Attachment I
Small Group Questions and Input Summary

Lower Dolores Plan Working Group
Small Groups Exercise
9/21/09 -- Reach 5

Process/Ground Rules

- appoint a moderator (moderator can share views too) but helps keep the process on track
- appoint a person to take detailed notes
- be respectful of others’ opinions, especially if you do not agree
- note where there is some agreement; if there is not agreement, please note why what is the range of opinion
- please give your notes to Ann at the end
- NEW: please do not switch groups

Questions:
1) What are your groups’ ideas about how the DPLO should manage this reach? Specifically address:
   (note: if group does not get to each of these, more time can be allowed in future meetings for discussions)
2) What is your input on the management goals and objectives? Are there goals or management objectives missing?
   a) Similar to all reaches, should the outfitter and guide permits have reserved campsites.
   b) Should we withdraw lands in the Dolores River Wilderness Study Area from mineral entry? (this means they would no longer be available for oil/gas, uranium or other mineral exploration and extraction or is a No Surface Occupancy Stipulation enough protection)
   c) Should the Big Gypsum Recreation site be maintained as is, improved, or decommissioned? This is one of the main boat launches servicing Reach 5.
   d) How should the Dolores Office coordinate river management with the downstream offices (Uncompahgre BLM (Montrose) and Grand Junction BLM)?
   e) If (when) tamarisk is removed from the main Dolores and associated tributaries; how active (or passive) should the subsequent restoration efforts be?
   f) How should the illegal OHV access into the Dolores Wilderness Study Area be managed/enforced? Coyote Wash, Bull Canyon, and areas west of Silvey’s Pocket are being impacted.
   g) How should the cultural sites currently being impacted from rafters be protected?
   h) Should there be additional interpretation at Indian Henry’s Cabin located in Bull Canyon?
   i) According to the 1990 Dolores River Corridor Plan water manages are to provide a minimum raftable release of 800 cfs. How should water managers balance both rafting with flushing flows for management of other resources (riparian, fisheries, etc.)?
   j) If you were granted one wish for the Dolores River, what would it be?


3) Overall, what protection tools might be recommended in this reach?
A. Similar to all reaches, should the outfitter and guide permits have reserved campsites?
- First come, first served, or designate one camp in each for commercial trips (no consensus)
- Is this a non-issue? Not much guiding and outfitting
- Very limited campsites
- How can we enforce?
- First come, first served most practical
- Yes, might help organize and address issues
- Since they have to have permits (to launch) anyway
- How can you enforce?
- Educate private parties with signage
- But a lot more bureaucracy – enforcement is a challenge
- How about “preferred campsites” versus assigned? (use signage to indicate)
- Wait until it’s a bigger problem and solve it then

B. Should we withdraw lands in the Dolores River Wilderness Study Area from mineral entry?
- No, surface occupancy stipulation should be enough
- Range – need oil – NSO working
- Stick with NSO and BMP’s because we need the energy (some agreement)
- Others: prefer withdrawal, but NSO good as long as stipulation cannot be waived
  - Volume of gas is small
  - Focus on energy alternatives
- Geology restricts anyway - don’t really know what volume/value is there - don’t trash the place

C. Should the Big Gypsum recreation site be maintained as is, improved, or decommissioned?
- Need sanitary facilities, otherwise no improvements – also, better management of weeds in recreation site
- Decommissioned is unrealistic
- Better maintenance – trash issues
- Improvement – better maintained
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- Don’t decommission
- Don’t know much about site
- Best access to river in area
- No strong need for improvements – don’t improve because detracts from values
- Is it not meeting demand?
- The actual put-in ramp is very small - consider adding another put-in

D. How should the Dolores office coordinate river management with the downstream offices?
- Should coordinate management plan so management doesn’t change when management boundaries are crossed
- What does “coordination” mean between district?
- Already coordinated – needs more private land owner input
- By telephone
- Makes sense to change management at end of WSA (not in the middle)

E. If tamarisk is removed from the main Dolores and associated tributaries, how active should the subsequent restoration efforts be?
- Should be passive because it’s in WSA, but water could be an active restoration tool to release floods to improve habitat for cottonwoods and willows
- Knapweed control and seed sowing
- Not many weeds upstream of Coyote Wash
- Passive – grasses and willow and cottonwood will come back
- Should be active, at least to restore grasses and prevent invasion by knapweed and tamarisk (general agreement)
- Be realistic: don’t get overambitious – it’s extremely challenging to manage plants
- Make an honest effort
- What do you do if the bugs get there first?

