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CHAIRMAN BANIS: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. If you could start by taking your seats.

Thank you all for coming. Welcome to the DAC meeting today on Saturday, June 4th, 2011. I call the meeting to order.

I'd like to begin, please, with recital of the pledge of allegiance. Ron Johnston, would you care to lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance?

(Pledge of allegiance.)

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Thank you, Ron.

May we introduce ourselves. I'll start at the left side -- my left, please, Tom.

MR. HALLENBECK: Good morning. My name is Tom Hallenbeck. I'm the district director for CalTrans in District 9 region. I represent transportation and rights-of-way on the DAC.

MEMBER ACUNA: Good morning. I'm Tom Acuna, and I represent the Renewable energy industry.

DIRECTOR RAML: I'm Teri Raml. I'm district manager for the California Desert District, and I'm the designated federal official for this DAC.
CHAIRMAN BANIS: Randy Banis, representative of the public-at-large. I reside in Leona Valley, California, just outside Palmdale.

MEMBER SALL: April Sall, public-at-large.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Diana Shumway, geologist, nonrenewable resources.

MEMBER JOHNSTON: Ron Johnston, public-at-large.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: Dick Holliday, recreation.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Teri, would you be so kind as to introduce members of your staff that are here today.

DIRECTOR RAML: I will let them do that for themselves, starting in the back with Jack Hamby.

MR. HAMBY: I'm Jack Hamby. I'm an associate district manager with the CDD out of the Moreno Valley office.

MS. GOODRO: Good morning. I'm Margaret Goodro, field office manager for the El Centro field office.

MR. KALISH: And I'm John Kalish, field manager out of Palm Springs, south coast office located in Palm Springs.

MR. LEE: Rusty Lee, field manager out of Needles.

MR. VILLALOBOS: And I'm Hector Villalobos. I'm the field manager in the Ridgecrest field office.

MS. TROST: Good morning. I'm Roxie Trost, and
I'm the field manager from Barstow.

MS. LASSELL: Bekki Lasell, deputy district manager of resources, the Moreno Valley office.

MS. WOHLGEMUTH: I'm Jennifer Wohlgemuth. I'm on the district manager staff.

MR. BRIERY: David Briery, CDD External Affairs.

MR. RAZO: Steve Razo, CDD Moreno Valley, External Affairs Director.

And if I may, I'd like to introduce a special guest from the Sacramento office, Erin Curtis in the External Affairs office. As you know, Jan Bedrosian retired recently. Erin has been in that office for awhile with Martha Maciel. They're kind of playing tag right now as we work towards replacing or -- I don't know if it's possible to replace Jan. But Erin is here to give the state director's report. And of course any questions you might have on the state level, Erin is here to try to answer those.

So thank you, Erin, for coming down.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Thank you, Steve.

Thank you, Teri.

We have a few DAC members that expressed their regrets that they were not able to attend today. We'll miss them. And we always appreciate their involvement and we'll see them next meeting. That would be Monica
Argadona, Meg Grossglass, Alex Schreiner, and Richard Rudnick.

MS. WOHLGEMUTH: And Lloyd Gunn.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Thank you. I'm sorry. Lloyd Gunn.

I'd also like to introduce our new stenographer for today. Vesna is helping the DAC today for her first time. So I would appreciate everybody speaking clearly and into the microphones.

And, Vesna, anytime you need any help, need us to repeat or stop, please let us know, and we're more than happy to help make sure we get great transcripts.

Also, I'd like to announce that to help us save time with lunch, the facility is making available preorder lunch forms. And they're going to be coming by to collect them at our 10:00 o'clock morning break. As I understand it, if you fill out the form and submit it, lunch will be ready for you, all hot and ready to go.

Another housekeeping item, please, is the availability of discount parking stickers. I believe they're on the back table. And it provides a significant discount in the parking cost here. But it does take the place of your in-and-out privileges. But you can check that out on the stickers in the back.

And are there any other quick housecleaning items
or housekeeping items?

    No. Good. Housecleaning is over.

    I'd like to move on, please, to review the

agenda. The DAC members have had a week or so to review

this. Are there any changes? Additions? Deletions?

    Hearing and seeing none, are there any objections

to consent?

    The agenda has been passed.

    You also have had an opportunity to review the

transcripts from the last DAC meeting. Are there any

questions, comments, corrections, additions in the

transcripts?

    Hearing, seeing none, no objections, the

transcripts are approved.

    Next item on the agenda is a summary of

yesterday's field trip. My apologies. I regret I wasn't

able to join you all on this field trip. We usually

have -- I have a really good time with all of you on these

Friday field trips and I learn a tremendous amount every

time.

    John Kalish, the field office manager of Palm

Springs, would you fill us in on what occurred yesterday

and what I missed.

    MR. KALISH: I certainly will, Randy.

    Well, starting off, we had a very beautiful
morning, a nice cloudless sky here in San Diego County.

We did get an early start, headed out the I-10 and down to
94 and made it to the base of Otay Mountain. We had
originally planned to go up to the top of Otay Mountain
via the Minnewawa Truck Trail. But in the reconnaissance
the evening before, we discovered a number of washouts
that really required us to take another alternate route.

We headed over to the east side of Otay Mountain,
drove up the Marron Valley Road, headed up the Otay Truck
Trail to the top of the mountain. And from there we
proceeded on over the top, heading south right to the
border. And at that border location, we had our first
stop. And it really gave us a very good opportunity to
discuss the challenges and opportunities that we have in
managing public lands in very close proximity to very
large metropolitan areas. In fact, all of our
60,000 acres of BLM lands now on the border or the area we
call our border mountains region is in close proximity to
over 5 million residents if you include the three and a
half million from the San Diego metro area and over two
million from down south of the border including Tecate and
then all of the dispersed rural residents in the area, it
presents numerous challenges.

And we really -- in order to further talk about
that, we focus then on managing Otay Mountain itself.
Otay, back in 1991, was designated as a wilderness area. It is about 18,500 acres of wilderness on the top of the mountain. And in managing the Otay Mountain, we have a number of challenges and a number of facets that we really focus in on, one of which is managing for the number of listed species that are actually found on the mountain.

And I can just go through a list of the threatened or endangered species; the southwest willow flycatcher, coastal California gnatcatcher, Otay tarplant, Mexican flannel bush, arroyo toad, and Quino checkerspot habitats.

So probably from an overall BLM standpoint, it's one area where we probably have more species concentrated in a smaller area creating some real challenges, especially given the history of the more catastrophic fires on Otay Mountain, our effort is to try and protect the mountain from this continued and fairly frequent fire history on the mountain.

In addition, being right on the border, we put a lot of effort into facilitating the border patrol interdiction efforts. We feel very strongly that the efforts that the border patrol does really protects both the resources on Otay Mountain and also protects public safety in that area.

The overall border effects on that resource are pretty tremendous, and it does require us to concentrate a
lot of our overall management efforts in that direction.

And in addition to that, we do try to facilitate
to the degree possible recreation use of the mountain.
It's really an unmet need, just basically because of the
potential threats to public safety given the border
interdiction efforts that are going on and the frequency
of border crossings and potential threats to public safety
that are associated with those.

From that stop, we moved back across Otay
Mountain, headed down to Sycamore Canyon which is located
on the northeast corner of Otay Mountain. It is not
designated as wilderness, but it is directly adjacent to
the wilderness area.

A little history. Back in between 1998 and 2001,
we as an agency acquired about 2,418 acres of lands within
the Sycamore Canyon area using Land and Water Conservation
funds. And it's really part of an overall combined effort
with the city, county, state, and federal agencies in the
area to -- as part of an overall conservation -- habitat
conservation planning effort.

The real challenges that we have in managing
Sycamore Canyon are efforts to really meet the purposes
for which we acquired the parcel under the Land and Water
Conservation Fund. And those purposes were for habitat
conservation purposes. And it's an area that's very rich
in cultural resources, archeological sites, creating additional challenges.

We also are managing the lands consistent with the adjacent non-BLM reserve lands that are managed by other agencies such as Fish and Game, Fish and Wildlife Service.

But in that context, we are going through a process to really meet public access needs for gaining access into that area. Presently, all the gates into Sycamore Canyon are closed. We are developing a plan in which we can really open the area up, provide access to those activities that are compatible with management of Sycamore Canyon as a reserve and manage it consistent with all the adjacent reserve lands managed by other agencies.

From Sycamore Canyon, we went to Potrero, to the county picnic area, had a great lunch. But among lunch, we were able to squeeze in discussion about management of the adjacent Hauser Mountain Wilderness Study Area which is located on the east side of the Potrero Valley and some of the challenges presented there. It's been a wilderness study area ever since the late '70s. It's never been added to a wilderness bill that's really moved very far in the whole congressional process. But we still do manage it to protect wilderness values.

In addition, we talked about the Harris fire and
some of the other fire history in the area as well as the Sunrise Powerlink project that will soon be constructed right on the north side of the Potrero area, right in the interface between the BLM and Forest Service lands.

And our last stop was over right south of Campo at the Pacific Crest trailhead, which is the origin of the Pacific Crest Trail. And we discussed management challenges, trail maintenance, ongoing efforts to facilitate -- at least our efforts to facilitate use of the Pacific Crest Trail. And we also from that spot talked about the La Posta withdrawal process that we're going through with the U.S. Navy.

The Navy, on the top of La Posta Mountain, which is located about three miles north and east of Campo, the Navy has had about a 1,079-acre withdrawal that they've been using for training purposes since the 1980s. About 2001, they came in with a proposal to expand their training facility onto the adjacent BLM lands to include an additional about 3600 acres. We had gone through an environmental assessment process, fully analyzed that project. And right now the status is that we as an agency are moving a package forward to our Washington office for ultimate signature of the Secretary of Interior that provided the Secretary approves, the lands would be approved for an expansion of a Navy withdrawal for
training purposes within that area.

Just one unique feature -- and I talked about it at the last DAC meeting -- is there is a mixture of both exclusive use of withdrawn lands as part of this expansion proposal as well as a right-of-way grant on additional and adjacent lands to that central core of withdrawn lands.

The withdrawn lands would be exclusive use, not open to the public. However, the right-of-way areas, the Navy would be able to utilize those lands for training purposes. However, the parcels would remain open to public use. So there's a good compromise in that area to allow for continued use of those public lands.

And that concluded our trip. With that, we headed back to the hotel.

So any questions?

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Thank you, John.

Are there any questions? Any comments from the DAC members?

Well, that will teach me to miss a field trip. I won't be doing that again.

MR. KALISH: It was a good one.

MEMBER JOHNSTON: Randy, one thing. In case a lot of folks here or some folks may not know what the Pacific Crest Trail is, would you just explain what it is?

I thought it was really neat, and I wasn't aware of it.
MR. KALISH: Well, the Pacific Crest Trail, it starts down on the Mexican border. In fact, quite a few people try, and a few people actually succeed, in hiking clear up the designated trail, the maintained trail that runs clear up through California, Oregon, Washington, all the way to the Canadian border. So it's quite a trial.

In fact, most of the -- what are called through hikers, those that are attempting to hike the entire trail, they usually start toward the end of March. And in the last couple of weeks, we've been seeing quite a few through hikers that have been coming through to our area up in Coachella Valley. The trail starts down in Campo and makes its way up to just a little bit east of Palm Springs, heads up into the White Water area, and back up on the Forest Service and continues on its way up toward the Canadian border.

And so we've been seeing all the through hikers. And it's always very interesting to talk to them about their experiences that they've encountered just in that short segment and what they're anticipating in the rest of the trail.

MEMBER JOHNSTON: Thanks, John.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Thank you, John.

The next item on the agenda are public comments for items that are not on the agenda.
First, Steve, are we -- do we have speaker cards today.

MR. RAZO: Not for this particular item.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Quite all right.

Ladies and gentlemen, I forgot to alert you that it's helpful if you complete speaker cards for us. It helps me organize and make sure I don't miss anybody, particularly for the items that are on the agenda.

But for now, let's move -- before we move into those -- into the public comments, just briefly, just a reminder about cell phones. If you haven't, I just turned mine off.

I also want to allow an introduction to a member of the DAC who's joined us this morning, please.

MR. MITZELFELT: Brad Mitzelfelt. And I am still county supervisor of San Bernardino and elected official member.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Thank you.

The public comments are for three minutes, please. And the first public comment for items not in the agenda. Gerry Hillier, please. Gerry? There we are.

MR. HILLIER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Good morning, members of the DAC. I have one comment that I wanted to make. And I'm representing an organization called Quadstate Local Governments Authority
here this morning. And I probably should have arranged
and deferred to the local government representative on the
council. But it skipped my mind until I saw the agenda
this morning and saw that at least the state director's
comments were going to be -- include some comment on the
America's Great Outdoors program. And what I'm going to
share with you is probably in many respects politically
incorrect. But bear with me.

In February, the White House released a
comprehensive report that had been initiated a year
earlier in which they launched a basic study by the
Secretaries of Agriculture, Interior, and the
Environmental Protection Agency -- and there was one other
that escapes me right now -- looking at America's Great
Outdoors and activities and trying to increase federal or
participation on federal lands. And much of it in terms
of the report was oriented toward expanding urban
awareness of outdoors and providing urban outdoors
experiences. And for those, my organization endorsed them
solidly.

But built into the proposal were two things that
my organization, Quadstate Local Governments Authority,
made up of nine counties in the southwest including
San Bernardino, Kern, and Imperial here in California, we
took exception to two primary parts. The first was a
renewed strong emphasis on acquisition of private lands and conversion to or addition to the federal estate. Now, many cases those are well-meaning and well thought out and get some general public support. But what it does, it erodes the county tax basis. And most of our counties are desperate for having private land opportunity developments. And this was basically a recommendation -- a strong recommendation to increase land and water conservation funding and accelerate that.

There is a federal program that pays in lieu of taxes. Unfortunately, most of our counties in the southwest are too big and therefore maxed out and do not receive additional tax revenue to offset the acquisition. So there's concern there. And the other is of course the production of revenue that benefits local government and local communities. The other is that many of the proposals, when they get down to the nitty-gritty, are for further withdrawals and expansion of protection areas such as national monuments and even expansion of the national park system. And we took exception to that.

In most cases, these are unnecessary and we feel that they do not help local communities. And so we took exception to that. We've sent letters to the White House to the secretaries. And I wanted to share that position with the council. And if there's any further questions or
discussions, I'd be happy to add to them. But I wanted to
just go on record that we have taken exception as local
governments -- as a group of local governments to that
report.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Are there any comments or
questions from the DAC on this or anything to add?

Thank you, Gerry. Thank you. No questions.

Next on the public comment agenda for items not
on the agenda, Ed Waldheim.

Thank you, Ed. Go right ahead. You can get
started.

MR. WALDHEIM: Ed Waldheim, Friends of Jawbone,
Friends of El Mirage, and CTUC.

Items requested to be put on the agenda; I would
like to see us, in the next agenda, have the field
managers for the district offices provide us with a list
of those groups that you have as a partner in helping to
manage the public lands. And break it down in two
different distinct things. I know we're very well-covered
in the non-motorized side of it. But I think we're very,
very weak in the motorized side of it. So if we could
break it down and see who do we really have out there in
the California desert that helps us manage these public
lands, 'cause later on we'll be talking about that.
Number two, we had a report that we did that was something I guess that came from the DAC questionnaires of the field offices. We completed, participated one at the Barstow office and we completed none from the Friends of Jawbone for the BLM office in Ridgecrest. I'd like to know, what are we going to do with these reports? What's -- what's your plan? And so that probably would be an item for the agenda.

And the last thing on the PCT, Mr. Johnson, I'd also want to brag that the PCT comes through the Angeles National Forest. The CTUC manages the North Fork station. And every single PCT person that comes through the trail North Fork comes through our station. And we're glad we finally got three 3N17 opened up so the PCT folks can actually now be on the trail because of the hillslides. And then also we catch them again coming through the Jawbone/Dove Springs area where they come in and they go through 16 different crossings -- no. 22 different crossings that we have through the BLM area. So it is -- it's a challenging trail. And, yes, the BLM bureau is a very big part of that PCT.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Thank you, Ed.

The issue regarding the questionnaires and the partnerships, I'll be touching on that during my report. We'll fill you in on that, what we're going to do.
I have another speaker from the public, please,

Tom Tammone. Hi, Tom. Good morning.


I just wanted to speak about comments I heard regarding the field trip yesterday. I could not attend that one. But I attended the one on the 23rd last -- or the 24th last month in Johnson Valley that was put on by the OHMVR commission and division. And I heard a comment earlier this morning that a compromise has been reached that was workable for the Johnson Valley expansion proposed by the Marine Corps. From someone that attended that field trip and someone that attended the commission meeting the day after that, I have to argue that that is not the case. And quoting one of my comments that was quoted in the High Desert Star, "I work in Carlsbad. I know lots of people that" -- "lots of Marines at Camp Pendleton. I have a lot of friends that are Marines. They're all very skeptical that dust-producing, high-explosive grounds are going to be kept out of limited-use areas. They say maybe it will work for a year or so. There will be some change in command. Somehow something will get lost. Rounds will wind up in a limited-use area. The first time someone finds a high-explosive round, it's going to be gone."
So I don't know where that came from, that a
compromise has been reached. But as a recreationalist
from all ends of the spectrum, I can tell you a compromise
has not been reached.

And it was also brought up at the last meeting
the Marines aren't even using 50 percent of the land that
they already have. So I really can't understand why they
need this land, why they can't just work within their own
boundaries. And as sure as Pirate Four-By-Four turned
into 20,000 comments, and I understand all speaking
negatively to this, there is no compromise. And there's
no need.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Thank you, Tom.

That's all the speaker cards that I have for
comments on items not on the agenda. A last call for
speakers.

Hearing and seeing none, I'd like to move into
the next item in front of us. That would be the advisory
council member reports. I may take a few minutes on my
report. So I'll go last.

Why don't we go around the room and start with
the right side this time. Anything to report, Dick,
that's not on the agenda?

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: I don't have anything that's
not on the agenda.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Thank you.

Ron?

MEMBER JOHNSTON: No. I don't have anything, Randy, that I don't think is being addressed on the agenda. The one item was the California State Off-Road Vehicle Commission Report. And I see that calendared for later on this morning anyway.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Thank you.

Dinah?

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Randy, I don't have anything as well. But I'd like to take a minute or two to comment at our renewable energy agenda item.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Terrific. Thank you.

April?

MEMBER SALL: I don't have anything at this time as well. I'll save mine until later in the agenda.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Tom Acuna?

MEMBER ACUNA: I won't disappoint you. I have two items, and I'll go over it really quickly.

Okay. The first item. Yesterday's field trip, really enjoyed the trip. And it was important for us to see Sycamore Canyon. For those in the audience, that's a last parcel of land that BLM holds and is about to develop a land use plan. What's unique about this property is
that it is located very close to Jamul, which is an urban area, and it provides or it could provide recreational opportunities for OHV users. The uniqueness about this is that most of these type of facilities are located two, three hours away from San Diego.

So we have Daphne Greene here today. And what I'd like to suggest is that the state work closely with the federal government to see if they can develop some sort of unique plan for intensified use of that recreational opportunity. That's my first comment.

The second comment is with wind generation. And I just want to share with folks that there's a unique U.S. Fish and Wildlife proposal called Guidelines to direct renewable developers with wind generation, on how to do it ethically and to protect natural resources.

Let me draw a parallel for you. If you were to build a home in let's say a location and it was a two-story home and the county said you're good to go, but later a bird hit the side of your house on the second story and the county came back and told you you had to take the top story off, how would you feel? Not too good, I think. Well, that's what Guidelines are basically saying. What Guidelines are saying is U.S. Fish and Wildlife will approve wind turbine locations. But during the course of five years, if there's take of golden or
bald eagles, we may come back and have you remove some of
the wind generation or shut down your project.

So the point being here is what I'd like to see
BLM do -- this is a looming issue. And I'd like to see
BLM staff work closely with Fish and Wildlife to develop
guidelines that don't remove approvals after you've
received them. Albeit we need to protect resources.

That's fine. But we need to collectively think of ways
that are effective that encourages wind development
without pulling the rug out from them at a later time.

That's my report. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Any questions for Tom? Thank
you.

Tom Hallenbeck.

MR. HALLENBECK: Thank you, Chairman.

Since Tom broached the subject of talking about
the renewable plan, I just wanted to point out that in my
day job with the Department of Transportation, we're
seeing -- I've got a couple of initiatives I'm working
with the Bureau of Land Management on that are getting --
starting to slow down, actually stopped in their tracks.
And the word I'm getting back from your headquarters is
that they're all consumed with the renewable energy
reviews, the legal reviews. Some of the documents that
we're trying to review by their legal staff are put aside
because of the big push for getting through the slug of renewable energy environmental documents that are facing us. And this is something we've talked about in the past, the incredible workload that they're faced with. Well, it's impacting more than renewable energy. And some of the topics we talk about, it's their day-to-day business is getting impacted sometimes. So just an observation.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Thank you, Tom.

Good morning, Brad.

MR. MITZELFELT: Good morning. Just thought I would bring up and introduce the concept to the district regarding a project my office has taken on. It's relative to National Trails Highway, and better known as Route 66 and -- which runs from, you know, beyond the Colorado River, basically, to Upland in San Bernardino County. And the program is a route marker signage program. San Bernardino County has not participated in this type of signage before. But some counties have. I believe San Diego, I believe Imperial, I believe Los Angeles County has. It's basically county highway markers that help people to stay on a certain route. Even as they change from jurisdictions and the names of the roads might change, it allows people to stay on the route.

So in this case, we are looking to start the
program with National Trails Highway, actually with Route 66, what's better known as Route 66, to help people stay on it, help people know where it is. It should be very good for the visibility, for the tourism. And the initial phase will probably be from Colorado over to Barstow.

This -- the number that we're kind of playing with right now is 66. So, basically, the sign -- it's a county highway sign. It's San Bernardino County. It's blue and it has yellow letters, and it says "66." So far pretty good input from groups interested in promoting that resource, pretty supportive. But it's part of a larger effort, and that is the recruitment is -- there's an effort going on to try to designate the route as a national scenic byway. There's a state grant that's being used for that effort. There's some coordination, but not much, with the county on that effort. And that could affect, you know, use adjacent or uses or uses on and along the route, which is fine, if it's done right and -- in my opinion. But I think that the county also needs to look, and probably BLM needs to look at scenic highway designations in areas where they're appropriate, what exists now, what doesn't exist.

Department of Energy has a big, you know, transmission corridor that's supposed to go right down it.
And so there's a potential for a lot of renewable energy projects along that area. In fact, Senator Feinstein's bill, one of the early -- per the Desert Protection Act, the new one, one of the early selling points that they were using was, hey, this will help to preserve this -- you know, the National Trails Highway area from impacts from the large renewable energy developments.

Now, whether that is appropriate or going to happen or not is unknown. And we have to assume that it's not going to happen.

And so I know that BLM has a corridor study. And there's a lot of interest, not only tourism but also filming. There's a lot at stake. So the resources need to be protected and promoted. And so I wanted to suggest that we try to coordinate some effort to -- coordinate efforts like we do with the MOUs for the desert trail maintenance ordinance. We can have an agreement to -- perhaps while the byways designation effort is going on might be a good time for us to check in on those issues.

But I want to take the opportunity with -- I think the signage might be -- I thought it might be of interest to you. I think it will be helpful for the tourists and so forth.

Thanks.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Thank you, Brad.
For my report, I'd like to describe and remind the council members and describe for the members of the audience our process that we've settled in on regarding themes for our DAC meetings and how we will go forward and address issues relative to those themes.

At the last DAC meeting, we set forth a schedule of four meetings that each of those meetings had a specific theme; the theme for today, recreation, the theme for the last DAC meeting was renewable energy. As I envision the way we would adapt this new strategy, council members, would be that the morning sessions are essentially our reports and old business, cleaning up the things from the previous meeting. That's why you see SRP, renewable energy, and so forth. And then when we move -- and then when we move into the afternoon session is when we will essentially be kicking off today's theme of recreation, the intense focus on recreation. There will be a lot of issues that come up that we'll be discussing. I'm not looking necessarily that we're going to issue recommendations today on these recreation issues but rather that we hear from the BLM, we hear from the public, and we hear from each other. And over the coming months to the next meeting, we will have an opportunity to develop a solution and recommendations. And the first half of the next meeting, we will discuss what we come up
with.

So I hope the council members see that in the same flow. This is what we -- as I take it, what we decided our previous meetings. And, therefore, that answers Ed's question that at the last meeting we asked for the -- we asked for partners and subgroups to assist the DAC with the questionnaire to help us collect some information. And we'll be discussing that in the afternoon session relative to partnerships and how the BLM can create more and more effective partnerships.

So that's where we're going today, the strategy I'd like for us to employ.

The first item or the only other item in my report, Steve, I'd like to touch on the bylaws. I'd like to report, first of all, to the members of the DAC and to the members of the audience that the bylaw revisions that the council considered at the last meeting were posted for public comment, were reviewed. We received one public comment, me. And then the rest of the council weighed in through e-mail.

We were able to -- we did receive the requisite seven votes to enact the bylaws that were proposed and posted. However, during the course of that review, some of our council members came up with some real good spots of places in the bylaws that needed just one more round of
our attention.

And to set this up, the guiding document for the
DAC -- the overarching guiding document is the charter.
And the charter is revised by the Interior Department in
Washington, DC approximately every two years. And from
time to time, the charter is -- has changes. Things are
different. And our bylaws are a second guiding document
of the DAC. But the bylaws are subservient to the
charter. And what we find from time to time is the bylaws
may not be in sync with changes from the charter. And
that was the reason for the last bylaw exercises, were to
bring the bylaws into conformity with the changes of the
charter.

But we noticed that the charter has actually
gotten shorter in recent years. And some things have
gotten dropped from the charter that are not in the
charter or the bylaws. And these are some things that
were brought up by council members. And what I wanted to
do today, if it was okay, is not so much take votes or
actions here unless it's, you know, something the DAC
really wants to do today, of course, but more to go over a
couple of these issues for the BLM's information.

Steve Razo is the one who really works closely in
assisting the DAC with the bylaws and going through the
bylaws. And, you know, bylaws are boring and all that.
But they're important. And what we'd like to do is just bring these points up, give Steve some feedback. And perhaps over the course of the next few months, he can help us -- some of these points, he may have other documents of authority to help further guide us. And the suggestions that I threw on these PowerPoint slides, of course, I'm looking for better language, for the best language. Mine is just something really to just be a placeholder for discussion purposes.

So if that's all right, the first point that we noticed on -- Steve, you want to go right ahead to the next -- there we go. Sorry. It's a PDF.

The DAC members pointed out that, just to maintain the proper form of a guiding document, usually you define what a term is. Our current bylaws say council members are appointed by and serve at the pleasure of the secretary. We never really defined who. This is just a quick little housekeeping suggestion. No one's jumping back. Okay.

Next one, another would be term limits. For as long as I can remember, the charter had limited DAC members to two consecutive terms. Recently, that was removed from the charter, I believe because it was in the same sentence and paragraph with the elected official requirement, which was the real thing that they wanted to
pull out. But unfortunately now we don't have any
guidance on term limits. And my suggestion is to go back
to the way it was. So you can see that the blue text is
actually -- I just pulled that from the original charters,
just as a suggestion.

Steve?

MR. RAZO: There is discussion currently
regarding that particular topic --

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Good.

MR. RAZO: -- as I understand it at the
Washington level. There's a possibility that that might
come back.

As far as the DAC, we have, as you know,
traditionally held to that, two terms and that's it.
Believe it or not, I think we're the only RAC in the state
that actually does that. I think there are some people in
other RACs that have been there for quite a while. But
then again, locally, that might be the need.

Certainly, as you people serve your terms, you
probably learn more your second time around than the first
time around. And we like the continuity also. But again,
yes, it was the -- not in the charter, being discussed.
So for my own opinion, I think having this in the bylaws,
which is our local document, is probably a good idea.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Next point -- oh, questions.
I'm sorry. I'm sorry.

Steve?

I have a question from Tom.

MR. HALLENBECK: Since we aren't restricted by
the charter, why would we place it as a restriction upon
us? Has there -- is there any history to multiple terms?

MEMBER SHUMWAY: You mean more than two terms?

MR. HALLENBECK: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Council members, anybody want to
weigh in? Steve, would you like to take a shot at that?

MR. RAZO: We've actually never had anyone crazy
enough to want a third term.

MR. HALLENBECK: So it's not an issue.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: But it doesn't preclude -- I
mean, I kind of agree with Tom. Why limit it unless it's
an issue that we have to limit?

MR. RAZO: 'Cause ultimately the decision -- you
know, each nomination process is the same. You know, you
all have to renominate yourselves if you want a second
term. You still go through the process of being screened.
You still go through the process of looking it over. And
it's submitting the package up and on. And then of course
the secretary makes the final decision.

But we have found that two terms has -- no one
has really requested a third. But I guess if you want to
consider that, that's up to the discretion of the DAC and the designated field.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: I would think this would be a call for, you know, Steve perhaps to consult and see if there are others in the state office or other that have some reasons that we don't know of. That's why I bring this up. We have a question mark, do we need it, do we not. And perhaps at the next meeting we can have -- or before then, we can have some feedback on that question.

Anything else on this? April?

You know, Gerry -- I'm sorry. I'm going to break precedent for a minute. Gerry, I think you might have some history on this that might be helpful. Gerry, do you have a moment for that?

MR. HILLIER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I guess I can -- I guess I have my alumni hat on now.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Exactly.

MR. HILLIER: I've seen it both ways. The term limits came back in the mid '80s when the RACs and DACs were rechartered. And there was a decision -- and it was a very conscious one, I think, by the Washington office, and it was supposed to apply nationally -- that council members would be limited to two appointments of three years each. Something was lost there, though. Prior to that, I think there was probably too much moss backing
there. And many members of DACs and probably more
specifically to the Grazing Advisory Boards which existed
at that time literally became members for life. And that,
I have to admit, created some stagnancy.

