

**Colorado RRAC: Attachment B
 US Forest Service - Region 2
 BLM - Colorado
 Recreation Fee Proposals
 Summary of Public Involvement**

Date: 9/29/2010

Unit: Green Mountain Reservoir Recreation Complex

Proposal: New Fee _____ Fee Change X

Summary of Fee Proposals:

Site/Service	Current Price	Proposed Price
Green Mountain Reservoir Area	\$5/vehicle (camping and day use), \$25 season pass	\$13/site, \$65 season pass. No day use fee.

Public Participation Activities:

Public Participation Tasks	Date(s)
Posted notice at (Unit Location) inviting comments on fee proposal.	From 2004 to 2006, the Dillon Ranger District implemented a recreation management planning process for the Green Mountain Reservoir / Cataract Recreation Complex. There was extensive public involvement. Several opportunities to comment on the fee increase were made available to the public. Brochures (including a fee change) were available at the Dillon District Office in Silverthorne, CO from 2005 to 2009
Posted notice at (Field locations) inviting comments on fee proposal.	In 2005, 5000 copies of a brochure were produced and an effort was made to distribute to each camp and to trail users. The brochure was entitled "NEW RULES PROPOSED FOR 2006." Included was a section on fees that stated it would "cost a family with one vehicle \$20 to camp for a weekend." It was also stated that the day use fee would also be \$10, however, because of public input, that fee would be eliminated. Included in the brochure was a section requesting comments. A telephone number and e-mail address

	<p>were provided. Brochures were also distributed in 2006 through 2008. In these editions, the new rules were described and requests for comments were stated with contact information. A refined proposal was developed in 2010. During the summer of 2010, about 100 comment cards were distributed to campers on site.</p>
<p>Published press releases announcing fee proposal in (Newspaper of Record).</p>	<p>Summary of articles in the Summit Daily News.</p> <p>September 12, 2005: “Green Mountain Users Meet Forest Service Head-on.” Report of the Heeney public meeting. Fee increases discussed.</p> <p>October 20, 2005: “Senate to Review Public Land Fees.” Green Mountain Reservoir fee revenue does not meet needs to maintain the area.</p> <p>March 7, 2006: “Regulating the Last Frontier.” Green Mountain Reservoir / Cataract Recreation Management Plan completion announced. Proposed fee increases reported.</p> <p>March 8, 2006: Editorial supporting the management plan and fee increases.</p> <p>June 5, 2007: “Fees Lead to Camping Improvements.” Fee increases discussed.</p> <p>June 6, 2007: Editorial supporting Green Mountain Reservoir fee increases.</p> <p>September 26, 2007: "Feds Seek Input on Recreation Fees." RRAC members sought. Proposed Green Mountain Reservoir fees increases reported.</p> <p>January 9, 2009: “Pay to Play Under Fire.” Proposed Senate bill could end REA. Needs for fee increase at Green Mountain Reservoir described.</p> <p>March 16, 2010: A news release was issued about the latest proposal and it appeared in the Summit Daily as well as</p>

	<p>the Summit County Voice (a local news website)</p> <p>Copies of all of the above are available.</p>
<p>Article published in the (Newspaper, etc) explaining benefits of fee revenues.</p>	<p>Same as above</p>
<p>Internal memo sent out to (Unit) employees announcing proposed fee changes.</p>	<p>Fee proposal was shared with District employees at several staff meetings between 2004 and 2006. Several employees were directly involved with the management plan. Some employees submitted comments (Fenske, Shane)</p>
<p>Posted information on fee proposal on (Unit's) web site.</p>	<p>The 2005 brochure was posted on www.dillonrangerdistrict.com for two years. The March 16, 2010 and April 10, 2009 news releases were posted on the website.</p>
<p>Posted Federal Register notice of proposed new fees (if appropriate) as per REA, Sec. 4 (b).</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Letter sent to residents near the (Fee Area) announcing proposed new fee.</p>	<p>Heeney residents (the nearest community) were thoroughly made aware of the proposal through the 2005 brochure and by word of mouth as evidenced by the attendance of 70+ people at a public meeting there. In 2006, copies of the recreation management plan were made available for review. Even though the plan was completed, comments were still requested. A notice was sent to all of those who commented (including many people from Heeney) and the 292-person mailing list, in addition to an announcement in the Summit Daily newspaper. In September, 2010, the latest fee proposal was sent to the e-mail list requesting comments.</p>
<p>Briefed local Congressional Staff on fee proposal. Included Senators (List) offices and Congressional Representative (List) offices.</p>	<p>The District Ranger meets regularly with a representative of Congressman Polis and has discussed of the fee change. The 2010 revised proposal was sent to Senators Udall and Bennett in September of 2010.</p>
<p>Briefed local County commissioners on fee proposal.</p>	<p>The Summit County Board of Commissioners was sent a copy of the management plan in March of 2006. It included the fee increase proposal. The 2010 revised proposal was presented to them in March of 2010.</p>

