

**Notes from the Recreation Resource Advisory Committee Meeting
21 April 2009**

Time: 9:00 am – 1:30 pm

Location: REI Denver Flagship, small conference room

Note taker: Jane Leche

Agenda: (see attached)

RRAC members in attendance/representation:

- Mike Blanton – Chair/ Local governments
- Ken Emory - Summer motorized
- Robin Morrison (Paonia) – Winter non-motorized
- Ernest House, Jr – Tribal representative
- Drew Vankat- Summer non-motorized
- Tom Kleinschnitz – State Tourism Official
- Vera Smith – Local Environmental Group
- Steve Pittel – Motorized outfitter/guide
- Leslie Miller – Non-motorized outfitter/guide
- Jim Aragon (Salida) – Hunting and fishing
- Janelle Kukuk - ABSENT/Winter motorized

Agency employees in attendance:

- **US Forest Service (USFS):** Steve Sherwood, Designated Federal Official (DFO), Director of Recreation, Heritage and Wilderness Resources; Pam DeVore, R2 RRAC Coordinator; Julie Cox (R6), National RRAC Coordinator; Jane Leche, Public Affairs Specialist/note taker
- **Bureau of Land Management (BLM):** Jack Placchi, Recreation; Linda Ananaia, Ex-officio Official; Jim Sample, Public Affairs; Chris Ham, Supervisory Outdoor Recreation Planner for the Grand Junction Field Office

Public groups represented:

- Dave Scherer, Western Slope No-Fee Coalition
- Gene W. King, BLM Front Range Resource Advisory Committee

MEETING SUMMARY

Carry over topics:

1. Update on Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre, Gunnison National Forests (GMUG) cabins (only Mesa Lakes and Cold Springs cabins) public involvement recommended from June 2008 meeting (USFS) /*Update adequate, accepted*
2. GMUG still needs to report back on Silesca. 25 Mesa, and Jackson cabins.

Proposals/Decisions:

1. GMUG Christmas Tree Permit Fee Increase Proposal (USFS)/*Proposal rejected as presented. Bring back at next meeting, needs more information*
2. Mud Springs Campground Fee Increase/*Recommended for approval*
3. North Fruita Desert Campground Fee Proposal (BLM)/*Proposal tabled for more clarification*

Other Outcomes:

- Decision: Leslie Miller is new co-chair.
- Follow-up: With the GMUG on reducing the fees issue on the GMUG cabins-DeVore

- Recommendation: At least one subject matter expert from agencies presenting proposals be present at RRAC meetings and available to answer questions
- Suggestion: Hard copies of new proposals also are available at agency offices for the public to access in addition to being available on the web site.

CALL TO ORDER: BLANTON

1. Welcome/Introductions – Steve Sherwood

Steve Sherwood, DFO:

- Welcomed all in attendance
- Reviewed the RRAC roles and FACA
- Reminded the group of four upcoming RRAC position vacancies. They are: Hunting and Fishing, Winter motorized, non-motorized, and local government. Current members in these positions will be done July 16, 2009 and were encouraged to reapply for another three years. There will be a news release and a note in the Federal Register. Letters of recruitment went out to counties soliciting names regarding the RRAC vacancies.
- Notes are being taken and the meeting is being audio taped for accuracy. Also, notes will be taken on a flip chart to record decisions, bin items, and questions that can't be answered at the meeting. Answers will be researched and flip chart items will be entered into the meeting notes.
- Reviewed the meeting agenda and asked that we move through in an orderly, disciplined manner.
- Streamlined number of proposals from 20 recommendations for the last meeting to 3 for this meeting.

DeVore: reminded committee members to fill out their travel form and get it back to her as soon as possible. Also needs forms to get them entered into the new travel system.

Blanton: Opened up discussion to re-elect chair and electing a co-chair.

DeVore: Confirmed current members whose terms are up will be done July 16. Hopefully 2 more meetings will be held this year, including a field trip to Green Mountain Reservoir in the early summer and then one more in the fall. She encouraged one more with current committee members and then one with new members.

