

**DRAFT – DRAFT - DRAFT**

**National Forest Advisory Board (NFAB) Meeting**

October 15, 2008 – 1:00 p.m.

Rushmore Plaza Civic Center, Rapid City, SD

**Members Present:**

Tom Blair, Chairman; Jim Heinert, Mac McCracken, Nancy Kile, Everett Hoyt, Donovin Sprague, Pat McElgunn, Sam Brannan, Jim Scherrer, Nels Smith, Becci Jo Rowe, Suzanna Martley, Hugh Thompson, Tom Troxel, Doug Hofer and Bill Kohlbrand.

**Forest Service Representatives:**

Dennis Jaeger, Frank Carroll, Steve Kozel, Bethany Steinhauer, Tom Willems, Bob Thompson, Rhonda O’Byrne, Will Domagal, Carol Zmek, and Twila Morris - Recorder

**Others:**

Approximately 35 members of the public, news reporters, and three congressional representatives; Chris Blair (Johnson – D, SD), Mark Haugen (Thune – R, SD), and Rick Hanson (Herseth Sandlin – D, SD), were in attendance.

**Members Absent:**

Bob Paulson

**Welcome and Roll Call:**

**Chair Blair:** Quorum present, called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. Welcome everyone; please turn off your cell phones.

**Blair:** The purpose of our meeting today is to take comments from the public on a draft business plan and proposed special recreation permit fee for a motorized trail system on the Black Hills National Forest. We have traveled to both ends of the state, and across the border into Wyoming seeking input on this plan. We’ve had two task force groups, a Governor’s task force, and the Task Force that is working on this presently.

Our goal today is simply to be transparent, and take your comments back to the Board. We intend to allow this process to go forward. Our next meeting will be the third Wednesday in November; we traditionally do not have a December meeting. We have plenty of time to take comments. We will take written comments also.

We have a list today of people who wish to comment on the proposal today, and we’ll be going through that in a few minutes.

**Approve April Minutes:**

**Blair:** Are there any changes to the September minutes? Motion to approve minutes made by McCracken, motion seconded by H. Thompson. The minutes stand as reported.

**Approve Agenda**

**Blair:** Are there any changes to the agenda?

Motion to approve made by Brannan, motion seconded by Sprague.

**Blair:** The agenda stands as presented.

## **Housekeeping:**

**Carroll:** The Civic Center and nearby Holiday Inn have refreshments available. Everyone is asked to make your own arrangements for drinks and snacks.

## **Meeting Protocols – Issues:**

**Blair:** Today's meeting is being held for the Board to take public comments; oral, and written, related to charging special recreation permit fees to use a designated motorized off-highway vehicle trail system on the South Dakota side of the Black Hills National Forest. The recommended fees per vehicle would be \$40.00 annually, \$20.00 per week, and \$100.00 annually for commercial (rental) vehicles.

Please state your name and the group you represent, you will have three minutes. At the end of all public comments, you will have another opportunity to speak again.

## **HOT TOPICS**

### **Secure Rural Schools – Back on tap in emergency Wall Street legislation**

**Carroll:** Mr. Heinert is fully aware of the Secure Rural Schools issue. There was some concern that the Secure Rural Schools had ended suddenly, and the schools would not get the money they had in the past. This was addressed in the bail out package, and this year the schools do not have to worry. County governments are tied in to legislative changes.

## **REGULAR AGENDA**

**Blair:** This Board was formed almost six years ago, and travel management was one of the four threats that were identified by the Chief at the time. We've had three sub-committees, and passed comments on to the Regional Forester in Denver.

We've gone forward to look at all of South Dakota, but the Forest Supervisor sent a mandate a year ago that said we will have a program in force by the end of 2009. We have come now to the point in time, to simply addressing the dollars and cents, addressing the budget, and setting a program. We still hope to work with the State of South Dakota. We think that some day, this program will be stretched across South Dakota and Wyoming. Wyoming does have a reasonable plan for OHV fees.

