

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
CALIFORNIA DESERT DISTRICT ADVISORY COUNCIL

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
SATURDAY, MAY 21, 2016

JOB NO. 78201

REPORTED BY: DIANE CARVER MANN, CLR, CSR NO. 6008

MEETING OF THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR BUREAU OF
LAND MANAGEMENT CALIFORNIA DESERT DISTRICT ADVISORY
COUNCIL AT 2710 LENWOOD ROAD, BARSTOW, CALIFORNIA,
COMMENCING AT 8:10 A.M. ON SATURDAY, MAY 21, 2016 BEFORE
DIANE CARVER MANN, CSR NO. 6008.

APPEARANCES

MEMBERS PRESENT:

LESLIE BARRETT, CHAIR

RANDY BANIS

NATHAN FRANCIS

MARK ALGAZY

JAMES KENNEY

JOHN BENOIT

AL MUTH

ROBERT ROBINSON

ROBERT BURKE

WILLIAM "BILLY" MITCHELL

TOM ZALE

REPRESENTING:

RENEWABLE RESOURCES

RECREATION

NON-RENEWABLE RESOURCES

PUBLIC AT LARGE

PUBLIC AT LARGE

ELECTED OFFICIAL

WILDLIFE

TRIBAL INTERESTS

PUBLIC AT LARGE

RENEWABLE RESOURCES

ACTING DESERT DISTRICT
MANAGER

APPEARANCES (CONTINUED)

BLM STAFF PRESENT:

KATRINA SYMONS, BARSTOW FIELD MANAGER

MIKE AHRENS, NEEDLES FIELD MANAGER

CARL SYMONS, RIDGECREST FIELD MANAGER

TOM ZALE, ACTING DESERT DISTRICT MANAGER

JILL WILLIAMS, ACTING PALM SPRINGS FIELD MANAGER

CARRIE SIMMONS, ACTING EL CENTRO FIELD MANAGER

DOUG HERREMA, ACTING PALM SPRINGS SOUTH COAST FIELD
MANAGER

VICKI WOOD, SOUTH COAST PROGRAM MANAGER

JENNIFER WOHLGEMUTH, STAFF ASSISTANT TO THE DISTRICT
MANAGER

STEPHEN RAZO, EXTERNAL AFFAIRS, DESERT DISTRICT

SHAUN WHITECAVAGE, STUDENT INTERN, EXTERNAL AFFAIRS,
DESERT DISTRICT

DARYL AVERY, BLM CALIFORNIA STATE SAFETY MANAGER

CEDRIC PERRY, CALIFORNIA DESERT DISTRICT SAFETY MANAGER

DORAN SANCHEZ, ROUTE 66 FEDERAL LEAD FOR CALIFORNIA

STEPHANIE CARMAN, DRECP IMPLEMENTATION, ACTING

A G E N D A

ITEM:	PAGE:
Welcome/Pledge of Allegiance, introduction, approval of December 2015 meeting transcript, review of agenda and procedures for public comment - Chair	6
CDD District Manager Report - Carl Zale	10
Advisory Council member reports and Chair close-outs from previous meeting(s)	14
Public comment on items not on agenda, including requests for DAC to consider items for future agendas	35
Palen Renewable Energy Soar Project update - Doug Herrema	49
DAC discussion on Palen project	51
Public questions/comments on Palen project	49, 57
Morning Break	69
Route 66 Corridor Management Plan (CMP) update Doran Sanchez, Glen Duncan and Lynne Miller	69
DAC discussion on Route 66 CMP	72
Public questions/comments on Route 66 CMP	76
Bighorn Sheep presentation - Bob Burke	87
DAC discussion on Bighorn Sheep presentation	97
Public questions/comments on Bighorn Sheep presentation	101
Lunch Break	108
DAC Subgroups - Reports	108
Council questions/comments on SO/DM/FO/subgroup reports	115

AGENDA (Continued)	PAGE
Public questions/comments on SO/DM/FO/subgroup reports	None
WEMO SEIS/DRECP update, Symons/Carman	124
DAC discussion on WEMO SEIS/DRECP update	132
Public questions/comments on WEMO/DRECP update	154, 156
Mojave Trails National Monument Subgroup consideration	167, 190
Public Comment on Mojave Trails National Monument Subgroup consideration	182
Wrap-up and summary, including discussion of theme and agenda topics for next meeting. Future agenda items, council questions/comments on DM/FO reports	194
Adjournment	196
Motions	197

BARSTOW, CALIFORNIA; SATURDAY, MAY 21, 2016

8:10 A.M.

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

---000---

CHAIR BARRETT: Good morning, all. Thank you to the city of Barstow and its beautiful windy day. It's so nice to have you all here. Thank you, all, for coming. We're going to start this morning with the Pledge of Allegiance.

Nathan, can you lead us. Thank you.

MEMBER FRANCIS: Sure. Will the audience please stand.

(The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.)

MEMBER FRANCIS: You may be seated.

CHAIR BARRETT: Excellent. Do we have any special introductions this morning? Steve, any special introductions this morning? Any guests?

Hearing none at this stage, okay. We reviewed the last meeting minutes. Has anyone any comments with respect to the last meeting minutes? Hearing none.

MEMBER BANIS: Move approval. Do we have a second?

MEMBER KENNEY: I second.

CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you. All approve?

(A vote was taken.)

CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you. So we're going to review the agenda and the procedures for public comments. As you can see, we have quite a full agenda today, and I thank you all. I also wanted to acknowledge, of course, the wonderful field trip yesterday, and many of you participated in that. It was very informative, very full, and on schedule, I might add. So thank you, all, for that. And there will be more comments on that, more presentations on that later.

With respect to procedures for public comment, Steve is to my right, to your left, and he will receive public comment cards similar to this (indicating). Please feel free at any stage during the proceedings to give Steve one of these public comment cards, and we'll try to facilitate your input as early as possible. Thank you for that.

And with that I would like to bring in District Manager's Report. And, please.

ACTING DIRECTOR ZALE: Well, thank you. My name is Tom Zale. I'm the Acting District Manager for the California Desert District. It's my honor and privilege to be the designated federal official for this

meeting. I would like to introduce the BLM staff.

Steve, would you start, please.

MR. RAZO: Steve Razo, External Affairs for the California Desert District.

MR. WHITECAVAGE: Shaun Whitecavage, External Affairs, Desert District.

MS. WOHLGEMUTH: Jennifer Wohlgemuth, Staff Assistant to the District Manager and to the DAC.

MS. DENNISON: Dana Dennison. I'm the Acting Associate District Manager for the California Desert District.

MS. SYMONS: Katrina Symons, Barstow Field Manager. Good morning.

MR. LIEBSCHER: Thank you for putting this on. We love it.

(Applause.)

MR. AHRENS: I'm Mike Ahrens, Needles Field Manager.

MS. CARMAN: Stephanie Carman, DRECP Implementation, Acting.

MS. WOOD: Vicki Wood, South Coast Program Manager.

MR. HERREMA: I'm Doug Herrema, Acting Field Manager for BLM Palm Springs-South Coast Field Office.

MS. SIMMONS: Good morning. Carrie Simmons,

Acting El Centro Field Manager.

MR. SYMONS: Carl Symons, Field Manager,
Ridgecrest Field Office.

MR. PERRY: Cedric Perry, California Desert
District Safety Manager.

MR. AVERY: Good morning. Daryl Avery, BLM
California State Safety Manager.

MR. SANCHEZ: Doran Sanchez, Route 66 Federal
Lead for California.

ACTING DIRECTOR ZALE: So you can see there are
a number of actings here in CDC. Change is afoot.
Change is a good thing, and we're excited to be working
with you.

I would like to ask you guys to indulge me. I
attended my first DAC meeting in March of 1990, and
since then I have always aspired to actually have an
opportunity to sit up here, and so I would kind of like
to capture the moment. So would you guys mind smiling
and waving while I do that.

(Applause.)

ACTING DIRECTOR ZALE: All right. Thank you.
Then, Daryl, please, it's your turn. I've got to get
one with the council members here, so make sure you get
us all in, please. You guys are awesome for indulging
me.

Okay. Thank you.

(Applause.)

MEMBER BURKE: Did you take the lens cover off?

ACTING DIRECTOR ZALE: So, as I said, 1990 early, I guess, in my career of attending DAC meetings, DAC member Bob Filler used to refer to the DFO as the federal presence. So do you guys feel anything?

CHAIR BARRETT: I feel something, but I think it's Randy.

ACTING DIRECTOR ZALE: Maybe it's time for me to get a little serious here. I do have a report that I would like to go through from our State Director, and so I'll just talk quickly about our leadership. As I mentioned, there are a number of changes.

So in Washington Neil Kornze is the Director. Steve Ellis is the Deputy Director for Operations, and Linda Lance is the Deputy Director for Programs and Policy. Our State Director, Jerry Perez, started on January 11th. He replaced Jim Kenna, who retired last fall. Jerry has been meeting with staff, partners and stakeholders over the last several months and actually came down and had dinner with some of the DAC members here recently, and we appreciate that. Joe Stout is the Associate State Director.

In CDD, as we kind of went through, I'm Acting

District Manager. Doug Herrema is Acting in Palm Springs. Carrie Simmons is Acting in El Centro. Brian Quigley is the Acting Santa Rosa San Jacinto Mountains National Monument Manager; Rebecca Wong, Acting Sand to Snow National Monument Manager. And we're going to be putting someone in the role of Acting Mojave Trails National Monument Manager soon.

Shifting to budget, the president's budget proposes \$1.3 billion for BLM in fiscal year 2017. The budget requests address the following critical priorities. Those are, restoring the sage-steppe ecosystem, promoting responsible energy development, collaboratively managing wild horses and burros and support for our National Conservation Lands.

In fiscal year 2014 the BLM generated over \$114 billion in receipts from Public Lands, and that benefits state governments as well as the U.S. Treasury.

Brief legislative update. The State Director was in Washington, D.C. last week four congressional courtesy visits. He met with 17 members of the California congressional delegation to introduce himself and discuss various public land issues. A number of legislative proposals of interest to the California Desert District were discussed, and those include the California Desert Conservation, Off-Road Recreation and

Renewable Energy Act S.2568, which was introduced in February and includes Senator Feinstein's proposal for the desert that weren't included in the monument designations that were done under the authority of the Antiquities Act. BLM testified in support of a similar bill at committee in October of last year.

There's also the California Minerals, Off-Road Recreation and Conservation Act, H.R. 3668, that was introduced in the beginning of October. BLM and the Department of Interior actually opposed that bill at a committee hearing in December of last year.

The Imperial Valley Desert and Conservation Recreation Act of 2015, H.R. 4060, was introduced in November. No hearings have been scheduled for that yet. There's the Santa Ana River Wash Plan Land Exchange, so H.R. 4024 was introduced in November. Hearings have not yet been scheduled for that. There's a California Coastal National Monument Expansion Act, S. 1971 and H.R. 3565. The Senate bill was introduced last summer in 2015. It includes rocks and islands in the Palm Springs-South Coast Field Office. In a Senate Committee meeting in October BLM and Department of Interior testified in support of that bill.

The House bill, which excludes the Lost Coast provision, which is in the Senate bill, was introduced

in September, and in a House committee hearing on May 12th BLM testified in support of that.

Then there's incorporating the Orange County Rocks into the California Coastal National Monument, H.R. 4233, that was introduced in December. BLM and the department supported that bill at a committee hearing also in May.

Then finally Soledad Canyon Consistency Act, H.R. 4566, was introduced in February, and hearings have not yet been scheduled for that. So basically that's our report.

Again I'm really pleased to be here, and I'm here to listen. So with that I'll conclude.

CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, Tom.

And moving forward, I think you'll notice from the agenda today and specifically even from this afternoon that between the Mojave Trails National Monument and the Desert Renewable Energy Conservation Plan, implementation of these plans is something that we on the DAC and you as the public are going to need to work together as to the implementation phase.

And so we truly appreciate your input on that, and through these numerous presentations today we look forward to any comments you have. We'll be looking forward to perhaps setting up subcommittees and so forth

on this, but the idea being that the implementation of these plans should come from the public. And so we thank you for that.

Now we're going to ask basically for other DAC members for any subcommittee reports or any comments on previous minutes or otherwise.

Randy, thank you.

MEMBER BANIS: I'll start, if I may. Hi. Good morning, everybody. I'm Randy Banis -- I represent recreation -- from Leona Valley, California. I have a couple of issues I would like to bring out, but first I would like to observe that I haven't heard the word "acting" used so much since I was in the thespian society in high school. But we put on a pretty good play that year, and hopefully the BLM will too.

I'd like to first bring up an issue with respect to a community in the desert that's been very, very supportive of recreation. And I think they're equally supportive of conservation goals of the BLM and the Federal Government in the sense that the City of Apple Valley is working very hard on a MultiSpecies Habitat Conservation Plan.

An MSHCP is a very important plan to do. It helps a community or a region figure out how to grow and also figure out how to conserve for the future, and I

think that we all agree that the BLM and others should be encouraging MSHCPs in the desert to help coordinate management of the desert.

Apple Valley is working on -- the federal rules, federal regulations and the planning guides do require the BLM to work closely with communities when they are developing MSHCPs. The city of Apple Valley has -- there's a stretch of land between the city of Apple Valley and the southern boundary of the Stoddard OHV Open Area that's a mixed public and private parcel conglomerate. It is adjacent to Highway 15.

The DRECP establishes an ACEC for a wildlife linkage there. The City of Apple Valley would like to incorporate all of that area in its MSHCP and be able to designate those few parcels north of the city between Stoddard and the city as OHV area. They provided a very compelling comment to the BLM with maps showing the actual -- I'm going to say biological integrity of that area, and it's questionable with respect to the bar that it meets, if it meets a bar, especially compared with the incredible benefits of having an MSHCP in that region from the city. So I'm speaking in support of the City of Apple Valley.

John Stewart from Cal Four-Wheel drive and I attended the meeting with the city and found them

remarkably supportive and committed -- very, very committed to working on this project, and I've been working with the planners of the MSHCP since before the DRECP started, so this isn't something new. This is something that's been going on at the same time as DRECP. So I'm requesting the BLM dovetail better with the City of Apple Valley and see what can be done in order to facilitate their planning process.

Second thing, do we expect to have any in-depth discussion or words from the BLM on Planning 2.0?

ACTING DIRECTOR ZALE: I don't believe it's on the agenda today.

MEMBER BANIS: Then I'd like to just take a minute and say for once I feel a little stupid calling for an extension comment period because there's already been a couple, but unfortunately we were pretty much wrapped up in over our heads, at least up to our ears, in West Mojave planning and in DRECP planning, both of which were dovetailing and undovetailing and folding back together multiple places and multiple times. And yet at the same time the BLM was pushing forward a national plan to restructure the resource management planning process nationwide.

And, yes, there was a big comment period. There was an extension of public comment. There might

have even been a second. That's why I feel a little silly asking for another extension. But the truth of the matter is, as I've been digging into this very recently, there's one thing that I would like to bring up that frustrates me about the 2.0 planning process.

What was missing from that planning packet was a before-and-after comparison of the current planning process and what change that new planning process will reflect. Now, I admit there is a document that shows some specific language changes, like in the manual they're going to propose to change this and put in this. But the "put in this" is rather simplified. It just says, to strengthen the section on blah, blah, blah, for example.

And, now, the document itself does come out with a lot of strong goals. It wants to improve public participation, wants to improve the science and the information-gathering. Wants to improve this, improve this, improve this, improve this. I love it because we don't want a plan that makes it worse. We do want a plan making things better and better. But there's no comparison anywhere in it that says, "This is how it is done, this is how we would like it to be done, and this is how it's going to be different." That was very hard to find.

It was tremendous, tremendous documentation with respect to projecting what that future planning process would look like, but I still would have liked to have seen the contrast of today's planning process and how that specifically will change.

So I may miss the boat on that in terms of something significant with respect to comments, but perhaps the BLM can see that and maybe talk to us about that at some time in the future and show us where those differences end up playing out. And so those are the two issues that I wanted to bring up. And thank you, DAC members and the audience, for indulging me on those two matters.

CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, Randy. And any other council member reports?

Mark, thank you.

MEMBER ALGAZY: Well, my list is a bit longer than Randy's. And part of my comments dovetail nicely in regards to Randy's when it comes to the 2.0 planning effort. I don't have high expectations when it comes to getting an extension because I realize the DAC's purview comes to the realm in advising the district manager on matters for the Desert District and this is a national agenda. We would be the tail wagging the dog if we actually got that request.

But it's nice to dream, and every one of the concerns is actually founded, in that we are one of the resource advisory councils that has been extremely buried in very deep and contentious national policies, so we feel somewhat as we have the right to ask. But at the same time it is important to recognize that we are a regional council with a regional task to a regional district. So my expectations for an extension aren't the same.

But the planning process is a very interesting opportunity, as well as a very dangerous opportunity in terms of the possibility and the very real potential for public involvement to be cut back, you know. The intentions in terms of how the language is put out and how they want to make things better all sounds really well and good, but do the actual documents line up with that?

And so it's nice that we have limited comfort of knowing it's a very initial phase. There's no draft documents on the table, and there still will be plenty of more opportunities for robust public involvement. And I do believe there will be very strong public challenges to some of the changes that are being made specifically because they have a very real potential for diluting public participation.

So with that said on the 2.0 planning effort, I would like to recognize that we have a number of volunteers to do things for the Bureau of Land Management, and the bureau extends to us liability protection in the form of volunteer agreements so that, while we are out in the field doing various and sundry things to help the BLM, that we don't incur personal liability while we're trying to do good deeds.

And I would like to recognize the fact that Carl Symons in the Ridgecrest Field Office has managed to get our volunteer agreements signed again this year. We've been without agreements for a couple of years now, and it's very important that volunteers can go out into the field and know that they have protection while they're trying to help the BLM. So I want to say thank you to Carl for that on the record.

Also I would like to mention that in part of our own education some of the volunteers have been involved in a CASSP, California Archaeological Site Steward Program. It specifically trains us to recognize more specifically the cultural value of a lot of the resources that are out in the desert. It's not just a cool old can that you can take home. There's a lot of rules involved with what can and can't be taken, as well as how things can and can't be documented. There's a

lot of confidentiality in terms of what we know and how that information gets shared.

And I had a wonderful opportunity last weekend as a site steward to participate in a workshop where we learned a lot of recordation techniques that will be very useful to the bureau and will enhance our abilities as specifically designated site stewards to further help the BLM.

Now I come to that harder part of what I want to talk about this morning. We're going to get a presentation this afternoon about the implementation part of the DRECP, and it's all very well and good for us to start thinking about the process of moving forward on the DRECP. But I'm very much afraid and very much saddened by the fact that there are some very problematic things that happened along the way, and once again, a bulldozer is kind of coming along and attempting to bury some of the problems without further addressing them. I don't think it is beating a dead horse at this issue because the DRECP has not been signed, is not a done deal, but we do know that it is eventually going to happen.

And I would like for the council to either commit to spending time talking about the problems during the presentation period that we have allotted in

the afternoon or talk about it now. So I don't know which one the council has a preference for, but I would rather that we not just go forward talking about implementation without talking about some of these problems either now or later.

So I know that we have an allotted amount of time for talking about it later, and I don't know how much of that time is actually needed for a PowerPoint presentation. But does the council have a preference one way or the other about talking about this stuff now or later?

CHAIR BARRETT: Mark, as you indicated, maybe this afternoon would be the better opportunity, only partially because we have a presentation on the issue, but also we've got a number of public comment cards this morning. So to stay on schedule, if that's okay. Thank you.

MEMBER MUTH: That works for me.

MEMBER BANIS: And I'll have comments.

MEMBER ALGAZY: All right. Thank you for indulging me on that.

I have a more general concern that goes beyond the DRECP, and that has to do with a concern about our role as the DAC. And we've had reoccurring problems in the recent past where, as with the 2.0 planning process

and with the ACEC comment period on the DRECP, it's been very unfortunate that the comment deadlines that have been issued have not allowed the DAC the opportunity for formal comment.

And it is something that can't go without being acknowledged. There is a very real and present danger that the dilution of the DAC's purpose is happening not if purposefully but in fact as these processes are playing out. And I think that we need to go on record as reminding the BLM to remind those people higher up that Congress gave us a specific purpose to advise the manager and, through the manager, the director.

And we are being short circuited in our ability to do that which Congress specifically empowered us to do so that the -- and again, saying at the national level the 2.0, I don't expect the tail to wag the dog, but the DRECP is something that will profoundly affect the Desert District and something for which the BLM desperately should have the DAC's involvement. And it's more than unfortunate that that did not happen with the ACEC comment period.

So I think that we all need to have it on record as acknowledging that the BLM is effectually subverting Congress's will by having comment periods that don't coincide with the ability for us to have

formal comment.

All right. On a lighter note, I've been getting the weekly News Bytes from the BLM since I got on the DAC, and I thank Randy Banis for pointing that opportunity out to me. They have been very useful. But it occurred to me about a month ago that on their calendar they've never had any of the DAC meetings on their upcoming events.

So I sent them an email, and I said, "Hey, what's up with that?"

And they're like, "Oh, okay." And they sent me an email back a week later and said, "We'll have all the DAC meetings on the News Bytes from now on." So that was something that was very simple to take care of and went very well, and it's amazing what even a little word in the right place can do. So don't think there's a conspiracy behind everything, as Jennifer pointed out at this morning's meeting coming in.

And last thing, on a very high note, my daughter and her boyfriend are on vacation in Italy, and she sent us a picture this morning of her engagement ring.

(Applause.)

MEMBER ALGAZY: Thank you.

CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, Mark.

Any other council members wish to make a few comments?

We have Al. Thank you.

MEMBER MUTH: Unlike my loquacious colleagues, I would just simply ask to have two things put on the agenda for future meetings: Eagle Crest project and how it relates to the hydrology of the basin. I don't know what the particular name for that aquifer is, but there's an awful lot of fingers in it. And I think we should have a serious discussion about the project and the aquifer.

The other would be -- this was brought up yesterday when we were at Pisgah. I don't understand how all the existing management plans overlap and play, intermesh with the new national monument legislation and how those plans are included in the management plan that will be forthcoming for the new national monuments.

And to my friend Mark, sometimes a cigar is just a cigar.

CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, Al. I must acknowledge Al is actually leaving the country for many weeks and assisting in another country far, far away with his expertise over the next two months, which shows the dedication and the qualification that some of the members up here have. So thank you, Al, for that.

Any other council member reports? And thank you. I think we'll move on, then, to the public comment period. And I have a number of cards. So we will have to limit it to -- what? -- three minutes, I think, Steve?

MR. RAZO: Yes.

CHAIR BARRETT: If there is anybody else that would like to make a few comments at this stage, you'll have opportunity again during the day on the specific items on the agenda, but feel free.

