

## **Public Lands Coordination Commission**

### Meeting Minutes February 15, 2011

Commissioners present: Drew Gordanier, Frank Green, Zane Odell, Dennis Atwater, Rob Yates, Matt Clark

Commissioners absent: Frank Greene

Approximately 12 citizens, BOC Commissioner Steve Chappell, and Steve Beverlin and Tom Rice from the Forest Service were also present.

6:35 PM Meeting was called to order.

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited & ground rules established.

First Item of business was approval of agenda & minutes. Agenda & Minutes were approved with the addition of Matt Clark's name.

Old Business was reviewed,

The PLCC recommendation letter was discussed. A copy of the alternative letter that the BOCC sent to the Forest Service was circulated.

The PLCC SOPA recommendation letter was recited to the PLCC. The letter identified SOPA items which the PLCC felt that more information would be merited. (see attached exhibit A)

Drew Gordanier updated the PLCC on the Rangeland Stewardship Committee noting that they had been able to meet to discuss some of the range related SOPA items. Drew further noted that while we may want to still keep those items on the list we need to coordinate with the RSC to let them weigh in so that we could have more information by the next meeting. Al Heaton was doing information gathering on the Lower Glade.

Matt Clark asked if the point was to see where our concerns overlapped to see what they planned to take care of versus what we are going to look into and define that more clearly.

Drew reported that that was what Al was going to do. Meet with the Stewardship Committee and see what they were going to do first. Drew noted that there was no need for both parties to request the same information.

Rob Yates asked if the RSC would want to use the PLCC as a vehicle to get their information rather than have multiple different entities request it. If the RSC would come through the PLCC it would be an easier process for the BOCC to decipher what they are looking at. Rob added that it would be good for all of the information to come to the PLCC and then if the RSC wanted to come and voice their concerns as to how draft letters could be worded then it could go on up to the BOCC.

Drew noted that the RSC is appointed by the BOCC so they can do what they want anyway. Never-the-less it could save a lot of paper trail and duplication to work together.

Dennis Atwater noted that he felt the letter could stand as is because someone will need the information eventually anyway.

Dennis made a motion to send the letter to the BOCC as it is.

Matt Clark ask about the information to be gathered especially the science and environmental information noting that it could be a great deal of information. Is that something that on a case by case basis we will see what needs to be reviewed.

Dennis Atwater responded that we will get smarter as we go along and that we don't want a blizzard of paper work but we are going to have to figure out at some point what we do and don't need. So we may have to have a blizzard in the beginning.

Matt Clark asked if that was by direction of the BOCC and how we summarize. Do we want all of the references attached.

Steve Chappell noted that as long as things look like they are going well the BOCC does not need the information. However if it looks like AUMs are going to be cut or there is some other problem that comes up then what ever information that the agencies used to make their determination. At that point we can hopefully have a meeting with the ranchers there and ask why is this information important and why did it lead to the determination.

Zane Odell noted that on the Forest we need to know not some much all of the science and environmental studies but more what the action is that is proposed. It may not be anything controversial at all, maybe nothing more that a renewal.

Steve Beverlin noted that sometimes there is no change to the existing permit. And sometimes there is it just depends on the research conditions in our study that we conduct.

Zane Odell asked if be possible if we could separate some of this out and didn't ask for very much on it except what action is coming.

Steve Beverlin added that the Forest Service could just try to provide the pertinent information that really shows that the ecological trend is up or down or the same. Those are the kind of things that we really use to determine actions.

Zane noted that if there is not to be any action or change on a renewal then we don't need boxes of information.

Matt Clark added that that was what he was getting at. Do we need to make this a little-more-clear rather than asking for everything on every single issue.

Drew Gordanier noted that one other issues we need to take into account is whether or not the rancher or permittee does not want this group to act or ask for anything, adding that before we send this letter we might want to do a little checking to see if they wan the

information. Some may want to do it on their own too. I am saying this after visiting with AI. The RSC also probably has a list of all the permittees that would be affected.

Zane Odell recommended that we get back to meet with Dennis later on a couple of these to see if we really need all of these.

Robb added that on some of these like on the Dolores Norwood road we will need all of the information gathered but on the range allotments maybe not so it will be a matter of going through and picking out the ones we do actually want.

Zane indicated that a blizzard on the Lower Disappointment would be needed.

Matt Clark asked what the primary questions were on the Goodman Point pipeline? Are there issues with that one?

Dennis Atwater reported that during last month's meeting, these were the ones that we picked out that we wanted more information on.

Matt noted that some of these were ones that we needed to follow but did not necessarily need more information on and wanted to clarify that.

Drew Gordanier added that on a couple at the very beginning we ought to get everything we can so that we know exactly what we want or don't want.

Dennis Atwater added that we need a starting point somewhere and once we start looking we will see what is of value and what isn't.

Zane Odell noted that on the Tenderfoot Allotment that before we ask for the whole boat I would just like to see the action.

Zane Odell asked Dennis if he would like to rescind his motion and Dennis added that he would if we could identify the ones we wanted to keep.