However, the two terms, as you already pointed
out, you know, people learn a lot. And they finally,
after six years, get around -- pretty much around the
desert conservation area. And it's a big area. It's a
huge geographic area to know a lot of nooks and
crannies -- and appreciate the history and appreciate the
users. And what happens -- and the really sad thing is
that most members who get term-limited out never again
appear and -- in front of the council either as alumni or
just to check in once in a while. I saw Ron Schiller just
walk in the door. And that's really a pretty rare
occurrence for an ex -- for an ex-member to come back.

I think that in order to keep interest, public
interest, a certain amount turnover is good with groups
like this. It keeps funneling new blood, new ideas, and
provides, certainly, for the infusion of youth and new
users there and the adaptability of say bringing in
renewable energy, which probably wouldn't have been on the
horizon 15 years ago.

What really, I think, needs to be done is to
provide some focus to keep term-limited council members
engaged so that you can profit from their experience,
maybe not as sitting members of the council, but keep them
engaged either as presenters or as special committees or
subgroups and capitalize on that expertise. BLM has
invested a lot in those people over six years of dragging
them around all over the desert. And, darn it, they ought
to be able to continue to capitalize and you ought to be
able to capitalize on the history.

So I guess I would speak in terms of retaining
term limits. But I would encourage you to find a creative
way to keep former members engaged and active and
continuing to interface with the council once they're off.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Appreciate that advice. Thanks,
Gerry, for sharing that with us.

I guess what we -- I guess the opinion we'll be
most anxious to hear will be Teri's once she has a chance
to look at this and formulate an opinion on it.

April and then Tom.

MEMBER SALL: Yeah. I guess two other thoughts.
One, I agree that a certain, you know, level of turnover
is appropriate. But we do want to take the advantage of
really getting the experience that DAC members gain over
their two terms or more. We want to be able to capture
that. I think the change that has already been made where
you actually get to serve your entire term will help a
lot. Like for me personally, my term is up here in a few months. But I had already sat out an entire year by the time I was actually able to come to a meeting. So I think that's really going to help us capture an entire six years instead of four or four and a half or whatever it's been in the past. So I think, you know, that's one thing to consider in this discussion as well.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Good point. Thank you, April.

Tom?

MR. HALLENBECK: I agree with April wholeheartedly. Good point.

And just to reiterate my point is I don't know why we have to self-regulate this when the nomination process goes through the director and through Washington. If they think that our usefulness has come to an end, then they don't move our nomination forward. That's where the regulation should occur. I think they -- if they see somebody who's third, fourth, fifth term, they may decide they're not going to move them forward.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Should we continue? Tom, please.

MEMBER ACUNA: Okay. So we're not going to make a decision on that today?

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Not necessarily. I just want to bring up what the other council members brought up during
their review of the bylaws.

    MEMBER ACUNA: Very good.

I thought what Gerry Hillier said was just a great idea. And when -- Teri, I just urge you that when you look at this again, maybe there is a way we can utilize people to serve the DAC in some fashion.

    Great idea. That's it.

    CHAIRMAN BANIS: Thank you.

Next point. This is a true housekeeping issue. Steve, you could probably look into this a little more. But it refers to a section of the charter that has been entirely removed and is obsolete. So this was -- this is probably a minor housekeeping item that should have been included in the last set of changes that we underwent. But we can catch up on this --

    MR. RAZO: Erin can address that.

    CHAIRMAN BANIS: Oh, Erin. So this is something more than I thought.

    MS. CURTIS: Actually, maybe less. It was actually an error on the part of our charter makers to take out the elected official. And they're working on putting it back in. So you can choose to put this in your bylaws or not. But it should appear back in your charter very shortly.

    CHAIRMAN BANIS: All right. Thank you, Erin.
So you heard that news, folks.

What did you do, Brad?

MR. MITZELFELT: I don't know.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: I guess my point then would simply be that Section 16 wasn't even in the charter at that point. But we'll make that -- we'll be going through this exercise regarding elected officials again. We'll get good at it.

MR. HALLENBECK: What version of the charter are we working with today?

CHAIRMAN BANIS: 2010.

MR. HALLENBECK: Is it June of 2010?

CHAIRMAN BANIS: That is correct. That is correct.

Next item. This was an idea from Tom Hallenbeck. I put his name on it specifically. I thought he'd appreciate that. In our bylaws, there's a section about TRTs. TRTs, just quickly, are made up of staff, federal employees. It's a task force of employees to tackle a specific issue. And, therefore, in the bylaws, the TRT is -- would be set to terminate on completion of the assigned task. Tom suggests that we also add that to the subgroups's language. Something for us to consider.

Comment on it or are we all set?

MR. HALLENBECK: Self-explanatory. I think it's
self-explanatory. But I'm a big fan of putting things to
rest, you know. In my business, we get involved in a lot
of task forces and committees. And I take great pleasure
in submitting the final report and sunsetting that group.
Because if you don't, you just keep generating stuff
that's no longer pertinent.

So I really think this is a good idea. We focus
on an issue, we ask a subgroup to meet to address it. And
once they have done that, then they go away until we need
to form another subgroup on another issue.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Next point?

MR. RAZO: We've got to take out that apostrophe.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: You think I give you a document
and allow you to change it? Not without the password,
Mr. Steve.

This change simply brings into sync the bylaws
and the charter. This blue text comes directly from the
charter. That's all. I can't really debate it.

Next point, this one is just a discussion item.
I don't have a real recommendation. I didn't have an idea
on this. This was a discussion about transcripts versus
minutes. It was brought up, a discussion to have.

Any comments?

MR. HALLENBECK: This was my suggestion. For
this meeting, there were over 500 pages of transcripts to
go through, if you were going to do due diligence and be
prepared to, you know, make comments on it. And that's
just overly cumbersome to me. And what gets lost is, you
know, the true feeling of what's going on in the meeting.
There's no summary. There's no review of action items
unless you get to that point and you as a chairman have
covered that in the transcript.

So there may be -- I think there's a better way
of capturing what's going on in this meeting rather than
having -- no offense -- transcripts of every word that
transpired. And I think that would make our job easier to
review and approve. And it might make it easier for the
public to access, you know, what happened in that last DAC
meeting. If I didn't attend a meeting and I wanted to
find out what happened in the meeting, lordy, 500 pages.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Any other comments?

April?

MEMBER SALL: I agree with that.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Tom?

MEMBER ACUNA: I don't necessarily take the same
position. I think that the minutes are important.

There's a lot of folks that -- who are interested and want
to know who says what. That's what the minutes tell.
Now, I realize, yeah, nobody reads it. But if they want
to have it, it's there. So it's the record. That's
important.

The second part is that I think the new way we've
organized ourselves with focus and setting out -- okay, if
we give an idea to the BLM, how are we doing on those
ideas later in the next meeting? That's been illustrated
in the new web page. So we are working towards a summary,
I think, which kind of brings on how our meeting went. So
we have established that communication tool.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: My only point on this -- and I'm
undecided at this point. But to be a further devil's
advocate, I do know from time to time I've done a good
number of searching through the PDFs, particularly old
items. When I need to refer to the exact words that
somebody said and I can't remember, I really enjoy the
searchability of the PDFs to pull the data out. And I
remember one time somewhat recently where I actually had
to go to the transcripts and read Tom Hallenbeck's
comments very carefully and very specifically because they
provided some very detailed guidance to one of our
missions. As important as I'm making that seem, I can't
remember what issue it was. But I did find that that
review is what made it clear for me.

So that's another discussion we might just want
Dick?

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: Yes. It's kind of hard going through all that pages. I don't know how many pages it was. But as you said, it does provide a record of the meeting for people that want to find out who said what.

One of the issues that I had many, many years ago when I first started here was having a section at the end of these things, at the end of the transcript, if you will -- we call it the minutes. But the transcript -- that had a list of any motions or any action items that were referenced within the meeting, and so we could keep track of those. You know, we haven't done that. We really haven't had any motions, per se, lately. But in the old DAC years ago, we used to have motions, it seems like. And we'd want to see what the status of those were and how the BLM was operating on them, were they completed, rather than trying to go through the whole transcript looking for one motion or something.

So I still think we should go back to the idea that at the end of the transcript, if there's any action items or motions that were made, that those are in one consistent location that we can access and see what the status of those are and the BLM would keep those statuses up to date.
CHAIRMAN BANIS: Thank you, Dick.

April? April and then Dinah.

MEMBER SALL: I guess I have kind of a clarifying question slash comment. I mean, if the meeting is already being recorded, then we still will have a transcript available, correct, if we wanted to go back and look at actual detailed who said what. But what we're talking about is sort of an additional layer of being able to have minutes and sort of more of a summary. Is that --

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Maybe. It's one of the ideas. This is why I brought this out. Let's -- these are some ideas that we'll talk about.

Dinah.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Well, to follow up with what April was saying -- Diana Shumway -- we actually -- this might depend on the chairman and his wrap-up comments. But you're pretty good, Randy, at summarizing -- and, Tom, you are too -- what happened in the meeting. And one of the nice things about technology is you can have one document, and if you know you're looking for summary of the meeting and that's going to be in the transcript, then someone could easily search "meeting summary" or something like that and find that document and that section in the transcript. So it kind of precludes having to prepare two documents or having somebody go through and prepare a
So I think a lot of this might just arise from the way we handle the meetings with the agenda and the summary at the end.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Any other comments? Please.

MEMBER JOHNSTON: Ron Johnston.

I think Dick's suggestion, Randy, absolutely makes a lot of sense, to have -- whether it's within the meeting minutes as part of your summary of the meeting or whether it is an addendum item that is put at the subsect of these minutes, but have a summary of what action items were voted upon, moved upon, and taken at the meeting. And I think a brief summary of that -- of just those items would make a lot of sense.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Very good. I will keep these issues alive. Okay?

Next point, discussion No. 2. Alex brought up that the -- there's been a change in the termination-of-service clause. I don't know that I want to get too deep into it here. But just that Alex's point was that this may or may not be too restrictive or too loose or too easy. This is page 1.

Keep going, if you could, Steve. And there's a second page.

Essentially, the question is the
termination-of-service clause seems stronger than before.

Did I miss something? My answer is simply that the
provisions of the proposed bylaws were unchanged from the
previous version. The 2005 charter contained the
termination provision of having missed three consecutive
meetings. But that was removed in the 2008 version, and
it's not in the 2010.

So if there's any concerns or comments or
questions, maybe you could take a good look at that and
we'll continue this discussion.

Last point. And this one, I also -- this is a
stick of dynamite I'm just going to light and walk away
from. The bylaws on subgroups and subcommittees say that
subject to the DFO's approval, subgroups may be formed for
the purpose of providing counsel and advice to the council
and that the groups can gather information, conduct
research, analyze, and then draft proposed recommendations
for the full council. And the groups are established by
the chair and the concurrence -- we went over this last
time when we set up the subgroup. But there was a point
being brought up that felt that -- there's another guiding
document, let me just quickly say, for the Dumont and the
ISDRA subgroup. There is a guidelines document. And it
was pointed out that there are -- I'm sorry. Not a
guideline. A mission statement.
It was pointed out that there's inconsistency between the bylaws and the mission statements. And I think that's something that we want to address. And we will be talking about partnerships and subgroups in depth this afternoon. And I think I'd like to return to this stick of dynamite later this afternoon.

And that's all we found. These are all the results of my fellow DAC members' review of the bylaws and our ongoing attempts to clean them up.

And to the public, I apologize for the bait and switch. You came here for recreation and you got bylaws. That concludes my report.

Are there any questions or comments?

Moving on. Thank you for waiting. I appreciate it.

Erin, would you care to give -- is Erin giving this -- yes. Erin, would you care to give the state director's report now, please.

MS. CURTIS: Good morning. And just really quickly to the point of the error of leaving out the elected official in your charter, it's in all of the other advisory council charters. But, you know, the Desert Advisory Council is special and it has a slightly different charter. So someone made a clerical error, essentially, and we caught it. So we will definitely make
that change. And having an elected official as a member
of the DAC is very important to all of us. So I just
wanted to make that clarification.

Thanks for letting me come here today. It's
exciting to meet everyone. As you know, I think I'll
start out with some changes that are going on in the
California state office. One that affects me especially
is the retirement of Jan Bedrosian after 38 years with the
Bureau of Land Management, 21 or so, I believe, as the
external affairs -- as an external affairs staffer in the
state office, and most recently as our chief external
affairs. So we are working on filling that position. I'm
very interested in making sure that happens.

Another thing that has happened -- and I
apologize that this is not even on your report that is
written because it happened so recently, just a couple of
days ago -- we have some changes going on related to our
state director position. As you know, Jim Abbott, who was
our associate state director for many years, has been for
more than about two years serving as the acting state
director. He will be returning as of Monday to the
associate state director chair. And we will be having the
associate state director from Idaho coming as our acting
state director. That was a lot of "acting" and
"associates." So I apologize for that.
But Peter Denton is his name. And he'll be acting as our state director for about 30 days. And we've been told that Carl Rountree, who some of you may know, who is up in our Washington office as our resources and national landscape conservation system director, will be coming probably after that. So some shifting going on at the state director's chair. And all of that taking place as of Monday.

Any questions about that before I move on?

Okay. Let's see. As you know, we are operating under a continuing resolution for the rest of 2011 fiscal year. And one provision in the continuing resolution is that no funds will be expended on the wildlands policy that Secretary Salazar issued very late in December of 2010. Secretary Salazar did, just this last week, issue some more guidance as far as how we will handle wilderness proposals for the remainder of the 2011 fiscal year, most of the emphasis being working with members of congress, states, tribal leaders, and members of local communities on proposals for wilderness designations by congress. So that will be the focus during the rest of at least the 2011 year.

I've listed on your report just a few of the public lands bills that we have been following that are relevant to you folks here down in the desert district,
the California Desert Protection Act of 2011 as well as several other bills. None of these bills have been heard yet other than the Orange County Rocks and Islands Bill which was proposed by Orange County legislator representative Campbell. And the rest of them have been introduced but not heard yet, referred to committee only. If you have any questions about any of that, let me know. I'll give you an update on some of the things that are going on related to our wild horse and burro program within California. Many of you have probably heard news reports about the equine herpes virus that has broken out actually throughout the West. We do have a number of cases here in California. And our focus related to that has been to make sure that it doesn't get into any of our corrals where we have a number of wild horses who are in close proximity to one another. It is a very highly contagious disease. Most horses recover from it. But it can cause neurological damage. And if it does go into the brain, it is usually a fatality. And so it's something that we have been working very hard to make sure it does not come anywhere near any of the places where we have our horses.

So we've cancelled a couple of adoption events and we have asked the public not to bring any horses to our corrals. And we're just monitoring the situation at
Another focus for the program, we have a gather
that is currently being studied that is likely to go
forward at the beginning of the next fiscal year. So late
this fall up in our Surprise field office, Northern
California, right -- actually, it's -- most of that office
is in Nevada. And we do have plans to go forward with the
gather there. So we'll be keeping you apprised of that
and of our efforts there.

Let's see. I've just put some information in the
state director's report related to the president's
America's Great Outdoors initiative just to give you an
idea of BLM's participation in that initiative. And I
know Mr. Hillier also mentioned that initiative.

And then finally, I wanted to bring you up to
speed on a couple of things related to renewable energy
projects. Most of you are probably very up to speed
anyway. We do -- we have been apprised that there's going
to be a groundbreaking event for the Blythe solar power
project, which was one of the priority projects approved
last year. And they're planning an event on June 17th out
at the project site.

You may have seen a number of news reports
related to the Ivanpah project which has currently been
under temporary suspension of activities notice related to
the number of desert tortoises they were finding out on
that project site. And the suspension of activities
related to two stages of the project but not the first
stage which -- so construction continues on the first
stage of the project. And we're just waiting right now
for a new biological opinion to be issued by the U.S. Fish
and Wildlife Service. And we will take a look at that and
see what our next steps are related to phases 2 and 3.
So that's just an update.
I think that's all I have other than what's
written here unless you guys have some questions for me.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Let me start on this side.
Dick?

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: Yeah. I'm kind of interested
in the -- what's your time schedule, do you think, the
Fish and Wildlife Service is going to get a biological
opinion out on the stage 2 and 3?

MS. CURTIS: It's going to happen very shortly.
We had originally been -- they only have 130 days
statutorily to issue that. And we reinitiated that
consultation on March 28th. But it's very likely it will
happen next week or the week after.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Going down the line. Ron?
Dinah? April? Tom?
MEMBER ACUNA: Erin, I just have one quick question for you. You mentioned in the beginning the 2011 -- I think was it Desert Protection Act.

MS. CURTIS: Yes.

MEMBER ACUNA: It hasn't even gone to reading yet?

MS. CURTIS: Correct.

MEMBER ACUNA: So that means officially there's nothing out there to give us a sense of what it's encouraging, or do you have some sense of that?

MS. CURTIS: I do have some sense of that, because it has been introduced. So there is language. And it is related to adding some additional wilderness areas both related to the Bureau of Land Management lands and U.S. Forest Service lands. So it's a far-reaching piece of legislation. It also designates certain areas available and not available for solar and other renewable energy development.

So the easiest way to explain that bill, I think, would be with a map.

MEMBER ACUNA: Right.

And do you have an acreage amount anywhere?

MS. CURTIS: Not at the tip of my tongue. But let me see if I have anything here. I do have a quick summary which I can give to you. I don't know that it's
real specific.

I do not have an acreage. But it does establish special management areas, off-highway vehicle recreation areas, wilderness areas, monuments. It also releases some specified wilderness study areas and adjusts some park boundaries.

So I don't have specific acreage for you. I can look that up for you and get back to you, Tom.

MEMBER ACUNA: Okay. Thank you, Erin.

MR. HALLENBECK: Erin, in the final paragraph, the director is talking about royalties received, 600,000, 12 million, potential 37 million for the solar. Does any of that money stay in California or go to California in any way?

MS. CURTIS: Yeah. Actually, a lot of it does. Particularly the -- the lease money associated with renewable energy projects and other rights-of-way, it does stay within California so that we can manage those rights-of-way appropriately. So royalties related to oil and gas, those do not. But rights-of-way leases do.

MR. HALLENBECK: So it stays in BLM?

MS. CURTIS: Correct. Yes.

MR. HALLENBECK: Opposed to the state of California or the county?

MS. CURTIS: That, I don't know. Possibly. I'll
find out for you, Tom. I don't know the answer to that.

MR. HALLENBECK: Okay. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Any last questions for Erin?

Thank you, Erin. I appreciate your coming down today --

MS. CURTIS: My pleasure. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: -- and making the presentation.

Now, the time you've been waiting for. To my left, Teri Raml will deliver the district manager's report.

DIRECTOR RAML: Well, good morning. And I welcome the DAC members and certainly welcome all of you out there. This is a nice attendance for us. And I appreciate you coming out on this Saturday. And I'll be interested as you participate in our meeting what brought you here.

I want to start with a thank you to the DAC and particularly for -- to Randy. This has been a particularly busy session in between meetings. And Randy and all of you have, between subgroup meetings, subcommittees, reviewing bylaws have been exceptionally busy. And I really appreciate the effort.

I think -- I was thinking this morning I was trying to find out a new word for change. When change becomes so much a part of the way you do business, it
seems like it's a funny word, you know. So change,
change.

But anyway. So kind of in light of that, I did
want to highlight some reorganization in our district
office. Bekki Lasell back there, stand up just so I can
see you again.

She has assumed the responsibility. She's now
our deputy district manager for resources. And so that's
a new change for us.

We have a new deputy district manager now for
support services which will be Vicky Wood who many of you
might have known was the El Centro field manager. So
she's now part of the district manager's team.

Al Stein who has a wealth and tremendous amount
of experience is now going to become a senior technical
advisor also on our staff. So for the field managers,
this is kind of a formal announcement. We have a lot of
communication to do about these new roles and
responsibilities. But change is ever with us.

Thirdly, I wanted to call your attention to the
field manager reports. I looked at them. I have -- of
course, I'm very aware of how busy we are. But these
reports are especially enlightening about how much work is
going on in the field. If you take a look at them, you'll
see what our priorities are, kind of echoing what the
state director reported; renewable energy including
geothermal, OHV grants, a lot of energy. Thanks that
Daphne is here. But our staff has put a lot of time and
attention into preparing for grants, applying for grants.
We've been working on abandoned mine lands, special
recreation permits which we'll be talking about later.
And then also scattered among the reports from the field
offices are just some other wonderful things like cultural
resource work, riparian restoration.

And so really, I encourage everyone to take a
look at those reports because they really do support the
topics of our agenda and they are just a -- really just a
highlight of the tremendous amount of work that is taking
place in the field offices.

A couple things that were left out of the field
manager's reports -- I'm going to pick on them a little
bit. We also have -- in light of our theme on
partnerships, we were very fortunate this year to have two
special awards given, one to Craig Beck who is in the
Ridgecrest field office. He's the agency partner of the
year for the Pacific Crest Trail which we talked about
earlier. So that's a recognition for a BLM employee and
the amount of energy and attention that he spent on
partnerships. And then in the Palm Springs office, we
also had our volunteers recognized, Betty and Dee Zeller,
who are at the Big Morongo Preserve. And they received
the National Making-a-Difference Award. And I think they
got a lifetime achievement award associated with that. So
that's -- we're very proud of those folks and the
recognition they received. And, again, it indicates how
much energy and effort we spend on volunteers and
partnerships.

Let me think. I also -- the materials that were
provided -- well, okay. Back to -- let's talk a little
bit about this meeting structure. So this is the --
really the first meeting where we're going to try to
implement our work plan. I mean, the last meeting we had,
we were kind of introducing our work plan or our business
plan. And we kind of tried to tackle renewable energy
which we'll discuss again. But this is the first meeting
where we're really going to try to focus on a theme. And
I'm enthused about it. I think -- I'm enthused about the
agenda. And we'll kind of see how it works. It's still a
work in progress.

We have put some significant staff time and the
subgroups have put some time into it. I know there's a
lot more to do and to talk about in recreation. So I look
forward to working with this.

And I wanted to call your attention to the
materials in the book. This is also just a snapshot of
the stuff -- the materials that we produced to highlight recreation and our outdoors. So for the DAC members, we certainly hope that you took a look, and that will kind of support this theme of recreation.

And I think with that, I will tell the DAC I am really committed to trying to follow through on the recommendations made. I brought them with me. You know, I've got these just to show you. I've got my little handouts in front of me about what our themes are, what we're going to approach, and what I'm going to be held accountable for. So I'm committed to trying to make this work and following through on our work plan. And I think with that, I'm done.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Wow. You covered a lot of miles. Thank you, Teri. That was wonderful.

We'll move into the next section, agenda. I don't know how we did it. But we almost caught up.

And we now have council member questions for the field office, district manager, or state director reports. Actually, we already heard from -- had a chance to query the state director report.

Dick?

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: Let me start. I have -- I've read through all these reports. I have a couple questions about the El Centro and the Barstow field offices.
One for the El Centro field office. On page 2, there's a document about an Ocotillo Express, and it doesn't really say what that is. It just tells us what -- they're seeing contractors. They're working to prepare an EIS. But what is that? Is it a solar plan? Is it a wind farm? Where is it?

CHAIRMAN BANIS: We've got an answer coming. The answer is in the form of Margaret Goodro, the field manager for El Centro.

MS. GOODRO: So, Dick, for Ocotillo Express, it's a wind project. And the size of the turbines is being adjusted right now with their POD. And so we've had several meetings recently to look at some of those revisions. And so I'll give you the specifics of the original application. But they're looking at 14,691 acres to produce 550 megawatts.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: Where is this located?

THE WITNESS: It's right by the town of Ocotillo, on -- kind of wrapping around the backside and then to the right of it.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: I'm sorry, Margaret. How many acres was that?

THE WITNESS: That's 14,691 acres. And that's turbine, wind turbine. And proposing to -- up to 550 megawatts.
MEMBER SHUMWAY: That's installed capacity?

THE WITNESS: Yes. Yeah. And that's with Pattern -- Pattern Energy is the applicant.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: While Margaret is up there, I have a couple other questions. On the -- their report for the dunes area, Imperial Sand Dunes, they give an outline of their visitation and the amount of dunes permits that were sold, don't give any dollar amount. But one of the things that's going to happen is the reduction in -- looks like there might be a reduction in grant money, obviously. We're going to hear more about that later. But the $5 million is coming out of the grant which would affect the BLM probably greatly. And I'd kind of like to know what the planning is for that reduction. And let me finish -- go ahead and do that, and then I have another question.

MS. GOODRO: Okay. With the visitation, the visitation is down slightly. And it's kind of been on a little bit of a downward trend connected with the economy. And so there's two things going on with the fee dollars. One, there's less passes being sold. And also, there's more passes being sold offsite, which is less revenue generated. And so the fees are sliding downward for the amount of dollars that are available to manage Imperial Sand Dunes. And so that is something that we'll continue
to look at.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: Also as part of the Barstow report, there was a mention in there about the Barstow BLM law enforcement working on an MOU with the county sheriffs in order to be able to have -- tow and responsibility through the county. And I believe -- doesn't the BLM El Centro have an agreement with the -- an MOU with the Imperial County Sheriff that they can tow and impound vehicles?

MS. GOODRO: Our officers are cross-deputized. And so they serve as Imperial officers for the county also. That isn't taking place, I don't believe, with Barstow. And we do have -- beyond that, we also have an agreement with all the law enforcement agencies in the valley.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: It seems like we went through an issue here a few years ago about trying to get consistent rules for the area. It would almost seem like that there would be consistent rules across the CDD for the law enforcement officers also so that a law enforcement officer that comes from one area to another area could have the same rules.

MS. GOODRO: The authority for the cross-deputization lies with the county. And so that's where it -- it depends on which county you're working
MEMBER HOLLIDAY: I would also like to bring out, in the report for El Centro, is Margaret talked about the Dune Guard program and some other programs that are associated with trying to improve public participation by the BLM officers. These programs were funded not necessarily through BLM but through recreation dollars from either different sources in the United Desert Gateway, which is one of the organizations within the Imperial Valley there, provided funding and support for the Dune Guard and --

MS. GOODRO: Yeah. Neil Hamada actually had a safety grant that was utilized through United Desert Gateway which helped with the Dune Guard program and also the Frisbee program which has been highly successful in the Imperial Sand Dunes and getting the public engaged and protecting the resources and being safe.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: And we also -- when we go through these reports, we had some reports from Friends of Jawbone and the Friends of El Mirage. We also had some issues that I'd like -- not issues. But I'd like to bring up that we have a group that's from the dune area that's the American Desert Foundation. And they've gotten grants from state parks for defibrillators. They've gotten -- provided grant funding for training for off-road vehicle
users. This year, they had like 484 kids that they trained. I don't know if they were all children. But anyway, they trained and they expanded the program to Superstition Mountain from the dunes. So they're kind of spreading that out. And we also are planning -- they're planning on doing that again next year.

So the UDG also has provided support for cleanups out there as well as working with the BLM on the ranger station at Buttercup to support that generation near -- let me see if I've got anything else here.

Oh, yeah. As far as your LEO report -- one more thing. Could you please tell us how many positions -- LEO positions you have budgeted and how many are currently in place?

MS. GOODRO: For the law enforcement positions for the El Centro field office, there's 15 positions. And so right now we have some vacancies that we're filling. So we'll be filling six vacancies. And we're in the process of doing that.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: So the BLM in El Centro essentially has nine officers right now. They're trying to fill that for a huge area. I don't know -- I don't think it explained how many are in the BLM or the other areas. That might be a good thing to remember to put to the other field office managers' reports just so we know
where the status of the law enforcement is for the BLM. It's a real issue for them to keep people on staff. And they have a huge area to monitor.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Are there other questions for Margaret while Margaret is here?

Tom Hallenbeck.

MR. HALLENBECK: Good morning. I just want to point out in your report you have some very impressive and very promising statistics about the reduction in accidents. Just over the last five years, it looks like you may have cut them in half -- well, you have --

MS. GOODRO: Over the past ten years, there's been about a 50-percent reduction.

MR. HALLENBECK: That's to be applauded. And in the title of the chart, it's attributing it to education and enforcement of safety rule. Were there any other things happening? Has there been changes in equipment that people use?

MS. GOODRO: It's pretty much taking all those efforts together. So that's having folks to be enforcing the regulations, working with the partners for consistent messaging on safety themes, and then trying new educational tactics to get the word out to the public to promote safe recreation.

So it's incorporating all these things and the
amazing work of the staff. So Neil Hamada is a big part of that. And so I think Imperial Sand Dunes and what they've accomplished over the past ten years has been phenomenal in providing for safe recreation.

MR. HALLENBECK: Well, I congratulate you and your staff because that's an impressive decline in the number of accidents. However, to get a full picture --

MS. GOODRO: However.

MR. HALLENBECK: Just a detail in my mind is I also read in your report that visitation is declining. And I don't know if that's been going on over the same period of time. So to get a true picture from a statistical standpoint, a ratio would be more appropriate.

MS. GOODRO: Yeah. We can overlay -- one of the issues with overlaying the visitation numbers is that they're so high, it throws that schematic off. But --

MR. HALLENBECK: Yeah. It's .08 percent five or four years ago.

MS. GOODRO: There is a certain amount with the visitation that can definitely play a part in that. But our visitation is not down 50 percent.

MR. HALLENBECK: Well, that's really what I wanted to hear. It's down, but not -- that doesn't make it account for it.

MS. GOODRO: Right.
MR. HALLENBECK: So congratulations and
congratulations to your staff. 50-percent decrease,
that's great. Keep going.

MS. GOODRO: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Before I turn to Dick, I notice
the spike in the middle of the time. It's a personal
observation. That's about the time the economy was really
heating pretty heavy. And we had a lot of newcomers come
into motorized sports at that time. And we also saw a
number of people upgrade their equipment to bigger,
faster, and better. And it's purely only an observation
that's shared among some that I talked with that that did
result in a spike. The economy really pushed at that
time.

And I think now to some extent with the fewer
visitors and with the economy starting to shake out, I
think we're starting to see more realistic levels going
forward in these stats.

Dick?

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: What we'd like to say is that
now we have people with a little more talent. And like
Randy says there, some of the newer people -- it seems
like the people that get hurt or get killed typically it's
one of their first times out to the dunes because they're
just not aware of the facilities, what's on the other
side. And they end up getting hurt or killed. And so as people gain a little talent, then the number of injuries goes down.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Any other questions for Margaret?

