



USDA Forest Service
Pacific Northwest Region

333 SW FIRST AVENUE
PORTLAND, OR 97204



USDI Bureau of Land Management
Oregon State Office

File Code: 2350

Date: February 22, 2010

To: Recreation Resource Advisory Committee Members

Subject: Summary Notes for the February 2, 2010
Recreation Resource Advisory Committee Meeting

This memo transmits summary meeting notes from the February 2, 2010 Recreation Resource Advisory Committee (R/RAC) meeting held via net and teleconference.

If you have questions related to this material, please contact me at 541-308-1706, or Abbie Josie at 541-471-6500, or Kathy Mitchell at 541-308-1712 (R/RAC Administrative Assistant).

Sincerely,

/s/ Daniel T. Harkenrider

/s/ Abbie Josie

DANIEL T. HARKINRIDER
Designated Federal Official
Recreation Resource Advisory Committee

ABBIE JOSIE
BLM Officio/BLM Official
Recreation Resource Advisory Committee

**Pacific Northwest
Recreation Resources Advisory Committee
Agenda for February 2, 2010
Conference Call and Web Meeting**

Time	Topics	Purpose	Presenter
12:30	Welcome/Logistics/Introductions/Participation And opening statements, opportunity for committee questions. Review Committee Purpose and Agenda Ensure Participants are on Live Meeting	Housekeeping Background	Dennis Oliphant (Chair) Dan Harkenrider (FS, DFO)
1:00	Public Comment	Required	
1:30	Deschutes National Forest - Revised	Recommendation	Deschutes National Forest
2:00	Umpqua National Forest	Recommendation	Umpqua National Forest
2:45	Break		
3:00	Okanogan – Wenatchee National Forest	Recommendation	Okanogan – Wenatchee National Forest
3:45	Final Discussion Time – Summarize recommendations	Discussion/Wrap Up	Dennis Oliphant
4:15	Wrap Up – Critique		Dennis Oliphant
4:30	Adjourn		

Attendees:

R/RAC members present:	
Kevin Gorman	Category 2, Local Environmental
R/RAC members via phone:	
Elizabeth Lunney	Category 1, Summer Non-Motorized Recreation
Richard Fahey	Category 1, Hunting and Fishing
John Vogel	Category 1, Winter Motorized Recreation
Carol Jensen	Category 1, Summer Motorized Recreation
Dennis Oliphant	Category 2, Non-Motorized, Outfitter/Guide, Chairman
Todd Davidson	Category 3, State Tourism
John Walker	Category 3, Tribal
Charles Hurliman	Category 3, Local Government
R/RAC members absent:	
Gustav Bekker	Category 1, Winter Non-motorized Recreation
Robert Hamlyn	Category 2, Motorized Outfitter/Guide
Federal officials:	
Daniel Harkenrider	Designated Federal Official
Abbie Josie	Ex Officio BLM Representative
Federal staff:	
Jocelyn Biro	Recreation Fee Coordinator, Forest Service, R6
Julie Cox	National R/RAC Coordinator
Kathy Mitchell	PNW R/RAC Administrative Assistant, meeting coordinator
Cathi Bailey	BLM
Katie Donahue	Washington Office, USDA Forest Service
Tom Knappenberger	Pacific Northwest Region, USDA Forest Service
Alan Matecko	Pacific Northwest Region, USDA Forest Service
Justin Bauer	Note taker

Topic Summaries:

Topic: Welcome/Logistics/Introductions/Participation/Opening Statements	12:30
Presenters: Dan Harkenrider (FS), Dennis Oliphant (Chair)	
Summary of Presentation:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dan Harkenrider began by introducing himself as a Forest Service representative and the Designated Federal Official for the Recreation Resource Advisory Committee. He continued by thanking everyone for attending, in person or over the phone, and asked for their patience as the process of this teleconference and net meeting was worked out. Dan then addressed the members of the public who were on the phone, welcoming, and thanking them all, as well as laying out the ground rules for the public comment period. Each commenter was allotted three minutes to speak. Dan requested that each speaker respect the timeframe and that each comment be directly related to the proposals on hand, not just about fees in general, as this would be the most helpful for the committee members in making their decisions. Dan requested that committee members be patient 	

with their questions and ideally to hold them all until the end of the presentations.

- Dennis Oliphant explained to the committee members that when it came time to vote he would do a roll call, asking each member individually for their vote. He also asked each member to state their name when speaking in order to avoid any confusion over who was talking.
- Dennis Oliphant asked for clarification on how the public comment period would be managed in order to ensure that each commenter was given an opportunity to speak. Jocelyn Biro answered by saying a list had been compiled of the people who had requested time to speak. Jocelyn continued by saying that the teleconference assistant had this list, and they would announce the commenter's name and then open their line so they could speak.
- Dennis Oliphant next asked about staying on track with the agenda considering there were potentially 26 speakers each having three minutes. Dan Harkenrider answered by saying that he would leave it up to the committee's discretion. Dan said the flexibility in the agenda would allow for extra time for the public comment period, but that he would leave the decision as to whether or not extend the public comment period up to Dennis. Dennis followed by saying that it would be good to come up with a ground rule ahead of time because the number of respondents meant there would be a potential for up to an hour-and-a-half worth of public comments. Dan said it would probably be best to allow everyone their three minutes to speak and hope that the committee could get through them in a timely manner. Dennis agreed and said the committee could play it by ear. Dan finished by informing Dennis and the rest of the committee that Kevin Gorman was present at the meeting in person so that there was a quorum present.
- Dan Harkenrider next went into a description of the committee's purpose in order to ensure all teleconference participants understood the role and goals of the committee. He did this by reading from the Roles and Responsibilities section of the RRAC Notebook. He focused on the requirements for the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management before they bring a fee proposal before the committee. Secondly, Dan described the concept of general public support, and that it was the committee's role to determine whether or not the agency had done enough to elicit and allow for public comments regarding the fee proposals.
- Dennis Oliphant finished the introduction by asking if Gustav Bekker or Robert Hamlyn had joined the conference call. They had not. Dennis next asked for clarification on whether it was the Umpqua National Forest that had pulled their proposals from the meeting. Dan Harkenrider answered by saying it was the Wallowa-Whitman National Forest that had pulled their proposals, and that the Umpqua would be presenting that day. Finally Dennis asked if anyone was in charge of keeping time during the public comment period. Dan answered that yes, Kathy Mitchell would be monitoring the three minute time limit.

