

**Pacific Northwest
Recreation Resources Advisory Committee
Agenda for January 30, 2009**

**Marriott Residence Inn – Lloyd Center - Portland, Oregon
1710 NE Multnomah Street**

Time	Topics	Purpose	Presenter
8:15	Welcome /Logistics/Introductions/Participation and opening statements, opportunity for committee questions. Review Committee Purpose and Agenda	Housekeeping Background	Mary Wagner (FS, Regional Forester Dennis Oliphant (Chair) Dan Harkenrider (FS, DFO) Cindy Enstrom (BLM)
9:00	Review of Fee Program and Highlights	Discussion	Jocelyn Biro Dan Harkenrider
9:45	Break		
10:00	Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forests	Recommendation	Okanogan-Wenatchee
10:30	Public Comment	Required	
11:00	Fremont-Winema National Forests	Recommendation	Fremont-Winema NFs
11:30	Lunch		
12:30	Deschutes National Forest/ Ochoco National Forest	Recommendation	Deschutes National Forest Ochoco National Forest
1:00	Siuslaw National Forest	Recommendation	Siuslaw National Forest
2:00	Break		
2:30	Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area	Recommendation	Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area
3:00	Willamette National Forest	Recommendation	Willamette National Forest
3:30	Rogue River-Siskiyou NF (Time Permitting)	Recommendation	Rogue River-Siskiyou NF
4:00	Final Discussion time – summarize recommendations		Dennis Oliphant
4:30	Wrap Up – Critique Schedule Next Meeting		Dennis Oliphant
5:00	Adjourn		

Attendees:

R/RAC members present:		
	John W. Vogel	Category 1, Winter Motorized Recreation
	Elizabeth Lunney	Category 1, Summer Non-Motorized Recreation
	Richard Fahey	Category 1, Hunting and Fishing
	Dennis Oliphant	Category 2, Non-Motorized, Outfitter/Guide, Chairman
	Kevin Gorman	Category 2, Local Environmental
	Todd Davidson	Category 3, State Tourism
	John Walker	Category 3, Tribal
	Charles Hurliman	Category 3, Local Government
R/RAC members via phone:		
	Carol Jensen	Category 1, Summer Motorized Recreation
Federal officials:		
	Daniel Harkenrider	Designated Federal Official
	Cindy Enstrom	Ex Officio BLM Representative
R/RAC members absent:		
	Gustav Bekker	Category 1, Winter Non-Motorized Recreation
	Robert Hamlyn	Category 2, Motorized, Outfitter/Guide
Federal staff:		
	Jocelyn Biro	Recreation Fee Coordinator, Forest Service, R6
	Julie Cox	National R/RAC Coordinator
	Anne Kennedy	PNW R/RAC Administrative Assistant, meeting coordinator
	Kathy Mitchell	Note taker
Guests present:		
	Marilyn Orchard	Back Country Horsemen
	Kitty Benzar	Western Slope No Fee Coalition
	Mary Ellen Barilotti	Hood River
	Jim Anderson	Back Country Horsemen of Washington
	Gary Collins	Back Country Horsemen of Washington
	Claire Lavendel	Director, Recreation, Forest Service, R6
	Shandra Terry	Public Affairs, Forest Service, R6
	Marti Marshall	Assistant Director, Recreation, Forest Service, R6
	Mary Wagner	Regional Forester, Forest Service, R6
	Tom Knappenberger	Public Affairs, Forest Service, R6
	Al Matecko	Director, Public Affairs, Forest Service, R6
	Nate Lewis	Siuslaw National Forest, Forest Service, R6
	Sandy Ratliff	Willamette National Forest, Forest Service, R6
	Glen Sachet	Public Affairs, Forest Service, R6
	Rich Kehr	Winema National Forest, Forest Service, R6
	John Borton	Siskiyou National Forest, Forest Service, R6
	Les Moscoso	Deschutes National Forest, Forest Service, R6
	Barb Smith	Ochoco National Forest, Forest Service, R6
	Wade Judy	Cascades Resource Area, Salem District, BLM
	Stan Hinatsu	Columbia River Gorge NSA, Forest Service, R6

Edan Lira	Columbia River Gorge NSA, Forest Service, R6
Chris Knauf	BLM State Office Representative

Topic Summaries:

Topic: Welcome/Logistics/Introductions/Participation/Opening Statements	0815
Presenters: Mary Wagner (FS, Regional Forester), Dennis Oliphant (Chair), Dan Harkenrider (FS), Cindy Enstrom (BLM)	
Summary of Presentation:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chairperson Dennis Oliphant welcomed everyone and thanked them for coming. He then asked the committee members to introduce themselves and state the constituent group they represent. Additionally, all others in attendance were asked to introduce themselves and state the organization they were affiliated with. • After the introductions, Mary Wagner and Cindy Enstrom welcomed everyone in attendance and thanked the committee members for their work. Their service to the Forest Service (FS) and Bureau of Land Management (BLM) is integral to the fee programs and greatly appreciated. • New appointee, Kevin Gorman (Category 2, Local Environmental) was welcomed. Congratulations were extended to Charles Hurliman, Todd Davidson, Gustav Bekker and Elizabeth Lunney on their re-appointments. Richard Fahey, who was previously an alternate (Category 1, Hunting and Fishing) was welcomed as a primary committee member. All members were requested to gather at the first break for a group photo. 	
Summary of Discussion:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dan Harkenrider reminded everyone of the purpose of Recreation Resource Advisory Committees (RRAC): to review submitted fee change proposals and determine if the agencies have performed the appropriate tasks in good faith as required by law. It is not the duty of the committee to debate the merits of the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act (REA). • Jocelyn Biro told everyone that there had been an amendment to the bylaws and asked the committee members to please pick up the new copies. • Dennis Oliphant asked if there were any general questions. Elizabeth Lunney said she would like to address as a group some of the emails that the committee members had received recently. Dan Harkenrider replied that would be part of the discussion associated with the next agenda item. 	
Carol Jensen joined the meeting via speaker phone.	
It was noted that the meeting was ahead of schedule, but since the topic had been brought up, it was fitting to transition to the next agenda item.	

Topic: Review of Fee Program and Highlights	0845
Presenters: Jocelyn Biro (FS), Dan Harkenrider (FS)	
Summary of Presentation:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jocelyn Biro handed out copies of R6's Forest Accomplishment Reports for the past few years as they had been requested by the committee. She added that the 2008 report will be available soon. • Dan Harkenrider initiated the discussion of Region 6's Fee Program Review and response to No Fee Coalition's report. He said that it was important to focus on how the program being is being managed in this particular region. He reiterated that the role of the committee is not to look at the 	

specifics of REA interpretation on an agency level, but rather to ensure that the agencies have done what is required by the law. He apologized to the No Fee Coalition for the terminology used in an earlier version of the agenda; the intention was not to denigrate their organization or work.