More discussion and then a recommendation that the discussion to elect a new chair be tabled until the next meeting. However, electing a co-chair today was revisited. The committee needs an alternative so there will be a back-up between the end of Blanton's term and the time a new chair is elected. There was a lot of discussion on the process for getting new members on board. There was concern about having a meeting after terms expire and not having a quorum at the next meeting if it was held in July. Smith restated that a co-chair should be elected today.

Blanton: Called for nominations for co-chair.

Smith: Nominated Vankat who politely withdrew immediately.

Miller: Volunteered to be co-chair due to her involvement and extensive work on Green Mountain Reservoir.

- **Decision:** Blanton appoints Leslie Miller as co-chair.

2. Other committee business: There was none.

3. General Public Comments Session – (kept to 2 or 3 minutes)

Dave Scherer, representing the Western Slope No-Fee Coalition:

- Referred to an email sent by Kitty [Benzar] regarding Dave's trip to the Grand Junction BLM office.
- Very complimentary about the work the BLM had done regarding a map and brochures found outside the building that are available to visitors any time of day. Would like to see that "all over". Kudos to BLM.
- Also appreciated information available on the web. Very effective.
- Mentioned that it was difficult for him to prepare his comments for the meeting when he didn't know what information the committee had already had in their possession. It was difficult not to duplicate information that they might already have or to make sure they have the information to go with his comments. The more he knows what information they have the easier it is for him to make public comments and make them more succinct.
- Hoped everyone saw his email regarding the Fitton Guard Station. Glad to see it will be kept open and free to the public.
- Mentioned former Senator Emory Salazar is now Sec. of Interior. In the fall of 2008, he co-sponsored the Fee Repeal Bill, with Senators John Tester (MT) and Max Baucus (MT). The bill got buried by the economic crisis but is still alive. By co-signing the bill it speaks to where Salazar will potentially want to go for the BLM regarding fees. Dave says he can't speak for Salazar – but the fact that he put his name on the bill may speak to where he is going with the Department of Interior. Thought the RRAC should know that.
- Thanks the committee and hopes they will take the opportunity to ask him questions if they have any.

There was some confusion and discussion on why members of the public have to go through the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) to get information that goes to the RRAC.

- DeVore: All information that goes to the committee also goes on the general web site, however, just prior to this meeting the Forest Service web site was brought down due to a virus in the system. If people need to get information that is not on the web site and is more than what the committee receives then they need to go through the FOIA process. Emory clarified with DeVore that everything the RRAC members get is also available on the web site? Yes.
- Scherrer: Reiterated that he monitors the RRAC web site fairly closely but he misses critical information if it is posted for a short time and then gets dropped. For instance, at the last RRAC meeting he was not familiar with the 3 cabins on the GMUG NF – the Silesca and Jackson cabins and possibly Cold Springs. He was unprepared when the cabin proposals came up as Kitty had already left the meeting and she had the information. Best of his knowledge they were not presented to the public. Needs the opportunity to look things over. He likes to get on the ground before something happens and if he doesn't know it's coming up then he can't get out to see it.
- Emory: Talked with Tammy (Ouray District Ranger) about the situation and thought they were going to be briefed on it today. DeVore and Sherwood

explained that the cabin information WAS on the web site but there were problems with the site and it went down. When the site was restored, it was restored at the point of when it was last saved. Malworm also got into the www.fs.fed.us so everything was shut down.

Bottom line: All information goes on the web; the web site is monitored by the agencies; this particular incident, the entire Forest Service world-wide web crashed, and was restored to the last time the information was saved which resulted in dropped information that was critical to the public for comment.

- Sherwood and Ananaia: Explained the basics of FOIA and sometimes the impacts to agencies for very large requests. There is a process to address FOIA requests. Also suggested setting up a short educational forum for the committee to bring them up to speed.
 - Smith: Can appreciate web site problems and suggested hard copies be sent out the same time it goes up on the web site.
 - Ananaia: Suggests agencies take a look at the problem and get back to the committee.
- **Final Suggestion:** Hard copies be available at agency offices for the public to access as well.

