

**RAC Minutes
March 23-24, 2006
Wayne County, Utah**

March 23, 2006--Factory Butte Field Trip

Members in Attendance: Gordon Topham, Chair, Robert Uzelac, Mike Jenkins, Ashley Korenblat, Riley Cutler, Richard Sewing, Drew Sitterud, Fee Busby, Tom Clawson

Members not in attendance: LaMar Mabey, Norm Carroll, Amanda Smith, Lynn Stevens, Manuel Morgan

BLM employees in attendance: Gene Terland, Don Banks, Cornell Christensen, Frank Erickson, Sue Fivecoat, John Bierk

NPS employee in attendance: Dave Worthington (Capital Reef National Park)

Members of the Public: Marene Casper, Senator Hatch's Office; Peggy Harrison, Congressman Cannon's Office; members of Factory Butte Subgroup: Ron Jorgensen, Chair, Ray Bloxham, Steve Trimble, John Jackson, Allen Jones, Mike Swenson, Chuck Hawley, Forrest Sims; other members of the public in attendance: Parry Cutler, Don Sanderson, Crotilde Barrett, Tody Gale

Stop 1 Factory Bench Road.

Field Trip commenced at 9:00 at intersection of Factory Bench Road and Highway 24. Gordon Topham welcomed everyone and explained purpose of field trip—to gather information.

Allen Jones (Wayne County Commissioner) welcomed everyone on behalf of Wayne County.

Cornell Christensen welcomed everyone on behalf of BLM and encouraged everyone to remain open-minded and cooperative.

Ron Jorgensen provided context of subgroup and background for field trip agenda. He also handed out a black and white photocopy of the Factory Butte area that generally indicates routes, land ownership, and current OHV designations. (Copy available upon request.)

John Bierk (BLM Law Enforcement Ranger) spoke about manageable and enforceable boundaries. Must consider costs, monitoring, and enforcement. The larger the area, the higher the cost to manage. Only John is available to enforce, therefore, must rely on voluntary compliance. Onsite information is important—kiosks located at strategic points. Roads, railroad tracks, power lines make good boundaries—on the ground and people recognize. The more complex the terrain, the more difficult to manage and enforce. Have used carsonite signs; must be able to see. Cost about \$12 per sign—becomes expensive when have to replace. Boundaries must be real clear so riders know where the boundary is.

Stop 2 Lower Blue Hills. (Stop was on the flats east of Factory Bench formed on Tununk Shale.)

Ron provided an orientation and background for the stop, and spoke about the proposals, two would designate area as open.

Chuck Hawley spoke about OHV riding in the area—area is better suited for 4-wheelers than motorcycles. Area around Factory Butte is more challenging for bikes. Spines in Factory Butte area are hard on ATVs.

Fee Busby spoke about soils—described Tununk and Blue Gate Shales. Tununk is extremely erosive. Protected from wind erosion by a thin salt crust, which is disturbed by riders. Some swelling clay present. Erosion occurs even if not disturbed.

Ron summed up by discussing the three different proposals.

Stop 3 Swing Arm City Overlook. (Stop was on Factory Bench cliff overlooking Swing Arm City.)

Ron provided an introduction to the area.

Ray Bloxham presented the Multiple-use Alternative, which designates the area as open. The open area would basically include the Swing Arm "bowl." All of the proposals would include this area as open, by varying degrees. All of the proposals would have the area designated as a SRMA. Ray compared and contrasted the different alternatives.

Chuck spoke about having ridden the area for thirty years and how the improvement in technology has increased the area that can be ridden. Extreme riders use the area and some film crews have been filming in the area, which has created a greater public awareness of the opportunities. Some families like to camp in the area and be able to ride their machines directly from camp.

Issues regarding camping, informational kiosks, increased usage (it's estimated that the areas sees about 500 or more users per year), wind erosion and dust storms, safety (a larger area is safer than a small area because of crowding), and extreme riding were discussed.