<p>Personal contacts were made with (List) interested individuals about the fee proposal.</p>	<p>See above (Posted notice at Field locations). A public meeting was held in Heeney, Colorado September 10, 2005. During the winter of 2008-2009, a focus group was formed which consisted of individuals representing local residents, businesses, organizations, and the Western Slope No Fee Coalition. This group representing a variety of views provided input to help the District modify the proposal.</p>
<p>E-mails were sent to (List) individuals and organizations about the fee proposal.</p>	<p>In 2004, a mailing list of 292 people was made by contacting recreation users in the area. The intent was to have a sample of visitors to contact for input. The 2005 brochure was made available to them. A notice was sent to all of those who commented from this mailing list. The 2010 revised proposal including a request for comments was sent to the 292-person e-mail list in September of 2010</p>

Public Participation Results:

Method of Communication	Summary of Comments- as of 9/9/2010
<p>Posted On-site Notices - (Location)</p>	<p>Notices were posted several ways. Comments were submitted by e-mail, letters, and telephone calls. A record was not kept of how each respondent heard of the proposal (method of communication). The following is a summary of all of the comments received relating to fees (both positive and negative). There were numerous management actions proposed in the recreation management plan, however, only those comments relating to fees are reported here. The comments are stated, however, the actual letters or e-mails are available so that they can be reviewed to ensure they are not taken out of context.</p> <p>Kim Fenske (Summit County): “I think the toughest sell is the raising of a “day” fee to \$10, since many visitors to the wilderness area are only there for a few hours and have little or no use impact.” Forest Service Comment: The final proposal has no day use fee.</p> <p>Eric Scott (Heeney, Colorado): “I don’t agree with the new standard fee which really doubles the cost to camp for a weekend. I don’t believe that will be the deal breaker for most families.”</p> <p>Don Shane (Heeney, Colorado): “Seasonal parking passes are a great help to regular visitors.”</p> <p>Len Bachtell (Denver, Colorado): “I do understand why you want to charge a day use fee, but I would rather you raised the camping fee by one to two dollars per night than have to pay two fees to camp. Also, is there an annual fee and if not, that would be an idea to put in.” Forest Service Comment: The final proposal includes a \$65 season pass.</p> <p>Don H. Carton (Loveland, Colorado): “I do not mind paying a little more, but don’t think we should lose any campsites. They are very hard to come by as it is.”</p> <p>James O. Thompson (Lakewood, Colorado): “I would gladly pay a higher fee or even reserve a site if I knew that at specific area could be available when I arrive. Other national areas are set up to do this.” Forest Service Comment: One of the largest campgrounds, Cow Creek South, is now available for reservations.</p> <p>Anonymous (Glenwood Springs, Colorado zip code): “People will pay more if the area is clean.”</p> <p>William A. and Kimberly Weiland (Heeney, Colorado): “With the price of gasoline approaching \$3 per gallon, the average family</p>

does not have a lot of spending money to provide for distant, extended or extravagant vacations. In the past, Green Mountain Reservoir has provided a reasonable getaway for families, boaters, and fishermen, with economy in mind.” **Forest Service Comment: A reasonable fee is proposed. The current fee is less than what is needed to operate and maintain the sites.**

Debra Mitchener (Heeney, Colorado): “For TEN YEARS, we have heard from the Forest Service that they do not have enough money!” Ten years! There certainly does not seem to be a lack of money in the ski resort areas of the Forest!” First of all, the collecting of fees has been, over the last few years, a far cry from an efficient system and this year they would not even let private businesses collect fees for them.” **Forest Service Comment: Fee collection has been inefficient because of a lack of personnel. It was determined that it was inappropriate for private businesses to collect the fees, however, they are permitted to purchase season passes (at a reduced rate) and re-sell them to the public.**

