



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: July 11, 2008

To: Recreation Resource Advisory Committee Members

Subject: Summary Notes for the June 26-27, 2008
Recreation Resource Advisory Committee Meeting

This memo transmits summary meeting notes from the June 26-27, 2008, Recreation Resource Advisory Committee (R/RAC) meeting held at the Red Lion hotel, Portland, Oregon.

If you have questions related to this material, please contact me at 541-308-1706, or Abbie Jossie at 541-471-6500, or Anne Kennedy at 503-808-2477 (R/RAC Administrative Assistant).

Sincerely,

/s/ Daniel Harkenrider
DANIEL HARKENRIDER
Designated Federal Official
Recreation Resource Advisory Committee

/s/ Abbie Jossie
ABBIE JOSSIE
Ex Officio/BLM Official
Recreation Resource Advisory Committee



Recreation Resource Advisory Committee (R/RAC)
Proposed Agenda for June 26-27, 2008
Red Lion Hotel - 1021 NE Grand- Portland, Oregon

Time	Topics for June 26	Purpose	Presenter
8:15	Welcome/Logistics/Introductions/Participation and opening statements, opportunity for committee questions. Review Committee Purpose and Agenda	Housekeeping Background	Dennis Oliphant Dan Harkenrider (FS) Abbie Jossie (BLM)
9:00	Public Comment	Required	
9:30	Break		
10:00	Rogue River – Siskiyou National Forest	Recommendation	Rogue River Siskiyou NF
11:15	Wallowa-Whitman National Forest	Recommendation	Jocelyn Biro
11:45	Lunch		
12:45	Bureau of Land Management Yaquina Head National Historic Oregon Trail Interpretive Center Yakima River	Recommendation	BLM Salem District Vale District Spokane District
2:00	Break		
2:30	Umatilla National Forest	Recommendation	Umatilla National Forest
3:45	Final Discussion time – summarize recommendations		Dennis Oliphant
4:30	Wrap Up – Critique Schedule Next Meeting		Dennis Oliphant
5:00	Adjourn		

Time	Topics for June 27	Purpose	Presenter
8:15	Welcome/ Continue Fee Proposals/discussion		Dennis Oliphant Dan Harkenrider
9:00	Public Comment	Required	
9:30	Break		
10:00	Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forests	Recommendation	Okanogan-Wenatchee
11:30	Lunch		
12:30	Olympic National Forest	Recommendation	Olympic National Forest

1:45	Break		
2:00	Willamette National Forest	Recommendation	Willamette National Forest
3:15	Break		
3:30	Final discussion Time – summarize recommendations		Dennis Oliphant/all
4:00	Wrap Up -Critique		Dennis Oliphant/ all
4:30	Adjourn		

Attendees

R/RAC members present:	
John W. Vogel	Category 1, Winter Motorized Recreation
Gustav W. Bekker	Category 1, Winter Non-Motorized Recreation
Elizabeth Lunney	Category 1, Summer Non-Motorized Recreation
Robert Hamlyn	Category 2, Motorized, Outfitters/Guides
Dennis Oliphant	Category 2, Non-Motorized, Outfitters/Guides, Chairman
John T. Walker	Category 3, Tribal
Charles Hurliman	Category 3, Local Government
Todd Davidson	Category 3, State Tourism
Federal officials:	
Daniel Harkenrider	Designated Federal Official
Abbie Jossie	Ex Officio/BLM Official
R/RAC members absent:	
Carol Jensen	Category 1, Summer, Motorized Recreation
Frank Bird	Category 1, Hunting and Fishing
Member and alternate resigned	Category 3, Local Environmental
Federal staff:	
Jocelyn Biro	Recreation Fee Coordinator, Forest Service, Region 6
Julie Cox	National R/RAC Coordinator, note taker
Anne Kennedy	PNW R/RAC Administrative Assistant, meeting coordinator
Guests:	
Marlene Orchard	Back Country Horsemen
Roger Cole	Sierra Club
Dave Bybe	Sierra Club
Pete Springer	Oregon Public Broadcasting
Tom Knappenberger	Public Affairs, Forest Service, Region 6
Shandra Terry	Public Affairs, Forest Service, Region 6

Al Matecko	Director, Public Affairs, Forest Service, Region 6
Claire Lavendel	Acting Director, Recreation, Forest Service, Region 6
Marti Marshall	Assistant Director, Recreation, Forest Service, Region 6
Jessica Roosevelt	SCEP Budget Technician, Forest Service, Region 6
Cathi Bailey	Recreation Fee Program Coordinator, BLM, OR/WA
Patty Burel	Public Affairs, Rogue River-Siskiyou National Forests
Traci Meredith	Mary's Peak Resource Area, Salem District, BLM
Wade Judy	Cascades Resource Area, Salem District, BLM

Topic Summaries

Topic: Welcome/Logistics/Introductions/Participation/Opening Statements	0815
Presenters: Dennis Oliphant (Chairperson), Dan Harkenrider (FS), and Abbie Jossie (BLM)	
Summary of Presentation:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Chairperson Dennis Oliphant welcomed everyone and thanked them for coming. He asked for introductions around the room. He then reminded committee members that their task is to make recommendations on fee proposals. ▪ Jocelyn Biro handed out accomplishment report packets and briefing papers on the Baucus Bill. She mentioned the recent oversight hearing, where one of the questions was how the fee revenue is spent. She mentioned that the Pacific Northwest Region has posted this information on the web since 2003. ▪ Dan Harkenrider passed around R/RAC member list for members to correct and write their work addresses if they want hard copy mail sent there. 	
Summary of Discussion:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ John Hurliman asked how road maintenance is addressed in determining costs of maintaining sites, mentioning the recent high levels of snow, which increased costs of sites. He asked that these costs be shown so that people understand the true costs of operating these sites. Dan Harkenrider and Jocelyn Biro mentioned that each forest may or may not have special arrangements to fund snow removal. (Arrangement could be with the State, private interests, etc.) Recreation fees do not pay for these costs as they are significant and would not allow funds to be spent on the sites themselves. 	
Task: The agencies will figure out how to present these costs and share with the R/RAC via e-mail.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Todd Davidson asked which special recreation permits fall under the purview of the R/RAC. Jocelyn Biro listed those under the REA authority, for instance non-commercial permits and one-time recreation events, such as weddings & road races. While outfitter and guide fees are under REA, the R/RAC doesn't make recommendations on them. Other permits not reviewed by R/RACs are ski areas, recreation residences, lodges, etc. 	
Scheduling Next Meeting:	

- October 30 and 31 was scheduled as a tentative date for the next meeting.