Thank you, Margaret.

Any questions for field office managers? Dick, did you have one for Barstow or are we okay on that? Do you want to follow up?

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: Yeah. I notice that in the Barstow office -- you know, in the El Centro field office we got a report on visitation and fee and number of permits sold. I didn't see that anywhere else. And, again, I would like to see -- I'll end my spiel right now on the fee thing. We'll talk about that more later.

But the BLM is responsible for providing a yearly report of the fees collected, expenditures, and what they're going to do the next year. And somehow we need to get that provided to the DAC members and to the public. Now, we can do that once a year. We can do that -- have a fee theme and have that done at that time. That's one option. But there is a requirement from the BLM Washington office that a report is generated each year that shows the amount of money that was collected and where that money went and how it was going to be used and
what they're going to use it for the following year.

I would just like to see -- I would like to see
us have some way of getting that visibility out to the
public. I don't think I've ever seen one of those reports
from Barstow. I don't think I've ever seen a complete
report from El Centro on the fees where how much was
collected and where it went and what you're going to do
with it the next year. And that's a requirement of the
law.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Any other comments for -- or
questions for field office managers?

MEMBER SHUMWAY: I have a question for Barstow,
Roxie -- remember the part about learning curves. So this
is going to be part of my learning curve.

Roxie, the Lucerne Valley Chevron Solar Project,
you said that you're working on reassignment of ownership.
Could you elaborate on that?

MS. TROST: Yes. It was originally a Chevron
project. And just after the record of decision was
signed, Chevron has sold the project to another company.
So they're going through the reassignment process.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Okay. So it's the project, not
necessarily land ownership transfers or anything.

MS. TROST: Yes.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Thank you very much.
And I also have a question for Hector.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Any other questions for Roxie?

Thank you, Roxie.

Hector, Dinah had a question, please.

Dinah, why don't you go right ahead.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Maybe a quick question, Hector, while you're walking up here, I'll ask my question.

The Reofoce people, that's probably some kind of a clay or silica commodity?

MR. VILLALOBOS: It's pumice.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: What was the reason that they didn't start their mining activities? Do you know?

MR. VILLALOBOS: Well, the definition of mining is really what is being debated between the BLM and the Reofoce company. They did some work. They improved a road to the location within the state park and they sampled some of the material in the old mine. And so the question is whether that fits the definition of mining according to our plan.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Under their plan of operation?

MR. VILLALOBOS: Yeah.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: So it's more like prospecting activities?

MR. VILLALOBOS: That's what might be debated between us and the company.
MEMBER SHUMWAY: Okay.

MR. VILLALOBOS: And so that question is really -- we're trying to sort that out between the companies. We ask them questions exactly what was their idea of what mining was. And they provided us some feedback. And we're going to review that with our solicitor and see if that constitutes mining --

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Okay.

MR. VILLALOBOS: -- under the plan of operations.

MS. SHUMWAY: All right. So --

MR. VILLALOBOS: And you kind of understand the importance of their mining claim that was grandfathered inside the state park at Red Rock State Park when this land was turned over to the state park I think back in 1990 -- I forgot the exact date -- 1994 or something like that. However, the mining claims remained the jurisdiction of the BLM, those that remained within the state park.

And so we're carefully evaluating these mining claims as they want to go into development of their mining claim. And then what we need to decide is, is it a valuable and a prudent mining operation, kind of like is it really mining. And so if not, then the mining claim might be basically put to rest. And then the state park has the jurisdiction.
MEMBER SHUMWAY: So essentially they haven't gone through the proper due diligence to --

MR. VILLALOBOS: That's correct.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Now, had their plan of operations been updated prior to the activities?

MR. VILLALOBOS: Yes. It was updated.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: And that included recommendations, requirements, and things like that?

MR. VILLALOBOS: Yes. And that happened about a couple of years ago. And so now it's time for them to demonstrate their due diligence on that mining claim. And so there's that discussion between us and the mining claimant as to what constitutes mining between the BLM and the mining claimant.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Okay.

MR. VILLALOBOS: Does that make sense to you?

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Yes. I'm just trying to rectify the situation or the situation you're trying to show. You're trying to get this applicant -- or applicant is not the right word.

MR. VILLALOBOS: Mining claimant.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Mining claimant to demonstrate that they have a viable project, essentially?

MR. VILLALOBOS: That is correct.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Which is where we all are?
MR. VILLALOBOS: That it's economic --

MEMBER SHUMWAY: I'm just comparing that with the
attitude that we all have toward renewable activities as
well. So thank you. I appreciate that.

MR. VILLALOBOS: You're welcome.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Any other questions for Hector?

Thank you, Hector. I appreciate that.

Last call for questions for other field office
managers.

Ron and then April.

MEMBER JOHNSTON: Just quickly, for Needles, as I
recall at the last meeting three months ago, the
Horsethief Springs riparian damages issue was brought up
and the damage that has been caused by U.S. Iron. And it
seems like this is still ongoing with no resolution in
sight. And they've apparently been guilty of some pretty
severe damage to that area.

You know, what seems to be the problem? What's
the progress? What's the dollar amount we're trying to
recover to repair that area?

MR. LEE: The problem right now, as I mentioned
last time, they appealed to the Interior Board. BLM
basically was sustained in our decision. 65,000 was the
ballpark number we were talking about for recovery. The
company has since retained an attorney and they are in
negotiation with our solicitors as to exactly how to go

about that.

    MEMBER JOHNSTON: Over $65,000?

    MR. LEE: Yes. They actually -- their latest
counter, I think, was $15,000. And it's not going well.

    And a side issue, they are not fully bonded with
the state of California to operate on the private land.
So our guess is they're dealing with some financial
problems at this point. So we're trying to basically come
up with whatever we can get to fix the problem and
hopefully get them operational, 'cause they're not going
to fix their money flow problems until they are
operational, so...

    CHAIRMAN BANIS: Dick -- I'm sorry, Dick. April.
April first.

    MEMBER HOLLIDAY: I'm sorry.

    MEMBER SALL: Do you have a specific thing?

    MEMBER HOLLIDAY: I was just going to say if
they're not bonded, are you still allowing them to operate
on public land?

    MR. LEE: Oh, no. This is purely state bonding
on private land.

    MEMBER SHUMWAY: The state is the lead agency in
this case?

    MR. LEE: It's messy. The mine is actually on
private land. So as far as BLM's concerned, we don't even
consider it a mine. It's just a commercial activity on
private land. Our concern with -- on that aspect is are
they permitted by the state -- are they allowed to operate
by the state of California. And it just so happens that
since it is a mine they have to go ahead and bond for
reclamation under state law. And we're still waiting for
that. That's not with BLM. That's not ours.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: You just -- they had to access
it through BLM's property?

MR. LEE: Yes. And that was where our distress
came in. All they needed to cross with us was to go up
the road and back down. So why they did the disturbance
on BLM, we're not really sure at this point. And that was
basically what the Interior Board found. They couldn't
understand it either.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: April?

MEMBER SALL: This is just a general comment. So
it's not -- I just wanted to express some appreciation for
all the field office managers in mentioning volunteer work
and updates on restoration in volunteerism throughout the
California desert. I think it's really important to
acknowledge the work that our volunteers and students do
whether it's trail work through the SCA, Student
Conservation Association, or volunteer cleanups with
different friends groups, et cetera, et cetera.

So I would just like to see those updates continue to come so that we can recognize all the work that happens throughout the desert.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Comments or questions, field office managers?

Once, twice.

Thank you, council members. Thank you, field office managers for your reports.

Vesna, still okay?

THE REPORTER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: I'd like to go through the public comments, and then we'll take our break. Any objections?

I have public comments on the field office manager, district manager, and state office reports. And Ed Waldheim.

MR. WALDHEIM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Ed Waldheim.

Nails. I've come across the issue that the local law enforcement folks cannot enforce the nail special regulation that the BLM has instituted. And so we need help on figuring out how we can get that resolved. Even though we have a Memorandum of Understanding of Ridgecrest with Kern County sheriffs, they say they cannot implement
it. Barstow, Mr. Hillier was going to help us -- I don't
know -- with Brad to try to get the sheriffs involved or
get the memorandum going again with the BLM.

        And, Gerry, you said you were going to work on
that.

        MR. HILLIER: It's gone south.

        MR. WALDHEIM: It's gone south. So much for that
one.

        Anyway, I think we need help. We need to make
sure that any special regulation that we set up with the
Bureau of Land Management, that at least with those
agencies we do have an MOU, that we can get them to
enforce it. And right now, they say if you come in with a
whole bunch of pallets and a sheriff sees it, there's not
a darn thing he can do about it. And that has me really
bummed because we're starting to see those again.

        Your men, what you're talking about, I agree with
both of you. Keep the stenographer going. That is
excellent. However, Mr. Tom Acuna, you did a great job
last year, and Randy will do the same thing, is you do a
synopsis on record which will show up on the minutes. And
I would suggest you come up with action logs. I'm a big
fan of action logs. Most of the agents, you understand
what action logs are now about, like it because it
institutionalizes things that we want to take care of.
You may take care of it today, but you may take care of it
five years from now. At least you don't have to rethink
and go back and back and back again.

So I would say come up with an action log for the
DAC so you have it. And put who is it assigned to, what's
the due date, so you can keep a record so we can take
better time of our time.

On the wall up there, I put the West Mojave plan
up there. And I put it -- the reason I talk about it now,
because there's nothing in here that anybody talked about
on the West Mojave except the two field offices who put it
in their reports. I want to make sure that the DAC
understands the enormity of what we are being asked to do.
We have 13,000 miles of trail. The big map over there,
that's West Mojave. Those were all the trails we had.
After all the years of planning -- and if you look -- pick
you up Richard Crow's analogy or history -- I have it out
there. I'll pass it to you. We lost 8,000 miles of
trails which are the red ones. They took -- everything
red is taken away from us. We have 5,000 miles left over.
Those 5,000 miles of trails are the ones that now are
being attacked as being excessive and you haven't done
your job in designating them right.

I would like to submit to you, how often are you
going to keep on milking the same thing until we are out
of the desert and you shut us down, which is the ultimate
goal, unfortunately, for those folks who continue to don't
understand.

I bring this up to you because we are desperately
trying to manage our public lands in the right way, keep
the people on designated trails. And it's high time that
all of us in this room work together to help us manage our
public lands in a responsible way. Continually taking
away our trails when we have them fenced and there's no
off-road travel and not letting us go on those trails,
it's unconceivable. I don't understand what's going on
with that. So this is something that we need to really
think.

And Tom is gone now. The issue on the money. I
think the DAC needs to take up that $12 million, the
$600,000 of royalties, somehow we have to figure out how
do we get to keep it in here. Because right now we see
very little of that to help us manage the public lands.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Thank you, Ed.

I'm going to continue for a few more minutes. I
have a speaker card from Ed Stovin. Ed, would you like to
make a presentation for us?

MR. STOVIN: I'd just like to make a quick law
enforcement comment about a friend of mine last winter who
was camping in the Superstition open area. And he had a
law enforcement come into his camp -- he had a number of
people there -- and demand to see registrations. To my
understanding, there was no probable cause for their
coming in. They came in and demanded registration papers.
And they found a couple that he didn't have them for, and
they were cited. I think it was on a big weekend.

So I don't know if it was the BLM's law
enforcement or -- I think sometimes you bring in, you
know, help law enforcement. But I've heard of this
happening to other people. And I don't really understand
why and how this happens. And I hope it could be stopped.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Any questions or comments from
the council?

Thank you, Ed. Thank you.
I'm going to continue. Kim Campbell had a
comment.

MS. CAMPBELL: Hello. I just have a brief
comment about the bylaw changes. And that is that I think
transcripts are very important. Summaries, action items
are great. But occasionally it's important to see exactly
what was said. And the only way you can see that is with
a transcript. So that's all. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Thank you, Kim.

The last comment we have for this period before
we take a break, Ron Schiller, nice to see you, Ron. For
those of you who don't know, Ron is a former DAC member.
And some of you actually served with Ron. Our terms
overlapped. And nice to see you back.

MR. SCHILLER: Nice to see you.

I just wanted to comment on the transcripts as
well. Although it was before many of you were involved
with the DAC, the reason that I recall that the
transcripts were so important was wherein Roy Dinner and
later Ron Kemp were chairmen of this advisory council,
there was a lot of turmoil and a lot of discussion on the
accuracy and the -- maybe some considered sanitizing of
the minutes that came out of these meetings. As far as it
goes this particular meeting, they were very important for
me this week because an issue came up that I wasn't aware
of. I was able to go online and see all the discussion
back to last summer at every DAC meeting -- who said what,
why it was important, and why I'm here today.

Also, it's very, very helpful for the public to
have those reports, the field managers', the state
director's, and the district directors' reports online. I
can remember before I was on the Desert Advisory Council
running in here, grabbing them off the table, trying to
listen to the meeting, trying to go through the reports so
I could have my questions beforehand. It was very nice to
be able this week and last night to sit down and know
exactly what my concerns were and being able to
intelligently discuss and express my concerns with a
little bit of thought beforehand.

So I'd like to thank you for your time.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Thank you, Ron.

Dick?

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: Yeah. I'd like to ask BLM too,
if this issue -- we spend a lot of time with this issue on
pallets and nails and these supplemental rules. It was a
crusade of mine for years, and it took years to get it
through the process into Washington. And it seems that if
now we've spent the time to get that through and we can't
enforce it, it seems like we have a huge hole there. And
that was -- so it seems like there should be some way,
either with an MOU with the sheriffs or maybe instructions
to the sheriff, if they can't do anything, at least notify
the BLM ranger that this guy is coming in with a truckload
of pallets. And the BLM ranger can take care of the
problem.

But it's really a huge problem. And we need to
get that solved. I mean, we're trying to keep our areas
clean and protect the environment as much as we can. We
want to use the area, but we want to protect it. And so
we spend lots of time with getting these supplemental
rules in place.
CHAIRMAN BANIS: I'll bet Erin has a helpful comment on this.

MS. CURTIS: Not just a helpful comment but some good news. It looks like those supplemental rules are going to be published in the Federal Register Notice in about a week.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Well, thank you, Erin.

MS. CURTIS: So then you'll have teeth.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Thank you.

I'm sorry. I do have another speaker card from Susan and Carolyn. But I'm sorry. I'm going to have to start your -- start the next session after the break with your comment. We promised a break for some folks, and I'd like to stick with that. So when we return after our break, we'll have a last public comment and we'll move on to the agenda from there.

So we have a 15-minute break scheduled. I will see you all back at 10:25.

(RECESS TAKEN.)

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Thank you, everybody. If we could take our seats, we're going to reconvene.

I'd like to begin the session with a final public comment on this -- on the reports. And I have a comment from Susan -- well, actually it's one card with two people. However you want to do this, Susan and Carolyn.
MS. BROADWAY: We'll come together.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Susan Broadway and Carolyn Jungwirth. Thank you. Please.

MS. JUNGWIRTH: Thank you, Chairman.

We're new at this. We belong to three gem and mineral clubs which we enjoy. And we just, you know, have a question on how this is going to affect our collecting areas and taking people out to enjoy Mother Nature and the beautiful rocks and everything.

MS BROADWAY: On the public lands.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: So essentially it's a question --

MS. BROADWAY: Well, it's more than one question. That's the first question.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Okay. I've noted it. We'll reply. Keep going.

MS. BROADWAY: Second thing is we have a lot of -- I started some rocks going around, some tumbled rocks that have -- most of them have been collected in the areas that are cited for some of these projects such as the wind farms and things like that. And that's what we're worried about is going to shut down these lands. All of these stones that are in this box have been set aside for the children in the community which inspires them, hopefully, to join the club and get involved and do
things like lapidary or jewelry or something of that
nature, wire wrapping, whatever inspires them, whatever
they want to do with them, or just become geologists or
whatever their heart desires. They can join the club and
do just about anything, whatever their mind can come up
with. But we'd rather them do that or, you know, enjoy
the land. They get out there and they dig things up.
It's a treasure hunt, really. And then they can see what
the end result is before they ever begin. And it's just
an inspiring thing to see the children get involved. So
rather than seeing them with their fingers on some sort of
a video game, we'd love to see them get out and enjoy the
public resources. And this seems to help them get excited
to get involved.

And I have to mention that we gave my nephew who
recently got adopted from Russia a mineral collection and
he just went nuts. So this is a real interesting thing
for the kids to get them involved in something other than
video games. And I think it's really important to
preserve the natural resources for our children, our
grandchildren, and the people to come.

And I just want to know what's going to happen if
you guys put up all these wind farms and all these things
to enclose off the trails.

And the third question we have is how do you know
that we're out there collecting? I notice you guys mentioned something about a time we don't know people are on the trails. We don't tell you guys, call you up and say, "Hey, we're on the trail this weekend." But we go out almost every weekend. So how do you know we're on the trails?

Those are our questions.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Very good.

I'm not sure if we have direct answers. But we're definitely happy to open for comments.

MS. JUNGWIRTH: Can I just say one thing? When you look at those rocks, each one is a little picture.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Oh, yes.

MS. JUNGWIRTH: And you can take a picture of that and blow it up on a canvas, and you see some in doctor's offices and everything. They're beautiful. It's Mother Nature.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: They sure are.

Dick, you had a comment or question?

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: Yeah. Think it's real important -- and I was talking to these people at the break here. And that too many people think, you know, just off-road vehicles are using these trails and roads. And they're really not. I just want to make sure we understand -- I'm sure the BLM does -- that these routes
are used for not only just trail riding, but they're used
by people of disabilities or people that want to get
someplace to do something else. And whether it's rock
climbing, rock collecting, mining, you know, just bird
watching, visiting the desert.

So it's very important that we look at each one
of these projects and see what kind of impact is it going
to have on the ability of people to get to where they want
to go. And that's what's really damaging about all these
losses of routes. Whether it's from the Johnson Valley
expansion of the military base or whether it's a renewable
energy project, we're stopping people from getting where
they want to go. And that's just been happening too much.
And we've got to really look at that. I for one just
think that the BLM needs to look more closely at these
projects and whether they're really viable. And I
understand they're getting a lot of pressure from up above
just to get them through no matter what. But a lot of
these projects are probably really not a viable entity.
And maybe they're not the people to stop them. Maybe it's
the congress that needs to stop them. But it's something
that needs to be looked at.

And I think we just -- as far as knowing where
these people are, you know, I talk a lot about visitation
at these recreation areas, whether it's a dune area or
some other area. And that's one of the things that we
probably don't really have a very good handle on, is how
much other uses is there going on in the desert by other
people, whether it's, you know, I'm going on this trail
ride, and how many people go down the Mojave Trail.
Probably nobody keeps track of that. But, you know, a lot
of people go down and use that area too.

So that's my comment.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: I agree.

Comment, Dinah?

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Ladies, you're talking my
language. One of the things that I think we forget is
that -- and I constantly -- I think I do this every
meeting now -- is point out that we are -- as a society
are allowing our federal government to shut off public
access to public lands via wilderness designation, via
closed roads, via these what I consider boondoggle
renewable projects that would not be a viable business
enterprise, in my world certainly. And we have that
evidence right here from Hector's recent testimony.

So the mining industry gets no subsidies. And
the mining industry has to post bonds. And the mining
industry has to prove that they have a viable mining
project. That means a profitable project that does not
rely on any taxpayer subsidies.
So I think these ladies have pointed out that it's not only the off-road community that is suffering here but those of us who work in the desert, have clients in the desert, maintain claims, try to permit mining operations on public lands. And besides, these ladies are representing a viable gem and mineral community, which the association that I'm associated with, the Victor Valley Gem and Mineral Club has a young prospect -- it's called the Petrified Pups, which is like a Boy and Girl Scouts program for rock hounds. They study geology, they study minerals. I run them on field trips. And I'm going to be giving lectures to this group of about 16 kids, ages 18 through like eight.

So you know what? These are viable operations, and these people are going to be hurt too by losing access to our public lands.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Further comments?

Tom.

MR. HALLENBECK: Well, just so they're aware, as any project, it has to have an environmental document. And if you have concerns about a project, access being one of your concerns, you need to stay engaged. You need to access the document and make your comments so that they're heard and officially responded to by the BLM. A lot of
times a project is proposed and there's uses out there
that the proponents aren't aware of. And by your
comments, they all become aware that that's an access
issue that they need to address and mitigate for if it is
an impact to the project.

So stay engaged. Make your comments online, if
you wish, to that environmental document. That's where
you will be heard. It's great you're here today and
informing us and giving us your viewpoint, and it's shared
by many of us here. But what we do is we advise the BLM.
And you have a more direct impact to individual projects
by making your comments on those environmental documents.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Any further comments?

Hearing and seeing none, I'm going to close the
public comment period for this moment.

We have a presentation I've been alerted to that
would like to take place for the DAC by Ed Waldheim.

Please, Ed, from California Off-Road Vehicle
Association.

ED WALDHEIM: Put my right jacket on. Thank you
Mr. Chairman.

Ladies and gentlemen, it's a great privilege as
CORVA, California Off-Road Vehicle Association, we've been
in business almost 50 years. We're the ones who started
creating the OHV forum in 1972 when we brought it to the
legislators. And every year we have awards that we put
out.

    Well, I'm privileged to be able to give the past
president's award. Having been a president -- there's
only four of us left over, unfortunately. But at least
we're here. And it is to the person who has done the
most, who is working the most to work and keep our access
of our public lands open. And I'm absolutely delighted to
present it today to somebody who is on the DAC.

    So I'm going to go right up and get it. Come on,
Steve. Get over here. This person works tirelessly,
ever stops. And it's none other than Mr. Randy Banis
that gets the award.

    (Applause from the audience.)

    CHAIRMAN BANIS: Holy moly. I am shocked.

    MR. WALDHEIM: I finally got one on him.

    CHAIRMAN BANIS: I am so shocked.

    MR. WALDHEIM: So you deserve this.

    CHAIRMAN BANIS: Oh, my goodness, Ed. Thank you.

Gentlemen, thank you so very, very much. Wow.

    MR. WALDHEIM: I'd like to introduce Jim Collins.

    He's a VP from administration. He's got another award to
do.

    MR. COLLINS: Good morning. I'm here on behalf
of CORVA. Randy wasn't able to make our annual meeting a
couple weekends ago in Visalia. So we would have loved to
have done it there.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Me too.

MR. COLLINS: But congratulations.

We have one more, though, to honor on the DAC
today. And that would be for our George Thomas Memorial
Trophy of off-roader of the year. Now, this trophy has
been with CORVA and was first initiated to Mr. George
Thomas in 1972. Each year, this award has gone to the
off-roader of the year, presented to the individual whose
contributions to the betterment of off-roading during the
preceding year are worthy of this very special
recognition. This recipient may be any individual who has
provided special help to off-roading. This person doesn't
have to be a member of CORVA or affiliated organizations.

The winner for 2010 is Mr. Dick Holliday.

MR. WALDHEIM: Last year's winner was Daphne
Greene. So she's here to present and pass it on to him.

DIRECTOR RAML: Get your cart. You need a cart.

MR. COLLINS: Now, Dick was nominated for the
off-roader of the year award for his 40 years of desert
recreation activity as a user and an advocate. Dick
has -- is a lifetime member of CORVA since 1991 and is a
member of the American Sand Association where he served on
the board of directors for the previous five years, also
holding the position of treasurer for the past four. And he recently stepped down.

But Dick is still involved, as you see here today in the DAC, the TRT for the El Centro. I met Dick before he was involved in any of this stuff. And I don't know if I helped do this or not. But I'm sure glad that he's won this award. Thank you.

(Applause from the audience.)

MR. COLLINS: All right. You get to take it home.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Thank you, CORVA, for taking the time to make the presentations on behalf of Dick and I. We're quite honored. Thank you. Thank you very much. I appreciate the audience for indulging us here today as well. I'd like to move on, if I may, to the next agenda item. I think we're going to get caught up. I think it will be fairly quick.

Steve, I need help with a PowerPoint. And I'll set this up. This is the report -- this is the renewable energy update, a report from the renewable energy subcommittee. The renewable energy subcommittee is a small group of DAC members, includes April, Lloyd, Meg, myself, Tom, and Dinah. And we may see Brad joining us at some time soon as well.

And we met, more than half of us -- about half of
us met in May to have an update on renewable energy projects. And we discussed some issues. And I came up with a few recommendations that I shared with my fellow subcommittee members and received their okay to present these recommendations today. They're just recommendations to the BLM. And we're starting out, I'd say, small and simple here at this first step.

The first recommendation we have is we would recommend that the BLM regularly update the DAC on the DRECP process. That stands for Desert Renewable Energy Conservation Plan. That is an overarching 20-plus-million acre conservation plan that has a goal of deciding where would be the best places to locate renewable energy and where are the best places to enact conservation programs to mitigate for the effects of renewable energy development. So the DRECP is a gigantic plan that is on its way down the track, I'd say getting close to halfway down the track in producing this desert-wide plan.

We advised -- we asked the BLM should move its fellow REAT agencies -- sorry for the acronym. But REAT is the Renewable Energy Action Team. That is the four agencies that are moving this DRECP through. The four agencies are BLM, United States Fish and Wildlife, California Energy Commission, and California Fish and Game. Those are the -- they make up the -- I'd say the
steering committee, essentially, for this DRECP. And we
would ask the BLM to convince the other REAT agencies to
urgently seek the participation of counties if the DRECP
is going to be anything more than a BLM plan.

And the reason behind -- the point behind this is
that this plan can only designate renewable energy and
mitigation among the plan's participants. And right now,
the only participants are those four agencies. In order
for this to really be a desert-wide plan, the counties, we
believe, must come on board. And it's our opinion that
the counties share that opinion as well. We've been
hearing that quite vocally at the DRECP meetings.

Next slide. And it's only three slides long.

Second is we ask that the BLM regularly update
the DAC on other renewable energy programmatic planning.
And that would include the solar programmatic EIS that is
under way as well as the Coso and Truckhaven geothermal
programmatic EIS. We've been hearing little bits of that
in the past. That's going to be coming front and forward
in the next couple of months. And because of the unique
circumstances -- this is something we learned at the last
renewable energy subgroup meeting. We were fortunate to
receive a presentation from a representative of the state
office. And based on that presentation, we would urge
that because of the unique circumstances in the California
desert with regard to the advanced solar energy research and planning that has occurred and is under way, the BLM should consider a California-specific decision on the solar PEIS. And what we mean by that is the solar PEIS is an eight-state plan. And the states are in various stages of considering renewable energy development and mitigation on the public lands. Some states are more ahead of others. And as you may know if you've read the solar PEIS draft document, there are different alternatives being proposed. We would like to suggest the possibility that not all states have to have the same alternative, that some states could have a different alternative.

    And the third slide, please.

    Our third recommendation at this point is to continue to update the DAC with key project status overviews such as -- pardon me. I didn't have time to really run through my packet today. But I know that at our last meeting we received a handful of printouts, one for each pending project that had a kind of thermometer that showed the status and so forth. And they're in these packets as well. We'd like to see that continue. That's helpful. And we won't need to have in-person presentations on a project-by-project basis that way.

    So our advice, for example, is that recent tortoise surveys at the Ivanpah site have called into
question industry-provided resource survey data for the other desert solar energy projects. And we would like the BLM to seek a similar validation of resource data at other recently-approved proffered solar project sites.

And that's all we've got so far. We considered -- we considered terminating the life of that subgroup as it perhaps had -- we thought it may have reached an end. But at the last subgroup meeting, in discussing with the BLM, the BLM would like us to keep the subgroup or the subcommittee active for the time being and continue to meet and help them in developing their progress going forward.

So that's it for me. I have a comment from April and I have Dick. And then I'll take any other comments after that.

April, please.

MEMBER SALL: Yeah. Just one quick thing I wanted to add to your list, Randy, on that second slide. I think we discussed also getting an update on the -- Chocolate Mountain's geothermal EIS. I don't know if I have the term right. But anyway that's something where it was announced that was going to be studied. And then I understand an EIS could be released possibly this month. But I'd like to know the status of that and a little bit more kind of comprehensive check-in on where geothermal is
in general because that was something we did a DAC field
trip on and we looked at a specific project. But I don't
feel like we have much context on how geothermal as a
renewable energy form, I guess, is really moving forward
and what the big picture and how that plugs into DRECP and
all the other things we're juggling.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: The DAC is blessed to have a
member who's one of the state's renowned authorities on
geothermal energy, Alex Schreiner. And unfortunately he
couldn't be here today. But I hope that he can help take
the lead with his expertise and bring us all up to speed
on developments there with the BLM.

Dick?

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: In light of the tortoise
surveys that were done at Ivanpah and found out that --
apparently that the original studies were flawed in some
way. Who does -- who does these studies? Does the BLM do
these studies? Are they independent? Are they
independent people that go out and do those studies and
are paid for by the applicant?

Okay. I was just wondering about that. It just
seems that maybe that particular study consultant didn't
do a very good job or maybe there was some other
mitigating -- maybe things wandered into their area when
they weren't looking.
DIRECTOR RAML: That's Rusty. Rusty, would you shed some light on that, please.

MR. LEE: The studies are done by third-party contractors. Actually BrightSource contracted to CH2M HILL and I believe Kiva Biologicals who did the actual subcontractor work for the surveys. The folks that are doing it are specialists in the field. They do tortoise surveys for a living. So it's not just a matter of some third-party contractor who was hired, you know, go forth and do this. You have to be certified, you have to know protocols for dealing with them, protocols for documenting their presence.

The problem with tortoise is they literally come out when they feel like it. And if they don't feel like it, they don't come out. You know, they aestivate during the summertime. They hibernate during the winter. But springtime, it's got to be between 70 and 95 degrees. There's got to be enough moisture. So it's sort of a hit-and-miss process even in the best of years. And the surveys, because of the timing of the project, were done in a spring that was very dry, windy, and on the warm side. So bottom line is there were a lot of tortoises that were underground and were missed from what we can tell.