F. How should the illegal OHV access into the Dolores Wilderness Study Area be managed?
- Permanent posted signs big enough to see – most people may not know – are there multiple entry points? – physical barrier might help in Bull Canyon and Silvey’s Pocket
- Physical barrier won’t work or will block Suckla’s
- Enforcement nearly impossible
- What is damage?
- “Actively discourage” illegal use – a few motorcycles already signed
- Education - don’t let up
- Signage (although some have heard that signs routinely get removed)
- Start slow, don’t get too heavy handed
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- Figure out where they are coming from, although others added: this is obvious, they are using the existing old road

G. How should the cultural sites currently being impacted from rafters be protected?
- Recommend that Shoman Cave be day-use only – signage at major sites – visitation ethics posted at launch sites and registered – closing some social trails
- Remote sensing?
- Wild & Scenic – more damage, more people
- Spill – more people
- Education/signage/peer pressure
- Small fence or barrier
- Brochure with outfitters and guidebook information
- Education
- Close camping @ archeological sites
- 1% of the people cause the problem
- Use low fence around sites to remind people to keep a distance
- Plant poison ivy, etc.

H. Should there be additional interpretation at Indian Henry’s Cabin located in Bull Canyon?
- Need sign and history of cabin
- None of us have been there
- Yes, should protect and in favor of education about history of cabin

I. How should water managers balance both rafting with flushing flows for management of other resources?
- DRD science recommendation for habitat restoration should be implemented on “big water years” over consistent 800 cfs for boaters
- Time with spawning better
- 800 cfs steady siltation is problematic
- 2000 max? Natification needed downstream
- Need to understand flushing better – what is the needed Q
- This is the basic issue that DRD struggles with
- Rafting is the priority (question raised: isn’t management for fishery also a stated priority?)
- Keep science driving process
- Keep DRD effort focusing on this question
- Could re-operate under EIS if science supports
- BLM management plan is the wrong document to address this question
- General agreement: management focus should be changed to address not just rafting but also ecology - comment: this is just the reality
J. If you were granted one wish for the Dolores River, what would it be?

- Management plan is now good, with a few exceptions – would like to see plan more permanent – would like to keep 1990 plan (not everyone wished)
- Leave alone, limit advertising
- Manage spills for ecological benefits
- Rafting remain informal
- BLM retain and improve management
- Keep it a secret
- Long-term protection
- Keep it as it is and has been
- Not so many tourists
- Provide access to most of the river – provides important recreation area for low income folks

Overall, what protection tools might be recommended in this reach?

- Existing plan covers a lot
- Can have too many rules
- Wild & Scenic interpretation would help (Roy Smith)
- *Use good scientific information
- WSA should be designated as Wilderness
  - already pre-scripted as WSA
  - recommended for designation
  - language w/o federal reserved water right
- Water rights are contentious in Wilderness issue, so look a different direction
- General Agreement: the WSA/Reach 5 is worth protecting
- Current Goal = “Not more than 3 group encounters per day between users”
- Is it realistic to be that specific?
- Raising the profile brings more people
- If we don’t act, the area might get overrun with people in the future
  - Better to be proactive than to have to react to protect the resource
  - There are 2 sides to wilderness issue: impacts by use/impacts for people
- Limit use, but don’t need Wilderness: Wilderness = an advertisement (like the Monument)
- Personal observation: Monument did not increase use of Sand Canyon, etc.
- Personal observation: Monument did increase use on north end, around Pleasant View
- Question: are we currently under the 1990 plan? Yes, although not all of it is implemented/enforced
- Is there a plan that can be enforced?
- W&S water language even less tractable than Wilderness
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- Proposal: remove Suitability in Reach 5 and just focus on Wilderness designation; solve the water rights language to meet approval of water community and wilderness community - general agreement of group.
- Agree as long as something happens to protect for the future
- Group member strongly supports the idea, would be pretty much the same management as currently exists - Concerns:
  - Prior and existing rights must be protected and honored
  - Grazing must continue
- Could live with suitability if knew it wouldn’t get designated as W&S (because of Federal Reserve Water Right)