Drew Gordanier noted that we want to probably hold off on all of the range at this point.

Dennis noted that the Revision of the Resource Management Plan would be #1. then working from the bottom up we will take off # 11 Upper Glade. We will leave the Tenderfoot on.

Zane Odell noted to leave the Range on there and simple ask what the action will be on those. But not the blizzard.

Dennis Atwater asked if by action you mean the change?

Yes was responded.

Drew asked Steve Beverlin about what the action would be on the grazing and Steve Beverlin responded that any of these that do not have a final decision the Forest Service cannot give you an indication of exactly what change may occur. Period. Until the final decision is made we can't. A lot of these like some of the Glade ones Lower and Upper Glade... we have a little bit of monitoring data but we haven't even convened any ID

teams yet or anything. The SOPA was just an early alert that it is coming. But they sit on hold and we probably won't even begin on analysis on these until next year... that includes Lower Glade and Upper Glade both. North Mancos is a group of 3 allotments and the Tenderfoot...those are the ones on the Forest side that we are going to actively pursue this year but we haven't even had an ID team meeting yet.

Zane Odell noted that it appears there is no plan of action or anything.

Steve Beverlin responded no and added that Lower Disappointment was began in 2008 or maybe 2007 and we have been through many different iteration of it with two EA's and it has lots of information. Steve noted that the Suckla's may not want the PLCC involved. Steve added that we do not have a final for that either. We could provide alternatives that we have analyzed and proposed but not where we are landing. We may be able to give some indication of if there has to be a change or not.

Zane Odell noted that if we have to wait until we have a final decision we are out of the loop and cannot influence the decision.

Rob Yates echoed that sentiment.

Steve Beverlin added that the FS could give an indication of where they are headed based on the analysis but not exactly where we are going to land.

Rob added that whomever holds the grazing permit has a vested interest in this without the PLCC involved.

Drew Gordanier noted that we should put the Lower Disappointment on hold until we get further input from Al Heaton. Drew asked how long a section 8 takes?

Steve Beverlin reported that it usually takes about six months. There are two permittees Steve has a permit for two allotments and then Larry and Jimmy Dean have one permit they share.

Dennis asked if we want # 2 on there and Drew responded no.

The McLean Grazing Permit was discussed and it was noted that only two or three decisions had been made. It was noted that we could ask for everything there and that it could be passed down. McLean was decided to be left on the list.

Dennis made a motion to make corrections as discussed and forward the letter on the BOCC with corrections. Motion was seconded and motion passed.

Zane Odell asked if we needed to draft a letter for Norm Zwicker on the Adam Louie Allotment or if the PLCC letter covered it ?

Drew Gordanier felt like it covered it.

The next item of interest was to review the letters of interest for new members on the board.

Drew Gordainer interjected that he felt that the Board should stay as it was, noting that he felt that we could add one member rather than 3 and include one alternate.

Rob Yates noted that a lot of it had to do with what the BOCC wants. I agree with Drew a smaller group is sometimes easier to manage.

Dennis Atwater interjected... I have a little different perspective. I have a basic philosophy about committees and that is that the fewer people you have the easier it is to get something done but we have an elephant in front of us right now. Just looking at the SOPA we have a whole new Management Plan in front of us right now and a whole new federal register to go through and look at. It is this whole issue all over again with a comment period that goes through May 14<sup>th</sup>. So there is a lot of work to do. In the beginning we need the extra members just to accomplish the review. Otherwise there is going to be just a couple of people doing an awful lot of work and that is not right. It is a tremendous amount of work and with 9 members we can sub-out a lot of work.

Drew asked if that was the San Juan National Forest Plan?

Dennis responded yes.

Matt Noted that the Draft had been out for a long time and we are now waiting on an EIS supplement. Matt Clark noted that it may be the National Planning Rule that we are talking about which came out last week.

Steve Beverlin added that the same information that the PLCC had received is all the information the Local District received.

Matt Clark added that he needed more time to think about the size of the PLCC.

Steve Chappell added that the purpose was to get good representation from all of the users of the public lands. So if you feel like you have good representation from all of those users... cattlemen, sportsmen, loggers... if you feel like you have a weakness let us know and we can possibly appoint somebody that would have an interest in that area that would bring something to you that would be helpful. But as far as enlarging the group we just want good representation it doesn't matter so much the size as whether each group is represented.

Zane noted that everyone from the public gets to have input as well. I would represent them objectively. Zane added that we can sub-committee the public to help us just like Duane Likes.

Drew moved that we recommend that the BOCC down size to seven members with one alternate and a quorum of 4.

Rob added that he would like to see two alternates.

Drew rephrased the motion to reflect seven members, two alternates and five as a quorum. Motion was seconded. Motion passed with Dennis Atwater voting nay.

Zane Odell forwarded that he did not feel comfortable voting on the letters of interest and recommended that we send it right up to the BOCC for their vote and that each member

should write a letter supporting their recommendations for members that way each of us have an equal say.

Rob agreed that was the fairest way to handle it rather than an open forum.

Zane Odell noted that we have some individuals present that submitted letters of interest and asked if there were any questions?

