San Juan Islands National Monument Advisory Committee
Meeting Summary
October 29-30, 2014

Table of Contents

Next Steps/Action Items from Meeting: 2
Day One- October 29 2
Welcome and Introductions 2
Presentation on Advisory Committee Nuts and Bolts 2
Presentation on the RMP Process and the MAC's Role 4
Vision Exercise: MAC's Vision for the National Monument 6
Wrap-Up and Adjourn 7

Day Two- October 30 7
Welcome and Introductions 7
Chair Selection 7
MAC Vision Next Steps 7
RMP Process Overview 8
MAC Feedback on Scoping 9
MAC Meeting Norms 10
Public Comment 13
Wrap-Up and Adjourn 13

Attachment A: Meeting Agenda 14
Attachment B: Meeting Attendees 15
Attachment C: Detailed Public Comments 16

DRAFT

San Juan Islands National Monument Advisory Committee
Meeting Summary
October 29-30, 2014
10:15 a.m. – 3:45 p.m. each day
San Juan Island Grange
152 1st Street N., Friday Harbor, WA 98250

Next Steps/Action Items from Meeting:

- Lauren Pidot will share with the MAC links to sample planning documents, and will also consider equivalent Monument examples to share at the next meeting.
- Rhea Miller, Gene Helfman, and Erin Corra will meet before the next meeting to work on refining the draft vision statement for the MAC to review.
- Marcia deChadenedes will send a Doodle poll to the MAC with potential meeting dates. Marcia will also distribute an email with the email addresses of MAC members and BLM support staff to MAC members for future communications.
- Tom Reeve, Tom Reynolds, and Jamie Stephens, in coordination with the BLM team, will work on drafting a 2015 MAC meeting calendar based on the planning process and timeline.
- MAC members will email Tom Reeve or Marcia deChadenedes their thoughts about using external or internal facilitators for future meetings.
- Stephen Baker will provide the MAC with examples of advisory group Subcommittees.
- Nick Teague will work on preparing a "virtual field trip" presentation for the MAC.
- The Chair and Vice-Chair will work with the DFO and Marcia deChadenedes to start the process for scheduling the next meeting and circulating the draft meeting agenda.

Day One- October 29

Welcome and Introductions

Daniel Picard, Bureau of Land Management (BLM) Spokane District Manager, welcomed the San Juan Islands National Monument Advisory Committee ("MAC" or "Committee") members and thanked them for their participation on the MAC. Daniel Picard is the Designated Federal Official for the MAC.

Betsy Daniels (facilitator) introduced herself and her role as the outside facilitator for the meeting and reviewed the meeting agenda (see Attachment A). She then invited each MAC member to introduce themselves and share why they are on the MAC, what they hope to get out of the MAC process and the first MAC meeting (see Attachment B for full list of MAC members and other meeting attendees). BLM staff present for the meeting also introduced themselves and shared their hopes for the meeting.

One member of the public, Lovel Pratt, was in attendance and introduced herself. The facilitator noted that the meeting is open to the public, and that there is specific time on the agenda for the public to engage with the MAC and DFO.

Presentation on Advisory Committee Nuts and Bolts

BLM Public Affairs Specialist Stephen Baker shared a presentation on how federal advisory committees work, with a focus on the regulations and policies that govern all federal advisory groups.[1] The purpose

[1] Contact Stephen Baker (sbaker@blm.gov) for copies of the presentation slides.

of the presentation was to introduce the MAC members to the policies and regulations governing federal advisory committees, and to establish the parameters in which the MAC may operate. He noted there are approximately 1,000 federal advisory groups nationwide, 41 BLM advisory committees nationwide, and 10 BLM advisory committees in Oregon and Washington. MAC members were provided with copies of policies and legislation governing advisory committees. Stephen provided an overview of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA), which provides guidance on how federal advisory committees are to be convened and operated. He noted that the main purpose of federal advisory groups is to provide information and advice to federal agencies. In the case of the MAC, the primary role of the MAC is to provide recommendations and advice to BLM.

Stephen reviewed the roles and responsibilities of the Designated Federal Official (DFO), DFO Designee, MAC Chair, and MAC Vice-Chair. For the MAC, the DFO is Daniel Picard and the DFO Designee is Marcia deChadenedes. The MAC Chair will be selected by the MAC and will serve as the liaison between the MAC and the BLM. He also provided information about voting, subcommittees, transparency and interactions with the public (all meetings are open to the public), ethical concerns (members cannot participate in a committee matter in which they have direct financial interest—if this is the case members must recuse themselves from discussion), administrative and travel issues, and new member recruitment. Details regarding these topics can be found in the presentation slides. MAC members were encouraged to contact Stephen with any questions regarding the topics of his presentation.

