

Lower Dolores Plan Working Group Meeting Summary Dec. 14, 2009

Note: Presentations, documents, meeting summaries, agendas and other information related to the Lower Dolores Working Group process are posted at <http://ocs.fortlewis.edu/drd>. (There is a button on the left on the home page for the Lower Dolores Working Group.)

Agenda review: Facilitator Marsha Porter-Norton said that Cole Crocker-Bedford requested a review of how the current Outstandingly Remarkable Values (ORVs) were derived. This was added to the agenda. She also explained that the suggested consensus document (emailed to the Working Group prior to the meeting) includes the areas identified by staff as “low-hanging fruit” from the small-group discussions meaning areas where it was perceived by staff (i.e., Marsha, Ann and Shauna) that there was a general consensus or less of a range of opinion. This document was covered later in the meeting.

Public Comment: One member of the public commented stating that he lived in Lewis and is interested in the process.

Review of meeting summaries: The October and November 2009 meeting summaries were approved with some changes related to the report outs from the small groups.

Discussion of Proposed DeGette Wilderness legislation: Dolores County Commissioner Julie Kibel said U.S. Rep. DeGette responded to the letter sent to her by the Dolores County Commissioners regarding the wilderness bill she is proposing that includes acreage in the Dolores River Corridor. The response reflected that very little if any change would be made to her proposed bill, Julie said.

Marsha said this top-down approach is a concern to the Working Group and is perceived as a slap in the face of the local effort. Cole Crocker-Bedford said the BLM has managed this area effectively for a long time and seems to be doing a good job. He said if this bill passes, the Working Group and local citizens will have little or no influence on what happens in the corridor. Marsha also noted that a letter was sent to Rep. DeGette on behalf of the Working Group based on a consensus decision at the

October meeting (note: this letter was later emailed out to the Working Group members).

Jeff Widen, from the Wilderness Society, said he believes locals can successfully give input and that, without local support, it is doubtful that this bill will pass. Amber said Rep. DeGette has introduced some form of this legislation unsuccessfully for the past seven to nine years. Commissioner Kibel said anyone can go onto Rep. DeGette's website and e-mail her office, and suggested that anyone with concerns should do so.

Development of ORVs: Shauna Jensen of the Dolores Public Lands Office (DPLO) gave a brief history of how the ORVs were determined for the various reaches of the Lower Dolores. The ORVs came from the 1976 *Dolores River Wild and Scenic River Study Report*. Shauna said there is no concrete guideline or detailed definition of what constitutes an ORV. The Interdisciplinary Team (ID team), made up of BLM and USFS staff, look at attributes and features of an area to determine if they have meaningful value or regional significance when compared to the features of other comparable areas. Features must be found to be unique, rare, or exemplary in the professional judgment of the ID team if they are to rise to the level of being an ORV. Appendix D of the 2007 *San Juan Public Lands Draft Revised Resource Management Plan* has notes on each ORV and why it was selected.

Amber asked if there was a public-comment session in the development of the ORVs. Shauna said yes, that there was public comment when the current Draft Land Management Plan was in a comment period.

Mike mentioned that eligibility for WSR status was considered first by the SJPLC (San Juan Public Lands Center) in developing the Draft Plan and then suitability was evaluated. Suitability is a higher standard. In considering suitability, practical questions were asked to narrow the eligibility list.

Workshop Portion: The group then delved into issues. Marsha congratulated the group for getting to this point. She said the group has been educating themselves for almost a year and now, it is time to get to the recommendations that will be forwarded to the DPLO.

Review of the Document Sent out Ahead of Time: The Working Group then went through the document emailed out ahead of time. Discussion occurred on each item. The tracked changes below reflect the points and changes made by the Working Group and where each recommendations stands (i.e., if consensus was reached, more

wording that needs added, points made, etc.). Below that are summarized comments/points made by the Working Group.

Campsites: The group developed a set of recommendations around campsites (see below).