- Dan Harkenrider continued by saying that the agencies in R6 do their best to publicize any proposed fee changes: information is posted at the specific sites and on recreation websites, user groups are informed and worked with closely, notices are placed in newspapers, and local government agencies are contacted. He reminded everyone that the committee has had similar discussions surrounding the question of adequate and appropriate public engagement and involvement. When there is not much response from the public, general counsel says that may demonstrate that there is no strong opposition to the proposal or plan. The presenters will summarize how they conducted public outreach and the results they received for each proposal. In cases where a proposal receives 10 negative responses, closer examination of the opposition would certainly be in order.
- Jocelyn Biro commented that the public is overloaded with the many projects they have been asked to provide comments. Except for the die-hard souls, it is difficult to get the optimum level of involvement. Still, it is important to be transparent with our process, that is, to display the methods of public outreach and their results. She asked the committee if there was a specific question or area of concern associated with public outreach.
- Elizabeth Lunney asked if broader visitor surveys have been done, research that is not site specific. Dan Harkenrider pointed to the Forest Service's ongoing nation-wide survey: National Visitor Use Monitoring (NVUM). This survey is conducted every 5 years on a unit, throughout an entire year, and in a variety of settings. The agency looks at those results and gets a general sense of visitation figures as well as public sentiment about sites or fees. Elizabeth Lunney asked if that survey had a question about fees. Jocelyn Biro replied that there was and it is relatively new. Elizabeth wondered what was the public's general feeling about fees. Dan Harkenrider responded that there is a high percentage of visitor satisfaction reported. Jocelyn Biro added that in this region specifically there is a high level of satisfaction.
- Charles Hurliman commented that fees are always a problem; even at places like the KOA they elicit a negative response from visitors. The Forest Service has had to look elsewhere for revenue to maintain programs. If taxpayer dollars are going to subsidize the general public's recreational experience, he would like to see it go to young families at places like trailheads and day use areas. Campground users should pay for services. He also offered his opinion that in most cases, the agencies are not charging enough.
- Kevin Gorman commented that he was still working on getting all the background of the fee program and the role of the RRAC. He commented that there are places where the agencies could improve their public outreach. He pointed to the collaborative relationship his organization (Friends of the Columbia River Gorge) has with the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area (CRGNSA). He agrees that the agencies are following the letter of the law (REA) but questioned if they truly were following the intent. He cited the procedure of posting fee proposals in the Federal Register and that typically the general visitors are not going to go to the Federal Register to find out that sort of information. It is important and it is the duty of the agencies to work with the public and there should always be more of a push to increase public involvement.
- Charles Hurliman commented that it may be helpful to look at the meeting notes from the very first meeting of the PNW RRAC and review that discussion concerning public involvement.
- Kevin Gorman replied that his organization did not receive any notification of this meeting nor could they find information on the Forest Service websites concerning it. He knows that there are

mailing lists and infrastructure in place to get information out.

- Dennis Oliphant asked if there was a way that the agencies could get information out in a balanced way. There are very broad interests groups, with some constituent groups being more organized than others. Depending on the manner in which the information was disseminated there may be the possibility of being biased. Different people have different preferences for receiving information. Press releases through a variety of media such as printed, radio, closed circuit, and electronic are all options.
- Elizabeth Lunney wanted to bring up two points: 1) reaching the public through newspapers is good, but communication channels are changing (especially with younger groups), there is the need to think beyond the newspaper; and 2) the Forest Service should consider the scope of the fee change and understand that different situations require different handling. The Forest Service should be especially careful about new fees and tailor the amount of public outreach appropriately. Charles Hurliman added that the agencies need to let the public know the reason behind fee changes or site availability changes, especially in cases of site closures. It may be assumed that the public understands why a fee is being increased or a site is being closed when they do not. He echoed Dennis Oliphant concern about potential problems of being fair with the dissemination of information through emails.
- Dan Harkenrider responded that the agencies are truly interested in getting public comments and suggestions as shown by the efforts made by the forests. Some have gone beyond the minimum outreach required. He gave the example of the Recreation Facility Analysis (RFA) and the public outreach and involvement required by that process. He continued by saying that RFA process put campgrounds in three general categories. Typically the high-end campgrounds that make money are the ones that the concessionaires have interest. The campgrounds at the next level are the ones that the fee program touches. Those at the lower end of development do not bring in the money they need to cover operations and maintenance costs but still need to be managed appropriately to ensure public health and safety and resource protection. Dan Harkenrider concluded by agreeing with Kevin Gorman that CRGNSA proposals should have been posted on the website. He added that postings on the bulletin boards at the sites seem to be working well.
- Dennis Oliphant shared that he had received correspondence discussing R1 postponing fee changes due to the economic situation. It is projected that there will be a 30% decrease in hotel stays this coming next year. The private sector is doing everything it can to get people to go out and use hotels, go on vacation. Raising fees during times like these demands close scrutiny. Dan Harkenrider responded to Dennis Oliphant by saying that there is a difference in raising a campground fee from \$8 – 10 and a hotel having a special promotion to cut room rates in half. Ultimately the Regional Forester has three options in association with the fee recommendations given to her by the RRAC: she can accept, reject, or postpone their implementation.
- Jocelyn Biro returned to Elizabeth Lunney's question about general satisfaction with the fee program and pointed out a national survey in the RRAC Notebook that indicates people typically are supportive of fees when they see a benefit of those fees - the amenities and services that are offered. However, there is unseen work associated with maintaining a site to a certain standard, for instance, hazard tree and graffiti removal. This work occurs, but is not visible to the public.
- Elizabeth Lunney asked about the status of (High Impact Recreation Areas) HIRAs. Jocelyn Biro replied that under the REA an area fee is allowable. For the purposes of implementation the agency delineated special areas called "HIRAs" (High Impact Recreation Areas). Perhaps this is a bad term as typically the fee is only charged at developed sites within a designated area. Region 6 has made the decision to review how area fees have been implemented. Perhaps within the established HIRAs there are smaller complexes that provide all the amenities. This review may

result in a size reduction for some HIRAs or a change in management or fees related to these sites. Adding an amenity simply so monies could be collected would not be appropriate. She cited the Deschutes as an example: there are sites without garbage collection and at this time adding that service does not make sense. Sites such as those may fall out of the fee program.

Dennis Oliphant asked if there was any more discussion. Since there was not. It was noted that we were ahead of schedule. Two options were put forth: take a break or begin public comment period. It was decided to start the public comment period. Dennis Oliphant thanked the public for coming especially due to the weather.