Yeah, sorry.

MEMBER MITCHELL: Fell asleep here. Billy Mitchell, fourth-generation cattle rancher, Mojave Desert founding family here in Barstow. On the upcoming agenda we've got our ten-year renewals coming up for the last five ranching families that go back to the 1900s. So I would like that to be put on the agenda so we can keep track of that.

Also we've got two ranches that are trying to be retired that the ranching community don't feel were properly retired in the first place. I would like that to be on the agenda whenever the BLM's convenience, next meeting or whatever Katrina can do about it.

CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, Billy. I know the location hasn't been determined for our next meeting

yet, but there was talk it might be in Bishop. Then there was talk, as well, to either include in the field trip or some discussion with respect to Native American interests in that area. And I wasn't sure if we could add that or if you have additional comments on that from last night.

MEMBER ROBINSON: Yeah. We discussed last night about the possibility of the meeting being in Bishop, and there is a number of tribal entities up there that have real active environmental offices or have been involved in the communities around them. And actually the Forest Service and BLM regional office is on the Bishop reservation, and so it would be just a matter of getting ahold of those environmental offices and the tribal council and making those arrangements.

CHAIR BARRETT: Excellent. Thank you. With that, then, let's open it up for public comments. As I said, three minutes each.

And Daryl, first of all. Thank you so much, and good to see you again.

MR. AVERY: Good morning, council. So as the state safety manager for BLM here in California, every time that I am informed of or made aware of a serious injury or fatality in our land from the OHV community, it's always concerning. BLM has put forth a lot of

efforts to try and reduce the number of incidents on our land, but of course there's only so much that we can do.

And this is where I come to this council to either request from the council or through this council to the subgroups if you could assist us with some robust safety awareness campaigns for some of the local communities to try and increase the safety awareness and increase the importance of safety within the minds of those who enjoy the recreation activities on our lands.

Some individuals see these activities as inherently dangerous. Some people disagree with that. However, either way, no matter which side you're on, we should always put forth our best effort to ensure that we're trying to help reduce the number of injuries and fatalities on our land.

One thing that we've learned from the safety community that really works is generational-type teaching. And I think that, if we try to do some generational-type safety campaigning, that may really help us with reducing the number of incidents. In some cases, if we can actually make good contact with some of the children within families, children actually have the ability to have a positive impact on the parents at times.

So that is where I am requesting assistance

from this council or through this council to try to help us with reducing these incidents. Thank you.

MEMBER ALGAZY: Mr. Chairman, can I comment on that.

CHAIR BARRETT: Absolutely. Thank you, Mark.

MEMBER ALGAZY: I think that Randy Banis might be able to answer Daryl's question or concern even a little better than myself. But it is my understanding that each of the field offices has the ability to partner with user groups that do such training and several of the field offices have taken advantage of that. I know that Tom Zale has been very active in the El Centro with user groups down in the Glamis area and that Randy knows a lot about the efforts of Ed Waldheim working through the Friends of Jawbone and the Friends of El Mirage. They also have safety programs.

What could we possibly add to that? Do you have even a daydream of how the DAC could do something other than what the field offices are doing?

MR. AVERY: Yeah. And I have some thoughts, and at times I know BLM, I feel, can be limited at times as far as our reach goes. So I do believe that some of the subgroups may be able to reach a little farther into the communities, deeper into the communities.

But then also, when it comes to some of the

more innovative techniques to address safety, I believe that there may be more flexibility within the DAC or within the subgroups to try more innovative ways, because of course as a government entity, we are limited in some ways when it comes to what we can and cannot do or sometimes just budgetary constraints. So I do believe that the potential reach for one of those subgroups of this council may be a little bit farther than the BLM could possibly go.

Again, this is brainstorming kind of ideas about, you know, what can we do to try and reduce the incidents? Because of course we have been making effort over the years, and the numbers have varied from year to year when I go back and look at them. Now, I don't know if it's directly related to some type of campaign that we've put on or if it's just a fluctuation with the upturn and downturn of the economy. It's kind of hard to gauge that, but I do believe that, you know, there's a lot more that could always possibly be done.

And one thing I did forget to mention is that I am also here with Cedric Perry, because he is the district safety manager. So if any type of efforts were to kick off from one of the subgroups or from this council or if additional information is needed from BLM, he would probably be one of your contacts to work

directly with you, as I'll be back up in Sacramento. But hopefully that answers your question as far as what my thoughts are going forward.

MEMBER MITCHELL: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIR BARRETT: Yes.

MEMBER MITCHELL: I think I have a major concern where these cattle ranchers are involved. I'm between the three biggest OHV areas there are. You know, Soggy Dry Lake, not this one here, involves the Fisher family and on these -- what do they call them? -- kiosks or the signs you have going on these roads and restricted areas, there's nothing mentioned about cattle grazing in that area on that sign.

Now, we do have signs that say, "Domestic livestock," which apparently some of these people might think they're ostriches. I don't know. We have cattle guards, and they think that's to clean their tires off as they come into these ranches, which we're responsible for and have to dig out.

So I think these signs you have in these restricted areas on all these road designations going in there should specifically say to watch out for the livestock. There is a ranching community here, and it is not an OHV area. It is a corridor through there.

Now, personally, on my road, I posted

15-mile-an hour signs. When hit gets too out of line, I involve the sheriffs. And I know we can't solve -- or I can't solve all the OHV that's happening. They're not taking care of what they're supposed to. I know there's a lot of good people in District 37. I have personal friends in there. But there are some people that are not only breaking legs on my cattle and the Fisher Ranch running into them, which is almost impossible for me to catch in 29,000 acres with those hot rods they got.

I think radio programs like you had in Palm Springs -- it used to come up that you would hear them talking about different areas you can use, something that, signing. On a good note -- well, the main problem is there's no enforcement. There's not enough money for enforcement. They've got too much area to cover.

On the second thing, I was involved and have been with that King of the Hammers where that one event brings out the Johnson Valley, which might have 6,000 people in it -- brings out 70,000 people for a week straight that think they're just in the middle of nowhere and have no law enforcement whatever.

Katrina did a very good job two years ago of curtailing that. We had three people killed on a highway two years ago, I guess it was. After that

sheriffs, highway patrol, BLM this year Mike Ahrens out of Needles and whoever is out of Palm Springs really put the damper on it.

My intent or the cattlemen's intent are not to stop this, but we can't keep having this abuse to our ranches going through there. Somehow we've got to reach these people, whether it's signing saying there's a ranch in operation here. Maybe it will help. I don't know. But I get into a lot of confrontations with people over what they're supposed to do within the boundaries of my ranch and what they can do.

They can kill themselves in the OHV area if that's what they want. I can't do anything there. But while they're in my place, I've got grandkids riding horses. I've got cattle out with calves. While you're doing 80 miles an hour on one of those things with a hood on, you have no vision when a cow walks out. And I've lost three animals because of this. One motorcyclist that was there lifted out spent four months in a hospital.

Now, I don't know how we're going to solve it, but I think going in there on those signs that say the rules and regulations, there should be something underneath there about this operation that's from this boundary to the next checkpoint in there. And it might

help the people because, when they see domestic livestock, they have no idea the ranching community is still alive.

So that would be one of our ideas as a community that maybe you can do more signing, unless we can get more money for rangers, and I don't know you're going to do that. Thank you.

CHAIR BARRETT: Yes.

MEMBER BANIS: Thanks for coming down and saying this message. I can say that the two subgroups that work the OHV open areas, the Dumont Subgroup and the Imperial Sand Dunes Subgroup, I think, would welcome very much to work with Cedric on these issues. I know that both of the subgroups have talked about this, and we're confused about it at the same time because, when you have -- when somebody doesn't go home with their family that day, it's a serious tragedy.

But to put it up on a billboard and say, "Zero fatalities" -- oh, "One fatality this year," "Two fatalities this year," I mean, are we taking advantage of somebody else's pain and suffering and tragedy there? Can we work with that information and that data in more effective ways? We talk about it a lot, and we don't get to a conclusion. And so I think we'd really like to partner with the district and with the state to take

that next step. And so thank you for bringing that up.

CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, Daryl. And thank you again.

With respect to public comments, these are for items generally not on the agenda. But it is an opportunity for the public to make recommendations for a future agenda item. So with that, I think we're running a little behind time, so let's quickly go through.

Shirley Leeson. Thank you so much.

MS. LEESON: Good morning, gentlemen. I'm from ALAA, American Lands Access. I've seen a lot of you here before, and I would like to make one comment. You're all men. This is the first time that I have attended a meeting in several years where there were no women on the DAC committee.

I'm here this morning to enter into the record -- and you have a copy of two of the items, the L.A. Times article about aging rockhounds -- and I'm one of them -- also Senator Feinstein's letter because of the L.A. Times article.

The other item is a new find in Cady Mountain. It was recorded too late after the monument was put in place, but we decided that we would like a copy of it so that they know where the location is. So we're entering all of this into the record this morning. And thank you

for your time.

CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, Shirley.

And next public member is John Stewart. Thank you, John.

MR. STEWART: Good morning, council members. John Stewart with the California Four-Wheel Drive Association.

Some interesting comments provided by the gentleman from Sacramento and Mr. Mitchell. And coincidentally it is something that I wanted to bring to the council's attention. Within the State of California there is the Off-Highway Motor Vehicle Recreation Program, which is a division of California State Parks. That program was set up by California statute in 1973 and has been in operation continuously since.

One of the key components of that is a Grants and Cooperative Agreements Program. It is within that Grants and Cooperative Agreements Program there is a component for safety and education. There is a law enforcement component. There is an operations component. There is a restoration component.

With numbers up through 2012, the BLM statewide has received over \$157 million worth of grants from this program. The bulk of those grants have been awarded to Inyo-Kern, San Bernardino, Riverside and Imperial

Counties. So there is money available. It is something that within the OHV community we would like to see continued.

And I'm here to kind of request -- I know that the council cannot request an extension or a reauthorization of the program because of federal statute and conflict-of-interest issues. But I would encourage the council to put it on as a future agenda item to have a representative from the Off-Highway Motor Vehicle Recreation Division attend a council meeting to give a presentation to the council members about the program.

It is something that is cooperative agreements that -- OHV recreation occurs for the most part in California on Federal Lands, being Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management, and it is an important tool for you to be informed about and know about because there are options in there to garner income or money from the grants program in order to help some of the programs and some of your issues. Thank you.

CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, John.

MEMBER ALGAZY: Leslie?

CHAIR BARRETT: Yes. Thanks, Mark.

MEMBER ALGAZY: I would like to add on to what John said that very few people in the public realize how

much the BLM relies on those state grant monies for their law enforcement. And it really is a sad state of affairs that should have some more light shed on it. So I wholeheartedly agree with John's suggestion about having somebody from the state commission make a presentation.

CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, Mark.

Lisbet Thoresen. Thank you.

MS. THORESEN: Good morning. It's nice to be here today. I submitted a letter on behalf of the San Diego Mineral and Gem Society this morning and entered into record. There's copy for you, Randy, that I put at your table.

MEMBER BANIS: Thanks.

MS. THORESEN: And I sent copies also yesterday by email to the group.

I'm the editor of the group. I'm not a rockhound myself. Yesterday was the first opportunity for me actually ever, ever to go out on a rockhound site. I want to thank Katrina Symons for arranging it, Kimberly Erb for the incredible work that she has done all this time.

And it was an eye-opening experience to be able to see the value, the cultural value people have, the social value people have in doing this hobbyist

activity. And so much of the feeling and the sentiment behind it that some people think of as being exploitive and commercial, really, is about preserving value of and loving a natural resource and the land and what it produces.

I come from a cultural conservation background; that is, antiquities preservation. And I see the values the rockhound community and being able to continue doing what they do as consistent with those kinds of values we want to preserve for future generations the materials that people collect that they make things from to share and education and edify the public.

I would like to say also thank you to the BLM for publicizing on the website, saying that during the interim period, while the management plan is being drafted, that rockhounding will continue to be a permissible activity. We look forward to participating in the drafting of the management plan so that protection for this activity will be included pro forma hopefully in all management plans as a permissible recreational activity.

And so you can expect to hear more from our society, which represents 800 dues-paying members and 1,500 subscribers. We speak on behalf of many organizations and want to help publicize their values.

And so you can look forward to hearing from us and from me in the future. So thank you.

CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, Lisbet.

Next is Jay Erb. Thank you.

MR. ERB: Good morning, members of DAC. My name is Jay Erb, and I lost my notes. Anyway, I represent rockhounds, and I would like to thank the Barstow office and the DAC for allowing us to demonstrate and to explain our hobby. It was totally cool to have everybody come out.

As will be mentioned many times, I'm sure -- I need my notes -- our chief concern is access to sites where minerals occur. These sites are static. They are where they are, and once they've been eliminated from our collecting, we can't go back. They're, like, gone for forever.

Okay. Once again let me just say thank you, and I'm sorry.

MEMBER BANIS: It's all right.

MR. ERB: Thank you very much for yesterday.

MEMBER BANIS: Let me just say, Jay has addressed this council before many times, and when he has his notes, it's like poetry. I'm serious. He does. He sits down, and he writes poetry, and it's got a beginning, a middle and an end.

So, Jay, I understand, and I heard you, and thank you. We'll catch you next time.

CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, Jay, and, actually, my apologies. It should have been ladies first.

So Kim Erb, thank you. Kim, did you want to add more additional comments?

MS. CAMPELL-ERB: Definitely. Thought you'd never ask. Thank you deeply for giving me the opportunity to share the hobby with you a little bit yesterday. That was very special to me, and I was very pleased that there were so many other rockhounds there who also wanted to share the hobby with you.

As you know, there is a great deal of concern in the rockhound community because of the national monument designation of the Mojave Trails National Monument. Some of the most wonderful collecting areas are within the monument, and we are very concerned about the future of rockhounding there.

We deeply appreciate that there has been a clarification that rockhounding will continue but a little bit concerned still that that was a discretionary act and just as easily as it was clarified that we can continue, it could be later deemed that we can't continue collecting. So we would really like a little more than just the clarification. We would really like

something to come from the interior secretary saying, "Rockhounding continues in the monument." So we will be pursuing that, and we would appreciate some support.

But the other thing I wanted to say was, yesterday I didn't get to everything I wanted to say, so I'm going to say it now. I am on the board of the California Federation of Mineralogical Societies. I'm not here speaking on their behalf, but I can tell you that we really do love to support the earth sciences. And that is a major goal of ours, and we especially love to introduce others, and most specifically children, to rockhounding and collecting and the lapidary arts, because more than just enjoying the pretty rocks and learning how to display them, we know from experience that, when children in particular are exposed to rocks and minerals, that they start thinking about -- because this is the way we think -- what is it about that rock that makes it look like that and feel like that, and how on earth was it formed?

And we found that, especially children, when they're exposed at a young age to rocks and they learn to love them, that they become interested in geology and mineralogy. And that is one of the reasons why we have a really wonderful program to give grants and scholarships to students for the earth sciences.

But the other thing I want to say is, when those families come out to the desert and they collect, they don't just collect rocks. They're out there learning about the desert. They're out there appreciating the biology, the beautiful desert sceneries and gaining a love of the desert. And those people are going to be the people that are going to want to take care of the desert later.

So it's really important to us that you realize that as you are making your recommendations to the BLM and that the BLM consider that. We love the desert. We love the rocks, but we learn to love far more than the rocks. We really appreciate the desert, and we feel that rockhounding is an important thing that should be continued. So thank you.

CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, Kim.

And next up is Ruth, Ruth Hidalgo, please.
Thank you.

MS. HIDALGO: Hi. I'm back. In March I came to my first DAC meeting, and I was bewildered and heartbroken and very concerned about rockhounding in the national monument. This DAC has stepped up. I want to thank Randy for working with Feinstein's office to get a letter to the Department of Interior. I want to thank Katrina for getting a rockhound spot on the agenda

yesterday and everyone for putting up with all of us out there.

I want to piggyback on Kim's comments. She said things so much better than I possibly could, but on that end of it as far as reaching out, the Discover the Desert Program that you have, rockhounding would be an awesome way to get people to discover the desert. When we take people out to the desert that come to our clubs, they love it. They learn so much new. And I think that maybe rockhounds can work with the BLM in that regard. Again, thank you, everyone.

CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, Ruth. And last up is Andy, Andy Silva.

MR. SILVA: Good morning. I'm Andy Silva from the County of San Bernardino. It's good to see this panel full. It's hard to fill those seats because it's a big commitment.

We have our new national monument, as we knew we would get, so we look forward to working with BLM on the management plan. The county, the BLM interests overlap tremendously, and Katrina and our folks have a great working relationship. So I appreciate that.

On renewable energy, we are still developing our renewable energy element for our general plan. Some of the most contentious projects are not BrightSource or

Stateline or Soda Mountain, although I'm looking forward to that six-hour board of supervisors meeting. It's the 20 acre, two-megawatt projects, the hundred acre, five-megawatt projects that are of most concern to the community, especially in Lucerne Valley, Newberry, areas like that. So we're continuing to work on our renewable energy element of our general plan.

Our general plan, it works out good. It's time for a new general plan, but we're not going a general plan; we're going a county plan. So it's not just going to be a land use planning document. It's going to implement a vision for a county. A few years ago we adopted a county-wide vision that basically states, what do we want to be when we grow up in sustainability and economic development and those things? Working together are a big part of that.

Randy mentioned the Apple Valley HCP. San Bernardino Associated Governments, which is our transportation commission but also acts as a council of governments, is doing an inventory of all the HCPs and other conservation plans throughout the county and are down the road going to see how those can all tie together.

Our planning director has always been concerned about -- the resource agency wants to protect the

resource. And definitely, if you want to get from "A" to "B," where is "B"? What does it look like? And how do we get there while supporting economic development and growth and all the important stuff?

Also FYI, ravens have popped onto the board of supervisors radar based on concerns from constituents in the desert, farmers and just generally protecting the tortoise. So at the request of some of the constituents, our chairman asked us to submit a letter to director of Fish and Wildlife and also to Congressman Bishop, Chairman of the House Natural Resources, asking ravens be removed from the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. It's a treaty, so it's a tough hill to climb, but at least it's on our radar. The county has long advocated through the county that predator control be a part of protecting the tortoise. So there's a county update.

CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, Andy. I think it's so helpful to have basically feedback from the county. So thank you so much. And thank you to all public for your comments.

We have some further comments from council.

MEMBER MUTH: Yeah. I just wanted to point out that the raven issue is deeper than just the Migratory Bird Treaty. It's human behavior. I mean, it's closing

your dumpsters. You've heard all of this. It's not tossing that half-eaten hamburger out in the parking lot at McDonald's. All those things have contributed to the explosion of ravens. So it's not just a federal issue, a federal permit. It's a community issue, a county issue, a people issue that really does need to be solved. It's not just tortoises that the ravens are taking their toll on.

MEMBER BANIS: Andy, you spoke about the Apple Valley MSHCP. I forgot to mention that the state and federal wildlife agencies do not object to the Apple Valley's plan. Thank you.

MEMBER MITCHELL: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIR BARRETT: Yes.

MEMBER MITCHELL: I would just like to say one thing. When you refer to these land uses like grazing, rockhounding and stuff, if you look in the Taylor Grazing Act, the FLPMA, PRIA, they refer to it as the custom and culture of the land, so that actually entails everything, even up to OHV use. We've been doing it for eons.

So in writing your letters and stuff -- as the cattlemen have done it, we've always referred to that because it is our custom and culture of the land. So that might help in your letter-writing stuff. And I

would suggest, if you have nobody in San Bernardino County, I would get with your supervisors, your congressmen, because they all make decisions up there with Cook and the rest of them. And, even though you're in L.A. County or wherever, they can get with the people that are in this county. And that just makes them a lot stronger, you know. And it's worked for the cattlemen, so I know it will work.

We were talking about it last night. I know for a fact it will work for your group. You've got to reach out to them, even though you don't have a spokesman right here in San Bernardino. If you would like me to, I would speak to Congressman Cook for your people. In my grandfather's day they were prospectors. You are the same people today. You're just rockhounds now. That's all I have to say. Thank you.

CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, all. I know we're running a little over time, but it shows the depth and breadth of interest on various subjects here. So thank you for that.

With that, we would like to continue with the presentation on the Palen Renewable Energy Solar Project. I think Palm Springs Field Office will lead that presentation. We've been asked to clear the stage, so thank you.

(A PowerPoint presentation entitled "Palen Renewable Energy Solar Project Update" was given by Doug Herrema.)

MR. HERREMA: Happy to field any questions or comments.

MR. LIEBSCHER: Will Liebscher, public. What's the lake used for? Is that for fire control?

MR. HERREMA: With apologies, this is only my third week on the job. So to that question -- and I anticipate probably several others -- my answer will be I do not know, but I will find out and get back to you.

MS. THORESEN: Lisbet Thoresen. Are you going to publish this PowerPoint presentation on a website so that we might comment on greater detail on it?

MR. HERREMA: Yes. It will be posted on the DAC web page.

MS. THORESEN: What section? This section?

MR. RAZO: For this meeting, yes.

MS. THORESEN: Thank you.

MR. SMITH: Will Smith, public. I was listening to your presentation about how the project can change hands and change hands and change hands and change hands. And I'm wondering if these things, based on my investments in renewable energy, if we have any -- you may have a look at them, where they're going.

These projects seem to be in line with the old

real estate problem we had, where they're packaged and packaged and packaged then flipped and flipped and flipped. Can you guarantee that this project is not going to be flipped on someone else?

MR. HERREMA: We can't speculate upon the nature of private company acquisition.

MR. SMITH: One of the things I've noticed in being involved with the renewable energy elements in the San Bernardino County is that the photographs that are generally submitted are not reflective of the view of the human eye. And I notice that in your photographs there, that they do not reflect. When the human eye sees the particular site in a photograph, it doesn't match the human-eye perspective. The visual can be completely misleading.

The last comment is, is your six- to seven-year-old biological survey still valid? Thank you.

CHAIR BARRETT: Perhaps, if you don't mind from the presentation perspective, and we'll give an opportunity for the DAC members to discuss or make comments with respect to the presentation, and then we can open it up for more public comments. And we can actually take you up to the microphone as such, and everyone can hear a lot better. So if there are any

questions.

Billy, perhaps. Thank you.

MEMBER MITCHELL: Yeah. I obviously learned something down in the Coachella Valley that I never knew. I thought I knew a lot of things, but Al did a real good presentation down there about that -- is it fringe-toed lizard? -- which I would not never imagined. But where does that sand dune feed, like the other ones you showed us down by the windmill?

MEMBER MUTH: I've been involved with the Palen Project for a long time. I've testified against it at the California Energy Commission. I've supported Center for Biodiversity in their objections. So being an opponent to it is no big secret.