To make things complex, tortoises are not
uniformly distributed across the landscape. So one of the
things we're looking at right now is there were a high
number of tortoises in unit 1. Unit 2 and 3, I think the
biologists concur the numbers aren't going to be that
high. But we went ahead and estimated based on what we
know in 1, the same thing was going to carry through to
the entire project. So you may have seen some very large
numbers in the biological opinion when it comes out. And
if you look at our biological assessment, it shows some
very high numbers.

When I talked to the biologists one on one, their
answer is they don't think the numbers are going to be
that high. But they're scared now. We've gotten the
numbers wrong once before. So -- is that --

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Oh, April?

MEMBER SALL: I understand the same consultant is
being selected for the Cadiz studies. Is that in your
district or which -- the Cadiz water project EIS that I
think is going out for public comment now -- someone else
may know this.

MR. LEE: I officially know absolutely nothing
about that.

MEMBER SALL: Okay. All right.

MR. LEE: I am not allowed to expend federal --
that actually is a privately funded project. And it's
going through CEQA at this point for an EIR.

MEMBER SALL: And that doesn't touch any BLM lands?

MR. LEE: We're not sure. We're studying. They are stating it does not involve BLM. And to the best of my knowledge right now, it does not.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: I'm sorry. Tom? Dinah?

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Not to you specifically.

Rather than commenting on any specific renewable energy projects, I will comment as I always do about reminding everybody of the underlying reason why we are being forced to consider public lands for renewable energy -- utility-scale renewable energy projects.

Solar projects are best used at point of use. They are inefficient, 20 percent for wind and maybe 20 to 30 percent solar. So I don't think that the return that we are getting is worthwhile to the taxpayers. But ultimately too, the science does not support this. These projects were undertaken to address human-generated CO2 issues. CO2 has never been shown to be the primary driver in climate change. Therefore, the citizens are being asked to give up access to their public lands based on what I consider and many other scientists consider faulty so-called science.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Any further comments?
Dick, you okay?

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: Yeah. I'll kind of beat on Dinah's drum here a little bit.

We keep hearing the resources -- we need these renewable energy facilities to reduce our dependence on foreign oil. So I kind of went through and did some research. And there's actually a federal research document that shows that less than one percent of the country's electrical generation is generated by petroleum. Most generation in this country is either by water, hydro, nuclear, natural gas, or coal. So less than one percent is actually used by -- is using petroleum. So any of these resources are not going to make one iota bit of difference in our reliance on foreign sources of energy.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Are there any further comments regarding the recommendations, direct recommendations? Is there any motion to accept or are we just going to lay it on the table and move on? I thought that would be nice to acknowledge.

I have a motion to accept the report of the subcommittee.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: I'll second that.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Second.

Discussion on the report?

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: My only discussion would be
that this is exactly what I think needs to be put into our record as action items and in some kind of an action item report so that we can see how the BLM is responding to these requests or thoughts.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: There's no further comments?
The motion is to accept the report of the subgroup -- subcommittee. All those in favor, aye.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: Aye.
MEMBER SHUMWAY: Aye.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Opposed?

Hearing none, the report is accepted. Thank you.

Public comment on the renewable energy issue that we would like to hear. I have -- wrong pile. I'm going to read them in order so that you can get ready. I have three perennial's comments today. We have Ed, Marie Brashear, Ron Schiller, Gerry Hillier, and Terry Weiner.

And I'll start with Ed on renewable energy.

MR. WALDHEIM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I spent two days in Sacramento attending the California Chamber conference, 1200 people up there. Unbelievable.

The issues that are taking place in the state when Jerry Brown talked to us is $1.3 trillion in debt that we are in in the state of California. Things don't look good.

And with the comments that you're making about
it's one percent, I don't understand why we are losing all
our public land for something that has absolutely no
return or benefit to the public. I also found out there's
a new bill now in Sacramento that is asking that the state
lands start working to acquire more land so they can have
connectivity to work on renewable energy projects. And it
was SB -- I forgot what it was. SB -- AB 982 is now up
there. So now the state is getting involved.

Because of all these issues, we are embarking on
trying to resolve the issue of who really is in the
desert. And so we formed a little group, loosely-held
group, Recreation Access Council of California. And this
group is soliciting anybody in this audience who wants to
help us.

Is Kim here? She was here earlier. There she
is. Kim is our lead person that's keeping track of all
the comments from people. If there's a destination point
that you have in the California desert, we want to know
about it. Let Kim know about it. Because on the 26th,
we're going to get into my office at 3550 Foothill
Boulevard in Glendale, 8:30 in the morning to
4:00 o'clock, and we're going to go over all the input of
everybody who has an interest in the California desert
that likes to use the desert. And we hope to come up with
a map that will be an overlay of showing all the different
interests that people have in the California desert so that we can go to DRECP who thinks all of a sudden it's blue, these are land of opportunity for mitigation.

Excuse me. We've been there first. I'm going to take the American Indian stance. I've been here way before you ever got here.

And so we want to see if we can work on that. But we need everybody's help on that. It's very loosely held. Anybody can join us. Anybody can participate.

Terry Weiner, you can participate too and help us identify those areas -- I don't care how you get there, what it is. We need to identify what are the areas of interest that you want to protect, and so we can put it on a map and figure out what we come up with. We'll have a map guy coming to the meeting and so we can present it to the DRECP.

So this is one way for us to try to reclaim what they keep taking away from us, and that's our liberty and our American freedom, which we seem to be losing so easily with a stroke of a pen, either be it the military or the BLM or renewable resources. We've got to stop this nonsense.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Thank you, Ed.

Marie. You sat on the DAC once; right, Marie?
MS. BRASHEAR: Yeah, for eight years. And TRTs then were made up of staff, DAC members, and sometimes the general public, not just staff.

On your little three-slide show, you talked about requesting maybe separate rules and regulations for separate states. California Desert Conservation Area designated by congress as part of the Federal Land Management Act is a special area. It doesn't fall under the requirements of the rest of the state of California. It is a special area. That's one of the problems with the PEIS on solar, is because it doesn't treat it as a special area. It treats it as another piece of the California state. And so maybe you want to look at that issue when you go back.

Another -- you keep talking about utility-size projects. They have now got the level down to where a few hundred megawatts is a -- considered a utility-size project. It keeps decreasing as rulings come out of Washington. And somebody in the audience said, how come? How come we're doing all of this is because the president of the United States said in his misinformation, I think, that there have to be 30,000, I think, megawatts generated on public land. He didn't say public and private. So the government employees, the folks we're working with, have no option but to try to find a spot where they can
generate that kind of numbers. And unfortunately, the
California desert, which is why it needs to be treated
specially, unhappily happens to be in the top five
locations in the world for solar generation. It's a
really, really ugly situation. And that's why I think all
of us need to keep talking about the California desert and
its special status as opposed to the state of California.

CHAIRMEN BANIS: Thank you, Marie.

Ron. Ron Schiller.

MR. SCHILLER: Thank you again, Randy.

I'm here today as a representative of our local
gem and mineral society, the Indian Wells Gem and Mineral
Society, based in Ridgecrest, California. And what our
concern is with all of these energy projects has to do
with the amount of land and the competition for what land
is left available. If you stop and think, these are not
going to go on wilderness areas. They're not going to go
on ACECs. These are not going to go anywhere but areas
that is currently now used for recreation. And as you
take that out of the recreation base, you're going to
start putting pressure -- more and more pressure in all
these other areas.

So what I would recommend is to consider
mitigation. You mitigate for tortoise, you mitigate for
this, you mitigate for that.
And you say, well, where are we going to get more land? Well, we don't have to get more land. You look at the West Mojave and the northeast -- the NEMo and WeMo and all of these, and there's tremendous amount of roads that were closed for reasons that weren't really significant, mostly because they were, you know, lack of inventory or whatever. These are existing roads. They're not new roads. They're just closed roads. Many of these roads were opportunities to gem and mineral collecting and other types of recreation. As we close these lands, we need to mitigate recreation now. And we can do that by going back and revisiting some of these areas where these roads were closed for, quote, density or manageability or this or that and the other.

That's all I have to say. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Thank you, Ron.

Gerry Hillier, comment on renewable energy.

MR. HILLIER: Good morning once again,

Mr. Chairman and members of the council.

I had a couple of thoughts as you were running through the recommendations on your subcommittee. And you've already adopted the report. So they probably are not timely. But I did want to express a couple of thoughts.

First, with all three recommendations, to what
end do you see them being presented? You've asked the BLM
to present the council with certain information relative
to the PEIS on solar and the update on the DRECP. Is the
council then just going to absorb them like a load of hay
or are they going to then take the next step and wrestle
with it and function in an advisory capacity so as to
provide the BLM with input on those documents? And I
think your recommendation probably ought to express from
the council's standpoint some anticipated use of that
other than just simply being a forum to receive the
information. You know, my feeling is that the council
really, on some of these projects, ought to take a
position if they indeed are going to function as advisors.
And I know there's probably some disagreement in terms of,
you know, the level of information that individual council
members may have on any particular project. But it just
seems to me in terms of overview or principles or
something, the council ought to speak.

The second relates -- and specifically to
recommendation No. 2 in terms of the solar PEIS and PEIS
and the California-only position, I think that's a really
good thing to do. I think the recommendation stops short,
again, of saying, okay, what's going to happen to that
recommendation, is the council recommending that the
district manager write a memo to the state director
saying, "My council has recommended that we have a California-only and I concur" or "not concur," as the case may be? But I think the council stops short of directing a specific action. And I would hate to have -- you know, come back in September to the next meeting of the council there and, well, the recommendation was in the minutes but nothing has happened. So I think the council probably should take one more step and say, and we request the district manager to initiate some correspondence. And if she opts not to, then fine. Then she can take that up with the council and say why she didn't. But at any rate, I think you stop short of -- your recommendations were sound. I think you stopped short of recommending the next step.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Thank you. Thank you, Gerry.

MR. HILLIER: While I've got 22 seconds there.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Take it.

MR. HILLIER: I might say, Rusty commented on keeping the consultants there in the tortoise inventory. Kiva and Peter Woodman has done tortoise surveys in the desert for at least 25 years, both in California and Arizona. And I know them to be really a highly-respected firm in terms of doing tortoise inventories. And so they may have -- they may have miscounted. But given all the problems of counting tortoises, I can tell you that there
is certainly nothing wrong with the contractor's qualifications. They're a sound outfit.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Thank you, Gerry. I appreciate your bringing up those points.

Number one, I -- to the council members, I did err in calling for that motion prior to our accepting some comment. I should do so. And following this comment, I do want to revisit and see if we have any changes to our motion. It was my fault. We were supposed to take our action after we hear all the advice.

Number two, relative to the DRECP and what advice we would provide, Gerry is right. It is our intent to advise the BLM, through Teri, in their role in the DRECP. And it wasn't clearly stated. This is an evolution, essentially. We -- you may recall that last year and recent months we've been looking at things project specific. And we want to look now at a different level. And we have found perhaps that the most effective place for us to provide our advice is on that level of planning documents, the overarching programmatic documents as opposed to getting into the individual projects because of the difficulty in timing of our meetings and the approval processes that the projects face. And therefore, it took us a little time. But we did, I think, come around to identifying the DRECP as a process that needs to be a key
focus. And we do want to effect the BLM's role in the
DRECP and will do so through our advice to the desert
district manager.

And the point very-well taken on the steps for --
that the BLM might take to convince its REAT -- its fellow
REAT agency participants to consider a California-only
option, we can provide a more specific direction if we
like or we can leave the BLM up to all of its devices that
it has available to it for moving these agencies in that
direction. So I wouldn't want to just limit it to a phone
call or a letter. But I would like to see boots on the
ground for trying to convince their comrades of that.

Thank you.

Sorry. Continuing with the public comment, if
there's no other comments on that.

Thank you, Terry Weiner. Thank you.

MS. WEINER: Hi. Terry Weiner. I'm representing
a couple of different groups today; Desert Protective
Council, I'm the Imperial County projects coordinator for
the Desert Protective Council. And last April, I helped
co-found another group which we call Solar Done Right.

And first of all, I'd like to comment on the term
the DRECP has a $21-million acre conservation plan. It
could also be thought of as a 21-million-acre decimation
plan.
And to address the translocation of tortoise problem, I have a number of wildlife biologist friends who have -- we've been just so, so sad over what's happening at Ivanpah. It is known that they probably are going to find more tortoises in the other two sections they want to develop. Two problems that probably most of you know about translocation of tortoises is that there's a huge mortality rate associated with translocation. And there is not a lot of viable habitat that these tortoises can be translocated to. And some of the areas where they could be are also land for big solar projects. So it's just -- I'm really glad that you're addressing this.

My Solar Done Right group submitted comments to the Department of the Interior on the PEIS for solar. And I thought I had a copy with me in the car that I'd like to submit to the record. We've got like a 28-page comment letter which we turned into a report that -- if I don't have it, I'm going to go up on the mesa and get it during lunch so it can be in the record for you all. Maybe some BLM have already read it. But our main point in our comments on the PEIS is that the BLM, the Department of the Interior did not follow NEPA in that you did not really address all the viable alternatives. And I know that some would say, well, we can only address alternatives within our jurisdiction. But that's not what
NEPA says; that you need to look at alternatives that may be able to be viable outside of BLM lands.

Namely, as Dinah pointed out, point-of-use generation is the big elephant in the room that nobody wants to look at.

The other mythology going on here is that congress dictated to the BLM that they would do X amount of multiple thousands of megawatts of solar development on public lands. It was not a mandate. It's actually -- if you read the language -- and this is in our report -- it was a sense of the congress. And so, arguably, you don't have to do this at all.

And we -- what we're doing is as we're doing this, we rush to the big corporations, and the thing that looks easiest, before we do the sensible alternative, which is to develop rooftop and parking lot and solar locally. And you may know that the ARR, the stimulus funds were given by the multiple millions to the corporations gratis for them to adopt these projects. Also, there's these huge federal loan guarantees.

What Solar Done Right is doing, we've already been to congress last fall to talk to key congressional members and their staff about looking at the alternatives, many of which said they had -- you know, they hadn't really thought about that. But now they are. And we're
going to work with Governor Brown to develop his fee and
tariff system and have rooftop and solar -- but what we
need to do is slow down the process long enough to be able
to start getting some of these megawatts up to --
happening like in Germany. I wish I could remember how
many megawatts they've put online since the beginning of
the year. They now get 20 percent of their energy from
local renewable rooftop development. Germany, if they can
do it at that latitude, there's no reason why we can't do
it in California.

The other thing --

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Terry, I'm so sorry. Your time
has expired. And I even gave you an extra minute by
mistake.

MS. WEINER: I'm sorry. I just enjoyed this so
much.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: You may have additional public
comment. There might be additional public comment periods
that --

MS. WEINER: All right. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Thank you, Terry. My apologies
for that.

MS. WEINER: My apologies for going over.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Not at all.

The last comment that we have on renewable
energy, Tom Tammine, please.

MR. TAMMONE: Good morning. Tom Tammine.

Well, our record shows I haven't really agreed much with the previous speaker. But when it comes to solar energy and point-of-use generation, I have to say, yeah. I'm a mechanic. You put a generator on an engine. You put a wind machine where there's wind. I don't think the sun is any brighter out in the desert than it is, you know, in the urban areas where they need the power. And if it is, what you're going to lose in transmitting it all that distance is going to overrun that. So from a technical standpoint, it makes no sense to have solar projects all the way out in the desert. You're better off going to the public, a lot of small projects. Come up with low-cost government loans, kind of like we have student loans to have people put these units in their houses that will reduce power at the point of use as opposed to swallowing up our public lands.

I agree there needs to be more look at solar energy. 'Cause of the disaster in Japan, I know nuclear power isn't very well-received right now. I mean, the thought of a disaster at San Onofre requiring a 50-mile evacuation zone, well, that's from about where we're standing right now to where I used to work off by the 605 Freeway two years ago. So there is a need for it. But it
needs to be done closer to home.

    Point of use, when it comes to solar energy is
the way to go. And at the same time, we need to face the
reality we need power. We need to drill the natural gas
and we need to go after that. And we have to do that 'til
we get it right.

    Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Thank you, Tom.

That concludes the comments on renewable energy.

We're now going to move into the issue of the special
recreation.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Oh, I'm sorry. First of all, do
we have any -- based on the public comment, do we want to
revise our vote before? Just want to bring that out.

    No motion. Thank you.

Dinah?

MEMBER SHUMWAY: I have a quick question. I must
have missed the last -- the final e-mail about our revised
letter, did that go out to Teri?

CHAIRMAN BANIS: That is actually the last point
on this item. Thanks for bringing that up.

    I also wanted to report to the public and the
members of the DAC that the DAC did revise its statement
on renewable energy. Its original statement was a
unanimous statement from 2008 -- yeah, 2008. And this
letter was revised. Thank you to Dinah for taking the
first shot at it and to several other members who had
their pen on it as well. The DAC -- I'm pleased to say
that the DAC, again, was able to generate a unanimous
statement relative to renewable energy. And that letter
was sent to Teri. And we are hoping that at some point
we'll be able to make that available as we had the
previous one.

Yes, Dick.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: Perhaps that could be put on
the website for public.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Thank you. I'll remember that.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Mr. Chairman, I might follow up
that I agree to put it on the website. But it also
addressed Gerry Hillier's comment to us that it is more or
less a position that the DAC as a group is taking with
their recommendations. And most of the recommendations
that the DAC might make in the future would probably be in
line with our stated position.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Agreed. Thank you.

Okay. We'll move on now, please, to special
recreation permits. Thank you.

Pardon me. Just a moment. Just a one-minute
recess for the chair. Please don't leave, anybody.
Okay. I appreciate your indulgence. The council will recall at the last meeting we acted to create a subgroup for special recreation permits. At that last meeting, we opened nominations. Nominations were announced through a BLM news release and through the BLM news bytes. The 30-day application period concluded with 11 applications submitted by the deadline. On May 17th, Steve handed me the packets of applications. I reviewed the applications, consulted with other DAC members. And my goal for making nominations from those 11 applications was, first of all, I wanted to seek at least one candidate that could provide some perspective of those who are involved with non-motorized events. One applicant expressed familiarity with the equestrian events, and that garnered my nomination. I also sought to achieve a balance in residency among the northern part of the desert, the southern part of the desert, and the cities. I also sought to seek specific expertise among people who are personally involved in permitting events, who have experience with actual permits. And I also sought to balance among the different OHV groups that had representatives apply. And lastly, I also consulted with Teri Raml and we discussed the nominations.

And following Teri's concurrence with my nominations, I informed my fellow DAC members of the seven
nominations. And on Thursday, we received the seven
requisite approvals on Thursday. And I am pleased to
announce the results of the application process for the
special recreation permit subgroup.

In alphabetical order, they are Holly Beckard,
Meg Grossglass, Jerry Grabow, Jeff Knoll, Clayton Miller,
Rob Niemela, and Wayne Nosala.

There were applicants who were qualified for
these seats. But we had more applications from qualified
people than we were able to seat. I hope there will be
other opportunities for them to participate. Thank you,
Teri, for your advice. And I'd like to -- and so I'm
announcing that we did receive the seven requisite votes
from the council. Those are the nominations. They have
been approved, I'm pleased to announce.

And before I move on, I want to state that I'm
going to delay the naming of a chairperson to that group
until the group has a chance to meet. And I don't know
that we have a first meeting scheduled yet. But I think
we'll be looking at the calendar soon on that. And we can
also hear a bit from Roxie on what she envisions this SRP
group to work on.

Before I take comment and questions from the DAC,
I'd like to hear from Roxie and from Teri and hear how
they would like to utilize the SRP. Remember -- this
subgroup. Remember, the SRP subgroup is being formed at
the request of the BLM to assist them in working out the
difficult issues that have arisen in the last several
months with regard to permitting events, primarily OHV
events.

Roxie?

MS. TROST: Thank you, council. Roxie Trost, BLM
field manager.

First, I want to say that all of us are extremely
anxious and appreciate your speedy response in setting up
this subgroup. I thought that it might help by letting
you know and giving you an update on some of the things
that we have wrapped up.

One of the things that -- we have the BLM task
group, and now we'll have the BLM -- the SRP subgroup. So
the BLM task group has adopted the monitoring assessment
matrix. All of the offices have been using that tool.
And we have found it to be very useful.

Another update from my last presentation was
regarding the insurance requirements. And new direction
has come down that the medical expenses are covered under
the aggregate. On the insurance policy rider, that area
has to be either left blank or it has to have a dollar
amount in it. But it can't say "Excluded" or "Nil" or
anything like that. So this is a substantial change from
when I was here in March. And I see some --

CHAIRMAN BANIS: I don't understand that. And
that's why -- sorry. Not to interrupt. But this is
essentially why we need this subgroup, to help us
understand these things.

MS. TROST: And I'll be happy to try to explain
that a little bit more clearly, if I need to.

Another milestone that has been hit is that all
CDD offices have hit the 180-day mark. So that means that
permit applications are required to be in our possession
180 days prior. Now, we realize that there are
extenuating circumstances, and that can be looked at on a
case-by-case basis. But right now, for any big planned
events, we do have them in our possession 180 days in
advance.

Some of the things that we identified that we
could really use some assistance with is the booklet. And
some substantial changes need to be made to that booklet.
And specifically to that booklet, we feel that we need to
look at the standard stipulations and work on the
operating plans. And those are going to be big
assignments. And we would like to recommend that the SRP
subgroup meet sometime the last week in June to help us
get through that. We have a one-year report that we're
working on. And we'd like to be able to address some of
these things specifically in that one-year report that
we're submitting for Teri.

Another item that we identified is the Frequently
Asked Questions website. And, you know, there's a lot of
rumors. And we thought that the subgroup could help us
and spearhead getting the Frequently Asked Questions
website up and running.

We also thought that they could help us with
checklists that we send out to the applicants. And it
would -- they could help us with clarity on that
checklist.

Bekki Lasell and her staff are putting together
binders that have all the operating plans, has
stipulations. It has the booklet so that our new subgroup
has a way to move forward with historic information and
where we need to go next.

Something that I wanted to share that is somewhat
related to the special recreation permit program is that
there is a five-year cycled from the general accounting
office where they come in and they do audits of the
program. California was scheduled for that audit last
year. And because of funding issues, that audit did not
occur. It is going to occur this year. It's going to be
both an internal audit of BLM files as well as some of our
external event organizers being audited. So this has
nothing to do with the process that we are currently involved with. It has to do with the normal five-year cycle. And it just happens to be happening this year.

That's really all I have for an update, unless you have any questions.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Do we? Opening the floor for questions.

Ron?

MEMBER JOHNSTON: Just a question on some of the issues that the special recreation subgroup might want to consider that have been brought up prior to the meeting and during the meeting today are concerns by some groups other than off-road recreational vehicle groups, which are small groups but use the public lands for gemology, et cetera, and that there's no provision in this current proposal for a small-group exemption, that is groups under ten, groups under 25. There's no exemption apparently at this time. And before a brochure and things that go out to the public are printed, I suggest that it might be something that we would want to consider as an exemption for small groups.

MS. TROST: Let me address that a little bit.

There's no magic number of 25, 50, what constitutes a small group. I commend the people that are going out with the gem and mineral organizations and doing
education on public land. That is considered casual use.
That has not changed. It will not change. We're not
looking at changing regulations. If a person chooses to
go out and have a picnic, they -- again, that is casual
use. They do not need to notify BLM.

Some of our rules of thumb which have not changed
is that an event charges a fee or that the event is
publicly advertised. Now, even with charging a fee, if
the fee only covers the costs of the event, for instance,
if fuel is used or lunch is provided and it only covers
those costs, then that event does not require a special
recreation permit. If $1, however, is left over at the
end of the day, whether it goes into the club coffers or
to a charitable organization, then it does require a
permit.

So I think that there is a lot of
misunderstanding at the types of things that we're looking
at. We're not looking at asking people to come in and
require them to have a permit for the casual use
activities that they've always done.

MEMBER JOHNSTON: Is there some clarity that is
going to be put out that further details this so it gets
rid of some of the questions like an FAQ or something?

MS. TROST: Absolutely. And that is where we
thought that the Frequently Asked Questions could help
address some of these specific items.

MEMBER JOHNSTON: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Before I turn over to Dick, I just want to echo Ron's comments. Those are my number-one comments I would like to see the subgroup, before getting too deep in the weeds, which we do want it to do, to maybe look at; when is a permit required, when is it not, so that we can focus on the things that do require a permit. Because that's essentially what this subgroup is for. So it will help us narrow that down. And there is a good deal of misinformation that is going out now regarding the need for a permit. So casual use is not dead. Thank you.

Dick?

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: Yeah. I think in the operation of the subgroup -- and you're just going to schedule a meeting here hopefully soon at the end of June -- it needs to be well-publicized. We need to figure out a way to publicize this in areas that is not off-road community. If we can figure out a way to get the other users of the dunes -- the other users of the desert aware of this group so that they can provide input. I mean, it's a public meeting and the subgroup will be a public meeting. And so we should allow the other participants that are not represented on the group, some of the other areas, to know about the meeting so that they can be there. I think that
will help -- that may take care of a lot of the questions
too and bring up questions where you can add to your FAQ
that are asked at this meeting.

And I would also like -- you know, as Tom said,
we need to be able to look at this group -- I look at this
group as having a sunset at some point in time where once
it's kind of got this FAQ, got some of these issues
resolved and there is more knowledge of the operations of
these special recreation permits, that this group can kind
of go away.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Thank you.

April?

MEMBER SALL: Roxie, I have another hypothetical
question for you. Since we just addressed ones for rock
and gem collecting, if you had an equestrian group that
was advertising on their website an event ride and it went
out to several equestrian group LISTSERVs and they were
charging a fee to cover costs, would that count as public
advertisement and require an SRP or not?

MS. TROST: From the advertising standpoint, it
would not. However, we also have to look at whether or
not there's going to be any significant resource concerns.
So in that case, we'd need to look at where are they going
and what are they doing.

MEMBER SALL: Okay. Thanks.
CHAIRMAN BANIS: What I'd like to do, if it's all right, today's lunch time certain, 12:15. That leaves us about 30 minutes. Would it be all right if we move right into public comments at this time, and then we can turn the floor black to the DAC members if there's more that's needed to be said?

Then I'm going to call the first three speakers, please. And I'm also closing -- I'm closing the public cards, public comment for this. I'm going to start first with Sophia Merk, Robert Neth, followed by Mark Budke.

Sam Merk. Hi, Sam.

MS. MERK: Hi.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: You have three minutes. Thank you, Sam.

MS. MERK: My name is Sophia Merk or Sam Merk, NPL News. I have concerns about whether the public's going to be actively participating in some of these meetings that are being held by the subgroups and if all aspects of the public land users are going to be able to have viable comments with these subgroups and so on and so forth.

I also did not get a clear naming of all the people and what they represent as far as the committee. So if you could elaborate on that, that would be greatly appreciated.
And that's all I have at this time.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Will do. Thank you. Let me do that again, please.

Okay. Let me run the list again. Thank you, everybody. Sam isn't the only one to bring it up. Let me go through them again.

The first nominee -- the first appointed was Holly Beckard. That's B-e-c-k-a-r-d. I am looking to Holly to provide help with non-OHV-related interests. Her application stated that she's familiar with equestrian events.

Jerry Grabow is the president of AMA District 37. Jerry, you're here; right? There he is.

Meg Grossglass is the DAC member who was appointed to this committee. Meg is a representative of the public-at-large to the DAC.

Jeff Knoll, that's K-n-o-l. Jeff Knoll is probably best known as the former operator of King of the Hammers and other professional competitive off-road events.

Clayton Miller. Clayton is here too, right, in the very back. Clayton represents CORVA who also does a number of permitted events.

Also, Rob Niemela. Rob's here too, right? That would be N-i-e-m-e-l-a. In the very back, Rob Niemela
represents American Motorcyclist's Association District 38. So both District 37 and District 38 are represented. We have found that the over -- I don't know if it's really -- I should be careful of my adjectives. But a substantial, if not majority, of the permitted events in the desert are from those two organizations. And lastly, Wayne Nosala is a participant in off-road racing events and a spokesperson -- often a spokesperson for that segment.

And those were the seven.

Thanks, Sam, for encouraging me to repeat those.

Thank you.

The next speaker, Robert Neth.

MR. NETH: Good morning. I'd just like to thank you for putting together this SRP and for taking so much consideration into the sport of desert racing and making sure that our interests, among others, are represented within that group. And I'd like to at this time just elaborate a little further on another aspect of our sport which may not be considered as often as it probably should. And that's the off-road racing industry as a business side.

Off-road racing is my livelihood. I took up an apprenticeship position with a master fabricator within our industry six years ago. And since taking up that
apprenticeship, I've done jobs for somewhere between 150
and 200 different customers, all of whom are directly
associated with the sport of off-road racing. And our
sport contributes at least 95 percent of our total
business clientele. And furthermore, within our own
business park, we have half a dozen world-famous off-road
shops and businesses including Fox Racing Shocks,
MasterCraft Safety, Jimco Racing, Alumacraft, Stewart's
Raceworks, and Mirage.

The sport in general supports fabricators,
welders, designers, shop managers, race drivers, crew
members, retailers, material suppliers, media personnel,
and photographers, among many others. And in today's
difficult economic times where so many people find
themselves out of work, despite land closures, we still
find ourselves employed and with the ability to put food
on our table and a roof over our heads.

In the denial of permits for special events, it
takes away that opportunity for us to have an income. And
that was recently the case for the Southern Nevada
off-road enthusiasts whose permit for the midnight special
event was denied in the Ridgecrest area. I only found out
about that recently and do not know the reason why that
permit was denied.

But, again, when permits like that are denied, it
takes away our opportunity to have our business, to speak
nothing of taking away a sport that draws people together
from all walks of life to come out and enjoy the desert.

The California BLM's own website states that,
"Public lands are to be enjoyed. So let's go play." And
I think that's an attitude that is really well-represented
here today. And I just ask that you consider continuing
to support our sport and open public access for all lands.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Thank you, Robert.

(Applause from the audience.)

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Mark Budke. Mark.

MR. BUDKE: Hello. I'd also like to thank you
for allowing us to say our piece here.

My name is Mark Budke, and I am a chaplain for
Racers for Christ, and I am the district chaplain for
District 38. And I've got a few comments.