Task: If these dates don't work, Dan will send out a message requesting other ideas.

Topic: Public Comment Period

0900

Presenter: Marlene Orchard, Public Lands Chair for Back Country Horsemen

Summary of Presentation:

- Marlene was representing Back Country Horsemen from the states of Oregon and Washington. She stated that the organization wants to maintain access to the backcountry and is not opposed to fees at horse camps if the roads are maintained into sites and other amenities, such as water, remain available.
- Marlene mentioned two instances where this wasn't the case. One was in a campground where heat gets up to 100 degrees and no water was available. Another was at Dosewallips where the roads were not repaired and people couldn't get to sites.
- Marlene also mentioned the good partnership effort occurring on the Willamette National Forest with volunteer coordinator Judy Mitchell where chapters can contract with local ranger districts to work on trails. She would like to see other volunteer training programs similar to the one on the Willamette. She would also like to see volunteers exempted from paying fees while they are doing their volunteer work if they have some sort of contract/agreement in place.
- Marlene appreciated that the agencies are looking at the fee program on a regional rather than a site-by-site basis.
- Marlene submitted two e-mails for the record from Back Country Horsemen members. These e-mails will be shared with R/RAC members.

Topic: Public Comment Period

Presenter: Roger Cole, Sierra Club

Summary of Presentation:

- Roger stated he is opposed to trailhead fees, but generally understands campground fees. He has been hiking since in college and was shocked in 1996 when he was leading a hike and found a fee at a trailhead on the Gifford Pinchot National Forest. He had to drive 15 miles to get a permit. Since then he has written letters and e-mails and made phone calls to Congress. He mentioned that in 2005 there was talk of eliminating fees but then REA came along and just perpetuated it. He mentioned the new effort (Baucus Bill) to repeal fees and hopes they go away.

Topic: Public Comment Period**Presenter:** Dave Bybe, Sierra Club**Summary of Presentation:**

- Dave has also been leading outings for the Sierra club for decades. Fee Demo was shocking to him as he believes that public lands belong to the people and visitors shouldn't have to go through the onerous task of figuring out how the program works. Dave stated that some fees make sense so long as the amenities exist. However, his experience has been that now there may be an outhouse, but no toilet paper and garbage cans are overflowing.
- He stated that there has never been a debate in Congress on this. The legislation was passed "behind closed doors". He also does not like the very concept of an "enhancement" act. When he visits the wilderness, he doesn't want enhancements, he simply wants to park and go. He also stated that if fees must be part of life, then they need to be straightened out. Currently he sees one fee here, one there. He believes on site payment apparatus should be available at sites so visitors don't have to know where fees exist and do a lot of upfront planning.

Summary of Discussion:

- Gus Bekker said that a lot people have your sentiments. What do you think will happen if tomorrow or next year, we eliminate the fees? Do you think there will be more appropriations?
- Dave Bybe stated that he believed Fee Demo was put forth by American Recreation Coalition who, he feels, lobbies Congress to reduce appropriated funding to condition the minds of public so that they must pay. Dave mentioned a few examples of volunteer efforts that could help with costs of facility maintenance such the Pacific Crest Trail Association, the Sierra Club's Adopt-a-Trail program, and Trail Keepers of Oregon. He said that people are willing to give their time for these efforts. He philosophically believes that user fees could expand to other arenas. Also he believes fees discriminate against low income families. Finally Dave mentioned that today's kids are afraid of the woods, and need to more rather than less opportunities to visit.
- Elizabeth Lunney mentioned that she has received some e-mails from a gentleman, who may be coming tomorrow, on Willamette proposal. Dennis Oliphant said there would be a public comment period and/or the e-mails can be shared with the committee at that time.

Topic: FS Rogue River – Siskiyou National Forest**Presenters:** John Borton**Fee Proposals:**

District	Campground	Change	Current Fee	Proposed Fee
High Cascades	Beaver Dam	Increase	\$5/\$2 extra vehicle	\$8/\$3 extra vehicle
High Cascades	Daley Creek	Increase	\$5/\$2 extra vehicle	\$8/\$3 extra vehicle
Gold Beach	Foster Bar	Increase	\$5/\$3 extra vehicle	\$10/\$3 extra vehicle
High Cascades	Imnaha	Increase	\$6/\$3 extra vehicle	\$10/\$3 extra vehicle
Gold Beach	Lobster	Increase	\$6/\$3 extra vehicle	\$10/\$3 extra vehicle
			\$5 (gravel bar)	\$10 (gravel bar)
High Cascades	Lower South Fork	Increase	\$6/\$3 extra vehicle	\$10/\$3 extra vehicle
High Cascades	Mill Creek	Increase	\$6/\$3 extra vehicle	\$8/\$3 extra vehicle
Gold Beach	Miller Bar	Increase	\$5	\$10
High Cascades	Natural Bridge	Increase	\$6/\$3 extra vehicle	\$10/\$3 extra vehicle
Gold Beach	Nook Bar	Increase	\$5	\$10
High Cascades	North Fork	Increase	\$5/\$2 extra vehicle	\$10/\$3 extra vehicle
High Cascades	Parker Meadows	Increase	\$6/\$3 extra vehicle	\$10/\$3 extra vehicle
Gold Beach	Quosatana	Increase	\$10/\$3 extra vehicle	\$15/\$3 extra vehicle
Gold Beach	Redwood Bar	Increase	\$5	\$10
High Cascades	River Bridge	Increase	\$6/\$3 extra vehicle	\$8/\$3 extra vehicle
Gold Beach	South Fork Camps	Increase	\$5	\$10
Wild Rivers	Store Gulch	New	\$0	\$10
District	Cabin	Change	Current Fee	Proposed Fee
High Cascades	Big Elk	New	\$0	\$50
Gold Beach	Lake of the Woods	Increase	\$40	\$50
High Cascades	Lodgepole Guard	New	\$0	\$75
Gold Beach	Ludlum House	Increase	\$40 for 1 st 10 \$3 each up to 60	\$60 for 1 st 10 \$5 ea up to 60
Gold Beach	Packers Cabin	Increase	\$20	\$40
Gold Beach	Snow Camp	Increase	\$30	\$40

Summary of Presentation:

- John began his presentation with a discussion of the importance of public involvement and a description of the high cost of snow removal this past winter. He said most revenue goes towards operations and maintenance and reducing the deferred maintenance.