4. Briefing on Secure Rural School (SRS) Act – Pam DeVore (Twenty-five Percent Fund Act vs. Recreation Enhancement Act (REA))

(This discussion was based on comments the agencies had received regarding concerns over counties losing 25% Fund receipts if some programs such as Christmas Tree cutting, goes under REA. It was determined that taking a few minutes to educate the committee on this issue was necessary.)

DeVore: The Twenty-five Percent Fund Act goes back a long time [May, 1908]. In general, counties get 25% of all fees that *go into the United States Treasury* (note: this excludes fees under the Recreation Enhancement Act) in lieu of taxes for federal lands that are within those counties and are to be used for the benefit of public schools and roads. In the 1980's, the spotted owl situation in the Pacific Northwest reduced timber harvesting and the revenue, particularly in Washington and Oregon. The reduction hit all counties and the schools who depended on the 25% funds hard causing severe financial hardship (production went from 12 billion board feet down to 3 billion). Congress listened and created the Secure Rural Schools Act. The intent was to wean counties off the 25% so they have a more level income.

Blanton: Explained affects/benefits to schools and counties in Colorado and changes are being proposed.

DeVore: Two parallel programs for counties to choose from for federal funding in lieu of federal taxes to reduce dependency on the 25% fund. Counties get to choose, SRS Act or the more stable, full payment based on an average of 3 highest years of the 25% payments between 1986-1999. Most counties in Colorado chose to go with the SRS. There are a few like Summit Co. that chose to stay with the 25%, (she has been told primarily because of the ski industry). Today, those counties who chose SRS - what goes into the Treasury now doesn't impact the amount they are getting today.

Issues today: Current SRS – expires in 2011, counties are concerned that it's not going to be reauthorized. Those counties who chose to stay with the 25% Fund know that what they put into the Treasury does impact what they get in return. Those counties that chose the SRS are not impacted.

Blanton: Understands the complexity. Funding goes away in 5 years. Counties don't know what will happen in the next few years. Concerned that money will go away or be reduced.

Morrison: Do these acts affect recreation on public lands? REA says fees don't go into the Treasury – fees stay locally, not part of the 25% Fund.

Sherwood: 25% Fund depends on receipts from programs such as timber, grazing, and special use permits - all go into the national treasury. It makes sense for counties who have ski areas in Colorado (under a special use permit) who put about \$17 million a year into the Treasury, to stay with 25% Fund because they get a large portion of that in return.

Ananaia: Oil & Gas royalties are paid to the state under a different formula.

➤ **Outcome:** Briefing only.

5. Update on Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre and Gunnison National Forest (GMUG) Cabin rental public involvement from June meeting-Pam DeVore (hard copies passed out)

DeVore: Cold Springs and Mesa Lakes Cabins (see hand outs). In the June meeting the RRAC asked the GMUG NF to go back and do more public involvement which they did and it resulted in more news releases, published newspaper articles, emails, an explanation why USFS doesn't use these cabins any more, supportive phone calls and other comments. None negative. Also, internal memos, USFS employees, posted on web sites, contacts, and one comment from the Mesa Lakes Lodge owner saying cabins would provide additional service opportunities that he doesn't have to deal with.

- Emory: Thought the RRAC had made changes in the rental rates. Proposed rates still seem high.

General discussion: No one can remember if they reduced the rates at the last meeting or just recommended it. Some confusion regarding Mesa cabins and Mesa Lakes cabins and if a decision was made.

- Sherwood: According to notes from the last meeting there was discussion but no recommendation or proposal made to reduce the fees by the RRAC. RRAC was concerned that \$120/night was too high and wanted the GMUG to look at \$95/night.
- Vankat: Pending approval depended upon public involvement efforts which now seem to be adequate.
- DeVore: Will follow up with the GMUG and have an answer on fee changes by the next meeting.