Debra Mitchener (Heeney, Colorado), Second comment: “The proposed fee increases seem reasonable if they are to provide trash dumpsters and toilets, both fairly basic human needs to enjoy a camping vacation but closing toilets and camp areas does not seem to justify higher fees.” **Forest Service Comment: One campground was proposed to be changed to day use only, but the final plan left eight campsites open. In 2009, 15 campsites were restored. One small 3-unit campground was closed because it was isolated and costly to operate. Additionally, three very old toilets were removed, however, two new toilets were installed in 2008 in locations where the need is greater. Another toilet will be installed in 2011 at Elliot Creek CG.**

Glen Morgan (Summit County, Colorado): “It is unreasonable to up the day fee to \$10.00 then take away the bathroom amenity.” **Forest Service Comment: The proposal was changed to reflect no increase for day uses. Additionally, three toilets were removed, however, three new ones were installed in locations where the need is greater.**

Keats Scott (Heeney, Colorado): “Green Mountain Reservoir is the place for the working man’s vacation. Green Mountain Reservoir has always been the “step child” when it came to services provided by the Forest Service. Now adding these rules and making it cost \$20.00 to camp for a weekend and not even have an outhouse is a bit much.” **Forest Service Comment: The original proposal included the removal of three toilets at Willows Campground, however, because of public input, only one toilet was removed because it was old, needed costly repairs, difficult to clean, very smelly, and close to another**

toilet.

Sherry (Marrsherry@aol.com): “You seem to want to turn this into a state park. I feel that this should stay National Forest Land.

Why are you wanting to change the forest? More money, that’s all the government is about. You do not care about the nature or the people. What about the lottery money?” **Forest Service**

Comment: The main purpose of the fee increase is to allow the Forest Service to protect the environment and maintain public safety. Colorado Lottery funding is not available for this program.

Phil Irwin (Erie, Colorado): “Recreation users do not mind paying for a nice area, but we have and what you are proposing will not cut it!”

Jack Taylor (Heeney, Colorado): “Asking people to pay to camp in areas that do not provide adequate services is not reasonable. If your motive is to reduce the number of campers on Green Mountain Reservoir, then say so. It is my opinion that the proposed fees schedule will exactly do that. More importantly, the proposed plan appears to ask for additional fees with no additional benefit to the campers. How will you justify that?” **Forest**

Service Comment: It is not the motive of the Forest Service to reduce the number of visitors by increasing fees. The purpose is to provide the funding for adequate services (e.g., toilet cleaning/pumping, garbage service, litter pick up, information, and law enforcement).

Bona Dea (Silverthorne, Colorado): “One thing that has not been addressed is the new fees, and if locals will still be able to get a season pass for the area. I know for a fact that if we can’t, then we will be going to other places that won’t cost so much. I am a single mother of two boys, struggling to live in Summit County for the good of my kids. Going to Green Mountain is a cheap and fun experience to get away from all the tourists of the summer months and lets my kids swim in the lake as well!! Please don’t make it unaffordable to those of us who really use it and LOVE it!”

Forest Service Comment: A season pass will be made available for unlimited use of all the sites, May through October, for \$65.

Rhonda Greene (Castle Rock, Colorado): “I don’t have a problem with higher fees for use and services, but to cut services, close areas down, and limit recreation, is not right.” **Forest Service**

Comment: The original proposal included the closure of some campsites and some reduction in services, however, many of those have been restored. The fees would need to be even higher than proposed to provide more services.

Mike and Jennifer Voxakis (Silverthorne, Colorado): “High prices will turn people away and no \$ will come to you anyway. Reasonable prices with practical season passes will keep people coming.”

Vonnie Ciarnello (Boulder, Colorado): “A \$20 fee to camp for a Friday and Saturday night is too much for no hookups. If a person is camping the night – the day fee should not apply. Fees should only apply Memorial Day to Labor Day. Make sure annual passes are available to purchase in Heeney, too.” **Forest Service**

Comment: The final proposal includes no day use fee. There is a demonstrated demand for early and late season use so sites are kept open during those times (with fees because funding is need to provide services during that time). The passes are available in Heeney.

Daniel Shane (rochelleshane@comcast.net): “Increased fees, I wish it didn’t happen, but I understand you need money to pay for services.”