Key presentation points:

- Recreation enhancement fee proposals were incorporated into Recreation Facility Analysis. Included a major rollout to key stakeholders, a website, and 7 public meetings with 101 participants. Received a total of 38 written responses.
- Results of public participation:
 - Support for fees when services provided at sites where fees collected.
 - Fee increases and new fees generally supported.
 - Increase in FS personnel desired.
 - User fees should be used to increase compliance and reduce vandalism.
 - Use of campground hosts is very successful and increases safety.

Summary of Discussion/Questions/Comments:

- Todd Davidson commented that it was interesting people want to see fee dollars provide more staff with fees. What is this tied to? John Borton replied that it's largely tied to increasing vandalism and reduced safety, which are outcomes of not having appropriate

staffing in the field.

- Gus Bekker wanted to know if the lookout that burned during the Biscuit fire was still in use. John Borton replied that there was a lot of community support for building a new one. It looks like the old one and resembles the era in which the old one was built. It is no longer used as a lookout however. It is a very popular site.
- Elizabeth Lunney commented that it appeared revenue would cover operating expenses with about \$17,000 extra generated. She asked if that money would go towards deferred maintenance. John Borton: Yes – districts make determination how to best use the dollars.
- John Hurliman asked how many people and vehicles it takes to maintain this revenue stream. John Borton said he did not have a specific answer to that as districts use a mix of dollars for people who do a variety of tasks, of which managing the recreation fee program is just one.

Task: John Hurliman requested to see a copy of work plans that show how specific dollars are used.

- John Hurliman commented that the average rate for private campgrounds is \$30. The Forest Service is going up at a much slower and lower rate.
- Gus Bekker asked how many campgrounds on the Rogue River-Siskiyou are concessionaire-run. John Borton mentioned that the forest has two concessionaire operators who run campgrounds in the Union Creek and Siskiyou mountains. He said that most Forest Service managed campgrounds are occupied 20-30% of the time and concessionaires need a higher occupancy rate just to break even. He believes less than 20% of the sites are run by concessionaires.
- Robert Hamlyn asked if the forest is beginning to figure in fuel costs now. John Borton answered yes, we include months of use and amount per mile which factors in fuel and wear and tear on the vehicle. This is adjusted periodically.
- John Vogel asked for a clarification on Lodgepole Guard Station. The executive summary says \$75 but the Forest Summary says \$50. John Borton explained that one is Big Elk Guard Station, one is Lodgepole Guard Station. Lodgepole has toilet/hot water, plus fence and cross fenced area for equestrian use. The forest is proposing \$75.
- Chairperson Dennis Oliphant reminded people of the process on making recommendations. Questions are pre-motion discussion.
- John Hurliman asked how many no-fee sites can be visited. John Borton said RFA identified 30 free sites, all of which have a lower level of amenities.
- Elizabeth Lunney wondered why the area proposal was missing. Jocelyn Biro replied that it was pulled because work was being done and isn't completed, so the proposal will come at a later date.
- John Hurliman said he believed fee proposals are low, but the forest could come back with another increase at a later date when more information is available.

John Hurliman moved to recommend fees as presented. Motion was seconded.

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

Topic: FS Wallowa-Whitman National Forest

Presenter: Jocelyn Biro

Summary of Presentation:

- Jocelyn Biro discussed two cabin rental sites, Christmas Creek and Boundary Guard Station, which are being proposed for an elimination of fees. Even though there are a few users, the occupancy and revenue is not enough to maintain for public use. For example, Christmas Creek has an annual operations and maintenance cost of over \$3000, but only brings in about \$600.

Summary of Discussion:

- The committee deliberated on whether or not they should make a recommendation on a proposal that was essentially an administrative decision to close a site to the public. Administrative reasons to close include lack of use, poor water, lack of ability to make them accessible. The committee stated that should a recommendation occur, then the agency would need to submit another proposal if the situation changed and the site became available again for public.
- Jocelyn Biro mentioned that the forest planned to return the cabins to administrative status. They are also considering partnering with a jet boat club to cover operations and maintenance on Christmas Tree Ranch.
- The committee elected to include language in their by-laws on the elimination of fees so that if the agency needs to close a site permanently or temporarily, the committee does not make a recommendation, which changes the fee authority and requires yet another proposal should the need ability to reopen the site to the public occur.

By-Law Inclusion. The following language was proposed to add to the by-laws:

Elimination of Fees:

- The Recreation RAC will not make recommendations on administrative decisions that result in a permanent or temporary closure of a site or facility. This allows the fee authority for the site or facility to remain in place enabling the agency to reinstate the fee at the same fee level should the site be re-opened. Agencies will, however, share these administrative decisions with the Recreation RAC.

A motion was made and seconded to adopt statement into by-laws.

Vote: Approved unanimously

Topic: BLM Yaquina Head Outstanding Natural Area

Presenter: Brad Keller

Fee Proposal:

	Current	Proposed
Private vehicle (9 passenger maximum)	\$5/3 days	\$7/3 days
Motorcycles	\$2/3 days	\$3/3 days
Private vans (10-20 passenger capacity)	\$20/3 days	\$25/3 days
Commercial vans (10-20 passenger capacity)	\$20 (one time use)	\$25 (one time use)
Commercial bus (21+ passenger capacity)	\$40 (one time use)	\$50 (one time use)
Annual vehicle pass	\$10	\$15
Non-motorized visitors	Free	Free

Topic: Legislative update**Presenter:** Jocelyn Biro**Summary of Presentation:**

While the next presenter was getting set up, Jocelyn Biro mentioned the following recent legislative activity:

- A Bill was introduced by Senator Baucus of Montana to repeal the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act. A hearing for this was scheduled and cancelled. The bill, as it is currently written, would put fee authority back under the Land and Water Conservation Fund. This would still allow the federal land management agencies to charge fees but requires that those fees go back to US Treasury. Difference is that agencies currently retain up to 95% of fees under REA.
- Earlier in June an oversight hearing for both the Departments of Interior and Agriculture occurred where the question of what happens to the agencies if REA were to be repealed was discussed. Lynn Scarlett and Mark Rey testified, as well as a panel of five individuals who do not support fees. Some of the responses were that fees are the ‘life blood’ of agencies. These funds are used to leverage grants/partners and volunteer efforts. The committee also asked questions on how fees are used. Both gave examples on how monies were spent in local areas. No decisions or recommendations came from this hearing.
- Some of the concerns raised were that the agencies don’t have a good way of tracking revenues and there was no opportunity for the public to comment on the legislation itself, even though there were several oversight hearings on the proposed legislation. Jocelyn Biro suggested that Recreation RAC members look at the testimony when it becomes available.

