

March 2, 2017

Meeting began at 7:05 p.m.

Present: Bill Muse, Mayor; Steve Cox, Pete Benson, Council Members; Judi Davis, Clerk.

Absent and excused: Gladys LeFevre, Farlan Behunin, Council Members.

Public present: Keith Watts and Lisa Varga, Elizabeth Julian, Brynn Brodie, Perry Tancredi, Cheryl Cox, Ryan, Oakley, and Ryker Haws, Mary Jane Coombs, Molly Benson, Nina Brownell, Josh Ellis, Kate McCarty, Jeremy Strebel, Peg Smith, Blake Spalding, Julie Robinson and Dave Hensel*, Eric Scott**, Tabor Dahl *** Jeff Sanders****, Brandie Hardman*****, Jabe Beal*****.

Pledge of allegiance

Approval of the minutes of the February 2 meeting was postponed because there isn't a quorum at this meeting who were at that meeting.

Josh Ellis reported that BCA is willing to help with the **4th of July celebration**. It will be an all-day celebration, with kids' games earlier in the day. There was a discussion on dates * involving the Council and Blake from Hell's Backbone Grill. The Town celebration will be on July 3, and the Grill/Lodge will hold their ice cream social and talent show on July 4. ** The Town will contribute \$1,500 toward the July 3 activities. BCA was asked to have their plans to the Council by June.

There was discussion on whether the contracts for Tract Park and Community Center **grounds caretakers and custodian** should be advertised annually. We will advertise the positions (\$14/hour, 12 hours/week at Tract, 10 hours/month at the CC grounds, and 2 hours/week for custodial work) and the season for grounds work will be April-October and the custodian work will be year round. Interested people should submit their names to the clerk by 5:00 p.m. on May 5. Notice will be posted on the bulletin board and on the Town's website. ***

At the request of **Lisa** Varga, who read her letter to the Council, discussion was held regarding the **County's resolution on reducing the size of the GSENM**. The County Commission will meet at 10:00 on March 13, and she asked if the Council would write a letter to them before their meeting. **** **Steve** read the County's resolution in which they support the reduction of the size of the Monument. He stated that we were never consulted by the County for our opinion. ***** **Blake** stated that she established her business here because of the GSENM proclamation. Her business has grown, and she hires many local people with a payroll of \$600,000 last year. Sales tax generated has

March 2, 2017

Page 2

contributed to the economy of the area. Her business may not survive if the size of the Monument is reduced. **Lisa** stated that the proposal is a top-down movement instead of a grass roots proposal and that town meetings were not held throughout the County to get citizen input. The State has already passed a similar resolution, and it feels like it's being forced onto us.

Tabor stated that it feels like the Monument was originally created that way.***** It's hard to know what a reduction would look like. Because people have more free time and means, he believes tourism is increasing everywhere, so maybe there won't be a reduction in the traffic. He believes that tourism and other types of business could co-exist, so we don't have to choose between the kinds of activities that will take place. He is in favor of a reduction in size and doesn't think it will kill our businesses. **Steve** has asked others, without getting a good answer, so asked Tabor what reducing the size of the Monument would do for him and others in his situation, as it would still be BLM land. He asked Tabor if he thought there would be an advantage in shrinking the size of the Monument. He responded by reviewing a conversation he had with Quinn Griffin, whose family lost their grazing permits. He, Quinn, said it is like a sheet of plywood with its many layers, just as the management of the Monument has many layers, which restrict what can be done, tying hands at the local level. Their loss of grazing came from above, not from the local level. The layers of bureaucracy take the management away from the locals who know the land.

Mary Jane agrees with Tabor and would like to see the size reduced. There needs to be multiple use, allowing the businesses that were here before the Monument to return. She feels that the public had more say under BLM management. Past publicity has made this a popular area, as has designation of Highway 12 as a Scenic Byway. We still have Bryce Canyon and Capitol Reef, and the land is not going to leave. The Antiquities Act only requires monuments to preserve a minimum amount of land to protect the antiquities. The BLM will still manage the lands which are public, and it will still be the same beautiful land without the monument designation. We are losing grazing land. All businesses are good—we can all work together.

Peg is opposed to shrinking the Monument and is in favor of the Town writing a letter opposing the change. The creation of GSENM was done without any local input. There are many management problems that are not related to the size. The problem she sees with the County resolution as it is written is that it contains misleading information and assumptions. **Tabor** asked if the paving of the road opened up tourism and suggested that it might be as responsible for increasing tourism as the Monument was. People come to see the west—things such as cattle drives. We can all use the public lands. Tourism jobs are seasonal—it would be good to have both.