Topic: Public Comment Period

Presenters: Joan Taplin

Summary of Presentation: Joan Taplin began by informing the committee that she lives in Washington and is opposed to trailhead and day use fees. She said that she does not have a lot of money and would like to be able to use recreational sites on a daily basis without having to pay for things like picnics and hikes. Joan finished by saying that she hopes we do not have to make
--

the public pay to use sites for daily use.

Topic: Public Comment Period

Presenters: Kitty Benzar (Western Slope No-Fee Coalition President)

Summary of Presentation: Kitty Benzar began by saying that the RAC has a statutory responsibility to make sure that the Forest Service had done their job in accordance with the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act (REA). She stated that this committee has overwhelmingly approved fee proposals, while not recommending very few. She said that the Wallowa-Whitman National Forest misrepresented their public comments, saying that while most of the comments received were opposed to fees, the forest instead chose to only present those comments that supported of the fee proposals. She continued by saying the Umpqua National Forest presentation clearly showed that they had failed to demonstrate “general public support” for their fee proposals, but the committee still recommended them. She finished by saying that the Forest Service had gone too far in asking the committee to recommend fees even before the sites had all the amenities in place and before they had posted notices about the fee proposals.

Topic: Public Comment Period

Presenters: Peter Wiechers

Summary of Presentation: Peter Wiechers began his comment by wishing everyone a good afternoon and thanking the committee for taking their time to listen to his comment. He explained that he lived in a small mountain town called Kernville, California and was in opposition to the trailhead fees being proposed by the Umpqua National Forest. He said that he has become familiar with REA and that he was aware that it prohibited national forests from charging access fees to public lands. Peter said that the proposed Champion Trailhead fee appeared to him to be a public lands access fee. He requested that the committee postpone the implementation of this and other fees. He also expressed concern over whether the Umpqua had met the requirement that they demonstrate that a fee proposal has “general public support.” Peter pointed out that the Umpqua only received one comment on the proposed trailhead fee, and that it was in opposition to the fee. He questioned whether or not this constituted “general public support.” Peter finished his comment by pointing out that the Forest Service had received a poor grade in Congress for where the agency is spending their money, and it worried him that recreation fees were being used irresponsibly.

Topic: Public Comment Period

Presenters: Scott Silver

Summary of Presentation: Scott Silver began by saying that he is a resident of Bend, Oregon and that his comment would be addressing the fee proposals on the Deschutes National Forest. He said it is fair to say that it is appropriate for a private for-profit business to seek a profit, but that this was not the case for the Forest Service. His main concern was that the Deschutes National Forest was using the argument that the lack of fees at certain sites was undercutting the business of the concessionaires operating other sites on the Forest. Scott argued that the only concessionaire on the Deschutes National Forest is Hoodoo Recreation Services, and that the Forest Service should not be in the business of worrying about competition with private businesses. He also pointed out that since the Deschutes only has one concessionaire, it is the same people who are making the same comment each time. Scott said that he was hoping that

the RRAC could be more independent of the Forest Service and be more representative of the public. He requested that there be more documented public support for fee proposals before they receive committee recommendation. Scott said that what is being misrepresented is the perception that since the public understands what the fees are being used for that they support fees. He again asked that the committee ensure that the presentations showed “general public support,” as this is what the committee was mandated to do. Scott finished by requesting that if there is not documentation of public support for a fee proposal that the committee not recommend it, and cautioned them against becoming a cover for the Forest Service.

Topic: Public Comment Period

Presenters: Kristi Laguzza-Boosman

Summary of Presentation: Kristi Laguzza-Boosman’s comment was directed toward the Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest. She asked that the committee uphold their responsibility to the public and encouraged the committee to decline the fee proposals in Region 6. Kristi next told about a ticket she was given for not paying the recreation fee at a site in a High Impact Recreation Area (HIRA) on the Okanogan-Wenatchee, and its subsequent dismissal by the district attorney. She said it was determined that the fees were being imposed illegally due to the lack of all the required amenities. She said that in REA it is required that the Forest Service have six of nine amenities, which they do not in the Okanogan-Wenatchee HIRA. Kristi informed the committee that the district attorney has launched an investigation into the legality of the HIRAs. Kristi next pointed out two studies which she said showed that fees on national forest trails impose a serious barrier to 50% of low income people, and 30% of all others. She said that according to these studies it is no surprise that visitations to the National Forests throughout the region have dropped. Kristi followed by saying that for a struggling family, a \$5 dollar trailhead fee is a choice between going hiking and having food. She said the Forest Service should not be imposing more barriers on families seeking to take their families hiking. Kristi finished by saying that the imposition of fees is legally questionable and asked the committee to do their job and request that the Forest Service remove fees.

Topic: Public Comment Period

Presenters: Scott Phillips

Summary of Presentation: Scott Phillips began his comment period by thanking the committee for opening the Recreation RAC process by holding the meeting via teleconference. He said that he is a retired U.S. Forest Service employee, having worked in the Inter-mountain Region as a Recreation Specialist. He pointed out that Region 6 is especially notorious for charging fees in backcountry areas, and despite this, the Pacific Northwest Recreation RAC has continued to recommend fees. Scott pointed towards the Deschutes National Forest’s Windy Trailhead as an example of an illegal trailhead fee. He believes that there should not be a fee at this trailhead. Scott next commented on the Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forests’ proposal to impose fees at four dispersed recreation sites. He felt that these sites should be left alone. Scott disagreed with the Okanogan-Wenatchee’s reasoning that trash service was needed in these areas, as historically, the pack-it-in pack-it-out method has been successful. Scott next recommended to the committee that they review all national forest trailhead fees and request that they be removed. He then mentioned that he has a Masters degree in recreation, and that he believes it is destructive to a visitor’s spiritual and mental rejuvenation experience when they see a fee collection tube in a backcountry setting, especially in our currently over-mechanized society.

Scott finished by requesting the committee consider the quality of the experience that American citizens have a right to experience when considering fee proposals.