## **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**James Hansen:**

- Have lived in four states with outdoor recreation.
- Involved with off -road highway vehicles.
- Followed the issues since 1968, and been involved with matters of management.
- Understand there are different areas of constituencies, the non-motorized, and motorized.
- Strongly in favor if implementing a fee structure, recognizing that those using the trails should pay for the use.
- Believe we should consider all things on each vehicle, and the fee structure should reflect that – such as skiers, no impact.
- All fees should be ear-marked exclusively for the recreation users, not into other government programs.

### Bob King:

- Annual permit fee, I agree, we need to pay.
- Believe there could be a differentiation between a two wheel, and a four wheel vehicle.
- Consider a discount rate for the second vehicle.
- Out of state license plates, differentiate between residence and non residences.

### Ross Brown:

- Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Off-Road Riders.
- Need adequate funding for trail system.
- Concerns: When you sell something and the price is too high, fewer customers, less revenue. A lower sticker fee would bring in more revenue.
- Difference between looking at the trails, 50" or less, vs. full size trucks. If a sticker is required, the locals may decide to license their ATV's rather than buy a sticker.
- Consider having a fee based on the trail head area, so regardless of who was using the trail, they would be helping fund the trail.
- Fairness and equity – a sticker for all users, not just non-licensed, broaden who will pay. If you charge a fee for level 2 or 3 roads, and a lower fee, the fee would help fund everything.
- Will be submitting written comments.

### Pete Hopkins:

- I disagree with the policies that you have stated.
- I should not have to pay to ride the 75 miles you have given us so far.
- It's just wrong, and I shouldn't have to pay.

### Nancy Hilding:

- Prairie Hills Audubon Society
- Whoever is responsible for implementing the fees, I thank you.
- Don't understand the estimate for the cost on the spreadsheet for maintenance; do not think they are high enough. \$350.00 for maintenance should be \$500-\$1,000.
- Volunteers, spreadsheet does not show appropriate expense.
- Quarter million in grants; I would like more info on how secure this is.
- Anticipated cost vs. the budget – it is out of whack. The license fees should cover the whole cost. \$40.00 is way to low.
- Object to it only being a vehicle registration, and not a license. When driving in SD, we have to have registration, and a license.
- Suggest a separate fee – one to license the vehicle, and one as a registration for the user.
- \$100.00 fee for commercial users, way too low – could split the registration fee and license fee.
- Different vehicles have different threats, consider different rates.
- Another option may be a seasonal thing.
- The use of volunteers to enforce, that could be a real problem, there could be security issues. You should have uniformed professionals. Also wonder if you would get the volunteers.
- Expenditure spent in the same year, should keep flexible. Good for the money to be ear-marked for fixing the resource damage.
- Question about children, will the license be for children.

### Patty Brown:

- Board member for Off Road Riders.
- I use and ride OHVs. Have several OHVs.
- I support a sticker fee, and the program.
- Many of us have more than one bike, so a lower fee such as a \$30.00 fee would be more reasonable
- There are lots of people who only ride occasionally. Weekly fees should be lower, and more affordable.

- With Greg Mumm's proposal, you would see a lot more compliance.
- Some people have a \$20.00 license plate, and can ride on any rode. You should watch this group, because these are the folks we need to sell the program to.
- Start lower, and work our way up, this is a growing system that will change with time.
- The users want to know what they are getting for these fees. If we can show them what they are getting, over time, it will be easier to increase.
- Thank you for your time and effort, and making our comments important.
- I do like the idea of having a fee for trail heads.

Colin Patterson:

- Norbeck Society. 600 members are supportive of the proposed system.
- Concerns about the business plan and budget. The annual maintenance cost of \$350.00 is inadequate, evidence here in the Black Hills, \$10,000 per mile on the Centennial trail.
- The plan, budget, minimally covers Law Enforcement. Should be professional law enforcement.
- Without the volunteer part of the budget, it would be a deficit of \$200K the first year. We can not afford to let the Forest Service cover the cost of developing this system.
- There is nothing in this program to deal with the areas damaged by motorized travel, 4,000 user created trails that need to be fixed, who will take care of these miles?