Also available are letters/e-mails from local individuals/ organizations that were asked in 2008 to support the fee increases. These were sent in response to news that the RRAC had not approved the fee increase. Included are support documents from the Friends of the Eagles Nest Wilderness, Blue River Chapter of the Sierra Club, Summit County Off-Road Riders, John Taylor, Town of Dillon, Denver Water Board, Thousand Trails (campground concessionaire), Leslie and Peter Miller, and others.

Comments from the news release, comment cards, and e-mails regarding the 2010 revised proposal:

Steve Jacobson (sjacobsoncrs@msn.com): Green Mountain Res is a wonderful place to go to. The proposed fees of \$13 per campsite p/night is still attractive. We enjoy being able to go to a clean and well managed area and would pay to do so. having rules enforced for trash pick up as well a s enforcement of guidelines is important for the safe being of ourselves and others. Thank you for the continued efforts to provide this.

Kim Fenske (coppersnowboarder@yahoo.com): Forest Service Fee Review Committee, I support the proposed increase in fees for overnight camping at Green Mountain Reservoir to \$13 per night. I have a long-held belief that all Forest Service campgrounds under public management are under-valued. Most users of developed campgrounds are costly users of public lands, bringing heavy loads of trash compared to dispersed camping backpackers and usually building large bonfires compared to minimalist backcountry users. Therefore, maintenance costs are much higher for the car-camper or RV-camper groups who have a heavier

	<p>footprint on public lands than users in more remote areas.</p> <p>Furthermore, the developed campground user has an expectation of more availability of services and facilities, justifying larger expenditures per user by public lands managers. On this basis, I support higher fees to support more intensive development and maintenance for Green Mountain Reservoir campgrounds. Thank you.</p> <p>Bunny Terill (Heeney, Colorado): I never got your original email re fees at Green Mountain Reservoir campsites but Anne Marie was kind enough to forward it to me.</p> <p>I agree, the fees, although almost tripling still seem relatively affordable and if they're consistent with fees at other Summit County locations, are probably acceptable.</p> <p>I know I've heard the answer to this question but cannot for the life of me remember the answer--why are you eliminating the \$5 parking day use fee at trailheads? If the Forest Service is so strapped for dough, wouldn't the \$5 help?</p> <p>Laverne Rotello (Heeney, Colorado): I think an increase in fees is appropriate, as I have seen the condition of the campgrounds after a weekend. Also, my philosophy is that the users should pay – not the taxpayers in general.</p> <p>Ann Marie Damian (Heeney, Colorado): I think the increases sound okay as long as you closely monitor them for at least a year to see if you are actually losing money due to the increased fees. If that is the case, then you will need to lower them again to a level to get back those who could only afford to camp here when the cost was lower. Also, I want to make sure that you indeed have spoken to the owners of all businesses in Heeney recently (not a year ago) to see if these increases will negatively impact them in any way. Thank you.</p>
<p>Posted on-site notices – (Focus Group comments)</p>	<p>The following comments were received from the 2008-2010 Focus Group in the development of the revised proposal:</p> <p><i>Keep it Simple. Forest Service Comment:</i> This proposal is simple. One fee will to apply to all sites.</p> <p><i>Fee amount should be based on the amenities. Forest Service Comment:</i> The analysis comparing this program with the fee revenue at nearby sites now demonstrates that the fees would be less than other sites with similar facilities. These campgrounds do not have water provided and some sites do not have picnic tables, therefore, the lower fee should be valid.</p> <p><i>Putting Cow Creek South into the reservation system should have been a public process. Forest Service Comment:</i> Not every</p>

management decision that is made has to be a public process. The proposal to have reservations was identified in the Green Mountain Recreation Management Plan

\$17 is excessive...especially with no water. **Forest Service**

Comment: The proposal has been modified to \$13.

The people pay already (taxes). **Forest Service Comment:** User fees were established so that the people who use the facilities are those that pay for or the upkeep of those facilities.

The vision is a dollar sign at the end of the road. **Forest Service Comment:** The dollar sign is a goal, but beyond that is what it buys, which is customer service and the protection of the public and natural resources.

Explain the drop in fee revenue in 2009. Revenue went down in 2009 because of tough economy, how can new fee generate over \$100K? **Forest Service Comment:** Actually revenue at other nearby campgrounds went up during this bad economy. Revenues at Green Mountain Reservoir were down because fee compliance was low (because we had fewer staff to ensure payment) and there were fewer campsites because of the shoreline closure. There were weekends in June and August when wet weather affected visitation-rainy weather in June/July (?) may have also contributed to low use numbers at GMR. The table that identifies the number of sites, days in the season, and occupancy rates demonstrates how over \$100,000 could be generated.

