

PACIFIC SOUTHWEST RECREATION RESOURCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

**January 15-16, 2014
San Bernardino, CA
Draft Meeting Notes**

January 15, 2014

Roll Call

Members Present: Don Amador, Dick Dasmann, Paul McFarland, Chris Oberti, Linda McMillan, Nate Rangel (via teleconference), Danna Stroud, Tom Severin, Bob Warren

Members absent: Monte Hendricks

Designated Federal Official (DFO): Ramiro Villalvazo

Forest Service (FS) Staff: Jennifer Ebert, Tamara Wilton, Frances Enkoji

Meeting Notes for 01/15/2014

Meeting called to order and Jody Noiron, Forest Supervisor, San Bernardino National Forest (NF), gave a welcome to the Recreation Resource Advisory Committee (RRAC) and a safety message.

At 10:15 a.m. public comment period began. Trent Sanders - doesn't represent anyone but himself and other forest visitors. Fee cannot be required solely for parking or without using the facilities or services and been adjudicated to the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals. Mentioned specific trailheads where people park to solely access the general forest area and not use facilities. He stated at Shortcut Gap trailhead (TH) the Angeles NF has added amenities, table and portable toilet and called it a fee site. Nobody has ever used that parking area for anything but for parking to access the two trails that lead from there. Portable toilet is not a permanent toilet by legislation. SRP – should be for specialized uses and no one can say with a straight face that a family building a snowman along 30 miles of Highway 2 is specialized use. Highway 2 is a State highway and State has an easement ten feet on both sides of highway and FS may not put up signs or control parking without a permit from Caltrans. Time for FS to lose, we don't care, we don't have to, we are the FS attitude and begin obeying the fee legislation instead of intimidating forest visitors. Concerned he is talking to the foxes guarding the hen house since everyone appointed by FS and some have a vested or financial interest in making FS happy. Remember that the Forest belongs to American people, not to Forest Service.

Kitty Benzar, President of Western Slope No Fee Coalition - do not have quorum here today and meeting not legitimately being conducted. In 2012 did a Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request to know names of RRAC members and their appointments. Received two Decision Memorandums signed by Secretary Vilsack on July 13, 2010 for Oberti, Dasmann

and Severin appointments. Three year terms so they expired on July 13, 2013. RRAC works under Charter and these appointments were made under second Charter which says members are appointed by Secretary of Agriculture. Rest of members appointed under third Charter which says members are approved by the Secretary of Agriculture. Current fourth Charter says three year terms and begins on day the decision to appoint the member or replacement which was July 13, 2010. In that Memorandum the three committee members, who were originally appointed for 2 year terms, were appointed on July 13, 2010 for three year terms so they expired July 13, 2013. Remainder were appointed on March 6, 2011 so terms still current until March 6, 2014. Brought same issue at last meeting and it is not fault of members and not saying it has anything to do with them. They received a letter dated March 2011 saying they had been appointed and Ramiro said the date of the letter is when the term began, there is litigation and you three are now part of litigation. Their names are in the brief that was filed yesterday by the FS attorney for the Department of Justice (DOJ) and it was the letters that two of them got and for some reason no one has Ms. Oberti's letter. Referred to letter for Mr. Severin and Dasmann that had a rubber stamp date of March 9, 2011 and certificate stamped with same date, what FS attorney is trying to get the court to approve is that the rubber stamp on this letter and certificate trump the date of the signature of the Secretary of Agriculture in his own handwriting that he made the appointments of these three members. We are contesting that and the attorneys for Adventure Pass (AP) case and the Sequoia case think they have a good case to make. Don't have quorum today and it is not up to you to decide and not up to me. It is now in hands of judge. Three member's terms are now part of the litigation through no fault of members, it is the fault of R5, and someone dropped the ball.

Peter Wiechers - he was one who brought FOIA and was told when terms began and just keeps getting a song and dance. He was at first meeting, and was there when Forest Supervisor Tina Terrell stood up and lied to them in Vallejo and it took another year before he could come back in Mammoth to bring that up and she got transferred to Job Corps in Colorado soon after and it got swept under rug, the appropriated funding, the trash signs in violation of standard amenity fees, etc. He had questions, in 2008, in Redding the RRAC voted to double and make year around Standard Amenity Fees (SAF) at Lake Isabella and how could Tamara Wilton and Tina Terrell say it met SAF criteria and now suddenly at last meeting it didn't. Operating strategy that just appeared on the website has a timeline but most of the stuff occurred in the past few weeks. Photos about changing to an expanded amenity fee (EAF) for your decision at August meeting came after we filed a brief and he had taken pictures on how the same signs were still up about SAF area and they were charging everywhere. Changes only made after filed brief. They are saying that the website was updated in September 2013 but maps were just changed two days ago. RRAC approved this at August meeting and within days DOJ filed to make case moot. He was standing up against a billion dollar federal agency, maybe put a sock in his mouth or tie him up to make a fair fight. Lake Isabella, EAF Plan did not begin in 2011; it was summer of 2012 there was a meet and greet with Kevin Elliott, Forest Supervisor. He asked Forest Supervisor about it because Kitty had gotten copy from Washington but he denied any knowledge of it. He apparently called R5 officials because came back and said it did exist but not doing anything with it now. June of 2013 was the first time any public or press about it. Few weeks later RRAC voted to approve. It still isn't completed and didn't respond to anything until 2014 when brief filed. You have to sue government to get them to do something. At August meeting, he was told no teleconference but at last minute there was, probably to get a quorum, Tamara said Interagency (IA) Passes can be accepted for EAF and SAF fees and decision was made by local agency. Legislation states that accepted for SAF areas, IA Pass handbook says the

Passes cover entrance or SAF fees not parking, EAF, tour or other types of fees. Where do you get citation that decision can be made locally and how does that override the law and IA Pass handbook? Bob - it is public comment period not a question and answer period. Peter - National Park Service (NPS) study that came out in April said AP costs to enforce and administer the program almost equal the revenue. Kitty has worked out the numbers and says it is 35-40 percent but whatever it is this came out from NPS. If you go to San Gabriel Canyon and what they call a picnic table you can't sit on and you better know what poison ivy is so you don't walk in it. Day use area #7 is just a dumpster and pullout and you have to walk a mile to a toilet. In lots of cases there are porta-potties not permanent toilets. There is no quorum to hold the RRAC meeting. FOIA response said when appointments were made and they were for three year terms rather than some little certificate that somebody stamped with rubber stamp with a different date. DOJ is working as much as they can and he has done three declarations with photos he emailed to RRAC. They were about no trash collection on the Kern River. DOJ not trying to get out on veracity because everything he submitted is true but instead on technicalities of the Administrative Procedures Act. He felt that if the judge takes a look he will be hard pressed to leave it out, although not guaranteed, he felt they would prevail in cases. He is being told that a portable toilet is a permanent toilet. He felt that most people in the room believe that but it was key argument in the cases. DOJ is trying to make it so the judge doesn't see that. He said going from absurd to really absurd, on Page 5 of San Gabriel Canyon proposal even though FS says they have to have six amenities they list sites that say No in lots of places to picnic tables, interpretive and toilets. Now the question is not is a portable toilet a permanent toilet, it's now is the lack of a toilet actually a toilet, lack of table a table, etc.

Public comment period ended and Ramiro provided an overview of FS perspective for this meeting. Not here to request fee increases or add areas but quite the opposite. SAF area reviews were conducted in 2011 demonstrates that the FS wants to contract these areas, which is why we are here. You will be looking at proposals for four National Forests that are going to point out how these areas are getting smaller, more clear where the areas are, where the amenities exist. Recognize we are having the meeting early in the year for a couple of reasons. One because RRAC memberships expire in March and Frances and Tamara who have greatest corporate knowledge of these projects and have the most history are now retired, they are under contract for this meeting. Bob - assumption is that we are here so we are members of the RRAC and will act in that way until we hear otherwise. We can only make the assumption that what the Designated Federal Official is telling us that we are still members of the RRAC.