Taffy Howard:

- Representing myself and family.
- Would like to dispel the misconception that if you can buy a \$10,000 ATV, you can afford a \$50.00 fee. A \$40.00 fee per bike is a lot, we're not all rich people riding in the Hills.
- I would like to see the fee lowered, and the out of state people pay more.
- I am concerned about the 79 miles of single track trails, \$40.00 to ride on 79 miles isn't logical.
- If I pay the fee, I want it to be used to maintain and expand the single track trails.
- The fox guarding the hen house is another misconception. Not every dirt biker, is a law breaker, and dangerous.
- We want to continue to do what we love to do. Please make the fee reasonable, so a single income family can afford it.

Ralph Kopp:

- Norbeck Society
- Business plan, not much info on how the money will be spent.
- Law enforcement, the budget seems to reflect zero dollars to be spent because of the volunteer part. Feel that we need professional law enforcement. This program will be generating money that we could use for LEOs.
- The plan is developed under the Recreation Enhancement Act, guiding principals; one objective is to eliminate recreational deferred maintenance. Under this plan we wouldn't see this, any revenues from this program won't be spent to cover any of that. This is a revenue based plan, pay as you go. All of the revenue would be spent, but nothing more, if there are more needs than money they won't be addressed.
- No money marked that would go toward repair or maintenance of damage off of the trails.

Larry Bol:

- Represent self.
- I'm not against the user fee; I think it should be across the board, hikers, horses, etc.
- The fee is too high. Colorado, \$25.00 yearly.
- LEO – volunteers are alright, the folks that are concerned might want to raise funds to hire professionals.

John Bahuemen:

- I put on 5,000 miles on a year.
- Don't know where all these fees will be needed.
- The Forest Service should look at this as a business. Wyoming gets \$16 a year, license can be purchased locally, keep it simple, \$25.00/\$15.00 week – and you'll have all the revenue you'll want.
- Hill City generates \$1 million on ATV's.
- Don't make a mess of it.
- Would expect to have more trails open in the winter.

Gaylord Strong:

- We do a ton of stuff in the Hills; generations of us are users of the Hills.
- The BH is unique in how we've kept this area pretty wholesome, other places have changed. The proposal here is the start of joining up with the ranks of the others, which in my opinion, is not all that hot.
- National organizations trying to get their claws into the program.
- I have my vehicles licensed, and when we go into the woods, we take pride in it. Once in a while, we run into people who are doing corrupt things, we have a talk with them. We take pride in making sure things are done right.
- The more we start charging people the less compliance we'll have.
- I'm tired of national organization groups getting their claws into the Black Hills; they don't do what we do. They are part of national organizations that do not participate.
- I would spend more to license my ATVs to go out with my grandson, than I would on my car. I haven't seen anything done to the trails.
- Be careful not to just keep adding to this, because this is just the start. We are not the Rockies or Sierra Nevada's.

**Chairman Blair:** It's 2:00 p.m.; we'll take a 15 minute break.

**Blair:** We have a couple of former board members, Jeff Olson, GF& P Commissioner, and Jim Margadant, Sierra Club, who spent four years on the Board. We meet 10 times a year and have one field trip, and there are folks who have put in lots of hours. We are closing year number five, and after 2006 there will be openings on the Board. Reconvene at 2:20 p.m.

Kathleen Schmidt:

- Live near Nemo, near the motorized portion of the Centennial Trail.
- We have multiple OHVs going down our road to access the trail. I've tried to get dust control.
- Dust control should be a part of the plan. The FS and Lawrence County have both passed the buck on doing dust control.
- All of the ATVs are in the Nemo area. They're talking about adding more parking. This has been a huge impact on my life. There is no speed limit on the road.
- Lawrence County sheriff said that they cannot enforce this because they do not have the funds.
- There should be enough money for dust control for the people who are impacted.