Stop 4 Neilson Wash Drainage. (Stop was slightly east of the west branch of the wash.)

Ron explained that the drainage is habitat for endangered cactus (Wright's fishhook) and any designation must be approved by the US Fish and Wildlife Service ("USF&WS"). Ron also discussed how the different proposals deal with the plants.

Sue Fivecoat discussed the plants and where they are present in the area (generally). There are lots of plants north of Highway 24—maybe up to seven other locations in Factory Butte area and another seven locations in the Lower Blue Hills area. Collection is the number one threat to the plants. Rodents, cattle (trampling), and draught are also threats. Could use fencing to protect, but would need to fence a large area to protect habitat and to avoid giving away the plants' location.

The three proposals were contrasted—USA-All proposal, area would be open; other two proposals, area would be limited to designated routes.

Tom Clawson spoke about how the middle ground proposal handles the plants. Bikes would be limited to trails that would keep them out of the habitat, but would still allow them to travel between the Pinnacle and the open area west of Factory Butte, as they do now. Tom also pointed out some issues regarding protecting soils and preventing erosion by designating the area as limited and keeping the bikes out of the steeper parts of the drainage.

Mike Swenson spoke about the USA-All proposal. Would support fencing to protect species—recognizes that USF&WS must be satisfied. Allowing OHVs in area would allow such riders to

report on collectors. Also OHV community could help with fund raising. Suggested using all administrative tools to protect the plants before closing area.

Stop 5 Skyline Rim. (Stop was at the Skyline Rim Viewpoint.)

Riley Cutler explained the concept of establishing visual corridors from the Skyline Rim viewpoint and the Pinnacle. Designating the area below Skyline Rim viewpoint as limited would be intended to minimize conflicts between users and to establish a scenic vista that could be enjoyed by “windshield” tourists and other visitors.

Ray discussed potential boundaries for a limited area to protect a viewscape.

Forrest Sims explained that the area below the viewpoint is a fun place to ride and explore and that not very many ATVs use the area currently. He proposed that Muddy Creek would make a good boundary. The group discussed various issues before breaking for lunch.

Stop 6 Salt Wash. (Stop was toward east side of Salt Wash area.)

Mike Swenson explained that the USA-All proposal would designate the area as open, providing more opportunities for long day-trip tours. An open area would expand the opportunities and disperse people. Mike handed out a map of the USA-All proposal. (A copy is available upon request.)

Sue talked about the presence of endangered cactus (one of which was discovered at the site) and the different types of soils in the area—not Mancos Shale, sandier, more like the Notom area. Questions were asked about endangered species inventories and archeological surveys.

Fee discussed vegetation in the area. Different types due to sandier soils: grasses, Mormon tea, salt brush. Erosion is controlled by a weak biological crust (crypto-biologic soil). Crust keeps wind from blowing sandy soil away. Soils accumulate in mounds around plants. Disruption of crust would likely lead to more erosion.

The group discussed the creation of a designated loop system in the area to protect plants and erosion, but also allow access to what appears to be good dispersed camping opportunities. Ashley suggested that education really helps with respect to biologic soils; when people are made aware of the sensitive nature of the crust, they tend to leave it alone.

Stop 7 The Pinnacle. (Stop was at the base of the Pinnacle--hiked up Pinnacle to view Factory Butte.)

Steve Trimble explained the concept behind designating the Pinnacle and the area east of Factory Butte as closed. Closing the area would provide a scenic vista of the butte, unimpeded by vehicles and tracks. The Pinnacle could be an interpretive area accessible to “windshield” tourists and riders alike. Combined with the vista at Skyline Rim, attracting park visitors to the Pinnacle could cause them to slow down and stay in the Caineville area longer. Riley also helped explain the concept and how it evolved. Closing this part of the area also would provide an opportunity for people to hike to the butte without running into a conflict with bikes. Closing the Pinnacle would most likely require fencing. Ashley Korenblat suggested the area could be designated as limited and the viewshed still protected.