Dick Dasmann moved to approve draft notes from last meeting. Don Amador seconded and all approved.

Tricia Maki, Sequoia NF Kern River Ranger District Recreation Officer - update on Lake Isabella EAF Sites. She outlined the Communication and Operations Strategy that was given to the RRAC. September 13 the Regional Forester approved the change in fee structure for three sites, Auxiliary, Lake Isabella and South Fork, directed to implement and to update the RRAC at their next meeting. In September they began communicating changes both internally and externally with news releases and updates to website. When returned to work in October, after furlough, removed some of the signs between the sites and initiated communication with the Board of Supervisors. In December continued communication with interested parties and posted maps at the site. Recently received decals and posted actual boundaries at Lake Isabella.

Proposal Reviews

Jennifer Ebert presented proposals for the Mendocino NF and Tamara Wilton presented proposals for southern California Forests.

Proposal 1

Proposal Name/Location: Mendocino National Forest, Camp Discovery Group Camp Ground

Proposal: To implement a single fee structure for overnight and day use

RRAC Recommendation: No motion was made, all voted. Don and Nate voted Yes, all others voted No. Proposal was not approved.

Discussion and Questions:

- Don – liked consistency. Mendocino has other group campgrounds that are used by lots of off-highway vehicle (OHV) clubs and they like one fee and to use the National Recreation Reservation Service (NRRS).
- Bob – what is current use? Jennifer – mainly September-October and Spring primarily by lots of school groups. Bob – appears counting on reservation system to increase use but it appeals to users from a greater distance, where your use is mainly local. Any hit on groups that can afford to use this when increasing day use. Jennifer – 80 percent of use is overnight so small percentage day use, didn't receive comments from those groups. Bob – did forest outreach to those groups who used it. Jennifer – did not know. Don – in Tehama County and if they feel a hit on constituents, good about letting agency know when not supportive.
- Tom – if hours are 2-11, what if want for day use, what do I do, what if I come at 8 do I pay 2 fees. Jennifer – Forest would work with group. Tom – if gets reserved for Saturday for day use then can't be used for overnight for Saturday.
- Bob – is there other examples of FS offering two different products and charging one fee for two products. Tamara - NRRS can only charge for 24 hours and all group sites are supposed to be reserved under the NRRS so bringing in to line.
- Paul – fee change is \$9 reservation fee; the NRRS is one step removed and end up in internet land rather than dealing with a human being who knows the place to obtain information which is a concern about NRRS rather than this proposal.
- Danna - Tamara, you said NRRS rents on a 24 hour basis. Forest will have check in and checkout time, if I can't come in until 2 and leave by 11 but reservation system giving me 24 hours on that site than how is that rectified? Tamara - have misspoken, the NRRS can do one fee and the Forest has chosen a 24 hour period.
- Bob - problem with times the Forest wanted to offer, felt it was not well thought out. Was concerned that if day use can't start until 2 p.m., if wanted to use all day would have to rent for two days resulting in a large increase in cost.
- Chris – 2-11 like renting a hotel, not really 24 hours it is overnight, agree with Bob it is fuzzy, need to clarify better.
- Ramiro – hearing that trying to get consistent with other group sites, need for time block, the NRRS can only deal with one fee for 24 hours, what isn't precluded is Forest can work with groups. Don – has concerns but RRAC can't change NRRS.

- Bob – didn't go out saying you were eliminating day use at this site, you have to rent from 2-11 and not 8-5 which is generally day use. Ramiro - 80 percent overnight use.
- Don – spend time trying to get user groups involved, we ask that they publish in newspapers, put on websites and contact public officials, they have done all this, don't know what else we expect if they do all we ask.
- Tom - redo the public involvement and say eliminating day use and contact past day users to see if they have any concerns.
- Paul – estimates 12 percent occupancy about 30 groups a year, many are return users so recommend in future for sites with specific user groups like this outreach to those specific groups.
- Tom - advantage to NRRS is anyone can see it; down side is you can't talk to real person about questions such as occupancy. Had good experience though with the Inyo NF renting a group campground, didn't have to go online, just reserved with them over phone.
- Dick – works with lots of youth groups to get them in the outdoors and rents day use sites. Need the sites from 8-5. Support 2 fees; same fee is okay but variable check-in/check-out times like 8-5 for day use and 2-11 for overnight. Need to outreach to those 20 percent of users who used the site.

Proposal 2

Proposal Name/Location: Mendocino NF, Sycamore Grove Family CG Yurt

Proposal: To add a yurt in one site and increase fee for the site with the yurt

RRAC Recommendation: Don made motion to approve, Chris seconded. Tom voted No all others voted Yes. Proposal was approved.

Discussion and Questions:

- Bob – will seniors be half price. Tamara – believe it would but would need to confirm with the Forest. Bob - is this handled by NRRS and do they typically give Senior discount. Jennifer – yes. Bob - there is no longer a lake at Lake Red Bluff.
- Paul – if installing a yurt would you need to charge a transient occupancy tax. Bob- if FS managed don't charge, if not then they do.
- Linda - Forest needs to look at the type of construction for the yurt; do not want to have Hantavirus issue Yosemite had. Did feel that older people and even younger people have said they would go camping but hate to sleep on ground so this would introduce new users to camping, so good idea.
- Dick – there are none currently, and if successful may install 4 more. Jennifer – that was the campsite number for the yurt, probably if popular may come back in the future. Tom – what is cost of yurt? Jennifer – Forest said \$22,000. Bob – yurts cost \$5,000.
- Kitty Benzar, member of public attending the meeting - read her comment she provided to the Forest, feels a step to commercial lodging that isn't appropriate for FS, will use campers fees to purchase yurt so fees not benefiting those who paid them, also local community nearby so competing and should be provided by private capital. Linda - from what she sees when she is camping there is shrinking population camping she can't

imagine a giant build-out, potential for people to enjoy public lands and maybe let next RRAC know how it is going.

- Bob - concerned about return on investment, if spending \$22,000.

Proposal 3

Proposal Name/Location: Angeles NF, Angeles Crest SAF area

Proposal: To eliminate SAF area, retain 12 SAF sites, retain 7 EAF sites and eliminate fees at 3 EAFs

RRAC Recommendation: Tom made motion to approve, Don seconded. All voted Yes. Proposal was approved.

Discussion and Questions:

- Bob – take elimination of SAF areas in single vote, same for change of fee type then Special Recreation Permit (SRP) winter recreation separate.
- Tamara - overview of review R5 completed as part of national review that was directed by Washington Office (WO). R5 convened independent team to conduct review and met with each forest and visited some of fee areas. Review was completed in July 2011 and WO approved R5 review recommendations winter of 2012. Changes were implemented in summer of 2012 which included removing hundreds of signs, installing signs at individual sites, changing website which we are still refining while bringing forward to RRAC. This is last step, to bring before RRAC for recommendation. Described public involvement and directed RRAC to press releases and comments received in their handouts. Summarized by saying proposals resulted in a large number of acres that would now be free, Angeles NF 160,000 acres, Los Padres NF 40,000, Cleveland NF 36,000 and San Bernardino NF 120,000 acres.
- Bob - Shortcut Saddle trailhead brought up in public comment, when so many trailheads free why was it converted to a fee site. Tamara – was always a fee site, not being converted to one, has all the amenities to charge a fee, and others do not. They were previously in a SAF area and didn't have to have the six amenities at each site but within the area had to have the amenities. Met the criteria when an area and meets criteria now as a fee site. More than a trailhead; it is day use area.
- Tom - clarification on what amenities need to be in place for an SAF area. Tamara - amenities are not required at each site when SAF area but within the boundaries of SAF area have to have the 6 amenities and directed them to amenity table in proposal. Bob – designation of sites that use porta-potties for permanent restroom structures, is it FS opinion that either considered a restroom. Tamara – yes that meets definition in Interim Guidelines and FS Handbook. Bob – you are saying that a portable toilet and a vault toilet is the same thing, because he believes they are, they serve the same function. Tamara – yes, it meets the requirements.
- Paul – did you reach out to volunteers or partners to get comments, feels that more in depth mutual discussion needs to occur to address results of these changes because it will affect them. Wished Forest responded to what he felt were inaccurate press releases. More media on these proposals than on any others and would have been opportunity for Forest Supervisor or Public Information Officer (PIO) to get out there talking about needs on the ground. Sees it more and more that Forest isn't conveying the full impact of these

