

In the Matter of:

U.S. Department of the Interior Bureau of Land Management
California Desert District Advisory Council

Reporter's Transcript of Proceedings

10/15/2016

Personal Court Reports

Job #: 85333

(818)988-1900

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

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
SATURDAY, OCTOBER 15, 2016

JOB NO. 85333

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

1 MEETING OF THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR BUREAU OF
2 LAND MANAGEMENT CALIFORNIA DESERT DISTRICT ADVISORY
3 COUNCIL AT 1200 UNIVERSITY AVENUE, CONFERENCE ROOM D,
4 RIVERSIDE, CALIFORNIA, COMMENCING AT 8:13 A.M. ON
5 SATURDAY, OCTOBER 15, 2016, BEFORE DIANE CARVER MANN,
6 CSR NO. 6008.

7
8 APPEARANCES

9
10 MEMBERS PRESENT:

11 LESLIE BARRETT, CHAIR

12 RANDY BANIS

13 ROBERT BURKE

14 MARK ALGAZY

15 JAMES KENNEY

16 WILLIAM "BILLY" MITCHELL

17 NATHAN FRANCIS

18 ROBERT ROBINSON

19 ROBERT BURKE

20 BETH RANSEL

21
22 \\\

23 \\\

24 \\\

25 \\\

REPRESENTING:

RENEWABLE RESOURCES

RECREATION

PUBLIC AT LARGE

PUBLIC AT LARGE

PUBLIC AT LARGE

RENEWABLE RESOURCES

NON-RENEWABLE RESOURCES

TRIBAL INTERESTS

PUBLIC AT LARGE

DESIGNATED FEDERAL OFFICIAL
(DISTRICT MANAGER, CALIFORNIA
DESERT DISTRICT)

1 APPEARANCES - CONTINUED

2

3 MEMBERS OF THE BLM PRESENT:

4 STEPHEN RAZO, EXTERNAL AFFAIRS DIRECTOR, CDD

5 JENNIFER WOHLGEMUTH, DISTRICT MANAGER STAFF ASSISTANT

6 TOM ZALE, EL CENTRO FIELD MANAGER

7 CARL SYMONS, RIDGECREST FIELD MANAGER

8 KATRINA SYMONS, BARSTOW FIELD MANAGER

9 MIKE AHRENS, NEEDLES FIELD MANAGER

10 DOUG HERREMA, PALM SPRINGS SOUTH COAST FIELD MANAGER

11 DUSTY PARSON, CDD ACTING ASSOCIATE DISTRICT MANAGER

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

A G E N D A

	AGENDA ITEM:	PAGE:
1		
2		
3	WELCOME/PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE, INTRODUCTIONS,	
4	APPROVAL OF MAY 2016 MEETING TRANSCRIPT, REVIEW	
5	OF AGENDA AND PROCEDURES FOR PUBLIC COMMENT	6
6	CDD DISTRICT MANAGER REPORT	9
7	ADVISORY COUNCIL MEMBER REPORTS AND CHAIR	
8	CLOSE-OUTS FROM PREVIOUS MEETING(S)	17
9	PUBLIC COMMENT ON ITEMS NOT ON AGENDA, INCLUDING	
10	REQUESTS FOR DAC TO CONSIDER ITEMS FOR FUTURE	
11	AGENDAS	22
12	DRECP - NEXT STEPS - RUSSELL SCOFIELD	39
13	DAC DISCUSSION ON DRECP - NEXT STEPS	48
14	PUBLIC QUESTIONS/COMMENTS ON DRECP - NEXT STEPS	81
15	MORNING BREAK	98
16	SPECIAL RECREATION PERMIT PROGRAM - SANDRA MCGINNIS	
17	AND DOROTHY MORGAN	101
18	DAC DISCUSSION ON SRP PROGRAM	102
19	PUBLIC QUESTIONS ON SRP PROGRAM	124
20	MTNM ENVISIONING SESSIONS REVIEW - NEEDLES FIELD	
21	OFFICE	130
22	DAC DISCUSSION ON ENVISIONING SESSIONS REVIEW	134
23	PUBLIC QUESTIONS/COMMENTS ON ENVISIONING SESSIONS	
24	REVIEW	135
25	LUNCH BREAK	139
26	MTNM MANAGEMENT PROCESS - MIKE AHRENS, NEEDLES	
27	FIELD OFFICE	139
28	DAC DISCUSSION ON MANAGEMENT PROCESS	143
29	PUBLIC QUESTIONS/COMMENTS ON MANAGEMENT PROCESS	147
30		