More discussion on whether enough public outreach and involvement was done on the 25 Mesa, Jackson, and Silesca cabins. An update on these cabins was not presented, still some question.

Ananaia: Suggested the RRAC articulate a resolution, expectations and realities the GMUG didn't meet; really helpful to the agencies to put recommendations in the form of a resolution so they are able to track decisions and revisit them and expectations are clear.

- Sherwood: Reads from previous meeting notes that *GMUG cabins were recommended for approval contingent upon the forest doing additional public involvement, specifically publishing a request for comments in the local paper. The RRAC will revisit the recommendation at the next meeting if negative comments are received.*
- **Outcome:** Update from GMUG was given for Cold Springs and Mesa Lakes cabins. RRAC was satisfied with additional outreach done. GMUG met their commitment for these cabins. Still needs update on Silesca, 25 Mesa, and Jackson cabins.

6. Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre and Gunnison National Forest (GMUG) Christmas Tree Permit Fee Proposal – Pam DeVore (copies of the GMUG's proposal.)

Proposal: Raise permit fee from \$8 to \$10 for enhancements to their program. GMUG has been selling tree permits under Recreation Enhancement Act (REA) since 2007.

- For the overall Christmas Tree program under REA, \$2 automatically goes to the Treasury (or sometimes goes to K-V fund for improvements into the timber sale [tree cutting] area – slash, stump removal, road or trail damage, etc)
- Christmas Tree cutting program has always been supported by Timber and most of the permit fees went to the Treasury. Funding by the Timber program was taken away [in the mid-1990's] and program was supported by other sub-activities which could not sustain the tree cutting program. USFS on the Front Range in Colorado put the program under the Recreation Fee Demonstration and finalized in REA in 2004. Other forests followed.
- Program is currently managed under two different authorities.
- The program has typically been a good, family activity. Cutting your own Christmas Tree connects people to natural resources and their public lands, gives people a stewardship opportunity to take part in managing their public lands for fuels reduction, benefits communities, and gets kids outdoors.

General discussion on the \$2 increase being too significant and it seems like the GMUG can manage the program at the current price. More outreach to the public also needs to be done.

Kleinschnitz: Motion to reject fee increase proposal as presented

Emory: Second

- Smith: Would rather "table" it rather than "reject" it until the next meeting
- Kleinschnitz: Reiterates motion - inappropriate time to be raising fees
- Vankat: If rejected can they give GMUG a list to come back with?

Blanton: Called for vote to reject proposal as currently presented (a "yes" vote would reject proposal)

- **Yes** votes: Emory, Vankat, Aragon, Pittel (as is), Smith, Kleinschnitz, Blanton
- **No** votes: Morrison, Miller, House
- **Decision:** Proposal as presented was rejected. Need more information.

- Pittel: Clarifies he's not against the \$2 increase for a Christmas Tree but is against the way it was proposed. Wants to bring it up again at the next meeting. Doesn't believe the \$2 increase is that much of an increase. Made the point that he bought a commercial tree at a much higher price. Wants to make motion to bring it up again at next meeting.
- Sherwood: For sake of cleanness, recommends a new proposal by the GMUG be presented to the RRAC at a future meeting since this proposal was rejected. There are still some concerns about more public involvement needing to be done. Committee will make note of concerns for the GMUG. GMUG to come up with a whole new proposal, indicating additional public involvement
- Blanton: Counties and schools will have issues with anything that takes money away from....forest programs.
- DeVore: Clarifies this proposal will not take money away from the county programs. There is still the \$2 minimum fee that goes back into the Timber program. Any increase in the fee will go to the recreation part of the program stays on site to manage the program. The Timber program will always get \$2 despite any fee increase which the counties still benefit from.
- Morrison: Understanding that the GMUG has been managing their Christmas Tree program under REA, fee increase will not take away from the counties? Western Slope No Fee concerns about money being taken away...are not true...correct?
- DeVore: Correct. All counties with the GMUG have chosen to go with the SRS fund so there is no affect on what amount goes to the counties.
- Blanton: Clarifies that all counties in GMUG took the full funding option.
- Smith: Fine with the increase. Representatives from forests need to be here to present proposals.