Topic: Public Comment Period

0913

Presenters: Kitty Benzar, Western Slope No Fee Coalition

Summary of Presentation:

- Kitty Benzar handed out copies of a collection of documents related to fee information, costs and visitor use to committee members. She stated she felt the need to come and address the group because of one agenda item's title, in particular, the use of the word "mythbuster." She flew in from Colorado and had she known there was an opportunity to participate via telephone she would have taken that option. She asked if the 3 minute time limit would be enforced. Dennis Oliphant said she could have 5 – 6 minutes.
- Kitty Benzar continued by pointing out that RRAC committee meetings are held on weekdays and a member of the public would have to be extremely dedicated to take time off of work or out of a busy day to attend. She suggested that meetings be held nights and weekends and at different places so more people would have the opportunity to attend. The public needs to be involved in the process, but the effort required is so great that the public has tuned out the process in some cases.
- Kitty Benzar stated her chief criticism of the Recreation Facility Analysis process was that it did not engage the public in a meaningful way. The public has not really been involved in decisions affecting recreation sites and changes to how they are managed. She asserted that visitation is down across the national about 17% based on NVUM data, with the biggest drop occurring in R6 (20%). She thinks that if the public does not use public lands, they will not continue to support the costs associated with them. The agencies should be seeking to increase visitation or maintaining it at its present level. Kitty Benzar continued by responding to information presented earlier about visitation studies. She said that Mr. Cordell's study didn't include FS, but was focused on the Park Service. There have been two studies in the FS: one on the west coast and one on the east coast. Those studies show that even a small fee deters 30% of visitors and 50% of low income people.
- Kitty Benzar pointed out and commented on specific topics in the handout.
- She stated that the use of HIRAs as a way to collect monies under REA is questionable and that the RRACs need to examine that situation closely, making sure those fee proposals are implemented in accordance with REA.
- She said that Congress has been told that RRACs are the firewall between public and the fees.

Questions:

- Charles Hurliman stated that each person needs to pay their fair share when they use National Forests. He does not think he or anyone else should have to subsidize use in places they do not use. Kitty Benzar replied that everyone pays Federal tax and, in part, it is to support

governmental functions. She wanted to make two points in regards to this: 1) fees to access and use public lands has not been debated in Congress as stand alone legislation and it should be, and 2) there exists a concept of “public good” (such as access to public libraries and support of emergency services such as Federal Emergency Management Agency) and that financial support of public lands belongs in this category.

- Charles Hurilman commented that the Forest Service is multiple use agency, but perhaps it is becoming more of a single use agency like the Park Service. Kitty Benzar replied that since the Forest Service has started managing lands like a business, they are much more interested in charging and keeping fees. Prior to Fee Demo, as a member of the public she felt like an “owner” of the public lands. Now she sees in Forest Service documents the public being referred to as “customers.”
- Kevin Gorman asked about the organization’s background. Kitty Benzar replied that groups started forming in 1996 in response to Fee Demo. User groups that typically do not agree on land use issues found common ground in opposition to user fees.
- Kitty Benzar closed by saying she feels that it is her job (not the committee’s) to work on repealing REA, and, in the meantime, she asked the committee members to know and understand what is in the law and make sure the agencies are adhering to it.

Topic: Public Comment Period

Presenters: Mary Ellen Barilotti, Hood River

Summary of Presentation:

- Mary Ellen Barilotti stated that she is happy to hear that R6 is rethinking fee charges in HIRAs. She does not have an issue with the committee’s purpose or charging fees in campgrounds. She questions the legality of charging fees in HIRAs. She also pointed out that the members of the committee represent specific constituent groups, so their participation in the committee is another way the agencies are reaching out to involve the public in the fee proposal process.

Topic: Public Comment Period

Presenters: Marilyn Orchard, Public Lands Chair for Back Country Horsemen of Oregon

Summary of Presentation:

- Marilyn Orchard passed out copies of the *Backcountry Horsemen Newsletter*.
- She stated that Back Country Horsemen organization agrees with the Western Slope No Fee Coalition in that there should not be access fees at trailheads. She continued by giving examples of volunteer work done by Back Country Horsemen groups and despite their service that day they were still required to pay a fee to camp overnight at a site. She felt this was not right. She also pointed out that there is still confusion about the passes and where in particular they are accepted. She felt that it was not consistent.
- Marilyn ended with the sentiment of being “fee’d to death just to park our vehicles.”

Topic: Public Comment Period

Presenters: Jim Anderson, Back Country Horsemen of Washington

Summary of Presentation:

- Jim Anderson described maintenance work completed by Back Country Horsemen volunteers on a horse camp around Mt St Helens.

Topic: Public Comment Period

Presenters: Gary Collins, Back Country Horsemen of Washington

Summary of Presentation:

- Gary Collins told the group more about the volunteer work of Back Country Horsemen – the group typically volunteers 60 – 65,000 hours each year. In general he does not support fees, appreciates the opportunity to work for a Forest Pass, but often times the cost to get to a trailhead or remote site is more than the cost of the Pass, so people do not volunteer simply for the Pass.
- Marilyn Orchard added comments about work that had been completed by crews on the North Fork of the John Day: there were three crews working for three days and got a lot accomplished. They have a good relationship with the people on the Umatilla National Forest and it is great to see the trail crews out and working. Some of them need to be supervised more closely as some of the clearing limits are not being adhered to. She said it is good to see the trail crews out and she has met some wonderful people doing that work.

Break from 1000 to 1015**Topic: FS Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest****1015**

Presenters: Jocelyn Biro, present; Amy Tinderholt and Michael Alvarado, via phone

Fee proposals:

District	Site	Site Type	Fee Type	Current Fee	Proposed Fee
Tonasket	Beaver Lake Campground	Campground	Expanded Amenity	\$6.00	\$8.00
Tonasket	Beth Lake Campground	Campground	Expanded Amenity	\$6.00	\$8.00
Tonasket	Bonaparte Lake Campground	Campground	Expanded Amenity	\$8.00	\$12.00
Tonasket	Cottonwood Campground	Campground	Expanded Amenity	\$5.00	\$8.00
Tonasket	Kerr Campground	Campground	Expanded Amenity	\$5.00	\$8.00
Tonasket	Lost Lake Campground	Campground	Expanded Amenity	\$8.00	\$12.00
Tonasket	Oriole Campground	Campground	Expanded Amenity	\$5.00	\$8.00
Tonasket	Salmon Meadows Campground	Campground	Expanded Amenity	\$5.00	\$8.00
Tonasket	Sugarloaf Campground	Campground	Expanded Amenity	\$5.00	\$8.00

Summary of Presentation:

- Jocelyn Biro gave background on the site, its location and visitation dynamics. The fee changes proposed are for two levels of campgrounds: rustic and more developed. The campgrounds were built in the 1960s and are all in need of heavy maintenance and some degree of reconstruction. The extra vehicle charge is consistent across the forest.