It doesn't matter how many times it changes hands. It doesn't matter how many times you do the biological surveys. The problems are not going to go away. The project is positioned in such a manner that it will have an impact on the sand transport corridor that comes down through there and feeds into the dunes systems that are to the southeast of the project. So it's not just a local impact. It's a regional impact that that project would have.

Also that population of Mojave fringe-toed lizards is the southernmost population of that species.

And as such, it is adapted to warmer and drier conditions than you find throughout the range. If it's climate change -- and as climate change begins to have an impact, that population could very well be extremely important in the long-term preservation of that special genetic composition that allows that animal to persist there.

So there's a whole lot of issues. You can redesign the technology, you can change the ownership, but the biological and physical process problems are not going to go away. If they want that project to go smoothly, move the darn thing out of the sand transport corridor. That's my take on it.

MEMBER MITCHELL: That's what I was wondering, if there's an alternative. I mean, obviously I'm not against energy. We're all going to have to have it in the future. Our grandkids are. Is there an option for them to move that anywhere?

I guess I can address that to you. Is there another option that you can get out of what he was just talking about to continue with that project, or is that the only option you have?

MR. HERREMA: I will ask and find out for you and respond to the council.

MEMBER MITCHELL: All right. Thank you.

CHAIR BARRETT: Are you okay, Al?

MEMBER MUTH: Yes.

CHAIR BARRETT: And Mark.

MEMBER ALGAZY: I would like to echo something Al said earlier, that the world around us is not static; it's dynamic. And new plans keep coming along, and more regulations keep coming along. And one of the things that I didn't see mentioned in the presentation that has been long overdue is that California has spent 100 years in denial, and we're now in the first step of our 12-step program of admitting we have a problem when it comes to water.

So we have a new regulation called AB32, and I'm very curious to know how AB32 interplays, in that it wasn't a regulation when all of this started. And, as the BLM is processing this application, a lot of the new projects' homework is being piggy-backed onto the old homework where AB32 wasn't involved. So could you speak to that.

MR. HERREMA: I'll find out and get back to you.

MEMBER BURKE: You'd make a great politician.

ACTING DIRECTOR ZALE: Let me just say these things that you're capturing are things that we'll need to take into account as we prepare the environmental

analysis for this. So I appreciate you bringing them up.

CHAIR BARRETT: Randy.

MEMBER BANIS: I would be curious, with the zoning the DRECP envisions for this area, is this part of a DFA?

MEMBER MUTH: Uh-huh.

MEMBER BANIS: Thank you. What's the vegetation impact on this P.V. versus, for example, the solar trough you said would have to be mowed, scraped? The towers have other impacts. I guess at Ivanpah they mowed a little bit. What happens to the vegetation under this project?

MR. HERREMA: If I understand correctly, there are a couple of options being discussed. One would be the scraping method. The other would be allowing for some natural contour and some natural vegetation to continue to persist, and that's being discussed and studied.

MEMBER BANIS: Thank you.

CHAIR BARRETT: Any additional comments from DAC members?

Hearing none from here, I would obviously encourage more public comment on this. It's such a large and important project in that area and big impact

in Riverside County. But I think it also shows how market forces changes technologies. Many of the large projects that are being proposed, whether it's in Riverside County or San Bernardino County or Kern County, are being driven by ultimately what the market will bear. And in this particular case it shows the evolution of technology in that area in which P.V. has become so much more the dominant factor in renewable energy and largely pushing aside wind technologies, geothermal to a great degree and, of course, clearly the other technologies that were once proposed for this site.

So it shows that, when we start to evaluate proposed projects, that we need to consider that ultimately the technology may change. And as a result, we should look at the whole range of impacts that that particular project might have.

And with that, Al, perhaps, another comment.

MEMBER MUTH: See what happens when you get me riled up? So another issue there is the hydrology. The estimates for the water use on the solar projects immediately to the north, the P.V. panels, all of a sudden they discovered they needed -- was it 50 more acre feet a year? -- just to keep the panels clean. And that request was granted.

So I suspect that you'll see the same thing with this project, and it's all coming out of the same aquifer, as far as I know, that the Eagle Crest is going to be pumping out of. And we go back to, we don't know anything about the aquifer. How much is there? We don't know. So that's another consideration when you look at that project. Thank you.

MEMBER ALGAZY: Leslie?

CHAIR BARRETT: Yes, Mark. Thank you.

MEMBER ALGAZY: It wasn't in the presentation, but I had read in the Palm Springs Field Office Report -- and I may be mistaken in what I read, but I thought I had read that under the first iteration of the project there was some groundbreaking and some initial grading that had been done. So I'm wondering if the third iteration of the project can completely piggyback on the water usage calculations of the initial grading that was done or if we'd be realistically looking at more water being used, because there was water used in the initial grading that was done then abandoned, plus the grading that will be needed to be done for the eventual project.

My math skills aren't the greatest, but I've developed a knack for translating the somewhat nebulous figures of acre feet into gallons. And my quick number

crunching told me that the third iteration alone is 300 million gallons of groundwater. That's a number that is very hard to put your head around but still a lot easier to put your head around than 850 acre feet.

CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, Mark.

No other council members. We'll once again open it up for some public comment. I don't have any speaker cards.

MR. STEWART: I do.

CHAIR BARRETT: I'm sorry.

MR. STEWART: I put mine in for all of them.

CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, John. Please, please, do.

MR. STEWART: Good morning, council members. John Stewart, California Four-Wheel Drive Association.

I am glad to see one thing, is that the design is going to something that is more aesthetically appropriate. There are a couple of items that really draw -- I need to draw your attention to focus on as this plays out. Number one is the transmission medium to get that power from the site, to the marketplace. As found in many areas throughout the Southern California desert region, there are projects being proposed right and left, and yet the power grid itself is at or near capacity.

Now, as these projects move forward, a singular one may not have an impact, but cumulative they could have a significant impact. So without due process consideration being given to the transmission mediums and the transmission corridors in the development of these projects, I think it is kind of premature to start permitting and building additional solar projects or even wind projects, you know. Why break ground on them if you can't get the energy to market?

And Al Muth pointed out very clearly the biologicals, the hydrology of that area. Previous desert planning in that found the Palen Dunes area to be an unacceptable place for a designated OHV area for the very reasons shown as biological considerations for this project.

And now this project comes along with a political support from the governor, from the administration, and all of a sudden it's okay? Somewhere political consideration, political correctness have trumped the environment, and that's flip-flop from what it should be. Thank you.

CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, John.

And I suppose I must -- in response to John's comments, I must acknowledge that BLM do actually require that the project developer show the capacity to

move the power to the market before they move forward on the permitting, which I must commend them at least on that.

But with that, Kim, please. Your eloquence is much needed. Thank you.

MS. CAMPBELL-ERB: Kim Campbell-Erb. I'm not sure about my eloquence, but from my time on the DAC, I had the fortune of being able to participate in some of the field trips for some of the solar projects that were in place. And what I was appalled by at these sites was the fact that -- I have a bit of a construction background -- those projects were graded. I would call it more of a fine grading. They were stripped. They were scraped, as it was described earlier. And that really shocked me.

But what shocked me more is that we were told that they used a plasticizer so that the water flow, when it rains, doesn't sink, doesn't go back to the aquifer. So not only do you have them using these vast amounts of water for the project, most of which apparently -- and the projects that were in place where vastly underestimated, but then you're not returning it to those aquifers. It's going where it doesn't belong. It's going somewhere unnatural.

So I hope that they are taking a look at, when

they review these projects, when they require what is evaluated in these projects -- looking at what has been learned, changing the way they study the hydrology so that it is really more effectively evaluated and considered when they go forward with the project.

And, again, after listening to Al for many years, I hope they consider maybe altering the site location so that there is less of an effect on the biology in the area. Thank you.

CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, Kim. Actually we have one more comment card. And if there are other members out there, please drop a comment card.

But this is Joseph, Joseph Goetz? Thank you, Joseph.

MR. GOETZ: Good morning to all of you. My name is Joe Goetz. I'm with the Pasadena Lapidary Society. I represent approximately 140 members, and my comment about this is, like, for -- well, I should also tell you I've had some 34 years with Southern California Edison before I retired.

And chances are that Palen they'll have to scrape because, if they allow for natural fauna or vegetation to be there, you're going to have snakes. And I know at Solar One on the heliostats they had snakes in the stands themselves. So if they need to

mitigate the dust, three-quarter crush works very nicely and also cuts down on the amount of vegetation.

The biggest problem with a lot of these is that, as rockhounds, it cuts into where we can have access. So basically that's what I wanted to say. Thank you.

CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, Joseph, and congratulations on your retirement.

MR. GOETZ: Thank you.

CHAIR BARRETT: Lisbet, thank you so much.

MS. THORESEN: Lisbet Thoresen. So speaking now as public, there were 12,000 letters submitted to the DRECP, a lot of them extremely critical, for not considering distributed renewable energy generation as an alternative among the plans. And it would seem, as speaking to your point -- I was reminded of it when you raised the comment about the technologies are changing rapidly and profoundly -- why are we talking about creating industrialized projects out in the desert when we should be thinking about creating energy where the energy is used? And we could just get rid of this whole issue of having to create these transmission corridors.

Speaking to what John Stewart was saying, that happens very often, having to go through Public Lands, and these projects in fact are not local. They have

more broad base, more broad-ranged impacts on the wider environment. And I wonder if Al Muth might speak more on that particular subject and prospects for the future. Thank you.

CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, Lisbet.

Al?

MEMBER MUTH: The question of industrial-scale development versus distributed power was one that we didn't debate but we discussed internally in the DAC. And my personal view is, I am in full accord with yours, that being that distributed energy is preferable along with conservation programs. But I don't think -- there's not as much money to be made that way, I think, is what it comes down to.

And also the DRECP was handed to us, and it did not have a provision in there to debate and discuss the relative merits of either distributed or industrial-scale technologies. So I think that's the reason it wasn't -- the DAC didn't do anything about that in our recommendations to the bureau. That was not within our purview at that point. But that's my take on it, and I'm in full agreement with you.

Do you ever fly into Ontario?

MS. THORESEN: Sorry?

MEMBER MUTH: Look at all the rooftops. There

are acres and acres of warehouses, and they're all staring up at you with this empty span of white asphalt roofing. To me, that makes sense. It doesn't make sense to go out and clear vast acreages of desert to put up industrial scale. That's my opinion on it.

Does the rest of the DAC have something?

MEMBER BANIS: Like you said.

CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, Al.

Mark?

MEMBER ALGAZY: We are in the wonderful position being on the DAC as being the interface between the public and the government. And one of the things that we recognized, even before the public comment period opened on the Draft EIS for the DRECP, was that we were going to get a lot of good information from the public and then have to try and sit down and figure out what we could do with it, if there was things that we could work with and where we could try to fit them in realistically with what our charge was to deliver to the government.

And I wouldn't say on a daily or a weekly basis, but a number of constituents have remained faithful to me personally since I got on the DAC with sending me information. And we're here to be your conduit. And if you guys know of things, you have a lot

more eyes and ears than we do, and we will take in what we can and see where we can fit it in with our charge.

So, by all means, don't give up, and push every button you can push. And if you think we've overlooked something, you can always ask us, "Hey, is there a way to try and fit this in?"

CHAIR BARRETT: Good. Thank you, Mark.

And we have one more public comment.

Susan? Susan Martin. Thank you, Susan.

MS. MARTIN: I am here representing American Lands Access Association. I happen to be secretary this year. I am a rockhound activist, but in addition to that, I also am a docent in the Antelope Valley Poppy Reserve.

I live in the Antelope Valley. Oh, my goodness -- we have those solar panels, and guess what? They graded the lands. Oh, my goodness. Dust everywhere. So I definitely would not ever be in favor of seeing grading. Not only that, there used to be poppies there. You can't find any now. If you don't grade it, the poppies can still come up. So my husband actually has a limerick, and the Discovery Center might want to use this in their Burma Shave thing.

"Solar panels in the city keep our deserts clean and pretty."

(Applause.)

MEMBER KENNEY: I like that.

MS. MARTIN: In addition to that, I'm a grandmother. And my six-year-old granddaughter loves painted lady butterflies, and I keep asking -- at the poppy reserve we are on the migratory path, and this year we found two, and they were so furtive, we didn't even get a picture of them.

Is there any -- and, Al, I think I'm speaking to you. I've been asking around. Is there any indication that solar panels do anything about butterfly migration? I can't find any information on that. But that's just my observation, because they're on the way to the poppy reserve, and there are a number of the solar projects. And I know the drought has played a big part this year, but I just wondered if all the solar farms had any impact on that.

MEMBER MUTH: Solar panels -- I am not aware of any detrimental impacts on migratory butterflies. There may be some heat generated in some local thermals, but that could sort of disrupt flight of individuals temporarily, but I'm not aware of any significant impacts. The power towers are different. They create thermals, and they fry a whole bunch of stuff, not just butterflies.

So does anybody have any --

MEMBER BANIS: The vegetation.

MEMBER MUTH: I'm sorry. I was thinking of the installed solar installations. But, yeah, if the vegetation is gone, the butterflies need a place to lay their eggs for the larvae. They're often quite specific in what they eat, the caterpillars. So in that regard, that would have an impact, as would any new roads or anything that disturbs the vegetation.

We have had a significant drought. A number of -- in my particular area, the Coachella Valley, on the floodplain of the research station at University of California Boyd Deep Canyon Desert Research Station, two years prior to this we had no annual plants because of the drought. And all of our populations crashed of rodents, insects, whatever. So that kind of an impact you'd expect to extend to the butterflies as they migrate and lay their eggs.

MS. MARTIN: Well, I do know that this year and the last couple of years have been miserable poppy years, and so that I can see where that can have an effect, too, and that's directly because of the drought.

In addition I would just like to say, as a homeowner, I have two and a half acres, and I do have 60 solar panels on my property. And we were the first

residential in the city of Lancaster. And, as a matter of fact, when the inspector came out, he had to make up the rules because there weren't any rules at that point. So I do understand solar.

And, as a matter of fact, I actually -- because we're all inundated with people who want to sell us solar panels. And I actually talked one off of the telephone. By the time I was done with him, he said, "I have to go."

MEMBER MUTH: Congratulations on that one.

MEMBER ROBINSON: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIR BARRETT: Yes. Thank you.

MEMBER ROBINSON: With regard to the solar panels, they also moved the population of ravens out farther because of resting places in the shade underneath the panels. And they've devastated populations of all different kinds -- butterflies, insects, snakes, lizards -- everywhere in the areas they move into. And, you know, it's a cumulative effect that people that brought ravens out in the desert in the first place from the mountains.

CHAIR BARRETT: Thanks. And thank you for all those comments. And in addition, with respect to distributed solar, I think we should pressure on the state level and county level that new buildings be

designed to be solar ready, essentially the roofs be able to take the load and have conduits or anchor points and so forth in those roofs. As Al pointed out, there are an awful lot of roofs out there. And to make them solar ready as part of new building standards would be appropriate, I think.

Finally on the DRECP, we've all had many issues and comments on that, and the goal, of course -- part of the DRECP was to focus solar development in specific areas. But that doesn't negate, you know, the need for the public to comment on what a particular project and what impacts it may have.

As Al pointed out, the DRECP is not the solution to every project that's out there. And although this project doesn't fall within the Desert Focus Area or is not using the Desert Focus Area of the DRECP to move forward on permitting, although it is within one, that doesn't mean that it's not without its significant issues. And so please feel free as the public to comment, irrespective of where these projects lie.

With that, I think we can close. Thank you for the limerick. Thank you so much. And with that, I think we can close for now for a quick break. We're somewhat back on schedule.

Thanks, Steve. How long, Steve, on the break?

MR. RAZO: Ten, 15.

CHAIR BARRETT: Ten, 15 minutes. That will give us all an opportunity. Thank you, all, so much. Thank you.

(Morning break was taken.)

CHAIR BARRETT: We're back on the agenda. And next is a presentation on the Route 66 Corridor Management Plan. Doran Sanchez is going to give that presentation. And please allow some of the council members the opportunity to ask some questions, and then we'll open it up for public comment. That way we make sure we get everybody and we get everyone, more important, on the record.

So, Doran, thank you so much for coming.

MR. SANCHEZ: Good morning, and thank you for the opportunity to tell the council about the great things that we're doing on Route 66.

I kind of have to reference a comment by Tom earlier. My first DAC meeting was March of 1990. I think geologically that makes me about 90 years old. But it's a good year to be 90. Glad to be on the road again.

And that leads us right into Route 66 and an update on the Corridor Management Plan. It began with a

vision five or six years ago, and now it's a reality. And it represents the commitment that all of us have, how we can work together to protect, preserve, restore and promote Route 66 and the adjacent Public Lands and how we can hopefully enhance economic and tourism development opportunities. So thank you very much.

And going back to the vision part, it started about five, six years ago when the Bureau of Land Management started an extraordinary partnership with the California Historic Route 66 Association. And what I would like to do is let them tell the story and let you meet our partners, a tremendous organization and what we have been doing for the last four or five years.

But first, if you have any questions for me, we can answer them at the end.

CHAIR BARRETT: Yes, please. Thank you.

MR. SANCHEZ: So I would like to introduce Glen Duncan and Lynne Miller. We will have a presentation, so you might want to go ahead and move now and be ready to go.

MR. DUNCAN: My name is Glen Duncan, president of the California Route 66 Association, and this is Lynne Miller, who is on our board of directors. And we were the primary liaisons on the Corridor Management Plan with Doran, and we're just thrilled to have had the

partnership with the BLM.

The BLM has just been terrific. We have the common goals of education, promotion and preservation. Of course, preservation when it deals with the context here in the desert, it also means conservation.

(A PowerPoint presentation entitled "Route 66 Partnership: BLM & CHR66A" was given by Glen Duncan and Lynne Miller.)

MR. LIEBSCHER: Have you presented any geocaches along the way for promotion and education of geocaching? Do you know what that is?

MS. MILLER: We absolutely know what that is. And that came up in several of our public meetings, and in our plan that is one of the strategies for marketing Route 66 because we recognize geocaching is a very, very popular, and there are already geocaches on Route 66 that people can access.

MR. LIEBSCHER: Good.

CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you so much for the presentation. And just from a formatting perspective, we'll allow some of the DAC members an opportunity to comment, if you don't mind, then open it up to the public so that way we get everybody.

So, with respect to that, and thank you, all. And let's open it up for a few questions, comments,

support from the DAC committee members.

Who would like to start?

MR. DUNCAN: I would just like to add that any input you can give, any ideas you might have to add to the CMP, we're all ears.

CHAIR BARRETT: Excellent. Thank you.

Supervisor?

MEMBER BENOIT: The CMP that you proposed for California segment, have there been others approved by the BLM or by agencies in other states?

MR. DUNCAN: There are, I think, three states that already have scenic byway status. And actually the Arroyo Seco Parkway in Los Angeles through Highland Park and South Pasadena does have National Scenic Byway status. But the bulk of our road is not.

MEMBER BENOIT: What are the chances that you're going to see that happening with funding for this?

MR. DUNCAN: I'm working on that. There are other -- the National Scenic Byway Foundation is very active on that. There is one person at the Federal Highways who was sort of responsible for the program who sort of put the stop sign on it. And we're trying to -- we may have to get -- we may have to get a letter from Jean Fuller and Dianne Feinstein and

Barbara Boxer and all of them in our state and several other states that in the same way got the rug pulled out from underneath them. It's sort of a crying shame that Federal Highways gave us the money, you know, \$175,000 to do the CMP and then they can't designate us.

MS. MILLER: We're this close (indicating).

MR. DUNCAN: Yes.

MS. MILLER: We've done all of the work. We've met all of the guidelines of the Federal Register and the legislation change, and we're not giving up.

MR. DUNCAN: And certainly this group could write a letter on our behalf too.

MEMBER BENOIT: Thank you.

MS MILLER: I might mention that we do have resolutions in support of our Corridor Management Plan from the city council of Needles, the city council of Barstow and also the San Bernardino County Board of Supervisors. So we really have a lot of support. We just need that opportunity to submit and get the designation.

CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you.

Billy?

MEMBER MITCHELL: Yeah. The city Oro Grande -- the town of Oro Grande, I guess, used to be all the tractor supplies, John Deere, Ford. The people that

have that now down through Oro Grande, are they participating in trying to help do anything with this? Do you know?

MR. SANCHEZ: No. The planning section for this CMP was from Needles to Barstow. So from Barstow west, that has not been analyzed or pursued yet.

MEMBER MITCHELL: I see. Okay.

MR. SANCHEZ: So if we get the additional funding, then the Barstow to Victorville would be the next logical section to work on a designation potential.

MEMBER MITCHELL: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIR BARRETT: Sorry, Mark. Thank you.

MEMBER ALGAZY: I see here an interesting opportunity to connect the dots. We had a presentation at our last DAC meeting from the Billy Holcomb Chapter of E Clampus Vitus, and they presented to our esteemed council here that one of the things they like to do is erect monuments and help in the preservation of things.

I'm seeing nods from recognition. So they have approached you about helping in your project?

MR. DUNCAN: No, but I'm very knowledgeable about the organization. Several of my close friends belong. So it's a good idea.

MEMBER FRANCIS: Seems like a natural.

MEMBER ALGAZY: It does seem like a natural for

them to be participating in your preservation and educational components.

MS. MILLER: They have already erected signage on many parts of Route 66. Yesterday I happened to read the sign on the Blue Cut marker on the newly constructed part of Route 66 in the Devore area. So they would be an excellent partner.

MEMBER FRANCIS: As far as the blacksmith shop with Rio Tinto, we may be interested in participating in that. I know that they're in the process of building a new wagon that will be in the Rose Bowl Parade in 2017, as well as there's work in the inaugurationsal parade in D.C. that same month. So I'll get my card and information. And so there might be at least capturing some of the work that's being done on the new set of wagons that may be of interest for a museum. Then we also have a foundation, so there may be some opportunities for partnership.

MS. MILLER: Right. Wonderful.

CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, Nate.

MEMBER ALGAZY: It was that easy.

CHAIR BARRETT: Randy?

MEMBER BANIS: Do I understand it correctly? I believe a Scenic Byway and National Scenic Trail requires an act of Congress.

MR. DUNCAN: National Scenic Byway is a Federal Highways decision. I think they have to go to Congress for the funding. I don't know if they go to Congress for designation. I don't think they do.

MEMBER BANIS: National Historic Trail requires an act of Congress. Thank you.

MS. MILLER: That is correct, yeah.

MEMBER BANIS: Sorry. Thank you.

MS. MILLER: Yeah.

CHAIR BARRETT: Excellent. Any further comment from the DAC? If not, we're going to open this up for public comment. I do have two cards, and I saw some hands being raised back there as well. Actually I have three. So if there are any additional folks, please drop a speaker's card with the effervescent Steve over there.