Connie Douglas from the audience asked who on the board represents the general public?... and who on the board is making sure that what you are doing is constitutional.

Zane Odell answered that the County has an attorney who would determine that everything is constitutional. We don't do anything that does not first go through the BOCC.

Matt Clark furthered that all of the PLCC are members of the general public.

Connie Douglas added that she was concerned that members of the general public have left the PLCC and we are not replacing those numbers. Connie further noted that most of the work is falling on Dennis Atwater.

Zane Odell noted that we will take comments from the public at the appropriate time according to the agenda.

Matt Clark asked if the applicants had anything more to add.

Slim McWilliams responded that he would like to represent agriculture and recreational use noting that he likes to ride horses and has experience in oil and gas. Currently my focus is on recreational.

Casey McClellan responded that he would represent oil and gas, mining experience OHV, and had made comments on the other travel management plans. Single track motorized use is near and dear to my heart. I have coordinated with the Forest Service on motorized travel in the past.

Dennis Atwater noted that Casey had prior experience with RS 2477.

Casey explained that it was related to some mining claims up near Dunton. He further noted that RS 2477 may ripple across all areas of interest including grazing allotments and asked if any road closures had affected any grazing allotments?

Zane Odell responded that it was not a concern as of yet but that it could happen in the future.

Rob Yates encouraged the public to assist and noted that that what the PLCC expected.

Drew Gordanier furthered that the PLCC has public comment periods on the agenda and that comment would be taken.

Connie Douglass responded that public comment does not give the public a vote and that she really gives a lot of credit to Dennis, and if he says he needs more help on the committee then it needs to happen.

Rob Yates explained that Dennis can have all the help he wants. But he will only have one vote. This is not a bully pulpit, this advisory committee is just to advise the BOCC on what the concerns of our citizens are and the BOCC has the final rule on it. This committee rules on nothing. All we do is draft recommendations to the commissioners. You are right there is a lot of work at the back end of these things and we need the public to be involved and to help otherwise we would all have fulltime jobs just doing this.

Connie Douglas added that she would like the PLCC to consider the bigger picture and that being across the United States that this happening everywhere, and when you are talking about this you sound like you are referencing recreation and oil use and you don't go beyond to the bigger picture here that is happening and how important this is.

Zane Odell asked if Connie Douglass would like to submit a letter of interest to serve on this board?

Connie replied that she might do that.

Matt Clark added that as far as the bigger picture goes as citizens you all have access to your elected officials all the way up to your congress people. This is not the one stop shop to engage in all the debate and dialogue. There are a lot of other avenues, this is not the only funnel for things to come through.

Zane Odell offered an explanation of coordination, and added that we are now trying to build a relationship with the Federal agencies to achieved good coordination on plans. We are not here to whip on the travel management plan. We are not here to fight for any one thing. We are to try to achieve coordination between the two agencies. Any agencies, DOW or whatever.

Rob Yates added that this board was put in place so that citizens could bring issues forward rather than getting on the BOCC agenda on Monday mornings to bring to them. You should bring issues to us committee and we research with input from whomever brought it and we send it to the BOCC in a coordinated package that they can look at.

An Audience member asked if the PLCC had looked into the Secretarial order 3310 Wild Lands Designations?

Drew answered that no, we had not looked into it yet.

Steve Chappell added that the PLCC should take a look at it because it look like it is open ended and that it by passes congress without going through a process. It will probably impact oil and gas more that anything but it will have some effect on everything else.

Drew noted that they had been briefed on it at the Livestock Association meeting.

The question of who to coordination with was brought up.

Dennis Atwater gave a briefing on Secretarial Orders and overviewed the Wild Lands concept which identifies all land that have wild characteristics and offers them the same protections as wilderness does. Dennis read a letter regarding the Wild Lands order.

Steve Chappell noted that the BOCC will be sending a letter in opposition to the order.

The PLCC procedures were next on the agenda.

It was recommended that all letters to the BOCC go through the Montezuma County Federal Lands Program. It was also recommended that whom-ever has the most expertise also be in attendance.

A PLCC request for additional RS 2477 was asked for but there were no

Zane Odell also added that the PLCC should make field investigations before making final recommendations on 2477 assertions.

A brief update on Joe Stevenson's problem with 2477 was given. Joe was not able to be present.

Rob Yates asked if we want to handle each 2477 at a time or wait until we have bunch of them.

It was discussed and decided that the priority 2477 roads were those that lead to private property. And that we should get those to the BOCC as quickly as possible.

An audience member asked if Casey McClellan had an attorney that would provide advice would the PLCC listen. The PLCC responded that they would indeed listen.

Steve Chappell furthered that that could be a recommendation of the PLCC. I you feel like you need further advice and you think that the BOCC would benefit to know what the next steps would be then make a recommendation that we contact that attorney or whoever.

Dennis added that those on the RS 2477 subcommittee do have some questions.

Connie Douglas added that she would be willing to gather up the questions ask them and then present them to the PLCC.

The PLCC responded that if the private citizens did that the PLCC would definitely look at it.

Meeting was adjourned at 9:00.



