ackerman (opposed to fee proposal) - I understand the need to fund this, that said, I think we are a year pre-mature. To avoid development of this area, find money in the budget for law enforcement prior to development of the site.

Arthur – The fee is appropriate, the area is loved to death. Users of site should fund remedial efforts to improve it.

Kathryn – I questioned the fee before site visit, given experience in the past, I want LEOs to be able to enforce rules which requires some infrastructure. It's easier to enforce laws when you have improvements. The fee makes it easier for public to see rules and regulations, helps with citizen enforcement.

Scott - Support because of field trip and BLM materials, public input - there are significant concerns about impacts to resource and impacts to local community. Tandem actions may not be silver bullet, but gives BLM tools they need. We will monitor and revisit in the future if needed.

Julie - sheer user numbers necessitates development.

Bill - Strong advocate of public lands in public hands, social media has augmented use, the reverse should happen - not a party site anymore and will lose allure.

Kit - We are reacting to a problem, we've identified the problems (parking, waste, alcohol, music, animal control). These changes will have positive impacts on the problem.

Ashley – I learned a lot in past two days, applaud the BLM and the public for the amount of attention put into the land. There are two big issues - human capacity and traffic, being able to enforce safe practices. Rules address safety, allows for human capacity, doesn't mean much if you can't enforce it. Fee provides resources to the BLM. Don't think the fee will deter people, and that's not an appropriate use of fees.

Jason - a few things have made me uncomfortable. There is an undercurrent of judgement of good and bad people. We are saying that one is more important than others (family vs adventure seekers). We can't go back in time - Colorado is rapidly growing. Unenforced rules are much worse than no rules at all.

Kristin - enforcement issues are a big concern. Cheeseman park doesn't allow dogs, we would group together to unleash dogs and post a lookout. Once they stepped up enforcement, we stopped doing it because word got out. Having that increased enforcement plus word of mouth will start to decrease problems.

Diana- same as others - BLM has limitations on how to get funding. Colorado is changing, rapidly. As an active rec user, I'm willing to pay to protect these resources. It may need to be a more standard process for BLM so that we can fix these issues.

Jara - second the comment on resource protection. The permit provides a way to build accountability among users. I voted for the fee because BLM and Park County have already contributed funds for the project. Fee helps fill the gap - neither could pay for site improvements on their own.

Ed – Protects resources. Can't regulate rules without resource protection.

Dean - Land management issue. Necessary - BLM is acting on it quickly given that bureaucracy moves slowly.

### **FEE PROPOSAL DISCUSSION – CACHE CREEK**

Kalem (James) Lenard, Assistant Manager for Renewable Resources, Royal Gorge Field Office

See PowerPoint on BLM Front Range RAC website. These notes capture discussion and questions not contained in the PowerPoint.

One of the RAC members asked Cindy Peratt (the Rock Doc) what she thought of the proposal. Cindy – I think it is a good compromise. We saw a lot of folks from out of state there. Price of gold was a big factor. When rules changed in 2012, we saw a drop in use and actually appreciated it despite the cost to business due to resource impacts.

Q: Intent isn't to generate funds, correct?

A: Yes, we are trying to offset some operating costs.

Q: What is the role of campground host?

A: Help inform rules while also providing education on how to pan.

Cindy - people behave better when people are watching.

Stephanie Carter - 2008-2009 saw explosive growth because you can find gold there. It's a rare location for this activity and changed from a fun thing to do to people trying to make a living off of gold.

Kathryn motioned to approve fee. Diana Seconded.

Hand vote: unanimous in favor of the fee. The RAC was asked to explain the rationale behind their vote.

Brett - specific user group, high impact activity against stated purpose of property. Adaptive management. Fish and elk habitat.

Arthur - unique user group, unique experience. Some cost to maintain site and reclaim damage.

Kathryn - Field trip and presentation provided good education. Support because of a use-activity fee.

Scott - LWCF Fund purpose of elk and riparian. Not comfortable with recirculating pumps and mechanized use - more important to protect resource values. Yes but with resignations.

Julie - concentrated use - more proactive steps when use is not overwhelming.

Bill - Concerned about Brown Trout.

Kit - huge contrast in previous use versus what we see today. Sedimentation and water flow. No water benefited fishery.

Ashley - well thought out. Support.

Jason - excellent job. Covered all your bases. original intent of BLM is a land of many uses, should accommodate uses when we can.

Kristin - lots of overlapping resource concerns. Balanced approach to addressing concerns. Similar concerns to what Scott stated about mechanical use. Can be monitored, limited scope that won't impact stream.

Diana - proactive approach - gives BLM tools down the road. Intensive use compared to other activities.

Jara - meets definition of SRP. FairPlay changes 5, so same as what I see locally.

Ed - didn't attend field trip this time. Shining example of BLM and RAC doing what we are supposed to do.

Dean - appropriate fee

Keith Berger - thank you for the active participation and questions. It's important that this fee process is viewed as a slam-dunk kind of thing, we will lose credibility. The questions that went into this are really important. Thanks for the deliberate considerations.

Kit - my lesson for the day is that there are more and more creative uses of public lands every day. We need to protect public lands from threats and open them up to new uses.

## **CLOSE OUT**

The RAC was asked to provide a meeting critique

Jason - Glad to see that folks make us uncomfortable and hope that continues into the future.

Kristin - good to work on something that we can discuss and work on. Active discussion was great. Lots of information all around.

Diana - learned a lot more about BLM recreation process. Field Trip was key to us making decisions. Public engagement was helpful.

Jara - good meeting.

Ed - good meeting

Dean - good to be actively involved.

Brett – As the dissenting vote, I own our decision and will support moving forward.

Arthur - meeting went well, field trip went well.

Kathryn - good to connect, learn. Field trip was awesome. Want to continue to do that.

Scott - enormous amount of preparation staff did was very helpful.

Julie - thanks for helping us get to the point where we can have meaningful conversation. We need to focus on being pro-active with other issues - lets work as a RAC to identify where we are pushing that use to, set up management.

Bill - We were appraised of these issues a number of years ago, it's nice to get to a decision.

Ashley - Meeting was really motivating and telling of what the RAC can do, we want to build on this momentum. Hope it continues. We tabled topics on Salida East and Feral Horses and we want to be helpful on those and other high priority issues. Discussion seemed rushed at the end of the day, need more time.

Kit - great to have the band back together.

**THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 4:25 PM**

---

Tom Heinlein, Designated Federal Officer  
Front Range District Office  
Bureau of Land Management

---

Christopher “Kit” Shy, Chair  
Front Range Resource Advisory Council