But we'll start with Marcia, Marcia Goetz. Thank you, Marcia.

MS. GOETZ: Thank you. Just a brief comment, because, as he was talking, it reminded me that my grandparents would always talk about having come out here on Route 66, and they had come, and they showed the dirt roads, how tough it was.

I'm with the Pasadena Lapidary Society. And on our field trips out to the Lavic area, we often go along

the old Route 66 that's there. We also make sure that we provide some educational information to the people that are attending the field trip. And we pointed out to them that the area through there is the Route 66, old Route 66.

And you should have seen them. They were all getting out their cameras and standing in the road and taking their pictures. And I believe that a lot of that area there is paved with some of the lavic that's from that area. And so they were down on the ground looking at the road. It was very, very educational and great fun for the kids. Thank you.

CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, Marcia. And thank you for bringing Joe out as well.

With that we have a second comment from Andy. Andy Silva, please. Thank you.

MR. SILVA: So just for the folks -- well, first I forgot to say welcome to San Bernardino County. Thanks for being here. I'm always happy to be in the desert instead of my cubicle. And thanks for the field trip, everybody who participated and worked so hard and the gem societies. That was awesome.

For the folks who weren't on the trip yesterday, Route 66 presents some particular challenges, namely 128 bridges that were built 80 years ago. Our

deputy director of public works who works on this was nice enough to come out on his day off and brief the group that was on the field trip.

So just to sort of recap that, we have 128 bridges that are made of wood and probably had a 20- to 30-year expected lifespan. Brendan's joke is, the only reason the bridges are standing is because the termites are holding hands. They're using duct tape and baling wire to hold the bridges together. A number of them have been weight limited. At some point bridges are going to have to close. We have to do it soon. It's washing the bridges on the road out.

So public works is being pretty creative. They're trying to do it. Getting through NEPA and CEQA, even for a project within the right-of-way, is difficult. And these bridges are historic, so you can't just go in and throw in a concrete bridge. They have to be historically appropriate and still engineered correctly. There is a template for bridges that will do that that we're looking at. We've got a couple of bridges funded.

We're trying to do a programmatic for the whole stretch between Barstow and Needles, sort of streamline that environmental review process. The bridges have been prioritized as far as which stretches are most

important for traffic, and those will be done first.

So getting funding is a challenge. There's some federal bridge funding, but that would be, like, one or two bridges a year, and there's 128 of these and some that are not even bridges because they're shorter than 20 feet, so they're not considered bridges. So that's an ongoing challenge as we do that.

Now we have the monument with the goal of driving traffic onto Route 66, so, you know, Congressman Lewis isn't there anymore. There is no such things as earmarks, so we've got to be creative to find funding to fix these up and deal with impacts, hopefully good impacts, of the monument that's designation is driving traffic.

Then one other thing, the folks who didn't hear me yesterday, I wanted to give props to my former boss former DAC member and former County Supervisor Brad Mitzelfelt. If you see those blue county number signs, those were his idea to bide some continuity, because, if you don't know, Main Street in Barstow is Route 66. So, anyway, it was the first county numbered road in, like, 40 or 50 years.

MS. MILLER: 1953 was the last one before ours.

MR. SILVA: So props to Brad for getting the signs up. You don't know that Seventh Street in

Victorville is Route 66. You don't know Fifth Street in Rialto is Route 66. Rancho has done a good job. So, anyway, just -- folks, we have a major engineering program with Route 66, but we're trying to work on it.

CHAIR BARRETT: And I thank you so much for giving that update from the county perspective.

And John. John Stewart, thank you.

MR. STEWART: Good morning, council.
John Stewart, California Four-Wheel Drive Association.

I congratulate the folks with the Route 66 Society for the work that they have done. You know, it's great. Preservation of history is very important to the Cal-Four members.

I would also like to point out that there is an opportunity. You had mentioned in your presentation that you're bringing into account the General Patton's use of the desert region. I would suggest a look or a discussion with the desert, the Patton Museum at Desert Center just outside of Palm Springs, as they have some historical coverage of the entire region, which does include your Route 66 segment, which may be of assistance to you as far as publicity, education, moving forward with other opportunities.

And the bureaucratic morass to move forward with overall funding is a tough, tough route to go. The

Federal Highway Administration is in struggles right now to re-authorize its program. And I really hope that you can get your funding. And I know that from Cal Four-Wheel's perspective, I can offer up that we stand here to help you advertise and get the word out if you need people to contact legislatures in order to promote and to ask for federal funding and letters of support for your efforts. So thank you.

MS. MILLER: Thank you.

CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, John.

Kim? Kim, we have the pleasure again. Thank you.

MS. CAMPELL-ERB: This is what happens when I come to the meetings. I was looking over the documents in the back for Route 66. I didn't see anything about rockhounding. There are rockhounding locations in close proximity to Route 66 where people have been coming for years and years and years. You need them. You need them on your list. It will bring people. There are people who will come from all over the world to collect rocks in this area. Just a thought. Thank you.

CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, Kim. And finally, John Smith. If there is anyone else, please get your comment up real quick. But, John, if you don't mind. Thank you.

MR. SMITH: John Smith, public, I suppose. I am at the moment.

Personal observation. There may be a lot of people here who have never experienced Route 66, but if you have a Lexus, you won't be able to. I suggest that maybe there might be a vendor's application for a fleet of 53 Chevys with no air-conditioning that you have to take a 30-mile stretch riding in. Then you'll get the flavor. And deteriorating bridges? Where's your sense of adventure?

Recently -- my jacket says "High Desert Roadsters." There's a few of us. All the jackets say "President" except for one. It says, "Personal A.D." (phonetic spelling). It's a very loose-knit group of people who are traditional roadsters. I've had the opportunity to run sections of Route 66 in an open-wheeled '29 Ford roadster with a flat end. The shiniest part is the nickel-plated grill shell. It's not your normal hot rod, but it's very reliable and home built. It's wonderful to get out where you can run without being molested by other traffic that is intent on running you over while you're out there to enjoy it.

An incident happened at the Bagdad Cafe, made famous by the movie called "Favorite." Recently about 30 of us ran out there for breakfast, such as it is, and

in the course of us leaving, a truckload -- a busload of French tourists arrived at the point.

Can you give me a few minutes? Is that my buzzer?

Anyway, they were overwhelmed. Route 66 draws people from all over the world seeking the sense of freedom that Route 66 presents that can be had nowhere else in the world. Nowhere can you look 100 miles and see what you see on the high deserts in Germany or France or anywhere in Europe. You don't get it, and they come here to see that because it's something they've never experienced.

The busload of French tourists all bailed off in astonishment because before them were 30 American hot rods, muscle cars and collectible cars. And only two people could speak English, and I took them in tow. It started out with two. It ended up with a whole busload, and I went down the line of cars and explained exactly what each car was. They left there in astonishment with their luck, put it that way, for that meeting.

And to give them even a little bit more, some of us left in clouds of smoke.

CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, John. Hopefully you don't leave today in a cloud of smoke.

But with no more public comments, I do want to

take the opportunity to again thank the -- you know, thank you all for all the hard work you put in. Do we have one more public comment? You have a card down there.

MR. MARTIN: I want to say one quick thing -- John Martin -- on route 66. I traveled Route 66 yesterday on the tour, and I just wanted to comment that it's exactly the way I remember it from 1954 until they built Interstate 40.

CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, John. Just in kind of wrapping it up, the presentation today is wonderful but only barely touches upon all the hard work and dedication you three put into this and the success that you've made. And so from the DAC, I know I speak for all of us when I say well done, and it's been a true sacrifice but rewarding, I'm sure, as well. And you've given us all the opportunity to continue to enjoy something that you hold dear. So thank you for that.

(Applause.)

MEMBER MITCHELL: For the second gentleman, do you have aluminum heads on that hot rod of yours?

MR. SMITH: There are four components on that car that are not on original Ford cars: Edlebrock heads and manifolds and Halibrand quick-change rear-end differential housing.

MEMBER MITCHELL: Didn't mean to be a headache.

MEMBER MUTH: Edlebrock heads and manifolds.

MEMBER ALGAZY: I did have one question for Diane. Did you actually put the lyrics to "Route 66" in the notes?

THE REPORTER: No. I got to take a break on the presentation.

CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you as well for the music. If you all come next time, we'll have some dancing as well. So thank you for that.

Doran, would you like to make some closing comments. Thank you.

MR. SANCHEZ: Just a couple. First of all, the county was an extraordinary partner in the development of the CMP, and as a result the San Bernardino Board of Supervisors passed a resolution with that partnership and, as Andy said, the condition of the road and the bridges, much which qualify for the listing on the register.

We had provided BLM the opportunity to write now three letters for major funding opportunities to help the county get some funds for road maintenance and repairs as well as the cities, which we are providing cost-share grant opportunities that the community can use for revitalization projects as we work towards

building a sustainable economic program as well as potential economic development. So there are a lot of good things that the CMP is doing. Scenic Byway designation would even further that along.

And for the comment on the Patton Museum, over the last three years -- we just finished writing a brand new brochure about Patton's eight camps here in California. It coordinated closely with the museum. Hopefully you received copies of that. If not, we'll get them to you. But that's been an extraordinary part of the CMP is recognizing the historical and cultural significance of our military history in California. And so we take all that into consideration and, as we move forward, would like further implementation. But, again, thank you, all, for this opportunity.

CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you again, Doran. Thank you.

Now we actually have a privilege. We have our own hot rod council member Bob Burke, who is going to give a presentation on bighorn sheep. And so I thank you for that.

Thank you, all.

MEMBER BURKE: This is off the record. John and I are not related. We may look alike, but we're not related.

MEMBER BENOIT: We could be.

MEMBER BURKE: Now you can go back on the record.

Hunting, fishing and bighorn sheep. I'm the vice president of the Society for the Conservation of Bighorn Sheep. We're the first bighorn sheep conservation group. We're 51 years old. For those of you that know anything about sheep hunting, desert bighorn sheep hunting is one of four North American wild sheep that we're able to hunt.

Desert bighorn hunting in the State of California has only been legal -- this year will make 28 years. It's a once-in-a-lifetime tag, unless you get an auction tag, and the last one went for \$150,000. So this will be the 28th year that I've applied for a tag that I still haven't been drawn.

So some bighorn sheep facts. They're about five feet. They can get up to 220 pounds for the rams; the ewes, 155 pounds. Ten- to 20-year lifespans on the animals.

The biggest thing here is some of the stuff that we've been told in the past that sheep aren't out at nighttime and so on and so forth -- somebody forgot to tell this guy that it was 3:00 in the morning. That's at the top of Ord Mountain at Willow Spring. The

bobcat thinks that the sheep doesn't see him. And then big daddy runs him off.

A little bit about the life history. Depending upon how much rainfall and how green it is will depend upon the lamb recruitment. They have babies all the time, it seems like. They can move over level ground about 30 miles an hour and uphill slopes about 15. Sometimes I think they move faster than that.

They eat whatever is available. They're very selective. They get the most that they can get out of what they eat. But water is the most important thing to bighorn sheep, along with everything else. The management and conservation of desert bighorn sheep is done through the California Department of Fish and Wildlife now and other governmental agencies and a non-governmental agencies, such as SCBS, Cal Wild Sheep, Wild Sheep Foundation and just a few.

Some of the biggest threats, predation, highways, solar fields.

This is where all the bighorn sheep, the populations are. Now, that's a pretty big area, but that doesn't mean that there's a lot of sheep in each one of those areas.

This camera program we started back in 2009 covered 19 water sources, 11 game trails. Right now we

have over half a million photos, and we've got cameras out there clicking pictures today.

This is why we do what we do, the little guy there.

This is on the back side of the Cady Mountains. Go back, Steve. That's inside the Cady Mountains, a couple of young ones there. Next one. Three moms, three lambs. These are all full of water, and they're drinking out of the little, itty-bitty metal container right there. This is plumbing from a rain mat that helps keep these full. This mast is part of a satellite monitoring system so we know when we need to go put water if we need to. And there's the "Ah" moment. Next.

Al, this is an old ram that had a broken horn, and actually when it grew down, it grew down in front of the muzzle and actually prevented him from eating and drinking. And he showed up at this water source. I've got about 3,000 photos of this guy, and then he laid down and died. Next.

Even snakes drink water. This is Aztec Spring, Ord Mountain. Randy, chukar.

MEMBER BANIS: Look at them all, getting hungry. It's lunch.

MEMBER BURKE: Now, birds are smarter than

humans. Rattlesnake is right there next to the tank. The birds are checking him out. They're really checking him out again. They give him a wide path, except for the one teenager. He wants to mess with the snake.

This is the back side of Ord Mountain at a place called Badger Spring. And for those of you that don't know, that's what a badger looks like in the wild.

Randy, more chukar. The bar is open. That's a dove.

MEMBER BANIS: No wonder there's no more chukar everywhere else. They're all with you.

MEMBER BURKE: And I'm not going to tell you where.

Okay. Golden eagles and chukar. This is the line in the sand. Everybody has to have water, and they kind of all get along.

Kane Springs. This is on the back side of the Newberry Mountains. And Billy is familiar with this one. Bighorn sheep coming in. There's water there, and there's a water tank there. Some young ones coming in. Now, when I first got involved with bighorn sheep, I was told, "You will never see cows and bighorn sheep eating, let alone being, in the same area." Next.

Somebody forgot to tell them. This is Willow Spring. This is at the top of Ord Mountain, very

nice big, big ram. They're a little camera shy. Randy, another chukar. This was one of our calendar pictures. We had a ewe come in and a golden eagle take off. That dry lake bed is Calico Dry Lake Bed, and that's Calico itself back there behind it, so it's not far from here. Next?

A mom and some younger ones working on their tan. This is in the Cady Mountains. Some more in the Cady Mountains, big tank right here. That's part of our water-monitoring system. This water system was the first one that was put in 30-some years ago.

This is what sinusitis looks like, which is sinusitis that you get -- well, bighorn sheep, it eats their horn core, and then their horns fall off. Next.

Everybody needs water. Next.

MEMBER BANIS: Do you notice the temperature up there, top right?

MEMBER BURKE: Yeah. That's not the hottest. Next.

This is a tenaja. Anybody know what a tenaja is? You rockhound people don't know what a tenaja is? It's a natural basin. There's a bobcat and a kitten, and there's water down there in the bottom of it. This is a beach in the North Bristol Mountains. Next.

The sheep like it. Every time it rains, that

fills up with water. That guy right there, he's about the same size as me, and you can see where the water line is up here. But when we get a really good rain event, that fills up with water in there. That's one of three water sources in the North Bristol Mountains.

Again they're camera shy. Now, when people are looking for bighorn sheep, they seem to always want to look for the horns. That right there is how we find them. We look for that big white spot, and when we -- when you start seeing white spots when you stop and get your binoculars out only to find out it's a big rock, we call those rock rams, but you're looking in the right direction now.

You can see that water is getting smaller and smaller and smaller as the month goes on. Next.

This is a game trail between the Cady Mountains and the Sleeping Beauties. This is where Calico Solar said there wasn't any bighorn sheep. You can see the power lines back there. Somebody forgot to tell the sheep that they weren't supposed to be there. Zzyzx. Everybody knows where that's at. Okay. North Bristol Mountains.

MR. RAZO: Is that temperature for real?

MEMBER BURKE: Yes, that's for real, 139 degrees. They're eating dirt. There's a mineral

content out there. I'm not sure what it is that they're eating, but they're kicking up and eating dirt. Where we were at yesterday, there's another small area there where they kick up and eat dirt there too.

MR. LIEBSCHER: That dirt keeps them cool in the summer. It does for me too. It was a joke.

MEMBER BURKE: You opened the door, so I'm just not going to say anything.

Now, we're developing a new way to try and identify bighorn sheep: retinal scan. This is North Bristols. The females, they don't like their face being shown. But the guys, they're kind of hams.

This particular ram, Rose, where have you seen that ram before?

MS. BRASHEAR: Discovery Center?

MEMBER BURKE: On the donut stand. That's where that picture came from was for that.

This is one of the older style. Leon Leseka, this is the old thing that he built. There is about 10,000 gallons underneath there.

September 18th, 2011, midnight, two mountain lions. September 22nd, the sheep came back, and it's full of water. Bobcat. Piute drinker, Mojave National Preserve, Piute Mountains, right in there. Everybody needs water, including the turkey vultures that are in

there every now and then, other birds of prey. Next.

Okay. What you didn't see yesterday was this tank, which is actually underground, and we put one in at Camp Cady to use it for a demonstration. We use the shade rocks for cover and concealment.

Okay. Twenty-three hundred gallons. I think that's wrong. I believe it is 2400 gallons. They are 192 inches by 102 inches by 30 inches high, 750 pounds. Eight of us pick it up and move it around. Rotationally molded so it has lifting lugs. We can make them in different colors, and we have a system for remote drinker systems, such as with the metal drinker box.

This is Omya Mine just basically across from Amboy Crater. We put this in. The mine actually helped us put it in, and then they started have contaminated calcium stuff for making Tums and Swiss Miss hot cocoa and what have you. And so they flew some guy out from Switzerland to figure out what was contaminating their stuff, and he went out to this site and said it's sheep crap. So if your hot cocoa tastes like crap, you know where it came from.

You can see they walk down in. This guy was at Big Gee, which is on the 15 side of the Cady Mountains. Now he's over in the Cady Mountains. Well, now he's dead, but old guy named Rocky. For some reasons

biologists don't like to name animals, but they'll put ear tags on them with numbers. Same difference.

This metal that you see here was a burro, slash, cattle-exclusion device. It's designed to where the sheep can get through but the cows can't and the burros can't. Since there's no more cattle in there and there's no burros in there, we took it down. We left the upright posts so I have places to put cameras.

Okay. This is where we were at yesterday. When you wanted to know what a stock tank was, that's a 500-gallon stock tank. Now, guys, when they go to the bar and start drinking, they want to fight. So he kicks him. The young guy over here says, "I'm out of here." And then turnabout is fair play.

Everybody needs water. This is a member of the desert survivors' group who complained about what we do filling his canteen from our water sources.

Route 66, Hodge Road, bighorn sheep right there, a young ram on his walkabout.

Apple Valley Airport, we chased him for three weeks trying to get him caught because he ended up in downtown Apple Valley at the Walmart.

MEMBER ROBINSON: There was a sale.

MEMBER BURKE: Four North American wild sheep: The dall sheep, the white one with the curly horns,

British Columbia, Canada and Alaska. You have the thin-horn sheep, the Rocky Mountain bighorn sheep. You have the desert bighorn sheep, and you have the stone sheep. California does not have any stone sheep. However, we do have the record for the largest stone sheep. This is on the road between Goode Spring and the California border.

During Christmastime somebody, besides decorating all the Joshua trees like Christmas trees, put sheep horns on a rock with a Rudolph nose. You'll never know what -- John, don't look at that, John. We had this out where Soda Mountain Solar is supposedly going in. This particular CHP officer is looking for the driver of a drunk-driving fatality. We were trying to catch bighorn sheep going under the freeway, but we got him instead.

Springs. Springs are very important. Coyotes. They actually dig to get the water out. Randy, big chukar. Everyone know what these black stripes are for? That's so you'll know what they look like coming off the grill. Randy, that's a quail. See the difference? The reason I pick on Randy is, he likes to think that -- he says he likes to think he's a chukar hunter, but he doesn't ever see any. Next.

Okay. This is in Morongo. There is a bear

laying in the water trough. That's Big Morongo Spring, actually, is what feeds that. And earlier Boo-Boo was there, and they were looking for Mr. Ranger. So next.

Any questions?

MEMBER BENOIT: Good job.

MR. LIEBSCHER: Could you speak to the --

MEMBER BURKE: Have you submitted a question card?

(Applause.)

MEMBER BURKE: We have a protocol.

MR. LIEBSCHER: Protocol?

CHAIR BARRETT: Bob, thank you so much. Thank you for the presentation. I wanted to give the opportunity to the DAC members if they have any further observations, questions, comments.

Please, Billy. Thank you.

MEMBER MITCHELL: On this deal when they run out of water, you got to haul it in on this new Antiquities Act thing. Is there any verbiage in there for, like, we have minimum use or to be able to do that, because I know in the old Wilderness Areas all the old guzzlers, there's many of them dry because they can't pack water on their back, and you don't expect them to, but they won't let them use a vehicle to get in there.

MEMBER BURKE: Actually the wording in the

monument designation says that nothing in the monument designation shall preclude the state wildlife management agency from managing their wildlife. So based on that and, with careful consideration through BLM Barstow Field Office, we're able to haul water when needed.

MEMBER MITCHELL: So, when a drought or that that's totally run out there, you don't have to let the animals go to another spring?

MEMBER BURKE: Right. Our new water system with our rain mat, two inches of annual rainfall keeps those 2400-gallon tanks full of water, once we get them started.

MEMBER MITCHELL: Good. Thank you.

CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, Billy.

MEMBER BURKE: Al, don't ask me nothing. Please, don't ask me nothing.

MEMBER BANIS: I've got a softball for you. What would happen to the sheep population in the desert if those guzzlers -- if you didn't put them in and maintain them? It's a softball.

MEMBER BURKE: We worked very, very hard to get the sheep population up to what it is now, and a lot of that was through habitat reconstruction and wildlife water.

But the important thing I want to say about the

water is, it's not just bighorn sheep. When we started our camera program, we had one of our board members said, "I want cameras that will only take pictures of bighorn sheep."

I said, "Well, okay, but everything drinks water." There's some pictures that I could have brought that I didn't. We have illegal aliens trying to get the water and taking a leak in the water and all kinds of stuff. So I have insects and birds and squirrels and all kinds of critters. As you saw the snake going in and getting a drink of water and coming back out.

MEMBER MITCHELL: Just for the public, the ranchers -- some of these ranches no longer have cattle on them, but the responsibility for the rancher is, not only do they own the water through the State of California, but it is our responsibility to keep those springs going. And when one of us get bought out or taken out due to restrictions, whatever happens to us, then that becomes their responsibility trying to keep these springs going.

And in the '50s, '60s, '70s, personally I was involved on one ranch with my grandparents. We ran water every two miles over 110,000 acres, and how they determined that and how we do that is with the Bureau of Land Management all under Section 15 of the Taylor

Grazing Act.

And what that does is, the money we pay to run cattle on federal land, 50 percent comes back to the County of San Bernardino in order to enhance the wildlife and for domestic livestock. So through my history and familiar his history and others in the East Mojave, that's how most of this has been developed and allowed these animals to flourish.

When these ranches get taken out or, like the park, parts of the park they remove the water source and try to locate things right back on one spring, which obviously you can see there's going to be too many animals, and there's going to be a decline -- and I'm sure Bob will agree -- in all the animals, you know, sheep, coyotes everything. Anyway, I just thought I would explain that to you guys. Thank you.

CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, Billy. And thank you, both Billy and Bob, for all your hard work on not only preservation but the reintroduction of many of these animals into the desert. So thank you so much.

And this will be an opportunity for the public to make some comments. And it's certainly been an interesting presentation. So feel free.

MEMBER BURKE: Your question about poaching, I'll say two things. Part of the problem with the

poaching is punishment if they get caught. We had a poaching incident two years ago, Sandy Valley meat hunters. I mean, they weren't -- I mean, the bighorn sheep skull and horns, no taxidermist will do a mount for that unless it has the proper core. Fish and game will drill a hole and put a plug in, and that lets the taxidermist know that that was a legally-taken animal. So trophy hunters won't go poach one to have it mounted and put on a wall somewhere.

But we had some illegal aliens, illegal immigrants, poach a ewe in Sandy Valley. They were caught. They were prosecuted in the San Bernardino County courts. They were told they couldn't have a California hunting license ever again, but they didn't have one to begin with, and they were fined \$500 because it's a misdemeanor. It's not a felony.

So there's groups like mine and some others that are petitioning the government to through legislation to raise poaching -- the fines and so on to be incumbent upon the resource.

Does that answer your question?

MR. LIEBSCHER: Yeah. And do you preserve these guys so you can hunt them?

MEMBER BURKE: Do I preserve them? I conserve them. I'm not a preservationist. I'm a

conservationist, and I only harvest mature animals to ensure the progression of the species.

MR. LIEBSCHER: And how many of those are there permitted a year?

MEMBER BURKE: Fourteen, I think. Fourteen tags this year. We had a die-off in the Old Dad Mountains because somebody let a goat use -- a feral goat, domesticated goat, loose, and they carried disease. Al can explain that better than I can, but they carry disease that doesn't bother them but kills wild sheep.

And that same year we had a truckload of domestic sheep that were headed to slaughter that were sick and dying in the back of a semi trailer that someone let go at Halloron Springs. And again, they carry that disease which causes problems for the wild sheep. So we lost -- at one point we were up to 32 tags for the entire State of California. And now we're at, I think, 14 tags because of that.

MEMBER BANIS: Bob, getting a tag is no guarantee you're going to get an animal.

MEMBER BURKE: That's why people pay a lot of money for a guide.

MEMBER BANIS: That's what I was going to say. A lot of them do enlist guides.

MEMBER BURKE: Or unless they're me. There's only nine zones where bighorn sheep are allowed to be hunted in the State of California. The Cady Mountain Range is a new zone. Where we were at in the Newberry Mountains yesterday, that's not a hunting zone. That's just water so that we can help get the herd back up where it needs to be.

CHAIR BARRETT: Mark?

MEMBER ALGAZY: Touch on funding. Those tanks don't look like they're cheap to make.

MEMBER BURKE: That's the funding (indicating his own wallet). We buy them ourselves. We actually own the patent and the mold, and then what we do, sell those tanks. If anybody is interested, we do sell them. Non-profits get a better price than solar fields, but they're not really that expensive. The rain mat is probably more expensive.

John.

MEMBER BENOIT: So are you a non-profit that someone can contribute to?

MEMBER BURKE: Yes.

MEMBER BENOIT: For the record can you tell us the contact information.

MEMBER BURKE: Sure. Me. Society for the Conservation of Bighorn Sheep.

MEMBER BENOIT: Thank you.

CHAIR BARRETT: John? John Stewart. Thank you.

MR. STEWART: Good morning, commissioners, John Stewart California Four-Wheel Drive Association.

Thank you, Bob, for your entertaining display. Growing up in southern Idaho, I remember times when they actually began a stock of bighorn sheep population in the Owyhee Mountains in southwestern Idaho. That population, that trial population came from the Southern California deserts. That population is also showing signs of increasing and crashing, dependent upon diseases, predators. And, like Bob said, most important thing is water. Sheep need water. All animals need water.

And I did spend a few years working with the Society for Conservation of Bighorn Sheep and maintaining some of these guzzlers. Yeah, that hike up the Iron Mountains, that guzzler up there, that's a brutal hike just to check the condition of the guzzler. Most recently the Orocochia Mountains -- there's some great places up there, and they actually had to drag a pipeline in from the Coachella Canal in order to fill a guzzler after one time for repair of the drinker box.

But, yes, all of the volunteers do an exemplary

job. It is a commitment, and it is all personally funded, donation funded. So thank you to the society and for your efforts to move things forward. And if you haven't seen a sheep in a while, they are magnificent. So thank you.

CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, John.

Billy?

MEMBER MITCHELL: Yeah, Bob. The tags that sold, does any of that have money come back to the one tag that sold for \$150?

MEMBER BURKE: You mean 150,000?

MEMBER MITCHELL: A hundred fifty thousand, yeah. Does any of that come back to help with your guys' costs?

MEMBER BURKE: It goes back to the resource. That tag was auctioned off at the Wild Sheep Foundation Auction in Reno, and that money goes back into California Department of Fish and Wildlife Big Game Management Fund.

MEMBER MITCHELL: But does that eventually get back to the local area here? Do you know?

MEMBER BURKE: Eventually, yes, through grants and that.

MEMBER MITCHELL: Okay. All right. Thank you.

MEMBER BURKE: We just got two \$90,000 grants.

We partner sometimes with 29 Palms, for example. Check my time. The base out at 29 Palms, they decided they wanted to help with the bighorn sheep, so we've got four systems out there now that we just got done putting in. DOD uses our tanks for training. What I mean by that is, they set safe charges the right size and then blow up ordnance, and our hole is already dug for us then. And we just clean the hole out, put the tank in, cover it back up. But it works.

And Department of Defense has been very good about purchasing our tanks, and we provide the labor, and the military provides some labor through other means. It works very well.

Al?

MEMBER MUTH: Just a bit of biological nit-picking. Not all animals drink water.

MEMBER BURKE: That's true.

MR. MATTHEWS: Kangaroo rats, spiny mice, a number of other rodents never require water. You can keep them on dry seed their entire life. We also have a number of desert lizards that in captivity, arguably, yeah, they'll under certain circumstances drink water. But for the most part they get it out of their food like the rodents do. They've got really good kidneys for those sorts of things and a number of adaptations to

reduce water loss. That's how they do it. But big things like your sheep, yeah, they need water.

MEMBER BURKE: That's why I'm not a biologist.

CHAIR BARRETT: No further questions, Bob. Thank you so much. And to all those who volunteer their efforts as well, thank you for this.

(Applause.)

CHAIR BARRETT: Steve, I'm going to take a little bit of guidance here. We're actually ahead of schedule, and if you know from the agenda, we've got a sizeable gap before we all come back. Now, there are some members of the public who would clearly probably only attend the afternoon session, possibly. And as a result I don't want to mess up their opportunity to come and listen to some of the presentations.

So, Steve, if you don't mind, in order to move things along, I'd like to take the end of the agenda and move it to the front of the afternoon agenda.

MR. RAZO: Sure. That's fine.

CHAIR BARRETT: Would that be fine? Essentially we're looking at the subgroup reports, the questions on the subgroup reports and the public questions and so forth on subgroups. Have that first at 1:15? Would that work?

MR. RAZO: Yeah.

CHAIR BARRETT: That would bring us back a half an hour earlier than the agenda's schedule. But it will get us out so much earlier as well.

MEMBER MITCHELL: I'll second it.

CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, Billy, on that. That keeps the same timing on the presentations just in case somebody arrives in the afternoon but allows us all to leave a half an hour earlier than scheduled. So if that's okay, we'll all be back at 1:15 instead of 1:45 to listen to the subgroup reports.

With that, we're adjourned until then. Have a good lunch.

(A lunch break was taken.)

CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, all, for coming back from lunch. And for those who are still with us, I mentioned just before lunch we are going to do a slight reordering to the agenda to give those who are basically arriving this afternoon for those presentations the opportunity to still hear them by switching the agenda to bring the subgroup reports to the front.

And as a result we're going to start with the various subgroups. If there is anyone on the DAC who's prepared to present a subgroup report, we would be much pleased to hear it at this stage.

MEMBER BANIS: I'm happy to report on

Dumont Dunes, and that is we haven't met since the last meeting, so our next meeting will be right before the September DAC meeting, one week before the September DAC meeting. We'll be having a Dumont Dunes meeting on the Tuesday before, and it will be at Barstow. But until then the group is taking the summer off. Thanks.

MEMBER BURKE: Go play in the sand dunes.

MEMBER BANIS: Play in the dunes. And if I may, Tom Acuna, the former chairman of the DAC, is the chair of the Imperial Sand Dunes Subgroup, and he sent an email to report on their meeting of May 19th. And there's some interesting highlights. The dune season down at Imperial Sand Dunes generated 777,000 visitation days, 777,000. Two point nine million was collected in user fees, and about 20 percent of that goes to the cost of collection, which is actually down a lot, down a lot.

They've been removing sand from roads. That's really a big problem down there. The sand accumulates on the roads, and the RV's can't get through. That needs to be removed. Restroom maintenance. Also interesting, they're building their Facebook presence. This is interesting.

The past season law enforcement reported 25,000 visitor contacts out in the dunes, 25,000 visitor contacts, 5900 warnings, resulting in 1400 citations,

which is down by 43 percent, and only 103 arrests for season. That's incredible. And EMS had -- get this. There are 319 calls in the season, with a 63-percent response time of one to nine minutes. In the middle of a sand dune, 63 percent were reached in one to nine minutes. That's amazing.

So congratulations, from my observations, to these reports for the management down at the Imperial Sand Dunes. But mostly thanks to the subgroup members who are working on all of our behalf. We have a group of members of the public who we don't even see unless we go down to El Centro. They'll come to our meetings, and they meet every couple of months for us and report to us. And when they see something, a red flag, they let us know and they'll ask for our help. But it looks like they're not asking for our help today. Thank you.

ACTING DIRECTOR ZALE: I don't have any favorites, of course, but that El Centro Field Office does a pretty good job.

CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you.

MEMBER BANIS: Lastly those are the only subgroups that have met, actively met. Is Connecting People With the Desert on hiatus at this time?

MR. RAZO: Yeah.

MEMBER BANIS: And just a mention to everybody.

At the last DAC meeting we voted to reconstitute the Special Recreation Permit Subgroup. Those applications, the call for applications was published in the Federal Register. Applications, I believe, have been received, and the deadline, I think, is the end of next week.

So what I'd like to suggest, if that's okay, you recall that this subgroup, one of the big reasons we voted to reconstitute this subgroup is because the state office has directed the Desert District to try a pilot program that can help reduce potentially -- might potentially reduce the cost recovery burden on organizations doing permits.

And there is a review in Washington, D.C. right now of the SRP whole process. I know because I was called a couple of weeks ago and interviewed on it. So in my opinion I think this SRP group really needs to come together and start meeting and start reporting to us.

And so with that, I would like to -- our normal process in the past has been that the chairman receives the applications from Steve and the chairman reviews and then makes a recommendation to this full group, and we say "Aye" or "Nay," and then they're off. In this case our next meeting isn't until September. What I'd like

to do is for us to publicly put forward, perhaps, a process that we agree with that Leslie can start to get these things going without having to wait for September for us to take a vote.

So I'm just curious. I think, Leslie, I would be curious to hear your comments if that's what you want to do. Or do we want to slow this boat down to September on this one issue? I think that would be a mistake. Tom is saying we don't want to slow the boat. So, Leslie, would you be willing to do that? Do you have a process you would like to suggest or something?

CHAIR BARRETT: Any other comments? Billy?

MEMBER MITCHELL: How many people is going to be on that, you said?

MR. RAZO: It could be eight.

MEMBER BANIS: I think it was about eight. Six to nine, I think it was.

MR. RAZO: Eight to 12.

MEMBER BANIS: Eight to 12, an odd number, preferably.

MEMBER MITCHELL: Myself, if Leslie wants to okay it, I see no problem. I don't know about the rest of you. By the time you wait for that, you'll just be three more months behind, so -- if he's the chair, but I guess he's got my vote.

CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, Billy. Mark, thank you.

MEMBER ALGAZY: For those of us who don't have short-term amnesia, I recall at our last DAC meeting that we had Seth make a very impassioned plea to get the DAC involved with something, and we said we have channels, we have ways of doing things and there is an order to things and things have to be brought up in one meeting and then voted on in another meeting. And now I'm hearing a very, very different voice come out of the DAC.

And I think, while you may be looking at this as an ends-justify-the-means kind of situation, I also think it's kind of two faced, and I'm embarrassed on behalf of what happened to Seth at the last meeting.

MEMBER MITCHELL: I know I get involved with a lot of -- what do you call it? -- I guess, phone conferences. What would be the problem if we handled it that way, set up a time, and then we could be discussing it over something like that? Would there be a problem with that? I mean, we weren't physically there, but it still might put Seth in a predicament like you just said, and we could still have a vote like that. Is there a problem with that?

MEMBER MUTH: At the last meeting Seth was

requesting a formal recommendation from the DAC to the bureau. I don't think that's happening in this case. I don't think they're exactly the same sort of an issue, unless I missed what was going on.

So Leslie.

CHAIR BARRETT: Thanks, Al. I just want to make sure. No further comments?

Sorry, Bob.

MEMBER BURKE: I'm a firm believer that, if we have a system in place, that we follow that system and not play favorites one way or the other.

ACTING DIRECTOR ZALE: Yeah. So I believe -- and, Steve, correct me if I'm wrong. But there is precedence for the DAC to work together outside of the normal meeting schedule when time is of the essence and the matters are, I think, fairly straightforward. So I would think that, you know, appointing a subgroup is something that could take place in that forum, and I would hope it wouldn't be delayed until September because there's a lot of work that needs to be done and we really do need the advice that a subgroup would provide for us.

MR. RAZO: And you can lay the groundwork in between meetings and discuss. You could have working sessions, is what they're called, so that ultimately in

September you report to the public, you know, what you've done and preferably you don't vote on anything per se but hang onto votes until the public meeting so that they witness that and then can react to it.

CHAIR BARRETT: Excellent. Thank you. In light of that, then, we can certainly meet and discuss the proposed members. We consider them provisional until such time as we can reconstitute and vote on the membership. But in the interim they'll have the opportunity, obviously, to work and meet and confer. And we'll bring it back here -- well, not here but at the next meeting, and hopefully we won't be embarrassed by that. So thank you, all, for your participation in that.

And just in light of the agenda and so forth, is there any questions with respect to the subgroup reports or lack thereof? With none from the public, I would like to move forward to the field office reports, and specifically if there are no presentations on any of the field office reports, which there not often are, are there any questions from the DAC members with respect to those reports?

Oh, Bob, thank you.

MEMBER BURKE: I think the Barstow Field Office field report was awesome, along with the field trip.

MS. SYMONS: Thank you, Bob.

CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you. And just because you brought Barstow up, Bob, I hope you don't mind, Katrina, I'll ask you a question.

MS. SYMONS: Okay.

CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you. And I must say I always get value from reading these reports. So thank you on that.

One that was of particular interest to me was the DWP Path 46 Project. And in reading the BLM action and reading what is being proposed by DWP, I thought to myself, well, it's not just DWP that's in the desert with sagging lines. It's SCE and to some extent Metropolitan Water District, and there's a number of even some private companies out there. Can you run through for the benefit of the public the kind of scope of work involved in what DWP are proposing, and then perhaps we can opine as to whether that work needs to be done by other agencies as well. Thank you.

MS. SYMONS: So at the last DAC meeting the same question was raised, and the same rule applies from a safety standpoint. Wherever you have a designated route that goes underneath the power line transmissions, there has to be a certain safety distance between the road and the line itself, and lines tend to sag, given

temperatures.

So even though DWP is the first one out the chute, anybody else that has a transmission line on Public Lands where there is a designated route that goes underneath it will need to wind up going through the process of making sure that we have the proper height between the ground and the potential for the sag in the line.

CHAIR BARRETT: Thanks. And while you're here, I understand that the Abengoa Solar Project is going through a transition with respect to ownership. Have you any further update on that?

MS. SYMONS: No.

CHAIR BARRETT: Okay. And also within Palm Springs I see that they're an LLC on the proposed transmission line coming from Arizona, so it may be interesting to see how they reconstitute on that, too. And any other questions?

Oh, Mark, thank you.

MEMBER ALGAZY: I had actually emailed Katrina. Unfortunately there was a glitch in the electronics and she wasn't able to get the message in time. We started the discussion on the Iron Age reprocessing of old ore on the site at the last meeting, and I had a question about water consumption at that site. And in the

meantime Katrina has been very diligent in getting more information about that.

And if I understood the email correctly, they use some aerial imagery to determine that, based on the size of the tailings that were going to get reworked, it would take 15 years at the water use estimate that they had to go through all of that ore so that the nine acre feet would be a repeatable commodity over the course of the 15 years.

And then my follow-up question to that would be a determination of the groundwater resource in that area, how the overlay of the AB32 issue plays into that situation, whether that was a heavily impacted resource before they make their final determination. But unfortunately she couldn't answer the question in time because I didn't get it to her in time, so I just wanted everybody to know that I have every reason to expect Katrina will be looking at the AB32 impacts as they move forward.

MS. SYMONS: Yeah. So my response to Mark on the side was that the California Desert District no longer has a district hydrologist, and so we are seeking assistance from hydrologists from outside the state in order to help us do the review of our projects, of which one of them will be the Iron Age Mine, because right now

what's being proposed is the drilling of a well and the use of, give or take, nine million gallons annually for 15 years in order to support that operation.

It certainly will take the review of a hydrologist to make sure that the environmental document adequately discloses the impacts of the operation on groundwater.

CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, Katrina.

Any further questions from the DAC members on any of the field reports?

MEMBER ALGAZY: I had a question on the Ridgecrest field report as well. If you haven't noticed, I have a heartburn about groundwater.

In the report regarding Haiwee and the water consumption for Haiwee, I know that lease sales are being considered coming up in October and statistics on Haiwee water consumption were supposed to be available as of March, two months ago. And so I sent Carl an email a couple of days ago also asking if we had that information about the water consumption on Haiwee so that we could get an idea of consumption versus the amount of electricity that's actually being generated, kind of a cost-benefit analysis, you know, what the bang for the buck is.

MR. SYMONS: The water consumption reports are

finished, and they're in the BLM, and we're in the process of incorporating those into the final documents, the decision. What I could do is check to see if we can release those reports out as stand-alone reports out to the public or whether or not we have to finish our analysis and put them in context or not. I can get back to you, but the reports are done between binary and flash and consumption.

MEMBER ALGAZY: When the reports are done, is the water usage weighed against the electricity that's produced, that bang-for-the-buck analysis?

MR. SYMONS: I don't know if it's -- as far as trying to weigh that, I don't believe that there's a scale into it. It will be water consumption and what that effect will have. I would have to go back and look at the exact section to see what analysis they did in their economic, socioeconomic one.

As you know, that report, when it got finished -- now they're into the process of redoing it -- was sent to Washington prior to my coming in. Once they incorporate those, it will come back to me for review, and that hasn't happened yet. As soon as I get that back and it's incorporated into the contractor, I'll take an analysis and I'll report back to you.

MEMBER ALGAZY: Okay. I just want to make the

point a little bit clearer. Why I'm asking is, we've had a lot of public focus between target energy goals on solar projects and what they actually deliver. But I don't think anybody really understands between the targeted goal of injecting that groundwater and the geothermal resources versus what we get back, if it's anywhere near as a percentage of what the predictor model is for it.

MR. SYMONS: For those of you who weren't familiar with it, that's a potential geothermal lease area just north of Coso Junction up along 395.

CHAIR BARRETT: Excellent. Thank you, Carl. Thank you, Mark.

Yes, please, Jim. Thank you.

MEMBER KENNEY: This is about the Camino Project. It's pretty big, what you've got in here. And refresh my memory where actually it is and what they're proposing to do.

MR. SYMONS: The Camino Project is one of the sections that was the Tylerhorse Wind Project. The Tylerhorse Wind Project, they redrew that application. That was one that had a little piece where the PCT went through and then along the bigger section. There's a map in the report. It's basically outside of Mojave. They're in the wind farms. It's surrounded by wind

turbines right now in that area.

Right now we're scheduling a public meeting for the variance process, so it has to go through the variance process, because under the solar PEIS, just over half of that section was in the variance lands. And under DRECP, that would be a Development Focus Area, but DRECP is not signed and is not enacted yet, so we have to go by what we have now.

So hopefully here -- I believe it will be right around the middle -- 15th, 16th of June we're going to try to schedule a meeting. It will be published in the papers in both the Lancaster and Ridgecrest areas, Mojave, Tehachapi for hearing. And BLM will have to make a determination on whether or not the project will go forward through the variance process. It's 44 megawatt.

MEMBER KENNEY: Okay. Not very big. All these dots on the map, those are wind?

MR. SYMONS: Yeah.

MEMBER KENNEY: Yeah. Thank you.

CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, Jim. No other comments from the committee. And any public comments with respect to the field office reports? I expect not. I want to thank you again for reordering this agenda, and hopefully it means we all get out of here a little

earlier.

But for those who are just arriving, we're still on calendar with respect to the WEMO and DRECP update. And so we look forward to a presentation, I believe, on that. There will be opportunities for the DAC to respond with comments and for the public as well. So thank you for that.

Katrina, you've been earmarked for this.

MS. SYMONS: It's actually Carl. The baton has been handed.

CHAIR BARRETT: Sorry. Actually, Carl. Just one other thing. We do have one procedural thing to accomplish here. And, Tom, thank you.

ACTING DIRECTOR ZALE: I would like to ask John Martin, who is the President of the California Federation of Mineralogical Sites and Shirley Leeson, Director and California State Representative of American Lands Access Association, to come forward, along with Carrie Simmons, Acting Field Manager for the El Centro Field Office.

And as I do, that I'll just mention that some years ago we entered into a Memorandum of Understanding with these groups to help manage the rockhounding that was taking place in the Hauser Geobeds in the northeast part of Imperial County. And so after about 16 years we

decided it's time to refresh this agreement. So we're just going to take a couple of minutes now to sign that.

MEMBER BANIS: We've never done this. Bring a box of pens for Shirley. She does one letter per pen.

MS. LEESON: Oh, come on.

(Applause.)

MS. LEESON: This is so good.

ACTING DIRECTOR ZALE: So thank you very much for indulging us with that. As I said yesterday in the field to the group of rockhounds that we met, rock on.

MS. LEESON: With your permission.

ACTING DIRECTOR ZALE: Randy is my mentor.

CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, Tom, and thank you, all. Just goes to show, come to these things. New things happen all the time.

So now my apologies to Katrina but actually Carl, we're going to have a presentation both on WEMO and on the DRECP, I think. So thank you.