4 X 4 Road: The Working Group decided to stay in one large group for discussion of the 4 X 4 item and thus, it was decided not to use the bucket-list exercise for this topic. Ann Oliver presented information she researched regarding the 4x4 road along the river from the pump station to Slick Rock in Dolores and San Miguel counties. The section of the road that is in Dolores County is maintained by Dolores County Government. Commissioner Kibel said it is not a priority road for the County, but is maintained about once a year. The road portion that is a San Miguel County Road for 2.4 miles north of the San Miguel/Dolores County line is maintained on that stretch. However, after the 2.4-mile marker, San Miguel County has formally removed the road from its maintenance schedule. No maintenance is done by that county or the BLM. (Note: due to a question raised, Ann learned through subsequent research that San Miguel County has formally vacated this portion of the road and considers it to be entirely under BLM's management.) This vacated portion amounts to 1.5 to 2 miles of road that was formerly recognized by San Miguel County.

A portion of the road is closed seasonally by the Colorado Division of Wildlife (CDOW). Brian MaGee, the new CDOW representative serving on the Working Group to replace Dave Harper. He said that at a bare minimum the CDOW would like the seasonal closure to remain in place for lambing season.

It was asked why San Miguel County claims just the first 2.4 miles in their County? Amber said there is a significant change in the road at that point, and that is also the location of the seasonal closure.

Cole asked: What is the problem with this road? Why are we covering this issue in such great depth? The facilitator noted that this was a great point and asked Shauna to explain why the Working Group was asked to tackle this issue. Shauna suggested considering whether the road impacts any of the ORVs in this segment. For example, she said, is the fact the road isn't maintained in some areas causing sediment problems? Are there other ORVs affected by this road being open most of the time? She also noted that Steve Beverlin likely posed the road question to the group as a way to gather information leading up to the DPLO's Travel Management Plan process for this area which is set to kick off in 2010.

Chester Anderson said he wouldn't consider this a water-quality issue in regard to sedimentation because this is a sediment-starved section, and the amount of sediment coming off the road is insignificant compared to sources like Disappointment Creek. Chester learned this through his work on a water shed study/planning process (319 Study) that is currently underway.

The Working Group discussed the amount and type of usage on the road. Al Heaton said he typically sees groups of three to four four-wheelers and that users seem to be considerate. Clint said the trail is overgrown and especially hard to travel near the end. The five river crossings have rock bottoms so there is little chance of creating a sediment problem, Clint said. He also said he would like to see the trail kept accessible to everyone. Al also said that the bighorn sheep do not seem to be affected by travelers on the road. Cole noted that this could be because they are not a significantly hunted species in the area by the 4x4 road and he noted that highly hunted species learn to be wary of humans.

David said it should be kept in mind that the group is being asked to look to the future. He said that other 4 x 4 areas, such as near Moab, used to have little use like this 4 X 4 road now. But, now those roads are over-run. He encouraged the group to plan for what he said are high usage due to population changes in the Southwest in general. It will be discovered, he noted and could then impact many aspects of the area.

The road should not be closed but major improvements are to be discouraged, some said. It's a matter of thresholds. It was suggested that people be required to register at a box (similar to hiking trails) so usage can be gauged.

Carolyn said she would like to see the recommendation include that the road is for recreational use only, not for commercial access to mining sites. Later, the word "recreational" was changed to "4x4."

Staff were tasked with finding out:

- whether or not San Miguel County has vacated or abandoned the section of road past 2.4 miles into the county (see above); and
- what the words "vacate" and "abandon" mean in relation to county road policy.

After all this discussion, the Working Group came to a set of consensus decisions about the road. They recommended that it stay open with the current seasonal closure in place (see below for more).

After this consensus was reached, Amber and Meghan noted that by their supporting that the road not be closed (meaning their interest groups), everyone should consider this a trade off that was made; that this decision should be viewed in the context of all the decisions that need to be made for the entire corridor. Amber noted that this decision should be evaluated in the context of larger issues and other travel management considerations.