➤ **Decision:** Proposal was rejected as presented. Ask the GMUG to have a forest representative at the next meeting to present proposal.

7. Mud Springs and North Fruita Desert Campgrounds Fee Proposals - Chris Ham, has been in this job for four months.

Proposal #1: Mud Springs Campground–Raise the overnight fee from \$5 to \$10 and establish a new day use fee at the picnic area.

Admits to some mistakes. Kitty had informed him of some deficiencies in the way he had developed the RRAC proposal. Sent part of the proposal on a RRAC form requesting fee increase from \$5- \$10 and on another part of the form asked for a new day use fee at a picnic area. To simplify the discussion, he wanted to just focus on the fee increase for overnight use and none of the other options because the budget is written that way. Not sure if he can do it unilaterally. Would like to come back with the other proposals at another time. Clarifies the fee increase for overnight use.

Kleinschnitz: To begin the discussion move to change the over night fee @ MS CG from\$5-\$10

Smith: Second.

Discussion:

- Blanton: Clarified public comment with Dave Scherrer.
- Dave Scherrer: Doubling the fee seems a little much in this economy but not arguing with the request.
- Amenities at the site are on-site hosts, interpretation, potable water, host mileage, tent sites, security
- Some discussion on how much is paid to campground hosts. The site is very remote and the BLM offers to pay some expenses such as mileage as an incentive. Campers are more comfortable with hosts there. Hosts are not paid a salary but are under volunteer agreement and the BLM agrees to pay a stipend for a certain amount to offset expenses. Stipend is negotiable. There is also a pretty substantial volunteer group to help out with cleaning restrooms, etc.
- Public involvement: No mass email was sent to organizations; Montrose bike group are highly against the fee increase; they were not contacted; some good letters of recommendation and some letters against it.
- Some discussion on how security is provided (mentioned in the proposal). It is handled primarily by BLM Law Enforcement which is not paid for by this fee and campground hosts, who have no law enforcement authority, but do provide some security through communications and general presence. Also, occasionally done by county sheriffs through agreements. Hosts also have own radio repeater for communications.

Blanton: Call for vote – to approve fee increase on overnight campgrounds from \$5 to \$10.

- **Yes** votes: Morrison, Vankat, Aragon, Pittel, Miller, Smith, Kleinschnitz, House, Blanton
- **No** votes: Emory
- **Decision:** Recommended for approval.

(DeVore: Clarified that there has to be a majority vote in each of the 3 different categories outlined in the law - *recreation users, interest groups, local government entities* - to be recommended for approval.)

Proposal #2: North Fruita Desert Campground – request establishing a \$10 fee per night/per site. (Handout – North Fruita Desert Campground)

Discussion:

- Campground boasts national and internationally renowned mountain biking opportunities and serves mountain bike groups mostly from the Front Range and nationally. There is no fee charged at this time.
- Question about errors on the ground such as random picnic tables
- Dave Scherrer: 2 sites 1 had no amenities, 1 picnic table and no fire ring
- Question about parking along the road location of particular camp spots. There are no site delineators but improvements will be done this summer ('09). Campsites will be numbered. Funding is already in place for this.
- More discussion on restrooms, no water, no parking, capacity of sites. There are 37 sites. Sites will be overcapacity and dispersed camping will have to cease. People will be limited to specific campsites if a fee is imposed. Lots of ways to get around the historic use of dispersed camping. Renting out to one permittee for an event or having a free day, etc.
- There are six bathrooms. Comment was made that demand for restroom facilities in that part of the country is huge. There are also two trailheads –

one ¼ mile to the south and one north with 2 large parking areas. South trailhead has delineated parking, a restroom, and information kiosk. North trailhead has just a kiosk – no restroom.