MR. SYMONS: Good afternoon. I'm going to give you a status update on where we are with the WEMO Plan. Originally I was going to provide it after lunch, so I was going to make it real quick while everybody was sleepy. But now that you're in a good mood after signing, I can be longwinded.

Basically where we're at right now, where we

stand with the Court is, we have a date to have the ROD done by November of this year. However, when we put that into the Court, we stated there that that was contingent on the DRECP ROD being signed now by the 29th of February. And we're pretty sure that's not going to happen.

So we've since gone back and tried to look and see where they're at and when DRECP is going to be coming out and what we can do. And based on that, we did file a motion with the Court, joint motion, in order to give us about 45 days meet and confer with the plaintiffs and the intervenors to try to come up with a joint motion for a revision of the schedule, and then that schedule would need to be within 60 days to be filed. So 45 days to confer and another 15 to get it in, so a total of 60 days.

Out of that from the judge came back that he has ordered a status conference between the plaintiffs and our attorneys and himself, and that will be on June 7th, so not sure. We'll have to wait to see what comes out of that. Our lawyers will be presenting our side of the case then the plaintiffs on theirs and see what comes out, whether or not they'll set a date or whether they'll continue on with the meet and confer or not.

But based out of that meeting we'll get a final schedule proposed. There's quite a few different things. Some of the things that have come up since then, of course, is the monument is now part of the WEMO area, so we're going to need to figure out how to put that and integrate that into the WEMO process.

Then also the fact we're trying to do the disturbance cap analysis. We've been working on that. We have awarded a contract. It's got a one-year timeframe that they have to get that done for the disturbance cap analysis within the ACECs and NCL lands within the WEMO area. It will also incorporate a little area outside of WEMO because of the fact we have to do it by unit, so if an NCL or an ACEC is part in and part out, we have to do it for the entire unit, so there's actually more units than are in the WEMO Plan.

We're also continuing on, and some of the members here are involved with the HPMP process for cultural resources that we signed the P.A. but -- which was a great accomplishment and with a lot of hard work and public involvement and tribal involvement, but now they're getting down to the meat and potatoes of trying to get actually the implementation plans and stuff going on.

And right now Ashley Blythe, who was heading

that up, has taken a position with the Forest Service, and Tiffany, who is out of the district office, is now heading that up. And hopefully that will still be done within the one-year timeframe. They're making great progress, and I think a lot of great work has been coming out of that.

So there's a lot of things to look at. We're trying to decide whether or not -- how we're going to progress depending on what the Court says and what we find from all these different things that have been changed since the draft and into the final, whether or not we have to do -- whether we're going to be within the alternatives, and that will affect our timeline.

If we don't feel that what we're going to be able to come up with is going to be within the range proposed or alternatives, then we'll probably have to go back out with a new supplemental. But we haven't gotten that far. We have to get the disturbance caps put together. We have to decide on the issue of how the monument is going to be and how we're going to treat the monument as far as the route designation. We also need to look at the fact that there's all these new ACEC and NCL lands that weren't included in the draft proposal, because we thought WEMO was going to go first.

That's kind of where we are. Got a lot of

behind-the-scenes stuff but also some things that are out of our control because this is a court proceeding and the judge will ultimately give us our marching orders as to what we can and can't do.

CHAIR BARRETT: And, Carl, thank you. The complexities of what you just presented, you know, clearly offer up a whole lot of opportunity for questions. As the agenda was laid out, though, I think we'll have a presentation on the DRECP, and then we'll see if we can pull the two parts together.

Stephanie Carman, thank you so much. I understand you're a new addition from Sacramento. So you're very welcome, and thank you for waiting.

MS. CARMAN: Hi. Thank you. I'm going to go over the DRECP status a little bit. Then I'll talk about my role and what we're working on now.

As you're aware, the DRECP has been a very long, arduous process. It has taken many, many years, and the planning team in Sacramento greatly appreciates all the input and comments that they have received. We are looking towards Phase 1, the BLM Land Use Plan Amendment. That's the only part of the DRECP that we're really dealing with here right now.

The secretary has mentioned numerous times that she intends to get this out. I don't have exact dates

on when it will be done, but it will be done before the secretary leaves. So right now they are in the midst -- they, being the Sacramento DRECP planning staff -- they're in the midst of going over the protests that were received a couple of months ago, going through, reviewing those and resolving any of the issues there. Their ACEC comment period just closed on May 9th, you're aware, and they're going through and reviewing those comments.

They're also going through all the other comments that we've been hearing, Apple Valley, for instance, these things that have been coming up they are looking at, if there's an opportunity to make changes. We do want to get the best plan out that we can, but we do have sideboards to work within. Don't want to supplement at this point in time, so there's some weighing the risk and the benefits that they're looking at.

Don't have a final timeline yet, and so we don't have a final ROD. I can't speak to any of the changes that are in or not in but in general do not anticipate that there will be significant changes from what was proposed to what will be finalized. That's assuming nothing major comes up. Again, nothing is final.

So a couple of months ago, several, I guess -- like, four months ago now, I was looking to get -- I've been in Washington, D.C. working on sage-grouse, and I needed a break, and so I talked to Joe Stout at the state office and said, "Do you have any opportunities in California?"

And he talked to the district, and they said, "We could really use someone to come in, not quite proactively but before we actually have the ROD signed, figure out if there's any major holes in the plan that we need to sew up before we sign this ROD and have to implement it. Do we have all the right policies? Do we have staff? Is the plan complete? Are we missing some grammar in it that would make it much more clear to implement and also to get some of the tools together to help with implementation down the road."

So I came in. So I am in the district office. Been meeting with all the field offices, going over concerns, questions about the plan. And then I've been working on kind of training materials, cheat sheets. The document is really big, so trying to cut it down into a reasonable, a digestible document and then also looking at some of these big holes that are out there.

For instance, you know, the plan lays out a lot, but when we actually get down to the ground to do

it, there are additional things we're going to need to know. For the disturbance caps, you know, what exactly is the numerator? What is the denominator? Is it the whole ACEC just one point or .5 percent of the ACEC? How does all that work? So some of those things, looking at differences like that.

Also looking, like, Carl mentioned about getting support, funding support to do the baseline calculations, recognizing that there's going to be a lot of work coming out the door when this thing -- when it hits the streets, it's going to be part of our land use planning process. So we'll need to be ready to use it, so trying to get us prepared for that.

So far I've been primarily working internally with the field offices and with the state office a lot, too, running back and forth between and seeing what we can change. But over the next two months -- today is my halfway point, so over the next two months I'm available to talk to external groups as well.

The ROD is not complete. The ROD is not final, so I can't promise what's in it or say for sure, and I'm not making any of the changes. I can make recommendations, but I'm not in charge of editing the document.

But I think the biggest thing to remember

overall about the DRECP, when it does come out, it's not the end of our planning process. As you had mentioned earlier, we will still go through and do individual planning approvals, NEPA, for most of the projects that come in. We'll just do those now within the bounds of the DRECP. It just changes our sideboards sometimes maybe significantly, but it changes our sideboards. We'll still have the individual site-by-site decisions that are going to need to be made.

So that's my spiel, and I think we mostly just want to focus on discussions.

CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, Stephanie. Perhaps the sage-grouse will seem so much easier after spending time on the DRECP. But that in light I think I would like to open it up for DAC comments and questions with respect to either the DRECP or the WEMO status and combine them both.

So would anyone like to start? Oh, no questions. Okay. Good.

Mark, can I impinge upon you?

MEMBER ALGAZY: There has been a fair amount of email communications going on behind the scenes, and it's no secret to anybody on the DAC that I've got some major heartburn about the way things have been proceeding. And I was the one that filed the protest

letter against the way the ACECs were designated and instituted eventually the putting out of a new Federal Register Notice to deal with them.

So my comments coming in today's meeting were on three different levels. I get confused easily. I made some notes for myself. My first had to do with the way that the comment period was closed on the ACEC. I touched upon this morning the fact that we can't deal with every problem that's brought to us. We're not always the appropriate body. We have specific marching orders in the Desert District, but there's nothing that will more profoundly affect the Desert District than the DRECP, and therefore, by reason of our marching orders from Congress, I think that we have no higher purpose than to be heavily engaged at every step in a process like this that so profoundly affects the Desert District.

And so I had my first major heartburn just over the timing of the closing of this comment period 12 days before our DAC meeting, which precluded the DAC from having formal discussions and perhaps forming a formal consensus for submission at the meeting within the comment deadline. We've been assured that our comments are always welcome to the district manager and to Sacramento, and I believe that we will have robust

discussions as we continue on through the afternoon. But it's not the same as being able to make a formal comment during the public comment period.

And it's not the first time that it's happened in recent memory. It seems as if Sacramento is completely blind to the fact that there is a DAC here that has a specific charge, and they could have very well considered the fact that we had a meeting 12 days and moved it up.

In my comments on the larger 2.0 planning process, one of the things I just cannot fathom is in this day and age of adaptive management that the government is still marching on the strictly 30-, 60-, 90-day comment period. One of the first things they can do in terms of being more adaptive is to recognize a duly constituted body and perhaps looking at their calendars a little more often and, when something involves the Desert District so intimately as the DRECP, to not make any comment deadline that does not incorporate an opportunity for the DAC to comment. That's my first point that I wanted to make.

In the broader sense, moving forward, I think it behooves us to look at that mission statement more closely because there's going to be more things coming up down the road, and again I think the message needs to

go to Sacramento that planning processes that involve the Desert District, they need to make sure that the DAC can be formally involved.

And I think that, having made a public notice like this in a public notice in front of a public recorder, if Sacramento continues to move forward making plans for the Desert District that don't incorporate opportunities for formal comment, that they are de facto diluting the power of the DAC, diluting the DAC's mission, marginalizing the DAC.

And that's very unfortunate because, when I was first offered the option of joining the DAC in 2010, I thought that the DAC was kind of a marginal organization in that they were not paying any attention to renewable energy projects, and I predicted in 2010 that renewable energy projects would be the driving force in the California desert over the next ten years.

Well, the DAC came around. The DAC got heavily involved in looking at this stuff, and that's when I said, wow, this is really cool. This is a group I want to be involved in. And now to see what is happening, not purposefully but by inattention at the very least, is that the DAC's influence is being eroded here, and I don't want to see that happen, and I certainly plan to stand up at every opportunity that I have a microphone

at my disposal and say, "I think you guys need to remember that we have marching orders from Congress. We're here to be an interface between the public and the BLM, and you can't cut us out of the loop."

My third thing is very hard for me to do, in that it was just at the last DAC meeting, again, that I made the comment about how collegial this group is overall. We have a lot of camaraderie. We have a lot of laughter. We have a lot of fun behind the scenes. But in the process of making my point about the DAC not having this opportunity to comment, I had to make a very hard call of telling our chairman that I think it's a failure in leadership not to have asked the BLM for an extension of the comment period. And his very blunt answer to me was that, "You know the BLM is going to say 'No.'"

And my response to that is, there's a difference between the BLM saying no and not asking the question.

I'm not going to be on the DAC forever. None of us are going to be on the DAC forever, and I don't want to see the power and the prestige of this council be eroded by giving up one ground of one inch of influence in how we can work with the BLM by not asking a question. That's how I want to start this dialogue

off. Thank you.

MEMBER MITCHELL: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIR BARRETT: Yes. Thank you, Billy.

MEMBER MITCHELL: First of all, I apologize because I'm way, way behind speed on this particular thing. But what I guess the question I would like to know is, how is this affecting grazing? And I haven't found it. And the county is supposed to be helping with this, and again we're way behind the times here.

However, I want to say three ranches are retired in this document that were used for mitigation without the vehicle at the time of the formal expansion. How is that incorporated, or why was that incorporated into the DRECP? I could care less who answers it.

I'm really concerned about it because, in order to retire a grazing allotment when it is sold, you have to be not bona fide anymore. I think Bruce Babbitt took that out, but you have to have animals or be of animal husbandry to even own one. And it is my knowledge -- and I could be wrong. I don't know everything. The private land that was involved with it, yes, the grazing part of it, the people that acquired this were not stock operators. So I guess I would like somebody to answer. The first question is, why or how?

And then I guess the second question is for the

field office -- is why? These leases are mandated to be put out and notified to other leaseholders to be able to pick up the grazing lease. I mean, it says right in there this is supposed to be done. It hasn't been done. There has been ranchers that have formally requested these leases, and I don't know if they have been answered yet or if they've allowed their due process. So I don't know. I guess Katrina can answer one. I guess you can answer for the DRECP.

MS. SYMONS: Did you want to try it?

MR. SYMONS: Go ahead.

MS. SYMONS: So in general, Billy, the Desert Renewable Energy Conservation Plan provides for land use allocations. It is my understanding that underneath the preferred alternative, any grazing permit or lease that is currently active will stay active. Those that have been inactive will no longer be allocated to livestock grazing underneath the preferred alternative in DRECP.

MEMBER MITCHELL: Okay. I don't think that's answering my question, because I know for a fact these leases have been applied before the DRECP came into effect. Jay Moon would be one ten years ago -- not ten. They retired maybe 11 years ago and not under your lots, believe me. But people have still not got an answer out of the resource office to have their due process, which

states they get in the Taylor Grazing Act.

So I want to know how we're going to handle this. And, believe me, through the county I've been trying to get them -- and hopefully it will sign off on this because this is not right to the ranchers.

And for a second thing just for you, Mark, Congress mandates us to be here. That's the bottom line. I mean, it is supposed to be. I just want to make that clear, and I think that's what you're saying.

MEMBER ALGAZY: Yeah.

MEMBER MITCHELL: I want these ranchers to either get an answer for these or how we're going to deal with this because those leases were not properly retired.

MS. SYMONS: So, Billy, I would hope that those comments were submitted to the DRECP team both when the Draft EIS came out and when the final came out.

MEMBER MITCHELL: Well, that I don't know.

MS. SYMONS: In following the process, that question would have been the perfect one to have asked.

MEMBER MITCHELL: Well, then again, these were done before that came out, and there was still no response that was offered. So, you know, I know we're going in a circle here, and we better get a gate open for this to go through.

MS. SYMONS: What I will submit to you, Billy, is that I will take your concern and work with Stephanie to raise it back on up to make sure that that is on the list of one of the standing concerns.

MEMBER MITCHELL: Yeah, because one of my other hats, just to clarify to people, is a chairman of the RIAC Board, and these leases for the last ten years create money that comes down into San Bernardino County. They have been just side saddling with no response. I've been working with the county. I'm also working, to be honest with everybody, with Congressman Cook on the same issue of why is this happening.

Twenty-five years ago, ten years ago, 15 years ago, this wouldn't even be an issue, but somehow this is getting pushed under the table, pushed under the table, and these leases, including P.K., are not being set out for when the people properly asked for them. So if you will work with me on this -- and believe me, I want them put out, or I want a dang good reason -- excuse my language -- of why they weren't.

MS. SYMONS: Okay.

MEMBER MITCHELL: I want to be on record for this because this is a direct violation of the Taylor Grazing Act, direct violation of what the BLM is supposed to be doing for these ranchers.

ACTING DIRECTOR ZALE: Can I ask a quick clarifying question.

MEMBER MITCHELL: Go right ahead.

ACTING DIRECTOR ZALE: Did I understand what you said that the base property surrounding three allotments or associated with three different allotments was sold by permittees?

MEMBER MITCHELL: By the permittee.

ACTING DIRECTOR ZALE: And then the new owners of the base property did not seek --

MEMBER MITCHELL: Well, they can't retire the lease. They're the government. They're not even allowed to own a lease. So how can they retire a lease?

I went to Washington, D.C. and created the -- excuse me. You can tell I got heartburn with this -- not I. Three of the ranchers sat in Feinstein's office and Lewis' office to create the avenue for this to happen to these ranchers when solar plants come on so the secretary does have the right that these ranchers do not lose their livelihood, 50 years of work then just sold down the river. That bill, I think, is HR 112-something.

This was to stop -- not to stop solar plants, but if we're going to have to eat one on our ranch, is to get compensated, for which it states in the Taylor

Grazing Act we are supposed to be. And these leases have been sitting idle hopefully finding way or a vehicle to get them out of their hair.

Well, that's a direct violation of the Taylor Grazing Act. You are supposed to notify the nearest rancher if he wants it. If he doesn't want it, it goes to the next. If none of them wants it, it goes to "John Q. Public" that applies for it properly and -- I shouldn't use bona fide. Let's just say a stock operator that can qualify as a stock operator. Well, Ft. Irwin never ran a cow in his life, you know, at the last I heard.

That's what I'm really serious about. I know San Bernardino County is serious about it, and I want to get it resolved because there's families out there that do like the lifestyle. Four generations I've been in it, and there's two other families and generations that wanted to do this, you know. So that's mainly what I brought up to see if we can get this resolved.

ACTING DIRECTOR ZALE: Okay. I don't have answers for you at this point.

MEMBER MITCHELL: I know.

ACTING DIRECTOR ZALE: But we can work.

MEMBER MITCHELL: I'm sure nobody does. I'm sure we're going to find some, but I want it to go on

record because the DRECP is here, and I just want them to know that I know there's no vehicle for it. Now, if I'm wrong, then I apologize to everybody. Excuse my language. But if I'm not, there's going to be cows out there on that land. It's kind of like the rockhounds. You want to take them off. People have been doing for decades since 1992 trying to kill our industry and our families. But we've made it through that.

We're going up for ten-year leases again, and I'm sure we're going to make it through that or there's going to be a lot of senators and congressmen going to get an earful. I'll guarantee you that. I've been to Washington once. I'll go back again.

With that, I'll give it back to you, Mr. Chairman. So long as it's on record, ranching family from high desert, I'm cool.

CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, Billy. We do appreciate bringing these items up. I'm sure Stephanie does as well. You know, the record on the DRECP is, we've had a lot of concerns from the DAC with respect to that and have expressed those on a number of occasions and including letters. But still I think we should have some more comments.

And, Randy, perhaps you.

MEMBER BANIS: Thank you. First I had a

request of the bureau for some information. I understand that the WEMO route designations will be compatible with DRECP in the sense that the Conservation Management Actions of the conservation envelope are being applied. So I am assuming also that the Conservation Management Actions associated with Special Recreation Management Areas is also being applied to WEMO. Is that right?

MR. SYMONS: Yeah. All of the management actions that are within the DRECP will be applied. The only thing that you have to remember is, if there is overlapping designations in an area, the most conservative measures will apply.

MEMBER BANIS: Correct.

MR. SYMONS: So if you have a SRMA and an ACEC, whichever has the most conservative will apply.

MEMBER BANIS: A perfect nexus, because that's kind of where I was going. But you are recognizing the SRMAs?

MR. SYMONS: Yes.

MEMBER BANIS: Where and how it's appropriate to recognize them?

MR. SYMONS: Correct.

MEMBER BANIS: Okay. My request is that I would be grateful to have a comparison of the miles of

designated routes within the SRMA polygons current under the supplemental and then -- current under the court-ordered supplemental route designations versus the supplemental Draft EIS. In other words, here's what I'm getting at. I'm sorry I'm using the word "supplemental" twice, but I didn't make it up. The bureau made it up.

Let's go back to the first step right now, route designations on what's being called supplemental maps in WEMO. That's what currently we're following on the ground in WEMO; right?

MR. SYMONS: No. Currently we are enacting the 2006 WEMO Plan. That's by order of the judge.

MEMBER BANIS: Okay. Let me back up. The maps that are on the BLM website for all of the --

MR. SYMONS: The ones that came out in the supplemental draft?

MEMBER BANIS: No, not even associated with the supplemental draft, the court-ordered route designations. Back in 2010 the Court said that you guys have to implement temporarily in the interim a route designation system, and you produced some 11-by-17 maps of all the different -- the CMs, the EPs, the RMs in all the different areas, and on the back of it had an overview map. And then remember the Court ordered you to stamp on the margins a certain phrase that had to be

court ordered. These are the route designations that will be followed. Those were labeled and described on the website as Supplemental Travel Management Plan maps. That's what they call them, and I'm sorry. If we want to call them something else, we can. It's fine by me.

MS. SYMONS: That's in my mind, aka the 2006 WEMO.

MEMBER BANIS: Exactly. Thank you.

MS. SYMONS: We are on the same thing.

MEMBER BANIS: We are on the same thing. I wanted to use the most current. If we're looking at the WEMO 2006 routes, future ACEC across the SRMAs, put on the SRMAs, put in the 2006 routes, let's say, a thousand miles of roads from the 2006 are in the DRECP SRMA. And then I'd like to see the supplemental draft WEMO of how many miles of routes are being designated in the SRMAs.

Do you see where I'm getting at? What I'm getting at is this. What I'm getting at is this: we've got a recreation designation called a Special Recreation Management Area, a SRMA. Okay. It's supposed to promote recreation. It's supposed to be good for recreation. I'd be curious to know in the SRMAs that are being proposed by the DRECP how many miles of roads and trails exist in those SRMAs now under the 2006 and how many are in those SRMAs in the Supplemental Draft

EIS?

And what I'm showing -- what this is going to show -- and I hate to -- I'm asking for data so I can draw a conclusion. But I'm going to tell you what the conclusion is going to be, what it's going to show. It's going to show that, despite the fact that we've implemented this thing called the Special Recreation Management Area, it's going to show that routes are decimated in all of those Special Management Recreation Areas.

In other words, there's going to be a designation that these areas are great for recreation but it's going to end up resulting in less access to recreation because of -- because of the overlaying conservation envelope; in other words, the barbecue sauce that's been slathered on top of the SRMAs.

And that's kind of what I wanted as the point. And I'm asserting that this is what I think it will show, but with that data, I can be shown a darned fool, and I could possibly be shown wrong. But I might be right too. But it's important for me to try to understand how we're putting down a route, a designation. We're designating 3.5 million acres in DRECP supposedly for the benefit of recreation, and I contend that we're not going to see any benefits to

recreation because all but 30,000 acres outside of OHV open areas is slathered with conservation CMAs.

MR. SYMONS: Just to make sure so I have it clear -- and tell me if I'm wrong, Randy -- you're talking about in the SEIS, when we produce it, if you look at the draft that's out now that has a proposed action of 11,000-something miles of routes, that's not the one that you're referring to. So you're referring to when we get the final TMPs that will come out based on DRECP?

MEMBER BANIS: Based on DRECP. That's right.

MS. SYMONS: So just right now based upon the final DRECP, about 89 percent of the limited use area where we're actually designating routes, that is what is covered by ACECs, JCLs, 89 percent of the planning area.

MEMBER BANIS: Seventy-eight percent desert-wide, 89 percent in WEMO, yeah.

MS. SYMONS: With disturbance caps ranging from .1 percent up to one percent, dependent upon the ACEC NCL unit.