Topic: BLM National Historic Oregon Trail Interpretive Center**Presenter:** Sarah LeCompte**Fee Proposal - Fee increase for existing standard amenity fee**

Per Person	Current	Proposed Apr 1-Oct 31	Proposed Nov 1-Mar 31
Adult	\$5/ 2 days	\$8/2 days	\$5/2 days
Youth (under 16)	Free	Free	Free
Seniors*	\$3.50	\$4.50	\$3.50
Commercial Groups	\$3.50/person	\$5/person	\$5/person
Annual Pass	None	\$25 individual \$45 family	\$25 individual \$45 family
Exterior Visitors	Free	Free	Free
Scheduled educational groups	Free	Free	Free

*Seniors and other holders of Golden or Interagency Passes (Annual, Senior, Access or Volunteer) are admitted free.

Summary of Presentation:

- Sarah LeCompte gave background on the site, where it’s located, users and history of fees. The site was built in the late 1990s as an economic development project. The Oregon Trail is the primary attraction at this site. Since about 2005, approximately ½ of visitors have Interagency passes, so are not charged a fee on site.

Key presentation points:

- Public participation included:

- Direct mail and visitation with partners and local interest groups
- Copy of report to county officials
- Summary of proposal to congressional offices
- General press release
- Public notice posted on site
- Results of public participation:
 - The facility is maintained in good condition, the program level should be maintained
 - You can't do the programs without a fee increase.
 - Had questions on 2-day pass – it is the same as the existing pass and a courtesy to visitors.
 - Questions about Interagency passes & senior decals – people using for free (no fee both)
 - One negative editorial citing double taxation, but no public comment from news articles
 - 2 comments from the on-site postings stating “that’s nothing, it’s well worth it.”

Summary of Discussion:

- Gus Bekker asked why so many people, 52-60%, are not paying fees. Sarah LeCompte and Jocelyn Biro explained that many have the Golden Passports or Interagency Passes and youth are not charged a fee. If passes are sold on site, the site retains the funds, but when people buy passes at other locations, that money doesn't go to all the different facilities where people use the pass. The mechanics of sharing revenue, especially for Forest Service and BLM sites where there is no ‘entrance’ station to count visitor use, is very difficult.
- Todd Davidson asked about multi-agency passes such as the Washington/Oregon pass and the Oregon Coast Pass. Who sets the fee level for that and who brings forward the proposal? Jocelyn Biro stated that theoretically the majority of agencies are federal however the exact process is unknown.

Task

- Jocelyn Biro will research and share an idea for a process on changing fees structure for multi-agency passes.

It was moved and seconded to recommend fees as presented.

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

Topic: BLM Yakima River

Presenter: Diane Priebe

Fee Proposal - No change for existing standard amenity fee, fee increase for existing expanded amenity fees at Umtanum, Lmuma Creek, Big Pines and Roza

Current*	Proposed*
\$5/day, \$10/overnight	\$15 per night
*Holders of Interagency Access and Senior passes receive a 50% discount	

Summary of Presentation:

- Diane Priebe gave background on the site, where it's located, users and history of fees & how revenue will be used. Yakima River Area is very family friendly and has about 120,000 visits a year with use increasing.

Key presentation points:

- Public Participation:
 - Met with County Commissioners
 - News release to local and state-wide newspapers
 - Website posting
 - Posted on site
- Results of Public Participation:
 - Most of the responses were positive because of improvements made in the Yakima River Canyon. No comments were received as a result of newspaper articles. One e-mail that wasn't in favor was received. Most on-site verbal comments were supportive.

Summary of Discussion:

- It was noted that some fee revenues are being used for law enforcement. Was that decision generated by what the agency saw or by visitors? The request came from both law enforcement and visitors to help address gang issues and vandalism. Diane Priebe said they use BLM rangers and some county law enforcement.
- Todd Davidson noted a slide that showed a significant drop in visitation between 1997 and 2000. While Diane Priebe said that reflected a better counting system (earlier reports came from employee and ranger observations) Todd Davidson commented that they needed to be clear on the reason as the drop may look like a result of fees.
- John Hurliman asked about the number of free sites in the area. Diane Priebe said all other sites are free, with the nearest one at the northern end of the canyon. In addition, sites managed by other providers are free. For the campgrounds, fee sites are only in place from May to September.
- After noting that the area has a \$30,000 shortfall, John Hurliman noted that free sites are often subsidized by fee areas. He mentioned that higher fees are appropriate where law enforcement is provided as use then goes up.

It was moved and seconded to recommend fees as presented.

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

Lunch break from 1215 to 1315

Presenter: Larry Randall, Janel Lacey

Fee Proposal:

District	Campground	Change	Current	Proposed
Pomeroy	Tucannon	Increase	\$5	\$8 +\$5 each vehicle over 2
North Fork John Day	Bear Wallow	Increase	\$5	\$8 +\$5 each vehicle over 2 North Fork
North Fork John Day	Frazier	Increase	\$5	\$8 +\$5 each vehicle over 2 (\$20/Group)
North Fork John Day	Lane Creek	Increase	\$5	\$8 +\$5 each vehicle over 2
North Fork John Day	NF John Day	Increase	\$5	\$8 +\$5 each vehicle over 2
North Fork John Day	Olive Lake	Increase	\$5	\$12 +\$5 each vehicle over 2 North Fork
North Fork John Day	Tollbridge	Increase	\$5	\$8 +\$5 each vehicle over 2
North Fork John Day	Welch Creek	Increase	\$5	\$8 +\$5 each vehicle over 2
Walla Walla	Jubilee Lake	Increase	\$15 (+\$5)	\$17 +\$5 each vehicle over 2
Walla Walla	Mottet	Increase	\$5	\$8 +\$5 each vehicle over 2
Walla Walla	Target Meadows	Increase	\$10	\$12 +\$5 each vehicle over 2
Walla Walla	Umatilla Forks	Increase	\$5	\$10 +\$5 each vehicle over 2
Walla Walla	Woodland	Increase	\$10	\$12 +\$5 each vehicle over 2
Walla Walla	Woodward	Increase	\$5	\$8 +\$5 each vehicle over 2
Heppner	Penland Lake	New		\$5 +\$5 each vehicle over 2
Pomeroy	Alder Thicket	New		\$8 +\$5 each vehicle over 2
Pomeroy	Forest Boundary	New		\$8 +\$5 each vehicle over 2
Pomeroy	Godman	New		\$8 +\$5 each vehicle over 2
Pomeroy	Ladybug	New		\$8 +\$5 each vehicle over 2
Pomeroy	Midway	New		\$8 +\$5 each vehicle over 2
Pomeroy	Panjab	New		\$8 +\$5 each vehicle over 2
North Fork John Day	Drift Fence	New		\$8 +\$5 each vehicle over 2
North Fork John Day	Driftwood	New		\$8 +\$5 each vehicle over 2
North Fork John Day	Gold Dredge	New		\$8 +\$5 each vehicle over 2
North Fork John Day	Oriental	New		\$8 +\$5 each vehicle over 2
North Fork John Day	Winom	New		\$8 +\$5 each vehicle over 2