Questions and comments from MAC members:

- *What is the NLCS?*
    - National Landscape Conservation System, which includes special places that BLM manages. The San Juan Islands National Monument (SJINM) is included in this.
- *In terms of congressional oversight for the MAC, who is responsible for this?*
    - Congressional oversight varies for each agency. GSA manages advisory groups and oversight is distributed to the most appropriate committee. For BLM, this may be the Natural Resources Committee.
- *Can MAC members serve consecutive terms?*
    - Yes, members can re-apply to serve on the Committee once their terms are complete.
- *Where are MAC member terms listed?*
    - Terms are listed on the BLM San Juan Islands National Monument website and also in the introductory letters sent to MAC members.
- *Does the Committee have an end date?*
    - Referencing the Committee Charter, the Committee cannot continue indefinitely. The MAC will expire after the initial resource management plan implementation phase. Charters are renewed every two years, and sometimes amendments are made.
- *In order to vote, do MAC members need to be physically present, or are there ways to call-in or participate virtually in meetings?*
    - Advisory groups have used teleconference options, and this may be possible for the MAC. Participating via phone does count towards a quorum.
- *Do the same conflict of interest guidelines apply to MAC Subcommittee members as MAC Committee members?*
    - Yes, the policies are the same for Committee and Subcommittee members. Note, non-MAC members may serve on Subcommittees, but they are subject to Committee policies.
- *Do Subcommittee members need to be residents of Washington State?*

    - Yes, they need to be residents of Washington State. Out-of-state guests could potentially attend meetings to address the MAC.
- *Is it necessary to provide public notice for Subcommittee meetings in the Federal Register?*
    - Yes, a notice needs to be published in the Federal Register 30 days before all Committee and Subcommittee meetings. Note that meetings need to be advertised and open to the public when the MAC is conducting any official business. Also, the DFO (or DFO Designee) needs to be present for all Committee and Subcommittee meetings.
- *What's the main vehicle for providing public notice for meetings?*
    - The Federal Register and press releases in local papers are the primary ways to provide public notice. The BLM (Stephen Baker and/or Marcia deChadenedes) can assist with posting meeting notices. The MAC should let BLM know if there are other venues where meeting notices should be posted.
- *The Charter notes there is $50,000 available for Committee operating costs. Is this for annual operating costs, or for the life of the Committee? Have these funds been allocated?*
    - The $50,000 noted in the Charter is a calculation of the staff time for supporting the work of the Committee, as well as for travel and per diem for the Committee members. Most of the funds are already allocated. These funds may also be used to support field trips for the Committee to visit different resources within the Monument.
- *When does recruitment for new MAC members begin?*
    - Recruitment will likely begin in January 2015 and new appointments will likely be ready by the time current appointments expire (July 24, 2015). BLM will manage this process.
- *If the Chair selected by the MAC has a one-year term, will the Committee have to elect a new person to be Chair once the current Chair's term expires?*
    - The Chair is elected annually at the first meeting of the year. Ideally, the Chair election would take place apart from the time when members are exiting or joining the Committee.
- *Is there a role for MAC members to publicize available MAC positions with their constituents?*
    - Yes, MAC members are welcome to assist with recruiting new MAC Members. BLM will first ask the MAC for nominations when seeking to fill MAC positions.

Presentation on the RMP Process and the MAC's Role

BLM Planners Chris Carlton and Lauren Pidot provided presentations on the resource management plan (RMP) planning process and the MAC's role in the planning process.[2] Chris began by providing a general overview of the BLM land use planning process, including information about the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA), which mandates that BLM develop land use plans or RMPs for the lands it manages. BLM RMPs include goals and expectations regarding how BLM lands are managed. National Monuments are their own segment within BLM and have specific planning processes. In terms of determining how to manage areas within a National Monument, direction comes from two key sources: 1) FLPMA and 2) the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA). NEPA requires that federal agencies consider alternatives and identify reasonable identifiable environmental impacts of their actions—either through an environmental assessment or an environmental impact statement (EIS) for larger actions. Federal land use/resource management plans require an EIS.

For the BLM land use planning process the planning and NEPA requirements are merged. It typically takes three to five years to complete the planning process and develop an RMP. Chris provided a detailed summary of the planning process steps (see slides for more details). The final RMP helps set the stage for on-the-ground projects and the implementation phase. Chris noted that in addition to the MAC

[2] Contact Chris Carlton (ccarlton@blm.gov) or Lauren Pidot (lpidot@blm.gov) for copies of the presentation slides.

(which will advise Daniel Picard throughout the planning process) other "cooperating agencies" will also provide input during the planning process (federal and local agencies and tribes need to be involved where they have jurisdiction).

Lauren Pidot provided a presentation on several aspects of the SJINM planning process including a preliminary planning schedule and potential areas within the planning process for the MAC to provide recommendations to BLM (Lauren will be the lead planner for the SJINM starting in January 2015). Lauren noted that BLM is at the beginning of the planning process and there are many different factors that may impact the schedule over time. BLM will notify the MAC of any schedule changes. In terms of MAC engagement in the planning process, BLM has some ideas about this, but it would like to hear from the MAC about how they would like to be involved. In general, BLM will bring the MAC concepts as they are being developed to get the MAC's feedback. BLM will consider recommendations from the MAC and will let the MAC know what they plan to do with those recommendations. Examples of issues the BLM would like the MAC's advice on include (but are not limited to): planning issues and questions, the range of alternatives, and communicating with the public. In the near-term, BLM would like the MAC's advice on how best to plan public scoping meetings for early 2015, once the Notice of Intent (NOI) is issued (marking the beginning of a 30-day scoping period for public comments and meetings).