- changes. We need to take partners seriously, meet with them and talk with them, and stand up for benefits that this program offers to public and be proud of what has been done. Need honest discussion with public if this happens, this will be the impact, can't continue to say you can rely on partnerships and appropriated dollars, they are disappearing and partners are stretched and losing ability to fill the gaps. Negative framing of this program is frustrating. Linda - RRAC would like to end the meeting with Talking Points and RRAC can also communicate to public. Chris - reading from notes in August, partnerships are the norm, not the exception. Not enough acknowledgements from the FS in terms of all the partners, faith based groups, community groups, camps, don't just look to traditional FS sponsored groups of folks. Be more inclusive.
- Paul - concerns about shifting use to other areas like along road. Tamara - one of the main concerns particularly in riparian areas and will need to monitor, and if results in issues will probably be bringing a new proposal to RRAC as a result to address. Ramiro - because of concern that many of the amenities are far away is why we are shrinking. Very concerned though about people parking farther away and still come to area. Paul - imperfect solution hemmed in by legislation. Bob- at Shortcut if you park 200 feet outside fee area is it free? Tamara - it is within the winter SRP so if parked along road or in site when snow present would need AP, otherwise if no toilet present, no fee. When no snow present and you park along road there is no fee.
 - Danna - with contraction of site, can they only accommodate certain numbers of vehicles and as it becomes more popular, do people park outside fee sites, or are they being forced to park outside site? Tamara - that is part of the picture, realities of trying to charge in areas that are closer to amenities. Ramiro - concern of Forest not collecting fees from people who may be using the area, illegal parking, and cars parked where they shouldn't in order to not pay fee. Bob - didn't look like a parking lot, like at Shortcut. Tamara - it is roadside parking that means Caltrans and FS developed area where parking is appropriate for that site. L'Tanga Watson, Angeles NF Forest Public Services Staff Officer - 7 to 10 spots, but not striped, designated parking area is paved beyond fog line. Bob - have a Memorandum of Understanding with Caltrans, if people parked in right of way, can you charge a fee? Ramiro - don't need permission from Caltrans, Caltrans gets an easement to maintain road. Tamara - it is NF system lands. Ramiro - we partner with Caltrans to create safe parking. Danna - Caltrans and FS have a specific relationship, so they should have been specifically contacted. Tamara - yes we have been working with Caltrans very closely. Perfection of title agreements are being worked on across the entire state. Frances - District Ranger on phone, clarified that toilet is not there in summer; moved to another location and moved back in winter. Paul - had public safety concerns with people parking along roadside. Tom- wanted to summarize, we had an area and you couldn't stop or do anything, dispersed camp or anything, without AP. Now opened up all of the areas, except for these specific sites and you still need an AP so no change on ground to the people. Bob - yes, areas in between sites you don't need AP. Tom - if I want to dispersed camp, there is a change and three sites that are now free. Danna - what are the impacts? To all, the public, the agency, Caltrans, etc., still struggling with what are the impacts of this change but don't know how to answer. Tom - believe ought to let them manage it, let managers manage and don't dictate in each instance how they have to behave. Ramiro - it will be a continuous work in progress. Line officers in the field continue to learn how and to manage, continue working with Caltrans, with volunteers, with partners in order to take care of resource.
 - Kitty Benzar, member of public attending the meeting - important information that hasn't been given. Lot of these sites listed as trailheads and now in this proposal they are called

day use areas. Ninth Circuit court case says if just park and hike in the backcountry there is no charge, primarily trailheads are subject to the prohibitions, cannot charge solely for parking or solely for walking or horseback riding through NF. These 5 sites primarily function as trailheads and parking off the highway, should not be fee sites.

Proposal 4

Proposal Name/Location: Angeles NF, Big Pines-Big Rock SAF area

Proposal: To reduce size of SAF area, retain 7 SAF sites, 9 EAF sites and eliminate fees at 2 EAFs

RRAC Recommendation: Dick made motion to approve, Chris seconded. All voted Yes. Proposal was approved.

Discussion and Questions:

- Dick - no fee increases, eliminate 2 sites. Tamara – yes and reduce area
- Tom - will there be confusion where it is, and the fee is SAF fee. Tamara – still use AP and signed on the ground. Camping is a separate fee at developed campgrounds.
- Bob - what distinguishes the fact that some of trailheads in this proposal are free? Does that mean nothing there except trailhead? Tamara - probably have 1 or 2 amenities but don't have all 6 amenities required to charge a fee. Did meet criteria for SAF area fee but now removing the area, so no longer have a fee.

Proposal 5

Proposal Name/Location: Angeles NF, Big Tujunga SAF area

Proposal: To reduce size of SAF area, retain 4 SAF sites and eliminate fee at Trail Canyon Trailhead

RRAC Recommendation: Don made motion to approve, Chris seconded. All voted Yes. Proposal was approved.

Discussion and Questions:

- Tom – why one area, why not two sites. Tamara – use extends beyond sites and in entire SAF area, impacts to riparian zone and the way people use area is not just in the sites it is throughout the area, better managed as an area.
- Bob – you can park along road that goes through and no fee, but at pull out you pay a fee. Tamara- yes at western end, quite a bit of parking. Paul - area is clearly demarcated. Tamara -sign on either end.

Proposal 6

Proposal Name/Location: Angeles NF, Elizabeth Lake, SAF area

Proposal: To eliminate the SAF area designation and retain Elizabeth Lake Picnic Area as a SAF site

RRAC Recommendation: Dick made motion to approve, Chris seconded. All voted Yes.
Proposal was approved.

Discussion and Questions:

- Danna – Forest trying this but what are they looking for that potentially changes how they will manage it given community concerns. Don - get the sense the management will be dynamic.

Proposal 7

Proposal Name/Location: Angeles NF, Frenchman Flat SAF area

Proposal: To eliminate the SAF area designation and retain Frenchman’s Flat Day Use Area and Piru Ponds Interpretive site as SAF site

RRAC Recommendation: Tom made motion to approve, Chris seconded. All voted Yes.
Proposal was approved.

Discussion and Questions:

- Paul – why didn’t extend the SAF area down the road. Tamara – discussed but nationally wanted to ensure the amenities were positioned in a way that that they are easily available to public, road is gated and is the trail.

Proposal 8

Proposal Name/Location: Angeles NF, Front Country SAF area

Proposal: To eliminate the SAF area designation, retain 5 SAF sites and eliminate fees at 7 SAF sites and 8 EAF sites

RRAC Recommendation: Don made motion to approve, Chris seconded. All voted Yes.
Proposal was approved.

Discussion and Questions:

- Danna – sites where eliminating fees, are there plans to remove any amenities? Are there costs to maintain those sites? Tamara – no amenities will not be removed, yes part of the challenge to address the maintenance and upkeep of those sites and Forest will have to make decisions on how they will manage these sites and how to fund.
- Paul – seems like this proposal would be a concern to partners who sell AP since eliminating many places where people use AP, can partners sell America the Beautiful (ATB) Passes. Tamara - yes they can sell the \$80 Annual Pass but cannot sell Senior or Military Passes because of personal documents required. Paul – how much does partner keep from sale of pass. Tamara – not familiar with third party vendor agreements, that is done nationally through Department of Interior.

Proposal 9

Proposal Name/Location: Angeles NF, Littlerock SAF area

Proposal: To eliminate the SAF area designation and to retain the Littlerock OHV trailhead SAF site

RRAC Recommendation: Dick made motion to approve, Chris seconded. All voted Yes. Proposal was approved.