District	Cabin	Change	Current	Proposed
Heppner	Ditch Creek	Increase	\$40	\$50
Heppner	Tamarack	Increase	\$25	\$40
Pomeroy	Clearwater Big House	Increase	\$40	\$60 (May-Sept) \$75 (Oct-Apr)
Pomeroy	Clearwater Lookout	Increase	\$25	\$50
Pomeroy	Godman	Increase	\$40	\$60 (May – Sept) \$75 (Oct – Apr)
Pomeroy	Wenatchee	Increase	\$30	\$50
North Fork John Day	Fremont Congo Gulch	Increase	\$60	\$80
North Fork John Day	Fremont Hilltop Hideaway	Increase	\$30	\$55
North Fork John Day	Fremont Miners Retreat	Increase	\$50	\$65
Walla Walla	Fry Meadows	Increase	\$25	\$40
Walla Walla	Summit	Increase	\$35	\$45
North Fork John Day	Fremont Caretakers	New		\$80
Pomeroy	Tucannon Guard Station	New		\$100

Standard amenity fees proposed at the following trailheads:

Pomeroy RD (8): Elk Flats, Meadow Creek, Panjab, Teepee, Three Forks, Timothy Springs, Tucannon, Twin Buttes.

North Fork John Day RD (4): Big Creek Meadows, Frazier, North Fork John Day, Winom.

Summary of Presentation:

- Larry Randall gave background on the Umatilla National Forest, and the Recreation Facility Analysis process. Currently the forest does not have many fee sites; however the analysis showed that adding fees in key places would enable the forest to continue providing

opportunities in their niche. New fees will not be implemented until August or later.

Key presentation points:

- Public participation was conducted through the RFA analysis process; working on it since 2006:
 - Mailing
 - Press releases
 - Newsletters
 - Forest web site
 - Personal contacts with local and state officials
 - Personal contacts with various clubs such as the Back Country Horsemen of America.
 - Open houses held at 7 locations in August 2007
- Public participation results:
 - Less than 20 written comments.
 - About half support new fees or fee increases as long as facilities and services were maintained or improved. Some liked the approach of the analysis process.
 - Many expressed the importance of retaining fees at the local level.
 - Eight opposed fees with several being opposed to fees in principle, especially at trailheads while others felt facility quality didn't warrant a fee or fees too high.

Summary of Discussion:

- John Hurliman asked about the condition of the roads on the Umatilla. Larry Randall and Janel Lacey said that some were in good condition because of resurfacing projects; however others have pothole problems. They mentioned that about ½ of roads were closed in 1990 and many roads now have lower standards.
- Gus Bekker made the comment that many people don't know about the cabins on the Umatilla and better marketing is needed. Larry Randall mentioned some things that are being done, featuring Umatilla cabins on the R6 website & ads in local papers. An idea of showcasing these at the State Fair was mentioned. In addition it was mentioned that some cabins are used as much in winter as summer.
- John Walker questions the kind of improvement planned given that the Umatilla offers a rustic experience. Janel Lacey commented that picnic tables, as an example, have been shortened to remove rotten legs. They would still look rustic, but they are in need of replacement.
- Elizabeth Lunney asked if the NW Forest Pass would be used for the trailheads proposed. Randall said yes, the Pass applied to all standards amenity fee site. He said they will also have on site payment apparatus for those who do not have a pass. He mentioned that many of these trailheads had fees under fee demo, but were dropped because they did not meet the interpretive requirement.
- Gus Bekker asked why the concessionaire site, Jubilee Lake, is going back to public management. Larry Randall said the original package had 5-6 campgrounds in it, but through attrition, all sites ended up back in public management with the exception of Jubilee Lake. The administrative costs are not worth having only one site under concession.
- Gus Bekker wondered if any campground closures are considered in the Umatilla's 5-year program of work. Larry Randall said that they are not considering closures.
- Elizabeth Lunney asked why the forest is putting a lot of money into facilities maintenance

and not so much into law enforcement. Larry Randall said the increasing crews create a more regular presence, improving some of the issues that require law enforcement. He also mentioned that the Forest would be focusing on education and compliance to help people understand where fees are required.

Elizabeth Lunney moved to recommend fees as presented. Motion was seconded.

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

Topic: FS Okanogan and Wenatchee National Forests

Presenter: Amy Tinderholdt

Fee Proposal:

- Amy Tinderholdt gave background on the Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forests. She presented the proposals in three segments; overnight camping proposals, the Enchantment Permit system and the Echo Ridge Nordic Trails. The committee voted only once at the end.