MEMBER BANIS: That's exactly correct. And that's the contrast I'm looking to see. I'm looking to see what benefit the SRMAs have actually given us outside of the OHV open areas, and I don't see any of it, and I see the whole SRMA thing outside of OHV areas

a complete and total waste of time.

CHAIR BARRETT: Randy, thank you for those comments. Actually this relates to a conversation we actually had four years ago. And, Randy, if you would just hold a second, Billy wants to make a comment with respect to what you said.

MEMBER BANIS: Absolutely.

CHAIR BARRETT: Then we can move to the next.

MEMBER MITCHELL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want the board to realize and the public that I've been dealing with this a very long time. It is not the area managers' fault -- Mike, Katrina, Carl in Ridgecrest. This was prior actions that led up to what's dumped on the BLM today that they're dealing with from previous things that have happened.

So I just wanted to clarify it's not -- you know, I'm not against these people. I'm working very good with them. They work very good with me. It's the first time in 20 years that I or the ranchers -- I keep saying "I" because none of the ranchers are able to come here, but that we've had this kind of a working relationship. So I just want you people to know that I get upset. It's a passion of mine. But they're doing the best job they can, and I know they will get the answer for me. So thank you.

MEMBER ALGAZY: Leslie?

CHAIR BARRETT: Mark, does it relate to Randy's? Excellent. Randy, if you don't mind. Mark.

MEMBER BANIS: Go for it.

MEMBER ALGAZY: I just want to make a further comment and clarification. If Randy didn't paint a fuzzy enough picture of what the net benefit is for recreation and in all of this, one of the moving components in DRECP that moved forward with zero public participation was the crafting of the 106 Programmatic Agreement, and it wasn't done in the public process because it moved from the draft to the final before the Programmatic Agreement could be accomplished.

But being one of the consulting parties to that Programmatic Agreement allowed me access to more information. And one of the shocking pieces of information to come out of being involved in the cultural Programmatic Agreement was learning about the predictive model that the BLM is using for identifying and protecting cultural resources. It is an amazing model. The factors that go into this thing are just wonderful. I think it's going to really, really, really help the bureau in the long run in terms of managing cultural resources.

But the shocking thing to make public is that the predictive model compared to what the BLM knows about cultural resources identifies a huge knowledge gap. Where the BLM knows about maybe 10,000 cultural resources in the West Mojave, the predictive model says they will probably eventually identify 500,000. That's a knowledge deficit in the factor of 50. And when you have a knowledge deficit in the factor of 50, it's going to have a profound effect on the route networks.

When you start implementing plans and protocols and procedures protecting cultural resources, roads are going to need to be closed. So decisions are being made now that are profoundly going to affect recreation in the future, and all of this has been done with very little input from the public.

There are procedures being put in place, and I've been working very hard to see that happen. and as -- what's the term we're using for doing something to protect a cultural resource? A management action?

MS. CARMAN: Conservation Management Action.

MR. SYMONS: Minimization?

MEMBER ALGAZY: There's a specific term within the Programmatic Agreement for it. But in any event, there will be public involvement down the road when

we're looking at options for what to do. But there is going to be even less of a net benefit than what Randy was painting a picture of. That was my point.

CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, Mark. And, as Randy and I have discussed for many years, the Special Recreation Management Areas aren't so much being set up for recreation per se. It's the management of recreation within those areas that is the critical part. And whether they are the most -- if they're overlapped by ACECs, then clearly there's a conservation element as part of that too.

Randy, do you have some additional comments, or is there any further comments to that specific item you brought up? If not, Randy, thank you for your patience.

MEMBER BANIS: Of course. I do understand. Well, let me first say also the ACEC comment period I'm not convinced was an earnest effort to solicit real comments from the public on the ACECs, as it maybe was a perfunctory call to have to cross the t's and dot the i's in order for the plan to go forward, and I think that was unfortunate. I think that we could have commented, I could have commented a great deal more on the ACECs if I had had more time.

I had created a database for the purpose of generating my comments ACEC by ACEC. And you'll see in

my comments, those last 12 or 13, that's the only number of ACECs I was able to get through for specific. And so I was on my way through every single one of them, but I only got through three regions.

But beyond that, I know it's time to move on with implementation. And I get it. I get it. It's just hard for me to get excited about implementing something that I just don't support. There are some people in this room that were involved in DRECP before me but not many; okay? Not many. I was there really as early on as possible. And the assurances that the stakeholder discussions yielded for recreation I just don't believe were lived up to. It was a rude surprise.

So implementation is going to be tough for me, but there will be a time when I'm sure I'll turn the corner and get in the car with everybody else and we'll do the job. But I'm just not looking forward to it.

I think that it fails with respect to being landscape level (indicating), air quotes. As long as it doesn't have the private property component, it's really not landscape level. And I think it was a mistake moving forward the way it was by itself. And I think that shows that this deadline for DRECP is artificially driven by election-year politics and it's not about making the best plan we can make. It's about making the

best plan we can make before January of next year. That's what it's about but not the best plan we can make, period.

So with that, thank you. Oh, I'm sorry. One more point -- sorry -- about routes. Now that Cadys are a national monument, I think those should be pulled right out of WEMO, pulled right out, gone, whole different thing. Let's not waste our time. We've got interim routes. We've got interim corridor routes. It's in my opinion no longer part of WEMO. The president has spoken. It's a national monument. Let's move on with those lands that are national monument planning. I don't think we should waste the bureau and public's time with Cadys and WEMO at this time. Thanks very much. Thanks, everybody, for your indulgence.

CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, Randy. And additional comments from the DAC with respect to the presentations? Hearing none, I don't have any public comment periods, but perhaps, yes, at least one, please. Thank you.

MR. STEWART: Good afternoon, council and members. John Stewart with California Four-Wheel Drive Association.

Cal Four-Wheel has also filed a protest on WEMO. In fact with WEMO we were part of the original

litigants on that lawsuit as it moved forward.

Cal Four-Wheel also provided comments and protests at the DRECP decision.

I look at the -- I don't know what the terminology is -- supplemental. All these are just bended around at will. But this last call for comments based on an ACEC is still deficient. Number one, it did not define a scoping period to identify a purpose and need for the ACECs. It has pre-determined that these ACECs will exist for no quantifiable reason and especially within the numbers, within the locations and with the sizes.

This is all very problematic when you look at the fact that the agency bills the DRECP program or document as a programmatic document to provide guidelines for future planning efforts by incorporating these ACECs, creating the overlap of the areas with the ACECs, the SRMAs, all these other zones and creating any kind of an overlap then adopting the phraseology that, in case of conflict, the most restrictive prescription will apply, you have now stepped out of being a programmatic document and stepped into being a site-specific land management document. And within that context, you have failed to provide an adequate description, an adequate disclosure and an adequate

analysis as required by NEPA. Thank you.

CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, John. Additional public comments? Hearing none.

Actually we want to hear from Jim. Thank you.

MEMBER KENNEY: I think including the ACECs situation as it is presented in the supplemental final or whatever you want to call it is a big mistake. There's no information. There's no way to make a judgment on what it's going to be. I think politically it's going to be like a hot potato because they're going to want to include everything, depending on your point of view, either in or out with no boundaries, no roads, no anything taking into consideration. In what they've done there is no guidelines. And it's like handing a guy that's broke a blank check.

There's no way in the world the ACECs should be included in this whole thing in any form, in my opinion, and that's mostly the opinion of my constituents that I've talked to about it. They have no clue what's going to have to happen to settle this. They say there's no way you can't have some kind of guidelines in there of what this ACEC is needed for or the boundaries or the conditions.

If you read the ACECs -- and I did -- every one of them is like a piece of boiler-plate with no specific

information except somebody's wish list. I think it's a mistake to include them. I think they ought to be totally excluded from the final document.

CHAIR BARRETT: Jim, thank you.

Mark.

MEMBER ALGAZY: So now that we've come full circle, the question is, what do we want to do about it? The question is, does the council want to make a formal statement despite the fact that the deadline has passed?

MEMBER MITCHELL: To extend the deadline, you mean? You got me confused.

MEMBER ALGAZY: No, not a matter of extending it. It's matter of making a formal comment to the BLM about what we think is appropriate in the situation. I had made a very short PowerPoint regarding that, explaining to people in laymen's terms what the deficiency was and the best way forward in my opinion to deal with that. I don't know if you gentlemen recall it or if you want me to just briefly go over that again.

CHAIR BARRETT: I think it's appropriate, Mark. Thank you.

MEMBER ALGAZY: Okay. I endeavored to try and take some of these very complicated legal things and provide a description that makes it easier for lay people to understand. And in my mind the way that the

designation of the ACECs is going forward is
ass backwards. It's a matter of an ACEC is an Area of
Critical Environmental Concern. It means there's
something special that needs to be protected. The
government has identified there's something special that
needs to be protected, and they've designed something in
order to facilitate protecting that.

During the public comment period for this
process, they put out maps for the public to make
comment, but the maps didn't have any roads on them, and
that was a matter that the WEMO process is still in
play. As Carl gave us the update, everything is still
very, very much still up in the air as far as WEMO goes,
and everyone was counting on WEMO to supply the routes
to help describe the ACECs. But the fact of the matter
is, those maps didn't come out. So the whole public
process went forward when we were given maps to look at
in the WEMO planning area where there were no roads.

And with that, to me, it's comparable to
saying -- I'll pick on you, John back there. It's like
if I went to you and I said, "John, I've got a building,
and I want your opinion on whether I've designed the
building properly in order to try and protect something
inside it, but I can't tell you where the doors and
windows are." The doors and windows are the primary

means of ingress and egress, the primary vulnerabilities when you're trying to protect what's inside that building.

And to ask the public, "Have we done a good job defining the size and the shape of this building in order to protect what's inside of it? We can't tell you where the doors and windows are," is a failure of due process. That's what I'm talking about.

And, to me, there's no way to compensate for that other than to delay the designation of the ACECs until the route maps can be provided and the public can have an opportunity to comment on that.

I do not think it is impossible for the BLM to delay the designation of the ACECs until WEMO is done. We have precedent in management of the desert for things like Wilderness Study Area before something is declared a wilderness where the BLM can manage something in a way that's consistent with what they want to see happen to it in the long run.

And I believe that this council should suggest to the BLM that they postpone designation of the ACECs but manage them consistently in the interim consistent with what they want to see happen but not have a designation until the public has an opportunity to look at route maps so they can make an informed decision, an

informed opinion about whether the ACEC is properly sized and shaped to perform what its goal is.

We have something in our laws called NEPA that provides opportunity for the public to provide input, but what NEPA contemplates is that we provide opinions, not guesses. And without those roads, we're just guessing. Thank you.

CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, Mark. And we may very well entertain a motion, and we're going to have to try to coalesce around the specific motion. I'm not sure to suggest that they continue to operate as though they're designated as ACECs similar to limited Study Areas is even appropriate because, if the due process has failed in this particular regard, then it's failed, and, you know, we should acknowledge that and move forward.

Many of these ACECs were predicated on the belief they would be funded by private development on private lands, and that clearly isn't going to be the case because, you know, the whole DRECP now has been segmented. And so there's quite a number of due process concerns, and I'm sure many other board members here would like to bring others up, as many of the public.

I'm wondering if you could coalesce a motion specific to a general concern with the process, and

then, you know, you might get more support rather than specifics, you know. But I leave it up to yourself.

MEMBER ALGAZY: Well, I know it's a little bit of a long shot to ask the BLM to do this in the first place, but I believe that there's more of a chance of them embracing the idea if we give them a specific management prescription to follow. And I don't know what other management prescription to suggest other than to manage it consistent with the ACEC that is intended for it in the long-term.

There is an asset that needs to be protected, and they've decided that the use of an ACEC is the appropriate means for protecting it. So it seems appropriate to say manage it consistent with what your long-term intentions are but don't designate it until the due process has been met.

CHAIR BARRETT: Any other comments to that respect? Comments from the public? Thank you.

MR. STEWART: Can I say something else in response to him?

CHAIR BARRETT: Please.

MR. STEWART: John Stewart, California Four-Wheel Drive Association.

Mark has brought up a topic and potentially a discussion point of how to do it. One of the

problematic issues seems to be -- the most problematic is the ACECs, as there are so many overlapping this, might be an opportunity to encourage the agency to drop the ACECs and adopt Special Recreation Management Areas with the caveat that within the Special Recreation Management Areas, the agency will have those as the targets to move forward with the site-specific analysis in order to develop a site-specific plan that will quantify the issues, quantify the reasons why that has to be either excluded and would also help determine if a disturbance cap should be applied or is necessary.

Thank you.

CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you. One more public comment? Thank you.

MR. PANKEY: Dick Pankey, rockhound, public. I would like to see in your motion to add a conclusion date, or we'll get ourselves into the situation we have now where Wilderness Study Areas are managed as wilderness, but once they've been determined not wilderness quality, their life goes on forever. That is another issue to address, and we should get ourselves out of that untenable situation.

But to start with, using this example, which I think is a good way to do it, is to manage it like you want and put a sunset clause so that after such-and-such

a date we revert back to the average status quo.

CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you.

MEMBER MUTH: Yeah. I'm confused, as usual. Can you manage an area sort of off the cuff if it hasn't been designated as an area for that management? Yeah, let's hear from the bureau.

MS. CARMAN: So just thinking about this option and the ACEC, first thing to remember is a lot of ACECs are already designated. A good portion of them that are out there are existing ACECs currently. They have management actions, ACEC plans that are existing in the current CDCA and all of the amendments.

There are -- and the DRECP has proposed -- there are CMAs, Conservation Management Actions, that apply to all lands, and there were some that apply just to SRMAs and some that apply just to ACECs or the National Conservation Lands. So, depending on whether or not it's an ACEC or a SRMA or overlapping, those apply.

But there are some that apply everywhere, and a lot of those are the Conservation Management Actions and say, you know, don't build a road on top of a tortoise, you know? I mean, it's kind of best management practices.

But then there are more detailed ones. In

Appendix L it goes through each ACEC in there. You'll find even more prescriptive management actions for each ACEC as currently envisioned, so there's a range of what applies in each area. And you have to overlap all of those, and it does get confusing and overlapping. But that's land management to a large extent. I mean, unfortunately the world isn't designed to be clean, you know?

So, okay. Can I help with any other questions?

CHAIR BARRETT: No. And thank you for that, Stephanie, and welcome to Southern California.

And, with respect to that, I do concur to an extent that it may not be the appropriate forum at this stage without duly notice to propose new ways by which we can manage ACECs, but I do want to capture the sense of dissatisfaction with the process. And, you know, if at least that, we make a motion and discuss it. And I think that will be helpful.

It's not just the DRECP. It's not just the ACEC. It's not just this particular deadline that's been missed, but there's a sense that there's an opportunity here for the DAC to take public comment and make a difference, and that's been compromised to some extent, maybe through no fault of anyone or maybe more so than that. And we want to be able to reassert that

this opportunity still exists. It's a congressionally mandated opportunity. And at least we're dissatisfied with the process.

So understanding that we would all like these areas to be managed, perhaps, differently, I'm not sure that it's appropriate to develop a concept or a motion around that, but at least I would like to entertain a motion of dissatisfaction. Perhaps more comment.

MEMBER BENOIT: No. Perhaps maybe a conclusion from a guy who knows the least about what all those acronyms mean than anybody in the room, but having listened to the discussion attentively, it would appear to me there's kind of a consensus on the board that we didn't have the time we would have liked to have had --

MEMBER ALGAZY: Opportunity.

MEMBER BENOIT: -- the opportunity we would have liked to have had, that in so doing we were not allowed to address four or five concerns that have been individually addressed here and that perhaps the board could, through my motion, authorize you to draft a letter seeking input from those people that have spoken here to express the dissatisfaction with the timing and that these specific issues weren't addressed to our satisfaction and that we just want to make that statement for the record.

And I would so move.

MEMBER FRANCIS: I would also make the amendment to that that in any future things, when they set dates, that they accommodate a hearing with the DAC before they close the timeframe.

MEMBER BENOIT: I would accept that amendment.

CHAIR BARRETT: Mark, do you have any comment on that before someone seconds?

MEMBER ALGAZY: No.

CHAIR BARRETT: Okay.

MEMBER BANIS: It captures my sentiments exactly. Thank you, John. Those were the words we were talking about.

MEMBER MUTH: Can we state the motion as amended.

MEMBER BENOIT: The motion is that we authorize the chairman to write a letter on behalf of the council expressing our concerns with the timing and lack of ability to input and hope that in the future they would consider the DAC's schedule for these types of things. And, since we weren't allowed and didn't have the opportunity, we had the discussions of these four or five bullets, and we just want to make a statement for the record that those were concerns expressed here today.

MEMBER MUTH: I'll second that.

MEMBER BURKE: I'll second the amended motion.

CHAIR BARRETT: Recognize Al?

MEMBER BURKE: I don't care.

CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you. Recognize Al as seconding and take a vote. All in favor?

(A vote was taken.)

CHAIR BARRETT: Any object? No? And I think the motion passes. Thank you. Thank you for that. Thank you, supervisor.

MEMBER BENOIT: I have to get going. I'm sorry.

CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you so much.

MEMBER BANIS: He did his job. You're good. Thank you.

(Member Benoit left the meeting.)

CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, all. Public as well. We truly appreciate the participation of that. We only have one more item on the agenda. And, if you don't mind, I know many of you probably need a break, but if we move on, we'll get through this too.

And it's Mojave Trails National Monument Subgroup consideration. Before we start, I'm going to take a little out of order here. And Mike, Mike Ahrens, and perhaps would you give us a flavor of the discussion

point, if you don't mind, and that way we'll be able to better understand the question request. Thank you.

MR. AHRENS: Mike Ahrens, Needles Field Manager. And let me just say that was uplifting. I hope it's inspired you to want to help us on the next large planning issue that we have. So having talked a little bit on the field trip yesterday, we now have the Mojave Trails National Monument. It's a huge national monument with .6 million acres with extraordinarily diverse interests and concerns and values by folks near and far from the monument.

So clearly we can't do this by ourselves, and we really do want and need the expertise of members of the public, yourselves specifically, if you're up to it, but certainly representatives of all of the perspectives represented on this council. Additionally I think it's very much my and the bureau's goal to have a really very robust and inclusive and transparent kind of discussion that will begin before we even actually consider the planning effort itself, move through the planning and, I would propose, well beyond.

So, you know, with that, that's really what we're looking for. I would also encourage you to, beyond the skill sets here and perspectives here, tourism, economics, local area governments, you know,

again I think there's a lot of perspectives that need to be involved in this discussion, and I certainly would welcome all of them.

CHAIR BARRETT: Mike, thank you for that. And before you leave, just a point of clarification. With respect to this group that's so clearly needed, we discussed, like, an advisory group, per se. But also within the DAC we discussed a subgroup. Are the two similar? overlap? the same? How best can you help phrase what you're looking for so we as a committee then can see how we can assist?

MR. AHRENS: Well, let me try. So our next phase in this really is to develop this public outreach to figure out who all those interests are and bring them to the table. And, you know, I imagine the DAC subgroup would be paramount in helping us to do that both in identifying and defining people and to go find those folks to be involved in that.

Yesterday I mentioned that the bureau has what they call the Collaborative Incentive Program. That program provides funding and technical expertise in facilitating collaborative efforts like this. We managed actually to receive some funding to do that. We have some additional funding we want to put with that, and so we are poised to do that work now. And so I

would imagine a subgroup would help us both design and implement that.

And then I think -- as we go through the planning effort, I think it should be an ongoing effort. I think that the more of these kinds of where we have, for lack of a better word, conflicting values, the better we can resolve those through relationships and understanding each others' values and needs, the easier the planning process will go. That's what I'm looking for.

CHAIR BARRETT: Excellent, Mike, on that. And many of the members of the public here have much more experience of this than I do, but a subgroup isn't just a group of us up here.

MR. AHRENS: Correct.

CHAIR BARRETT: A subgroup is heavily involved. In fact, Randy, you mentioned it earlier about the participation of the public into various subgroups and the presentations that give back to us. Without the public involved in this to a large extent, these groups don't operate as well as they could.

So with that, if you don't mind, Mike, I'd like to open it up to some of the DAC comments here.

MR. AHRENS: Okay.

CHAIR BARRETT: And Randy, perhaps.

MEMBER BANIS: Just to speak to that -- sorry. This is a little historical perspective for some of our newer members. Subgroups can involve members of the public, but the subgroup does not advise the BLM directly. The subgroup meets. There's a representative of the DAC on that subgroup. They have a recommendation. That recommendation comes to the DAC. The DAC looks at the recommendation and then says, "Yeah, we like that recommendation, or, "No, we don't like that recommendation," or, "We like it, but." And so that's how a subgroup works. The subgroup reports to the DAC directly.

Some of our subgroups have been very specific issue subgroups requiring outside expertise. Connecting People With the Desert, for example, the Imperial Sand Dunes Subgroup, for example, some of those items aren't particularly within the core of some of the seats that we hold and therefore may not be within many of our DAC members' direct core interests. But, as a DAC, it's important that we have experts involved on those issues.

Then there are other issues that are more broad that aren't specific to -- specific to OHV, for example. They're broader. And in that case the DAC certainly can volunteer members. Ourselves can volunteer for this subgroup, and if we find that that's still deficient in

expertise, we can put out a call for public participation, for other public members in seats that we may be deficient in our own expertise.

However, I would say that, drawing off what you said and what Mike has said, reaching out and identifying and involving interested parties does not have to involve an appointment to a seat on a board. We can reach out, identify and involve members of the public through subgroup meetings.

One, just talking off the top of my head, we could hold, for example, a monument subgroup meeting and at a certain meeting we'll just deal with the conservation envelope, just conservation. So we would make sure to reach out, that all of the conservation interests made sure to be there that day at that time and that we would have that big discussion there.

It doesn't necessarily mean that we have to create a body that has a seat for each and every single member of each and every single organization who wants to be a part of it, but we certainly can make a way to involve them and draw them in.

I think our DRECP Subcommittee kind of did that. We identified interests, and we asked them to get involved. So that's the parameter that I see that we could be operating here.

And just to lead to the conclusion, generally, what we have done in the past is, we say, okay. We want a subgroup. How many do we want on it? And what are the kinds of expertise that we want on that subgroup? That's often what we will do as a body. And then we ask the BLM to go out and solicit these representatives, and then we make the appointments.

But just to kind of push this along a tad, I did print out for you a copy of the advisory committee that Senator Feinstein envisioned in her bill for the national monument. And I'm just saying this is a place to start. Somebody has got to sit down and write something, and so somebody wrote this for us, and I am just putting this out.

For example, it calls for representatives from historical preservation organizations. Mark is involved with the cabins. Jim is involved with the Historical Society of the Upper Mojave Desert. Hunting. Bob, you shoot better than I do.

MEMBER BURKE: Way better.