Tom explained the boundaries between the open area to the west of Factory Butte, the closed area to the east of the butte, and the limited area to the south as proposed in the middle ground proposal.

Concerns were expressed regarding conflicts between users and manageability. Steve mentioned that some photographers take pictures of the butte from spots located further north.

Stop 8 Notom Road. (Stop was in the sandy hills east of Notom Road before it drops into the Sandy Wash drainage.)

Ron explained how the three alternatives deal with the Notom area.

Forrest described the nature of the riding experiences available in the sandy soils east of the road and in the Mancos Shale further east.

Sue mentioned threatened and endangered species issues.

Dave Worthington from the Park Service described the Park's concerns. The washes to the west of the road and east of the park tend to flood, and therefore, are not desirable for OHVs. Some members of the group disagreed.

The group discussed how Aspen Academy's operations might be affected by increased OHV use. Ray brought up issues regarding the riparian environment in Sandy Wash. It was pointed out that management issues cost money and Ashley discussed the economic value associated with providing a wilderness experience and having places where that can occur realistically. The group also discussed dispersed camping in the area east of the park—currently it is mostly due to park overflow.

The field trip adjourned at about 4:00 at the Notom Road stop.

March 24, 2006--Loa Civic Center

Members in Attendance: Gordon Topham, Chair, Robert Uzelac, Norm Carroll, Mike Jenkins, Ashley Korenblat, Riley Cutler, Richard Sewing, Drew Sitterud, Fee Busby, Tom Clawson

Members not in attendance: LaMar Mabey, Amanda Smith, Lynn Stevens, Manuel Morgan

BLM employees in attendance: Gene Terland, Don Banks, Cornell Christensen, Frank Erickson, Sue Fivecoat, John Bierk

NPS employee in attendance: Dave Worthington (Capital Reef National Park)

Members of the Public: Marene Casper, Senator Hatch's Office; Peggy Harrison, Congressman Cannon's Office; Members of Factory Butte Subgroup: Ron Jorgensen, Chair, Ray Bloxham, Steve Trimble, John Jackson, Allen Jones, Mike Swenson, Chuck Hawley, Forrest Sims, Gary Mason, Randy Ramsley; other members of the public in attendance: (see attached list).

Gordon commenced the meeting at about 8:30. Gordon provided an orientation of the nature of the proceedings and brief overview of the three alternative plans.

Ron Jorgensen thanked the BLM and the RAC subgroup for their efforts, recognizing the level of work and effort expended by the group's members. Ron explained the process involved with the subgroup's efforts and how the group reflected the different values of how the public lands should be used. Ron explained that, although the group did not come to a consensus, much was accomplished and significant value was created. In the end, three proposals were created, although lots of other considerations were made as well. Ron explained that the subcommittee's work was finished; there are no plans for the group to meet again.

USA-All Alternative

Chuck Hawley, substituting for Mike Swenson, presented the USA-All alternative. Chuck handed out two written plans that contain the USA-All proposal. (Copies available upon request.) Chuck explained how the proposal was created in response to plans by the BLM. He then read an email/letter from Mike Swenson. (A copy of the letter is available upon request.) Gordon handed out a copy of a letter from the Utah Association of Counties addressed to the RAC. (A copy of the letter is available upon request.) USA-All proposal is essentially the same as what was proposed at the subgroup's meetings eight months ago—a 230,000 acre open area. USA-All recognizes that its map does not indicate where boundaries need to lie; threatened and endangered species must be protected, but USA-All will leave how and where to protect the species to the BLM. USA-All's proposal has unanimous support of the local counties and strong support of Utah's other politicians. Chuck expressed his own view that it's better to start big because it's easier to contract an area than to expand it, and that USA-All is willing to fit its proposal into the BLM mandates.