A G E N D A (CONTINUED)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

AGENDA ITEM:	PAGE:
OHV MANAGEMENT - RANDY BANIS	195
DAC DISCUSSION ON OHV MANAGEMENT	202
PUBLIC QUESTIONS/COMMENTS ON OHV MANAGEMENT	204
AFTERNOON BREAK (CANCELLED)	
DAC SUBGROUPS - REPORTS	207
COUNCIL QUESTIONS/COMMENTS ON SO/DM/FO SUBGROUP REPORTS	213, 220
PUBLIC QUESTIONS/COMMENTS SO/DM/FO SUBGROUP REPORTS	214, 225
WRAP-UP AND SUMMARY, INCLUDING DISCUSSION OF THEME AND AGENDA TOPICS FOR NEXT MEETING. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS, COUNCIL QUESTIONS/COMMENTS ON DM/FO REPORTS	230
ADJOURNMENT	242
MOTIONS	243

1 RIVERSIDE, CALIFORNIA; SATURDAY, OCTOBER 15, 2016

2 8:09 A.M.

3
4 ---000---

5
6 CHAIR BARRETT: Good morning, all. Thank you,
7 all, for coming, and apologies for the few minutes'
8 delay. We had some technical issues, but thank you so
9 much for being here. And if we might start today with a
10 Pledge of Allegiance.

11 Nathan, perhaps. Thank you.

12 (The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.)

13 MEMBER FRANCIS: Thank you.

14 CHAIR BARRETT: Yes. Good morning. So today
15 we have Beth here with us as well. So she is the new
16 district manager for the California Desert District
17 per se, and many of you may have joined her yesterday
18 for her first introduction to the area. She's only here
19 since Tuesday. So she'll be speaking a little bit about
20 her background and what she brings to this area. So I'm
21 sure we'll all welcome her.

22 And perhaps with respect to the minutes of the
23 meeting, does anybody have any comments on the Desert
24 Advisory Council with respect to the last meeting's
25 minutes?

1 MEMBER ALGAZY: I have a couple of corrections.
2 I noted on Page 4 the acting district manager from our
3 last meeting was named Carl Zale instead of Tom Zale.
4 You might want to fix that for the record. And on
5 Page 148, there is mention of the ACECs, and after that
6 the JCLS, which I think was NCLS. Those are the two
7 corrections that I noticed in the minutes.

8 Other than that I have two comments to make
9 about the minutes. One was the discussion of the timing
10 of the closing of the SEIS on the ACEC issue and the
11 DRECP and the fact that the DAC was precluded from
12 entering a formal comment on that. And I'm hoping that
13 we have an opportunity to revisit that today to discuss
14 with Beth the importance of the role in the DAC in
15 advising the BLM in the timing of planning events from
16 the BLM.

17 And the second was to note that on Page 166 of
18 the minutes a letter was supposed to be written from the
19 DAC to the state, and I'd like to get a follow-up on
20 that.

21 CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you. Thank you, Mark.

22 And any other comments, questions,
23 clarifications or changes to the last board meeting's
24 minutes, last council meeting minutes?