Topic: Public Comment Period

Presenters: David Scherer

Summary of Presentation: David Scherer began his comment period by stating that he has spent time in the Pacific Northwest Region, particularly with the cabin rental program on the Umpqua National Forest. He said that after he had looked over the Forest Service reports it appeared that the cabin fees would leave them with an excess of money. He stated that at the current fee level, the Umpqua would be able to pay off their deferred maintenance in only four years, and with the proposed increase, that would be cut down to three years. David questioned what the Forest Service would do with the surplus money. He next gave the example of the Recreation RAC in Colorado, which denied the proposal to increase cabin rental fees, and that this decision was celebrated among the public. David pointed out that in 2010, money appropriated to the Forest Service is up 1.7 million dollars and that keeping fees at current levels will not hurt the Forest Service one bit, and in fact they will be swimming in money. He requested that the committee defer the fee proposals.

Topic: Public Comment Period

Presenters: Elaine Newcomb

Summary of Presentation: Elaine Newcomb began by thanking the committee for the opportunity to comment. She said that most of her comments were already covered by those who had gone before her, but that she would like to add a couple things. Elaine had recently retired and was looking forward to taking her truck camper and discovering the Pacific Northwest. She said that she does not have very much money, and was looking for undeveloped camping, much like that in the Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest's presentation. She said she does not need amenities or kiosks describing the area. She said that she and her husband had always subscribed to the pack-it-in pack-it-out method and that she did not see a reason for charging fees for garbage service. Elaine also commented about the Forest Service passing campgrounds to concessionaires to operate. She said concessionaires do not care about people, only about their bottom line. She pointed out that some concessionaires will not honor her Inter-agency Senior Pass and was concerned about the loss of a discount for camping. She said that she was guaranteed some things and that the Forest Service needs to move away from depending on private for-profit businesses running recreation sites. She said she likes the idea of fewer amenities for free access. Elaine then questioned how the Pacific Northwest has been able to charge fees at so many backcountry trailheads. She asked the committee to deny the fee proposals as they are prohibitive for folks; especially in this economy when people are depressed and need to get out in the woods.

Topic: Public Comment Period

Presenters: Tom Halpin

Summary of Presentation: Tom Halpin began by informing the committee that he runs a business in Washington which manufactures down sleeping bags. Through his work he talks to a lot of outdoor recreationists and that most people he speaks with are opposed to fees. He finished by saying that having to pay for something you already own is an insult.

Topic: Public Comment Period

Presenters: Jim Goes

Summary of Presentation: Jim Goes began by thanking the committee for their volunteer service, as he knows it is not easy. He said that he is particularly interested in the fee proposals on the Umpqua National Forest. Jim suggested that the committee may not be listening closely enough to the public, pointing out that the committee has recommended 249 fees while turning down zero. Jim next turned his comments to the Bryce Creek Trailhead fee proposal, saying that it is a very popular site that only recently had facilities installed. He stated that the site did not meet the requirement of six amenities. He said it is a site many people rely on. Jim then pointed out that Cottage Grove, Oregon, is an economically depressed community, with high unemployment. Many locals depended on recreating on the National Forest. He then pointed to the Lahota Campground fee proposal, saying that this is another popular site which faced a fee increase. He said that even though public comments showed universal opposition to the fee increase, the Umpqua still brought it in front of the committee for recommendation. In addition, Jim said that there were a lot of letters to the editor in opposition to the fees. Jim finished by saying that he thinks most people do not mind paying fees as long as it is apparent that they are making a difference, but he still encouraged the committee to be strongly opposed to fees.

Topic: Public Comment Period

Presenters: Cliff Nellis

Summary of Presentation: Cliff Nellis began his comment by saying that he is highly offended by recreation fees based on principle. He thinks this is double taxation. Cliff explained that the public owns public lands through taxes, and that he believes that public lands are his lands. He said that he does not mind paying fees for some things, such as renting a campsite, but was opposed to fees to access public lands for hiking. Cliff said that it is almost a prehistoric right of passage to freely walk on the land, and that it is a pioneer value. He values public ownership of property, but if the Forest Service is going to charge fees they might as well turn it over to private companies. He is also opposed to paying for boating on public waters, such as boat launch fees. Cliff used an example from the Grand Canyon, explaining that he used to enjoy taking groups of youth hiking into the canyon, but that he cannot do it anymore because after all the fees and food costs are added up, it is around \$100 per child to complete the trip. Cliff said that he likes the Bend area, but if we start charging fees everywhere, he might be banned from the area. Cliff said that he values the tradition of the Forest Ranger. He then pointed to the El Dorado National Forest, which in some places is charging \$25 for a campsite, and questioned the need for these fees. He finished by saying that he heard the Forest Service had gotten an increase in their budget from Congress, and that the recreation fee increases far outpaced the inflation rate.

Topic: Public Comment Period

Presenters: Ed Atwood

Summary of Presentation: Ed Atwood began his comment by describing himself and his wife as recreational enthusiasts, enjoying snowmobiling and skiing. He informed the committee that he was calling from Northwest Pennsylvania and that he and his wife were members of AARP. He was extremely concerned with the Forest Service doing away with discounts for seniors and disabled people. Ed continued by saying that there are established fees already in existence, any

increase must be done as a last resort, and that the agency must be able to demonstrate good use of the money. He finished by saying that we the people already own the land and the agency does not need to add to the cost of accessing public lands.

Topic: Public Comment Period

Presenters: Marlene Orchard (Backcountry Horsemen of Oregon)

Summary of Presentation: Marlene began her comment by informing the committee that she was calling from West Linn, Oregon and that she was a volunteer for the user group Backcountry Horsemen of Oregon. She is generally opposed to fees, especially when they have to pay to park their vehicles and trailers when they are there to volunteer their time cleaning and maintaining trails. Marlene used the example of Chelsea Horse Camp, which was built by a volunteer horse group which still volunteers to maintain it, and now the Forest Service wants to increase the fee at the camp. Marlene finished by asking the committee to be considerate of those who use the camp and consider the amount of service that is rendered through the time users' volunteer.