Oakley feels the Monument should be downsized. He reported that his school lost 75

March 2, 2017

Page 3

students when the sawmill closed and that they now have 64 students. He believes the Monument put teachers out of work. He doesn't think tourism will go down. He agreed with Mary Jane that when the cattle were taken out of certain areas, the tamarisk and Russian Olives took over, and now taxpayers are having to pay to have them cut out. There were comments that, because there were no trees (except P/J) on the Monument, closing of the sawmill was not related to creation of the Monument, even though they occurred at about the same time. **Perry** is against the resolution and thinks the Town should write a letter. He is not ready to say that he is opposed to shrinking the size. The way the Monument was created caused a lot of anger. If the Monument is changed now, there will be a new round of angry people. Each change of leaders creates angry people. He believes that what should happen is discussions like we're having tonight. If the community (county and towns) sticks together, it will be hard for the State or Federal Government to go against them. He likes grazing, but doesn't know how it was when there were mining and drilling here; however, they are regulated. He doesn't like exploratory fracking. He likes the locals to decide what to do with the land. Mismanagement can destroy the habitat. The Monument is not in a natural state because of roads, uses, etc. He doesn't want chip sealed roads or mining and doesn't trust outsiders to manage the land. He'd like to keep it as is until we have a public discussion.

Cheryl is concerned about using the schools as a tool to promote their agenda. There is too much negative marketing. The sawmill is more responsible for downsizing of the school than the Monument is. She is opposed to the WHEREAS regarding the schools. **Keith** feels the Monument gets blamed for the sawmill closing, but there are no lumber trees on the Monument. He asked what other businesses were affected by the Monument. Grazing is allowed in the Monument. Signing the Resolution is like signing a blank check. Local conversation is what we need. The proposal needs to come from the ground up. A lot of the information in the resolution is inaccurate. He would like the Town to write a letter to the County opposing the resolution.

Ryan stated that grazing permits require the permittee to maintain fences, water, etc., and the Grand Canyon Trust is not caring for theirs. Peg asked Ryan why we can't put pressure on the administrators to fix the problems? He replied that it was easier to work with the BLM before the Monument was created. He also talked of the difficulty of making repairs and doing maintenance on allotments because of the many restrictions. Mary Jane agreed that the BLM cooperation was better before the Monument was created—there is too much bureaucracy now. **Josh** is glad we're having this conversation. He feels we should write a letter pointing out that we were not consulted before the resolution was prepared. The problem is that we don't have appropriate access at local/regional levels to the resources in our back yard. What we should be doing is working together—he feels the way it is being done is a solution looking for a problem. This change will not solve any problems. What he really is concerned about is diminishing the Monument (he doesn't think we need to worry too much about extraction

March 2, 2017

Page 4

industries) is large-scale tourism development, and he doesn't want to be another Moab. Business is good, but living here would be miserable.

We don't have the natural extractive resources to compete with the big companies.

Jabe (as a resident and not as a BLM employee) appreciates what he has been hearing and feels there is truth in everything that has been stated. He admits it is an imperfect system that doesn't always function well, although it is much better than some others he has seen. He is opposed to the resolution as it is written. It is lacking in facts. We need to have local discussions, and we need to partner. He encouraged everyone to speak up. The BLM people are good but are governed by bureaucracy. He doesn't think there is a common goal to help everyone. **Peg** thinks we should send a letter not only to the Commissioners but also to the Monument people. There are some problems that should be addressed at the Monument level. She has found it nearly impossible to reach someone there that she could really talk to. There are problems that need to be addressed that can't be solved tonight, but it's a matter of local engagement, and we're not being asked nor heard. Jabe stated that nothing is perfect.

Blake said that she came to Boulder soon after the Monument was declared, and that not much has changed. Many here have based their lives on what the monument offers. We don't know what a reduction in size would look like. She likes the ranching culture and has no interest in the extractive industries culture. She's not sure there are enough people for the jobs that are already here and wonders where the people will come from (and live) if those other industries come with the change. We should be careful of what may come if the Monument is changed. She understands that the driving force for the change is the State's desire to sell extractive minerals. **Brandie** stated that we all love living here. She is opposed to the resolution and to the changes to the Monument. She doesn't think they have done a proper analysis and, like Blake, believes we don't know what we're getting into. She was in the governor's office yesterday and was told that it's being done for coal. Ranching and farming is good, and the land should be protected for that. She asked what would come after the coal is gone. She hopes we can be a community that comes together and is afraid of the people making the decision. We need to hold the leaders accountable and to stall the process in order to do the proper research.