Discussion and Questions:

- Paul - basically only pay a fee if you unload a non-street legal vehicle? Tamara – yes. Paul – can ride a street legal vehicle to area and not have to pay? Tamara – yes

Proposal 10

Proposal Name/Location: Angeles NF, Mt. Baldy SAF area

Proposal: To reduce size of the SAF area, retain 3 SAF sites, retain 1 EAF site

RRAC Recommendation: Dick made motion to approve, Chris seconded. All voted Yes. Proposal was approved.

Discussion and Questions:

- Paul – legend has recreation sites and squares but says free site. Tamara – not sure why that is there, think it was something the person who made maps added as a note to me. Paul – all stay fee sites? Tamara – yes if black box it is a fee site. Map may be inaccurate in handout. It is correct in the power point presentation.

Proposal 11

Proposal Name/Location: Angeles NF, Rowher/Drinkwater SAF area

Proposal: To eliminate the SAF area designation, retain 2 SAF sites and eliminate fees at 3 SAFs

RRAC Recommendation: Tom made motion to approve, Chris seconded. All voted Yes. Proposal was approved.

Discussion and Questions:

- Tamara – again note the legend has the same note as last proposal, cross out.
- Bob – how popular? Don – popular OHV area, clubs have no concerns.

Proposal 12

Proposal Name/Location: Angeles NF, San Gabriel Canyon SAF area

Proposal: To reduce the size of the SAF area, retain 2 EAF sites, eliminate fees at 1 SAF site

RRAC Recommendation: Nate made motion to approve, Dick seconded. All voted Yes. Proposal was approved.

Discussion and Questions:

- Bob – effort to outreach to Spanish speaking communities? Sherry Rollman, Angeles NF PAO - press release was in Spanish and went to Telemundo and other Hispanic outlets. Did know it was widely picked up by media, but didn't know specifically about Hispanic outlets.
- Paul – is roadside parking prohibited because of amount of traffic? Tamara - it is not.
- Dick – does smaller area mean fees can be focused on areas with greatest impacts? Tamara – yes it is an outcome, but not the reason we made changes.
- Bob - any agreement with private landowners? Tamara - wasn't aware of any; they are resorts that provide recreation for the public also.
- Linda - remembered RRAC visit to this place, was moving. Many from inner city coming to just stand in water. Huge gap in what they understand. Vibrant important part of our society. How can we help get message out to these people? Do you need help getting local politicians involved? Area is like the Mt. Everest of impacts and issues with management. Ramiro - held a Latino Engagement Workshop last year. Primarily for Forest Plan Revision but overall message to Forests is it is important to establish the trusted community leaders. In order to get the message out make contacts with the trusted leaders.
- Bob - went there on a Sunday a few years ago, appears to be organized chaos.

Proposal 13

Proposal Name/Location: Angeles NF, Winter Special Recreation Permit Fees

Proposal: To establish SRP fees for winter recreation

RRAC Recommendation: Dick made motion to approve, Don seconded. All voted Yes. Proposal was approved.

Discussion and Questions:

- Don – concerned about what hoops people go through to get their permit, but now see you just pay your fee. With many first time users coming, how will they know they need to have an AP or pay a fee, are there opportunities as they go up to purchase an AP? Tamara - yes AP or IA Pass is the payment mechanism to recreate in SRP and several communities you drive through or surrounding these areas have AP vendors. No fee change. Signs at SRP and the media are also involved and they talk about where to go play in snow.
- Paul - are there sales onsite on road? L'Tanga Watson - mobile fee station at Mt. Baldy and message board. Local radio station communicates how to buy passes. Chris - can you use Sno-Park Pass in lieu of? Tamara – no that is separate program with the State. Bob – are the toilets put out prior to season or when it snows? L'Tanga Watson – when we have our planning meeting before Thanksgiving with community, we plan where toilets go and then they are put out and are out now. Danna – are mobile fee stations manned during peak times or daily? L'Tanga Watson - manned usually during the weekends or during peak periods.
- Peter Wiechers, member of public attending meeting – where does Agency get authority to use ATB Pass for SRP fee, it comes in play in lawsuit. Kitty Benzar, member of public

attending meeting - when does throwing snowball or building snowman become specialized use, law doesn't say specialized management, it says specialized use.

- Tom – confusion between summer not paying and then winter paying. Tamara – hope that signing will make understandable.
- Danna – fee goes in to effect when snow present is ambiguous, is it left to the Supervisor to decide when enough snow, is there a joint decision for the entire area or is there enough snow in one area for a fee but not another? Her town says no parking on street from November 1-April 30, snow or no snow. Is there a way for signing to remove ambiguity? Tamara – talked about dates but if you say November and no snow, could snow in April so decided to say when snow present. Danna - discretion is with those who make the decision, important to have communication to public when fee is required or not.
- Tom - example of other SRP that are non-commercial. Tamara - the Sequoia NF boating on a portion of a river and the Shasta-Trinity NF climbing pass.

Proposal 14

Proposal Name/Location: Cleveland NF, Corral Canyon SAF area

Proposal: To eliminate SAF area designation, retain 2 SAF sites and retain 2 EAF sites

RRAC Recommendation: Tom made motion to approve, Don seconded. All voted Yes. Proposal was approved.

Discussion and Questions:

- Bob – do you call these trailheads or staging areas? Tamara – OHV staging areas.
- Don – checked with groups and they are fine, this is an improvement. Tom – didn't get any feedback, most buy an Annual Pass because visit them all.
- Peter Wiechers, member of public attending the meeting - use of IA Pass question. Tamara – Washington Office has said we can accept the IA Pass in these sites.
- Bob - campgrounds linked to trailheads. Spencer Bleadorn, Cleveland NF, Descanso Ranger District Recreation/Lands Officer - tie directly to OHV trails through campground and there is no separate fee. AP is accepted for campground fee.

Proposal 15

Proposal Name/Location: Cleveland NF, Holy Jim SAF area

Proposal: To reduce size of the SAF area and eliminate fee at one trailhead

RRAC Recommendation: Dick made motion to approve, Chris seconded. All voted Yes. Proposal was approved.

Discussion and Questions:

- Tom - read a comment he received, trailhead still in proposed area, parking a nightmare at trailhead, toilet is disgusting, don't see how reducing fee will have effect since everyone will still need to park in fee area.

- Bob - Horsethief Trailhead is just a trailhead? Tamara - yes and it didn't have the 6 amenities.

Proposal 16

Proposal Name/Location: Cleveland NF, Mt. Laguna SAF area

Proposal: To reduce the size of the SAF area and include 3 small SAF areas, retain 4 SAF sites, retain 2 EAF sites and eliminate fees at 2 sites

RRAC Recommendation: Dick made motion to approve, Chris seconded. All voted Yes. Proposal was approved.

Discussion and Questions:

- Tom – same reason for the three blobs and how they are drawn? Tamara – yes, used in an area way and extend beyond just the site and used interchangeably. Tough one, highly used area and popular Scenic Byway.
- Bob - Wooded Hill Trailhead has fee because it is in the area. Tamara – yes Wooded Hill, the group campground and Agua Dulce Trailhead are included in the SAF area. Bob - you pay a fee at trailhead because you use toilet in campground? Tamara – Agua Dulce Trailhead has toilet, Wooded Hill campground has toilet, Wooded Hill Trailhead does not but they are located in the same place. Tom - toilet is unlocked in the group campground when no group. Spencer Bleadorn - yes it is unlocked and there is bathroom at Agua Dulce Trailhead which is nearby. Bob – assumption for people using trailhead that all the facilities at campground are available to them. Tamara- yes.
- Bob – Burnt Rancheria campground says seasonal toilet. Is there no fee in winter? Tamara – remember for a campground you don't need a toilet to charge a campground fee, it is 5 of the 9 amenities. In this case it is part of SAF area and campground amenities are part of the area amenities, so if all 6 amenities are not there, would be no fee. Frances – clarification, still a toilet at Wooded Hill so a toilet in SAF area. Tamara – since an SAF area, even if no toilet at campground there is still a toilet in the SAF area, still would have a fee. Bob - asked if there is a specific distance for calling it a toilet. Tamara - tried to go no further than a half a mile in our area review. But neither Interim Guidelines nor Fee legislation specify a distance.