You know, I do chapel services out in the desert
for these desert racers. And I started doing this about
four years ago and, you know, God led me out there to do
this. But I didn't know what the desert racers were all
about. I hadn't been out in the desert for probably about
15 years. But I quickly found that the District 38
motorcycle and quad racers are a special group of family
racers. The families are out there. The kids are racing.
Even the wives are racing. And it's a great desert family.

And like I say, I do chapel services, and also I'm there if anybody does get injured or hurt, any of the racers. And we have rescue staff onsite. And just personally, my four years of being out there, there's never been a spectator injured since I've been out there. And I've talked to many, many other racers. And that's something you're probably going to hear time and time again, that the motorcycle and the quad racers -- I can't speak for the truck racers or any other groups. But just for the motorcycle and quad racers, you know, there's -- you know, over 40 years, there's never been a spectator injured out there.

So when we're overstaffed out there with BLM people, rangers and stuff like that, it just seems like it's -- you know, to have eight, ten to twelve rangers out there for a sport that -- you know, as far as the motorcycles and quads goes, there's never been an injury. So it seems like a gross overexpenditure of money. And to have us shell out more money to pay for those extra costs is really choking this desert racing family to death. And the whole cost recovery thing is -- it's ridiculous. I mean, like I say, you know, they're overexpending having us pay for the money.
So in closing, I just wanted to say that, you know, the desert racing family, we love that desert out there. And there's many other groups out there that love the desert. And we just want to be able -- we police ourselves, basically. District 38, they have a big -- they have a big old rules book too to make sure that we, you know, control ourselves and that we're all safe. You know, there's pit road speed limits. And we're a safe, good desert racing family. And I don't want to see that go away.

And once again, I just thank you for allowing me to say my piece. And I'm sure you'll hear that again.

Thank you very much.

(Applause from the audience.)

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Thank you, Mark.

Before I continue, just a quick reminder, last meeting in March, we were fortunate to hear from well over 30 representatives of the OHV permit and racing family. And we received some very compelling testimony to the benefits and the need for these events to continue. I'd be grateful today to hear more from the public as to what this SRP subgroup could do, what it could tackle and how it could operate. I just want to remind you, we have heard a good deal on the virtues and benefits of the events. And it's none of our intention to, you know,
speak against events or that events should not occur. We agree with you on that point.

So, again, I'm going to call Mark Baker followed by Ed Waldheim and Marie Brashear.

Mark Baker?

MR. BAKER: Thank you. It is my first time to ever come into one of these kind of meetings regarding anything. I'm actually a little nervous. But I'm -- I'm just -- I go to District 38, and I've been associated -- I've lived out in this area, the East County for my whole life.

I'm in my 40s. I have a family. We all participate out here in District 38. And over the last couple years, we've just been seeing a big change, which, you know, safety is a big thing. And we all want everyone to be safe. And we definitely explain -- show that out at our events.

And the reason I'm here is because the cost of everything. I mean, everything in life -- everything is going up, and we've gotta help put food on your guys' plate too. So I'm coming to the council and I'm saying, you know, this SRP group, I hope they -- the work that they do is -- represents the motorcycle -- that's what it mainly is here, the motorcycle events and the truck and buggies. And we want to bring down the costs. And
there's a reasonable way to do it. And right now, I just see our desert racing disappearing because people can't afford -- or the few clubs that we do have out in District 38, I belong to one of them. And I'm fortunate to have a decent job. And we're putting our own money into this thing, for this to happen now. And I would imagine most of the clubs aren't going to be able to do that.

So I'm asking you guys, be reasonable with your decisions because you guys are the ones making the decisions here. And there's a lot of us out there that want to continue doing what we do.

So thank you.

(Applause from the audience.)

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Thank you, Mark.

Mark, I'm sorry. We have a question from Dinah.

Do you have a moment?

MEMBER SHUMWAY: You've never come to a meeting here before. Where do you live?

MR. BAKER: Right now, I live in Pine Valley.

But I grew up in the East County here in Santee.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: So you're here kind of because of the location as well?

MR. BAKER: Well --

MEMBER SHUMWAY: We're in San Diego.
MR. BAKER: Yes. The location, definitely, and --

MEMBER SHUMWAY: So part of it is location?

MR. BAKER: And it's mainly the El Centro BLM office, that area, that district is where we spend a lot of our recreation time as a family. It's a family thing.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Could I just ask a quick question of the audience, Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Please.

MS. SHUMWAY: Could everybody raise their hand who is here at this meeting primarily because it's in San Diego?

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Thank you. Best question of the day. We've been talking about this.

Mr. Waldheim, please.

MR. WALDHEIM: So you justified me having to travel 235 miles to get here and Ron Schiller had 275 miles.

Okay. The political football -- no -- the soccer ball -- Ms. Raml has passed the soccer ball off to the subgroup. When this first thing happened before, I begged her to have the group together, let's have a meeting of all the minds. We had semi kind of a going there, but we never got there. I talked to Jan Bedrosian. We didn't
really quite get here.

So now that you have a subgroup, we've lost an awful lot of time. We've had businesses go out of business. We've lost an economic downturn which is killing us. It's just killing the economic growth or the economic basis of all these little mom-and-pop shops who live on a shoestring. We all are living on a shoestring. Miss a paycheck and you're in big trouble. You're in big trouble.

So I certainly hope that the subgroup will get together very quickly. And the first thing that they need to do, they need to establish, okay, who are the people that we really need to regulate? That is the No. 1 item that you have to do. I don't need an SRP on a stupid poker run after a cleanup. I don't need it for a cleanup in the Barstow office unless we have a million people. There's got to be some threshold. I don't need it with an equestrian trail in a national horseback ride from Ridgecrest to Death Valley with police people sitting on the top of hills and looking at us with binoculars. That's insane. A horse can go anyplace they want to. A hiker can do anything he wants to. Yet we're up there with binoculars, spending precious money and time when law enforcement people should be doing other things. Reason has to be brought into this thing. The economic reason
has to be a real liability.

The chairman of the commission -- last chairman of the OHV commission said, "I hope the BLM" -- he said it to Jim Keeler, "I hope" -- and, Erin, I hope you come to the commission meetings. Jim Keeler was told, "I hope the BLM doesn't go overboard." Boy, was that a statement. BLM didn't only go overboard, they went off the board and down in the ocean with this whole reaction they did on this whole thing. It makes no sense. You're trying to kill the goose with an atomic bottom. It doesn't make any sense whatsoever.

So I hope that this SRP gets some sense into what the reality is, what is the real issue that we want to accomplish. And so the people can get back to racing and enjoy their sport. 'Cause God only knows we're being squeezed everywhere. And this is the last thing that we want to lose as we don't want to lose any more lands for recreational opportunities.

(Applause from the audience.)

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Thank you, Ed.

Marie Brashear followed by Ron Schiller.

MS. BRASHEAR: I think we have, of your seven members, six of them are event people, guys who are involved in the commercial end of what goes on. My concern is that while that has to be addressed, they will
sign off on stuff that the rest of us won't sign off on
because they're making money. They'll say, well, we'll
just charge our event people who are in our events, we'll
charge them more money so they can meet the requirements.
Basically, all that does is force the smaller guys out of
business, out of racing, out of whatever. So that's one
of my concerns.

Another one of my concerns is last meeting
documents were passed out that had three categories of
risk. In the low category of risk, the lowest, there was
the names of three types of users, desert users, one of
which was spelled out very specifically which said rock
hounds. And the insurance was like $100,000. And then it
said the next category, and one of those was equestrian.
And it said a half-million dollars based on the risk. And
then the third category were the commercial events,
basically. And that was, you know, a million dollars up.
I have a concern about that. How much of this stuff, when
you get done, is going to be put in writing? How much of
this stuff -- you know, it was nice for Roxie to come up
here and say, oh, well, you rock hounds aren't going to --
you know, with just a little casual event, you're taking
some kids out, it's not going to matter. I want it in
writing, in your regs, in your whatever it is you're going
to be using. We need it to be in writing.
I'm concerned that it's not just going to be us.
It's going to be everybody. And by the way, the 50
vehicles as an event is still in the law.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Thank you, Marie.

Ron Schiller is going to be our final speaker
before we break for lunch. The rest of the public
comment, I'm afraid, will have to come after lunch. As I
said, lunch is time-certain today. So I don't have the
liberty to keep us here a little bit longer on that.

Do it in order of height, is that how we're going
to do it now?

Okay. Thank you, Ron. You'll have the last
words for this morning before lunch.

MR. SCHILLER: Okay. I'll try to go through this
quick. I have quite a bit I'd like to say. But I'm a
little worried about where this is going, what the intent
is, and what the flexibility is.

When I look at your document, special recreation
permit information booklet, it's very rigid, and it seems
to me written backwards. It's written for reasons you
can't and not how you can. It looks like the BLM is using
a shotgun for a flyswatter. The collateral damage is
tremendous.

When you look at some of the publicized events
that's going on around Ridgecrest, we've got the track
club, the astronomy club, the garden club. These are not
high-dollar folks. They charge a $5 token fee. Yeah, it
goes into the club coffers. It pays for track equipment,
it pays for telescope and lenses. Some of the gem and
mineral clubs have filed mining claims on site deposits to
protect them from the commercial interests, to protect
them for the public. We have to pay for that. And while
it may go in their coffer, there needs to be some
flexibility and some token fee that can be considered.

Every one of these -- this document is written to
the extreme so that any one of these checklists is going
to force you to question whether you need a permit. It
doesn't say when you don't need a permit. It needs to
give you guidelines as when a permit is not needed as well
as when it's needed.

We were told the other night at the Ridgecrest
BLM meeting that if you allow the public to participate,
you automatically have to have a fee whether it was
publicized or not. Well, that's how we get new members
and get new people interested in some of these issues. If
you just go three or four club members and you don't allow
no guests or public, then all of a sudden your clubs are
dying. And in a lot of cases, they're dying right now.

It was said earlier that primarily the OHV groups
are here. And that's true. However, by no means are they
the majority of users when you count everybody out there. Granted, they get the most focus and they're the most demonized. But they're by no means a majority of folks out there. There are a lot -- there's a lot of casual use that goes on every day that the BLM is not totally aware of.

So another problem is we don't go 180 days in advance. We don't know where we're going. The weather might have a washout over here and a good deposit where you can see what you're looking for. We want to go over there. Well, we didn't know that six months ago. So there needs to be some flexibility, some group numbers, some allowable monetary benefit if it's only $5 a person that helps sustain what we're doing. Although you can't really say, well, it provided your lunch and this and that and the other, and even if $1 goes back into the club coffers, then it's not acceptable.

So I'm a little disappointed in the makeup of the group. I think there should have been more non-motorized focus, maybe motorized based. But I'm really disappointed. But I want to say for the record I want to be on the mailing list and I'll be at every one of the meetings. And sometimes it's an advantage not to be on the committee. Thank you.
(Applause from the audience.)

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Thank you, Ron.

That's the first time I found myself on the other side of the microphone from Ron.

Before we break for lunch, Teri had a couple closing comments, please.

DIRECTOR RAML: Yeah. I wanted to say a few words before the lunch break to -- maybe to recap on the SRP subgroup. And then maybe that will influence folks whether they come back from after lunch or not.

But after the tragedy at Johnson Valley, then BLM took great pains to look at our rules and regulations and to start focusing on procedures and, you know, focusing on the regulations that would ensure the safety of our events. And we formed an internal task group that Roxie Trost led very early -- I think, gosh, within a couple weeks we formed that internal BLM group. But it also became quickly apparent to us that the event organizers were also -- you know, in addition to being impacted by the way BLM did business, they were also ready, willing, and able to come forth to assist us.

You've heard today, and Randy referred back to the earlier meeting, this is an engaged and invested group in desert racing. And they -- people indicated not just -- not just willingness to comment, but a willingness
to get in and dig to help us. And it also became apparent
very early on that this stuff is complicated. And people
have brought up the rules and regulations, easily
misunderstood, and that when you're reading this stuff
it's easy to misunderstand it. And then when you're
translating information verbally and without the stuff in
front of you, we were seeing that there was a lot of
miscommunication that we needed to address.

So I thought that I should make -- take advantage
of the advisory council and also the willingness of this
community of users to participate. And I asked the DAC to
provide us assistance. So this is a little process part
of it. So as the designated federal official, I said I
would really like the DAC to help on this. And the DAC
everly on determined that they required -- that they would
be willing to provide recommendations and assist on this
task but that the people that would be most helpful are
those with the expertise for the task at hand. And that
is why we formed the subgroup.

Now, the subgroup is starting out, obviously,
more narrowly focused than I think some of you that have
come forward would like to see. But it was in a specific
response to my request for assistance on these events.

But how things work is -- you know, and this
is -- this is kind of civics. How things work is we've
started out with a subgroup. We've started out -- Roxie laid out some very specific items that we would like some help with. But it's a process. And so for those of you that I encourage -- I am pleased to hear you say you're going to watch, you want to participate, you will be there, you want to comment. That's what this is about.

You've started the process today by addressing the council and saying, "I really want the subgroup to look at this," to start that process. But you will have an opportunity to influence this group's work by being present and asking questions and providing input. And I encourage you to do so.

How this will work, though, is that the subgroup is making their recommendations to the DAC who will make them to me. So it's kind of -- but it's always -- I'm the person that -- I'm fine with chaos. I love chaos. Chaos is my friend. So I'm comfortable with the ambiguity of how this works out. But we've got a subgroup. Randy announced the names of them. We're going to have a meeting fairly quickly. We're going to do our darndest in terms of our website and our mailings to make sure you're all informed and can participate. And then we will do tasks that we've outlined for you and we will consider additional tasks that come forth from the group.

And, also, what -- I can't overestimate -- you
know, this communication stuff is so important. And one
of the values of having you folks here in the room and
also this subgroup is to translate. We get so immersed in
our own bureaucratic language that sometimes -- you know,
in this particular case, it's not clear to us always. But
in some cases things seem very clear to us, you know, what
requires a permit and what doesn't. But if it's not clear
to the people we're serving, the public, then we need
help.

And so this communication and making -- and
frequently asked questions and continuing to ask us
questions so we can be clear is going to be a critical
function of all of you that participate.

Second of all is my thanks. I am extremely
grateful. People are so busy. And there are so many
things that can -- that people have to pay attention to --
their jobs, their family, all sorts of stuff. And when
anytime someone takes the time and will come and
participate in public meetings and will participate in the
management of their public lands, I am extremely grateful.

We never -- I don't think we can ever get enough
participation. The California Desert District is a very
special place. CDCA is very special. And the more people
that participate in how we manage, the better. So thank
you all, and particularly thank you for the subgroup
members. They are volunteers. They are volunteering to
do this hard work. And believe me, when they get to about
page 15 of that booklet, they are going to say, "Are you
sure you can't pay us?"

And, no -- and our answer will be, "No, we can't
pay you. We'll bring cookies."

And so anyway, that's kind of closing words, and
be sure to thank you all for coming. I'm not dismissing
you. But I'm just saying I really appreciate the effort
that has gone into this so far.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Thank you, Teri. We'll resume
comments after lunch. And we're adjourned for lunch. We
will adjourn for lunch and we will be back at 1:30 p.m.,
please.

(Lunch recess.)

CHAIRMAN BANIS: I call this afternoon session to
order, please. I hope lunch was okay. Thank you for
hanging around for the afternoon session. We still have a
lot to talk about. I still have public comment on the
special recreation permit subgroup.

And, again, I'd like to remind our speakers, the
most helpful thing you can do is to provide us with advice
and examples of how to make this SRP subgroup do its job
as well as it can.

The first speaker this afternoon is Kurt

MR. JUNGWIRTH: Hi. Hello.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Hi, Kurt. You've got three minutes. So the floor is all yours.

MR. JUNGWIRTH: All right. Thank you very much. I use the desert mostly because I'm a railfan. If any one of you know what a railfan is, it's a person that videotapes and photograph railroads. I've been in the hobby for something like at least 20 years. I've gone to various places like Cajon, Needles in particular, a lot of different areas along with rock counting. And I've kind of been getting a little bit worried about seeing that a lot of the land closures because of the conservation act and energy, you know, taking away, you know, being able to railfan out in some of these locales.

Can you let me know what's -- like, for instance, going on Route 66, would I be okay to park on the side of Route 66 at least 50 feet minimum from the, you know, right-of-way of BNSF, of course? But I'd like to be able to just park there and be able to film and not have to have a problem. Can you tell --

CHAIRMAN BANIS: You know -- do you have another comment? 'Cause these three minutes are yours. If there's any other comment --

MR. JUNGWIRTH: And another thing too, the
Adventure Passes too, various areas like Cajon Pass -- now, I'm not sure if BLM is tied in with San Bernardino National Forest. Are they or not? I'm not -- they're not?

CHAIRMAN BANIS: No.

MR. JUNGWIRTH: Okay. All right. So I guess I'll use this for the Needles stuff then as far as Route 66 is concerned in that case.

So is there any like special permission to go into these places with the energy conservation and all that being tied up or -- I mean, what's going to happen with a lot of this land, and in particularly the major -- one of the major roads that's adjacent to Highway 40?

CHAIRMAN BANIS: That's a good point. That's a good point. Thank you, Kurt. I've got to say I think this is the first time DAC's heard from a railfan. And I have a personal connection to that, Kurt. When I was a kid, I rode on many GP7s, GP9s. We had the last of the BL2s on our line where I was born and raised and the old F3 is still running. So I know exactly where you're coming from.

And just to express, some of the conflicts that exist might -- an example might be Afton Canyon, for example. In Afton Canyon, the throughway for vehicles as well as for the trains is all on the same right-of-way.
And it's a narrow, narrow, skinny canyon. And there's places where you have no choice but to ride on the right-of-way -- not on the rails. God, no. Not on the rails, but on the right-of-way. There's places where that is -- that is the road. And as a result of that allowance, Afton Canyon remains a really wonderful place to go railfanning. It really is. And I'd like to see those kinds of accommodations continue.

    MR. JUNGWIRTH: I really would too.

    CHAIRMAN BANIS: Let me say this: That the designated motor routes, dirt roads that you're allowed to travel, many of us that fight to keep these roads open often express it under terms of riding our motorcycles or four-wheel-drives or something on it. But those same roads are used to access the rail points of interest.

    MR. JUNGWIRTH: Right.

    CHAIRMAN BANIS: And these roads need to have that -- you know, we need to keep that into consideration as well.

    Now, as for the answer to your real question, I think that we're going to have to find someone to help you with those questions. The rights-of-way of public -- of the public and the railroad and how those conflict -- let me take some time during the course of the day. We'll make sure we connect somehow through the bureau. We'll
find someone to have you speak with that is most familiar with that. Because what you're talking about touches on a little bit of everything. And I think a few people in the room would have part of the answer. But I'd like to find someone who has all the answer for you.

MR. JUNGWIRTH: Okay. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Thanks for your comment.

MR. JUNGWIRTH: Okay. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: The next speaker, please, is Susan Broadway. Susan?

MS. BROADWAY: I just had a question again about the permit information that we had earlier. I've never heard of that permit thing before. Sorry for my technical terms. I know they're astounding.

The rock hounding community actually goes out on these field trips quite frequently, as I mentioned before. And we carry our own insurance through the CFMS group. So there was a mention about a tragedy that happened with the off-roaders. And I don't know how that really affects the rock hounding groups since we all carry our insurance. We sign off when we get to the field trips and then we get in the carpools and we go together in our vehicles and go on the paths provided.

So making us get a permit months in advance to go on these trips would be very detrimental. We don't really
know often where we're going. Or if the weather permits or whatnot, we'll meet in one place and we'll all decide where we want to go. So that would be very difficult for us to actually continue using the land properly the way we want to use it. And it would hurt our field trips.

Also, as Ray mentioned -- not Ray. I'm sorry -- Ron Schiller mentioned earlier, this is one of the ways that we do get people to join our clubs, are these field trips. They're very exciting. People get into it. And that's how we get people to join the clubs. And we have geologists and everything that go on these field trips with us, and it's really quite exciting. Without being able to publicize them properly, put them on the Internet and, you know, we have to get a permit if we publicize, if we put it on the Internet, we send out e-mail blasts, we put it on the Yahoo groups, L.A. Rocks and stuff like that, that gets more people to come to these things. And if we publicize it that way we're going to have to get a permit, that seems pretty excessive for a very small club that has a tiny bit of money in our coffers.

So we would not be able to go on field trips anymore or publicize them. And like Ron said, the clubs will pretty much choke off and die because it really requires new members continuously. As the other members get older and pass on, sorry to say, we need new members.
So that's all I have to say.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Thank you. I think we are definitely hearing the message to make sure that other activities don't become collateral damage and suffer unintentional consequences of the administration of the SRP permits.

I hope that some of our non-motorized groups that have this interest will come to these meetings. They are public. They'll be published in advance. And it's a way for all of you to learn about this. And better than that, as you learn about it, you'll come up with ways to give us some advice.

But your point is absolutely taken. I don't have a real answer for you. But I do appreciate that.

Now, any other comments?

Thank you, Susan.

Next, Terry Weiner. You have the floor on special recreation permits.


Good to see you all again.

I'm representing a different group this time, Alliance for Responsible Recreation, which is a coalition of some conservation groups but most property owner, community groups, and a land trust.

We are not -- we like your criteria as far as
they went. But as far as having balance with other types
of people who might be interested in cost recovery and
special recreation permits, you didn't cut it. I'm sorry.
And I don't -- you know, since the subgroup is what I
would call stacked, I wonder how we're going to get a fair
hearing out of the subgroup meetings in terms of whether
or not our input might be accepted. Just a little
question I have.

Also, we did -- one of our members did apply to
be on the subgroup. And she was a representative of
non-motorized. She happened to be an equestrian too. And
I'm disappointed that you didn't choose her because she's
very active with the BLM Bakersfield out of Kern County.
And she would have been a very fair-minded and thoughtful
person to add. I'm sorry you didn't choose her. And that
was the only person we could find because everybody else
said they couldn't go to the meetings.

But I do want to emphasize that, you know, from
our point of view, the impacts from the special recreation
permits are -- that involve the huge desert races,
especially the ones called closed canopy, are very
impactful on the desert and that we are glad you're
pursuing cost recovery. Because there are impacts that
the rest of the public is concerned about, not just on the
desert ecosystem but on air quality. We had -- there was
a race in Plaster City on May 14th that created a dust
cloud that went for about 15 miles in either direction.
The wind was blowing. And so we really are interested in
participating and learning what you intend to do.

So, you know, the other taxpayers, when the BLM
has to put all their law enforcement in one place at a
special race, then it impacts what goes on in the rest of
the desert too.

So thank you.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Thank you, Terry. Did you --
you mentioned that you knew of an applicant. Did you say
a lady?

MS. WEINER: Uh-huh.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Could we speak after? I don't
know about that one. Thank you.

Next, Kim Campbell. Hi, Kim. Do you have a
second? Thank you, Kim.

MS. CAMPBELL: You're welcome. I was going to
wait 'til later. But I'm going to go forward with this
now anyway.

I was reading over the booklet that has the
requirements for the special recreation permit
applications. And it is so broad. It is so wide open.
It could be anybody for anything. And so I'm going to
read it, because everybody's here and I have this. And
this is 43 CFR 2932.11.

"Except as provided in 2932.12, you must obtain a special recreation permit for, one, commercial use including vending associated with recreational use or, two, competitive use.

"B. If BLM determines that it is necessary based on planning decisions, resource concerns, potential user conflicts, or public health and safety, we may require you to obtain a special recreation permit for, one, recreation use of special areas, two, noncommercial, noncompetitive organized group activities or events, or, three, academic, educational, scientific, or research uses involving means of access or activities normally associated with recreation, use of areas where recreation use is allocated, or special-use areas.

Further up in the booklet, it talks again about when they're required, how to determine if you need one. "In general, an SRP may be needed from the BLM if any one of the following items is true: A fee is going to be charged, the permittee will make money on the event, there will be competition, there will be advertising, there will be a marked course, there will be vehicles at the event, the event will involve public lands."

Everything we're talking about is public lands.

So that's everything. This is why everybody is so
concerned. The regulations or rules -- I'm not sure which
they are -- need to be very specific. What is
advertising? When my gem and mineral club posts on their
website that they're going to have a field trip, is that
advertising? If they put it on L.A. Rocks, which is a
user group that a lot of rock hounds use, is that going to
be advertising? This is just too wide open. It needs to
be more well-defined. It needs to be well-defined. And
it will put all the gem and mineral clubs -- they'll be
gone if they can't do this. This is one of their key
functions and really important to all of us who love
rocks. And we love the California desert. And I need to
say it's a really special place, and a lot of us have
really come to love it and enjoy seeing the wildlife and
respect it more because we go rock hounding.

And we have to have vehicles to get there. One
more really important point. A lot of rock hounds are
elderly, retired people. They can't walk very far. They
have to be able to get in with their vehicles. So if they
can't get in with vehicles, they can't go. So that's also
very important.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Kim, thanks for those very
specific, very specific comments. Very helpful. Thank
you.
Tom Tammone, followed by Ed and Marie.

MR. TAMMONE: Tom Tammone. Good afternoon.

In 1994, a group of us started a small
four-by-four club called Dirt Devils of Southern
California. And we actually were able to host triathlons
that started in the San Bernardino National Forest and
ended in Johnson Valley. It included some timed events,
some point-to-point like geocaching-type events. You
know, they're still timed events. But it wasn't racing.
And we even got a permit to fire shotguns in the OHV area.

This was a small group. And we were able to do
it back then. And we have grown into a very large club
over the years that's well-respected in the community.
And it's done an awful lot to help the environment at the
same time.

Now, posting an event -- even back then, I don't
think that anybody would have wanted to do it again. It
was a lot of work. But I can't even -- the point we're at
now, I can't even fathom going through the permit process
to try and even consider doing this again. But hosting
that event did a lot to build our club. And we wouldn't
be where we were today -- or where we are today if we
didn't host that event.

So that was -- that wasn't a cookie-cutter event
or a re-occurring event either. So it would be rather
difficult, if not impossible, under the standards today to
put this on.

But a lot of these races are re-occurring events.
They occur at the same routes. And it really shouldn't be
much of an effort at all to grant a permit for an event
that's been occurring regularly for over a decade. So I
hope that this new subcommittee can put together some sort
of a mapping so they can basically just keep reusing
information from past events that are basically just being
duplicated so we don't have to start all over from the
beginning every time they do something.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Thank you, Tom. Appreciate that
suggestion.

Ed?

MR. WALDHEIM: I already had my turn.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Exactly. Thank you.

Marie?

MS. BRASHEAR: I'll take a second turn. I don't
mind. I have a couple of questions.

When I heard the committee, that's okay 'cause I
know several of the people on the committee. I think we
can go to them and they're going to react reasonably.

But I was concerned when -- and maybe I didn't
hear it correctly. But this is what I heard. Roxie and
her task group are going to come up with the rules and
regulations and the group get to do the website, get to do
the booklet, get to do the Q and I. But I didn't hear
anything else that they get to do. Maybe that's just the
starting point. But that doesn't sound like -- you know,
they'd be wasting their time giving it to you. That's
number one.

Number two, Afton Canyon, you mentioned. It's a
rock hounding site as well.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: It's the best.

MS. BRASHEAR: It's also under attack. CDD
doesn't think we should be doing anything in Afton Canyon.
It's also a place where we go -- the Society for the
Protection and Care of Wildlife goes to do wildlife
counts, bighorn sheep counts in July. It is truly one of
our gems in our desert. It is a multiple-use area. It's
got lots of history as well.

And I think when we're doing these rules and
regulations, we ought to be a little more honest with the
public and we ought to say, this is what you can change,
this is what you cannot change. And there's a whole bunch
of what you cannot change on this issue. And I think
maybe that's where this whole process has gone wrong.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Thank you, Marie. Thank you.

That concludes the public comments.
Any last comments from the council members regarding direction to the SRP?

Hi, Tom.

MEMBER ACUNA: Thank you, Randy. Okay.

Listening to everyone -- and I have a question. This is for Roxie and Teri. With regard to the current regulations, before the disaster at Johnson Valley, everything seemed to be going well 'cause there was no problem. The existing rules were working for everyone, rockers and everyone else. Then we had the accident. And now we're reacting to the accident by rewriting all of the rules. But would it not be better just to focus on motorized competition, just that subgroup, and leave everything else as it was? And then we would really be focusing on the area that needed to be addressed. Or am I misunderstanding something? Because if that's -- if we could just focus on that, that would be my suggestion for the subgroup, to only talk about motorized competition.

MS. TROST: And I'm sorry if I didn't make it very clear. But we aren't making new rules. We're not making new regulations. The Johnson Valley report was very clear in that the BLM has a process in place and that the process is not flawed. However, the report also found that the CDD as a whole was not in compliance with that process.
So that is one of the things that, as Teri moved forward and put our task group together, she asked us to do, to take the Johnson Valley report which has some very specific district manager action items and state director action items, and to ensure that we are moving forward and in compliance with those action items. We have no intention of putting out new regulations. We have existing regulations. And that isn't something that our task group has looked at or that I would suspect that the subgroup would be looking at either.

MEMBER ACUNA: So -- but it appears from the public input they're very concerned that they'll be negatively affected in some fashion. Is that a communication problem, miscommunication, they don't understand that they won't be affected, or will they be affected? If you're trying to fix competition so people don't get harmed from off-road vehicles, why are the folks that like to do rock hounding here?

MS. TROST: Well, I think there is some miscommunication. But I think as we look at implementing the regulations, that we're going to look at implementing the regulations collectively, not targeting specific areas, that we implement them across the board. And that's what our charge has been, is to follow existing regulations and processes.
CHAIRMAN BANIS:  You all set?

MEMBER ACUNA:  Yes. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BANIS:  Dick, you have the floor, and then followed by Ron.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY:  Yeah. I think that one of the issues that this group is going to look at, as Marie pointed out, there's some regulations that are -- that are regulations and really can't be changed on a local level. And there's some of these regulations -- or I won't say regulations, but some of these stipulations are local stipulations.