25 Hearing none, do we have anyone --

1 MEMBER BANIS: Move approved.

2 MEMBER BURKE: Second.

3 CHAIR BARRETT: Second. All approve, say
4 "Aye."

5 (A voice vote was taken.)

6 CHAIR BARRETT: Any "Nay"? No. The last
7 council's meeting minutes are approved. Thank you.

8 And perhaps take a moment to -- I don't know
9 how much of the public has had the opportunity to review
10 the agenda for today. It's quite full. And I think it
11 will be quite interesting and a lot of opportunities for
12 public comment. And with respect to that, we've already
13 got quite a number of slips from folks who wish to
14 comment on items not on the agenda. So if it is on the
15 agenda later on, there will be opportunities for
16 speaking at that time. But we do have a number of items
17 that the public wishes to talk about not on the agenda,
18 and that will be coming up shortly after the District
19 Manager's Report. So thank you for that.

20 And then procedures, part of doing so,
21 essentially hand them to Jennifer or Steve over here,
22 and they'll pass them up here so we can keep them in a
23 general order. I'm sure most of you are quite familiar.
24 If there's any other comments from the council members
25 before we get into the District Manager's Report, this

1 will be an opportunity.

2 And hearing none, Beth Ransel, pleased to meet
3 you. And welcome to our group as such, and we're very
4 pleased to have you on board in the permanent position
5 established again, and perhaps you will give us your
6 report and perhaps a little bit of your background too.
7 Thank you, Beth.

8 DISTRICT MANAGER RANSEL: Sure. Good morning,
9 everybody. I'm very pleased to be here with everyone
10 today and sitting on this board and hearing from all of
11 our distinguished members that sit on this board. From
12 everything I've heard from just interacting with the
13 folks on the board here, we have a lot of diverse
14 viewpoints, and so I'm very excited to hear the
15 interactions that take place on the board and hear from
16 you guys and your recommendations going forward on a
17 number of the topics that we have here.

18 My background. I started out my career in the
19 Las Vegas Field Office as a student, actually, while I
20 was working on my master's degree. I became full time
21 once I got my master's degree, and I moved into a realty
22 specialist position, so my background is in lands and
23 realty. I also worked with the power company in
24 Las Vegas Field Office assisting with permitting of
25 their facilities within that area. I did a detail into

1 the Lander, Wyoming Field Office as the assistant field
2 manager, and that was my first foray into management,
3 and it was very exciting and interesting.

4 When I went back to the Las Vegas office, I
5 moved into management there for about a year as the
6 assistant field manager over the Lands and Realty Group
7 there, so it's a pretty substantial lands and realty
8 group, so it was really, really good experience. And
9 then I moved on to our headquarters office in
10 Washington, D.C. as a national program lead for Linear
11 Rights-of-Way working on power lines, water pipelines,
12 roads, oil and gas pipelines, energy corridor work and
13 working primarily on the policy side, you know, at the
14 headquarters office. That's where you're at. And also
15 resolving major conflicts that bubbled up to the
16 headquarters office.

17 It was a great experience working in the
18 Washington office, but after about two years the West
19 called me back, and I moved out to the Moab Field Office
20 as the field manager there. I also sort of missed
21 working in line management. Being a manager is a really
22 rewarding experience.

23 So I was out in the Moab Field Office. They
24 have very interested public and stakeholders and local
25 and state governments there. And I just really thrived

1 and enjoyed that type of environment where there's so
2 many people that really care about the work and the
3 things that are happening on the Public Lands. And so,
4 you know, after several years there -- I was there for
5 about three years -- I've now come here, and I'm excited
6 because I think that this is the same type of
7 environment, just maybe tenfold.

8 And so I'm very excited to be here and in an
9 environment that's very similar to the one I came from
10 in that we have a lot of interested public, stakeholder
11 groups, a lot of partners. It's really impressive, the
12 work that's happening here by our partners, as well.
13 And so here I am. I started on Tuesday. So if you'll
14 bear with me a little bit while I learn about the
15 resources and the topics that we have here.