Proposal 17

Proposal Name/Location: Cleveland NF, Ortega SAF area

Proposal: To eliminate the SAF area designation, retain 3 SAF sites, retain 4 EAF sites and eliminate fee at 4 sites

RRAC Recommendation: Don made motion to approve, Chris seconded. All voted Yes. Proposal was approved.

Discussion and Questions:

- Tamara gave overview of proposal

Proposal 18

Proposal Name/Location: Cleveland NF, Tenaja SAF area

Proposal: To eliminate the SAF area designation, retain 1 SAF site and eliminate fee at 2 sites

RRAC Recommendation: Dick made motion to approve, Chris seconded. Bob voted No all others voted Yes. A second vote was taken, Dick made motion to approve, Chris seconded. All voted Yes. Proposal was approved.

Discussion and Questions:

- Dick - hiking trail or OHV trail? Tamara - hiking trail. Bob – do people use trailhead for anything else like picnicking? What kind of toilet? Jake Rodriguez, Cleveland NF Trabuco Ranger District Recreation/Lands Staff Officer - used a little for picnicking and there is at least one picnic table and vault toilet. Bob - it just seems like just a trailhead. Tamara - meets all of the SAF criteria. All 6 amenities are present, even has potable water. Paul - most popular of 3 trailheads? Jake – Tenaja Falls due to waterfalls. Is paved, has equestrian parking area and tie ups, well for water.
- Vote was taken. Frances - reminded RRAC the proposal wasn't recommended which included eliminating the SAF area, retain one SAF site and eliminate fee at two sites. Means the SAF area would remain as is. Bob – assumed by voting No there would be no fee remaining. Don – voting No, basically endorsing fees for the whole area. Bob – is there a motion to split into two votes, one eliminating fee at Fisherman and Falls and the other to eliminate fees at trailhead. Dick – if we do two votes and don't vote to eliminate area then what happens? Or are we saying no fee at all three sites. Frances - that wasn't the proposal before RRAC and need to vote on proposal that was put before RRAC. Paul – believe we have approved trailhead fees at trailheads with less development; this is similar to one on Hwy 50 with falls we approved. Bob – feel this has been around forever and at some point, no fee charged. Tamara – this has had a fee since Fee Demo, a number of sites didn't have a fee before Fee Demo. Bob - feels primary usage is a trailhead. Tamara – Federal Recreation Enhancement Act (REA) doesn't say trailheads can't have fees, it is a SAF site. Dick – did same at Eagle Falls on Tahoe. Bob - asked for second vote.

Proposal 19

Proposal Name/Location: Cleveland NF, Wildomar SAF area

Proposal: To eliminate the SAF area designation and retain 1 SAF site and 1 EAF site

RRAC Recommendation: Tom made motion to approve, Don seconded. All voted Yes. Proposal was approved.

Discussion and Questions:

- Bob - if you are in the campground can you access OHV trail from campground and only pay one fee? Spencer Bleadorn - campground has a separate fee, if using staging area for day use, need an AP. If camp you can access trails from campground and pay one fee.

Don - most off roaders support proposal since it will be like other Forests, you can ride a dual sport up to and on trails and don't have a fee.

Proposal 20

Proposal Name/Location: Los Padres NF, Ballinger SAF area

Proposal: To eliminate the SAF area designation and retain 1 EAF site

RRAC Recommendation: Tom made motion to approve, Don seconded. All voted Yes.
Proposal was approved.

Discussion and Questions:

- Paul – is there significant concern by forest about capacity to manage site after fee is gone since intensively used. Tamara – yes Forest felt since most people come to campground to stage or camp they could manage that way. Don – has camped there and that is where you go to stage to use the area. This is good because like other site, can now ride there and use trail in jeep or dual sport and not have to pay a fee.
- Paul – just concerned this is another place with no plan to back up management. Tamara - Forest uses some OHV funds to manage the SAF area as well. Paul – longer discussion, OHV funds not answer since they need match so it destroys the rest of the forest in terms of capacity. Were there any other alternatives discussed. Tamara - talked about SRP but forest felt they could manage from campground due to way it is used.

Proposal 21

Proposal Name/Location: Los Padres NF, Figueroa SAF area

Proposal: To eliminate the SAF area designation, retain 3 SAF sites, retain 3 EAF sites and eliminate fee at 10 sites

RRAC Recommendation: Chris made motion to approve, Dick seconded. All voted Yes.
Proposal was approved.

Discussion and Questions:

- Dick - Badly needed from standpoint of hunters and fisherman. Many of them don't use sites. A lot of the forest is closed to entry after fires, etc. Very positive improvement as far as hunters and fisherman. Chris – are the campgrounds popular with hunters and fisherman. Jeff Bensen, Los Padres NF Forest Recreation Staff Officer - yes during hunting season. Dick- does it get snow. Tamara – can be a popular snow play area but forest decided not to make a winter SRP. Also extremely popular wildflower location. Tough for forest to eliminate as a SAF area.
- Paul – what made these campgrounds accept AP as opposed to separate campground fee? Tamara – always accepted AP and IA Pass so not a change, for customer convenience to have one pass for multiple sites and employee safety to not have to empty fee tubes. Winter snow play is also popular here, but they did not go SRP route.

Proposal 22

Proposal Name/Location: Los Padres NF, Gold Hill SAF area

Proposal: To eliminate the SAF area designation and retain 2 EAF sites

RRAC Recommendation: Don made motion to approve, Chris seconded. All voted Yes. Nate was not available to vote. Proposal was approved.

Discussion and Questions:

- Bob – any issues with OHV community, Don - no.

Proposal 23

Proposal Name/Location: Los Padres NF, Mt. Pinos SAF area

Proposal: To change the fee type from SAF to SRP for winter recreation

RRAC Recommendation: Chris made motion to approve, Tom seconded. All voted Yes. Proposal was approved.

Discussion and Questions:

- Bob -what occurs on the private land? Jeff Bensen - not used for snow play, sledding hill called Bunny Hill that is where people go so they don't go beyond to private land. Bob – for 3 or 4 miles FS land and private land mixed, are people on private land. Concern about spilling on to private land. Tamara – managed this way for 15 years so if an issue we would be aware of it but haven't had any.
- Paul -do you have mobile pass sales? Jeff Bensen - Nordic Ski Patrol sells passes at parking lot.

Proposal 24

Proposal Name/Location: Cleveland NF, Pozo-La Panza area

Proposal: To change fee type from SAF fee to SRP for OHV recreation

RRAC Recommendation: Don made motion to approve, Paul seconded. Don, Paul and Bob voted Yes. All others voted No. Proposal was not approved.

Discussion and Questions:

- Don – have to pay a fee here, unlike others if I ride my dual sport here I will need to pay a fee, it is area wide. Tom – so no change, no change in amount of fee, just changing the name of the fee. Tamara - we are changing the type of fee. We typically don't bring those pro forma changes before the RRAC but since this was part of the area review we did. Tom – why do the change. Tamara –in S.CA OHV areas were SAF areas since Fee Demo but nationally OHV riding areas are SRP so wanted to be consistent.
- Dick - right now I can drive and hunt for free because I don't use the facilities. Tamara – as an SAF area if you are recreating in the SAF area you would pay a fee but we don't charge for driving through NF lands on a road.