So I think this group wants to look at, first of all, what can they change and what can't they change. And once they know exactly what can't be changed, what are national regulations that are -- would take congress or a higher level to change. Then they can look at what they have the ability to implement. And once they go forward with that, they can generate consistent rules. Again, what we're looking for, I think, is consistent rules for everybody, not one group is penalized or not penalized for their activities. And we want consistent rules. And we want those consistent rules to be very public so that everybody understands exactly what they are.

CHAIRMAN BANIS:  Ron, please.

MEMBER JOHNSTON:  Well, what Dick just pointed
out was pretty much what I was going to point out too; that I don't think just from the comments that I've heard -- first, I think everyone is looking at a document that was written in 2006 and using that as a basis for concern. That document is five years old. And so the rules have been in existence. It's just that the implementation of some of those rules and the enforcement of some of those rules may have been lax or not clarified to the point where people understood what it took to comply with all of those rules.

So I don't think this committee is by any means, nor have I ever had the impression they were going to draft a set of new rules. They were just going to make sure that there was a clear understanding of the rules that did exist and that they would, in fact, be implemented and enforced possibly more rigorously than they had been in the past.

It's almost like concerns about illegal immigration. You know, back in the Governor Pat Brown years, illegal immigration was enforced because there was an alternative that was clear in the way of the Bracero Program. In the last 20 years, that hasn't been the case because there's been a lack of enforcement and clarity. And so it's become a whole new issue again. In fact, the rules were already on the books for that too. And I think
there's a simile between that and what we're talking about today.

These aren't new rules. It's just a clear understanding of what those rules are.

Is that correct?

MS. TROST: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Any other questions from the DAC?

Thank you, Roxie.

All right. Seeing no further comments and questions from the DAC, we'll move on to the next agenda item, please. This would be a report, a much delayed report by someone who truly understands the public and the need for public participation and public input. May I introduce Ms. Daphne Greene from the Department of State Parks, Off-Highway Motor Vehicle Recreation Division.

Daphne, the floor is yours. Welcome.

MS. GREENE: Thank you. Appreciate the opportunity to speak to you today.

I would just like to take a moment to thank the public for being here today. They certainly have other alternatives to spend their Saturdays. And to all of you, thank you for identifying Saturday as a meeting day, because I think it's extremely important that we hear from the public. As agencies, we don't always do a good job of
it. It is difficult. But I think it's very worthwhile.
So thank you. And thank you members of the public. I
very much appreciate hearing what you've had to say today.
I have a number of items to share with you. I
think what's on everybody's mind, as was mentioned
earlier, Monday is the final awarding of the grants
program. As many of you know, California State Parks, the
OHV division, not only do we operate the eight state
vehicular recreation areas statewide, but we also have a
grants program that's extremely important with our
partners, the federal agencies, cities, and counties.
That is truly where as we balance OHV recreation and where
recreation occurs.

When we talk about OHV recreation, I think it's
important to note today, just listening to everybody,
there's a bit of a distinction. For the state, it really
is about when you're off pavement, when you're on dirt.
And we always say that some points in life you should --
you know, you should spend some time on dirt. The statute
says that off-highway vehicle recreation, for the purposes
of off-highway vehicle recreation. And then off-highway
motorized access to non-motorized recreation. So we
provide funding as well for the maintenance of those roads
and trails to be able to get you to those places. So I
think that's an important distinction.
The grants program, it's a $27 million program. And we award once a year to all of the different entities. So those awards go out on Monday. BLM, I think last year was approximately $10 million that was awarded to the Bureau of Land Management. We've been partners since the start of this program back in 1971. So good luck. I have no idea. I don't participate in the scoring. So you have to take that up with the grants team. But there is a month period of time where you can appeal the awarding of those grants. So just FYI.

So that's really important. And those grants are broken down to operations and maintenance, restoration, law enforcement, and safety and education.

What is important, I think, to note this year is, as we all know, within California we are in a deep budget crisis. And so what occurred in March as we were trying to grapple with a $26 billion deficit was the first stages of trying to get a budget moving through the process. As part of that budget, the legislature decided two things, one of which was to borrow $21 million from the OHV Trust Fund. That goes on top of the 160 million that's already been borrowed from the OHV Trust Fund. So that's difficult because that really impacts our program. But I would say, if it's a loan, then the intention is that that will be repaid.
What was problematic this time period was that there was a take of 10 million. And that take, essentially for the first time in the history of the program, broke the firewall that exists between the borrowing and the taking, which means that what happens now is before the money ever comes into the OHV Trust Fund, it's being diverted and goes into the general fund.

The impact of that take is a $10 million take, $833,000 a month. A direct impact for the grants program is a reduction of $5 million for next-year's grants and a reduction of $5 million for our operations of our state vehicle recreation areas as well as the -- essentially what we look at in terms of our environmental overview of the grants program, the operational overview of the grants program. So it really will have a significant impact.

Directly for the BLM, whether or not it be BLM itself or whether or not the nonprofits and California Desert District, whether or not it be the cities and counties, law enforcement, sheriffs, it will have that impact. In particular -- and I just have the numbers -- currently in the operations and maintenance, it's 13 million that goes to operations and maintenance. And these are -- these numbers are indicated in statute. So whatever the amount of the grants program is, it's then divided into those four categories. So just an FYI, 13
million will be reduced to 10 million, 6.5 in terms of
restoration goes to 5.2. The 5.2 million in law
enforcement will be reduced to 4.2. And the safety and
education from 1.3 to just under a million.

Where that's so significant, I think, is when we
look at the number of requests that we have currently for
the grants program. We have 27 million to allocate right
now. But we have $34 million in requests. Law
enforcement alone, we have approximately 5 million to
allocate -- to award. Excuse me. And we have over
$8 million in requests. So it really is something that
we're going to have to grapple with. But as you well
know, we're still going to grapple with it 'cause we don't
have a budget yet.

So as we go into this next phase of budget
negotiations -- and what will be interesting for the first
time -- and as voters we all passed Proposition 25, which
stated that the legislature has to get a budget in to the
governor. That will occur by June 15th. Otherwise, they
don't get paid. And so that will just be interesting to
see what happens.

But I think what it really is of concern,
everybody's getting cut. As you well know, we've got 70
state parks on the non-OHV state parks that are proposed
to be closed. And so there is that discussion about
whether or not OHV Trust funds should go to the state, should they go to the federal agencies and the cities and counties. That's going to be up to the legislature and the governor. But I did want to make sure that you guys are aware of it, because I think it has some very significant implications to our partners and how that may work in the future. So something I wanted to make you aware of.

So now that I just got the fun-sucker award for the day, we'll go on a little bit brighter note, which was the commission meeting just recently. We were -- just two weeks ago, I believe. So I would like to take a moment and to thank Roxie Trost and all the BLM office who were there in the Barstow field office for their help.

The commission wanted to go to Johnson Valley. Obviously, with the Marine Corps' proposed takeover, it was a little bit -- a little bit of a scheduling challenge. The commission meeting was the 24th and 26th -- I mean 25th. As you well know, public comments were due on the 26th. So as staff we were thinking, oh, my goodness. This is a little bit tight. But we'll try and make it work.

So we ventured out to Johnson Valley, had a delightful tour. And I think everything went really well. The commission was able to experience both four-wheel
drives. They also got into the rock buggies. So just
that opportunity to get the commission out there -- the
commission is a nine-member politically-appointed
commission. They're five from the governor, four from the
legislature. Right now, we have one vacancy. But it
still was really a unique opportunity for them to get out
there.

On the following day, we were -- had a meeting in
Ontario and elected a new chair. So Eric Lueder is now
the chair of the commission, Brad Franklin the vice chair.
But what was significant at that meeting -- there was lots
of discussion, obviously, about Johnson Valley. The SRP
process was also on the agenda. So I have to say today
it's been nice to sit in the audience and not right up
front. But the final discussions that occurred with the
commission, there were a number of points that were
raised, certainly the economic impacts that occur for that
expansion, certainly the recreation impacts for -- not
only, again, it's the motorized access throughout Johnson
Valley to any of the interest groups out there. The other
issue that was raised was the issue of safety. And that
was what happens when you displace hundreds of thousands
of people to other areas throughout California.

As we have seen up close and personal up north at
Clear Creek, an area that BLM manages that's on a
temporary closure, when they had to close that, it had a
significant impact on our state park. We find ourselves
now often closing at 9:00 or 10:00 in the morning because
we've reached carrying capacity. So the commission was
very concerned about the safety issues that were going to
occur on other public lands and whether or not the Marine
Corps had considered that.

At the end of the day, the commission felt that
there was a lot of discussion about the need. One of the
commissioners was talking about 58 percent of
discretionary spending going to the military and was that
appropriate or not. All of you have heard all of those
different discussions.

At the end of the day, the commission voted that
they could not support any of the alternatives and ended
up -- we submitted a letter to the Marine Corps saying as
much, that they didn't feel that really the Marine Corps
had done an adequate job of explaining why the need was
there and addressing all of the impacts that it would
have. So that was certainly a significant item that
occurred.

And then finally, I just wanted to take a moment,
if I may, share with you two documents. And I have more.
But they're awfully big, so I'll just give them to you to
pass around.
This is the 2011 report. This is a commission report that was submitted to the legislature and the governor in January. It is a required report that addresses both the -- specifically to look at the natural and cultural resources and programs that we have with our partners. So if you look on page -- I think it's 111, there's a specific section regarding BLM. Again, on 110 -- somewhere in the 148, some of the cultural, some of how do we address trespass issues, impacts to private property owners, the habitat monitoring that occurs with BLM. So there's a significant section throughout the document on BLM which may be of interest certainly to this group. So just wanted to let you know and make you aware of that. It's on our website. If anybody has any specific questions, I'd be happy to address that.

So with that, I don't know if you have any particular items. I appreciate you enduring me after lunch. I know it's about head-bob time. So I don't know if there's any questions that anybody has.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Thank you for coming. Your appearance here came as a direct suggestion from a member of the public.

MS. GREENE: Good.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: And pleased to see that that's how things can flow.
Dick, the floor is yours.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: The $5 million that is coming out of the trust fund, that is for the upcoming grants; right?

MS. GREENE: Yeah. It's not for the grants that occur on Monday. So what we did actually when we made significant changes back in 2008, the program -- there were a number of significant legislative changes that took place. But one of the things that we really wanted to do was ensure through the grants program that we had the money before we awarded the money. And so we're safe this year. The money is going out on Monday is the full amount. It will be the following year is where we'll feel the impacts.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: So the numbers you gave are for the following year?

MS. GREENE: Correct. Exactly.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: And what is the -- on the 181 million that has been taken out of the trust fund that was I guess designated for land purchases or other types of things, is there a requirement by the -- a requirement when they have to repay that?

MS. GREENE: You know, that's a very good question. And sometimes there is some specific legislative language that would either say that there has
to be interest repaid with it or not, or in some cases --
for instance, 90 million was borrowed some years ago. And
it has specific language that says if there's borrowing
that occurs to the account that adversely impacts the
trust fund, then the 90 million would have to be paid
back.

The governor just recently, in the May revise,
has talked about the wall of shame which is really that
wall of debt that has been borrowed from many of these
accounts. The proposal is to repay those accounts. I
think the concern is certainly one hand repays it, the
other hand takes it. I think we need to do a better job
all the way around of letting the legislature know the
importance of this program. This is a 40-year-old program
that was established by a member of the environmental
community and a member of the off-highway vehicle
community because they recognized that people are going to
go out to our public lands. We want them to go out onto
our public lands. But we have to do it responsibly. And
so the program was created -- I would say you can get into
lawsuits and, you know, everybody can do all that. But at
the end of the day, this is really more of a public policy
perspective of how do you want to try and make sure that
people are out on public lands and how do you manage that
when they do.
And so I would just urge all of you to try and speak to not only obviously congressional members, but in this particular case with the budget coming up, speaking to the legislative members in Sacramento because they need to hear about the importance of the program.

I understand that BLM isn't in a position where they can lobby. Certainly, they have been a great partner for us and certain they've received the funding. But you can imagine right now in state government the idea of giving federal agencies money is something that is just not familiar, nor is it very much supported.

So if that's something that we want to continue, really all the members of the public are going to need to make sure they talk to their members.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: Thank you.

MEMBER ACUNA: I mentioned earlier in today's meeting Sycamore Canyon. And when I hear this dire situation that you mentioned, it sounds like the commission is a little bit on, you know, life support in being able just to make contributions or -- to other agencies through funding. Has your acquisition program for new lands and new recreational opportunities come to a halt?

MS. GREENE: Thank you for putting me on the hot seat there.
It's certainly -- it is one of those things where we as a division can identify lands that we feel are important and that should be purchased. How that process then goes is internally we move up the chain to say that this is important. And so ultimately you hope that the governor's going to propose that in the January budget and that ultimately that will be approved by the legislature.

When we're dealing with a $26 billion deficit, you're going to find people oftentimes who will say we actually don't think that that acquisition is as important. And so that is where it becomes problematic.

I can't say to all of you before the governor's budget comes out, "Oh, yes. We'd like to do this." You know, some people know that there's certain acquisitions out there, lands that are available. Certainly, we want to look at them. Again, that comes back to the importance of letting the members know, the legislature, why it is that this program exists. As we certainly see lands beginning to be impacted -- Johnson Valley, renewable development, DRECP mitigation, et cetera, et cetera, I think it's more important than ever managed recreation out there is, as it should be, a high priority. And the legislature needs to know that.

MEMBER ACUNA: Thank you.

MS. GREENE: Sure.
CHAIRMAN BANIS: The rest of the council, any questions or comments?

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: Thank, Daphne, for showing up.

MS. GREENE: Absolutely. Thank you. I appreciate it. It's nice to see everybody again.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Thank you, Daphne. Thank you. We do have a public comment on the department director's report, a public comment from Tom Tammone.

Tom?

MR. TAMMONE: Hi. Good afternoon. First of all, I also attended the Clear Creek meeting which kind of goes into this because we have a lot of our money invested in Johnson Valley. And I'm a little upset because I'm under the impression that the Secretary of the Interior is just itching to get a document on his desk that he can sign and send on off to congress so we can get Johnson Valley out of his life for whatever reason, because there was a disaster that happened at the rock pile. I don't know the reason.

But as far as our state funds going to federal agencies, after what happened in Clear Creek, we have campgrounds that were funded with our state Green Sticker dollars that were ripped out before the process was even finished. That's unacceptable.

And I flat-out said at the last meeting that if
agencies are just going to be this way with things that we funded with our Green Sticker money, at some point we're going to say, you know, you don't need to apply. And I'm already asking people to write that into the organization. You're treating our money this way. We'll need to see it. It's our money.

And as far as the land acquisition, it's funny that was mentioned as far as division. I personally have been beating on division pretty hard about it. And frankly, as Daphne Greene pointed out, there is no real motivation on the legislators to do anything about the problem to eliminate the blocks so we can utilize our funds. They like borrowing from the fund. And, well, now they got around to not putting the money in altogether.

So it's our responsibility -- and I'm talking to the guys from CORVA, from ORVA, from all the orgs that are supposed to represent us to get after these people to eliminate the blockades, and to get after people at division to tell us what we need to write into the regulations and into the legislators to eliminate the blocks so we can utilize those funds. Because the people that work for them aren't going to do it, will you tell me why. So it's up to us to do it.

And as far as the meeting that took place two weeks ago, Ellen Baker is not here today. But I wanted to
play something that she said.

(Audio recording played as follows:
"(Unintelligible) came up with a great idea to do
a letter generator to create letters for the Marines to
give the people that wanted to write letters substantive
comments and opportunity to do it and a method. So they
came up with a (unintelligible) letter generator. They
put out a challenge. They wanted to have 20,000 letters
written. By the time the challenge ended, we had actually
written 20,800 letters.

"The letters are going to be delivered to the
Marines in San Diego today by Steve Gardener, little
buddy, who is our master printer who did all the printing
and all the folding. All the letters are tri-folded so
that when they go to the Marines, the Marines literally
have to open every piece of paper. (Unintelligible)"

CHAIRMAN BANIS: I'm sorry. Tom, that's becoming
illegible, I can see, to the court reporter.

MR. TAMMONE: All right. It's over. But you get
the intent. If the Marine Corps worked with anyone to
reach a settlement on this issue, an alternative fix or
any alternatives, it didn't happen.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Thank you, Tom.

Ed, Marie. This is on the -- on Daphne's report.
MR. WALDHEIM: Everybody -- everybody -- Ed Waldheim. Everybody owes Daphne Greene a great deep
gratitude for hanging in there and working and keeping our
project going, Daphne. You have done an incredible job.

She's gone through three administrations and
she's still there. So she gets to join those who don't
give up. And it's incredible. Gerry Hillier and I
probably -- we're probably the seniors around this whole
place. But Daphne's getting pretty close to that.

Terry -- no. Marie is the senior, and so is Ron Schiller.

Anyway, she's done an absolutely incredible job,
and we want to thank her. The one thing that she did tell
you -- and I don't think you heard it or listened -- is
that when you leave here today, it is incumbent on every
single one of you -- government, not government -- I don't
care who you are -- to find out who your legislator is in
California, your assembly and assemblymen and senators --
there's only 120 of them. That's all there is -- and
educate them on how important it is to you to not steal
from our off-highway vehicle funds. It is those funds
that make it possible for you to go take your vehicle to
go rock hound, to go do the guzzlers. Anytime you take
your vehicle -- I don't care if it's a Suburban and you go
off the pavement. You have now become an off-roader. I
love riding my motorcycle. But you like using your Jeep
to go do the rock hound or do a guzzler or go hunting or
even Terry over there to go hiking. You're going to use
your four-wheel drive or a vehicle.

So everybody has a stake in this. And those 120
legislators up there, they're immune. They don't think we
exist, that we don't care. And they just feel they can
steal from us and take the money without any
repercussions. And that's wrong. That's totally wrong.
So I beg you guys, all of you -- and you too, Brad. You
can send it from the County. Send it from the County.
You cannot afford them to steal the money from our program
'cause you, the County, depends on us getting the money.
All your sheriffs are getting funded from that. We can't
afford to do that. Everybody is in.

And the second note is everybody needs to get to
their congressmen, especially the few congressmen we have
down here, and to stop this insanity of taking Twentynine
Palms. There is no reason for them to take 180,000 acres.
They can go to Fort Irwin. Yes, the Marines don't like
the Army and the Army doesn't like the Marines. I don't
really care. This is a national issue that we're going
broke as a country. We do not need to take the recreation
away. We fight wars to keep liberty for people. And
right here underneath my nose, they're taking my liberty
as an American citizen, my soil away without firing a
single shot. It makes no sense. So all of you need to fight that one too. We
can't do it by ourselves. But collectively, if we let the
legislators know, we should be able to win this battle.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Thank you, Ed.

Marie?

MS. BRASHEAR: No. You can go on.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Thank you, Marie.

Okay. Thank you again, Daphne. We really
appreciate that very much.

The next item on the agenda, we'll be moving on
to subgroup reports versus a report from -- am I right or
am I wrong? Did I have a -- I'm sorry, Ron. No. You're
right. I filed your card away. My mistake. Ron, please
take the mike. I filed his card away already. It's my
fault.

MR. SCHILLER: I know you get tired of hearing
me. I've been giving you a break for a while.

Anyway, I would like to comment on what Daphne
had brought up earlier. And I'd like to state that I have
received a lot of e-mails from Daphne, and I appreciate
what I received. And you've asked me why I don't
participate so much. And let me explain from the user's
point of view.

As Ed pointed out and you pointed out, we're all
stakeholders in this and this provides access to our other activities. In theory, that's right. But you cry it at the BLM meetings. You go to the meeting and you say, "Hey, we need this road fixed to this great rock hound site," "this great hunting site." The problem is here's what you always hear. Oh, no. Because we have to do it EAA. We can only do any kind of maintenance in an OHV area, and that's all we're allowed. I've been hearing that for years and years and years.

When I go to OHV commission meetings as an interested stakeholder, it's very obvious I'm not appreciated there. And you can see by talking to the commission that it's of immaterial importance to them.

And so while I appreciate what you're saying, in reality, from our point of view as a user who's not an OHV user, that's what we constantly get. And that's why we're so frustrated with that system.

Thank you for the time.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Hey, thanks, Ron. Thank you.

Okay. Thanks. If there are no objections, we'll move on to the item of the report from ISDRA subgroup.

Dick.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: That's me.

We had a DAC subgroup meeting for the Imperial Sand Dunes Recreation Area on May 25th. We had an update
on the -- there's a landfill going out there that the city
of L.A. is going to move trash out to the desert there.

So that's been going on for years. And we had an update
on where they're at with the rail spur on that. We had a
short update on activities at the dunes, pretty much
parroting what's in the document here from the -- for this
meeting. We also went through this exercise for the
recreation activities that was requested by Teri for
the -- for this meeting here. And, you know, we just had
some general meeting of the DAC subgroup.

We scheduled another meeting for August the 16th
which will be reviewing fees in preparation for the next
DAC meeting which is in September.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Okay. Well, my challenge here
is that we have some documents in front of us that the
rest of the people don't have. That is essentially the
results of the exercises that our groups had. I have it
on the system. I just don't have a way to share them with
everybody other than reading them. Is that how you want
to proceed? Is that what -- pardon me. We're doing just
a minute of housecleaning here.

What we're talking about, Dick, is you remember
at the last DAC meeting, the DAC had asked subgroups and
friends groups if they would conduct an exercise of how to
assist the BLM in developing and maintaining effective
partnerships. Do you have the results of your item or do you want to look on here? Do you want to go over that matrix?

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: I have it.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Do you have it? Do you want to go over that matrix briefly, just run right down some of the key points? I don't know if all of the items. But there are probably some key points you might want to point out.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: Sure. I can go through them.

These were provided to the chairman here and to the BLM. Actually, the BLM put these together. The BLM generated this list from our meeting.

And, you know, we went through this thing and was looking at some successes, challenges, and opportunities. And we looked at some of the successes that we've had that the subgroups see. One is our camp host program out at the dunes, the youth safety classes, different partnerships that we've had at the dunes with the Chili Kris Dog Frick Safety Group, UDG, and the ADF, and Reach, air people. We've had some good partnerships with them.

The EMS -- obviously, the reduction in accidents at the dunes, EMS support has been a success. We produce a recreation guide each year that UDG and the BLM work together on that goes out. It's kind of like one of those
papers they hand when you go into a national park, like
this. And there's some of these that are on the back
table back there if you want to see them. This is
something that the UDG produces each year and gives out to
recreation people.

And the BLM, we have some really good ideas like
our Take It Outside cards. We have some cards that -- for
kids or for anybody, really, that have different things
about the desert, animals, plants, locations. We've had
some partnerships even with -- the California Native
Plants Society has generated these cards, the BLM
generated some of them. We have some in there from the
border patrol, different people in partnership for those.

We have, as a newer program -- one of the
successes, I think, is these consistent rules across the
CDD. We talked about earlier about having some consistent
rules that make it easier for recreationalists to use the
California desert. And the Dune Guard -- we have a new
program this year which is a Dune Guard and the Frisbee
program that was generated between the district manager --
or the field manager, Margaret, and the Unified Desert
Gateway.

Some of the challenges we're looking at, just
challenges finding volunteers. We have a challenge in
finding volunteers. Another challenge is with the
safety -- the ATV safety programs. Currently the safety programs are free for kids. But many of the adults would like to take them so that they can supervise their children. And that costs like 120 bucks. And so that's been kind of a problem for a lot of people, paying 120 bucks for this class out there. So that's a challenge.

And an opportunity would be to figure out if we can figure out a way to grant money for adult training also.

And, you know, another challenge is just limited resources and funding. I mean, the BLM has limited resources to provide to the area. They have limited funding for the area. How do we solve that? It's hard. We've tried to work with partners to figure out ways to solve those things.

One of the challenges we have out there is safety. And one of those is speed. I mean, we have people that are exceeding the 15-mile or 25-mile-an-hour -- 15-mile-an-hour within 50 feet of recreation areas. And that becomes a safety issue. And we need to see that that's enforced as much as possible.

Just challenges, again, one of the big challenges all along here is funding. BLM funding, local funding.

Let me see here. One of the other challenges that we have is in the law enforcement area. And that's
having everybody on the same page. And we have a lot of visiting staff that come to the dunes or maybe for special recreation issues at locations. And when they come into an area, they may not be familiar with the operations of that area. And so that's a challenge for us to have all those visiting usually law enforcement officers or EMS people understand the history of the area or how things operate in that particular area.

Again, each one of our opportunities seems to be keyed on funding; funding from the BLM, funding from our fees -- and a lot of our fee money goes to collecting the fees. And so, again, we need to figure out ways to utilize the existing funds we have in a better way.

We have some identified -- the second part of this exercise was to identify opportunities to increase the use of volunteers in expanded partnerships. And that was kind of a hard one to do. But we have different opportunities that we have out there with some of our partners over the past years. ASA, American Sand Association, has put out some books, dune smart books. We have a book that we published -- the ASA published years ago. It's called "Dune Smart." They produced a safety video called "Take it Outside." And we'd like to see those renewed or some avenue of those renewed to increase our safety aspects.
We're looking at maybe some opportunities of some
public service announcements on local TV stations. We
have some -- one of our members of our group works for the
local cable company and said that we could get some PSAs
on the local cable stations if we generated those. Again,
it's finding funding to generate those. It costs money to
make those videos.

That's probably -- without getting into a whole
lot of detail -- we'd like to see the camp host program
expanded. I know our dunes manager is working on that,
been doing some interviews with people that want to, you
know, increase the dune -- the host program. And maybe,
you know, one of the things that hasn't been received very
well, but we'd really like to see if it can work better,
would be to have some more tours maybe in the closed area,
in the wilderness area, BLM-supported tours. I know
they've tried that in the past and they haven't been very
well-received. But maybe if there was some way we could
publish that, some way to get more people involved, it
would just be -- even the wilderness areas that we have.

Anyway, this whole -- this whole document has
been prepared by the BLM and has been available to you.
It's kind of hit some of the highlights here. So I think
that's probably all I need to say.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Is there any objection among the
DAC to combine public comment for the ISDRA report and the Dumont Dunes subgroup report?

No objections. Thank you.

Then if there's no objections, I'll move right into the Dumont Dunes report. We went through the same exercise, the exercise of developing successes, challenges, and opportunities. I had the opportunity to express a lot of successes to my fellow DAC members at our business session the last meeting. So I don't want to necessarily repeat those. I think there's a good deal of successes.

I want to, if I could, though, focus on some of our challenges, because I think that's what we really want to work on.

We believe there should be more involvement from the law enforcement, particularly in the area of wilderness enforcement. Dumont Dunes is surrounded by wilderness. You leave the boundary, you may be where you're not supposed to be. And we need help keeping people inside the boundaries.

There's financial concerns, particularly with the potential loss of OHV grant funds. There's also the challenge of closures in other places, potentially at Johnson Valley, which could result in increased uses and growth at this area. And we want to ensure that the
facilities and the staff would be able to support that increased use, if that came.

We always believe there's more education opportunities, particularly in the avenue of safety and in terms of etiquette. Even things such as proper disposal of R.V. waste and things such as that. We think that education campaigns can be helpful.

The other issue is public attendance at our subgroup meetings. We like to encourage more users to come to our meetings. We schedule Saturday meetings once a year for that purpose. And sometimes it's successful and sometimes it's not in terms of drawing numbers from the public. So that's a challenge for us. And we're going to continue to work on that to get more public involved.

And the last challenge, big challenge, there are -- the Dumont Dunes user fees have a structure that we believe -- collectively with the BLM believe is unnecessarily complicated. It sounded like a good idea at the time. And now we would like to simplify the fee structure. But that requires us going through the fee change process as required by FLREA, the Land -- Federal Land --

MEMBER JOHNSTON: Recreation and Enhancement Act.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Recreation and Enhancement Act.
There are specific requirements to go through in order to implement or change fees. We attempted to do so last year. And we were unsuccessful in generating the notices and public support that would be necessary. So we want to try that again.

So those are our real challenges. I think, if I can editorialize for a minute, we have two different fee areas that -- surprisingly, you look at the activities, and the activity is very similar. You're driving dune buggies and sand toys around sand dunes. But yet you couldn't have two areas that are almost so very different, not only in terms of the people that it draws, the kinds of events that it draws, the kind of management strategies that are in place. It just -- there are times -- I'm going to echo something that Dick said. There are times in which consistency is a paramount goal. And yet there can also be times when consistency for consistency purpose may overlook some of the wonderful uniqueness of certain areas.

And so in our desire and work to have more common rules and ways of doing things to standardize for not only the education of the users, the efficiency of the agency, but these are different places that may have some special attributes that we can take advantage of for meeting challenges and opportunities.
So as we move forward in this discussion that's going to ensue between now and the next DAC meeting and we discuss in detail through our subgroups and among ourselves the challenges these two groups face and their uniquenesses, how are we going to successfully add our challenges, fix the things that are broken and not break things that are fixed. And that's the challenge I see.

And my advice to the public in commenting to the DAC would be in helping us figure out ways to develop better partnerships at Dumont and Glamis without breaking things. And that's what would be helpful for -- I think for the council to hear.

Are there any other comments of the council before I take the public comment?

MEMBER ACUNA: So are you suggesting that maybe at the next meeting there be more focus on how these groups work, subgroups?

CHAIRMAN BANIS: What I'm trying to put in place is the vision of the mechanism that we put in place in the last DAC meeting whereby this afternoon's session is for us to gather information from the public, gather information from the BLM, have some discussion among ourselves to gather information from ourselves, and that at the next meeting we'll come back with a list of solid recommendations for the BLM relative to effective
partnerships.

And that would follow the strategy we did for renewable energy, for example. Last meeting we did renewable. We had some recommendations today. And that's the context in which I'd like to proceed, if that's okay.

MEMBER ACUNA: Okay. So the focus would be subgroups and how they are managed and how they report to the DAC. And so I perceive that there -- you know, I haven't been following this as closely as I should have. But it seems to be they work differently yet they work under the same rules so that it would seem to indicate some inconsistency. So would we be getting some information between now and the next meeting so that we could be fully updated, and then we could have that discussion? Is that what you'd like?