MEMBER BANIS: Representative of San Bernardino County. Andy Silva already served on the Dumont Dunes Subgroup. He's familiar with subgroups. So what I'm getting at is, a lot of these seats that have been envisioned, I think internally we do have some good

expertise that I think we can take advantage of here. But there are certainly some holes that I think we don't have. Representative of Southern California Edison not here on the board. But goodness, Kathy Ip comes to a lot of meetings. She'd be a good person. So I think we can do this in one way or the other.

I think the biggest challenge in meeting this advisory committee envisioned by the senator, Bob, would be your interest.

MEMBER BURKE: Oh, yeah.

MEMBER BANIS: The senator envisioned representatives of four tribes. You see that? So how do we work with that? So I'm throwing it out not for an answer here today right now, but these are just things that I'm throwing out with ways that we could go.

So thank you for letting me at least throw that out. And I'm open for anything, folks, honestly. I'm open for anything.

MR. AHRENS: I just wanted to offer, just to be clear, in the Collaborative Incentive Program we will actually -- I anticipate we will end up with some, perhaps, focus groups. The bureau now talks about envisioning sessions, so I think those are going to happen. I would certainly anticipate that is going to be part of it, and I think the subgroup would be part of

helping us organize that and work through that.

CHAIR BARRETT: Excellent, Mike. Thank you for that. And what Randy refers to is the advisory committee that the senator proposed be set up to help the BLM and the management of this but obviously within the DAC.

Thank you, Al.

MEMBER MUTH: To, I think, summarize and clarify, at least for myself, what Randy has gone through -- well, I've got this. Thank you -- is, I believe, Randy, you're suggesting that a subgroup be equated to be the monument advisory committee; is that correct?

MEMBER BANIS: Yes.

MEMBER MUTH: Bottom line?

MEMBER BANIS: Yes.

MEMBER MUTH: Thank you.

MR. RAZO: If I may, please be careful with that because, remember, an advisory committee really is a result if you have one out of a congressional legislative act creating your monument. So make sure you stay within the subgroup definition, because if you go beyond that, Senator Feinstein's template was there if things had gone through on the legislative side. Well, but they didn't, but it's not a bad template to

utilize. Just make sure that you're not equating we're creating a pseudo-advisory committee because that's a whole nother RAC, and that means another DFO, and you know that well.

MEMBER BANIS: Let me clarify. It's an advisory committee to the DAC.

MR. RAZO: Sure. Okay.

MEMBER BANIS: That's what I meant. The subgroup is an advisory committee to the DAC.

MR. RAZO: That's fine.

MEMBER BANIS: That's what I meant. Thank you for clarifying.

CHAIR BARRETT: Mark, thank you.

MEMBER ALGAZY: My question was, would you be envisioning holding general public scoping meetings and entertaining and evaluating public comments independently of a subgroup, or would you be envisioning directing all the public to engage themselves through the subgroup in the monument-management process? Would there be multiple things moving forward, or would you be funneling all the public towards participating through the subgroup?

CHAIR BARRETT: Mike, I'll let you take that one. You're so much more eloquent than myself.

MR. AHRENS: I don't know if I can, and I'm not

sure if I completely know how to respond to that. I think all of the scoping and work that happens for the monument, that will be a huge workload, so I'm not sure that I'm prepared to say we should funnel all of that strictly through the subgroup. I certainly want the subgroup, though, to be involved in helping us to define how that scoping occurs and considering, you know, the comments and the interests that are raised through that.

MEMBER ALGAZY: If I might follow up, my question is based on reality. A number of us were involved in the West Mojave Route Network Project with Dinah Shumway, and one of the things that we found occurring was that there were a lot of wonderful comments coming in from the public independently of our subgroup and that we weren't given access to those comments in helping us formulate our own ideas to move forward to the DAC because they came in independently of the subgroup.

So it's not like I'm trying to hold the public back in any way, but without some sort of a channel, we found that the public had a lot of information that was being shared but we weren't able to incorporate into our own comments because the two things were existing independently. So they both have some challenges to them. I don't want to tamper in any way the public's

interest in being involved, but by the same token, the subgroup's work products directly relate to the amount of information and ideas that we get, and without a means to make sure that that happens, I don't know if our product would be limited.

CHAIR BARRETT: Mike, sorry for putting you under the gun with another one.

MR. AHRENS: That's fine.

CHAIR BARRETT: But much of what the work the subgroup may ultimately help with is work that could also overlap on to the Sand to Snow efforts as well. In the sense, Randy and others, that this could be an additional item within the scope of work of the subgroup as well, discuss that designation and how the management plan is associated with that? Or is it too unrelated?

MEMBER BANIS: Okay. My gut feeling about that animal is the weirdness of it being jointly managed with the Forest Service and with the BLM. And that's just very weird. And the other side of it is, isn't the vast majority of it already wilderness or in some sense --

ACTING DIRECTOR ZALE: Particularly on the forest --

MEMBER BANIS: Forest Service part? I don't mean to minimize it directly, but in our calculations we found only eight miles of lands and trails on the BLM

land in Sand to Snow. So from the standpoint of recreation, I would prefer to put my time on the 1,440 miles of roads and trails that are in the monument.

ACTING DIRECTOR ZALE: I understand that. I guess from my perspective my thought was this: that, you know, what's immediately before us are two planning efforts to address each of the two monuments, and to the extent that a subgroup could advise us with how to undergo that outreach and to pull people into the planning process for both of those, you know, where they might be the same advice, that would be great.

Where they might differ, it would be good to have your perspectives on that as well. I just wanted to make sure we didn't lose track of the fact that we actually do have two planning efforts that we'll be undertaking.

CHAIR BARRETT: Mike, timing-wise, if we work on this and, you know, reach out to the public -- obviously, great resources within our group as well -- are we too late to make a recommendation on the subgroup at our next meeting? Or it's not too late?

MR. AHRENS: I guess, like the SRP, we would like to see it happen sooner rather than later. As I said, there's some funding and expert experience and facilitation, what have you, that we're going to be able

to grasp ahold of or plan this fiscal year and implementing into the next, so I would like the subgroup to have some involvement in that.

CHAIR BARRETT: Excellent. And, I mean, as Randy pointed out, I think there is enough expertise within the DAC and supplemented with, you know, some public involvement on specific items as well. I think, in light of what you say, I would like to move forward to recommend that a subgroup be established for this specific purpose.

Hearing no further comment, perhaps Bob.

MEMBER BANIS: This is kind of a weird idea. Pardon me.

CHAIR BARRETT: Bob has something.

MEMBER BURKE: Mike, my group, the public-at-large and bighorn sheep and several other entities, we have a great deal of interest of what's going on with the monument. So I'm all for starting this subgroup to the DAC same to what we had with DRECP, so long as we don't have another North Peak Wind situation. I'm all for a motion to do the subcommittee.

CHAIR BARRETT: Anyone else? Randy, perhaps?

MEMBER BANIS: I have an idea of how to get out of this.

MEMBER MITCHELL: Tell me.

MEMBER BANIS: You like that? We can form a DAC subcommittee today of DAC members, subgroup, committee -- no -- a subcommittee of DAC members today.

MR. RAZO: Okay.

MEMBER BANIS: To meet June, July, to actually set the exact seats that we're going to have, who's interested, what the parties are, the mission statement, the whole thing and do that as a subcommittee to create the subgroup that brings in the outside people.

MR. RAZO: Right, as long as we get to the subgroup.

MEMBER BANIS: If we get to the subgroup.

MR. RAZO: The public we need is part of that.

MEMBER BANIS: It's a conversation we sort of need to have but we are looking at our watches and can't have, "Okay. Let's start striking this. Let's start putting this. Who are we going to get? Who wants to be on it? When are we going to meet?" da-da-da-da-da. That's the conversation we are trying to have, but it's 3:00 in the afternoon.

Let's have a subcommittee. Who wants to be involved? Raise our hand. He appoints us to a subcommittee. Hammer out details. Steve can work out the details. Publicize it. Have our subcommittee meeting, plan it, and be gone. And we'll have it.

MEMBER KENNEY: I'll second that.

CHAIR BARRETT: Bob has a comment on that.

MEMBER ROBINSON: I would be on the
subcommittee.

MEMBER BANIS: That's right, to start, and then
we would formulate what the subgroup is going to look
like, and maybe you would be on that.

MEMBER ROBINSON: I can represent the tribe.

MEMBER BANIS: Bingo.

MEMBER ROBINSON: I think there's some maybe
missing on that too.

MEMBER BANIS: Great.

MEMBER ROBINSON: This isn't set it in stone?

MEMBER BANIS: No. No way.

CHAIR BARRETT: Before I entertain a motion on
that -- sorry, Mike. Let's open it up for some public
comment.

And, John, you had your hand up earlier.

MR. STEWART: Good afternoon, council.
John Stewart, California Four-Wheel Drive Association.

I've had a few years ago of working under
collaborative processes. I have also spent several
years helping the Forest Service develop the Giant
Sequoia National Monument Plan from a proclamation.
Some of the discussion here is alluding to some pitfalls

that you're almost ready to step off into.

Steve Razo mentioned one about being careful of the names that you use. You brought up Senator Feinstein's advisory committee for the monument. Also within this proclamation you have three separate monument entities. One of the things is, is that all three management plans for those separate monument entities are going to have to conform to the base proclamation.

Stepping off and getting a subgroup too early too quick could be detrimental to the overall process. Sitting down and defining criteria to how that subgroup would work is a little bit premature, in my view, right now.

Now, number one, you also have the NEPA process, which is codified in law, that has to be followed. And within that NEPA process some of the things they have to do is scoping. Now, there are scoping which is considered a pre-NEPA scoping. Then there's also the formal scoping after. We're in right now what is called pre-NEPA with the left side of a triangle for a NEPA process. Within that concept, the more open you are to the public, the better off you are without putting any kind of restriction from a subgroup or committee controlled by another committee.

To that extent it is more appropriate that BLM proceed with the collaborative grouping that they have access to work for and begin to establish a broad base of public outreach meetings which are beyond the scope of what really the DAC or any group of DAC could do but let BLM do the broad scope initial public informational and outreach meetings and then start, you know, narrowing down the scope from that point on.

There is plenty of time for the DAC to come up with a subgroup that would actually help manage or carry the monument process forward in the future. Thank you.

ACTING DIRECTOR ZALE: John, just to clarify, from my perspective I think what we were looking for by way of input from a subgroup would be essentially help and advise on how to do what you just said as a pre-scoping thing. We're asking folks to help us organize that outreach and envisioning process and to make sure that we actually get all of the appropriate stakeholders involved.

MR. STEWART: I understand that, but I would defer to the fact that, if the BLM center for collaborative works like the Forest Service does -- and I think they're the same group -- they have the facilities, they have the advertising, and they have the ability to do the outreach to the public to facilitate

the meetings and to begin to boil the issues down into something that is -- you know, can be quantified to be moved forward with.

That does not negate the fact that in the long run there could be a group under this, but I think that within the timeframes that the processes they're looking at, that would be -- leaving it fully unto the BLM to move forward at their speed with what they can do is a much better process than to have them further constrained by the schedule the DAC would move forward with its recommendations up to the BLM.

CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, John. And another public comment and then one more. I have a card here as well.

So, please.

MR. PANKEY: In the announcement by the president declaring -- I'm concerned only with at this time with the National Trails Monument -- that he was basically -- what I read, what I remember. Maybe it's wishful memory -- that he was actually by prescription enacting Feinstein's bill. And this is everything that was going to be in her bill will be enacted, which -- from other information that I've been telling people already that rockhounds have to get involved and get ready because there is a prescribed process that an

advisory committee will be set up for the management -- with the management of -- and to your point, we should reexamine what's been said, because I think, from what I read and remember, that there was a prescription that we set up this advisory committee to the management of the monument.

And I would like -- the DAC committee is a good way to get the ball rolling, but I see it as a separate advisory committee, and I worked with Feinstein's people back in 2009 and '10 in coming up with this list and who is going to be involved. And that's the way she solicited support for her bill for all user groups, is by saying, "We've got a spot for you on the committee." I would like to just clarify that to the reading of the proclamation before we get down the road too far.

CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you. Thank you for that. We have one more public comment.

And Ruth? Ruth Hidalgo. If anyone else would like to speak, Steve is still accepting, even at this late stage.

MR. RAZO: I'm reading the proclamation.

CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, Ruth.

MS. HIDALGO: Hi. Ruth Hidalgo, rockhound.

In March, when I attended the DAC meeting, Teri had alluded to the management plan for the Mojave Trails

National Monument to being handled under a new process, Planning 2.0. I came here looking for some documents on Planning 2.0. I don't see anything.

I would like to know what the timeframe is for this new management plan for the Mojave Trails National Monument and if it will, in fact, be under Planning 2.0 or not. And if so, who's ready to deal with this and understands 2.0 and can tell me what the differences are, because I certainly don't know them.

CHAIR BARRETT: Ruth, since that's a specific question, and before we open up for more comments here, is there anyone who can address that specific question from the BLM or anyone wishes to try or to at least acknowledge the question and indicate you'll get back to her, perhaps?

MR. AHRENS: I'm looking for somebody. So in light of probably not being the best person to answer that, you know, I think the bureau plans for the Planning 2.0 initiative to be completed prior to the completion of our plan. So, yeah, I would think that it would be that this planning effort would fall under the auspice and planning matrixes in Planning 2.0.

So, now, am I prepared to explain to you the intricacies of Planning 2.0? No.

ACTING DIRECTOR ZALE: Would you make sure that

Shaun gets your contact information and we can provide you some more feedback with respect to 2.0 in the near future here?

MS. HIDALGO: Yeah. I was concerned we were going to forward with that. How long does it take for 2.0? When is this supposed to be in effect? If we have another plan coming up, how do we plan for that if we don't know how to plan for that?

ACTING DIRECTOR ZALE: That's why we need a subgroup.

MR. AHRENS: Precisely. I don't know exactly the timeline they hope to have 2.0 implemented. I imagine it's within the next two months or so.

MS. HIDALGO: So planning process for monument won't start for six months or so?

MR. AHRENS: We know what's in 2.0 because it's in the Federal Register and we also read most of it. So one of the main pieces in that is this preplanning outreach, this envisioning that we're talking about. So we're sort of doing that, and we'll be more or less doing that because it's the right thing to do. And then, as the Planning 2.0 becomes into effect, we'll align the actual plan with that.

MS. HIDALGO: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, Mike.

Just to clarify again here, we're not in the position to discuss whether we're an advisory group or anything like that. We're here today just to respond to a specific request from BLM to assist them with respect to the implementation, management thereof, whether a subcommittee or a subgroup ultimately can assist that process, and that's what we're here discussing now. And whether public is part of that or not, that's also what we're discussing. Thank you.

MEMBER ALGAZY: I've been thinking about what John Stewart said, and in my mind I'm equating his concern with trying to beat a square peg into a round hole in that we're dealing with something that's a new paradigm and just using the same old, same old way of dealing with it. And if I'm not paraphrasing you right, let me know.

MR. STEWART: Close enough.

MEMBER ALGAZY: But I think that what your concern is, is that our subcommittee and subgroup process will take the place of a new stakeholder and scoping process that is envisioned to be much larger than the way that things have been dealt with in the past, and your concern is that the BLM may devolve into relying just on what happens here. Have I got it right?

MR. STEWART: Pretty much so.

MEMBER ALGAZY: Thank you.

MR. STEWART: Yeah.

CHAIR BARRETT: Any additional comments from any of the DAC members and so forth?

Oh, yes, we do. I'm sorry, Doug. My apologies. You did come all the way up and fill out a card, so, please, I would love to hear your comments.

MR. FLAUGH: I'm Doug Flaugh, a rockhound. I'm also a bird hunter, and my experience with national monuments is with the Carrizo Plain National Monument. That one, when it was established 15 years ago, we saw a rapid increase in road closures and reduction of access. And it is my fear that the same thing may happen with this national monument.

And also the presidential proclamation pretty much says you cannot remove artifacts from the national monument. I was wondering if we can get a clear statement somewhere that says rockhounding is specifically allowed. Thank you.

CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, Doug. Thank you for that. With that, there is no further public comments. Thank you so much to all.

Essentially now we have a decision to make with respect to a subcommittee to address the specific request from the BLM, not to suggest in any way that

that's anything more than a response to the specific request. Mark, Randy or others, how might we couch a motion to establish a subcommittee with the view that any subgroup would ultimately be defined at the next DAC meeting and that committee then could assist in the interim?

MEMBER BANIS: I would say that I'm queazy about disagreeing with John because I've done that before and have been found to be wrong, but -- but -- but I am going to step off the line, and I'm going to move that we form a subcommittee and schedule a meeting for that subcommittee to set up the parameters for the subgroup mission, which seats are going to be on it. And we ask that Steve put out an application packet for the public and for that subgroup. That's what I'm asking for, a subcommittee of this group to meet as soon as possible to set this parameters up for the subgroup.

MEMBER ALGAZY: I don't think that it's necessary to disagree with John because I think we can preface it by saying, while we recognize the BLM has obligations above and beyond relying on us, we're going to move forward with this.

CHAIR BARRETT: Exactly. Can we make a motion, then, that within a short period of time, maybe a couple of weeks, members of the DAC submit their names to

myself of those interested in working on a subcommittee with a goal to ultimately developing the mission, members of a subgroup to be presented back to the public at our next meeting.

MEMBER FRANCIS: I just have a quick question, if I may. We'll have to coordinate these efforts with the U.S. Forest Service. So if we start -- no? All right. Then that was just -- my only concern is, before we create a mission, we may want to have their input, since they're a party in it as well.

MEMBER BURKE: I have one. Just a point of order. We already have a motion on the floor. We don't have a second yet.

CHAIR BARRETT: No, we don't.

MEMBER BANIS: I moved. You don't have a second; correct.

MEMBER BURKE: I made a motion earlier.

MEMBER BANIS: Did you?

MEMBER BURKE: Yeah, and it got blown right over, and that's okay. You made a motion. So under a point of order, Roberts Rules of Order, there's a motion on the floor. There's been no discussion yet or no second, and we're already into another motion.

CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, Bob. Good point.

MEMBER BANIS: What was your motion?

MEMBER BURKE: Basically what you said. You just "Randycized" it.

CHAIR BARRETT: Randy, would you like to restate your motion --

MEMBER BURKE: Oh, God.

CHAIR BARRETT: -- in a concise format so we can all open it up for comment or withdrawal.

MEMBER BANIS: Let me read from the bylaws. "The council chair with the approval of the DFO will appoint subcommittee members," period.

So it's your call. And so you have the right to form the subcommittee.

CHAIR BARRETT: Correct.

MEMBER BANIS: So the bylaws say the chairman forms the subcommittee and calls for members unilaterally.

MEMBER BURKE: You made a motion. Are you rescinding that motion?

MEMBER BANIS: We don't need it.

CHAIR BARRETT: Randy is pulling his motion, and based on what I've indicated -- if that's okay, based on what I've indicated, I would give two weeks for members of the DAC to submit their names to me for establishing a subcommittee. I don't know if I need a motion on that. I think Randy is indicating I don't.

Al, you have some comment on that?

MEMBER MUTH: Did Bob withdraw his motion?

MEMBER BURKE: Randy overrode my motion.

CHAIR BARRETT: So no motions are on the floor or on the table. And with respect to that, that's my goal. Is there any comment with respect to my goal that within two weeks I'll have names?

Hearing none, I'm making an executive action. Thank you. Thank you, Mike, so much. And thank you to the public for all your comments. And thank you for today. It really was -- really, two days. And yesterday for those who attended, it was quite informative, and I'm sure we all learned a lot from it. So thank you, all, for coming.

Sorry, Tom. Before I adjourn, you have something.

ACTING DIRECTOR ZALE: Just one really quick thing. From my perspective I wanted to make sure that I thanked Katrina and her staff at Barstow, Mike for the tour yesterday. I thought it was great. I wanted to thank the esteemed council here for indulging me today. I really appreciate the work that you guys do on a regular basis for BLM.

And then I finally wanted to thank the public for being here, for caring so much about how we manage

the Public Lands and to definitely invite you to continue to participate with us as we move forward with implementation of DRECP, with the planning for these new national monuments and with all the other work that we couldn't possibly do without your input and help. So thank you.

CHAIR BARRETT: And sorry, Steve. You --

MR. RAZO: Just a reminder. Our next DAC meeting is September 9 and 10.

CHAIR BARRETT: Excellent.

MR. RAZO: Carl is working on that. We're scheduled for Ridgecrest, but there might be a spin on that. Do we want to mention what you might be thinking or just leave it alone?

MR. SYMONS: Just one of the thought processes I've been working through with Steve and my staff is possibly going to the north section of the field office. And if we do that, there might be the possibility we may move it up to possibly Bishop because you can go right up out of Big Pine and drop into the northern area there as opposed to driving from Ridgecrest, which would tack on another two and a half hours each way. So we're still looking at it. But, from what I understand, the DAC has never gone up to that area, and so it will be an all new area and different things.

ACTING DIRECTOR ZALE: The DAC has met in Lone Pine.

CHAIR BARRETT: With that and with Mark's efforts, of course, to ensure that the DAC meetings are more publicized, I think we'll look forward to a final determination.

Steve, you had one addition.

MR. RAZO: And Tom has to close the meeting.

CHAIR BARRETT: I'm not finished yet, Steve. But thank you, Steve. I left out one person, Katrina. Thank you so much. I mentioned the public, but obviously you put this whole thing together, you and your team and so forth, and so thank you so much. It's been a pleasure being up here in Barstow.

And, with that, I will now pass it to Tom. Thank you.

ACTING DIRECTOR ZALE: Okay. So if it's my duty to close this meeting, I'd like to close it with a round of applause for everybody.

(Applause.)

ACTING DIRECTOR ZALE: Thank you.

(The meeting was adjourned at 3:38 p.m.)

---o0o---

MOTIONS

- A. Mover: Banis
 Secunder: Kenney
 Motion: To approve the minutes from the March,
 2016 meeting of the DAC
 Result: Carried
- B. Mover: Benoit
 Secunder: Muth
 Motion: Authorize the chairman to write a
 letter on behalf of the council expressing
 concerns with the timing and lack of ability
 to input and hope that in the future they
 would consider the DAC's schedule for these
 types of things and to include in the letter
 the four or five points discussed by members
 of the DAC stating the concerns expressed
 Result: Carried

CERTIFICATE

I, Diane Carver Mann, C.S.R. No. 6008, in and for the State of California, do hereby certify:

That the foregoing pages were taken down by me in shorthand at the time and place stated herein and represent a true and correct transcript of said proceedings.

I further certify that I am not interested in the event of the action.

Witness my hand this _____ day of _____, 20____.

Certified Shorthand
Reporter in and for the
State of California