- Smith: Costs seem to be covered adequately by appropriated funds. What will the fees cover? Concerned about imposing a fee will cause big impacts on surrounding area outside the campground.
- Ham: Current funding covers recreation management of the area and not necessarily facilities maintenance. Fees will cover more on the ground within the special recreation management area. Continued dispersed camping is a challenge. Maps will show designated areas for dispersed camping. Order is written that they don't have to specify where dispersed camping is but they do have to provide a map.
- Ham: BLM is updating all the existing recreation areas plans. Looking at designating dispersed areas while protecting the resource. Working on alternatives, several years before things get finalized.
- A lot more discussion on plans for the future for this area to clarify allowing dispersed use, resource damage mitigation and appropriate funding.

Public involvement:

- Counties will support with commitment of host and trash containers.
- Ham: Was not in on the discussions. Can't happen and not happening right now.
- Vankat: Talked to about 30 folks; rough consensus \$10 is OK; they really pushed for trash pick-up; no one said "no" because lack of trash; a couple said no just because they oppose fees. Seems a general willingness to pay. Common opinion by the mountain bike community is a real need to provide amenities, gravel on roads, etc.
- Blanton: Likes the fact that BLM has a place where you don't pay a fee; it's OK for people who live far away but it will cost the locals a lot.
- More discussion on capacity. Regulations can be passed to allow camping in designated sites only, establishing overflow areas, looking at the larger area as a whole – possibly allow camping 10 feet or so from the campground and people don't have to pay. Established campsites must be clearly delineated, signs and physical barriers available

Miller: Moves to pass recommendation with stipulation on trash

Vankat: Second

Blanton: Further discussion?

- Still some discomfort with the dispersed camping issue. Smith suggested if they approve this proposal BLM needs to come back with a plan on mitigating resource damage.
- The problem will persist whether there will be a fee a not. Not a reason to approve or reject. Refer to North Fruita Management Plan.

More discussion outlying resource impacts. Dispersed camping was not analyzed in current management plan. The fees go for services, less money to go to resource damage. Dispersed camping is valued by some users. Capacity issue more than a fee issue. Proximity to trailheads – very convenient. Others would prefer to pay \$10 to have the amenities.

Dave Scherrer: (personal comment - little weird to make a public comment with a motion on the table). (Had a handout) Understands the area and activities within it. Old campground might be a good place for the dispersed area. Little resource

damage. Explained that because the campground is free that's where all the impacts are. Agrees with Smith to keep impacts within the area. Suggests a donation box.

A lot more discussion on capacity, dispersed camping, trash clean-up and provisions, people who pay the fee will be subsidizing dispersed users who come in and use amenities, overnight campers subsidizing day-users, fees pay for services such as clean toilets, trash pick up and law enforcement, possibly need a larger strategy, offering some freedom for some users while still providing resource protection, etc.

Ham: Need to confirm in plan and then will provide the information to the RRAC

Miller: A second to motion amendment on the table is needed

Vankat: Second

Blanton: Call for vote

- **Yes** votes: Morrison, Vankat, Aragon, Miller, Smith, House,
- **No** votes: Emory, Pittel, Kleinschnitz, Blanton
- **Decision:** motion to recommend was rejected

Cox: Reminds the RRAC all they have right now on the table is an agreement not a recommendation so what does the committee want to do? Right now agency can't take action on this proposal. All you have is disagreement.

Still a need for a clear and decisive resolution. Concern that there is unanimity in the local government category and the vote will always be no. If the vote won't change then BLM people will be doing a lot of work for nothing if the recommendation is to re-do proposal for the next meeting.

Cox: Resolution process cannot be resolved here. Kleinschnitz and Blanton are the two local government reps and if they will always vote no then it will go back to the agency.

Sherwood: (read from bylaws) Recommendation was to approve the fee with the conditions, DFO, tabled 'til next meeting...RRAC can't table a proposal for more than 1 year. The Secretary can override the RRACs recommendation.