- Chris – how much of the funds stay on forest, is there a change in that amount. Tamara – no change.
- Dick - primary cost is road and trail maintenance from off road vehicle use, not from hunters and fisherman and their use of that area, so have a problem changing to be uniform.
- Danna - role partners have in reaching decision. Tamara - it was an internal review process to develop proposal to move to a SRP fee type. This change is essentially invisible. Jeff Bensen - they are aware of the changes, but they were not contacted directly. Dick - did not talk to the local sportsman's clubs and this is a locally used area. Fee has never been enforced, whether it could have been is a difference, not just a fee change, it is an actual change.
- Don - does not like the AP concept but they are not here to debate whether it is a good idea, purpose is to review proposals. Didn't like it, and still don't like it but that is not role today.
- Chris - what happens if we don't approve. Tamara – if No recommendation it would stay an SAF area with the same fee. Dick - one suggestion is to narrow the areas to specific staging areas and campgrounds. Tom – agree you brought forward a proposal for Ballinger and Wildomar that narrowed the fee areas. Tamara - there is extensive trail maintenance and resource management protection in this area. Don - seems to be more intensively managed more programs and a more complex unit. That is the difference. Paul - lot of infrastructure and daily management to protect species.
- Danna - can Forest go back and rethink. Vote it down and have the Forest come back. Tamara - reminded that if vote is No it will stay SAF area with the same fee
- Paul - thought this approach is a good one. Capacity would be retained. Ballinger is a concern because what happens when OHV funds goes away. Today's discussion has been about areas vs. sites, not a good way to manage the landscape. Areas more efficient, easier to understand by public, going to sites very confusing to public but stays within legislative framework we are given. Proposal was a breath of fresh air because gave a holistic view to manage a place.
- Danna- good dialogue, message back is there is support for holistic view but look at all of the uses out there, not just OHV.
- Paul - don't divide recreation groups, recreation is recreation.
- Dick – better communication between all users in that area.
- Bob – Ramiro, if RRAC votes No, FS can't change without going back to Congress to change.
- Ramiro – it will go to Randy next and he usually takes the RRAC recommendations.

Closing Remarks 01/15/2014

Motion to adjourn until tomorrow morning at 9:00 a.m.

January 16, 2014

Opening Remarks

Bob opened meeting with remarks: This land is your land, Woody Guthrie quote. Each has come to the committee for different reasons. Talked about why he loved promoting California. Bob said he had been to Europe many times and he realizes how lucky we are to have all of this public land. These are our public lands and we have to figure out ways to use them. In his 20 years of promoting our land, he has seen a dramatic change in how we fund public lands. Didn't have the worries that we have now, was a given that Federal Treasury would take care of funding public lands, now we have to pay as we go. Need to do better job of educating people of the value of public lands. Without people caring for public lands they won't support them for future. Feel it has been their mission to figure out new paradigm on funding and they need to leave with idea that we need to do a better job of educating people on public lands.

One of his passions is children. We argue about \$5 fee. Talked about his Starbucks card and how he gets a message each time his wife uses, he wished there was a public lands card that he could fund so that families could go enjoy public lands and he would get a message letting him know. Want to have goals and accomplishments. Think we have made some differences here. Appreciate Kitty and Peter, think differences are fewer than we think, he knows they love public lands and have a passion to make sure there is access for the public. Each has a passion. He thanked the RRAC members and said I hope we have accomplished something.

Proposal Reviews

Proposal 1

Proposal Name/Location: Los Padres NF, Rose Valley SAF area

Proposal: To eliminate the SAF area designation, retain one SAF site, retain 2 EAF sites and eliminate fees at 3 sites

RRAC Recommendation: Dick made motion to approve, Chris seconded. All voted Yes.
Proposal was approved.

Discussion and Questions:

- Dick – is Rose Valley Lake dry most of year or wet. Jeff Bensen - was not sure right now. He heard it might be dry right now. Was a popular fishing derby lake.

Proposal 2

Proposal Name/Location: Los Padres NF, Santa Ynez SAF area

Proposal: To reduce the size of the SAF area to include 5 small areas and retain 1 SAF site

RRAC Recommendation: Don made motion to approve, Chris seconded. All voted Yes.
Proposal was approved.

Discussion and Questions:

- Chris - looks like well used. Bob – probably a year there won't get much use if no rain.
- Kitty Benzar, member of public attending the meeting - asked Tamara if she was going to tell them that many of sites operated by concessionaire. Tamara - yes most of sites are operated by a concessionaire under special use permit. If concessionaire is selling the pass, vendor agreement, then a portion of the fees goes to the vendor and a portion to the FS. Vendor arrangement same with concessionaire as any other vendor. Paul – do you pay a concession fee and AP fee? Tamara - visitors pay one day use fee at concessionaire operated sites but there is a separate campground fee

Proposal 3

Proposal Name/Location: San Bernardino NF, Arrowhead SAF area

Proposal: To eliminate SAF area designation, retain 8 SAF sites, 1 EAF site and eliminate fees at 12 sites

RRAC Recommendation: Tom made motion to approve, Chris seconded. All voted Yes.
Proposal was approved.

Discussion and Questions:

- Bob - how does Forest coordinate with so many different landowners, water districts, stakeholders/partners? Do they outreach to them, are they comfortable with how things have been managed and proposed changes. Tamara – all received the press release.
- Tamara - had been questions on the effects of the changes and partners and we have a partner here that could give their perspective. Sarah Miggins, Executive Director for the Southern California Mountains Foundation - they interact with all of the partners on the mountain. Has been a huge advocate for nearly 18 years and was one the first employees of the non-profit. The non-profit has resulted in 21-year relationship with FS. Vision was to engage citizens down to San Diego to San Bernardino to Santa Barbara over to Las Vegas to help serve on the Forest. Have a variety of programs and help the FS where their funding gaps exist. Have put in over 21 million hours from 750 to 1,000 volunteers and engage in recreational services and educating what a valuable resource this is for S. CA. There is intense training. Fire tower hosts contact over 20,000 people a year. Big Bear Discovery Center, flagship program, inundated on busy summer weekends receives over 15,000 visitors with all kinds of interpretive programs. Are able to leverage fee dollars thru grants and corporate interests. Use AmeriCorps enrollees from surrounding communities and participate in trail work, litter abatement, etc. Now a Nonprofit Land Corps that can leverage restoration dollars from FS for hazardous fuels reduction, reforestation, etc. For every dollar we receive from FS, can return 10 to 15 dollars in volunteer time. Have approximately 75 staff which includes 50 Corps members. Incredibly passionate for the work that we do. Since 2008 been difficult to attract funding to sustain these programs but have grown. Big Bear Discovery Center receives a quarter of a million visitors a year. Bob - is there a concern that we are pricing people out of recreation. Do you see the \$5 fee as a detriment to people using the forest? What is public

response when you are selling them? Sarah - \$5 isn't enough. She was at Discovery Center when fees were piloted and only a handful of complaints among all the many people that came through. She has not heard any resistance and thinks it is a good idea to charge fees at individual sites. Think people see what is happening, like the devastating wildfires and see the need. Danna - your association is held up as an example for other associations trying to partner with FS. With reduction of the fee areas, what is the financial impact to your association? Sarah - we are concerned; it would impact us and the seed money they receive. Paul - other partner groups on forest such as Fisheries Volunteers and Trailbuilders have said by switching to a model of charging for sites instead of areas will impact the number of passes they will sell. Since volunteers are out with public, will it be a longer conversation to explain to the public now. Danna - amount of time the volunteer base has been doing interpretation and education of the resource may be reduced due to having to spend more time educating on where fee areas are now, is there any thought about the time commitment or the messaging needs to explain these changes. Sarah - we are completely adaptable. Don't think it will be that much of a burden can't really answer. Don't see any resistance to it. Paul - question not really resistance already part of culture. Chris - do you have special funding for educational programs? Sarah - yes different grants.