<u>Lauren will share with the MAC links to sample planning documents and will highlight ones to review.</u>

Questions and comments from MAC members:

- *Does "sustained yield" expand beyond extracted minerals to include aesthetic benefits?*
    - Yes, "sustained yield" refers to sustained use of lands for current and future needs.
- *What if issues/concerns are presented by the public that we can't consider?*
    - BLM welcomes any comments from the public, as they help the agency to understand the issues and concerns that are important to the public. What BLM can do in response to those comments is bound by policies and the Proclamation.
- *Will the Monument require a full EIS?*
    - Yes, any RMP is a major federal action and requires an EIS.
- *How will the EIS and RMP be funded?*
    - The Proclamation states that BLM must create a RMP, but there are no requirements to fund the RMP. BLM is willing and eager to develop an RMP for SJINM. DOI prioritizes what projects are funded and in what timeframes. Designation helps to raise awareness, priorities, and expectations.
- *What is an NOA?*
    - Notice of availability, which means a draft plan is available for review.
- *Who prepares the plan and how long is it?*
    - BLM prepares the documents, sometimes in house and sometimes with the assistance of consultants (scientists and others who specialize in developing government NEPA documents). Cooperating agencies also provide input. Typically, the documents are several hundred pages and come in multiple volumes (including appendices and maps).
- *At what level is the MAC involved in the planning process (for instance, the 10,000 foot level)?*
    - The MAC and DFO will determine the MAC's level of involvement (within the established parameters).
- *Is the primary purpose of these planning documents litigation?*

DRAFT

    - No, NEPA was put in place to make sure the federal government takes into consideration the potential impacts of its actions, and to ensure that information is available to the public. However, more extensive analysis can provide greater legal backing.
- *Can people provide comments electronically? What level of comments is BLM looking for?*
    - Yes, public comments can be provided electronically. BLM recommends that the MAC determine how best to provide comments and recommendations to Daniel Picard. When the MAC provides recommendations to Daniel, those recommendations come from the group. Individual MAC members can also provide their own comments as individuals.
- *Will the MAC have access to the 2010 scoping comments?*
    - Yes, the 2010 scoping report can be shared with the MAC. That report that summarizes the 2010 scoping comments, and issues identified through those comments. The report is currently on the Eastern Washington Website, but will be posted on the SJINM website as well (both the scoping report and the comments).
- *Will the analysis of the management situation occur before scoping?*
    - In BLM planning efforts, sometimes the analysis of the management situation (AMS) is prepared before scoping and sometimes after scoping. There is a lot of baseline information embedded in the Eastern Washington and San Juan Islands AMS for 2010-2011. The BLM will pull information regarding the San Juan Islands from that report into a separate AMS report and will revise/update the information as needed. It is likely that the revised AMS for the San Juan Islands will not be available until after scoping.
- *Are there any examples of National Monuments similar to the SJINM?*
    - The California Coastal National Monument is similar in some ways. It runs the entire California coast and is made up primarily of rocks and islands. However, they are mostly inaccessible, and do not have the same recreation issues. Lauren Pidot will consider other potential equivalent examples and will share them at the next meeting.

Vision Exercise: MAC's Vision for the National Monument

Marcia deChadenedes facilitated an exercise to assist MAC members with developing a vision for the SJINM. First, each MAC member was asked to articulate their own vision of what they would like the Monument to be as a result of a well-crafted RMP. To frame this, Marcia noted the multiple-use mandate for the Monument and the parameters the vision must fit within (based on the resources, objects, and values noted in the Presidential Proclamation). MAC members wrote down and shared their personal visions for the Monument with the group. The MAC then discussed different themes across the individual vision statements. From this discussion, four main themes emerged as important components of a vision for the Monument (below in **bold**). Small groups of MAC members then drafted vision statements for each of the identified themes. The vision statements are outlined below.

- **Management:** Offering a monumental experience through demonstrated community modeling and stewardship and connection to place.
- **Connection, dynamic, appreciation, scenic:** A place that is awe-inspiring.
- **Cultural/historical:** People will have a respectful knowledge of the millennia of cultural and historical use of the islands.
- **Natural environment, ecosystem:** Indigenous flora and fauna will flourish into the future in intact ecosystems.