Troy Hall:

- President of Off Road Riders (ORR) Association.
- I'm speaking on behalf of myself and my family.
- The ORR will have an official comment.
- Riding in the Black Hills for 30 years, and seen dramatic changes.
- I do agree with the concept of paying our own way. It's about time we get a sticker program to generate funds to help with the problem the Forest Service has.
- I have trouble selling the \$40 fee to my membership. I hear all the comments from we shouldn't have to

do it, to we can afford the machine we can afford the sticker.

- Assumptions, how many people will buy he sticker, how many miles of trail is out there.
- Require the sticker whether you're talking about the trails or the mixed use roads, so that you would eliminate the loop hole of people trying to decide if they want to buy a sticker.
- The assumption of 10,000 stickers being sold will go way down. They would just use the mixed use roads.
- Close the loop hole; require the sticker or license plate to be on the mixed use roads. For the trails, a sticker is required. By doing this, you'll have a lot more people buying stickers, so the price should be lower than \$40, the range of \$20 would be better.
- I support the idea of a trailhead fee.
- Question this being 100% user funded. By us paying our way, it is unfair when you look at the other users of the Forest. Other users are getting their trails cared for with appropriated funds.

**Blair:** Vehicles that are currently allowed to ride on mixed use roads, they may not buy into the system. South Dakota allows 4x4 etc., and is ordinarily licensed as a motorcycle. How do you differentiate the sticker being required in the mixed use areas?

**Hall:** You could say that you could have either or. ATV's buy license plates because they want to ride on streets. From a LEO point of view, you'll look for either a license plate or a sticker.

**Blair:** ATVs are licensable, with adding some equipment. None of that fee comes to the Forest Service, so are we begging the question, that everyone should license their vehicles and stay on the mixed use roads?

**Hall:** I'm suggesting we are only talking about the mixed use roads. The Sub-Committee is not proposing any sticker being used on the mixed use roads. I suggest we require either a license or a sticker on the mixed use roads.

**Blair:** Thank you

Dave Hague:

- Curious about where the \$40.00 came form.
- The Bighorn charges \$15.00, why can't we do it here. Oregon charges \$25.00 for two years.
- There is no problem with a user fee, be equitable about it, start charging the hikers as well.
- If I'm suing the trails, I should be paying a fee.
- If you price it to high, you'll price out the out of staters, they won't come – they'll go to Wyoming for \$15.00.
- 100% of the funding needs to go to the trails. If it's an ORV permit that is sold, it should be spent on ORV trails.

Gary Ladner:

- Concerned about the enforcement issue. Seen things over the years, no enforcement going on, things aren't the same as they were in the 50's. The Hills are a suburban area any more. See many illegal things going on.
- The license plates need to be big enough to see.
- All of us have broken the law at some point or the other.
- Way over optimistic about the amount of money you'll collect.
- You're asking volunteers to do law enforcement, and I would venture to say that you can't find a sign in the BH that doesn't have a bullet hole in it. Also the drug labs are becoming a bigger issue. Penalties are minimal and are ignored. People won't stay on their trail. Should start looking at enforcement then look at the fees, then look at how they regulate it. The Hills area will not be there for our children.

Doug Melhoff:

- You guys have a tough job.
- There are a few people who have selfish interests; some people have their grandkids riding.
- To see real damage, look at logging. The FS has torn up a lot of stuff. The people, who run their cattle in the woods, tear things up.
- Folks, who have their 4-wheeler licensed for the road, will have to pay another fee. Folks will put out a small fortune.
- I agree something has to be done. Things are getting tore up bad.
- If you go fishing, you pay a license for your boat, for your trailer, and a fee to use the lake. The 4-wheelers may not cause as much damage as you may think. You'll never have enough money to cover the whole forest with law enforcement.
- Don't make it to stringent.