Key presentation points:

- Public participation included:
 - Proposals posted at each site and on the forest website
 - Press releases and an article in the local newspaper
 - Federal legislators and county commissioners were briefed
- Results of public participation:
 - 1 written comment on the back of a fee envelope opposed to fees
 - 1 verbal comment from a woman leaving the campground in opposition.

Summary of Discussion/Questions/Comments:

- Charles Hurliman wanted to know how law enforcement was funded for these sites. The Developed Recreation Technician does it as a part of his job and there are others, such as the recreation program manager who contributes time that is not reflected in the cost.
- Charles Hurliman asked if the sites experience any water system problems such as coliform issues in the fall. The systems are shut down before that because of risk of frost.
- Kevin Gorman asked for clarification of written/verbal comments. Michael Alvarado said that he was the person she talked to and she understood the need for fees but would rather not see an increase. Kevin Gorman asked if there had been any letters written to the editor in response to the article in the newspaper. No there were not.
- Dan Harkenrider asked what was the date of the article. Michael Alvarado could not remember.
- Todd Davidson asked how long the notice of fee increase was posted at the sites and is the posting consistent across all sites. The notice was posted from May 15 through October 15 of this year and also the previous fall.
- John Walker asked what was included in the deferred maintenance. There is a large water system at the Lost Lake Campground that supports the campground and two organizational camps under special use permit that will need to be replaced soon. Also the deferred maintenance cost figure includes the eventual replacement of aging outhouses at two sites, parking barriers, fences and other small items.
- Charles Hurliman asked how a dumpster is bear proofed. Michael's response was to replace the current dumpsters with steel-lidded, ADA accessible ones. The dumpsters will typically be 2 yards.
- Kevin Gorman asked how the \$14,000 increase in revenue was arrived at. The district is hoping to continue the steady, "normal" occupancy levels. Visitors at the rustic campgrounds are typically locals.
- Dennis Oliphant reminded everyone of the procedures: a motion needs to be made and seconded, and then the voting takes place by category.
- Charles Hurliman asked how many non-fee sites are in the area. Limon Lake and Crawfish; two on the district as well as a number of lower developed dispersed sites that are free.

Charles Hurliman moved and Richard Fahey seconded to recommend the fees as presented.

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

As presented in the agenda, the public comment period would take place from 1030 to 1100. At 1045 at the conclusion of the Okanogan-Wenatchee presentation, Dennis Oliphant noted that no additional people had come into the meeting, and closed the public comment period.

Presenters: Rich Kehr

Fee Proposals:

Proposed Fee Increase Sites	Existing Fee (per night)	Proposed Fee (per night)
Aspen Cabin	\$25	\$40 (summer rental)
Bald Butte Lookout	\$30	\$40 (summer rental)
Currier Guard Station	\$30	\$40 (summer)
Drake Peak Lookout	\$25	\$40 (summer)
Hager Mountain Lookout	\$25	\$40 (winter rental only, fire lookout in summer)
Digit Point Campground	\$10, extra vehicle \$5	\$12, extra vehicle \$5
When the water is shut off	None	\$ 5
East Bay Campground	\$ 8, extra vehicle \$2	\$10, extra vehicle \$4
Williamson River Campground	\$ 6, extra vehicle \$2	\$10, extra vehicle \$4
Campbell Lake Campground	None	\$ 6, extra vehicle \$2
Chemult Recreation Site Campground	None	\$ 6
RV Dump Station	None	\$ 5 per RV
Cottonwood Campground	None	\$ 6, extra vehicle \$2
Deadhorse Lake Campground	None	\$ 6, extra vehicle \$2
Dog Lake Campground	None	\$ 6, extra vehicle \$2
Lofton Reservoir	None	\$ 6, extra vehicle \$2
Marster Springs Campground	None	\$ 6, extra vehicle \$2
Silver Creek Marsh Campground	None	\$ 6, extra vehicle \$2
Thompson Reservoir	None	\$ 6, extra vehicle \$2

Summary of Presentation:

- Richard Kehr gave background on the site, its location, visitation dynamics and results of the RFA process. Most of the visitation at these sites is local though there is international visitation occurring along the scenic byway. He also outlined some of the differences in visitor expectations of the two Forests. The monies generated from the fees will be used to reduce the deferred maintenance backlog and provide recreation site improvements.

Key presentation points:

- Public participation included:
 - Notice of fee changes was published in the Federal Register on September 8, 2008
 - Press releases were done in late Spring of 2008
 - Email address was established to receive public comments (received 7 comments)
 - Five public meetings were held (the number of public participants was typically 5)
 - Fee changes were posted at sites during the summer of 2008
 - Television interview
- Results of public participation:
 - Opinions expressed at public meetings were varied. Those in opposition were typically local residents who feel camping at these developed sites should continue to be free.
 - 8 responses to the proposals have been received, 7 were against. Visitors to the Fremont National Forest don't want fees at full service campgrounds with potable water.

Summary of Discussion/Questions/Comments:

- Charles Hurliman asked how they can keep the cost of the dump station so low. The Forest is not

trying to recoup the entire amount of the operational costs, simply trying to defray some. Dan Harkenrider interjected that the cost of some of services is covered by appropriated funds.

- Richard Kehr added that there has been a great deal of internal discussion about how much to start the fee at since these sites have been free.
- Charles Hurliman asked if there were any law enforcement issues. Not really. Does the Forest get any marine board money? Yes, some. Charles Hurliman continued by saying he noticed beetle killed trees in the presentation photographs and asked if tree removal would increase the operation and maintenance of the sites. No, the trees in that particular site have all been removed.
- Todd Davidson commented that there are 85 developed sites across both Forests, and the proposal is for an increase at 8 sites and new fees at 10. Are there sites not in the fee program? Yes, there are small campgrounds with 4 to 5 sites that do not have fee. About 25 % of sites on the forest would be fee sites (21 of 85). Many of these non fee sites are overlooks or trailheads.
- Richard Fahey asked about the \$5 dump fee. That charge would be in addition to the overnight fee.
- Kevin Gorman asked how many non fee campsites would remain on the forest. Richard Kehr was not sure, but estimated a little more than half would continue to be free. Is there any projection of occupancy rates to change? They are expecting a decrease in occupancy but plan on increasing their marketing of the Forest. The expected occupancy rate drop is 10 – 20%.
- Dennis Oliphant asked if the Forest thought users would shift to a non fee area. Some of the locals will, but non locals probably will not.
- Elizabeth Lunney noted that Silver Creek has a trailhead and asked if that would be part of the fee site. Richard Kehr said that there is also camping at that trailhead. If someone just wants to hike they do not pay a fee, parking is free.
- Charles Hurliman asked if people coming to the area in the fall to mushroom pick use fee or non fee sites. Richard Kehr is not familiar with those particular use patterns but knows that there are dispersed areas that some pickers frequent.
- John Vogel asked if they have considered offering the other cabins for winter use, besides Hager Mountain. The other cabins become inaccessible during the winter. There may be some use, but it is very low.
- Kevin Gorman said that in the last presentation they had standardized the extra vehicle fee has the Forest considered doing that? The forest is taking a staged approach to fee implementation; the \$2 fee is at sites that were previously free.