The individual vision statements were combined into a draft joint vision statement, outlined below.
San Juan Islands National Monument is an awe inspiring place where:

- *Indigenous flora and fauna will flourish into the future in intact ecosystems.*
- *People will have a respectful knowledge of the millennia of cultural and historical use of the islands.*
- *A monumental experience is offered through demonstrated community modeling and stewardship and connection to place.*

Several members expressed a need to spend more time on the vision statement before finalizing it. Rhea Miller offered to continue working on the vision statement on behalf of the Committee. Marcia noted that the Committee can decide when the vision statement is complete.

Wrap-Up and Adjourn

Prior to adjourning the meeting, MAC members were encouraged to consider nominations for Chair and Vice-Chair (to be selected on October 30). Members were also encouraged to consider timing and location for public scoping meetings scheduled for early 2015.

Meeting adjourned

Day Two- October 30

Welcome and Introductions

The facilitator opened the meeting by welcoming MAC members and BLM staff and reviewing a revised version of the meeting agenda (based on feedback from the October 29 meeting). No further additions or changes to the proposed agenda were made. Next, the facilitator invited MAC members to introduce themselves and share their perceptions of the first meeting day and advice on how to make the second meeting day successful.

Chair Selection

Daniel Picard facilitated the MAC Chair and Vice-Chair selection process. He first called for nominations for MAC Chair. The following members were nominated for Chair:

- Tom Reeve (accepted nomination)
- Tom Wooten (declined nomination)
- Rhea Miller (accepted nomination)
- Jamie Stephens (accepted nomination)
- Tom Reynolds (accepted nomination)

Each Member was advised to vote for one person for Chair, and that the Chair would be determined based on a simple majority vote. Twelve votes were cast and Daniel Picard read aloud the tally. Tom Reeve received the majority of the votes and accepted the Chair position.

Daniel Picard then asked for Vice-Chair nominations. A member suggested the nominees for Chair be considered for Vice-Chair. No additions were offered from the Committee. Again, each member was advised to vote for one person for Vice-Chair. Twelve votes were cast and Daniel Picard read aloud the tally. Rhea Miller received the majority of the votes and accepted the Vice-Chair position.

MAC Vision Next Steps

The MAC briefly discussed the process for reviewing and finalizing the vision statement, which was drafted by the Committee during the October 29 meeting. A member suggested considering the current vision statement as a draft. BLM suggested establishing the vision by the next MAC meeting and noted that the vision can change over time, if needed. The MAC agreed they would like to work on refining the

vision. Rhea Miller, Gene Helfman, and Erin Corra volunteered to meet before the next meeting to work on refining the draft vision for the MAC to review.

MAC members also shared the following comments regarding the draft vision:

- Question about how adaptive management is incorporated into the vision.
- Some concern about the word "modeling" and what is meant by that word.
- Question about incorporating "leave no trace" into the vision.
- Suggestion to simplify language and put language in the present tense
- Suggestion to incorporate messaging as part of the vision.

RMP Process Overview

Building off discussions regarding the RMP process on October 29, the MAC and BLM staff discussed the RMP planning process in detail. BLM staff provided detailed explanations of the steps that go into the "prepare to plan" phase and potential opportunities for the MAC to engage with BLM during that phase. They also discussed the "formulate alternatives" phase. Below is a summary of key points from the discussion.

Prepare to Plan

1) ***Analyze the Management Situation (AMS):*** The purpose of the AMS is to identify *current* resources and management approaches (sets a baseline). The AMS is a first, interim step and is meant to serve as an internal, living document. Information from the AMS will go into the "affected environment section" for the EIS (which will be more detailed than the AMS). The AMS will not be open for public comments. In the next several months BLM will review the Eastern Washington and San Juan Islands AMS (from 2010-2011) and identify if BLM needs to gather any further information specific to the San Juan Islands. The AMS is a BLM product and BLM will let the MAC know when the AMS is complete.

   Potential MAC roles with the AMS:
   - Provide comments on the draft AMS (particularly regarding accuracy and depth).

   Comments:
   - Several members suggested that it would be helpful to have a better understanding of the Monument lands and what it contains (including where there are cultural resources, threatened and endangered plants, areas with and without recreation, etc.). Having this information available, listed, and mapped would also be helpful for educating the public. It was suggested that BLM potentially provide a background presentation about the SJINM at a scoping meeting, and include a graphical overview of the Monument.
   - A member suggested that it's important to capture the community history of the Monument. A BLM staff member suggested setting up maps of the Monument during scoping meetings and inviting people to indicate where different cultural/historic sites are located.
   - A BLM staff member mentioned that an oral history project was created for the Grand Staircase National Monument, which documented the human history of that area. This was not part of the RMP/EIS process, but rather an add-on.

2) ***Notice of Intent (NOI):*** The NOI will be posted in the Federal Register and will kick-off the RMP planning process and the beginning of the 30-day scoping period. The NOI will likely be posted by the end of January 2015. The MAC will not be involved with the NOI.