January Preview: The next meeting will include a discussion of thresholds and speakers on the various tools being discussed for corridor-wide protection. Linda Bassi from the CWCB will discuss tools such as Colorado's In-stream Flow program, water leasing, water acquisition, etc. Roy Smith, who works for the State BLM office in their WSR program, is tentatively scheduled to speak to the group (not yet confirmed). Ann Oliver is going to cover what the Dolores River Dialogue is doing related to the issues the Lower Dolores Plan Working Group is grappling with...namely flow issues which links with the ORVs of rafting and the Roundtail Chub. Marsha asked Don to relay who he has been talking to related to represent the water planning and development point of view related to WSR issues. (At the last meeting, Don requested that if Roy Smith was going to talk to the group that a speaker from the water development and planning community also be present to give alternative views and clarifying information.) Don said that David Robbins a Denver Attorney has been approached about talking to the group.

Cole said federal legislation should not be the only recommendation made because he has concerns about losing local control in a congressional process. Don agreed. Peter said that Cole's comments seems somewhat inflammatory at this stage of the game and that an open mind about all tools would be more helpful. Amber said it is important that federal legislation remain on the table as an option for long-term protection. Jeff Widen said he doesn't believe that local control and federal legislation have to be mutually exclusive, and that locals' input can included in the congressional process to make bills. Marsha encouraged everyone to not debate this point at this time (meaning whether federal legislation should be what is recommended) because the process calls for first learning more about the tools and a debate at this time is premature. She assured everyone that the WSR issues including landscape-wide protection tools will be discussed at length this spring. Everyone's concerns on both side of the issue were noted.

Public Comment: Jodi Schwindt said, in regard to wildfires, she believes that fire suppression should be used when adjacent private land could be affected. Shauna said there are criteria for whether to let something burn or not. Karol asked that when a member of the public has something to say during a topic, they should be allowed to chime in at that time and not have to wait. Marsha noted that if a limited number of the public is in attendance then this seemed reasonable.

Lower Dolores Plan Working Group Recommendations
As of 12/15/09 -- (DRAFT * DRAFT * DRAFT * DRAFT * DRAFT * DRAFT * DRAFT)
Draft 2, Draft 2, Draft 2, Draft 2, Draft 2
(Comments made at December meeting noted in RED)

This document was developed by staff (*) in preparation for the December 14th, 2009 Working Group Workshop. It is a working draft at this point. What is presented below represents a list of proposed consensus recommendations for the Working Group to consider. These are areas where the staff believes there is either consensus *or* there is not a great range of opinions among the Working Group *and/or* the output of the Working Group is a list of recommended ideas for the Dolores Public Lands Office (USFS/BLM) to consider. The staff developed this list by analyzing the "Summary Document" handed out at the November 16th, 2009 Working Group meeting, as well as the original notes taken from each small group discussion. For each ORV, the management questions discussed by small groups are presented with a summarized list of the Working Group's ideas. Then, proposed Working Group recommendations follow in the boxes. Note: The numbering of the questions matches the numbers in the "Summary Document."

(*) Staff: Marsha Porter-Norton, Facilitator; Ann Oliver, Project Consultant; Shauna Jensen, Dolores Public Land Office (USFS/BLM) -- Hydrologist and Liaison to the Working Group

Archeology/Cultural Resources

1) How should the illegal OHV access into the Dolores Wilderness Study Area be managed?

- o Put up permanent posted signs big enough to see
- o Put up a physical barrier in Bull Canyon and Silvey's Pocket
- o Answer the question: What is the damage being done?
- o Do more education; don't let up

2) How should the cultural sites currently being impacted from rafters be protected?

- o Recommend that Shaman Cave be day-use only
- o Put up signs about cultural resource ethics at launch sites and at registers and in other key places
- o Crowd control: put up small fences or low fences or other barriers; close some social trails; plant poison ivy
- o Close camping @ archeological sites
- o Use education/signage/peer pressure; target a brochure to outfitters and guidebook information for other users/visitors

3) Should there be additional interpretation at Indian Henry's Cabin located in Bull Canyon?