Topic: Public Comment Period

Presenters: Bill Belitskus

Summary of Presentation: Bill Belitskus began his comment by informing the committee that he was calling from northwest Pennsylvania and that he was opposed to any fee increases. He said the public already pays for the use of National Forest land through taxes. He talked about how he volunteers with the Forest Service so he feels like he is already putting in his time. Bill followed by saying it is not the purpose of the Forest Service to create profit for private concessionaires. He is really disturbed that fees are increasing when Congressional appropriation for recreation has increased over the past few years. Bill finished by reiterating that he is opposed to all the fee increases for use of public land.

Dan Harkenrider concluded the public comment period by reading a written comment from Dick Atley over the phone to the committee members.

Presenters: Mark Christiansen (Recreation Program Manager, FS), Les Moscoso (FS), Holly Jewkes (District Ranger, Crescent River Ranger District, FS)

Fee Proposals:

	Site Name	Location	Proposal
New Fee Sites			
1	Crescent Lake Boat Launch	Crescent Lake Crescent Ranger District	New fee: \$5/day
2	Princess Creek Boat Launch	Odell Lake Crescent Ranger District	New fee: \$5/day
3	Simax Beach Day Use	Crescent Lake Crescent Ranger District	New fee: \$5/day
4	Spring Creek Boat Launch	Crescent Lake Crescent Ranger District	New fee: \$5/day
5	Sunset Cove Boat Launch	Odell Lake Crescent Ranger District	New fee: \$5/day
6	Tranquil Cove Day Use	Crescent Lake Crescent Ranger District	New fee: \$5/day
7	Trapper Creek Boat Launch	Odell Lake Crescent Ranger District	New fee: \$5/day
8	Windy-Oldenberg Trailhead	Odell Lake Crescent Ranger District	New fee: \$5/day

Summary of Presentation:

- Mark Christenson began the presentation by thanking the committee for allowing the Deschutes National Forest to address the issues surrounding their fee proposals that were brought up at the previous meeting. Mark went on to describe the sites at which new fees were being proposed. He listed the amenities currently in place, as well as the amenities that would be installed if the proposal was recommended. Mark explained that some of the amenities had not been installed because the forest wanted to see if the committee would support the fee proposals first. If the committee did not support the proposals, those particular amenities may be better utilized at other sites currently in the fee system. He highlighted that the missing amenities were already purchased or in development, and stressed that all the amenities would be installed prior to the implementation of the new fees. Mark continued the presentation by telling the committee that the forest did indeed consider all of the comments received, and weighed the number of people reached in comparison to the number of comments received. He said that the forest wished to become more consistent across all the districts in their fees.

Key presentation points:

- Public participation included:
 - Notice of fee proposals was published in the Federal Register in October 2008.
 - Proposals were posted onsite beginning in fall 2008.
 - Met with Crescent Community Action Team (CAT) and notes about proposal were published in the CAT newsletter.
 - Notices about the fee proposals were sent to approximately 50 local and non-local

newspapers and television stations in November 2008.

- Letters about fee proposals were sent to local recreation user groups, as well as other relevant parties.
- Approximately 60,000 people were reached.
- Results of public participation:
 - Ten written responses were received in opposition to the fee proposals, most of which expressed that taxes should cover the cost of operation and maintenance of facilities.
 - Several comments were opposed to fees at particular sites they frequent and did not address fees at sites they did not visit.
 - Some respondents wanted a “locals” discount or “pass” in lieu of fees.
 - CAT expressed concerns about how fees could affect the local residents’ use of the sites and how the fees would be used. CAT gave verbal support to the fee proposals once it was explained that the fees were retained onsite for upgrades and operations.
 - Deschutes campground concessionaire and other resort owners in the area verbally encouraged implementation of fees at the proposed sites.
 - Received one call that opposed to the proposed fees, indicating that taxes should cover costs associated with the sites.

Summary of Discussion/Questions/Comments:

- John Walker began the discussion by asking who makes up the Crescent Community Action Team (CAT). Mark Christenson answered that it is made up of a group of concessionaires, business owners, and citizens from around the Crescent, Oregon area.
- Kevin Gorman commented on the Windy-Oldenberg Trailhead, saying that with the lack of garbage service and picnic tables it seemed to have an unusually high cost associated with maintaining it. He continued by saying that, that trailheads need to meet a higher standard before he would consider recommending a new fee because the public has the expectation that they should be able to walk or hike for free on public lands. Kevin then asked why the Deschutes had chosen this particular trailhead for a new fee. Mark Christenson answered by saying that it is a high cost area because it is large and has a large parking lot which adds to the clean up and maintenance costs. It is also more expensive to police the area. Secondly, Mark said, the forest recently decided to utilize the Windy-Oldenberg Trailhead as access point to a trail system that is currently being accessed from the Whitefish Horse Camp. Mark finished by saying there has been some friction between different user groups, and the forest was trying to shift hikers from the horse camp to this trailhead. Kevin followed Mark’s answer by saying it seemed counterintuitive to implement a fee at an area that you are trying to attract people to. Mark answered by saying the Windy-Oldenberg Trailhead already sees high use and they believe that their efforts to concentrate more people there requires installation of improvements, such as garbage service and picnic tables. The forest also feels the need to develop infrastructure to help facilitate responsible use and to protect the environment. Mark concluded by saying with additional infrastructure come additional costs, and thus the desire to implement a trailhead fee.
- Richard Fahey told the committee that he had gotten cut off from the teleconference for a while and that he did not hear the earlier discussion. He asked, that of the ten comments received, were any associated with user groups? Mark answered that he was not sure. Richard then stated that he would like to see that volunteer horse groups have recreation fees waived while they are performing volunteer maintenance activities. Mark responded by

saying that the Deschutes National Forest has a policy to waive recreation fees for users or groups when they are performing volunteer work. Mark pointed out that most revenue from recreation fees are used for operating and maintaining facilities, not necessarily on the trail, so the volunteer work is critically important and welcomed.