16 The State Director did hand over the DRECP
17 Record of Decision and the responsibility for
18 implementation of the DRECP to me earlier this week, and
19 so I'll be putting a lot of attention and focus on that
20 implementation and trying to do the best that we can to
21 make sure that we're successful and that we carry out
22 the intent of that.

23 Okay. So as far as reports go, I know that we
24 have four vacancies here on the DAC, and so I'm going to
25 be -- I think that they're pretty much ready to go as

1 far as forwarding up through the chain to the
2 department, but they are waiting -- the team here was
3 waiting to brief me on those selections, and so I expect
4 we'll have those moving along soon here, and we hope to
5 make those appointments pretty quickly. And then I also
6 have the State Director Report that was sent to me. You
7 know, it includes leadership in Washington, D.C.

8 So, of course, Neil Kornze is our director for
9 BLM. Steve Ellis is the Deputy Director for Operations,
10 and Linda Lance is the Deputy Director For Programs and
11 Policy. So those are our key leaderships back east.
12 Leadership in California, we have Jerry Perez, our
13 State Director, who I'm sure most of you have met
14 before, but he was also at the FLPMA celebration
15 yesterday.

16 And Jerry wanted me to let you know he's been
17 continuing to meet with partners and stakeholders. He
18 recently joined Secretary Jewell for the signing of the
19 DRECP. I suspect that many of you probably were present
20 for that fantastic event, and that was in September.
21 And then Joe Stout is the Associate State Director here
22 in California.

23 Here in the district I'm the new District
24 Manager. We have Doug Herrema on board. He's the new
25 Palm Springs Field Manager. So if anyone hasn't met

1 him, definitely find some time to set aside and meet him
2 and make him familiar with what your topics of interest
3 are. We have Dusty Parson, who's acting as our
4 Associate District Manager at least for several more
5 weeks. He's been here for quite a while too, and so
6 he's helping just keep the operational side of the
7 office or the district keeping everything moving.

8 We have Ashley Adams, who's going to be the new
9 Santa Rosa San Jacinto Mountains National Monument
10 Manager. That's a mouthful. Then we have
11 Kyle Sullivan, who's going to be the new Mojave Trails
12 National Monument Manager. And those folks are coming
13 on board, not quite here yet.

14 I guess I'd be remiss if I didn't mention that
15 this is the 40th anniversary of FLPMA. Many of you were
16 at our celebration yesterday, but what that also means
17 is it's the 40th anniversary for the DAC, for
18 establishing the DAC, and so that's a pretty exciting
19 event that I definitely want to recognize as well.

20 So budget, Congress approved a continuing
21 resolution, and that will be in effect until
22 December 9th of 2016. And then Congress and
23 legislation, the 114th Congress will be coming to a
24 close at the end of this year. All legislation that's
25 not enacted, it says it will be dead, but I probably

1 would word it differently.

2 A number of legislative proposals of interest
3 to the California Desert. They include Senate Bill
4 2568, which is the California Desert Conservation
5 Off-Road Recreation and Renewable Energy Act. It was
6 introduced in February and includes items from
7 Senator Feinstein's proposal for the desert that were
8 not designated by the Antiquities Act. And BLM has
9 testified in support of a similar bill at a committee
10 hearing on October 8th of 2015.

11 California Minerals Off-Road Recreation and
12 Conservation Act, which is H.R. 3668, was introduced at
13 the beginning of October. BLM has opposed the bill at a
14 committee hearing on December 9th of 2015. Imperial
15 Valley Desert Conservation and Recreation Act of 2015,
16 which is H.R. 4060, was introduced November 18th of
17 2015, and no hearings have been scheduled for that.

18 Santa Ana River Wash Plan Land Exchange Act
19 H.R. 4024, was introduced on November 17th of 2015, and
20 no hearings have been scheduled for that one.