- John Karevoll, member of public attending meeting - live in Running Springs. Did you say you haven't seen much resistance to the fee? Sarah - yes. John - that is completely wrong the fee has done more to keep people away from the forest than it has to enhance the access. There are vast quantities, not just locals that don't want to have anything do with the forest. Enormous groups especially minorities that have no interest in the forest. Perception is that the San Bernardino National Forests Association displaced a lot of other volunteer work that was being done going back decades. Enormous number of people who felt the FS was going to partner with people who would partner with them and exclude those that weren't comfortable with fees. Enormous number of people who used to volunteer that will have nothing to do with your association or the FS. Biggest barrier to use of San Bernardino NF is AP. You guys are the boogey man in all of this. Have displaced an enormous amount of good will and volunteerism. Bob - John, issues with federal budget that affects how much funding goes to agencies, it appears we are going to have a future of pay to use. Do you think the current situation of larger areas or individual site where you pay makes more sense. John - no problem with paying a fee for a picnic area with bathrooms or campground but has problem with pulling off the side of the road to look at view and being in violation of federal law and being fined.
- Danna - what is number of visitors to the forest? Kitty Benzar, member of public attending meeting - National Visitor Use Monitoring for San Bernardino NF is 1,953,634. Bob - so about 2 million to the forest.
- Tom - John, do you think this has impacted the business community? John Karevoll - yes people don't come up because of AP; perception is that before AP visitation was greater than today even though population has grown. Don - understands what he is saying, he thought that during Fee Demo that was happening, he is from N.CA where didn't have that, you paid for campsites, but the forest is adjusting now to address this concern. Agree coming from the north, it didn't feel comfortable coming to the south with the AP program. Glad we are addressing some of that today.
- John Miller, acting San Bernardino NF PIO - response to question on how work with stakeholders in Arrowhead. 16 water agencies, 3 different fire agencies, CA Highway Patrol, Caltrans, County Roads, meet monthly and bring in the Chambers of Commerce

recreation fees are discussed, what we are doing, what we are planning. Also meet with these agencies to discuss the snow situation. Similar group that meets monthly in Big Bear

- Paul - question for John Karevoll, was volunteer displacement because of dissatisfaction of the fee? John Karevoll - got lots of calls from local volunteer organizations including one who developed a picnic area that were unhappy that people had to pay and their members no longer went there. This land is your land concept is taken to heart up there incredibly intrusive to pay to visit your backyard. Paul - many of the volunteers wrote letters in support of the fees. Peter Wiechers, member of public attending meeting - we purposely didn't solicit responses, those were obviously solicited. Bob - issue is entitlements eating up federal budget less money available. John Karevoll - didn't agree, feel a lot of overhead and administration. When it comes to public lands, let people have access. If there is stuff, charge, if there is no stuff, don't charge. Grew up in Norway, there is no FS they have ways to deal with it. People in Norway can't believe the AP. Linda - they pay in other ways, have higher taxes.

Proposal 4

Proposal Name/Location: San Bernardino NF, Barton Flats SAF area

Proposal: To eliminate the SAF area designation, retain 1 SAF site and eliminate fees at 13 sites

RRAC Recommendation: Dick made motion to approve, Chris seconded. All voted Yes. Proposal was approved.

Discussion and Questions:

- Bob - describe use at South Fork Trailhead. John Miller - been there for quite awhile, most developed site in the area, mixed use, access to Wilderness but also day use, has paved parking lot, toilets, picnic tables. People also stage there and make way to Jenks Lake another site down below.
- Paul - is Coon Creek dispersed camping area. John Miller - unique thing on the San Bernardino, yellow post sites, a fire ring and a table.
- Tamara - we have a lot of sites that are called trailheads but are multiple use sites, in our Infra database they might be called trailheads or picnic areas but are multiple use, not uncommon across nation. Bob - understand, but if it is a site where they are there and then gone, less inclined to have a fee.

Proposal 5

Proposal Name/Location: San Bernardino NF, Big Bear North SAF area

Proposal: To eliminate the SAF area designation, retain 7 SAF sites and eliminate fees at 11 sites

RRAC Recommendation: Dick made motion to approve, Tom seconded. All voted Yes. Proposal was approved.

Discussion and Questions:

- Tom - Grays Peak Campground and Big Pine Flat Campground, are they concession. Tamara – if not on map they are concession. Tom - is Grays Peak Group Campground still closed. John Miller - yes closed due to Butler fire. Tamara – so not concession just closed from fire. Tom – how will people know that a fee is longer required. Tamara – SAF area signs removed and the standard official fee area signs are posted at fee sites, fee information on bulletin board, or fee tubes, signs on site, etc. If site is free there will be no fee information.
- Paul - Little Bear Springs trail on map with proposal says it is fee site. Tamara - map is incorrect in listing it as a fee site, it will be free.

Proposal 6

Proposal Name/Location: San Bernardino NF, Big Bear South SAF area

Proposal: To eliminate the SAF area designation, retain 1 SAF site and eliminate fees at 6 sites

RRAC Recommendation: Dick made motion to approve, Chris seconded. All voted Yes. Nate was not available to vote. Proposal was approved.

Discussion and Questions:

- Chris - clarified not voting on winter recreation.

Proposal 7

Proposal Name/Location: San Bernardino NF, Black Mountain SAF area

Proposal: To eliminate the SAF are designation, retain 1 SAF site, retain 5 EAF sites and eliminate fees at 7 sites

RRAC Recommendation: Tom made motion to approve, Chris seconded. All voted Yes. Proposal was approved.

Discussion and Questions:

- Paul - what Monument is this? John Miller - Santa Rosa and San Jacinto Mountains. Paul – is there fee for the Monument. John - no. Bob - what is usage of the campgrounds? John Miller - heavily used.

Proposal 8

Proposal Name/Location: San Bernardino NF, Falls SAF area

Proposal: To eliminate the SAF area designation and retain 2 SAF sites

RRAC Recommendation: Dick made motion to approve, Chris seconded. All voted Yes. Nate was not available to vote. Proposal was approved.

Discussion and Questions:

- Kitty Benzar, member of public attending meeting - were 4 individual sites now 3 sites seem to have been combined into one site. Tamara – they’re one area and share a parking area and share same entrance. Kitty – 2 are trailheads and 1 picnic area. Tamara – all together in one large complex. Kitty - if I go on a backpacking trip in Wilderness, and am gone a week do I need AP. Tamara – yes. Kitty – even if I spend five minutes putting on my pack and leave. Can I use an IA Pass purchased at Mesa Verde NP, how much of the sale of that pass goes to San Bernardino NF. Tamara – none, IA Pass revenue stays where pass is sold. Kitty – if I just leave my car for a week then I am not being charged for parking? Tamara - no, all the amenities are there including security. Kitty - described lawsuit in Region 3.
- Danna – seasonal toilet same as yesterday, if not there fee is not charged. Tamara- yes, if all six amenities not present there is no fee. Danna – is it a snow removal. Gabe Garcia, San Bernardino NF Front Country District Ranger - it is a removed when no water, use is low or if monsoon season.
- Bob - what is the use of Momeyer trailhead? Gabe – day use since close to creek, overflow for Falls and as trailhead. 1,800 day use and 3,100 overnight last year. Danna – how long is season for toilet. Gabe – couple of months.

Proposal 9

Proposal Name/Location: San Bernardino NF, Lytle Creek SAF area

Proposal: To reduce the size of the SAF area and split in to 3 small SAF areas, retain 1 SAF site and retain 1 EAF site

RRAC Recommendation: Paul made motion to approve, Don seconded. All voted Yes. Proposal was approved.

Discussion and Questions:

- Bob- can we get the Forest to comment on the amount of use. Gabe - one of the heaviest used areas on the forest. Flash flooding is why it is seasonal in part of area. Probably second to San Gabriel Canyon. Approximately 1,300 - 1,500 cars per day on weekends in five mile stretch. Only 5 minutes from freeway and 15 minutes from Rancho Cucamonga. Have agreement with CA Highway Patrol (CHP) and work with community of Lytle Creek to distribute amenities in the area. Picnic area fills up by 10 am. John Miller - community group meets monthly with Fish and Game, CHP, Sheriff’s Department and other entities to discuss recreation use and impacts. Also meet with Forest Falls side.
- Paul- parking is available along the road. Gabe – yes there are turnouts.