Overnight camping proposals

Fee Proposals for Rustic Campgrounds

District	Campground	Change	Current	Proposed
Cle Elum	Beverly	Increase	\$5.00	\$8.00
Entiat	Spruce Grove	Increase	\$3.00	\$5.00
Entiat	Three Creeks	Increase	\$3.00	\$5.00
Entiat	Pine Flats	Increase	\$5.00	\$8.00
Methow	Ballard	Increase	\$5.00	\$8.00
Methow	Buck Lake	Increase	\$5.00	\$8.00
Methow	Camp 4	Increase	\$5.00	\$8.00
Methow	Early Winter	Increase	\$5.00	\$8.00
Methow	Falls Creek	Increase	\$5.00	\$8.00
Methow	Flat Camp	Increase	\$5.00	\$8.00
Methow	Foggy Dew	Increase	\$5.00	\$8.00
Methow	Harts Pass	Increase	\$5.00	\$8.00
Methow	Honeymoon	Increase	\$5.00	\$8.00
Methow	J.R.	Increase	\$5.00	\$8.00
Methow	Meadows	Increase	\$5.00	\$8.00
Methow	Mystery Camp	Increase	\$5.00	\$8.00
Methow	Nice	Increase	\$5.00	\$8.00
Methow	River Bend	Increase	\$5.00	\$8.00
Methow	Roads End	Increase	\$5.00	\$8.00
Methow	Ruffed Grouse	Increase	\$5.00	\$8.00
Methow	South Creek	Increase	\$5.00	\$8.00
Methow	War Creek	Increase	\$5.00	\$8.00
Naches	Crow Creek	Increase	\$7.00	\$8.00
Naches	Dog Lake	Increase	\$5.00	\$8.00
Naches	Halfway Flat Dis	Increase	\$5.00	\$8.00
Naches	Indian Creek Rec Area	Increase	\$5.00	\$8.00
Naches	Leech Lake (White Pass)	Increase	\$5.00	\$8.00
Naches	Peninsula	Increase	\$5.00	\$8.00
Naches	South Fork Bay	Increase	\$5.00	\$8.00
Naches	South Fork Tieton	Increase	\$5.00	\$8.00
Naches	Tieton Pond	Increase	\$5.00	\$8.00

Fee Proposals for Higher Development Campgrounds

District	Campground	Change	Current	Proposed
Entiat	Cottonwood	Increase	\$8.00	\$10.00
Entiat	Fox Creek	Increase	\$8.00	\$10.00
Entiat	Lake Creek	Increase	\$8.00	\$10.00
Entiat	North Fork	Increase	\$7.00	\$10.00
Entiat	Silver Falls	Increase	\$9.00	\$12.00
Methow	Blackpine	Increase	\$8.00	\$12.00
Methow	Chewuch	Increase	\$8.00	\$12.00
Methow	Klipchuck	Increase	\$8.00	\$12.00
Methow	Lone Fir	Increase	\$8.00	\$12.00
Methow	Loup Loup	Increase	\$8.00	\$12.00
Methow	Poplar Flat	Increase	\$8.00	\$12.00
Naches	American Forks	Increase	\$7.00	\$10.00
Naches	Kaner Flat	Increase	\$10.00	\$12.00

Fee Proposals for Group Campgrounds & Rental Cabins

District	Group Campground/Cabin	Change	Current	Proposed
Naches	American River Guard Station	Increase	\$40	\$60 (+\$30 holiday fee)
Naches	Clear Lake (Grade Forest) Group	Increase	\$50	\$60
Naches	Indian Flat Group	Increase	\$70	\$100
Naches	Kaner Flat Group	Increase	\$50	\$60
Naches	Pine Needle Group	Increase	\$30	\$50

Summary of Presentation:

- Public participation incorporated 2 years of comments
 - Fee proposals at each sites
 - Posted on website
 - Press releases and feature article in local papers
 - Briefing of federal legislator and county commissioners
- Public Participation Results
 - Verbal comment were generally understanding
 - 36 written comments
 - ½ opposed to fees in general
 - 3 stated that increases would affect their ability to afford sites
 - Remaining written comments were understanding of fees

Summary of Discussion:

- Gus Bekker asked why the forest was proposing an extra \$30 during holidays. Amy Tinderholdt responded that this is a busy time when the Forests are stretched for personnel and this helps to cover those costs.
- Gus Bekker asked if the Forest Service is getting into the hotel business. Jocelyn Biro shared that the Forest Service has a lot of historic lookouts and guard stations. Cabin rentals give the agency the opportunity to preserve and protect these historic resources. The intent is not to make money, but to try and keep these historic resources and keep them safe. They are “white hat” projects, which are actually priced quite low.
- Gus Bekker mentioned that the Forest Service should generate enough money to maintain the rentals and John Hurliman mentioned that other costs like road maintenance to the rentals are not counted.
- John Vogel asked if any of the money is going toward staffing. Amy Tinderholdt replied that some recreation fee money is used for things like camp hosts at all sites.

Enchantment Permit System

Fee Proposal for Enchantment Permit system-- Increase from \$3 per person to \$5 per person

- Amy Tinderholdt gave background on the Enchantments. The public comment efforts generated two written letters. One supported the fee increase, and suggested a lower price for children. The other supported the permit system, and suggested increasing the number of permits. Fee revenue will help with the permit administration system.

Questions/Discussion

- Gus Bekker asked how many people are in the Enchantments at one time. Amy Tinderholdt said there are 20 overnight visitors per night, but this does not count day users. She estimated about 150 people are in the Enchantments each day. Increased revenue would help with permit administration system.
- John Hurliman asked if any money pays for Search & Rescue. He said that with Secure Rural School funding going away, Search & Rescue will suffer. There is an expectation that this 'service' will happen. Amy Tinderholdt acknowledged that recreation fee program funds are not used for Search & Rescue.

Echo Ridge Nordic Trails

Fee Proposal for Echo Ridge Nordic Trails – Increase from \$5 day/\$40 season pass to \$10 day/\$70 season pass

- Amy Tinderholdt mentioned that the area received a lot of improvements in 2005/2006 and the revenue would enable increased grooming. Public participation results included 23 positive on-site comments; 8 comments from people who understood the need, but would have preferred a smaller fee increase, or discount for locals; and one written letter supporting the proposal.

Questions/Discussion

- John Vogel wanted to know who does the grooming; Amy Tinderholdt said Lake Chelan Ski Club has a contract.
- Dennis Oliphant questioned whether the comparables to other sites were accurate given that extra grooming occurs elsewhere. Amy Tinderholdt said that the fee increase would improve the grooming.
- Elizabeth Lunney opened a discussion on why the Forest Service charges children for Special Recreation Permits. With the need to get more kids in the woods, this seems prohibitive. Dan Harkenrider and Abbie Jossie mentioned that limited entry areas charge for the person because only so many are able to be in at one time regardless of age. These kinds of permits are different from places that don't limit numbers.
- John Hurliman mentioned that people who do pay would have to pay more to cover the cost of those who don't.
- Elizabeth Lunney noted that both the Enchantments and Echo Ridge proposals are permits,

yet one charges for children and one doesn't. She said there should be some consistency given the need to get kids into the woods. Dan Harkenrider mentioned that the Forest Service does have numerous programs to get kids in the woods. Many are targeted at younger kids to get exposure to the wildland experience and more comfortable in that setting.