21 California Coastal National Monument Expansion Act,
22 which is Senate Bill 1971 -- and there's a companion
23 bill in the house, which is H.R. 3565, introduced in the
24 summer of 2015, includes Rocks and Islands in the
25 Palm Springs-South Coast Field Office. In the Senate

1 committee hearing on October 8th BLM testified in
2 support of the Senate bill. The House bill, which
3 excludes the Lost Coast provision of the Senate bill,
4 was introduced in September, and in a House committee
5 hearing on May 12th BLM testified in support of the
6 House bill.

7 And I just have two more. Incorporating the
8 Orange County Rocks into the California Coastal National
9 Monument, H.R. 4233, was introduced on December 10th,
10 and BLM supported the bill at a committee hearing on
11 May 12th. And Soledad Canyon Consistency Act, which is
12 H.R. 4566, was introduced February 12th, and no hearings
13 have been scheduled on that.

14 So in terms of state issues and priorities that
15 are relevant for the California Desert District here,
16 national monument planning, during the last three years
17 there's been an additional four national monuments
18 including, Berryessa, California Coastal -
19 Point Arena-Stornetta and Sand to Snow and
20 Mojave Trails. They were established by President Obama
21 through presidential proclamations.

22 And with the importance of the establishment of
23 these new national monuments, our state office has
24 established a group at the state office that's going to
25 be working with the district and field offices, and

1 they've already started working with our district and
2 field offices here. And they're going to be helping to
3 kick off this planning effort. And so, I guess the
4 take-home from that is that we have support from the
5 state office and some resources that are going to help
6 us through the planning for these important national
7 monuments that we have.

8 The other piece is the implementation of
9 landscape level planning documents is also a statewide
10 priority. And for us the take-home on that is the
11 DRECP. Of course, the ROD was signed on September 14th
12 of this year, a very exciting event, and the focus is
13 now on implementation of the landscape planning
14 documents.

15 We have a new person or a new position within
16 our district office with Russell Scofield. I think
17 we're going to be hearing from him on the agenda today.
18 And he's going to be -- he has been named as the DRECP
19 Implementation Coordinator, and he and I are working
20 very closely together on this piece. But he's going to
21 help lead us through this endeavor of ensuring that
22 we're implementing the DRECP and all the intents of the
23 document.

24 And that's all I have for my report out today.
25 Thank you.

1 CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, Beth. And actually
2 if I can take a moment just to acknowledge one person,
3 and that's Tom, slash, Carl Zale for sitting up here for
4 the last meeting and so forth. It was a true pleasure
5 to work with you and to acknowledge all the work and
6 everything you put in for that period of time. So thank
7 you again, Tom.

8 MR. ZALE: Thank you. The pleasure was
9 entirely mine.

10 CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you. And also to
11 acknowledge again and later on in our meetings today is
12 presentations on Mojave Trails management and process
13 and essentially opportunities for more public engagement
14 in that, in the implementation of the plan itself. So
15 we'll talk about subgroups and others. So if you have
16 questions associated with that, you'll have many
17 opportunities to present your cards as we go through the
18 presentations. So thank you for that.

19 If now perhaps we can move on to some of our
20 council members' reports. We'd like to take a
21 volunteer, if there's any.

22 Randy, would you like to start. Thank you so
23 much.

24 MEMBER BANIS: Thank you, Leslie. And again,
25 welcome, Beth. Thank you. Good to see you.

1 DISTRICT MANAGER RANSEL: Good to see you.

2 MEMBER BANIS: First thing I'd like to report
3 is that for the past two years I've been fortunate to be
4 the chairman of the Public Lands Roundtable of
5 Ridgecrest. That is a community group in Ridgecrest
6 that invites the BLM to a monthly meeting to share
7 information and exchange ideas about the management of
8 Public Lands in the Ridgecrest area.