The ensuing discussion touched on the following points:

USA-All's proposal does not show how designating 230,000 acres as open protects the resources of the public lands.

Emergency closures may be used to protect resources if a large area is designated and problems emerge.

USA-All has decided to push its political power and has not presented a proposal to the RAC that identifies boundaries that bring the proposal within BLM mandates. The RAC should not do USA-All's work and should simply move on.

Whether any comparably large open areas have been identified in other areas? (No one knew.)

Whether the subgroup considered the RAC's OHV guidelines? (Yes.)

Utilizing the area for both motorized recreation and other user groups can maximize the economic development of the entire area.

Some feel that areas not conducive to open cross-country riding should not be designated as open; whereas, others feel that they want the freedom to explore even if the area does not exhibit cross-country attributes such as sand dunes, etc.

Although the area is currently designated as open, park visitors still come.

Whenever there's a conflict, it seems the riders always lose.

Whenever an area is closed, it never gets re-opened; which should encourage a "go slow" approach by starting large and managing the area "down."

Multiple Use Alternative

Ray Bloxham presented the Multiple Use Alternative ("MUA"). Ray handed out materials (copies of which are available upon request) and spoke from a large map taped to the wall. (The map has been delivered to the BLM for its consideration—copies are not available.) Proposal includes two separate open areas, Swing Arm City and behind the motel in Caineville. Recognizes that some of the area can be used for open riding. Swing Arm area would be fenced at its northeastern extent along the prominent ridge, as well as along the southwest. Expect about 4 miles of fencing required. Caineville Mesa would be utilized as the northwestern boundary, eliminating the use of

any fencing materials. Focus is on Factory Butte area and finding out what works for the agency. Management is key concern—what boundaries make the most sense—what would work in this place? Funding limitations realistically constrain what BLM can do. Agrees that economic development for both motorized and non-motorized users can be found in the area, which would provide diversification to county economy. Proposal concentrates high-energy use in specific areas and protects other areas by utilizing designated routes. Proposal attempts to minimize conflicts and soil erosion issues. Don't want to limit grazing—ranchers should be allowed to use OHVs for ranching operations.

The ensuing discussion touched on the following points:

The proposal would allow a trail system, but it may not work; would expect some non-compliance. Some trail systems do, in fact, work as evidenced by a trail system in Grand County located on state lands.

Proposal would deflect conflicts with the “windshield” tourists.

“Open, closed, limited” designations—“follow your nose” concept is lost in the term “limited” and the negative image hurts.

A significant problem is that a sense of trust regarding roads and designated routes has been lost because of the RS2477 controversies.

Riders get tired of trails; if so, new trails can be designated, the trail system can evolve.

If an area is designated as limited, and the area is designated as a SRMA, the process to designate a new trail would not require amending the RMP, it could be done under an activity plan (with appropriate NEPA documentation—most likely, an EA)—a trail can be re-routed if a problem appears.

Loops and trails have not been designated by subgroup; that process follows designation. USA-All has been pushing trail systems in many other parts of the state.

Whether open or limited, the management difficulties are different—open areas create greater impacts, limited areas require greater enforcement.

Middle Ground Alternative

Tom Clawson presented the middle ground alternative. Tom handed out a report (a copy is available upon request) and spoke from a large map taped to the wall. (The map has been provided to the BLM for its consideration. Copies of the large map are not available, however, a small version of the map is attached to the handout.) The map represents the subgroup's attempt to reach a common ground approach to address the issues that the group identified. It is a blend of different ideas found in the other two proposals, and an attempt to balance the identified issues and perspectives within a single cohesive package. It does not represent a consensus that was voted on by the subgroup. For the purpose of analysis, the greater Factory Butte area was divided into 11 separate areas. The subgroup was able to suggest designations for some of the areas, but not all. The focus was on the area around Factory Butte; that's the area that the subgroup concentrated on. Tom summarized management approaches for several key locations within the core area; including cross-country use in the Swing Arm City area, a transition to designated trail systems within the Neilson Wash area, where a T&E cactus species is found, and a proposal for visual viewshed corridors within specified locations near Factory Butte and the Skyline Rim viewpoint area. Tom suggested that the alternative attempts to provide a large open area for cross-country riding, while minimizing impacts to resources and conflicts between users, as required by the BLM's regulations. Tom expressed that the plan evolved over time and is