- Elizabeth Lunney asked that the forest consider waiving fees for children in the Enchantments.

Task: Amy Tinderholdt will share this suggestion with the district.

- Dennis Oliphant mentioned that he's hearing more and more that seniors are getting discount rates, yet they are a class of people who have the money. (i.e., students don't have money). He asked where in the fee structure are those decisions made and is this really fair? Jocelyn Biro noted that the language in REA says that seniors will continue receiving the benefits that they had with the Golden Passports.

Gus Bekker moved to recommend fees as presented. Motion was seconded.

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

Topic: Summarize and Wrap-up Day 1	1515
Leader for group discussion: Dennis Oliphant	
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Elizabeth Lunney passed around copies of an e-mail from Mr. Doug Quirke that described some concerns with the Indian Ridge lookout proposal.• Several comments were made on the proposal process:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Appreciate the hard work and presentations.○ Appreciate the planning, the many pages of information made available to the public.○ Fee increases represent a fee structure that has not been changed in a long period of time. They are fair.○ Members had a lot of time to digest the proposals, the process is well managed.○ Agencies are following through on Recreation RAC suggestions. A level of trust is building.○ The template is helpful. It's a format that members expect and makes it easier to process all the information.○ Presentations are getting better, especially the ones that wove the fee changes into a 5-year plan.• Gus Bekker expressed concern about missing members and the difficulty of getting a quorum to the meeting. Dan Harkenrider said he would get information about the next meeting out in about a month and use some tools such as Doodle or Survey Monkey if needed. Dan Harkenrider also noted that it would be possible to hold a meeting without a 'voting quorum' (a majority in each category present). Presentations could be heard and voting could occur on a meeting via conference call.	
Adjourn for the first day, Thursday, June 26, 2008	1545

Topic: Welcome for second day, Friday, June 27, 2008

0815

Presenters: Dennis Oliphant (Chairperson), Dan Harkenrider (FS), and Abbie Jossie (BLM)

Summary of Discussion/Questions/Comments:

- Dennis Oliphant opened the meeting asking if having proposals on the PNW Recreation RAC website works for everyone, or if anyone needed them printed and sent out. Members agreed the website works and would inform Dan Harkenrider if they couldn't get to them for some reason.

Topic: FS Olympic National Forest

0830

Presenters: Brad Paul

Fee proposals

District	Campground	Change	Current	Proposed
Hood Canal	Big Creek	Increase	\$10.00	\$14.00
Hood Canal	Brown Creek	Increase	\$10.00	\$14.00
Hood Canal	Hamma Hamma	Increase	\$10.00	\$14.00
Hood Canal	Lena Creek	Increase	\$10.00	\$14.00
Hood Canal	Collins	Increase	\$10.00	\$14.00
Hood Canal	Dungeness Forks	Increase	\$10.00	\$14.00
Pacific	Klahanie	Increase	\$5.00	\$10.00

District	Campground	Fee Type	Current Fee	Proposed Fee
Hood Canal	Coho	Increase	\$12.00	\$18.00 (Now concessionaire)
Hood Canal	Seal Rock	Increase	\$12.00	\$18.00
Pacific	Klahowya	Increase	\$12.00	\$18.00

District	Cabin	Fee Type	Current Fee	Proposed Fee
Hood Canal	Hamma Hamma	Increase	\$40.00	\$60.00
Hood Canal	Interrorem	Increase	\$30.00	\$50.00
Hood Canal	Louella	Increase	\$40.00	\$60.00

Summary of Presentation:

- Paul gave background on the Olympic National Forest, the recreation fee program and RFA, mentioning that there are four 'cornerstone' campgrounds (one is in concessionaire) that are proposed for fee increases.

Key Presentation Points

- Public Participation Results
 - Received very little feedback
 - Site specific comments concerned Klahowya campground, expressing that it remain affordable
 - General sentiment was that affordable local camping is essential in the current economy
 - Some support if fees result in consistent or improved services

Summary of Discussion/Questions/Comments:

- John Vogel asked why the deferred maintenance is so high at Coho Campground. Brad Paul said the cost reflects the water system, paved roads and site damage. Jocelyn Biro mentioned that water systems are the most expensive part of the budget. Most were constructed 30 years ago and are at a place now where managers are considering either removing potable water or making expensive investments.
- Elizabeth Lunney asked how many sites had water available. Brad Paul said the cornerstone sites have water, but most of the rest don't.
- Todd Davidson asked if the proposed fee increases will generate \$59,000 annually. Paul said that's what they expect.
- John Walker asked if Coho Campground is off the proposal list because it is now under concessionaire and asked, in general, if concessionaires price campgrounds to keep them competitive.
- Gus Bekker also asked what the Recreation RAC role was with regard to concessionaire-run sites.
- Jocelyn Biro gave some history on the concessionaire program, saying, that prior to fee retention authority, agencies were allowed to charge fees under the Land and Water Conservation Fund; however those funds were returned to the US Treasury. Then the Granger-Thye Act enabled agencies to offer sites under concessionaires. Concessionaires bid competitively on a package, which includes operations and maintenance, and the government gets a certain percentage back, which goes to US Treasury. The federal agency is still the landlord, and must provide the "big-ticket" items.
- Fees for concessionaire managed facilities are not under the Recreation Enhancement Act and are negotiated with the forest (forest supervisor or district ranger). Some people have concerns about concessionaires asking questions like 'who sets the prices and are they comparable to the prices set by the Forest Service?' Concessionaires put in 5 year proposals. Typically proposals show no change the first year and show slight increases throughout the 5-year timeframe.
- When agencies operate sites, they are often 'at a loss' with appropriations and other funding making up some of the difference. As a private a business, concessionaires won't bid unless they see some profit. Concessionaires who fall short default on their permit and asked to be released.
- Another comment sometimes heard is that the agencies are privatizing and commercializing recreation facilities. We are more interested in cost effectiveness. The ultimate goal is to decide who can best operate the facility and provide the best service to the public.
- Dan Harkenrider added a forest perspective saying that on the Mt. Baker-Snoqualmie National Forest, the capacity to operate the campgrounds was low. The concessionaire process allows the forest to maintain those sites at a higher standard. In addition, sites need to be profitable to the concessionaire, so often the most popular campgrounds go concessionaire so the Forest Service can maintain the more marginal campgrounds that have value for a different reason. It is a business decision, but also for public service.
- John Vogel stated that if the money doesn't go back into campground, but back to treasury, this is a disadvantage. Jocelyn Biro responded that that is true, but concessionaires can do 'fee offset', work in lieu of fee payment.