- Dan Harkenrider shared how volunteers may be compensated. He said that a number of Forests have a program where they recognize volunteer hours by awarding a Volunteer Annual Northwest Forest passes to those who volunteer enough hours. Jocelyn Biro added that it is actually a Region 6 policy.
- John Vogel asked for clarification about the concern that the Forest Service is undercutting private concessionaires. He said that it sounds like a number of people visiting Forest Service sites want to save money by utilizing free sites. Mark responded by clarifying that Hoodoo Recreation Services is not in competition with Deschutes National Forest and the only reason that they were included in the presentation was in order to disclose all comments received, regardless of who they came from, or what it was directed towards. John next asked what the forest was planning on charging at these sites. Mark answered by saying they are all standard amenity sites, so they will be \$5/day or \$30/season.
- Todd Davidson asked Dan Harkenrider, as the Designated Federal Official, to clarify the level of discretion the committee has when it comes to voting on fee proposals at sites that currently do not have all the required amenities in place. Dan answered by reminding everyone that at the last meeting it was decided that the committee can recommend fees before all amenities had been installed and that it is unlawful for the forest to implement a fee prior to all the amenities being in place.
- Kevin Gorman asked if the committee was voting on the proposals individually or as one block. Dennis Oliphant answered by saying they were voting on them as one block.

Charles Hurliman motioned to vote on the fees as presented.

Note: Motion did not pass (Category 1=4 yes votes; Category 2=1 yes vote and 1 no vote; Category 3=3 yes votes)

- Following the vote, Kevin Gorman explained that he did not vote in favor of the proposal because he did not want to recommend the new fee proposal at the Windy-Oldenberg Trailhead, but he had no concerns about the fees at the other sites. Dan Harkenrider responded by telling Dennis Oliphant that it is alright for Dennis, as the Chair, to decide to split up the sites and vote on them separately. Dennis asked Dan if he was recommending a re-vote. Dan said that either the committee can bring the proposals back to the floor, or the Deschutes can withdraw the trailhead from their proposal and then the committee can re-vote. Mark Christenson said that if the trailhead was the point of contention then the forest would withdraw it from the proposal.
- Richard Fahey commented that the proposal is much more to his liking without the trailhead.

Kevin Gorman motioned that the committee recommend the Deschutes' fees without the trailhead proposal. Dan Harkenrider interjected that the trailhead had been withdrawn from the fee proposal package, and so it was appropriate to simply recommend the proposal. Kevin agreed and motioned to recommend the Deschutes' fee proposals as presented.

Note: Unanimous approval (Category 1=4; Category 2=2; Category 3=3)

At this point Elizabeth Lunney informed the group that she needed to leave the meeting in order to pick up her ill son from daycare. She would make an attempt to re-engage the group when she returned in approximately one-half hour.

Topic: Umpqua National Forest			2:12 pm	
Presenters: Bill Blackwell (FS)				
Fee Proposals:				
	Site Name	Location	Proposal	
New Fee Sites				
1	Rujada Picnic Area	Cottage Grove Ranger District	New fee: \$25 (for one site) New fee: \$50 (for two sites)	
2	East Brice Creek/Champion Creek Trailhead	Cottage Grove Ranger District	New fee: \$5/day	
3	Thielsen View Boat Ramp	Diamond Lake Ranger District	New fee: \$5/day	
4	Ash Flat Campground	Tiller Ranger District	New fee: \$10/night; extra vehicle \$5	
5	Three C Rock Campground	Tiller Ranger District	New fee: \$10/night	
6	South Umpqua Falls Picnic Site	Tiller Ranger District	New fee: \$5/day	
Recreation Rental Fee Increases				
1	Fairview Peak Lookout	Cottage Grove Ranger District	Fee increase: \$40/night to \$50/night & \$65/night ¹	
2	Musick Guard Station	Cottage Grove Ranger District	Fee increase: \$40/night to \$50/night	
3	Acker Rock Lookout	Tiller Ranger District	Fee increase: \$40/night to \$50/night ²	
4	Butler Butte Cabin	Tiller Ranger District	Fee increase: \$40/night to \$50/night ²	
5	Pickett Butte Lookout	Tiller Ranger District	Fee increase: \$40/night to \$50/night ²	
6	Whisky Camp Guard Station	Tiller Ranger District	Fee increase: \$40/night to \$50/night ²	
Campground Fee Increases				
1	Cedar Creek Campground	Cottage Grove Ranger District	Fee increase: \$6/night to \$10/night	Extra vehicle fee increase: \$3 to \$5

2	Lund Park Campground	Cottage Grove Ranger District	Fee increase: \$6/night to \$8/night	Extra vehicle fee increase: \$3 to \$5
3	Rujada Campground	Cottage Grove Ranger District	Fee increase: \$8/night to \$12/night	Extra vehicle fee increase: \$3 to \$5
4	Diamond Lake Campground – Single Family Site	Diamond Lake Ranger District	Fee increase: \$12/night to \$16/night & \$20/night ¹	Extra vehicle fee decrease: \$6 to \$5
5	Diamond Lake Campground – Multiple Family Site	Diamond Lake Ranger District	Fee increase: \$18/night to \$21/night & \$25/night ¹	Extra vehicle fee decrease: \$6 to \$5
6	Diamond Lake Campground – Lakeshore Multiple Site	Diamond Lake Ranger District	Fee increase: \$24/night to \$27/night & \$30/night ¹	Extra vehicle fee decrease: \$6 to \$5
7	Broken Arrow Campground – Single Family Site	Diamond Lake Ranger District	Fee increase: \$11/night to \$15/night & \$20/night ¹	Extra vehicle fee increase: \$4 to \$5
8	Broken Arrow Campground – Multiple Family Site	Diamond Lake Ranger District	Fee increase: \$14/night to \$20/night & \$25/night ¹	Extra vehicle fee increase: \$4 to \$5
9	Broken Arrow Campground – Group J Loop	Diamond Lake Ranger District	Fee increase: \$132/night to \$165/night & \$200/night ¹	-----
10	Broken Arrow Campground – Group K Loop	Diamond Lake Ranger District	Fee increase: \$60/night to \$70/night & \$85/night ¹	-----
11	Broken Arrow Campground – Group M Loop	Diamond Lake Ranger District	Fee increase: \$78/night to \$95/night & \$115/night ¹	-----
12	Broken Arrow Campground – Group N Loop	Diamond Lake Ranger District	Fee increase: \$54/night to \$70/night & \$85/night ¹	-----
13	Thielsen View Campground – Single Family Site	Diamond Lake Ranger District	Fee increase: \$11/night to \$15/night	Extra vehicle fee increase: \$4 to \$5