Dennis Oliphant asked if the committee would like to entertain a motion.

Charles Hurliman motioned and Elizabeth Lunney seconded the motion to recommend the fee changes as proposed.

Further Discussion:

- Kevin Gorman asked, in general, what has happened in the past when sites go from being a non fee site to a fee site? Dennis Oliphant responded that the forest is behind in charging fees, there are services being provided that cost money. His personal feeling is that people will continue to come regardless of the fee.
- John Walker noted that it is more difficult to go from no fee to a fee in comparison to increasing an existing fee. The incremental approach is good, it makes sense.
- Charles Hurliman noted that there are areas that went from no fee to a fee area in order to provide

- Elizabeth Lunney stated that the availability of water at the sites tipped the scale for her in favor. In addition, there still are areas that users can go to that are free.
- Kevin Gorman asked the committee's role in looking at the numbers in presented. To decide in a general way if they make sense.
- Elizabeth Lunney commented that establishing a new fee is different than a fee increase. The visitation drop off is not good. However, the financial piece not as important as how the fee might change the person's relationship to the forest.
- Dennis Oliphant added further to the discussion about cost and changes in use and reiterated that he thinks the fee will not stop people from coming.
- Richard Fahey said that the price of fuel was a limiting factor to the amount of travel this past summer. Since gas prices have dropped, he expects visitation this summer to increase.
- John Walker stated that there may be an initial drop off, but these places are beautiful and will always be able to draw people.
- Charles Hurliman commented that the number of fires and the amount of smoke produced affects how and where people recreate. Smoke will drive people to the coast. Air quality is important.

Dennis Oliphant called for the vote.

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

Lunch break from 1130 to 1240

Topic: Deschutes National Forest/Ochoco National Forest		1240
Presenters: Les Moscoso		
Fee Proposal (Descutes National Forest):		
Fall River Guard Station	New Fee	\$70 - \$100 (as published in the Federal Register)
Summary of Presentation:		
Les Moscoso presented background and location information on the site. The Fall River Guard Station is adjacent to Fall River and eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. The cabin has been recently renovated as a Passport in Time project. Amenities include: mattresses, furniture, cookware, and dishes as well as propane refrigerator, lights, cook stove, and heat. There is no water system on site; bathroom facilities will be a campground style vault toilet. The projected use season is June through October and projected occupancy is 80%.		
Key presentation points:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public participation included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Posting at the site ○ Notice to local and non-local media ○ Public notice in central and western Oregon newspapers ○ Letter sent to local user groups • Results of public participation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Received no written public comments 		

- Verbal comments from fly fisherman were strongly supportive

Summary of Discussion/Questions/Comments:

- John Vogel noted a discrepancy between what was handed out in the proposal package what was presented, is the fee proposal \$90 or \$70? Elizabeth Lunney asked what information the public received during the outreach. There is uncertainty about what was presented to the public. Decision to go with the information outlined in the executive summary.
- Jocelyn Biro stated that the notice published in the Federal Register had a range of \$70 - \$100.
- Richard Fahey asked about the roof replacement and if that might affect the building's eligibility. Kevin Gorman commented that on the difference between a site being eligible and one that is listed on the national register.
- Elizabeth Lunney asked Dan Harkenrider, in regards to REA, what amount of flexibility the agency has to lower the cost of the rental. Dan Harkenrider said that the committee could recommend the range as in was published in the Register. Elizabeth Lunney stated that if we recommend the higher amount, would a proposal to reduce the fee need to come back in front of the committee. If committee recommends the range, the forest could chose to reduce the fee without bringing it back to the committee as long as the reduction was still within the range.
- John Walker asked if we can recommend a proposal of a specific amount since that is not consistent with what was published in the Federal Register. Is the proposal as published in the Federal Register what is "legal?" Julie Cox replied the interpretation of what precisely is the fee proposal (the executive summary or the notice published in the Federal Register) is determined on a case by case basis. Jocelyn Biro said that the specific proposal is for \$90, as outlined in the executive summary.
- Dennis Oliphant noted that this discrepancy between the executive summary and the Federal Register Notice may mean the cabin would not be available as a recreational opportunity this season. Additional discussion ensued about the procedure and proposal. Dennis Oliphant questioned whether or not the committee was appropriately following procedures and if the range is recommended, rather than a specific amount, would there be negative repercussions later.
- John Walker asked if the committee would be following appropriate procedures if it recommended the fee proposal as published in the Federal Register, even though that was not the fee proposal in the executive summary. There was a general consensus that would be alright.
- Todd Davidson asked when the cost comparisons were done. The information was done this winter, specifically, earlier this month.
- Dennis Oliphant requested a straw poll to see how many committee members were comfortable with the lower fee proposal as presented in the slide show; about 50% were comfortable with that fee.
- Charles Hurliman said that the committee is not here to decide what the fee should be; typically these fees are lower than they should be in comparison to private business. He asked if the cost was shown to be justifiable or logical. Dennis Oliphant commented that he is not sure what fee proposal the cost analysis was based on.
- Charles Hurliman stated that this cabin is different from others presented earlier: fly fishing would be a very valuable opportunity and could command a higher price. He thinks the \$90 fee is appropriate.
- John Walker commented that it is not the committee's task to tell someone they are undervaluing the job; what the committee needs to decide is if it is appropriate to vote to recommend a fee range or the fee as displayed in the executive summary.