3) ***Scoping:*** During scoping, BLM will ask the public to comment on what issues/concerns BLM should pay attention to and what questions it should answer through the RMP/EIS process. For example, if someone has a concern about "X" botanical species, they might comment "how will BLM manage X?" Anyone can submit comments and BLM will review all comments. Comments that draw attention to management questions may be more impactful. Often during scoping meetings BLM gives a presentation and takes comments from the public (comments can also be provided through email/web forums). However, scoping meetings may be set up in a number of different ways and could include presentations, small group discussions, etc. After the 30-day scoping period ends, BLM will review scoping comments, develop draft planning questions, and develop a scoping report (summary of the comments received, themes, and questions). Technically, scoping never ends. However, for information to be included in the scoping report, comments need to be provided during the scoping timeframe (within 30 days of the NOI).

   Potential MAC roles in scoping:
   - Advise BLM on how to set up public meetings.
   - Review the initial draft planning questions to see if anything is missing.
   - Review issues from comments before BLM publishes the scoping report.

   Comments:
   - A member suggested BLM use a different word other than "scoping" when publicizing the public scoping meetings. BLM is open to suggestions about this.

Formulate Alternatives

During this phase, BLM will develop different ways to respond to planning questions that meet the purpose and need. The purpose and need will help guide whether or not alternatives are feasible. A draft purpose and need will be ready before scoping (significant internal review will occur before it is released), and it will not be finalized until forming alternatives. The Proclamation will guide the purpose and need. The MAC also discussed examples of alternatives in hypothetical planning situations.

Potential MAC roles in formulate alternatives:

- During several MAC meetings, the MAC and BLM will discuss different alternatives. The MAC can advise BLM on how it would like to receive and review the alternatives.
- BLM will share the purpose and need statement with the MAC to make sure it accurately captures the intent of the Proclamation.
    - A MAC member suggested that the MAC discuss what is included in the Proclamation at a future meeting; combined with a review of the draft purpose and need statement.
    - BLM will look into providing a draft purpose and need statement at the next MAC meeting.

MAC Feedback on Scoping

The MAC Chair led a discussion to give feedback to BLM on how best to plan public scoping meetings and engage the local community. Below is a summary of the MAC's discussion.

Where should BLM publicize scoping meetings?

The MAC suggested publicizing meetings in the following venues:

- SJINM Facebook page (Tom Reeve manages this)
- Other social media (Twitter, Facebook)
- SJINM interested persons list
- Email networks (such as the stewardship network)

- Posters in strategic places
- Friday Harbor Rant and Rave
- Chamber of Commerce and Visitor's Bureau
- School District (also consider other ways to reach schools and students)
- San Juan Nature Institute
- Suggestion to develop engaging press releases to local newspapers in addition to using their regular Calendar of Events
- LopezRocks

Where and when should BLM hold scoping meetings?
The MAC discussed a number of different scheduling and location options and suggested the following:

- ***Scheduling meeting:*** schedule scoping meetings in February/March 2015 to stay on schedule and keep momentum moving forward (February is the earliest scoping meetings can be held based on when the NOI will be posted in the Federal Register). Some members expressed concerns about holding meetings during this time when some residents may be away for winter.
- ***Locations:*** hold a meeting on each of the three major islands (San Juan, Lopez, and Orcas) and one in Anacortes. Reach out to Stuart Island residents and state marine parks via mail.

How should BLM structure scoping meetings?
The MAC suggested the following ideas for structuring scoping meetings:

- There should be time for a presentation, questions/answers, and public comments.
- There needs to be an educational component as part of the meetings to explain what the Monument comprises (visuals will be helpful with this).
- BLM should consider holding thematic meetings which include a focused presentation and brainstorming sessions.
    - Example: BLM provides a presentation about the Monument (or other topic) and then breakout groups discuss different topics.
- BLM should provide an overview of comments previously submitted and provide an overview of the Monument.
- BLM should consider using electronic comment capture and map-based comments during scoping meetings. Someone should also be available to help people write down comments at the meetings.

MAC Meeting Norms

The MAC Chair led a discussion about establishing MAC meeting norms. The topics below were discussed.

Meeting Logistics and Expectations

- ***Timing and public notice:***
    - In general, the date, time, and location of each MAC Committee and Subcommittee meeting need to be determined five weeks in advance of the meeting.
    - A notice must to be posted in the Federal Register 30-days in advance of all Committee and Subcommittee meetings (there is an exemption where notices may be provided 15-days in advance, if needed). BLM needs one week to post a meeting notice in the Federal Register.
- ***Meeting schedule:***
    - The MAC discussed potential options for scheduling meetings and noted the length of meetings may be determined by tasks to be completed.

DRAFT

- The MAC would prefer to hold its next meeting in early December 2014 or early January 2015. Marcia deChadenedes will send a Doodle poll to the MAC with potential meeting dates. Marcia will also distribute an email with the emails of MAC members and BLM support staff to MAC members for future communications.
- Meeting dates will be selected based on the maximum number of MAC members available to attend (unless particular people are required for the agenda).
- Tom Reeve, Tom Reynolds, and Jamie Stephens, in coordination with the BLM team, will work on drafting a 2015 MAC meeting calendar based on the planning process and timeline.