complicated, with many boundaries, and would be very expensive to implement. But the plan represents, in his opinion, what the USA-All proposal might look like if it is made to fit the BLM's mandates. Education is key and an essential tool necessary to set expectations that both motorized and non-motorized recreation would occur in the region, as planned and authorized. Tom also briefly touched upon other areas outside the core region including Wood Bench, Salt Wash, and the Notom Road area.

The ensuing discussion touched on the following points:

Robert Uzelac commented that the middle ground proposal made sense.

Gordon stated that the proposal was a work in progress, more work could be added.

Mike noted that Wayne County route inventories are in progress and asked how is that work being dovetailed into the Factory Bench work? Frank Erickson noted that approximately 70 meetings have been held between BLM and cooperators to compile inventory and gain perspective on route designations. Frank further explained that travel planning is a two-step process starting with area designations and that the BLM will show a set of maps (by alternative) when the draft EIS is issued. The maps will show the proposed designations. Ron clarified that the Wayne County work is part of the RMP process.

Several RAC members asked about the process needed to make changes to route systems once the RMP is complete, and what level of NEPA would be required to make changes? Would plan amendments be necessary to add (or subtract) routes within the limited category? Frank (and others) suggested that normally new plan amendments would not be needed. Lower level, quicker EAs or other activity-level plans would be sufficient to subsequently modify travel networks within limited category areas.

Mike suggested that seeing specific route designations in RMPs would be helpful. Frank explained that RMPs do lay out route designation scenarios within the various alternatives presented in RMPs.

Fee suggested that the RMP should outline the process to make adjustments to trail systems in a RMP once the plan has been completed--helping to reduce the fears that some may have.

Several RAC members commented on various aspects of study and review they were familiar with regarding steps to inventory and ultimately make decisions related to travel planning. Drew Sitterud relayed his personal experience that cultural clearances and studies were often-times expansive and time-consuming.

BLM noted that the RMP process is not a decision involving an "on-the-ground" decision, so specific archeological studies are not required—the EIS will identify what possible impacts may occur in the area.

Public Comments

(Because of the large number of the public who signed up to provide public comment and to accommodate people who needed to leave, the public comment period began shortly after the alternatives were presented—the RAC did not break for lunch. The comment period ran through the advertised 12:30 start time for comment, and all persons wishing to provide comment were allowed to.)

Gary Mason (Sevier County Commissioner): Thanked the BLM for allowing counties to be co-operators in the RMP process. Factory Butte is a special area and recreation drives a small part

of economy. Recognizes that motors shouldn't go everywhere, but open areas should be ample enough to allow space to recreate. Have endorsed USA-All's plan, but recognize that it is not perfect; it's the plan closest to what he likes. It's up to the BLM to protect T&E species; the subgroup doesn't have the expertise to pick out. Agrees that the visual corridor should protect the viewscape from the highway. The area should be a great place for people to come to play. The area should be a SRMA. Recognizes that BLM has to enforce with limited funds. Wayne County sometimes helps, as do the neighboring counties. The counties are willing to do anything they can to help, to be involved in any way they can.

Following Commissioner Mason's comments, the ensuing discussion touched the following points:

The RAC wanted to know whether the Commissioner thought a trail system could work and what his reaction was to the Middle Ground Alternative. (A trail system would be difficult to designate and the map has points that deserve consideration.)

Boundaries could be marked by a cedar post fence, without stringing wire between the posts.