- Dennis Oliphant remarked that at least half of the committee members think that the \$90 fee proposal is alright as it is within the range.
- Jocelyn Biro noted that when the Cold Springs Cabin was before the committee last year there was a specific fee published in the Federal Register. Her advice to the forests has been to let the public comment on a range, see what sort of input is received, and then determine the precise amount of the fee proposal after that.
- Dan Harkenrider asked what was posted on the website. Did it have a range like the Federal Register or a specific amount? Jocelyn stated that the fee proposal posted on the RRAC web site was \$90.
- Elizabeth Lunney said that it made sense to give the agency a range so the fee can be adjusted according to the market without resubmitting the proposal to the committee. She is comfortable voting on the range that was published in the Federal Register and allowing the Forest to determine the precise amount of the fee.
- Dennis Oliphant cautioned about procedural correctness: is the committee recommendation based on the executive summary, the presentation, or the Federal Register. The Federal Register is the legal document on which fee recommendations are to be based.
- John Vogel voiced concern over the inconsistency between the information in the presentation and the executive summary and how to determine accuracy. Les Moscoso said that the numbers in the presentation came from the feasibility study and he was uncertain where the numbers in the executive summary came from.
- Dennis Oliphant asked if it was appropriate and reasonable to vote on a range.
- Jocelyn Biro understood that the proposal's inconsistencies make the committee uncomfortable, she suggested that the forest withdraw the proposal and resubmit it after revision.
- Dan Harkenrider offered the possibility of a short meeting or a conference call at a later date to discuss this proposal after it had been reworked. He added that the difficulty of coordinating schedules so as to have a quorum present added to the complexity of the situation. He reiterated that the job of the fee proponent was to give the committee as complete information as possible. The committee had to determine if the public would be better served to for the proposal to be withdrawn and the inconsistencies corrected.
- Concern over lost revenue from this summer season was voiced and it was asked if this proposal could be presented again at a meeting later this spring.
- Some committee members commented that they would like to see this site made available soon. There was concern expressed that if the proposal were to be withdrawn it would most likely result in the site being unavailable until next season.
- Two options were discussed: 1) the committee could recommend that the proposal be withdrawn and revised, or 2) the committee could make a recommendation on the fee proposal range with the caveat that if there is a procedural flaw with this the Forest would withdraw the proposal and resubmit it at a later date.
- Todd Davidson said that the committee had all reviewed the executive summary and the confusion occurred when comparing that information to what was presented in the powerpoint. If the committee could get clarification on the information the public received by the end of the day it may be possible to make a decision.
- Les Moscoso will get clarification on the fee proposal amount and the start up costs.
- Dennis Oliphant said it would be beneficial to get the fee proposal approved so the site can be made available to the public, at the same time the committee needs to make sure it is acting in accordance to REA.

- Kevin Gorman commented a typo is one thing (inconsistency between the executive summary and the presentation) and how the numbers associated with the fee analysis worked also needs clarification.
- John Walker said that the committee can only vote on what has been communicated to the public. The committee needs to go with what was available to the public.
- John Vogel agreed that the numbers need to be clarified and brought back to the committee.
- Todd Davidson asked if a call could be made to the office and the numbers and information given to the public confirmed. Les Moscoso said that he would do that.

Dennis Oliphant asked if a motion was needed.

John Vogel motioned to table the fee proposal until further research and discussion was done, the motion was seconded.

The vote was unanimous to table the Fall River Guard Station fee proposal until further information was provided.

Topic: Ochoco National Forest

Presenter: Barbara Smith

Fee Proposal:

Skull Hollow Campground	New Fee	\$5 per night
-------------------------	---------	---------------

Summary of Presentation:

Barbara Smith presented the background of the area, its use and costs associated with its operation and maintenance. This campground is open year-round and accesses 30 miles of trail and a popular rock climbing area, Smith Rocks State Park. The area in and around the campground is heavily used with some visitors exceeding their 14-day stay limit. Some campers have asked for better site maintenance and more law enforcement presence.

Key Presentation Points:

- Public Participation:
 - The site was posted with a notice asking for comments in June 2006
 - An article in the Bend, Oregon newspaper appeared on June 10, 2008
 - The Ochoco RFA was completed in July 2008 and recommended a fee of \$5/night for this site
 - Notice was published in the Federal Register in March 25, 2008
- Results of public participation:
 - Received 20 comments; mostly in opposition to fees
 - Also received comments that people do not want to stay overnight for security reasons and would pay a fee in order to re-establish the security element

Summary of Discussion/Questions/Comments:

- Charles Hurliman asked if the county is picking up law enforcement for the area since there is no law enforcement costs are displayed in the proposal. The Forest Service has a Forest Protection Officer during the day; anything that happens at night may be covered by Law Enforcement Officers (LEOs). Charles Hurliman commented that \$5 per night is low, but can understand a

stepped approach when establishing a new fee for a site. Dan Harkenrider added that most of the Forest Service offices have agreements with county law enforcement and some of the fees collected under REA can be used to increase law enforcement presence.

- Dennis Oliphant commented that charging a fee may encourage the full time occupants to move on as well as additional Forest Service and law enforcement presence. Typically people do not mind a fee if they see more Forest Service presence.
- Kevin Gorman asked about the possible loss of \$700 from their partner group for vault pumping, had there been a conversation with that partner group? Yes, the Friends of Smith Rocks has been taking care of the vault pumping, but now they are uncertain if they will continue if the area becomes a fee site.

Dennis Oliphant asked if there was a motion.

Charles Hurliman moved to recommend the fees as proposed, John Walker seconded.

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

Topic: Deschutes National Forest

Presenter: Les Moscoso

- Les Moscoso reported that he was unable to confirm how the numbers in the cost analysis were arrived at. He was able to confirm that the public outreach did contain a proposed fee range of \$70 - \$100.
- Dennis Oliphant asked if the committee would entertain a motion to approve a range and then if there is a procedural problem or the agency feels there is a problem, then the committee will ask the Forest to withdraw the proposal. He would like to see that site made available to the public.

Richard Fahey motioned to accept the proposal of a fee range as presented in the Federal Register of \$70 to \$100 per night, Charles Hurliman seconded.

Vote: Approved (Group 1 = 3 in favor, 1 opposed; Group 2 = 2 in favor; Group 3 = 2 in favor, 1 opposed)

Topic: Siuslaw National Forest

1350

Presenters: Nate Lewis , Hebo Ranger District

Fee Proposals:

Fee Increase Summary		
<u>Campground</u>	<u>Current Price</u>	<u>Proposed Increase</u>
West Winds Camping Area (SLRA)	\$10 per night	\$15 per night
East Dunes Camping Area (SLRA)	\$10 per night	\$15 per night
Sandbeach Campground (SLRA)	\$16 per night	\$20 per night
Hebo Lake Campground	\$10 per night	\$12 per night
*Note: The existing fee for additional vehicles would not change in at any of the campgrounds.		