- Yes: need sign and history of cabin; should protect it and offer education about history of cabin

Consensus Recommendations: The Dolores Public Lands Office should continue monitoring and documenting priority archeology and cultural resources when possible with available funding including finishing the survey which began in the summer of 2009. Additional management tools to protect this ORV should include targeted education and signage and erecting some physical barriers or "crowd control" apparatus where local managers deem important and "do-able." Any physical barriers put up should not deny access to grazing allotment holders.

Where possible, the DPLO should develop or sustain existing partnerships with user groups, such as grazers, rafters and OHV groups, to facilitate protection of cultural resources via ongoing education. Finding creative ways for users of the corridor to "self police" is another recommended tool especially given the isolation of the area and the limited Dolores Public Land Office (USFS/BLM) staff resources for ongoing enforcement in all reaches.

The Working Group supports doing additional interpretation at Henry's Cabin. (list ideas from small groups and make it clear this is not about closing the road)

- Strengthen
- Need baseline of data
- Post the ethnic messages on all Web site rafters check
- Continue personnel at put-in's when this can be realistically done
- Do education at boat ramps
- Get user groups engaged using a stewardship ethic
- Work with user groups' networks, formal and informal, to spread the word
- Be stronger...This is a little too weak; artifacts are disappearing and somethings needs to be done
- Work with SJMA and others on a Cultural Site Stewardship Program
- Cole: require rafting-group leaders to keep a log of all stops visited to increase accountability and management. The general consensus, after discussion, was that this would be very difficult to enforce.
- It's not just about rafters...it's about other recreationalists too

NOTE: The idea that Shaman Cave be day-use only will be handled through discussions with the Working Group about rafting and camp sites. This idea relates to a broader discussion about campsite management.

Scenery

1) What should the role of wild-land fire be within the corridor?

- Use prescribed fire carefully
- Suggested policy: let wildfire burn under right conditions; use as a tool when it makes sense
- Protect scenic values (suggest as a goal)

2) How should Ponderosa Pines be managed?

- Managed to maintain this feature
- Use fire in some way to help them regenerate without burning them down; ensure periodic burn
- Weed management

Reach 1:

- Controlled burn

- Protect recreational and scenic values, cottonwoods, archeology, and private property
- To enhance wildlife habitat

Reach 2:

- Use fire to control danger of catastrophic fire due to dog hair ponderosa and sustain and enhance the unusual/relic populations of ponderosa
- Let it burn under the right conditions
- Consider burning after mechanical treatment (thinning)
- Protect archeology

Consensus Recommendations:

Wildfire is a topic that relates to the ORV of Scenery and the Ponderosa Pine forests that are part of the Scenery ORV. The Working Group recommends that wildfire be managed by the Dolores Public Lands Office (USFS/BLM) using their expertise, resources and experience. The Working Group generally believes that managed wildfire should be used very carefully in the corridor and under the right conditions. Further, the Working Group is giving the DPLO various ideas and thoughts on wildfire issues and management (see above).

The Ponderosa Pines are a unique feature of the corridor in Reaches 2 and 3, and the Dolores Public Lands Office (USFS/BLM) should do all it can to protect this visual and ecological resource. Ensuring periodic burning as well as mechanical treatments and other management around wildfire are mentioned as strategies for consideration.

There was a range of opinion expressed among the Working Group with some believing in a “let it burn policy” and some believing in a more proactive “ensure period burn” policy. A let it burn policy is concerning for those who own land near the Public Lands and they do not prefer this policy for obvious reasons.

It is acknowledged that in some reaches pre-mitigation is not possible due to difficult access, so a “let it burn” policy is what is recommended for those reaches.

Rafting

1) Should there be any additional recreational opportunities in any of the existing sites (applies to other recreation as well)?

- Institute a longer season for Ferris & Cabin recreation sites (after Labor Day through the end of hunting season)
- Keep policy(ies) the same; nothing needs changed
- Bradfield: maintain presence during boating & hunting seasons; education over enforcement; public play area at bridge (CDOW site); put-in at Metaska site to accommodate day trippers
- Reach 2: appears adequate; designate campsites/capacities; some active management (poison ivy control)
- Reach 2: designated sites; voluntary sign-ups; specific reaches (Coyote Wash, Slick Rock WSA)
- Institute a policy: yes but let usage dictate what needs done
- Disperse the campsites and regulate (more-so)

Consensus Recommendation:

This question was a “catch all” category question posted by the DPLO. The Working Group gave various ideas and opinions (see above). Therefore, it is suggested that the DPLO staff review this list and incorporate ideas from the list into the Environmental Assessment and eventually, in some cases, into the 1990 Plan Update.