14	Thielsen View Campground – Multiple Family Site	Diamond Lake Ranger District	Fee increase: \$14/night to \$20/night	Extra vehicle fee increase: \$4 to \$5
15	Poole Creek Campground – Single Family Site	Diamond Lake Ranger District	Fee increase: \$11/night to \$15/night	Extra vehicle fee increase: \$4 to \$5
16	Poole Creek – Multiple Family Site	Diamond Lake Ranger District	Fee increase: \$14/night to \$20/night	Extra vehicle fee increase: \$4 to \$5
17	Poole Creek – Group Site	Diamond Lake Ranger District	Fee increase: \$72/night to \$85/night & \$100 ¹	-----
18	East Lemolo Campground	Diamond Lake Ranger District	Fee increase: \$7/night to \$10/night	Extra vehicle fee increase: \$3 to \$5
19	Bunker Hill Campground	Diamond Lake Ranger District	Fee increase: \$7/night to \$10/night	Extra vehicle fee increase: \$3 to \$5
20	Inlet Campground	Diamond Lake Ranger District	Fee increase: \$7/night to \$10/night	Extra vehicle fee increase: \$3 to \$5
21	Kelsay Valley Camp	Diamond Lake Ranger District	Fee increase: \$7/night to \$10/night	Extra vehicle fee increase: \$3 to \$5
22	Kelsay Valley Horse Camp	Diamond Lake Ranger District	Fee increase: \$7/night to \$10/night	Extra vehicle fee increase: \$3 to \$5
23	Clearwater Falls Campground	Diamond Lake Ranger District	Fee increase: \$7/night to \$10/night	Extra vehicle fee increase: \$3 to \$5
24	Toketee Lake Campground	Diamond Lake Ranger District	Fee increase: \$7/night to \$10/night	Extra vehicle fee increase: \$3 to \$5
25	Toketee Lake Group Campsite – Groups of 30 or less	Diamond Lake Ranger District	Fee increase: \$18/night to \$25/night	-----
26	Toketee Lake Group Campsite – Groups of 31 or more	Diamond Lake Ranger District	Fee increase: \$18/night to \$50/night	-----
27	White Horse Falls Campground	Diamond Lake Ranger District	Fee increase: \$7/night to \$10/night	Extra vehicle fee increase: \$3 to \$5
28	Apple Creek Campground	North Umpqua Ranger District	Fee increase: \$7/night to	Extra vehicle fee increase:

			\$10/night	\$4 to \$5
29	Bogus Creek Campground	North Umpqua Ranger District	Fee increase: \$11/night to \$15/night	Extra vehicle fee increase: \$4 to \$5
30	Boulder Flat Campground	North Umpqua Ranger District	Fee increase: \$8/night to \$10/night	Extra vehicle fee increase: \$4 to \$5
31	Canton Creek Campground	North Umpqua Ranger District	Fee increase: \$8/night to \$10/night	Extra vehicle fee increase: \$4 to \$5
32	Coolwater Campground	North Umpqua Ranger District	Fee increase: \$6/night to \$10/night	Extra vehicle fee increase: \$4 to \$5
33	Eagle Rock Campground	North Umpqua Ranger District	-----	Extra vehicle fee increase: \$4 to \$5
34	Hemlock Lake Campground	North Umpqua Ranger District	Fee increase: \$8/night to \$10/night	Extra vehicle fee increase: \$4 to \$5
35	Hemlock Meadow Campground	North Umpqua Ranger District	Fee increase: \$8/night to \$10/night	Extra vehicle fee increase: \$4 to \$5
36	Horseshoe Bend Campground	North Umpqua Ranger District	Fee increase: \$12/night to \$15/night	Extra vehicle fee increase: \$4 to \$5
37	Horseshoe Bend Group Campsite	North Umpqua Ranger District	Fee increase: \$85/night to \$100/night & \$120/night ¹	-----
38	Island Campground	North Umpqua Ranger District	Fee increase: \$8/night to \$10/night	Extra vehicle fee increase: \$4 to \$5
39	Lake in the Woods Campground	North Umpqua Ranger District	-----	Extra vehicle fee increase: \$4 to \$5
40	Steamboat Falls Campground	North Umpqua Ranger District	Fee increase: \$7/night to \$10/night	Extra vehicle fee increase: \$4 to \$5
41	Steamboat Ball Field Group Campground	North Umpqua Ranger District	Fee increase: \$55/night to \$65/night & \$75/night ¹	-----
42	White Creek Campground	North Umpqua Ranger District	Fee increase: \$6/night to \$10/night	Extra vehicle fee increase: \$4 to \$5

43	Wolf Creek Campground	North Umpqua Ranger District	Fee increase: \$10/night to \$15/night	Extra vehicle fee increase: \$4 to \$5
44	Wolf Creek Group Campsite	North Umpqua Ranger District	Fee increase: \$95/night to \$110/night & \$120/night ¹	-----
45	Boulder Creek Campground	Tiller Ranger District	Fee increase: \$6/night to \$10/night	Extra vehicle fee increase: \$3 to \$5
46	Camp Comfort Campground	Tiller Ranger District	Fee increase: \$6/night to \$10/night	Extra vehicle fee increase: \$3 to \$5
47	Cover Campground	Tiller Ranger District	Fee increase: \$6/night to \$10/night	Extra vehicle fee increase: \$3 to \$5
48	Devil's Flat Campground	Tiller Ranger District	Fee increase: \$6/night to \$10/night	Extra vehicle fee increase: \$3 to \$5
49	Dumont Creek Campground	Tiller Ranger District	Fee increase: \$6/night to \$10/night	Extra vehicle fee increase: \$3 to \$5
50	Threehorn Campground	Tiller Ranger District	Fee increase: \$6/night to \$10/night	Extra vehicle fee increase: \$3 to \$5
51	South Umpqua Falls Campground	Tiller Ranger District	Fee increase: \$6/night to \$10/night	Extra vehicle fee increase: \$3 to \$5

¹The increase in fees would be phased in. Phase 2 would occur in two or more years provided the economy improves.