- ***Logistics coordination and meeting support:***
  - BLM has a conference call line that the MAC can use for meetings.
  - BLM staff members are the logistics coordinators and will help with meeting logistics (conference call lines, public notices, etc.).
  - BLM will make sure there is someone at every meeting to assist with note-taking.
  - Funding is available to support meeting facilitation. MAC members should email Tom Reeve or and Marcia deChadenedes their thoughts about using external or internal facilitators for future meetings.
- ***Location:***
  - MAC meetings can take place in nearly any location (such as a hotel, library, church, BLM or federal facilities, etc.), but the venue must be open to the public, handicap accessible, and at least able to accommodate the 12 MAC members.
  - The MAC did not make a final decision on the next meeting location.
- ***BLM participation:***
  - Lauren Pidot (lead planner as of January 2015) is available to attend any MAC meetings.
  - With advance notice, Daniel Picard is also available to attend any MAC meetings. If he is unable to attend a meeting, Marcia deChadenedes (his designee) will attend in his place.
- ***Other meeting expectations and suggestions:***
  - Punctuality—members should be on time for meetings.
  - Meetings are always in public session (no executive session).
  - A member suggested continuing to use flipcharts during meetings.
  - A member suggested meetings should have time for discussion, in addition to presentations.
  - It was clarified that MAC members may communicate with one another between meetings for information sharing, research, and meeting preparation.
- ***Subcommittees:***
  - MAC Subcommittees are still to be determined. Stephen Baker will provide the MAC with examples of how other advisory groups use Subcommittees.

Potential Topics for the Next MAC Meeting

- Finalize vision statement
- Review the Presidential Proclamation and draft purpose and need
- Provide feedback on the current AMS
- Finalize scoping meeting plan and possibly hear planned BLM scoping presentation
- Discuss parameters around sensitivity to sharing information
- Receive an update on the BLM planning timeline (a regular agenda item each meeting)
- "Virtual fieldtrip" with pictures of the different Monument resources (Nick Teague with BLM will work on preparing this presentation). Discuss potential future field trip locations (hold on field trips until after winter)

DRAFT

Potential Pre-Meeting Materials for Next MAC Meeting

- 2010 scoping comments and scoping report
- Current AMS
- Draft purpose and need

Agenda Development and Approving Meeting Notes

- The MAC agreed to the following process for establishing meeting agendas:
    - MAC Chair, Vice-Chair, and DFO will confirm the date/time for the meeting and will draft a list of topics. This will be distributed to the MAC for review.
    - The meeting date and topics will be posted in the Federal Register 30-days before the meeting.
    - A detailed agenda will be sent to the MAC with pre-meeting materials one calendar week in advance of the meeting. Unless pre-meeting materials are noted as "FYI only" members will assume they are to review the materials prior to the meeting (more advance notice may be necessary when reviewing larger documents).
    - At the beginning of the each meeting, members can also amend the agenda.
- MAC members are encouraged to share any agenda topic ideas with the Chair, as well as comments regarding how they would like to see the next MAC meeting run.
- Approving meeting notes:
    - Typically, meeting notes are distributed to members to review and make corrections, and generally notes are approved at the next meeting when approving the agenda. Once approved, the notes are available to everyone.
    - The MAC did not make a final decision on the system for approving meeting notes but will finalize this at the next meeting.
    - For the first MAC meeting, Triangle Associates will draft the meeting summary and send it to BLM to review. The summary will then be circulated to the MAC with the pre-meeting materials.

Publicizing Meetings

- MAC members suggested publicizing MAC meetings in the following venues:
    - Facebook pages
    - Lopez Rocks—local community calendar (note time for public comments)
    - Listservs for Friends of the Monument
    - BLM list of people interested in the Monument

Public Comments

- Typically, the public can only ask the MAC questions during public comment periods.
- Public comments will be summarized in the meeting notes.
- BLM clarified that public comments shared during MAC meetings are comments to the MAC, not comments to BLM. The MAC is not required to formally answer questions/comments. The MAC is welcome to make formal recommendations to the BLM based on public comments.
- The MAC discussed how to best respond to public comments. It agreed to have time on each agenda to discuss previous public comments. It also agreed that members can ask clarifying questions to public commenters.

MAC Input and Recommendations to BLM

DRAFT

The MAC and DFO discussed different ways for the MAC to provide recommendations and feedback to BLM. Most often, advisory groups provide informal advice and suggestions to BLM, as opposed to making formal recommendations. If there is a time when the MAC would like an official response or a formal reply from BLM regarding a topic, then the MAC should make a formal recommendation to BLM. If the MAC would like to provide comments on a document, they could provide comments through dialogue. The MAC also has the right to ask for a response from the Secretary of the Interior. If the MAC and the DFO do not agree on a topic, the MAC can ask for a response from the Secretary of the Interior.