Summary of Presentation:

- Nate Lewis presented information on the Sand Lake Recreation Area (SLRA) and the district's campgrounds. This area is used year-round and is heavily used during the summer. He

highlighted the increasing costs of operation and maintenance and the need to upgrade facilities (such as replacing the wastewater system serving the SLRA). The additional fee revenues will cover the increasing operations and maintenance and the cost of hiring and training Level 2 Law Enforcement Officers that are critical to safe operations in the SLRA. Hebo Lake Campground is one of the few places with accessible fishing opportunities. The area sees moderate overnight use, but plenty of day use. Additional revenue will be used to add more day use sites.

Key Presentation Points:

- Public Participation:
 - Notices were posted at all the campgrounds
 - Press releases ran in 4 local papers
- Results of public participation:
 - Received 4 comments: 2 were general in nature about the use of fee monies; 2 were opposed (1 was in regards to exclusion of low-income families and the other was an anonymous, disrespectful comment)

Summary of Discussion/Questions/Comments:

- Elizabeth Lunney asked how much of the project fees will be put into the wastewater system. The district has \$300,000 to put into the wastewater treatment plant. Jocelyn Biro added that the Siuslaw has been given priority funding from the RO to fix that system.
- Kevin Gorman asked why there is a fee increase proposal for campground use at Hebo Lake when there seems to be a lot of day use as well. Nate Lewis replied that it is split 50/50 between day and overnight use; the forest wants to encourage day use in the area.
- Charles Hurliman commented that Hebo Lake is situated in a heavily forested area with lots of precipitation, picnic tables deteriorate quickly in those circumstances. In regards to Sandbeach, a \$50 per night fee could be charged and it would still be a heavily used area, it is nice that the Forest Service is trying to keep user fees down. There is a county campground close by and the fee is less, but it does not have same level of services. Charles Hurliman commented that there are some boundary issues between Federal and County lands; it would be nice to have the Federal government buy the county land. He also noted his experience associated with the presence of law enforcement at Sandbeach, that is, the less law enforcement, the more injuries that occur and the more security problems arise.
- Elizabeth Lunney asked why there was a difference in the ratio between the fee level and the operations cost in comparison to other fee proposals. She would like assurance that the additional money is going to additional law enforcement as it appears as though a surplus is being generated. Nate Lewis replied that the district has an increasing need to staff in the off season.

Dennis Oliphant asked if the committee was ready to enter a motion.

Charles Hurliman moved to recommend the fee proposals as presented and John Vogel seconds.

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

Break 1415 to 1430

Presenters: Stan Hinatsu/Edan Lira

Fee Proposals:

Site	Current Price	Proposed Price
Wyeth Campground Single Sites	\$10.00	\$15.00
Wyeth Campground Group Sites	\$20.00	\$30.00
Eagle Creek Campground	\$10.00	\$15.00
Herman Creek Campground	\$ 8.00	\$10.00
Eagle Creek Overlook Shelter Group Reservation Site	\$90.00	\$125.00

Summary of Presentation:

Stan Hinatsu provided background and context of recreation in the Columbia River Gorge. People have long recognized the value of recreation and the scenic beauty of the area. He described the Recreation Facilities Analysis process and the fee history and strategy that was an outcome of this effort. Additionally he described the partnerships that have been established and the collaborative efforts that have occurred. The results of the market study completed on similar facilities in the area and the typical visitation that occurs in the area were described.

Key presentation points:

- Public participation included:
 - Fee changes were posted at sites from April through September of this year
 - Press releases were sent to the local media (including Portland) and key stakeholders on August 21, 2008.
 - The Oregonian, Hood River News and The Dalles Chronicle published a piece based on the news release
 - Information and request for input was also posted on the Gorge's web page
- Results of public participation:
 - very few inquiries
 - no negative comments

Summary of Discussion/Questions/Comments:

- Dennis Oliphant said that the CRGNSA is doing a good job in regards to partnerships and that is good to see.
- Kevin Gorman stated that he could not find the fee proposals on the web and does not have a sense of the public outreach that was completed. He thinks that there should have been more public outreach and circulation of the fee proposals. Stan Hinatsu replied that the proposal was posted on the website in the press room. Kevin Gorman said that a visitor would not typically go to the press release area of a website to find out information about fee changes.
- Elizabeth Lunney asked if there had been any discussion with the partner groups. No since these fees were mostly related to campgrounds and the volunteer groups typically focused on trails and day use. She commented that the lack of public response seemed a bit odd.
- John Vogel asked if most of the people who use the area are local. Typically they are returning visitors driving through. The Gorge is not a destination; it does not see weeklong visitation, rather 1 – 2 nights on the way to another place.

- Kevin Gorman asked what was behind the thought process on the Eagle Creek Overlook increase. Stan Hinastu replied that the site is very distinctive with the Civilian Conservation Corp era construction and its location on the edge of a cliff overlooking the Columbia River. The unique offering commands the price.
- Dan Harkenrider made a comment as the Columbia River Gorge Area Manager and added that the area receives a high amount of precipitation resulting in the need for a large amount of maintenance. This fee increase still is not sufficient to cover the cost to operate and maintain the facility. Charles Hurliman asked what else could be accomplished if Eagle Creek maintenance did not need to be subsidized. There remains a huge gap between the cost of operations and maintenance and appropriated funds. These additional funds will help close the gap at Eagle Creek and free up some money to help close the funding gap in other areas.
- Charles Hurliman reiterated his support of young families; if sites are going to be subsidized he would rather them be areas that young families would use, such as day use sites rather than campgrounds.

Kevin Gorman moves to recommend fees as presented, John Vogel seconds.

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

Topic: Appreciation/Housekeeping

1503

Presenter: Dan Harkenrider

While the next presenter set up, Dan Harkenrider presented the group with tokens of appreciation – hats and binders.

- Next Dan Harkenrider queried the group about holding meetings in different locations, having a field trip at the next meeting, or tele- or video-conferencing. Public comment period could occur at any Forest Service of Bureau of Land Management office that has the appropriate equipment.
- Todd Davidson said that the committee is very sensitive to the FS and BLM budgets and is interested in looking into the ability to interact as a group with something like NetMeeting.
- Elizabeth Lunney added that she is supportive of alternatives to getting together, having presenters available via telephone (Okanagan presentation) worked fine.
- General support of 1 day meetings held at the end of the week, but coordinating the committee members’ schedule is imperative. Additional discussion about using teleconferencing as a way to open more sites for public comment.
- Teleconferencing may allow for more site availability for public comment

Task: Dan Harkenrider will send a message about the next dates on Monday (February 2, 2008).