²Begin charging increased fees in 2011 after improvements to facilities are completed and proposals have been presented once more to the committee for recommendation.

Summary of Presentation:

- Bill Blackwell began the presentation by explaining that the Umpqua National Forest's presentation included both new fees and the raising of fees at campgrounds and recreation rentals. In some cases there would be two phases to the fee increases, because of comments received from the public. The Umpqua was only asking the committee to vote on the initial phases of the fee increases, and would come back to the committee with the second phase of fees at a later time. Fee changes at the forest's four recreation rentals (Acker Rock Lookout, Butler Butte Cabin, Pickett Butte Lookout, and Whisky Camp Guard Station) will be part of this next round of proposals. The forest felt that since they were in the process of overhauling recreation fees across the forest, it was best to present it in whole to the committee. Bill went on to say that the Umpqua National Forest is known for its Wild and Scenic Rivers, waterfalls, and alpine lakes. The Tiller and Cottage Grove Ranger Districts tend to get more local users, while Diamond Lake and North Umpqua Ranger Districts attract visitors from a wider area. Bill stated that the Umpqua proposed a new fee at the Brice

Trailhead because it provides access to the Noonday OHV trail system and the forest would like to apply for grants from the Oregon State OHV Committee, and the revenue from recreation fees would help to fund a matching grant for trail maintenance and improvements. Bill went on to explain that there are other trailheads that access the Brice Creek Trail which are not being proposed as fee sites. The recreation fee revenue from the South Umpqua Falls Day Use Area would be used to hire a temporary summer employee to perform much needed routine maintenance at this very popular site. Bill finished by pointing out that secure school funding would expire in 2012 and is currently being phased out, and the increased recreation fees will backfill for that funding.

Key presentation points:

- Public participation included:
 - Fee proposals were posted onsite at all sites in 2008 and 2009.
 - Fee proposals were published in the Federal Register on June 30, 2009.
 - News releases were issued in November 2009 to local media outlets, interested parties and retirees, as well as elected officials. This resulted in coverage in four newspapers, two television stations, and one radio station.
 - Notices were published on the forest website.
- Results of public participation:
 - In 2008 campers questioned the range of fees but when the rationale behind the range was explained, most of supported the idea.
 - Received three letters concerning the fee increase for Broken Arrow Campground, which resulted in the phased approach to the increase (approx. 73,000 people camped at the three campgrounds on the district).
 - Received eight written comments concerning the Rujada Campground saying the proposed fee was too high; resulted in a decision to propose the lower fee.
 - Received one comment at the Tiller Ranger District asking increases to be kept to a minimum so campers can continue using these campgrounds.
 - Federal Register Notice prompted an email from the President of the Western Slope No Fee Coalition in opposition to the new fees.
 - News release generated six emails and seven phone calls: two in favor of the increases, ten opposed to the increases, and one asking the forest to wait a year for the economy to improve before implementing fees.

Summary of discussion/questions/comments:

- Dennis Oliphant began by asking when the last time a fee increase was implemented. Bill answered the last time fees were raised was in 2005 and it was an increase of \$2 to \$3.
- Kevin Gorman asked about the Rujada Picnic Area, saying that the increase in price seemed quite high, going from \$0 to \$25 and \$50 for the group site. He asked if the average family would still be able to just stop by and have a quick picnic. Bill answered that the site is a picnic area is designed for group events and is available through the reservation service. For example, if a single family wanted to stop at the site and it was vacant, and have a half hour picnic, then they do not have to pay for that. Kevin next turned his attention to the Brice Creek Trailhead, asking what Bill meant by the Noonday OHV trail. Bill explained that they Noonday OHV trail is a popular trail which accommodates Class A through C Off Highway Vehicles. Kevin followed up by asking, on a busy weekend, how much of the use at the

trailhead is OHV and how much is hiker. Bill answered that the Brice Creek Trailhead sees primarily OHV users, while hikers tend to use the other two trailheads which access the trail system.

- Todd Davidson asked about the proximity of the other two trailheads in relation to the Brice Creek Trailhead. Todd continued by asking why the forest was not seeking to implement fees at these two trailheads, and if they had any standard amenities. Bill answered Todd's second question first, saying that they do not have all six required for a standard amenity fee, but they do have some amenities such as bathrooms, trash cans, and parking areas. In response to Todd's first question, Bill said that the first trailhead is about 2 miles away from the middle trailhead, which is about 3-4 miles from the Brice Creek Trailhead.
- Charles Hurliman began his question by first thanking Bill for the comprehensive presentation, asking if the forest had explored the possibility of road fees. Bill answered no, that commercial road fees are only implemented for commercial timber sales. Charles noted that, as a county commissioner, this concerned him because of the cost to counties associated with road maintenance.
- Richard Fahey asked if the revenues from the Brice Creek Trailhead fee would be used to expand the parking area, as it looked from the picture that vehicles were sticking out dangerously onto the road. Bill answered by saying that, unfortunately, the land does not allow for a parking lot expansion, as it is flanked on one side by a deep creek channel, and a wall on the other. Bill continued by saying that they have looked into designating parallel parking areas on the other side of the road to accommodate more vehicles.
- Dennis Oliphant asked if there were any other questions. There were none and Dennis entertained a motion.

John Walker motioned to vote on the fees as presented.

Vote: Unanimous approval (Category 1=3; Category 2=2; Category 3=3)

Note: Elizabeth Lunney abstained from vote because she had missed the majority of the presentation.

Break

2:50 pm

Topic: Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest

3:11 pm

Presenters: Jacqueline Beidl (FS), Mike Rowen (FS), Brenda Yankoviak (FS)

Fee Proposals:

	Site Name	Location	Proposal
New Fee Sites			
1	Long Meadow	Little Naches Drainage Naches Ranger District	New fee: \$5/night
2	Longmire Meadow	Little Naches Drainage Naches Ranger District	New fee: \$5/night
3	Lost Meadow	Little Naches Drainage Naches Ranger District	New fee: \$5/night
4	Ponderosa Camp	Little Naches Drainage Naches Ranger District	New fee: \$5/night

Summary of Presentation:

- Jacqueline Beidl began the Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest's presentation by saying that it had been recommended as early as 2008 that they move ahead with these fees, but the decision has been to wait for improvement in the economy. She continued by explaining that most of the visitors to these sites come from Yakima and the Tri-Cities to the east, and Seattle and Tacoma from the west. The forest received Watershed Recreation Funds in the late 1990's, which were used to improve resource protection throughout this highly popular drainage. All four of the proposed new fee sites provide ready access to an extensive motorized trail system. The forest currently has a pack-it-in, pack-it-out policy at these sites, but heavy use of free dispersed camp areas throughout the drainage are placing a strain on garbage dumpsters at local fee area sites, and litter in dispersed camps has become a chronic problem throughout the area. Currently the forest is incurring \$12,500 in costs each year associated with these areas.