Public Comment

Daniel Picard opened the public comment period and welcomed members of the public to share comments, questions, and/or presentations with the MAC. Two members of the public, Asha Lela and Boyd Pratt, provided verbal comments in-person. Asha Lela shared remarks related to hunting and recreation concerns. Boyd Pratt shared remarks related to preserving marginal structures within the Monument. Marcia deChadenedes read comments from three members of the public (submitted via email) including: Lovel Pratt, Stephanie Buffum, and Janet Alderton. Their comments primarily conveyed concerns about vessel traffic and oil spill risks. See Attachment C for details regarding these public comments.

Wrap-Up and Adjourn

Prior to adjourning the meeting, the MAC confirmed that the Chair and Vice-Chair will work with the DFO and Marcia deChadenedes to start the process for scheduling the next meeting and circulating the draft meeting agenda. The Chair will also work on making sure the next MAC meeting is publicized locally.

Meeting adjourned

DRAFT

Attachment A: Meeting Agenda

Monument Advisory Committee Agenda
October 29-30, 2014
San Juan Island Grange
152 1st Street N., Friday Harbor, WA 98250

Meeting purpose: Establish and Launch the Monument Advisory Committee for the San Juan Islands National Monument Resource Management Planning Process

Day One- October 29th

Time	*Topic*	*Who*
10:15-11:00	Welcome and Introductions	Daniel Picard/Facilitator
11:00-12:15	Advisory Committee Nuts and Bolts	Stephen Baker
12:15-1:15	Lunch (on your own)	
1:15-2:30	RMP Process and MAC's Role	Lauren Pidot/Chris Carlton
2:30-3:45	Vision Exercise: MAC's Vision for the National Monument	Marcia deChadenedes
3:45	Wrap-up and Adjourn	Daniel Picard
4:00-5:00	Informal meet and greet (optional)	

Day Two- October 30th

Time	*Topic*	*Who*
10:15-10:30	Welcome, Recap and Questions	Facilitator
10:30-11:00	Chair Selection	Daniel Picard
11:00-12:30	Vision Exercise: What is Your vision for your Role in the RMP Process	Marcia deChadenedes/Facilitator
12:30-1:30	Lunch (on your own)	
1:30-2:15	MAC Establishes Process Norms	Facilitator
2:15-2:45	MAC Makes Recommendations Regarding Public Outreach	MAC Chair/Facilitator
2:45-3:45	Public Comments	Daniel Picard
3:45	Wrap-up and Adjourn	Daniel Picard

DRAFT

Attachment B: Meeting Attendees

MAC Members

Name	Representing
Michael Carlson	Private Landowners
Erin Corra	Education/Interpretation
Eric Eisenhardt	Wildlife/Ecological
Jacquelyn Ferry	Cultural/Heritage
Gene Helfman	Wildlife/Ecological
Michael Jonas	Cultural/Heritage
Barbara Marrett	Recreation/Tourism
Rhea Miller	Public-at-Large
Thomas Reeve	Public-at-Large
Thomas Reynolds	Recreation/Tourism
James Stephens	Local Government
Thomas Wooten	Tribal Interests

Meeting Organizers/Sponsors

Name	Affiliation
Stephen Baker	Public Affairs Specialist, Bureau of Land Management, Oregon State Office
Chris Carlton	Planning and Environmental Coordinator, Bureau of Land Management, Spokane District Office
Marcia deChadenedes	San Juan Islands National Monument, Bureau of Land Management, Spokane District Office
Daniel Picard	Spokane District Manager, Bureau of Land Management, Spokane District Office
Lauren Pidot	Program Analyst Planner, Bureau of Land Management, Oregon State Office
Nick Teague	Outdoor Recreation Manager, Bureau of Land Management, Spokane District Office
Betsy Daniels	Senior Associate, Triangle Associates, Inc. (facilitator)
Megan Johnston	Project Associate, Triangle Associates, Inc. (note-taker)

Other Meeting Attendees (Members of the Public)

Name	Affiliation
Lovel Pratt	Member of the public, observed meeting on 10/29
Asha Lela	Member of the public, observed meeting and provided public comment on 10/30
Boyd Pratt	Member of the public, observed meeting and provided public comment on 10/30

DRAFT

Attachment C: Detailed Public Comments

Public commenter (provided verbal comment): Asha Lela

Asha has been contracted with BLM to run a volunteer monitor program for ACEC lands on Lopez for 22 years, and also is the Chair of Islanders for the National Monument. As the population has risen for recreational use on Lopez to 30,000/year, she is more and more concerned about hunting vs. recreation. Several weeks ago an incident occurred on Lopez, where a volunteer was out on the first day of hunting season walking Point Colville on the south end and was about to go around a corner into an opening when she heard a shot. About 10 seconds after she heard the shot she saw the hunter, likely aiming near the trail. Right at the corner on the trail was the dead deer. The hunter was in the woods in camo gear. The hunter walked up to her and her dog and the dead deer. The hunter said nothing and she continued on and did not confront him. She has been saying for years there is an accident waiting to happen. She shared that the lands are heavily used, and local hunters have the privilege to ask permission from private landowners. There are locals walking the lands and people off island coming to hunt who may not know the land is used heavily for recreation. She noted that if you live on Island you know there's a lot of action happening.