John Hurliman moved to recommend fees as presented. Motion was seconded.

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

Topic: Public Comment Period

0900

Presenter: Marlene Orchard, Public lands chair for Back Country Horsemen

Summary of Presentation:

- Marlene shared a three-minute DVD highlighting accomplishments of the Back Country Horsemen.

Topic: FS Willamette National Forest

0915

Presenter: Stacey Smith

Fee Proposals -- Increases

Cabin/Lookout	District	Current	Proposed
Indian Ridge Lookout	McKenzie River	\$40	\$55/night
Warner Mountain Lookout	Middle Fork	\$40	\$65/night
Timpanogas Shelter	Middle Fork	\$40	\$50/night
Fish Lake-Commissary Cabin	McKenzie River	\$40	\$75/night
Fish Lake-Remount Depot	McKenzie River	\$60	\$80/night
Box Canyon Guard Station	McKenzie River	\$40	\$60/night

Fee Proposals – New Fees

Three Pools Day Use	Detroit		\$5/daily
Piety Island Campground	Detroit		\$10/night; \$20/multiple unit
Lost Lake Campground	McKenzie River		\$8/night; \$4 extra vehicle fee

Summary of Presentation:

- Stacey Smith gave an overall presentation of the Willamette National Forest and the fee proposals. She mentioned a Recreation Lodging Feasibility Study completed on the forest that recommended these rentals be self-sustaining at some point. This is more enabled by using one pot of money for these sites so that if a repair needs to be made those funds are available.

Key Presentation Points

- Public Participation
 - Postings on site
 - Briefings with federal legislators
 - Legal notices
 - Several press articles
 - Three Pools also had public participation through the project environmental analysis and was brought before the Opal Creek Advisory Council.
- Public Participation Results
 - 12 written comments
 - Most public comments were in support of the proposals
 - The Opal Creek Advisory Council advised that the Three Pools proposal move forward.
 - 3 comments were not supportive of fees in general.

Summary of Discussion:

- John Hurliman noted that Stacey Smith mentioned the hazard tree program and said that is a hidden cost. Stacey Smith said that each year the agencies must assess, using trained experts, where people are exposed to hazards at every site. If a hazard tree is found, it is cut. Sometimes this can be used firewood, sometimes salvage (but often not and this is the only time costs can be recovered), sometimes used in streams for fish enhancement, but most often left on the ground.
- Elizabeth Lunney mentioned the e-mail sent by Mr. Quirke, which largely concerned not receiving a timely response from the Forest Service. He mentions trying to comment on the Forest's website, contacting the Forest Service and waiting two months for a response.
- This led into a lengthy discussion on the role of the Recreation RAC with regard to general public support and how this is determined. Agency members (Dan Harkenrider, Jocelyn Biro, and Julie Cox) commented on the importance of public participation. Agency members also said that short of conducting scientifically valid surveys, identifying whether a specific proposal does or does not have general public support is an almost impossible task; therefore the best that the agencies can do is to provide public participation opportunities commensurate with the proposals and address any concerns that may arise. It was also noted that while some people do provide comments in support of fee changes, the agencies do not solicit those comments to show general public support in the same way that they do not solicit comments showing lack of support for proposals. Instead, agencies share fee proposals in both broad ways (newspapers and websites) and with targeted partners, volunteers and user groups to give people opportunities to 'weigh in' on the proposals. The role of the Recreation RAC is to assess the context of the proposal, the benefits to the public and public participation efforts and make a recommendation based on this assessment.
- Elizabeth Lunney asked about the liability of the Recreation RAC members. Julie Cox mentioned that the Recreation RAC provides a recommendation, but the decision authority lies with the agency and any concerns or issues that the public may have with those decisions are directed towards the agency.
- Elizabeth Lunney reiterated the need to fully understand the public's concerns.

Task: Look at original response to Mr. Quirke and see if, substantively, there's anything the Forest Service can do to ensure he is more satisfied.

- Another member mentioned the importance of documenting the efforts of volunteer groups.

Task: Share how partnerships/volunteers fit into the long term strategy to support sites up for proposal.

- Stacey Smith also gave an update from the last meeting on Harralson Horse Camp. She stated that they are working with the horse group and are not pursuing a fee change at this time.

Dennis Oliphant moved to recommend fees as presented. Motion was seconded.

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

Topic: Summarize and Wrap-up Meeting	
Leader for group discussion: Dennis Oliphant	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Members informed the agency to be as transparent as possible with public participation. Several also commented that they are comfortable with all the recommendations made. <p>Elizabeth Lunney moved to adjourn. It was seconded and passed unanimously.</p> <p>Next meeting is currently scheduled for October 30 and 31, 2008.</p>	
Adjourn the meeting, Friday, June 27, 2008	1025

Tasks from June 26/27 Recreation RAC Meeting

Task	Who
Will identify costs of road maintenance and share with RRAC via e-mail. This is not identifying actual costs, but identifying types of costs associated with each proposal	Harkenrider & Jossie
Send out reminder of next meeting and possible other dates if the current date does not work.	Harkenrider
John Borton said he would share a copy of work plans to show how specific dollars are used in response to Charles question about how many vehicles and people it takes to implement the recreation fee program.	John Borton (only show for RR-Sis at this time)
Incorporate elimination of fee statement into by-laws and ensure all members have new copy of by-laws.	Kennedy/Biro
Provide information as to why motorcycles have to pay a lower price given that they take the same amount of parking at Yaquina Head.	Keller/Jossie
Research and share an idea for a process on changing fees structure for multi-agency passes.	Biro
Share the suggestion of dropping fees for children in the Enchantments with the Okanogan-Wenatchee. Report back.	Tinderholdt
Look at original response and see if substantively there's anything the Forest Service can do to ensure Mr. Quirke is more satisfied.	Pavoni/Smith
Share how partnerships/volunteers fit into the long term strategy to support these sites up for proposal.	Biro