The process has evolved and it would have been very difficult for USA-All to continually keep the politicians up to date.

Conflicts between 4-wheel and 2-wheel vehicles on the same trails are likely.

The discussion then shifted to how does the RAC wish to proceed?

It was noted that the RAC (primarily its subgroup) has done its job and that lots of good ideas and information have been collected. The RAC's purpose is advisory and it has done a great job of gathering information and providing value.

Ray was asked his reaction to the middle ground proposal. He stated that he saw management problems with T&E and enforcement issues.

Fee suggested that the report for the middle ground plan should be considered as a set of "minutes" of the subgroup's work and called attention to the monitoring section toward the end of the report.

Ashley suggested looking around the country for examples of other areas where similar motorized areas are already operating.

Cornell was asked what he wanted from the RAC. He answered that the RAC has assembled some excellent information, which the BLM doesn't (otherwise) have and that the BLM will take the information and roll it into the decision-making process.

Drew made a motion that the information from the subgroup as presented in the three alternatives be forwarded to the BLM. Fee seconded the motion. It was suggested to wait to vote until after the public comment period was closed. Riley expressed a desire to wait until the next RAC meeting to vote to give members an opportunity to read the materials provided by the subgroup. Mike Jenkins concurred with Riley. It was noted that Sherry Foot has the minutes from all of the subgroup's meetings if the RAC members wish to read them. Mike suggested continuing with the public comment period.

Further Public Comment

Steve Trimble: MUA manages to protect the resources of the public lands. Factory Butte

badlands perhaps best badlands in North America—of national significance. Subgroup was close to presenting consensus; laid out path for management.

John Jackson: He's wearing a nice hat and he's taking it off to Ron for the way he managed the subgroup. Caineville is a small economically-depressed community. Lacks economic diversity. Disagrees with geologists, sees little change in 40 years—tracks stay in some soils, disappear in erodible soils. Providing a recreational opportunity can help Caineville. Asks to consider that the designation-decision can affect people's lives.

Tom Giles: OHV industry has an economic impact. Notes that there is a lot of closed areas. Agrees with Mike Swenson, start big and whittle down.

Kelly Taylor: Owns Blue Valley (Lower Blue Hills). Trying to develop for 30 years. BLM should consider development—need to have "something to live on." Trusts in commissioners' judgment; wants the plan to cater to ATVs.

Brad Bradley: Been riding in area for 35 years. The bigger the area, the less the user conflict. He's never had a bad experience with a fellow user in Caineville and he's never seen a hiker while biking. Questions whether 500-1,000 users-per-year estimate is accurate. More boundaries makes it harder to enforce. Used the Notom area for Easter egg hunts (while dispersed camping). Supports USA-All proposal.

Charles Chappel: Problem with too many closed areas.

Dean Wheaton: Complimented council; 40 years in area. Many job opportunities in area.

James Robinson: Increased ORV use has diminished quiet and solitude. Has seen number of tracks increase. Concerns about riders in wash along Highway 24, and entering private property, as well as sediments flowing into the Fremont and waste and litter. Not opposed to riders having play area, but is concerned about plants. Play area should be set back a couple of miles from highway.

Tim Pote: Concerns about litter and groups of users who do not respect the land. Asks users to be responsible.

Randy Ramsley: Representing self and Friends of Factory Butte. Gathered signatures on a petition by people who are in favor of riding, but who want some areas left natural. Machines can do a great deal of damage in short period. Supports MUA.

Brendon O'Neil: Economic development is not the sole factor in land management. Motorcycles are one aspect in considering management. Usage of resources must be restrained.

Dennis Jorgenson: Need to use resources reasonably. Area should be open.

Tracy Neilson: He's been riding in area since 1977—hasn't seen it change. Tracks don't show on Google. If close areas, draws users closer. Sells ATVs; majority of sales are to people between 40 and 85 years old. Leave it how it is.