By eliminating day use fees and Cataract fees, how can still accomplish increase? See the table referred to above.

Other campgrounds with no water are \$10-\$12. **Forest Service Comment:** Blue River Campground, a few miles away, has no water and is \$14.

Since (there are) no tables and roads are rough, you can't charge for something that doesn't exist. **Forest Service Comment:** There are tables at McDonald Flats, Prairie Point, and Cataract Creek. Tables will be installed at Cow Creek North, Cow creek south, and Elliot Creek campgrounds next spring.

People will park on Hwy 9. **Forest Service Comment:** This could be true, but it is not likely

Remove radio batteries if you have cell phones . **Forest Service Comment:** Cell phone coverage is spotty. For safety, our employees must always have communication. We need both cell phones and radios.

There will be less toilet pumping since there is less camping capacity. **Forest Service Comment:** That is possible, however, pumping costs are expected to increase. If there is some costs savings, then the savings would go to site improvements.

Leave a vehicle in Heeney . **Forest Service Comment:** We already leave two vehicles at the Cataract station. Only one vehicle is used to go to and from the ranger station in Silverthorne.

Cataract area sites should be closed if no fee is charged. **Forest Service Comment:** We will not close the trailheads to public use.

We do not see many of the suggestions of the focus group in the

proposal. **Forest Service Comment:** Of the 32 suggestions recorded, we are implementing (or proposing to) 17 of them. Some of the rest have significant costs associated with them and could be implemented if we get the fee increase. Several we have deemed to not be practicable, primarily because of excessive cost.

Forego host sites. **Forest Service Comment:** Volunteer campground hosts are also a very successful national program that improves efficiency and customer service.

Have employees drive their own vehicles to and from work. **Forest Service Comment:** All but one employee would be stationed at the Cataract housing facilities. The other employee needs to service Sapphire Point in the Dillon reservoir area.

Eliminate the reservation system to reduce staff time. **Forest Service Comment:** We could do this, but at the expense of customer service and it would necessitate staff time to collect and count the fee revenue (instead of it automatically added to the Forest Service account). Posting reservations will be one of the volunteer tasks.

Close campgrounds at the same time to increase capacity. **Forest Service Comment:** We could close them all at the same time (e.g., end of September), however, we are trying to serve the fall customers by having some sites open.

Have FS employees on site in the weekend evenings. **Forest Service Comment:** This is a good idea, however, it demonstrates the need for a fee increase. Requiring employees to work evenings is typically for overtime and is costly.

A \$10 flat fee would be simple and affordable – How do you determine what is affordable? **Forest Service Comment:** \$10 would not likely generate enough revenue. Affordable fees are primarily determined by comparing to other sites. If the fees were too high, campers would not come.

I do not understand the excessive delay of the authority that addresses the fees. **Forest Service Comment:** The Dillon Ranger District has been pursuing a fee increase for five years. The Dillon Ranger District is working through the fee change process as fast as possible.

The Forest Service is threatening to close all or some of the sites to public use. **Forest Service Comment:** The \$5 per vehicle fee and \$25 season pass generates only enough revenue for about 2 people to operate the sites (which have about 34,000 visitors annually), seven days a week, May through September. The Forest Service has standards for safety, customer service, and environmental protection that cannot be met at this staffing level. The District Ranger may choose to close the sites instead of operating them at the expense of public safety and the environment.

Threatening to close the Cataract trailheads is inappropriate **Forest Service Comment:** We are not proposing to close the trailheads, only to eliminate the fee charged to use them.