When she heard this she pulled 30 volunteers off their monitoring (and she has never done this before). She is not going to be responsible for sending out volunteers if they may be shot. This event upset the Lopez community and her. She understands BLM has responsibility for the land, conservation and preservation, not the animals (that's Fish and Wildlife's responsibility); however animals are on the land. She is bringing this up to BLM and banging against a wall. She sees at least three choices to move out of danger: 1) work something out with Fish and Wildlife; 2) work something out with the County (County dictates what kinds of guns that can be used); or 3) look at BLM management plan and see the inconsistencies in compatible use in recreational use and hunting. ACEC guidelines state the land must be monitored, but she is not going to send out monitors during hunting season, which is inconsistent with the Proclamation for preservation and conservation. She encouraged the MAC to keep this issue in mind when going through processes. She shared that this is the issue for the lands on Lopez—the next issue is parking.

Public commenter (Provided verbal comment): Boyd Pratt

Boyd has a background in architecture and architecture history, cultural properties, and architecture and the vernacular landscape (roads, barns, fences). He has three points to make in terms of approaching the monument and study. One, in the beginning all land was public land used by the Salish. When taken over by the US it was divided into townships, ranges, and sections. It was all public to begin with, but then went into private ownership through homesteads. The Monument is the marginal lands and left overs. There are allocated public lands for light houses, but the rest of it unusable for farming. That is the origin of what we're looking at in terms of the National Monument. Marginal lands often retain cultural values. Some of the natural environments are relatively untouched. He is an advocate for vernacular architecture. He went out with Nick Teague to Henry Island near Kellett bluff, and there are marginal structures that are falling apart and have little value, but are a fascinating and critical part to our history and heritage. There is lots of representation with light houses, and he would like to advocate for looking out for some of those more marginal cultural properties too.

Public commenter (submitted via email and read by Marcia deChadenedes): Janet Alderton

I am a San Juan County shoreline property owner who deeply grateful for the establishment of the San Juan Islands National Monument. Our islands and the San Juan Islands National Monument would be severely impacted by a major oil spill in the Salish Sea. Oil spills of all sizes negatively impact the multitude of creatures that live in our marine waters. Prevention is the way to go because oil spill "clean

up" is largely ineffective. Please place oil spill prevention high on the list of priorities to be considered when setting goals for the future management of our National Monument.

Public commenter (submitted via email and read by Marcia deChadenedes): Lovel Pratt
Thank you for welcoming me to the MAC meeting today. I trust that you all had a productive first day together.

Unfortunately I have to go off island tomorrow and can't attend the meeting during public comment. If it is possible to do so via email, I would like to convey my concerns about the existing and potentially increasing vessel traffic and corresponding major oil spills risk in our islands, including the SJI National Monument properties. I ask the MAC to become educated about and evaluate these risks and to consider recommendations for both accident and oil spill prevention and for oil spill response preparedness.

Thank you for conveying these comments, if that is possible.

Public commenter (submitted via email and read by Marcia deChadenedes): Stephanie Buffum, Friends of the San Juan Islands

Congratulations on your first inaugural meeting! I appreciate all of your guidance and service to our community. I apologize for being unable to stand in front of you tomorrow as I will be in Olympia testifying at the Ecology's Marine & Rail Oil Transportation Study regarding the adequacy of the analysis of increases in oil transportation via vessels and risk mitigation through the San Juans.

We all recognize that economic health of this Monument is intimately connected to the health of our environment. I would encourage this committee to consider the impact of an oil spill to the Monument, and consider a major oil spill as a priority in your planning documents. San Juan County has already placed the threat of a major oil spill on their federal legislative priorities list. I would encourage you to be engaged in advocacy for increased shipping safety and improved oil spill prevention, readiness and response and direct staff to ensure the interests of the Monument are represented in comment letters to the agencies involved in the permitting processes for existing and newly proposed trans-shipment projects.

Unique geographic circumstances place San Juan County in the center of national and international shipping lanes to US refineries, US and Canadian export/import facilities and several proposed new and expanding fossil fuel transport facilities. According to the Vessel Traffic Risk Assessment (VTRA), San Juan County is at the center of the majority of the existing and future oil spill risk in the entire VTRA study area (which includes a substantial portion of the Salish Sea).

Because of the importance of reducing the risks of a major fossil fuel spill in our marine waters and improving the readiness to respond should a spill occur, we urge San Juan Islands National Monument Advisory Committee to prioritize oil spill as allocate the resources needed to track projects, potential impacts, proposed legislation**,** changes to regulations, and to provide whatever help the Council needs to be most effective in addressing oil spill issues linked to the ever-growing proposals to increase vessel traffic around our islands.