2) Should the Bradfield launch site be permitted?

- o No, do not do it
- o No, do not do it -- but do more education
- o Before you make the decision, rafting industry needs to be consulted

Consensus Recommendation:

It is recommended that the Bradfield Bridge launch site not be permitted at the present time. It is further recommended that the rafting "community", both recreational and commercial, may need to be consulted relating to any new changes to rafting management. (Note: Once the Working Group discusses thresholds, this recommendation may have additional information. The threshold question would be: Under what conditions does the Working Group believe that a permitting system may need to be considered?)

We like having personnel at the put ins when this resource can be planned for

Do more on the ground management during known spill periods

Continue to discuss ethics of fire pans, porta poties, not taking artifacts, etc.

We like what you're doing – continue it

Talk about permitting as a threshold issue...now, a permitting system is not needed but what if the river gets more use in the future (future topic)

3) Does the DPLO have the appropriate mix of outfitter guides to meet public needs?

- o Yes
- o Monitor situation because of concern about impacts to camp sites

Consensus Recommendation:

There is consensus that the mix appears to be meeting the public's needs.

4) How should the BLM/USFS interact with the private land owners to manage the Slick Rock boat launch?

- o Consensus from one group: BLM should actively pursue a permanent access point with willing land owners or on BLM land - BLM should help ensure that waste, etc. is managed appropriately
- o BLM should commit more resources to help the land owners manage the site (i.e. signage); try to keep it open but accommodate land owners concern
- o Get CDOT involved and make it a rest area and then CDOT manages the site (idea: joint lease between BLM and CDOT)
- o Move the launch site to BLM land
- o BLM would purchase land or do land swap to acquire it (if land owners are willing and using fair market price)
- o Launch at boat ramp, but move parking somewhere else (to BLM lands)

Consensus Recommendations:

It is recommended that a viable put-in/take-out remain in place in the Slickrock Area. It is acknowledged that the present site is creating problems for the land owners and that a partnership between various entities (e.g., Dolores Public Lands Office (USFS/BLM), the land owners, CDOT, etc.) may need to emerge to better accommodate everyone's needs. Various ideas and solutions are being put forth by the Working Group as per the list above. These ideas were generated in the small group exercise and on the September, 2009 field trip where those in attendance heard from the Randolph's regarding problems they are experiencing at the site. The Working Group desires that private property rights be respected and desires that a put-in/take-out remain available in this reach. The Working Group further wishes that the Dolores Public Lands Office (USFS/BLM) will expend the necessary resources to manage and make available this recreational amenity.

Mention the Randolph's by name

5) Should the Big Gyp recreation site be maintained as is, improved or decommissioned?

- No: the site does need sanitary facilities and better management of weeds and trash
- Consider adding another put-in

Consensus Recommendation:

It is recommended that the Big Gyp site not be decommissioned but additional management needs to occur around trash and weeds. One small group suggested putting another put-in facility at this site but the Working Group recognizes the physical limitations of this site.

CAMPsites: Note: There are a range of ideas and complex issues surrounding the management of campsites in the corridor. Therefore, this will be a topic of discussion at the December 14th Workshop. Please refer to questions about campsites in the "Summary Document."