Proposal 10

Proposal Name/Location: San Bernardino NF, Thomas Mountain SAF area

Proposal: To eliminate the SAF area designation

RRAC Recommendation: Dick made motion to approve, Don seconded. All voted Yes. Proposal was approved.

Discussion and Questions:

- Tom- use level. Forest- light to moderate use.
- Paul – do they have vault toilets? Forest – yes Toolbox and Thomas Mountain.

Proposal 11

Proposal Name/Location: San Bernardino NF, Arrowhead Winter SRP

Proposal: To change fee type to SRP for winter recreation

RRAC Recommendation: Chris made motion to approve, Dick seconded. All voted Yes. Nate was not available to vote. Proposal was approved.

Discussion and Questions:

- Dick - are there mobile fee pay kiosks. Al Colby, San Bernardino NF Forest Public Services Staff Officer - no. Dick – is there a reason why not. Al – concern for safety of employees with collecting cash. John Miller - do not have onsite but there are a number of vendors located nearby that he identified.
- Bob – are these closer to local communities than the ones discussed yesterday. Tamara – yes. Bob - so impacts communities good and bad. Tamara – there is private land, especially Aspen Glen area because it is essentially in the neighborhood. We do make an effort to ensure that public is not on private land.
- Bob - what about public comments. Tamara – did not receive any public comments. Bob - comfortable with amount of outreach? Tamara - press release sent to all forest media contacts. John Miller – big impact whether at Arrowhead or Big Bear so have standing groups to deal with winter recreation and associated issues. No one agency can deal with alone so a cooperative effort. Traffic counts have shown 1,200 cars an hour. Bob – how much is ski resort traffic. John Miller – worked with Big Bear Chamber and Resort Association and they said 35 percent of bookings are going to the three ski resorts. Trying to determine economic benefits from winter recreation since everyone isn't using ski areas.
- Linda -do you have capacity to communicate in Spanish to visitors? John Miller - materials are in Spanish and English. Predominantly Hispanic visitors. Two private concessionaire operated snow play opportunities in the area but more expensive. Volunteers set up in a turn out near Fredalba to try to catch visitors on way up. Someone from LA doesn't understand difference between public lands vs. private land. Try to catch them early if they voluntarily pull over. Linda – does sign say free safety information. John Miller - says snow play information. Linda – perhaps try snow play safety information; may resonant with mothers or others. John Miller - big challenge to have those people go to SRPs and a lot of through traffic going to Big Bear ski resorts. Working with community to route people on State Highway 38 to reduce traffic through these areas, overhead message signs, portable message signs, etc. Volunteers are also telling them where they can purchase the AP.
- John Karevoll, member of public attending meeting - distinguish between the construct that Tamara gave on all the interagency workings and how actually plays out on the ground. Lives within 200 yards where booth is located and seen maybe 3 days in the last 5 years. No one ever stops, people just drive by. FS just wants a captive group, who come to let kids, throw snowballs, don't have facilities, and charge for it. FS is totally involved

and they park and walk and ticket or check for passes. Talked with Caltrans workers at the yard and they didn't know about any cooperation. Same with CHP and Sheriff's Department. It is various stretches of state highway that people come to throw snowballs and the FS just wants to make sure these people pay, that is what it is all about. Do not see the reality of what you described on the ground. Maybe in Big Bear but not in his area.

- Don- had he contacted his County Supervisors to relay concerns? John Karevoll - goes way back, in Fee Demo days the State Legislator said FS can't do this on State Highway, but that was a Resolution with no enforcement. I work with them on business, so didn't feel appropriate to contact them in this regards. Don – always look at involvement from County Supervisors, feel it is important positive or negative, he sees they were advised but had no comments one way or the other.
- Danna - SRP Management Plan talks about wanting to enhance the experience for the visitor, what are the intentions? Tamara - remember have been managing winter recreation in the SAF area for many years so special management services are how they are addressing that. Danna – looking to take it to the next step, if enhancement going on wanted to know what would be. Bob – because of REA we are required to track revenue and expenses by the activity. Tamara – no, because of REA, we are required to keep expenses and revenue for the program as a whole. Don't have the ability to separate out each individual area or type of use. Remember people use their AP many times a year for many types of activities at many locations on the S.CA forests. Bob – since many of winter recreation fees are collected on the day it happens do we have estimate of revenue during those times. Tamara - have Point of Sale System, so we could extrapolate maybe by location where a pass is sold but if selling to a vendor and then they sell, would mean trying to have a vendor keep track and then rolling that up. Closest thing for estimate is number of cars, but doesn't relate back to specific collection. Bob – wondering if expenses line up with revenues. Ramiro – are you asking is there enough money collected to take care of the issues. Bob - you're telling us there is a bunch of expenses, do we know what those are, and do we know revenue. Ramiro – another way to ask - based on the appropriations they get for recreation, and taking in to account revenue collected from this, do you still need to use appropriated funds to manage these areas or is the revenue enough to take care of these area. Bob – some assurance that without fees this program would be in danger or put people at risk, would let people go up there willy nilly on their own and do whatever they want without us intervening, how does that work out. Al – vendors in the area see an increase in sales and business. Big Bear Discovery Center can sell \$5,000-\$7,000 during snow play weekends. Bob – do you think there are expenses you could identify to do this program, is the revenue necessary to make that work. Al - yes, increased sales provides enough money to take care of what we need to do. Bob – not just a profit center. Al – no we staff up with extra people, like firefighters in off season, use extra vehicles, etc. Dick – if you didn't have the fees you wouldn't be able to do that. Al – it would cause an impact. Bob - what is public perception up there on charging a fee? Tamara – no comments when did outreach but asked Forest if they have heard comments with the groups they work with. John Miller - discussion usually not about the fees but about the impacts positive and negative, like impact to peoples commute, or business community like now with lack of snow.

Proposal 12

Proposal Name/Location: San Bernardino NF, Arrowhead target shooting SRP

Proposal: To change fee type to SRP for target shooting recreation

RRAC Recommendation: Don made motion to approve, Chris seconded. All voted Yes. Nate not available to vote. Proposal was approved.

Discussion and Questions:

- Bob - can any of these sites be reserved by clubs. Tamara – could be issued a special use permit for an event. John Mille r- not received request for a special use permit for an area. There is concession operated shooting area under special use permit in Lytle Creek where clubs frequently go. Bob - do these sites have anything more than a sign and trash can? John - for 1N09 that is correct but do have patrol there at this time of year. Tamara – there are no amenity requirements for an SRP under REA. Bob – so don’t have anyone there regularly, not policing for safety. Tamara - if there is a clean-up event or safety event, then forest personnel on site.
- Don - he liked the idea of a formalized area, may have found a reason to move to south, for \$30 he would have several areas to shoot, none in the north.
- Bob – had no opposition to fees. Tamara – received no comments and forest hasn’t received any in contacts.
- Chris - need to have a license to carry. Tom - State of CA requires unloaded and locked in a hard case to transport unless have a concealed weapons permit.
- Danna – by designating an SRP does that mean there will be increased cleanup efforts by the forest and emphasis by forest to recruit volunteers to clean up these areas more frequently more attention paid to it as an SRP shooting site, is that the intention. Tamara – these areas were always within SAF area and managed for shooting, changing fee type does not change our management strategy. Bob – revenue vs. expense. Gabe - 1N09 has not had much revenue in past few years because managed based on vegetative moisture so closed to shooting until enough fuel moisture. Bob - so closed during high fire danger. Gabe – yes road open but closed to shooting. Bob – is it signed? Gabe – in the entries and at the areas. Linda - her son Army Special Forces veteran and likes to go out with friends to shoot and it is a bond. Like to keep those types of recreation opportunities available.

Closing Remarks

Ramiro made presentation to RRAC members on behalf of the Regional Forester to thank them for their service. Bob closed with a quote from “Last Child in the Woods” and said to remember that is our mission, just one experience in nature truly does change people, hope as we leave that we remember what we do is important.