Dawn Madsen:

- As a private land owner, I get a lot of visitors. There are a lot of visitors that come to the Hills, and there is a lot of revenue from these people.
- I support the stickers; we need to have a source of funding. There is a lot of revenue out there.
- If you were to consider a \$20.00 fee for five days. As a business, I can license my machines and ride on the highway. Out of state visitors do not have the source of licensing their ATVs, so will have to have a sticker.
- I'm concerned about the law enforcement.
- Making stickers available at local vendors would be nice.
- Vehicles, machines as a rental or not, it should be a one time user fee.

**Blair:** Is there anyone out there that didn't get registered who would like to make a comment. Is there anyone who wishes to make a second comment?

Nancy Hilding:

- Issue of resident and non resident, Wyoming and South Dakota.
- Federal Agency Federal tax dollars, dispute from the tribes. Wide interest in different states.
- Fines charged, where will that revenue go, does it belong in this spreadsheet?
- Two things here, registration fee, and a separate license or sticker fee.
- Also wonder about the children, the supervision, and the license.
- The rates maybe could be a hardship category, low income category.
- Something I didn't notice, air quality, damage off the trail. Inadequate to look at damage on the trail only. Also look at damage off the trail.

**Blair:** Fines can not be put into the fund on a Federal level, but a judge can direct something to be fixed. A regular fine goes in to the treasury.

Is there anyone else who would like to make a second comment?

Hearing none, the meeting is now open for Board discussion.

The Board has listened to the comments; we've had public conversations, let's hear from each Board member.

**Smith:** Good ideas came out of this, appreciate the input. One that really got my attention is the idea of the sanctity of the fund. If the program is successful, it is very important that the fund be shielded from raids. Mike and I and others can attest to how easily it can be done. If it isn't protected it would be spent to quickly in order to avoid losing it. The idea of having a fee for different types of users is interesting. The last thought would be in terms of enforcement. Most people aren't lazy, and if you employ them, they'll find something to

do. I fear a big Federal law enforcement presence. You couldn't have enough law enforcement to cover the entire Forest anyway.

**Blair:** A RAC fee is titled to only certain uses, so it couldn't be used for other projects, or robbed.

**Hoyt:** A question about our procedure. I was unable to print the footnotes that went with the spreadsheet. Do I understand that we are to engage in further discussions in November?

**Blair:** We never came into this meeting expecting a decision. I expect that we will not make a decision until our January meeting. This will give us time to look at written comments, give us time to discuss in November, but as far as the final decision, I would be surprised if it comes sooner than January.

**Scherrer:** Thanks to everyone coming in to provide input. I propose that the Board be given time now to assimilate all the information, as well as the info available after November 3. Then the subcommittee would reconvene before the November meeting. At this time I believe it is sufficiently complicated for the public. I suggest we take the information from the November 19th meeting, and come back at the January meeting, and coming up with a recommendation for the Forest Service. It is my motion that we table this issue till the November 19 meeting.

**Scherrer:** Motion to table discussion till November 19, 2008.

**Hoyt:** Second the motion.

**Blair:** We can't continue discussion on the issue after it is tabled.

**Scherrer:** Most of the folks at this table have not had significant enough back ground to discuss the issue. The Sub-Committee is not prepared to present.

**McCracken:** Mr. Chair, a tabling motion is not debatable.

**Blair:** We will take a vote. A yes vote on the tabling motion will cut off discussion; a no vote will allow us to continue discussion.

**Motion failed.**

**Hoyt:** I'm hearing confusion about the manner in which law enforcement is funded. Clarify how the budget would anticipate funding law enforcement, and the duties of a Trail Ranger.

**Jaeger:** On the foot notes, item 11, motorized trail personnel does include Forest Service law enforcement personnel, it does not double count the trail maintenance cost.

**Hoyt:** We have budgeted values for the apparent in kind for Trail Rangers.

**Jaeger:** Others have a Trail Ranger program, and they are volunteers. We may provide them with equipment, training, etc. This would be similar as ski patrols. We wouldn't ask them to go after the drug lords, etc.