Campsites Recommendations (Consensus)

- "First Come/First Served" should continue as the policy for usage of the campsites.
- The Working Group recommends that the details around campsite management be left to the BLM professionals to protect the campsites and manage them in such ways so as to protect the ORVs.
- *The Working Group supports the ideas forwarded by Rick Ryan Allow camping in the 2 mile stretch between river miles 84 and 86 only at designated/posted campsites. Post the existing campsites at the mouth of the wash, as shown on the river map, and perhaps establish and post 3 or more additional sites in the 2 miles stretch. New sites would be established out of sight and sound of each other. All sites in 2 miles stretch would also be posted as large or small. Enforce the first season of implementation through pilot program. used as a key tool in helping protect this ORV (brochures, personnel on the river and at put/ins during peak season, encouraging an ethic of stewardship among river users, etc.)*
- *Bring this issue up as part of threshold discussion with the question being: Is there a threshold or point at which the BLM should institute a campsite sign up or permitting system?*

Fish, Wildlife and Ecological: Invasive Species

1) How do we cooperatively fund invasive species inventory and treatment?

- Use partnerships with other groups/entities; use outside means; incorporate other people's work: graduate students; Tamarisk Coalition; DOL Tamarisk Action Group, Walton Family Foundation; develop unlikely partnerships; coordinated effort already underway, but emphasis on land agencies working with DOW and others; engage counties
- Be more flexible in management and budgeting
- Acquire more funding for BLM to use
- Continue to inventory and do abatement and leverage other efforts
- Recommend BLM/USFS Agency to manage money and opportunities better (an example was cited of bureaucratic procedure/rules interfering with ability to spend funds on control of invasives)

Consensus Recommendation:

Since tamarisk and other invasive plants are a threat to the health of the corridor, the Dolores Public Lands Office (USFS/BLM) should continue working in partnership(s) with landowners and other entities and coalitions. The agency should be actively participating and bringing expertise and funding to the table. Wise and targeted use of limited money is recommended, as well as increasing funding available for projects as opportunities arise.

2) If tamarisk is removed from the main Dolores and associated tributaries, how active should the subsequent restoration efforts be?

- Passive (because it's in WSA, but water could be an active restoration tool to release floods to improve habitat for cottonwoods and willows)
- Active

Consensus Recommendation: The Working Group recognizes that this issue is ongoing in the corridor. Whether passive or active restoration is done, it should be done using adaptive management and site specific remedies. ~~There was concern expressed about water being used as a restoration tool. (Put in issues document) re does not appear to be consensus here but two ideas are suggested as alternatives.~~

Other Management Issues for Discussion

1) How should the Dolores Overlook site be managed?

- Keep if open – maintain current management
- Bathrooms need maintenance
- Interpretive sign would be fine - of river resources and geology
- Consensus that it is well managed
- Signage on the County Roads to the overlook is not very good or clear - needs to be improved

Consensus Recommendation: Keep the site open, and improve and maintain it.

2) How should the Dolores office coordinate river management with the downstream offices?

- Should coordinate management plan so management doesn't change when management boundaries are crossed
- Already coordinated – needs more private land owner input
- Makes sense to change management at end of WSA (not in the middle)

Consensus Recommendation:

The Working Group recommends that everything possible be done to reduce burdens on private land owners who are active in this reach and whose land crosses two BLM units. Everything possible should be done to ensure that private land owners are involved in policy decisions that span both units, and planning should be closely coordinated.

3) How should the Box Elder Campground site be managed?

- Do not preclude or discourage local historic community gatherings
- Better enforcement
- Negligible fees, especially for non-profit events/organizations
- Doesn't make sense to have a boat launch there
- It is well used
- No fee is good
- Bathrooms are good
- Group did not feel that the Box Elder Campground reached full capacity very often
- Consensus (of one group): signage to get there is good
- Consensus (of one group): fees not appropriate now, but donation box could be placed
- Improved parking throughout area – at campground and put-in

Consensus Recommendation:

There is not much change that needs to occur relating to management of this site. It is recommended that fees not be instituted, and maintenance and management be done as per the list of ideas given. The site should be easily accessible for community gathering

Consensus Recommendation: 4x4 Road from the Pumps to Slick Rock

- Consensus: Keep this as a 4x4 road for recreational and other uses such as cattle driving and emergency rescues; Keep current management practices for the road in place (**insert what the 3 jurisdictions are doing**); Using criterion (maybe give examples), manage problem spots on the road mitigating those issues that “rise to a problem level” and close spur roads that may be forming off the main road (better language?); Keep seasonal closure; If closure is not being followed, initiate actions to ensure it is enforced; Attempt to capture usage of the road (e.g. sign in boxes) so baseline information can be gathered for threshold analysis. (This last one wasn’t on the flip chat but did emerge later.....need to check for consensus.) I also had in my notes that if the ID Team has information on the road effecting any ORVs, they need to share it w/us.
- Action Steps: map; SMCCounty abandon or vacate issue; and discuss road in context of thresholds (Question: At what point, should the BLM consider a different policy than above?)