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Yes. That's my intent. I don't expect us coming up with recommendations here today. This afternoon, I envision as a factfinding, an opportunity for us at the DAC to become educated on these issues. And I had hoped at the next meeting we'd come back better informed and have informed recommendations.

MEMBER ACUNA: So to move swiftly on this, would it be appropriate at this time after we have public comment potentially to make a motion that this might be focused -- a focused topic for the next meeting after we
have public comment?

CHAIRMAN BANIS: I don't know that that's necessary. I think that that's going to come in our reports that come in the morning session for our next DAC meeting. And, again, I kind of envision going forward -- the morning session is the old business and the reports. The afternoon is our new business. And I would think that we would not take action on new business until we've heard from everybody.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: So just to follow up and not to beat a dead horse --

CHAIRMAN BANIS: No. This is new for all of us.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: So our recommendations will be hashed out essentially the way we did the last three months, by e-mail, getting it on -- I don't know if we're going to have a meeting. But arriving at some conclusions and recommendations based on what we find -- what we hear here today so that we will have recommendations ready for the next meeting.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: I think you will also have the added benefit of an additional subgroup meeting from both of those subgroups that will specifically address this and try to make some recommendations to the DAC.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: So that will be sort of the followup and the conclusions, and then go on with the next
themed meeting?

CHAIRMAN BANIS: That's how I see it.

DIRECTOR RAML: And let me add something too.

So I think -- so this is our first meeting with this approach of theme. And I think one of the things that we ought to do maybe also is think about the pacing of this meeting.

So for me, one of the things is -- so the theme of this meeting was recreation. And what time is it, and where is your energy. And where would -- and when we take on a topic, when we want the most energy focussed on the new topic.

So it's where -- we've had -- so this meeting has had some incredible successes. We've gotten public attendance, which is wonderful. We've got different people here than we normally have. So our public comment period was rich and it was full. We had Daphne here, which was a wonderful benefit. And yet we are now at 3:00 o'clock on a Saturday afternoon tackling our theme topic.

And so I think one of the things we need to talk about this next meeting in the structure, let's visit that. Because I'm wearing down. I bet you guys are wearing down. Our public is wearing down. And we're tackling the -- tackling what theoretically was the meat
of the meeting. And so it would be unreasonable for me to
expect between now and 4:30 when it comes to the
recommendations on this topic that you would have, you
know -- and part of it is to understand everybody's
thinking. But at the end of a long day, that's probably
not when you're thinking outside the box, most creative,
being able to synthesize the commonalities that you hear
from these different reports, all that sort of stuff.

So I think we got the overall structure and theme
part. But I think then we got the real mechanics of our
energy level and how the meeting flows. So let's kind of
keep that -- we'll kind of put that aside a little bit and
then proceed.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Dick?

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: I want to move on. But I just
want to make one quick point.

And, again, I won't say we're struggling. But
we're trying to learn here the process. And I don't think
that the process for this particular exercise was executed
correctly from the standpoint that we really didn't
generate a recommendation. Again, all we did was
generate -- fill out a form from a user's group and
provide that to the BLM. Now, how they use that, how they
want to do it, we didn't give a recommendation. We just
gave -- I mean, we didn't really have a recommendation,
per se. So -- and I don't know that we were asked for a
recommendation. We were just sent these forms, you know,
by e-mail.

I think that for the next one, when we discuss
later this afternoon what we're going to do for the next
meeting, I think we need more detailed instructions, or
maybe later on sent to us more detailed instructions about
what our action items should be.

DIRECTOR RAML: I'll respond to that real quick.

So one of the things I also have in front of me
is this key factors for DAC/BLM success, shared
understanding and direction clear request from the DFO to
the DAC. So if -- and if that comes out, we'll just
continue to improve. If it wasn't clear, I will -- we
will continue to work on clarity.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: I think we have lots of
information.

DIRECTOR RAML: I do too.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: It's a matter of how we as the
DAC are going to take it and make use of it.

And given that, one thing I do want to accomplish
today is to ensure that the presentations that have been
prepared for us today are delivered. And that's important
to me.

And another important thing to me is that we
ensure that members of the public who have sage advice
specific to these topics, we give them a chance to speak
on it. And if that's what we do for the rest of the day,
I think we will be good.

And, therefore, moving on, if any other comments
relative to these two presentations -- do we have any
advice from the public? I have four cards on how these
subgroups can specifically work. The first would be Terry
Weiner.

Do you have a specific comment on the subgroups?

Please.

MS. WEINER: Terry Weiner, the Desert Protective
Council. I just want to say that I would like to
participate in the subgroup related to the Imperial Sand
Dunes and work with you to promote other types of
activities there. I'm a botany buff and I spend a lot of
time looking at plants. And I know there's other people
out there like me. So I just want to thank you for that.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Thank you, Terry.

Marie, followed by Ron and Ed.

MS. BRASHEAR: Many years ago, there was a
partnership that did not succeed, because Bureau of Land
Management did not want it to succeed, to develop a
management plan for Dumont Dunes. I, Jim Dodson from the
Sierra Club, Chuck Bell from the Desert Protective
Council, got together and came up with some ideas. And one of the things we discovered -- and I haven't heard it mentioned here, and it may have changed over the years. But the biggest users of Dumont Dunes are not Californians. They're Nevadans, primarily from Las Vegas. They use it in -- to a great deal in the off times. And I didn't hear -- we're out reaching to those folks to get their input in what should happen at those dunes. So maybe that's something you want to consider.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Perfect, Marie. Yes. Thank you. We do have one representative from the -- specifically for Nevada OHV. And we have two representatives for Dumont Dunes users group, one of which is in Nevada. So we do have some representation. And that is a good point. It is a 50/50 use between Nevada and California there.

Ron, you have a comment on this?

MR. SCHILLER: No. I think I'll just wait. I've said enough so far.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Ed, do you want to say it? We've got a presentation from you coming up shortly too.

MR. WALDHEIM: The documents that you went through as a subgroup, I need to figure out exactly -- I can't figure out, where did that start? Who generated that?
Okay. So was it your intention only to send it to subgroups? Why did we deal with it in Ridgecrest?

CHAIRMAN BANIS: The Friends of Jawbone, you mean?

MR. WALDHEIM: Well, it was for Hector. We did it for him, so he would have his space. So this is only an exercise for subgroups. So every field office got this? Why did Ridgecrest get it and not the other field offices?

DIRECTOR RAML: When we started, we were trying to reach out to obviously our subgroups and then also very active friends groups. So that's why the Ridgecrest office got it, because there is no way to overlook the importance of the Friends of Jawbone and all the good work that you do. So we were also kind of trying to reach out to each of the --

MR. WALDHEIM: Okay. I appreciate that and I can understand where it came from.

So with that in mind, I am not too comfortable for the DAC group to try to come and try to micromanage what we do in the field offices. I would much rather you say, "Thank you for your report," and put the burden back on the field manager's office to work these issues out with the subgroups and come up with an action plan on the pros and the cons. 'Cause there's a lot of stuff that we
need to do within the BLM. There's things we need to do with the subgroups or the friends group. I don't think we want to burden the whole DAC with localized things.

Now, if we get to a point where we are at an impasse and neither one of the parties is happy with what the other party is doing, then at that point, okay, let's bring it up to the -- to Teri Raml in our OHV leadership meeting or something like that.

But I think you have done your job as airing this out. And I don't really expect much more from you except, "Thank you for going through the process. I want you to continue doing your work and work with your field manager." I think that would be the most appropriate way to do it.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: I think we have a lot to learn from these -- from these items. It's more than a thank you. I believe that we're going to learn things that work in partnerships and perhaps we will hear things that are not working and give us a chance to spread this magic perhaps in other places throughout the desert district. I think the partnership that works -- for example, in the Jawbone area, as folks see the presentation, I think the light bulbs are going to go off in their head and they're going to say, "Hey, maybe we could do this too. Maybe we could do that," or, "Gee, if we ever tried to do that,
they'd skin us." So we're going to get some ideas from all of this. And I think it's going to be valuable.

The intent to micromanage, no. I don't think there's any intent on our part there. I think we want to see what works and encourage the BLM and other people to put those practices into play.

Dick?

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: I'd like to make a comment on Terry's request there to participate. One of the issues I have here with the subgroup that there is a requirement for 15-day notice for these meetings. These meetings are -- will be noticed on the website, especially for the ISDRA and the Dumont. They have subgroup websites. They're linked off the DAC website on there. If you go to the DAC website, you can link to the individual subgroup websites. And we are -- we will have at least a 15-day notice on the meetings, where they are and the agenda items.

Like I say, the ISDRA subgroup will be meeting on August -- what did I say? August the 16th, I believe, in El Centro. And you're more than welcome to attend that meeting. And we try to get those -- we like to have as much public participation as we can.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Thank you.

Maybe this is a good time then, please, to
segment into the Friends of Jawbone report. So I'm going
to push Vesna and see if she can keep with us for a few
more minutes. Ed has a PowerPoint and a script to show
us, some things Friends of Jawbone does.

MR. WALDHEIM: Thank you, Randy. Thank you, DAC
members. My name is Ed Waldheim. I'm president of
Friends of Jawbone, also of El Mirage and California
Trailer Users Coalition.

What I'm going to talk about here is ditto pretty
much for all three nonprofits that we do. We are a very,
very active nonprofit. We have been meeting for 15 years
every month, the third Wednesday of every month in
Jawbone, the second Wednesday of every month in El Mirage
as a steering committee, as a friends group, and then as
an incorporation group. We understand what it's all
about, partnership.

This one was -- David took this picture. And
when did our inauguration of our open groundbreaking
ceremony, I asked everybody who was part of Friends to
please come up and get in the picture. The only thing
that was left over in the public was David's camera. And
we had to scramble to get somebody to take the picture
'cause everybody was a partner.

Let's go to the next one.

Who are we? Our group started -- we incorporated
in 1998. And so we are totally devoted to keeping our
access to our public lands and protecting those accesses.

   Next one. Next one.

   To improve and maximize the trails. Trails is
the key. If you do not mark the trails, if you do not
maintain the trails, that's when chaos happens.

   The education of the public is paramount. I keep
talking about -- well, we are -- we have to work with the
uninformed, willfully ignorant. The willfully ignorant is
what is making it really hard for us.

   We are improving on the trails, the work on these
trails, the signage. There's some people who say a great
thing -- I heard the other day, "Wow, you've got way too
many trails." Well, let me tell you -- I mean too many
signs. People need to get reassurance. You need to have
the trail signs. If you don't have reassurance, then all
of a sudden your brain starts doing funny things for you.
And you see something that smells and looks like a trail,
and off they go. So that's why we put trails everywhere.

   The trail maintenance is a key. Some say, "Well,
why are you putting that big blade on there?" Well, if I
put the blade sideways, it's only eight feet. By the time
the bushes come in, I've only got six feet, and sometimes
I end up with only five feet. Next thing you know, you
feel like a narrow trail. And those people who don't want
to have their paint disturbed by bushes, all of a sudden
they can't even get on it because the trails get really
narrow.

      And what happens is if you don't maintain the
trails, the trail gets wider. Then we almost start
doing -- going after the vegetation and next thing you
know, we've got a big freeway instead of a little narrow
trail.

      Fencing, the fencing -- if we didn't have the
willfully ignorant, we wouldn't have to put one single
fence up, period. But we're living in a society that
don't know how to read. They don't know how to understand
what they've read. And furthermore, "Yes, Mr. Officer,"
as a highway patrolman yesterday in Mojave told me, he
says, "I asked the guys why did they go on that road? And
they said, 'Well, I thought I wouldn't get caught.'"

      Now, this is the type of mentality of the people
that we're dealing with. So unfortunately we have to put
up the fences, which is -- it just drives me absolutely
crazy. We're spending $50,000 a month -- $50,000 a month
on payroll between Jawbone and El Mirage to help maintain
the public lands.

      Next, illegal trails. They call it illegal. But
it wasn't illegal before. And Jawbone Dove Springs, since
1986, you only had the designated trails. Before then,
you didn't have it. But you can see the bottom picture is
the before. And we have a very good computer program. We
do the first picture, the before. Then we do the Peeler
post as the second picture. And the after picture is
after restoration. Now, look at the difference. You
can't even see it.

Now we're in a quandary, what are we going to do
with that Peeler post because now it looks like we
shouldn't even have that Peeler post there. But for the
purpose of the OHV grants, we have to monitor that. And
if I can't even find where the trail is how to monitor,
what am I going to monitor? And each one of those Peeler
posts has a tag in the back. So it has a direct
relationship. There's 2200 of these all over the Jawbone
Dove Springs.

Okay. Next, education. Education is something
that we're getting into a brand new era. And that is
thanks to Sundance Media. They've taken us to a complete
new level. And this is thanks to the grants program also,
and also Kern County. Kern County, we get a lot of grants
from them to do the stuff.

Stocking, the BLM has us stock all the kiosks.

We probably have close to 80 kiosks we have around the
area.

Private education campaigns, new communication
tools. You see that screen over there? Here, you guys who are -- well, you're in San Diego. But if you're in the San Bernardino -- the Inland Empire, you will see these coming up in the movie studios, in the movie theaters where they have these advertising companies on how to behave on the trails.

Next one. Education, that's our visitor's center in Jawbone. We have likewise a visitor's center in El Mirage. We sell books of things of the local area. It helps us create a little bit of funds to do it. Are we self-supporting? No. But one of these days, I wish we could. But it's pretty hard. In Jawbone, you have to willingly want to come into the visitor's center. In El Mirage, you have to come through the visitor's center because you have to pay your $15. So we have a better participation in El Mirage than we do there.

Next one, educational campaigns. We're going out to -- we reach out. We go to different areas. This was the wildlife -- Wildflower Festival in Ridgecrest. It was their first year. And so we go out to all these different areas in the local communities.

Next, communication tools. This one is a -- any one of you can go join Friends of Jawbone Enews. Just go in there, sign up. Two times a month for the most part, we send you Enews. It's just a one-pager, two-pager. And
it tells what's going. I mean, it's incredible. And I
think we've got close to 8,000 subscribers in that media
of getting out. And El Mirage, we're close to 680
e-mails. And these are e-mails that we have voluntarily
received from the customers who come and visit us. In
El Mirage, we have Danni goes around. And she's
incredible how she goes and gets these e-mails for these
people. And they're happy to receive this news. So
anything we have new, we go and put it on there.

Okay. Next, maps. We're doing so many maps in
here. We've done our eighth map for Jawbone. That was
maybe the first one. The next one was Los Padres, the
Angeles, and then the San Bernardino Forest and the
Barstow. Now I'm working on four new ones. We already
finished one up in Indio. We're doing the second one,
Palm Springs. We'll have a three series in Needles we're
working on and the West Coast Padres. So we're heavy in
doing these maps. But they go like hot potatoes. Every
year, we print 20,000 of the Jawbone maps and they
disappear. Now, we charge $3 if you get it. But we give
away an awful lot the because OHV grant staff. Sixto
Fernandez, he wants us to get the education out there. So
we give away most of them. But the money we collect is
what we use for our match to get the printing going. So
that's what the maps are.
Next, just keep going -- oh, go back. Sorry.

Right there on the left side, that's one of our prides, is the augur trucks. We have four of those augur trucks. One is in El Mirage and three of them are in Jawbone. We have Shelly can go out and she can put 80 posts up in a day by herself and signing the trails. She comes home and she doesn't feel beat because the augur truck does all the work. And it's incredible how that works.

And okay next one. Keep going. That's the augur truck. It sits on a metal pallet. You can just pick it up and you can put it on any truck you want to. Put it on a trailer anywhere you want to go.

We also have the Jawbone store there where people go and have food in the Jawbone areas.

Go to the next one. This one is my favorite one over here from Washington, D.C. to Teri Raml and to the people out there doing the shovel. You have six still in there, you have Teri, you have the board of supervisors going out, Zach, the new board of supervisors coming in, myself, and Ben McFarland from Congressman Kevin McCarthy's office. Up on the top there, you have the city council of California City. We constantly go and educate and interact with those folks because they're partners with us. And of course you have our Washington trip there with the Congressman Kevin McCarthy. It's key for keeping
those people all informed and working with them together.

Now, of course in the middle we forget our boss
on the far right and Daphne in the middle and -- the three
on my right are -- that's Bob Abbott. And this was thanks
to the ASA that they had this at the sand show. I've got
to give them credit for hosting that. And it was an
incredible event that you had in that area.

Okay. Next. Oh, we still need -- we still need
those drones. Bob Abbott, he promised us some drones.
I'm still looking for the drones. He came up to my table
and he said, "Ed, BLM has drones." We need to follow up
on that.

Okay. This is the Jawbone Visitor's Center.
BLM -- that was -- what's his name? -- Jim Keeler and I,
we got the permission while we were going to the
commission. And everybody fought us from Sacramento and
all the way down. But we prevailed. And now we're doing
a million-dollar expansion on there.

The collaboration and groundwork, this is one
that Karen Sanders, we hired as a project director
coordinator. And we're getting all the law enforcement
people together. Yesterday I talked again with a CHP guy.
He said, "Yes, I'd love to come DUI-test on Jawbone Canyon
Road." Now when we go out there, they're all
coordinating. They're all working together from all the
different agencies around there.

Moose Anderson, this is the one that we do our annual cleanup. We had a heck of a time trying to find trash up there because we keep it clean throughout the year.

Next one.

This was one of our Moose Anderson days -- no, it was not. This was a holiday. BLM loves to have a safety day on Halloween. And this is Eddie Duque, the one who puts it up from the Ridgecrest BLM office. And this BLM officer is from Lake Isabella. He comes up and participates with us.

And this one was the last one. This is our boss up there in the middle. He's having a good time. The wind was blowing so hard. But the guy next to me in the middle, that's Eric Anderson. He was a brother of Mark Anderson, to which we honored the visitor's center on his behalf. He was a former OHV commissioner. And then we have Paul Gooley (phonetic) from Kawasaki. These are all guys that are very, very active. On so this was our last cleanup.

Okay. That's what the expansion is going to look like. Not quite totally like that. The two buildings -- they're building a 6,000-square-foot shop on the left side. It is not detached. That's just a breezeway. And
we have an 1800-square-foot building that we're doing for more education.

Next, that's what the shop building is going to look like, little pictures of how it's going up.

Keep going.

This is a PCT. We were really proud to hear that Greg Beck got an award from PCT. We put 22 of the gates for the PCT. I go to those meetings with Ben Hoyt from the U.S. Forest Service who runs that in Tehachapi. We have regular meetings. So we participate.

So in the Jawbone Dove Springs, we, Friends of Jawbone, did all of that work to keep these folks off of the trail. And we patrol this whole thing, monitor it all the time. That decal one is there that we want to do. And I just went and had 150 of them made. So those are on all the entry points going through the Jawbone Dove Springs area. We patrol very closely with a sheriff's department and the Sequoia National Forest law enforcement folks.

Red rock, this is Mr. Banis going through Red Rock. We are working very closely with Red Rock 'cause those folks are so understaffed they have let us do signing. We went and fixed an undercrossing of the Highway 14.

Tom, you may want to know that we did not touch
any of the bridge. We didn't touch anything. But I gotta
make sure I bring that up, that the road was almost gone
underneath there. So Mark -- no. Matt let us go and fix
that. And so we work with the Red Rock state folks pretty
good.

And next one is CalTrans. I have to give Tom and
his staff credit up there in Bishop. Every time I go up
there, they're working on the expansion that he's doing on
Highway 14. All the entryways into the Jawbone Dove
Springs, we provided them with all the number counts of
the BLM does to make sure we have room. The undercrossing
that we did on 203 up there in Mammoth, I was the one on
the commission got that going. And CalTrans is an
incredible partner to work with. You sit down with them
and they do a fantastic job. And I give credit to Tom.
And I appreciate, Tom, your staff really working with us
on that. Even out of Inyokern, those guys are incredible
out there.

Next one. And then with all the different
cities -- I mean, the one that's missing up here, city of
Ridgecrest, I have them there. And there was another one
that I forgot to put in there. But we work with all the
different areas. And they come to our meetings. When you
come to our third meeting every Wednesday, we'll have 30
to 40 people at the meeting. And they're from all walks
of life. There's only two off-roaders, myself and one
other guy. Everybody else has nothing to do with
off-roading in a sense, like I like to ride my motorcycle.
They have all different interests.

Okay. Next. And so here, you see the law
enforcement. These are the teams that we have all these
people work together. The one we have to add on there is
CHP. They want to be partners. They talked to me
yesterday about that they want to be partners. That's
pretty cool. So we'll have pretty much everybody in
there. And it's the synergy between all these folks is
absolutely fantastic.

The prior property, I'm really proud of this one.
This is Tip. He manages the ranch for the Rudnick, which
is now renewable resource. And he represents them. Go
down to renewable resource, and they're the ones who
bought the 64,000 acres at Rudnick Ranch. 20,000 of that
is Jawbone/Dove Springs. So we manage that very closely.
I, Ed Waldheim, have a written agreement from renewable
resources attorneys to manage the land so that we stay on
the trails and we keep the people off of their private
property.

So the rancher works with us very closely. And
especially with ranching, he's got 600 heads of cattle in
there. They're my biggest enemy right now 'cause they
knock down the signs, they knock down the Peeler posts. I
mean, it's unbelievable what those cattle will do.
But anyway, that's a sad story about doing business.

Next one, renewable energy. We work with DWP.
They constantly call me up. When fences start going down,
we go fix it. The wind farm calls me on that. And so we
work closely with those folks.

Next one, Bickel Camp. This is one of the jewels
up there. It's a destination point. We have a caretaker.
We pay out of Friends of Jawbone to make sure it doesn't
get ransacked, 'cause we missed that out in Burro Schmidt
Mine and they destroyed it. So this one is still like it
was in the early days. And it's an unbelievable place to
go visit and enjoy.

The next one, Ransburg, Rand Mountain, the board
of supervisors. This is a bad picture 'cause we don't let
people park in front of this anymore because we bought
three lots where the people park. But the Kern County
Parks and Recreation through the boards of supervisors
gave me $20,000 to fix the areas between the three cities,
Joburg, Rand Mountain, and Ransburg. And now we have
reduced the calls of complaints to zero because we managed
the sport in that town. We put out staff during the
holidays to control the traffic and we have a good
relationship between the sheriffs and us. We do the town,
they do the outlining areas.

   And then LAWP, next one there, when there's
issues on the pipeline road and so forth, we help them and
fix that or put up some signs or so forth.

   Next, these are the different groups that
participate. We have the Autobahn Society that's a Santa
Monica Autobahn Society. We need to fix that sign. It's
kind of gotten old. That's a good sign but I got another
sign that I have to do. DT & A, folks they show up at our
meetings.

   Next one. PCT they show up.

   Next one. And these folks also. There's an
incredible bunch of guys and girls from all over the
United States that come and do the work out there in the
fields. So they're working out there while we're also
working. There's sections that they do and there's
sections that we do. So we compliment each other very
well.

   Next, on the SCTA when they get in trouble in the
sense that these guys are not listening to me, they won't
stay away from the restored trail, we'll go and do our
thing. We'll go up and put up a Peeler post or put up a
wing fence so at least they can get their job because I've
had them cry like crazy. They work their heart out and
the next morning it's all destroyed because some idiot
went and destroyed it for them. So that's why we work
with them very closely

The future funding is a critical element. We've
gotten so well right now that our places are managed to
the tee. It's signed. The trails are done. There is no
washouts. There's no whoop-de-doos. You still have to
watch out where you go because it's still off-roading.

But the funds is one that really has us concerned. It's
an essential element of us being successful. The guidance
that we get -- Daphne's staff up there. They're the best
team I've ever seen under Sixto Fernandez. They do an
incredible job. And then they have other staff that helps
us when we need some help like Jeff. Nobody introduced
Jeff back there. He's sitting way back there. That guy
is an incredible guy. He runs Hungry Valley and Hollister
Hill and he still has time to come and say, "Hey, I'm
going to come and help you." At least that's what he
promised Carry Sanders. Now it's on public, Jeff.

Okay. Next one. Okay. To our partners, all the
strong relationships. This is one that I cannot
overemphasize on the partnership. And this is where I
want to leave it. The most important issue is that there
has to be a commitment from the BLM that you do want a
partner. I personally am not interested in picking up
trash. Anybody can do that. I'm not interested in having
a bunch of volunteers 'cause I burn them out. The
volunteers will not last with me because I expect a lot of
work out of them. And nobody wants to work that hard, not
every day. So I depend on paid staff. Now, when I do
paid staff, that's a whole new element that brings into
the partnership within the Bureau of Land Management.
There's things that I can do that you can't do. There's
things that I can do -- there's things that you can do
that I cannot do. Environmental documentation -- and even
that, I can do. In the Ridgecrest office, Hector had
allowed me to go and get NEPA work. We got NEPA work
done.

There's things that we can do because we're
underhanded. You don't have the staff to manage the
public lands the way we want to see it managed. We can
help you. But it starts with a field manager. The field
manager has to have trust. I will never remember while I
was in the commission that I kept complaining that the
Jawbone Visitor's Center was never open. Every time you
came, it was closed. My crew got so sick and tired of
listening to me. They said, you know, Waldheim, you can
have a visitor's center. Hector didn't even have a choice
in the matter, nor did the field manager. He just gave me
the visitor's center. And the rest is history. That's
how we started.
We know how to manage things and make you look
good. That's our purpose. I don't want the glory. I
want to maintain our public lands open for all of us to
use and help you to manage the land. So if you can do
that, if the BLM can really say, okay, let's work with
these people and really be a true partner, then it's a
win-win for all of us.

And I think that's the end of it. Is that the
end of it? Is that the -- I thought there was another
picture. Anyway, that's our story. And we duplicated all
the little places we worked very, very hard to make sure
the BLM looks good. But most importantly, public out
there, to keep the trails open for you. And even for you,
Ron Schiller.

(Applause from the audience.)

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Thank you very much, Ed. I hope
we all learned a lot from that.

Guess what? We are only seven minutes over.

Let's take our afternoon break right now. And we'll come
back and we'll wrap up for the day. So we are going to
have -- I'm going to make it a ten-minute break, please.

Please come back at 3:35.

(Recess taken.)

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Thank you, ladies and gentlemen.

We're going to move on to the last items on the agenda.
Now that we've heard from a number of OHV-related
recreation topics and we've heard from some non-OHV
topics, but we want to hear more about particularly
non-OHV topics. So if there are any questions from the
DAC members at this time relative to what we've been
hearing and about recreation, non-OHV recreation or
anything else, I'd like to ask the DAC's input.
Otherwise, we're going to take our final public comment on
this theme.

Any comments from the DAC? I have Tom, April,
and Dinah. Thank you.

MEMBER ACUNA: Okay. Real quick. One of the
themes, you know, we spoke during break with a number of
people. And it seems like the holdup is the money.
That's what it's all about. The money is available but
it's being utilized to feed state budget. I understand
that. We all understand that.

But what happens is that nobody's going to turn a
spigot back on unless the legislatures know about the
importance of turning the spigot back on. So what I heard
was that more outreach, more direct contact from the users
themselves to those who vote or make the decisions to turn
the spigot back on is most important. It's that simple.
And if that were to happen, I think that would help the
Green Sticker Commission, that's Daphne's group over
there -- might help them achieve their goals with more
funding to BLM and other organizations that support this
type of thing.

So, you know, I learned something today. And I
just thank you all for sharing those ideas.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: April?

MEMBER SALL: Yeah. I had a couple of quick
comments.

First of all, I guess I'd like to point out and
thank Ed for some of his comments earlier that were very
targeted at some action items for concerns related to
Johnson Valley and the Marine base expansion. And so
thank you for those comments. I think those were some
very helpful objectives. And I hope that our recreation
users take you up on those suggestions.

I think it's a really important issue and we do
have to hold someone accountable. Starting with our
elected officials is a good place to begin.

Another non-motorized recreation comment that I
had is I just -- you know, in general, we've talked about
the fact that it's very hard to get a lot of public
attendance at these meetings. And so any suggestions you
all have in getting the word out and getting
representation for your user groups here to talk about all
the types of recreation and all the issues on the desert,
I think we're all interested in hearing those, and as well as how the meeting locations affect you all. And we got a clear demonstration today with Dinah's question on how that was applicable for the meeting today.

And, yeah. I think -- last comment I guess is just that, you know, many of us are concerned about renewable energy and renewable energy on our public lands. I personally feel like this is an issue that affects every single user group. And the current approach and the size of these projects is very inappropriate. And so anytime we can discuss alternatives and other ways to forward renewable energy without taking our public lands, I think is one of the hottest topics.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Thank you, April.

Dinah?

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Following up with April's, but I'd like to also comment on the comments made by Dick and Ron. But I'd like to emphasize to our new SRP that if the regulations as stated really do indicate -- I'd like to echo the comments of Dick and Ron, that if the regulations as stated really do imply that casual users like gem and mineral groups, professional society field trips, academic field trips, and the like must secure permits, then I think those particular regulations need to be clarified and/or changed if necessary. Because I had never read
those regulations before. And frankly, I do a lot of professional and educational field trips in the desert. And I just don't think getting a permit is appropriate for those trips. So those need to be changed.

And, Randy, you had mentioned that that would be one of the first things they would do, is to identify who will need a permit.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: I would like that.

Steve, I would impose upon you one last time. I have a couple of comments of my own that I put on a slide so I could share with you.

And after I review a few of my slides, we'll give a last drink at the well for public comment.

These are some of my thoughts, some of my personal possible recommendations that I'd like to just throw out on the table for consideration. And perhaps some of these may come back as formal recommendations.

First thing I'd like to just say is that I believe in signing and marking the motorized and non-motorized routes because it's essentially putting an ID tag or a property-of sticker, a property of the general public. And that way we don't lose track of how many routes and which routes are out there. And we know where they are and we know what they are and they become more valuable for us to protect.
And this sometimes goes contrary to other people of the public who believe that they don't like to see signs, that they like an unguided, uninterpreted experience. And I can appreciate that. This observation comes from proposals to extend designations to certain areas that contain motorized routes on the claims that they could not find those routes or that they didn't think those routes existed, yet others know those routes were there and that they do exist. By having them signed, it's a way of tagging it.