**Hoyt:** How can the public be assured the product that has been budgeted?

**Jaeger:** It wouldn't be budgeted, it is based on what it would cost to hire or contract the work to be done. We're saying this is money we don't have to spend. We would need money from an outside revenue stream for adequate law enforcement for the trail system.

**Hoyt:** How do we realize this value and put certainty to it? The footnotes will clarify some of my questions; I will look forward to the Sub-Committee work.

**Hofer:** Comments today were constructive. Thanks to all the people that came regardless of the reason they are here. The comments will give the board a lot to think about and the Sub-Committee especially. I agree with Jim's point that some of us aren't ready to take a position, today is part of the learning process. One of the things we can do is throw out thoughts about what we are looking at for the November meeting. One comment that hit home to me, that I would like to see the Sub-Committee look at is to look at those mixed use roads. The fee may be a bit steep, when you apply it to a limited trail system that is exclusively for OHVs. The message was - make the fees reasonable, but broaden it to include where you could use it. This was articulated well by the president of the Off Road Riders.

**Kile:** Thanks to the Sub-Committee for all the work they've done. Appreciate all the comments. My comment is that I get confused when I hear people talking about the impacts of walking vs. motorized; the impacts are clearly a lot different. I also would like to make a comment that people also come here to pray, not just to play. Also remember we are a growing area.

**H.Thompson:** Congratulations to the people who commented today on the thoughtfulness of their comments. I would like to remind you that there is yet another class of OHV user, I heard some reference to fire, rescue, and grazing permittee, the recreationist will see them out there hauling salt, fixing fence. That grazing use will continue under this decision.

**Rowe:** Thanks to all who came out today. We appreciate where you're coming from. The Task Force has put in many hours trying to find the balance, to give the users what they want, and meeting the requirements of the REA. It's tricky when we add mixed road usage. The fees we collect must be sustainable. The ATV population is 5 or 6 % of Black Hills visitors. We all need to work together, and a representative of every stake holder is on the Task Force. We are trying to make sure we are taking care of this Forest. We will try to develop a business plan that will not leave the Forest Service holding the bag, and that LEO is a part of it, so that users are safe. We need to make sure we provide safety for all the users. We'll be back with a product.

**Scherrer:** Thanks Doug, this actually gives us an extra month, because getting the information together now will save us a month.

**Martley:** Thanks to all who have come out today. Congratulations to the Sub-Committee on the progress you have made. I want to echo the appreciate spoken by the other Board members for the comments. I would ask the Sub-Committee to focus on the cost issue, and whether we are making the assumptions necessary to cover the costs, this is urgently important. The Forest Service is going to be on the discretionary items list that will be at the bottom of the list. We need to keep conservation affordable and sustainable in the Black Hills. We need to make sure that what we collect is enough.

**McElgunn:** Comments were insightful. The numbers are significant, looking at roads/trails. That in addition to the access fees, in terms of an honor system at a trailhead, should be looked at. Still have some time and more facets that will be discussed.

**McCracken:** Thank you Mr. Chair. I would ask that you clarify for folks the assumptions that revenues for the trails would be put back into the system. Remind the folks about the time for written comments. The individual who talked about the person that has two vehicles and the idea of one sticker being one price, and the 2<sup>nd</sup> cheaper, that is a good thought, and consistent with other park fees, etc. Also one other thing, there is a new tag that is available in the park system, it is a portable tag, costs more, but is movable from one vehicle to another.

**Brannan:** I too want to thank everyone here; we might want to consider a night meeting next time to encourage more attendance. The Sub-Committee has been working on this for a very long time. We also have to thank the Forest Service; this is one of the best managed Forests in the nation. We have done a great job of self policing. I'm thrilled about the travel management plan. I would love to hear some comments from the Sub-Committee to the questions brought up today.

**Scherrer:** A lot of these points were so good we haven't even thought of some of these things.

**Kohlbrand:** I represent the State of Wyoming. No one is getting 100% of what they want, which is what the folks are trying to do, everyone has to give in a little. A lot of good work has gone in to this; I think we're on the right track.