Kelly Harwood: Has played in Caineville area for a long time—hasn't seen it change, no drastic impact. Federal government is pushing people off public lands, government has taken too much advantage. Has a stake here because he lives here—maintains his right to use the public lands.

Daniel Hawley: Finds riding around Factory Butte fun, quiet, and relaxing. Recreates with his family. Government is taking away his freedoms. Seldom has seen bikes at the Pinnacle and Factory Butte.

Newell Harwood: Population in Wayne County is decreasing. Adding just 10 families means a lot. Economy is changing without providing new jobs.

David Loyns: Supports recreation. Bikes cause minimal damage. Disputes petitions and comments regarding dust from prevailing winds. Supports unlimited use.

Allan Jones (Wayne County Commissioner): USA-All proposal is best proposal. If close, won't be able to re-open. Each proposal needs to be changed. USA-All proposal designed to be changed. Accept that T&E need protection. May require many changes to manage people. If open area is small, safety becomes a larger concern. OHV growth dictates making a place for the users to recreate. Read letter from Utah Association of Counties.

Jennifer Howell: Offered pictures showing impact of tracks and undisturbed areas.

One additional written comment was provided by Andrew Zeiler: Concern about damage caused by OHVs. Supports limiting OHV use in the area. (Copy of written remarks available upon request.)

Written Comment: Dee Hatch

It is a concern of many landowners, cattle permittees, and people who enjoy this great country to properly address the issue of how to properly manage the Factory Butte Area. There are at least two main problems: 1) To protect the grazers area; 2) To protect the beauty of Factory Butte and surrounding areas. Another concern - mining and other related issues. Possible solutions: (west of road) - place steel (signed indicating posts) in proper places with well marked or painted markers along the main road leading toward the abandoned coal mine and old Hunt Ranch. Add posting along east side of same road. Designate a broad area near Hwy 24 which could be made into a well described area where recreational vehicles can use. Regulations posted: Clean up and drug regulations. Patrol area on an intermittent basis. Talk to county commissioners about maintenance issues. Residents would like a positive attitude and not negative.

Public comment period was closed after everyone present had an opportunity to speak.

Gene Terland addressed the RAC and public regarding the remaining process.

Putting together draft RMP—may come out before can apply all final “touches.”

Looking at the full range of alternatives.

Preferred alternative is not necessarily the final decision.

SRMA would require an activity-level management plan; would include partnerships and public input—BLM still looking for lots of public comment.

Cornell noted that there will be public meetings on the draft RMP and that the BLM is looking for further public comment. The three proposals will be placed on the BLM's website

Drew reinstated his motion to pass the subcommittee's work to the BLM. Fee seconded the motion.

Discussion on Drew's motion:

Mike re-iterated that he'd like an opportunity to review the materials before voting on the motion. (Riley was no longer present, having left the meeting earlier.)

Richard urged the BLM to keep the area as large as possible based on the public comment.

Ashley suggested that the RAC could pass the reports to the BLM and add comments to the subgroup's reports later.

Ashley made a motion to amend Drew's motion to allow the RAC to further study the reports and discuss them at the next RAC meeting. Mike seconded the motion.

Following further discussion, the motion failed.

Then a vote was taken on Drew's original motion. It, too, failed.

After further discussion, Fee made a motion to pass the information to the BLM and allow the RAC members an opportunity to read the materials and consider the reports at the RAC's next meeting. Mike seconded the motion.

Fee's motion passed unanimously.

Next Meeting Discussion.

It was suggested that the next RAC meeting be held in conjunction with the BLM's celebration of the centennial of the Antiquities Act. The suggested date was June 8th. (The celebration is scheduled for June 9 and 10 in San Juan County.) Possible topics include SITLA proposals, further consideration of the Factory Butte OHV reports, and the recreation bill (?).

Approved by:
Gordon Topham, RAC Chairperson
April 4, 2006