Other Working Group Member Comments, by Topic:

Archaeology/Cultural Resources

- Cole: require rafting-group leaders to keep a log of all stops visited to increase accountability and management. The general consensus, after discussion, was that this would be very difficult to enforce.
- Use more education, especially during rafting season and at entry points.
- Develop more/continued stewardship ethics in user groups. It was felt that using their communication networks could produce a better response than more rules.
- Posting information about respect for cultural sites on websites where rafters get information such as DWCD’s website. Carolyn said the BLM already has such information on its Web site.
- Closing off problem areas. Many said this should be a last resort if the more subtle efforts to “nudge” people into doing the right thing aren’t successful.
- Developing/implementing a site-stewardship program. Marsha noted that the nonprofit San Juan Mountains Association already runs such a program in Southwest Colorado called the Cultural Site Stewardship Program. Possibly it could be expanded to cover the Lower Dolores River Corridor.

- It is not really known how many artifacts are missing. There is not good baseline information. Marsha said Vince McMillan, DPLO cultural-resource specialist, did tell the group that significant numbers of artifacts have disappeared. Some surveying was done in the 1970s, Ann said. More surveys will began this year. Andy said more quantifiable information is needed.
- Clint said he wants to make sure that additional interpretation at Henry's Cabin and any other recommendations do not lead to closing the road that runs near it.

Scenery

- Not much discussion.

Rafting and Recreation

- Staff presence in the corridor during rafting season should continue when it's feasible and can be planned for.
- A permit system is only needed on rivers where predictable, reliable flows for boating exist. This will never be the case, likely, on the Dolores.
- It is the management agency's job to assess the impacts of any user group, and there should be language to hold all user groups responsible.
- Should the Big Gypsum recreation site be maintained as is, improved or decommissioned? Carolyn- Consideration should be given to how much BLM land is there in reference to a large put in. It's a very limited site.

Campsites

Shauna gave the following feedback from BLM Ranger Rick Ryan concerning campsites:

- If a few commercial outfitting companies are granted reserved campsites, it creates a sort of reserved right. How could that be justified to other users?
- If you allow commercial outfitters to build campsites, you would have to consider letting everyone do so. Also, how much building could occur? Would changes to the channel be allowed? How far from the channel could modifications occur?
- Regarding registration for campsites, if recreationists are allowed to register for campsites, this still can't guarantee that the group registering for a particular site will get it. This is also a program that would be conducive to potential conflict.
- Ranger Rick suggested that the following pilot program may be the best resolution to this problem: Create two to three new campsites along Coyote Wash with designations of the suggested number of campers at each. For the first season, enforcement would take place; then the honor system would take effect.

- Ranger Rick also does not support a permit system for rafting. It would involve a lottery system, balancing commercial outfitters and private boaters, and a significant increase in personnel responsibilities.
- Important to note that campsites are used by other recreationalists as well, not just rafters.

There was consensus to support Ranger Rick's recommendations and pilot program. It was noted that Rick is a trusted BLM staff person in the area and has years of building credibility and relationships with rafters and other recreationalists.

Fish, Wildlife, and Ecological: Roundtail Chub

- How do we cooperatively fund invasive species inventory and treatment?
Don: the title here should reflect the word "Invasive Plants" as having it labeled under "Roundtail Chub" doesn't fit.
- David: We can recommend money be managed well, but we can't demand this.
Don't use word "force."
- If tamarisk is removed from the main Dolores and associated tributaries, how active should the subsequent restoration efforts be?
Don S.- Concern about water being used as a tool.
Peter- Site specific approaches should be used. Adaptive management is key.