**Troxel:** I apologize for being late. I'll defer since I heard no comments.

**Heinert:** I would like to echo what my colleges on the Board have said with regard to the work of the Sub-Committee and comments from the public. Procedurally, this info will go back to the Sub-Committee for refinement. The full board will then take the full plan and make the advisement to the Forest Service. Other Board members have suggested a general level of support for a fee structure. The idea of differentiating the type of vehicle should be examined. The idea of a fee for all users appeals to me. It's been an excellent afternoon.

**Blair:** Thanks to all the folks who joined us today, to bring fresh ideas to the floor, you've expanded our Task Force meeting by at least two fold. There are some things that I will charge Dennis to come to our next meeting with. There are ideas that are workable, but other ideas may not function in the confines of our RRAC, or the Forest Service. An example is multi use trails and stickers that may not be possible. Dennis, as we go forward and sift through the comments and questions, some of the things that just can't be done, we need to know what those are and dispense of them if it's really against the rules. Lots of questions don't know if we can take them and put them in categories. I like the idea of a portable tag. I like the idea of maybe a decreased fee as we're licensing more and more vehicles. I like the idea of a hiker fee, but I understand that we are talking about vehicles in this system. I like the idea of a potential fee for a parking area. You all brought a wealth of knowledge, many ideas we have yet to think about. Maybe what we can do, after the November meeting where we've sifted thought the written comments, we may steal some time from the Sub-Committee early in December if it's appropriate where we can sift through some things. Then we'll be ready for the meeting in January. Keep in mind the 7th for the January meeting.

**Jaeger:** Thanks to all who came out, good comments, my hats off to the Board.

**Scherrer:** I've been on this Sub-Committee since 2002, and I will tell you, I don't know if we appreciate how good of a Forest Service we have in terms of personnel. They are wonderful people and they work their butts off. They care and they do a heck of a job, and the issues relate to bureaucracy, not with the folks on the Black Hills National Forest.

### **Public Comments ~ Chairman Blair**

**Chair Blair:** If anyone from the public wishes to address the Board, please do so.

**Patty Brown:**

- Ranger or volunteer program, I want to say that when we've volunteered for the Forest Service, very obviously, I don't intend to carry a gun.
- Trail Ranger volunteers are the meet and greet, inform, education folks. I'm here to meet with my peers,

and encourage them to do the right thing. Signing up as a volunteer holds us accountable.

- The maintenance, the volunteers would see the problem and then report that back.
- Our group separately would be available for maintenance and other items.
- One more question, if I have my sticker for the Black Hills, does it work in Wyoming?

**Scherrer:** We've addressed this, and we know we have to do some common sense things.

**Brown:** I would think that if I buy a sticker for the Black Hills, I should be able to ride in the Black Hills of Wyoming, on the Bearlodge District.

**Hofer:** In South Dakota, we do give reciprocity to a licensed snowmobile from any other states. Wyoming requires it on top of the licensing they might do in their own state. Wyoming gives South Dakota reciprocity in the Black Hills. These are the things that will have to come into play. That's something we should discuss in November.

**Hoyt:** Could you advise the entire committee of when the Sub-Committee meets and what work product will be used by the Sub-Committee in advance so we would be more prepared?

**Blair:** I would be surprised that we would meet before our regular meeting in November. Our written comments don't come in till the 3<sup>rd</sup>.

**Jaeger:** Based on the volume we get for written comments, I would like to leave it open. If the Sub-Committee wants to meet before the regular Board meeting on the 19<sup>th</sup>, we'll work on assimilating the comments in time for the meeting.

**Blair:** If we do meet, we'll publish the date and information.

Side Note:

Planned Sub-Committee meeting date: November 12, 2008

### **Adjournment:**

**Chair Blair:** If there is no other business to come before the Board, I will ask for a motion to adjourn.

Motion made by Scherrer and seconded by H. Thompson. Meeting adjourned at 3:36 p.m.

### **2008 Meeting Dates:**

November 19

December – No Meeting

January 7, 2009 - Tentative