I'll move on. I believe that the updated maps that are going to -- that are being produced and will continue to be produced should be able to be purchased or downloaded online.

I believe that the OHV fencing projects that we do across the district need to make sure that we have equestrian step-overs and pedestrian breaks, unless of course that kind of access is prohibited. I don't know why or what, but we need to have ways for non-motorized to get through the motorized barriers.

I also believe -- this is my opinion -- I believe that OHV open areas should have a fenced perimeter but that that perimeter fence be broken with a gate or an entrance, a marked obvious entranceway wherever a designated route enters or exits an OHV open area. That
way members of the public will know when they're entering an open-use area where they can drive wherever they want and when they're leaving an open-use area, going to a limited-use area where it requires them to stay on the designated trail. So this fence is not a fence to keep people out. It's not a fence to keep people in. It is a fence with ample opportunities to go through one side and out the other but that provides you with information that -- you know, when the rules have changed.

And a -- and this is a little controversy. There are other people in the OHV community who don't necessarily agree with that. And I'm happy to hear opposing viewpoints on that.

And lastly, I would like to see the BLM nominate routes for inclusion in the National Trail something -- sorry. I cut my slide off. It's the National Recreational Trail System.

Steve, could you move to the next slide file, that is for that National Recreation Trail System. I just want to explain what this is.

MR. RAZO: Hold on a second.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Sure thing.

Did it get merged? Steve, I'm really sorry.

Maybe it did get merged. If you open that up again, maybe it did have subsequent pages. Oh, it is only two pages.
Then I'm going to have to -- if you can't find the slide, I'm not going to wait. I'm going to keep moving.

MR. RAZO: What was it called?

CHAIRMAN BANIS: National Recreational Trails.

There you go. Very good. Okay. Well, it's not quite the one. That's good. I guess I gave -- no. That's all right. It's the notes page. But that's all right.

Okay. I'll do the reading. The National Recreational Trail Act of '68 called for the creation of a system of trails to immortalize trails in the United States. The Secretary of the Interior announces new designations each year in June. And it provides benefits in the form of access to technical assistance, recognition, and special events highlighting the trail, trail markers with the NRT logo, and letters of support for fundraising and protection efforts. The program also provides access to funding opportunities through NRT partnerships, inclusion of a trail in the National Recreational Trail system gives the trail a prestigious title of National Recreational Trail.

By the way, this includes both motorized and non-motorized. The system is open to both.

The key here, though, is that -- if we can go to the next slide. These are the criteria for inclusion.
It's very specific. Number one, it must be open for public use. Number two, it must be compliant with environmental law. Number three, the landowners must support the designation. So this is going to be tricky. The trails that cross public and private property, they would require cooperation among -- with the private property owner. But there may be trails that are purely on public land that have recreational value that could earn this status.

The trail managing agency submits the application by November 1. And I'd like us to work with the BLM to evaluate some trails and apply for their inclusion. More information at Americantrails.org. That's a nonprofit NGO that is in partnership with the federal government for administering this program.

One of the reasons I bring this up, my final point, in reviewing renewable energy development applications and programmatic environmental documents, I am seeing a common thread that special attention needs to be paid to trails that are within this system. Even the DRECPs best management practices provides special awareness and consideration of trails that are in this system.

So my point is that if recreation is looking to stake its claim on some of its key public access routes
that may be in the path of development by renewable energy, this might be an opportunity for us to do so and protect some of those routes for future generations.

And that's my recommendation. It's some sets of recommendations. And perhaps when we come back for the next meeting, the DAC may find that they want to agree with some of these recommendations, and I'd be grateful to have that support. Thank you for the chance to review these.

Any other comments from the DAC, or we'll move into public comment.

Hearing and seeing none, thanks for the chance to make that presentation.

First up -- oh, I'm sorry. First public comment is coming from e-mail. Teri's going to read, please.

DIRECTOR RAML: Yeah. I know this is a little bit unusual. But I received an e-mail from someone yesterday. And it was directed to the Desert Advisory Council and it had to do with this meeting. So I'm going to read it for this individual. And it was from Carol Wiley. And she's the vice chair of the Mojave Group of the Sierra Club. And it's relevant to this topic. So I will do it.

"Dear Advisory" -- "Dear Desert Advisory Council,"
"In planning land uses associated with recreation, I urge you strongly to consider that there are many uses of the public lands besides motorized off-road vehicle use. Many people enjoy the desert for hiking, camping, birding, photography, botanizing, desert studies, rock hounding, or just enjoying the beauty and quiet of the desert. It is also true that wildlife and plants still have a right to survive in their natural habitat. And it is a goal of the Bureau of Land Management to protect the flora and fauna and their habitats in the desert for their survival and the enjoyment of people now and in the future.

"The desert also provides a classroom for many students and high schools and the colleges and also for other researchers. Our desert is fragile and under siege for many uses. It is very important as much land is being taken for other uses such as renewable energy and mining and that recreation uses are very carefully considered and planned for the long term.

"Please consider the many people that will be benefitted if thoughtful planning provides for the various uses of our beautiful desert.

"Sincerely, Carol A. Wiley, Vice Chair, Mojave Group of the Sierra Club."

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Thank you. Carol Wiley, a
former DAC member.

I'm going to start the public comment now, please. I'll start with Shirley Leeson. Shirley, Kim, followed by Ed, if he has -- if he wants a last drink.

Shirley Leeson, please.

MS. LEESON: I thought maybe you'd like to know about rock hounds --

CHAIRMAN BANIS: I am getting to like you.

MS. LEESON: -- in the desert.

You know, a lot of our brochures -- and they were published back to 1950s. And we were collecting then. Not me personally. I was small. But, you know, we want to be involved. We were involved in the '70s, we were involved in the '80s. All of our organizations are nonprofit. They scared us off by saying that if you get involved with the BLM or the forestry or whatever it is, that we're going to lose our 501(c)(3), which is not true. But it scared a lot of people.

We're back. Look out. We're back.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: You don't throw rocks, do you?

MS. LEESON: Not usually.

ALAA is the American Lands Access Association.

They're all rock hounds. We started a number of years ago. But we've only been involved the last three years. We have over 10,000 clubs and individuals in that
organization currently. Most of them are in California.

I am a past president of the California Federation of Mineralogical Societies which has 12,000 members in California and Nevada. I'm also a past president of the American, which is the regional -- over seven regions, which California is part of, and we have 52,000 members. So there are rock hounds out there, and I wanted you to know.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: I'm pleased. You had a very, very good turnout today. Somebody -- somebody must have gotten word from a little bird somewhere. And we really appreciate it very much. It's nice to see you all here very much. I really enjoy the fruits of your work.

Please.

MS. LEESON: Let me explain one more thing for the off-road. Dee and I are members of Cal 4 for those of you that don't know. And they keep the roads open to our collecting sites, which are usually at the end of the roads. So we're with them.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: That's right. Thank you, Shirley.

Kim?

MS. CAMPBELL: Thank you. I represent rock hounds too, as most of you already know. I mirror Shirley's comments.
First, I want to say I need to maybe clarify a little bit some of my previous comments about special recreation permits. I think the problem is they're the regulations themselves. I think the BLM so far has been very fair in the way they have interpreted them as far as rock hounds are concerned. I understand that they consider rock hound field trips to be a casual use. The problem is that that is an interpretation. It it isn't the way the rule is written. It's their interpretation.

So the interpretation needs to be solidified, put in writing, and published so that we can count on that continuing. Otherwise, we can't count on it. We don't know what's going to happen next month.

But I wanted to state that to be fair, because they've been very kind and helpful to me and to our organizations.

Next, another issue is wilderness areas sometimes reach into the open areas that we're allowed to collect so that the roads don't go through and we can't get to the collecting areas anymore. We have -- as I mentioned earlier, a lot of our -- my fellow rock hounds are elderly people or handicapped people who can't get around very much. If they have to hike in somewhere, they can't get there. So a lot of them can't go to some of the best locations anymore.
Next, the Wilderness Study Areas shouldn't be Wilderness Study Areas forever. They should be studied, and then they either become wilderness or they don't. But not remain in that status for an indefinite period.

And then finally, I love the idea of marking the motorized and non-motorized trails. I think that a lot of the other recreational groups other than OHV people will appreciate that. And you could even probably create a program where you would allow private organizations to sponsor that by maybe buying -- funding some of the signs, maybe putting them out. They would love to do that. We would love to do that for you. I think you'd find you'd be surprised how many people would participate in that.

And finally, the OHV people are our friends. If we can't get out there, as Shirley said, we can't collect anything. So rah, rah, and thank you, all of you OHV people who have been working so hard to keep access open for everybody. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Thank you, Kim.

Ed, followed by Marie.

MR. WALDHEIM: Council members, thank you for having us down here. It's refreshing to see that you're willing to think outside of the box. And I look forward to the BLM setting a new chapter in how they work with partnerships where they really start trusting us that we
know what we're doing. We run -- somebody came up to me
and said -- oh, Gerry said, "The difference between you
and the BLM is that you're running it as a business and we
run it as government." That's a very true statement. So
when Mike Poole gave me the visitor's center up in El
Mirage -- in Jawbone, I just run it like a business. And
I'm thankful always to Hector and his predecessors who
have always had trust in me and trust in the Friends to
get the job done.

The fact that I had renewable resources give me
in writing to do what I do, that has never happened
before. Because when we worked Rudnick, it was just a
handshake. But I never got it through an attorney to do
it legally what I'm doing. I'm doing it legally.

So we work at a complete different level. It's
something that others can do for the BLM where you can
maximize your limited funds and your limited amount of
people that you have available. And there's things that I
do that frees you to do the other things so you don't have
to worry about it. You don't have to worry about a
station being open or a sign being -- or a toilet being
cleaned or the trail maintained. A storm comes down and
all the road gets washed out, you don't even have to leave
your office 'cause we just go take care of it. It's done.
It's over with in four hours. The safety issue is taken
care of.

So these are the things that we offer as partners, true partners, not just volunteers; true partners to do work on that.

The users again, thank you. Thank you, young lady, for putting up with me. Sorry I kind of rambled on too fast.

I want to thank Jeff over there, that guy over there. He's the quiet guy. But he's an incredible asset too.

Daphne who goes all over the state -- and this guy goes everywhere. The dedication from the OHV staff is absolutely incredible. I've been around for a while. And since 1972 when I started when the bill started working on this. And you've never had a better staff than the OHV division as you have today. And I do not want to lose that. That's why I implore again that, like April said, let's get the letters out. Make it from the DAC, make it -- you guys have a total stake in it. All you rock hounds, you all have a stake in what goes in the OHV division. Participate and send the letters to your legislators to make sure that they don't take the money away from us.

And the last thing, please, if there's a destination point, get it to Kim. Let her have it so we
can come up with overlay. You're all welcome to come to
the meeting. She'll send a letter to you where it is in
Glendale. And participate in the map-making. And then
we'll see where we go from there. It's a loosely-held
organization. And so we can go --

Erin, thank you very much for coming from
Sacramento. I'm kind of sorry to see Jim go. But there's
going to be a turmoil in your office now, new people.
What do you call it? Revolving door. Anyway, that's
Daphne's problem. She can deal with it up in that area.

Again, thank you very much. And I appreciate you
coming all the way down here.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Thank you, Ed.

Marie?

MS. BRASHEAR: I wanted to clarify a couple
points that I've made.

One, the BLM who didn't cooperate with us was not
Gerry Hillier. Gerry was always very cooperative. It was
someone else in the Barstow resource area or field office
as they call them now.

One thing I noticed going on this whole
weekend -- and I didn't mention it before -- but it seems
like the advisory council and BLM puts people in
pigeonholes. You're an off-roader, and you're not. We're
all off-rodgers. We all have off-highway vehicles as soon
as that vehicle hits the dirt. So I don't know how you
unpigeonhole so that you can speak to people who race or
who ride motorcycles or who do dune buggies or who do
whatever as a different set than rock hounds or
photographers or painters or folks who look at flowers.
But it's something you need to do, because we're all
off-roaders.

And for new people who attend these meetings,
they don't understand that an off-road vehicle can be a
little kid's red wagon in a wilderness area just as much
as a motorcycle or a dune buggy or a four-wheel drive.

So I think that was one of the issues that I
wanted to bring up that bothers me a great deal, because
we are all under that same umbrella. And to make us all
different, we aren't.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Thank you, Marie.

You reminded me, the most skilled off-roader I
ever met was Toni Seger who drove her Mercury Sable around
the El Paso Mountains for 30 years when she lived there.
She was the most skilled off-roader I ever met.

Ron, followed by the final speaker, Terry Weiner.

MR. SCHILLER: Well, I'd like to thank the
council and all the public here for being willing to
listen to us non-off-roaders, I guess you'd say, so to
speak. I really appreciate your willingness to listen and
being tentative to what's being said.

I would especially like to thank you, Randy, 'cause you've heard me say this a hundred times about your last comments regarding the fences. The fences being put up, I understand and I appreciate Ed's thought. But they've been a bone of contention with the equestrian groups and the rock hounds. I've lost some significant collecting sites with that fence -- what do you call that, Spangler Hills and some of the canyon foothills for equestrian access for hunting. I do appreciate your comments.

And one last thing I wanted to point out is that, you know, we've talked a lot about rock hound groups going out. And one thing that we really didn't mention is how many there usually is. You know, nobody's really talked about numbers. From my local club there in Ridgecrest, when we have a big outing, it's probably about six people, seven people. We're not talking about great numbers. Even the bigger ones that I've attended with the overnighters with people bringing their campers and camping there at the bottom of Afton Canyon, I think the last time it was about -- there might have been six campers and a total of five vehicles. And, you know -- and I hope the others can speak to how many their numbers are when they go out. But we're not talking about vast
hordes of people descending on the land. And so I thought
that might be something that we should clarify before we
go.

And, again, thank you and thank the public. And
I appreciate your time.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Thank you, Ron. Nice to have
you back.

MR. SCHILLER: I was trying to get away. I
really was. Marie did this.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Yeah. It's Marie's fault.

The last speaker, please, Terry Weiner. Thank
you.

MS. WEINER: Terry Weiner, Desert Protective
Council. Teri Raml, thank you for the comments on where
this has ended up, this theme of meeting has ended up at
the bottom of the agenda. And what made me remember that
was when some of my constituents found out the DAC meeting
was going to be on the theme of recreation, they got all
excited and they wanted to come down and talk about their
kind of recreation which, you know, interestingly the
framing over the last whatever, 50 years has become
recreation is almost equivalent to OHV recreation. And
it's like non-OHV recreation is some sort of subcategory,
whereas for tens of thousands of years we walked around
this place. And now it's like if people walk around,
they're sort of subcategory of activity.

But anyway, when they saw that the recreation topic was not going to happen 'til 3:30 and it was only as a subset of DAC comments, they just got discouraged, the few who were going to come. And I appreciate your reading Carol Wiley's comment.

I see that OHV recreation, in the sense of off-road vehicle driving as a recreation in itself has taken a lot of resources. So the BLM has to manage the impacts, you know. Nobody's going to deny that they're high-impact recreation. And therefore, not enough encouragement has been given from the public to the BLM to promote other uses of the land. I was really impressed with Ed's statistic. He has 80 kiosks, 80 kiosks around the Jawbone/Dove Springs area, and we -- we're hard-pressed to find kiosks that promote the natural beauty of the area.

And I was thinking hiking trails. Let's see, non-motorized trails. Well, my goodness. I can't -- you know, there's very few places on the BLM lands that I can think of that there's an actual designated hiking trail. The National Scenic Trail that goes from Lone Pine up into Whitney Portal is the one that came to mind. I know there's some in the Ridgecrest area. But we don't even have hiking trails that you could even publish a map that
would be worth the paper on. And please help me if I'm wrong with that.

So the other clarification I'd like to make, wilderness is an area that isn't closed to people. You know, the framing on that is really off-kilter. People, because they can't drive vehicles, doesn't mean they can't go into wilderness. Have we become so depleted and, you know, unhealthy a population that we can't consider that we could get to an area if we could park our car on the outside and go walking? People can hike and they can ride horses in wilderness, not to mention hunting. So now I'm out of time. But just consider that when you talk about it being closed off.

I have a letter from another member of the Reliance for Responsible Recreation who she did not e-mail her comment, and it's under three minutes. Could I do that for her? She'd be here if she could.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Teri doesn't mind if you want to read that into the record, please.

MS. WEINER: Thank you. I did actually give it -- the hard copy. But since it really picks up where you left off --

CHAIRMAN BANIS: You can give the hard copy to the stenographer.

MS. WEINER: I already did. But you three people
mentioned fencing. So I said I'd read the letter from
Friend of Juniper Flats by Jennifer Wilder.

"Dear Council members,

"We request that the Council members give some
attention to hiking trails and equestrian trails on
BLM-managed lands. What will the hiking trail sign look
like? A brown carsonite marker with a hiker on it is much
too similar to an open route marker for vehicles. What
will the hiking trailhead look like? Will there be
parking, a kiosk, and maps of the footpaths? Will the
hiking trails be away from target shooting areas? Will
there be 'designated' target shooting areas instead of the
current system of shoot where you like? For Wilderness
areas, will there be some BLM security visits at access/
parking locations and a sign-in slip which is then
deposited in a box?

"The Friends of Juniper Flats have been
monitoring the lands managed by the Barstow field office
known as the Juniper Sub Region for nearly a decade.
During this time many improvements have been made to try
to control OHV recreation. This includes signs,
restoration, and some BLM presence as well as post and
cable fencing. Yet new motorcycle user-created trails
appear and almost all the old ones are still used by motor
vehicles."
Enough about the vehicles.

"While the BLM is focusing on OHV recreation, there is a total lack of focus on other popular forms of reaction in the Juniper Sub Region. There are no designated hiking/equestrian trails; none of the many riparian areas are designated or managed for wildlife viewing; there are no signs about the natural resources found in the area which makes it so special."

And some people think that they have to fence --

"Do we have to fence each route? It is our opinion the most effective solution is more BLM presence in this area which is so close to huge populations of Apple Valley, Hesperia, Victorville, and Lucerne Valley. And more focus on non-motorized recreation. The new fences block the path of equestrian users, and while they may be successful in helping to keep motor vehicles on the open routes, they are unsightly. Many trails that were restored (because of use by motorcycles) were previously equestrian trails.

"Thank you for your attention to non-motorized reaction."

Thank you for letting me read that for Jennifer Wilder.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Thank you, Terry.

Last opportunity for the DAC members to speak on the topic.
None? Thank you.

Today was a long day. Shall I do the wrapup and move it to you?

DIRECTOR RAML: No. 'Cause I'd like to talk about the recreation stuff.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Teri Raml would like to close for a bit.

DIRECTOR RAML: I'm going to talk about the recreation theme a little bit.

So this is a sausage-making exercise for us, and I'm pleased to say, as maybe a little bit unstructured and end-of-the-day, I think we achieved at least some of the questions that are -- started to answer some of the questions that were asked of this theme.

So we talked about what are the successes, challenges, and opportunities. I think we had a couple really quick reports on that. I thought that was good.

It was sort of what I had in mind. I think that went very well. And, Ed, your presentation was also very helpful.

We didn't get a chance really to touch on -- I think what's clear -- the second question was what are opportunities to increase use of volunteers and expand partnerships. I don't think so much that we touched on what are, except that there was certainly expression by the people here that there are incredible opportunities if
BLM is open and creative. So I think that's part of it.

And I think what was a surprise to me -- and I actually love these kind of surprises -- is the topic of what other forms of recreation in the California desert need attention. And much to my surprise and pleasure, here come the rock hound group. And honestly, you know, I've been here 15 months, and you have not been visible to me. And so what other forms of recreation, here you are. So thank you. That makes this item a little bit of a success.

I also appreciate the continued expression of support for hiking, equestrian. And I think that question got answered, you know -- the expression of interest in other forms of recreation in the California desert district, I certainly appreciate.

I had some other ideas about this topic. And in some ways, you know, we're still struggling with good execution. I think, Ed, your topic kind of fit the bill. I was looking forward to having other -- perhaps being able to have other speakers come and talk to us to kind of give us some more framing of the topic. And one group that I was very interested in having come talk to us was the San Bernardino National Forest Association, which in my limited experience is probably one of the premier large-scale associations out there. They're having a huge
event. We reached out to them to have them come. They're having a huge event this weekend and weren't available.

But I thought it would be helpful. And I haven't lost track of that kind of thread, to have them come talk to the DAC about kind of the scope of their activities, which is pretty unparalleled, I think, and would be something that perhaps desert-wide we could think about.

For DAC members, let me think as far as -- I'm always like Columbo when it comes to scraps of paper.

Okay. So I think something that came up -- I still -- you know, I have to figure -- we designated this meeting as the one that we were going to talk about recreation and the theme of recreation. There's still some things I would like to maybe bring before you and see what we can do. Early on, there was a suggestion about listing partnerships. I don't -- and this is me personally, not the BLM or even the district office. I personally don't have a list of all the partnerships we have and all the Friends groups that are out there. As people have pointed out, you know, we're a field-office-based organization. And the field managers manage those partnerships and relationships. But I think it would be good to rack them up and take a look at them. And I think that would be interesting to know all the smaller -- I shouldn't -- smaller is probably not the right word.
There may be a geographical scope to those partnerships that makes them appropriate to be managed at that level, and that's why the San Bernardino National Forest intrigues me from this larger scale. And maybe there's an opportunity to be looking creatively at -- maybe there's some gap in the way we work with partnerships and associations that could be filled by a different structure, maybe not. But that's an area of inquiry for me.

The other thing that I would like to throw on the table for potential thought is one of the ways to increase partnerships and volunteers is to continue to provide opportunities to recognize people. So it was another happy accident today that we were able to be a forum for recognition of two people here that are on the DAC, quite extraordinarily large recognition. But I also think there's an opportunity for the DAC to participate in providing recognition. And so we should -- we can think about that. You know, field managers can give awards and recognitions. District managers can. And I have familiarity from being in Arizona where the Resource Advisory Council actually would recognize. And so that may be something that we want to consider down the road. We can have nominations, we can continue to draw in presentations like Ed's and actually encourage that by
appropriate recognition. So that would be something I'd want to consider.

And I think that's kind of my closing comment.

So I consider this -- it's a very important topic for BLM, important topic for me. I think we really did well with it considering all of the other items on the agenda. And I certainly appreciate everybody that turned out. And also Terry recognizing that maybe people -- additional people would have come if we had staged it better. So I'm going to declare success and -- but more work to do.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Thank you for that wrap-up.

It's going to be better than my wrap-up.

DIRECTOR RAML: I have another wrap-up. That's the first wrap-up.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: All right. Well, do you want to --

DIRECTOR RAML: Okay. Well, why don't I start, and then -- I'll start, and then Randy can kind of do another wrap-up.

So one of the things, you know, when we had our meeting -- last meeting, it became abundantly clear that one of the things that will make this DAC feel successful and the public that participates in it feel successful is this kind of an accountability issue. So we're going to try to do a better job of capturing recommendations and
action items that come forward and displaying what we do
with them.

So just for today, I kind of looked back through
my little notes and my asterisks. And I'll tell you what
I captured. Some of it is a little bit of a summary.

I mentioned before the list of partners that Ed
mentioned. I think -- this is another happy accident, is
the involvement of former DAC members. I think Gerry said
the comment and then we were fortunate to have former DAC
members here to kind of show the value of keeping these
people engaged in what they bring to the table. And I
think we will -- maybe we'll even do a more concerted
effort to reach out to those folks and tell them we'd
certainly appreciate them coming back.

Quite a lengthy discussion -- not lengthy in
terms of time, but maybe in terms of giving me something
to chew on, the discussion of transcripts. That's an
operational aspect. I'm deliberating. I've got folks --
you know, I'm certainly open to the recommendations and
the feeling that have the word-for-word summary or
word-for-word transcript from the meeting is important.
But yet I think there are other forms of communicating
that might -- summaries -- there may be some other ways
that we can approach this. So that's -- I was happy to
hear. But it's an open topic for me.
I certainly recognize the interest in the yearly fee report. I haven't seen one yet either, and I've been a manager for quite some time. And it's something that's always -- maybe we don't pay appropriate attention to it. And I'm not just saying here in the California desert. I'm saying in Oregon, I'm saying in Arizona, places I've served. I haven't seen those produced and publicized.

I appreciate the interest in law enforcement staffing. It is not lost on me. Pretty much anytime we have a public forum, I continue to be impressed at how important the BLM law enforcement arm is to folks. And anything -- when anything goes wrong or anything is of concern, the first thing the public asks for is more BLM law enforcement presence. And even if they're unhappy with a particular specific encounter with a specific ranger, overall people's impression and their regard for BLM law enforcement is very high and the interest in our program is very high. And I'm always happy to hear that.

Renewable energy recommendations, I wouldn't say a lot about that because in this case there's some very specific things that came forward from the DAC. And we will follow through with them. One is the letter that you have recrafted and submitted to me. I haven't seen it yet. But I will look for it and do the -- take the appropriate action with it. And also the subgroup --
subcommittee made recommendations that we will also follow
up on.

Speaking of subcommittees, subgroups, we've got
work to do with the SRP subgroup. Pleased with the
interest in that group. Roxie will continue to stay
involved with that group. And we will hopefully have a
meeting before the end of June. And we will encourage all
of your participation.

Also, the other subgroups, the ISDRA subgroup --
sorry for the acronym. It's late. The Dumont Dunes
subgroup. I think what has come to our attention is --
and I think Randy really described it very eloquently --
is that, you know, there are very similar areas with some
similar recreation, but they're very different and how do
we manage through that. I think that that's an area that
will require some attention. We'll try to figure out how
to do that. I guess I will repeat Randy again. I don't
think we want to break what's fixed, but I think we want
to fix what's broke. And that's a challenge, isn't it?

And let's see. One more. There was -- I think
there were a couple questions that came up to Erin that we
will make sure we follow through on. I know one that I
should -- probably based on my position, I should have at
the tip of my fingers is the discussion of revenues

generated from renewable energy development on BLM-managed
lands. And I will make sure that I'm more well-versed in
that because that's something that I know everybody is
very interested in.

And then the last thing, and then I will turn it
back over to Randy. The good news for us is that at the
last meeting, you know, we -- the BLM, we knew that this
approach for the advisory council was going to require
more staff work. You know, and we made it -- really have
made a commitment to try to continue to improve our staff
work and our upfront preparation, our agendas, everything
that goes to make this committee -- council -- excuse
me -- run smoothly. And Steve and I have decided to
retain a student. We have a wonderful young woman, Stacey
Allan, who has worked at our -- as a public contact rep in
our front office. And she is interested in continuing to
stay working for BLM. And we're going to tap her to do a
lot of the support work for the DAC. So we will increase
the capacity of Dave, Steve, and Jennifer by one
additional person to try to kind of -- for the care and
the feeding of the advisory council. So hopefully that
will help in some of this prework.

And I think that's it.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: You know, I think it's -- I
think it's better having Teri do the summary. No. I mean
that. Because it tells us what she got from this meeting.
It gives us a chance to fill in if we got something that she didn't. And I think that's better than my summarizing or anyone else summarizing because it's Teri's task to follow up from this point forward on 'til the next DAC meeting. So I hope everybody caught that. And I think that's a good precedent to start.

So I have nothing more to offer other than a last chance at the microphone for our members of the DAC and to offer our thanks to all of those who attended today from the members of the public and for the BLM and for my fellow DAC members.

At this time, it's the job of Teri to adjourn the meeting. And I'd be -- oh, we have -- first we have to confirm the meeting. Next meeting, that's an issue.

DIRECTOR RAML: What we'll do is I've been -- we have a meeting date set, September what 9th and 10th in Ridgecrest. Let's keep that on the table. I believe that's set partly because of missing colleagues. I'm going to go back very quickly and take a look at it.

Our -- the BLM's fiscal year starts October 1st. So I'm thinking a little bit about that. But on the other hand, I also want to follow through on my commitment to set these meeting dates and keep them. So there's a little bit of tension for me there.

Also, the location, Ridgecrest, oftentimes these
locations get suggested at the very end just like now and
we all say, "All right. Good. Barbecue, you bet." I
also would like to keep open the topic of -- or the
location of this particular meeting, particularly based on
what Dinah asked as the amount of turnout we had because
of San Diego. So I'm not so -- so we have to kind of
weigh that tension too, because you raised your hands and
you said you came because it was here. To move it north
then to a remoter area, we may have to think about a
little bit.

And then the last thing, I guess -- is that it?

CHAIRMAN BANIS: I was just going -- all I was
going to bring up was that the BLM family -- within the
BLM family was a well-known mineralogist that made several
presentations to the DAC over the years. And
unfortunately, we've lost Linn Gunn from the BLM
Ridgecrest office who passed away unexpectedly
approximately a month or so ago. There will be a Memorial
service for Linn on June 10th at the wild horse and burro
corral facility in Ridgecrest. Those of you that know him
and would like to pay your respects, you can do that.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: That would be the day of our
scheduled meeting?

CHAIRMAN BANIS: June 10th.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Right. I'm sorry.
CHAIRMAN BANIS: So that's next weekend.

So, therefore, it's Teri's job to adjourn this meeting. And I gratefully ask her to adjourn the meeting in the memory of Linn Gunn.

DIRECTOR RAML: I'll say another word. You know, when someone passes, it's always -- it's a tragedy, and we all know that. And I think what made this one so heartbreaking for all of us it was so unexpected. And so, you know, one day your colleague -- and I'm speaking on behalf of all of BLM, but particularly Ridgecrest. One day your colleague is there. He leaves for a vacation and doesn't come back to his office, you know. So it was particularly heartbreaking and particularly hard on the Ridgecrest staff and for all of us that knew him.

So I was going to mention it earlier and I didn't. And I was so appreciative of Randy bringing it up. And it's a good reminder to me that BLM employees mean something to us and they mean something to all of you who work with them and have grown to have affection for them. And so I'm very happy to adjourn this meeting in honor of Linn Gunn.

(Proceedings adjourned at 4:28 p.m.)
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APPENDIX A

MOTIONS AND DECLARATIONS

A. MOVE: Banis
SECOND: Shumway
MOTION: To accept report of subcommittee
RESULT: Motion passes