Topic: Willamette National Forest

1515

Presenters: Sandy Ratliff, MacKenzie River RD

Fee Proposals:

Site:	Benson and Scott Lake Complex
Site Type:	Standard Amenity
Proposed Action:	New Fee Site
Recommended Fees:	Recreation Passes are honored or \$5/day at the site

Summary of Presentation:

Sandy Ratliff presented background information on the district and site, an overview of the area and opportunities near by. Scott Lake was a fee site previously under Fee Demo; however, it does not have all the amenities required under REA, so it was dropped as a fee site. The site has been upgraded now the forest would like to recoup the cost of operations and maintenance as well as continue upgrading the site.

Key Presentation Points:

- Public participation:
 - Notice was posted at the site and the district office on August 1, 2008
 - Notice was also posted on the Willamette website
 - News releases were sent out on Aug 14, 2008
- Results of public participation:
 - Received 2 comments, a letter and post card that were against fees in general

Summary of Discussion/Questions/Comments:

- Charles Hurliman asked if there was Title III money available for Search and Rescue (SAR) in wilderness areas. County is responsible for that; the district wilderness manager is the SAR liaison. Charles Hurliman added that counties don't get Title III money for SAR in wilderness. He went on to note that hazard tree removal cost did not seem to have been included in the operation and maintenance of the site was that it is in a beetle kill tree area.
- Dennis Oliphant asked if there was a fee related to the Limited Entry Area that is near this campground. The fee is for the use of the complex only.
- Kevin Gorman asked if the fee was the same if a visitor took a short hike or camped overnight. Yes, the fee is the same. He continued by asking whether there had been a fee for parking when the site was under Fee Demo. Parking was and still is quite dispersed; anyone who uses the site and parks in the area will pay a fee. Kevin Gorman finished by asking if there was a drop in use when the site was previously under Fee Demo. Sandy Ratcliff does not think that the fee will keep people from coming to the site.

Elizabeth Lunney moves to recommend fees as presented, Charles Hurilman seconds.

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

Topic: Rogue River-Siskiyou National Forest	1530
Presenter: John Borton	
Fee Proposals:	
Illinois River Scenic Area:	
Diver's Hole, River Bench, Six Mile, and Store Gulch Day Use Areas	New Fee \$5/vehicle/day
Summary of presentation:	
John Borton presented an area overview including a summary of use dynamics and the need to improve safety and water quality and reduce resource damage in the Illinois Wild and Scenic River corridor. He gave a summary of the recent improvements at 15 sites along the river (only 4 sites are proposed as fee sites). Fees would be charged from May 1 into September. It was noted that a fee proposal for the sites had been previously submitted for RRAC recommendation but was withdrawn by the forest and reworked.	

Key Presentation Points:

- Public Involvement
 - Notices were posted in the campgrounds, day use areas, at the Wild River Ranger District Office and on the forest website
 - 2 public meetings were held
 - 2 press releases were sent out
 - A television interview
 - Federal Register notice was published on January 22, 2008
- Response to public participation:
 - Several letters of support were received
 - An editorial in the local newspaper expressed support

Summary of Discussion/Questions/Comments:

- Kevin Gorman asked if the fee sites were for boat launching or swimming or both. Two launch sites are free. Kevin Gorman continued by asking how the development along the river corridor improved water quality. Installing toilets keeps waste from flowing into the river; use in the area has been dispersed but by channeling people into specific areas with amenities they are more able to reduce the impacts on the resources.
- Richard Fahey commented that the improvements he saw in the area were very impressive.
- Charles Hurliman asked how much how much of a presence can you get for \$25,000. John Borton replied that there is also a campground and guard station nearby. A FS employee is based out of the guard station during the summer; the added revenue will supplement the appropriated funds. The \$25,000 will allow the forest to double the presence in the area. Richard Fahey continued by asking if this area was part of the Forest Pass. Yes and other passes will be honored. Richard Fahey finished by asking if there was any group that stood out in the comments received. The comments received were primarily from visitors who participate in water-related activities.
- Kevin Gorman commended the forest on their public outreach efforts.

Charles Hurilman moved to recommend fees as presented, Elizabeth Lunney seconded.

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

Topic: Final Discussion/Recommendation Summary**1550**

Leader for group discussion: Dennis Oliphant

All proposals, with the exception of the Deschutes Fall River Guard Station were unanimously approved for recommendation. The Deschutes National Forest Fall River Guard Station was approved for recommendation; however one member in Category 1 and one member in Category 3 were opposed to recommending.

Topic: Wrap Up/Critique**1555**

Leader for group discussion: Dennis Oliphant

Summary of Discussion/Questions/Comments:

- Richard Fahey asked if an email could be sent out once the Deschutes question in regards to appropriate procedures was answered. Dan Harkenrider affirmed they will receive an email

concerning that outcome.

- Dennis Oliphant asked who had access to the email addresses of the committee members and is it possible to have a filter of some sort on what is received. Dan Harkenrider responded that the agencies do not publish or provide email addresses. Julie Cox added that it is not difficult to find them though. Everything is supposed to go through the DFO. The agencies do their best to safeguard that information. Kitty Benzar commented that the email addresses of committee members should be available to their constituents. Dennis Oliphant responded that the committee members are citizen volunteers and should not be expected to deal with a large volume of email.
- Charles Hurliman asked if the report from Mt St Helens on the effect of their fee increase on visitor use had been completed. He continued by asking if such a report would still be of value considering some of the other variables that may have an impact on the visitation. Elizabeth Lunney said it might still be useful as a comparison for other sites. Charles Hurliman commented that if it is not going to be useful he would rather not have people spend time working on it. Dan Harkenrider offered that the forest could report back with an email on the information they have collected so far, although it is difficult to say if it would be useful. He noted that the CRGNSA experienced increased visitation this past summer. This increase is attributed to the area's proximity to a large metropolitan area. Fuel costs have decreased, but there are still other variables affecting visitation.
- Charles Hurliman added his observations concerning visitation in the Sandbeach area and that the \$4 per gallon fuel price did not seem to make a difference, there were still plenty of people in the area. Todd Davidson said information from the tourism industry indicates that fuel costs only accounts for approximately 10% of vacation cost. Fuel cost may have had an affect on other parts of a vacation, such as how often a vacationer went out to eat, rather than if a person took a vacation or not. Tourism trends are perhaps tied more to consumer confidence rather than fuel prices.
- Elizabeth Lunney commented that she would like to have more supporting documentation on the public involvement process: letters of support or opposition, op/ed pieces, and the like. John Vogel added that it seems like the public comments are canned, he would also like to see the specific comments. Dennis Oliphant agreed that there could be more clarity in what kind of outreach and more specifics of the public involvement. Dan Harkenrider responded that he understands what the committee is saying, but it is also the job of the committee members to address the public as a representative of a particular group. It takes both our efforts – those of the agency and those of the committee – to produce a complete package.

Motion to adjourn was put forth and seconded.

Meeting adjourned at 1605