Key Presentation Points:

- Public participation included:
 - Environmental Assessment scoping and public meetings exploring the long term management of recreation sites throughout the Forest (2003-2004).
 - Fee proposals were published in the Federal Register in 2009.
 - Press releases were sent to local newspapers, radio stations, and posted on the forest website in 2009.
 - District low-watt radio announcements in 2009.
 - Letters explaining fee proposals were sent to Elected Officials in 2009.
 - Fee proposals were posted on site in 2009.
- Results of public participation:
 - Public input from the Environmental Assessment process indicated general public support for the fees as long as the revenue were used to maintain facilities or increased law enforcement presence throughout the drainage.
 - Received a total of 15 responses to the 2009 scoping efforts. Nine of the respondents supported the fee and six were opposed.
 - Two of the opposed respondents were hunters who use the site for extended periods during hunting season. This concern is addressed because the fee will only be implemented from late May to early September.
 - Majority of respondents expressed the desire that the sites remain primitive.

Summary of Discussion/Questions/Comments:

- Charles Hurliman began the questioning by asking, with 240 dispersed campsites throughout the drainage how does the Forest provide safety for the public. Jacqueline Beidl answered by saying the Forest used to have four or five ATV rangers, who were funded through Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation (IAOR), but now they are down to one-and-a-half rangers. She continued by saying they are usually out in the field every day in the summer. Charles expressed concern that the extensive OHV use through the area likely resulted in a great deal of Search and Rescues (SAR). Counties usually cover the costs of these activities. Charles continued by asking if the county has ever approached the Forest about a partnership in sharing the cost of SARs. Jacqueline said that the forest works with the county to show matches for SAR funding.

- Kevin Gorman noted that the other campsites throughout the area were not charging a fee, and asked what the long term vision for these sites was. Jacqueline answered that the Forest will likely keep these sites small and primitive, about 1-2 families, and not charge fees for them.
- Dennis Oliphant asked about amenities at these sites, expressing concern that the Forest did not have the required number of amenities to charge a fee. He pointed to Lost Meadow, which had no water or picnic tables and listed “protection barriers” as an amenity, which was not an amenity. Jacqueline Beidl answered that protection barriers are not considered an amenity, and that picnic tables and water were not installed at these sites because the public participation indicated the public did not want those amenities placed there. Jacqueline continued by saying that any revenues left over after maintenance costs are covered will be used for trail maintenance and improvement, not improvements at the sites. Dennis continued by asking if these sites would have the six of nine required amenities. At this point Jocelyn Biro clarified that Recreation Enhancement Act (REA) requires these sites have a majority of the nine amenities, which is five rather than six. Jacqueline answered by saying that the sites did meet the majority requirement and that they were listed on the provided documents. Dennis could not find where these were listed, but Kevin Gorman informed him where they were.
- John Walker asked about the OHV rangers and what authority they have in the area. He asked if they are authorized under the county or the Forest Service. Jacqueline Beidl answered that the Sheriff has rangers who are authorized under the county, and that the forest has Forest Protection Officers. John continued by asking where the funding for trail maintenance currently comes from. Jacqueline answered that the forest receives grants and that a lot of the maintenance is performed by volunteers through different motorized user groups.

Carol Jensen motioned to recommend the fees as presented

Vote: Unanimous approval (Category 1=4; Category 2=2; Category 3=3)

Topic: Final Discussion Time

Leader for group discussion: Dennis Oliphant, Dan Harkenrider

Summary of Discussion/Questions/Comments:

- Dennis Oliphant began the final wrap up by summarizing the recommendations from the meeting, saying that every proposal was recommended, with the caveat that one proposed trailhead fee was withdrawn from the Deschutes National Forest’s proposal.
- Dan Harkenrider thanked everyone for persevering through the experiment that was this committee’s first teleconference meeting. He said that he values the face-to-face interactions of a typical meeting, but that teleconferencing is an option. Dan said that they may consider using video conferencing at some point, but current technology makes this not a very convenient option.
- Dennis Oliphant said that he thinks the teleconference was effective, but when they are face-to-face the interactions seem to foster more academic discussion concerning REA, which he considered to be very helpful. He continued by saying that he would definitely encourage seeing each other face-to-face from time to time. Dennis finished by saying the teleconference seemed to limit the open and healthy discussions that took place in previous meetings.

- Todd Davidson commented that his opinions aligned with Dennis Oliphant's when there are a small number of Forest proposals, but he would never want to see teleconferencing replace all face-to-face meetings. He continued by saying that he thinks the interaction with opponents and proponents to proposed fees is very healthy. Todd thought that the teleconference format afforded the public a greater ability to provide comments and that is something he would like to see more of.
- Richard Fahey echoed the comments from the other committee members, and agreed that he would not like to see the teleconference method employed for every meeting.
- John Walker agreed that for one to three proposals, a teleconference is a good format but that the public may have felt slighted by having to comment over the phone, not being able to comment in person.
- Dennis Oliphant explored the possibility of having the teleconference available during typical meetings to allow for greater access for public comments, and he saw no reason why it is not possible to do both. He really appreciated hearing the public comments because, he reminded the members, the committee represents the public.
- Dan Harkenrider thanked Dennis Oliphant and the other members for their comments. He assured the committee that teleconferencing will not be employed all the time and that we would not consider dropping all the face-to-face meetings. He finished by telling the members of the public who were still on the line that he appreciated all their comments and that we tried to capture them to the best of our ability. The notes will be posted on the website and the public and committee members will be able to review them there.

Meeting adjourned at 1615