The Forest Service has failed to efficiently manage its money and

*operations to maintain the area...The Forest Service has caused the financial situation to deteriorate. **Forest Service Comment:** The Dillon Ranger District has managed to stretch a severely limited budget to allow for the campgrounds to be available to the public. It is that efficiency that has allowed for the campgrounds to remain open.*

*We do not have a problem with the \$5 parking fee. . .you are giving up a huge income. **Forest Service Comment:** We are modifying the fee structure to be consistent with REA, which does not allow for a “parking fee.”*

*Keep the parking fee at the McDonald Flats boat ramp, since it will unfairly compete with the marina parking. **Forest Service Comment:** The boat ramp by itself does not contain the required amenities described in REA for an expanded amenity site.*

*If you eliminate the fee at the Cataract trailheads, how do enforce those who park for several days? **Forest Service Comment:** The only regulation regarding occupancy at trailheads is a 14-day camping limit. Eliminating the fee would not prohibit Forest Protection Officers from enforcing that regulation. When a fee was charged, one pass was valid for up to 5 days. Anyone parking for more than 5 days needed one or more passes.*

*If road maintenance is a problem, then chip seal the roads. **Forest Service Comment:** This is a good idea, but it would be very costly.*

*Changing all the sites in the campgrounds to a per-site instead of a per-vehicle fee will initially cause another huge expense to mark all the sites and cause the campgrounds to open late. **Forest Service Comment:** The signs are already in stock and it would take one day to install. There would be no delay and no extra cost. *You are trying to further reduce the recreational access to this area and to not have to take care of it. **Forest Service Comment:** We are taking your advice and trying to add more campsites and to obtain the resources to do a good job of taking care of it.**

*Keep the per-vehicle fee. **Forest Service Comment:** The per-vehicle fee was efficient when the shoreline camping was open and there were no designated sites. Since we now have camping in designated sites only, there is no reason to charge by the vehicle. Nationally, most all campgrounds charge by the site and many do charge for extra vehicles (as we are proposing). In the past, many people paid for one vehicle in a group occupying one campsite and thought they have paid the correct amount (even though there were several vehicles in the group).*

*To generate revenue for the GMR area, consider increasing fees at the Dillon Reservoir campgrounds. **Forest Service Comment:** It is not administratively possible to divert funds from the concessionaire-operated sites.*

*Charging \$17 for a semi-dispersed camping with few amenities does not offer a fair balance between price paid and value received **Forest Service Comment:** The fee proposal has been*

	<p>reduced to \$13. McDonald Flats, Prairie Point, and Cataract Creek have toilets and garbage service and the campsites have parking spurs, a picnic table, and firepit with grill. We provide for visitor protection as well. Cow Creek South, Cow Creek North, and Elliot Creek have all of these except for picnic tables, but they will be installed in 2011.</p> <p><i>Missing in this proposal is any of the appropriated funding for recreation at GMR. Forest Service Comment: It was clearly demonstrated to the Focus Group how and why there is no appropriated funding available for <u>operations</u>. Appropriated funding will continue to be used for planning and design for facility improvements and for management.</i></p> <p><i>Establish a strong master plan. Forest Service Comment: We completed a master plan for the area in 2006 and many of the tasks identified are contingent on a fee increase to fund them. We also updated the business plan in 2010.</i></p> <p><i>Remove the mileage allowance and vehicle repair as this is double dipping. Forest Service Comment: These expenses are not funded by any other funding source. Vehicles used specifically for this program should be funded by fee revenue.</i></p> <p><i>Move the Developed Recreation Manager salary to another budget line item. Forest Service Comment: Funding the direct supervision costs for Green Mountain Reservoir by another funding source would take away from other recreation programs.</i></p> <p><i>The Forest Service does what they want. Forest Service Comment: That is correct<u>The Forest Service is responsible for managing recreational activities at Green Mountain Reservoir Recreation Area, and we do so in a manner that follows applicable laws, regulations, policy, and common sense. We also ,but we</u> listen to our customers and use many years' of both individual and institutional knowledge to make decisions on how to best manage recreation resources. The Dillon Ranger District staff have made it their career to help the public enjoy and protect the national forest.</i></p> <p><i>You will never get everyone's approval. Forest Service Comment: The Dillon Ranger District has addressed as many concerns as possible to reflect a balance of the needs and desires of the Green Mountain Reservoir visitors and stakeholders with responsible management of the natural resources.</i></p>
Press Releases & News Story of User Benefits	See Posted On-site Notices above
Forest Web Site Posting	See Posted On-site Notices above
Federal Register Notice	N/A
Letters to Neighbors	See Posted On-site Notices above
Congressional Staff Briefing	Verbal comments supporting the fee change were received.

County Commissioners Briefing	An e-mail from the Summit County Commissioners on March 30, 2010 indicated support for the fee change.
General Customer Contact Feedback	See Posted On-site Notices above
E-mail Responses	See Posted On-site Notices above