No other motions were made.

- **Outcome:** North Fruita Campground proposal is tabled until RRAC gets more clarification.

8. Future Meetings

Next meeting: July 11, 2009

- Morning: Field trip to Green Mountain Reservoir
- Afternoon: Meeting in Kremmling...actual location to be announced.

Adjourn: Blanton

Second: Emory

Bin items on flip charts:

#1

- Look at ways the public accesses info prior to RRAC meetings. Can we do more than posting it to the Web?
- Presentation on FOIA
- Training on decision process, resolution process

#2

- Require trash pick up
- Dispersed camping strategy in place for area – North Fruita SMA
- Clarification of season of use (heavy vs light use). This could enter into fee structure.

#3

- What options are available to dispersed campers?

April 21, 2009 Colorado RRAC Mtg. Proposal Vote Spreadsheet

					RRAC Member, Outfitters and Guides, Local Environmental Group										
Unit	Project Proposal Name	New Fee?	Current Fee	New Fee	Steve Pittel		Leslie Miller		Vera Smith		Voting Totals		Result	Motion	
					Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No			
GMUG	Christmas Tree Fee Increase	no	\$8	\$10	x				x	x		2	1	passed	reject as currently presented
BLM-Grand Junction	Mud Springs Campground	no	\$5	\$10	x			x		x		3	0	passed	increase fee from \$5 to \$10.
	North Fruita Desert Campground	yes	\$0	\$10			x	x		x		2	1	passed	motion to approve with the condition that trash collection is provided and only after dispersed camping strategy is completed
<p>GMUG Christmas Tree fee increase proposal: vote to reject as currently presented - not enough information, Forest needs to be here to present, counties not notified? Not enough public involvement, Forest can bring it back. Question on contacts with the public at Montrose. Motion passed to reject as currently presented</p>															
<p>Mud Springs: Proposal was changed to include just the individual overnight sites \$5 - \$10. Passed to increase fee from \$5 to \$10. Remainder of proposal can be brought forward at a later date</p>															
<p>North Fruita Desert: new campground, no current fee, motion to accept as long as trash collection is provided, motion amended to add condition to implement only after dispersed camping strategy is completed. (may already be in North Fruita Special Management Area RMP) - this motion was declined by vote due to lack of majority in Category 3</p>															

April 21, 2009 Colorado RRAC Mtg. Proposal Vote Spreadsheet

Unit	Project Proposal Name	New Fee?	Current Fee	New Fee	RRAC Member, Tourism, Tribes, Local Government						Voting	Totals	Result	Motion
					Tom Klienschnitz		Ernest House		Mike Blanton					
					Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No		
GMUG	Christmas Tree Fee Increase	no	\$8	\$10	x			x	x		2	1	passed	reject as currently presented
BLM-Grand Junction	Mud Springs Campground	no	\$5	\$10	x		x		x		3	0	passed	increase fee from \$5 to \$10.
	North Fruita Desert Campground	yes	\$0	\$10		x *	x			x	1	2	didn't pass	motion to approve with the condition that trash collection is provided and only after dispersed camping strategy is completed
<p>GMUG Christmas Tree fee increase proposal: vote to reject as currently presented - not enough information, Forest needs to be here to present, counties not notified? Not enough public involvement, Forest can bring it back. Question on contacts with the public at Montrose. Motion passed to reject as currently presented</p>														
<p>Mud Springs: Proposal was changed to include just the individual overnight sites \$5 - \$10. Passed to increase fee from \$5 to \$10. Remainder of proposal can be brought forward at a later date</p>														
<p>North Fruita Desert: new campground, no current fee, motion to accept as long as trash collection is provided, motion amended to add condition to implement only after dispersed camping strategy is completed. (may already be in North Fruita Special Management Area RMP) - this motion was declined by vote due to lack of majority in Category 3</p>														
<p>* concerned about resource degradation around the campground caused by dispersed camping and fairness needs more info</p>														