Julie agrees with not approving the resolution. There needs to be a change in the management of the land so it can work for more people. **Eric** is opposed to the proposed change in the Monument, to the resolution, and to extractive industries. He supports ranching and acknowledges the early settlers who built the roads and established the economy that we enjoy now. Pete asked how many support the Town writing a letter opposing the resolution. Nineteen hands were raised. He then asked how many are opposed to writing the letter (6).

March 2, 2017

Page 5

Steve has been battling the Commissioners because we are not being heard. They did an Economic Development Plan in 2007 which was very good but was never implemented. A regional plan recognizes that Garfield County states that it has different needs for different towns, and it appears that we may have had input at that time. But in this case, they have not asked for and turn a deaf ear on input from citizens. If we write a letter, he would like it to emphasize “we need to be listened to,” which we were at one point, but then our input was ignored. When he brought up the Economic Development Plan in a Commission meeting, one of the Commissioners didn’t even know there was such a plan. They are also in the process of writing a Resource Management Plan which has to be completed by this July. There is one in place, but it is meaningless. He keeps asking when the public will be invited to give input but doesn’t get answers. He doesn’t like the resolution. He thinks it’s divisive. He’s told them that in Boulder we have each others’ backs. The tourist industry and the ranching industry support each other and always will, and he told them we’re not going to let them divide us with the documents. When they have an open spot on any committee, they have a hard time asking our Council who we would like to have represent us; they find someone they like who will support their position and ask them to fill the position. He has protested that procedure—we need to decide who represents us and our town. The letter needs to be written because we need to have a voice on both sides, which we’ve had tonight and we support each other. Our message needs to be that we want the right to tell them what we want for all of us. The Resource Management Plan is a good place to start, as it has ranching, tourism, and many other categories that need to be addressed. They seem to be writing it, as they did the resolution, without any local input. The letter we write about the Monument needs to be sent and needs to state that we don’t like it because none of us had any input and we want to be heard.

Brynn stated that we all need to be working together using the same facts. No decision should be made without actual facts being considered. **Bill** stated that he is against the resolution because we haven’t been asked to become involved. He discussed the Bears Ears Monument and invited anyone who had questions about it to contact him. Written comments from Gladys, Alyssa Thompson, and Ashley Coombs were summarized/read.

Pete made a motion that the Council **write a letter opposing the resolution** because there has been no local input and there is no basis in facts. Steve seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous. It will be done before March 13.

Training for participation in the **CIB application** process will be held on March 15. Peg will represent us.

Steve made a motion that we make application to the Planning Commission for a **Zoning Ordinance change** to clarify the terms of Planning Commission members. Pete seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous.

March 2, 2017

Page 6

Pete will meet with Troy Mills on March 15 to be trained in the responsibility of the **Fire Marshal**. We need to return the Cooperative Agreement regarding the wildland fire program to Mike Melton. He will see about arrangements for homeowner fire prevention training. The Planning Commission will continue discussion on the concept plan for Daniel Kennedy's proposed subdivision.

Steve reported that he'd like to open the Tract Park restrooms on April 1. The brush hog has been ordered and will be coming soon. He may use the money set aside for a UTV to fix the maintenance shed roof. We need to have a system for reserving the pavilion—maybe a chalkboard where a notice of reservation could be posted.

Farlan sent a message that a new pit has been dug at the landfill.

After review of the list, Steve made a motion that the **checks issued** in February be approved. Pete seconded the motion, and the vote was unanimous.

Judi reported that a building permit was issued in January to Daniel Kennedy (Fox Grove LLC) to finish a living space above the garage/barn that he has purchased. Another building permit was issued in February to William Raaen for a shed with a patio and a roof over a sheep wagon.

Lisa stated that she is proud of the Town and Council for the civil discussion and cooperative manner of tonight's meeting. She also stated that the BCA wants to take a photograph of all Boulder citizens in front of the Community Center on Saturday, May 6, at 10:00 a.m. They will advertise so people will know about it.

Steve made a motion the meeting adjourn. Pete seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous.

The meeting adjourned at 9:45 p.m.

Minutes prepared by Judith Davis, Town Clerk