



[REDACTED] /WO/USDAFS

05/26/2009 05:24 AM

To [REDACTED] /R8/USDAFS@FSNOTES [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] /R3/USDAFS@FSNOTES

cc

bcc

Subject Fw: Rainbow: Additional conversation doc'n

=====

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Enforcement and Liaison Staff

USDA Forest Service

Law Enforcement and Investigations

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

=====

----- Forwarded by [REDACTED] /WO/USDAFS on 05/26/2009 08:07 AM -----



[REDACTED] /R3/USDAFS

05/22/2009 07:22 PM

To [REDACTED] /WO/USDAFS@FSNOTES

cc

Subject Rainbow: Additional conversation doc'n



2009\_5\_22 [REDACTED] conversations.doc

PLEASE NOTE NEW OFFICE NUMBER BELOW.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Santa Fe National Forest

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Executive Assistant: [REDACTED]



**Date: 5/22/2009**

**Time: 1150 hrs**

**Contact:** [REDACTED] (called in)

**Person Documenting Contact:** [REDACTED], Santa Fe NF

Rio Cebolla "definitely out". Forest Service is doing a "great job" of protecting this area. "The creatures that are supposed to gather there are gathering there." Also out: American Park area. (cliffs unsafe).

I stated that for the FS, the Rio Cebolla had the most concerns for us so was glad to hear it was off the table. I also stated that for us, the one that seemed the most possible of the 4 brought forward was Cerro Springs. [REDACTED] said they haven't gotten to Cerro Springs or Penas Negras yet.

They really like Rio de las Palomas – specifically SE of the Parque Venado area (away from stream). In general, like better than Carson. SFe considered to have less fire danger, less desert. They like Cuba and feel Taos is/will treat them as an "interference". Rio de las Palomas: access/parking okay, water – still checking. Has loop road and roadside (not lot) parking. Big rolling area, low and not wet Penas Negras was looked at in 1995 when Carson was chosen.

**Date: 5/22/2009**

**Time: 1430 hrs**

**Contact:** [REDACTED] (called in)

**Person Documenting Contact:** [REDACTED], Santa Fe NF

Rio de las Palomas has springs from which they think they can run pipe. Will look at more closely. Room for camping, level. Still looking for something better but this is "workable". Parking will be tricky.

Enter the area through road 70. Three spurs available possibly for larger vehicles. Parking along roads. Noted junction of road 70 and road 69. Possibility for shuttle or drop off.

I mentioned Forest's concern about the Rio de las Palomas being an impaired water under the Clean Water Act. (Note: We also have concerns re: Rio Grande Cuthroat Trout – RGCT).

I mentioned to [REDACTED] that we should schedule a meeting to discuss the Operating Plan and Permit. He said he was keen on meeting with the Forest Service and that the key would be "following up on Mark Rey's model" and that he would send me a copy of the letter he sent Corbin recently. He reiterated his belief that the agency should find a way to issue the permit with the Operating Plan and have the agency (rather than a Rainbow) sign the permit. We tentatively set June 2 or 3 as a date for the Carson, Santa Fe and RO (and others) to meet.

He said that the decision on where the Spring Council will meet is intended to happen on June 1. He said that while there is no guarantee, if the council is held in the "north" there could be a greater chance that the gathering will be happening on the Carson. Likewise, if the council is held "in the middle" there could be a greater chance that the gathering is on the Santa Fe. FS/Rainbow meeting earlier wouldn't be of as much value, and he committed to being in communication with me. At the Thanksgiving council and discussions with the Carson agreed to meet daily during the event regarding Op Plan issues. He'd like to do that with Santa Fe if gathering is here.