9 Proud to say that the sole nominee for the next
10 chairmanship of the Public Lands Roundtable of
11 Ridgecrest will be Bob Wood, who is the chairman of the
12 Desert Tortoise Preserve Committee. So hopefully we
13 will be hearing from Bob at some of our meetings as we
14 travel north into the Ridgecrest and Barstow areas.

15 Another thing. One thing I'd like to talk
16 about today is, we are all here really because we're --
17 we love our Public Lands, obviously. Some of us have
18 ties to our Public Lands that are very, very deep and go
19 for a very long time, many generations. We've all
20 spoken very critically of unmanaged activities on Public
21 Lands that degrade the sensitive resources. One of
22 those unmanaged activities has been the epidemic of
23 marijuana grows on Public Lands.

24 And this is a desert issue in the sense that in
25 the Ridgecrest Field Office the White Mountains have

1 been the home to such grows. And I know of that
2 personally because Friends of Jawbone has been asked to
3 assist with equipment, loaning equipment, dump trucks
4 and things like that, to be able to clear all the
5 garbage in the pipelines and everything else that gets
6 left behind from those operations. Those operations are
7 by and large run by cartels that are tied to other
8 atrocities and things all across our country and
9 throughout the hemisphere.

10 We have an opportunity to really strike a blow
11 to the illegal marijuana grows on Public Lands through
12 Proposition 64. We all have feelings on this issue. We
13 all have families. We may have professional ties to
14 public health, to law enforcement and to a number of
15 other important social aspects that may affect
16 Proposition 64.

17 But being here today talking about Public Lands
18 and the benefits to Public Lands, I would just like to
19 urge my fellow DAC members and members of the audience
20 to consider that extra variable when you go to the
21 polling booth and vote on the propositions. Think about
22 your Public Lands. And I hope that you'll vote to
23 protect our Public Lands from those cartels.

24 So thank you. And that's all I've got today
25 for a report. The agenda is really loaded. Thank you,

1 Leslie.

2 CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you again, Randy.

3 Mark, do you have some comments? Thank you.

4 MEMBER ALGAZY: For those of you that don't
5 know, I've had a personal issue come up. I had a fire
6 in my warehouse a couple of months ago, and it's made me
7 more than a little distracted with what I feel are my
8 duties as a responsible member of this council. I'm
9 struggling to maintain the high standards that I brought
10 to the job. I know that different people make different
11 levels of commitment to this job, but I've been very
12 committed for the last two years, and it's really been a
13 struggle the last couple of months to maintain.

14 The only real report that I have to give at
15 this time is my ongoing frustration with the
16 Programmatic Agreement for the cultural resources.
17 Under the worst possible conditions I had to have a
18 teleconference with the Bureau of Land Management, which
19 was forced under a deadline to have that conference
20 call. And I couldn't have been more distracted under
21 the terms of that meeting.

22 And I stress once again my frustration with the
23 fact that the modeling program, which in itself is a
24 wonderful vehicle that the BLM developed, will
25 ultimately more or less decide that 94 percent of our

1 cultural resources in the California Desert are not
2 qualified for protection under the National Register
3 Program, which then leaves them in a hazier position as
4 far as management. And the BLM has a long history of
5 not having always managed those things in the most
6 responsible way under other terms.

7 So I haven't bowed out as a consulting party
8 from the official process yet, but I've made it
9 abundantly clear to the BLM I'm more concerned with the
10 94 percent of the properties that are not going to be
11 listed in the National Register. And I was given a
12 verbal commitment during that conference that the BLM
13 would work with me to try and organize a better system
14 for managing those other resources. Nothing has come of
15 that yet, and I have little faith that it will,
16 considering how many other priorities the bureau has to
17 deal with. And unfortunately I just do not have the
18 time or the energy to deal with a push from my end, so
19 I'm not exactly sure where that's all headed. But I did
20 make statements about this at a previous meeting, so I
21 wanted to follow up on that.

22 CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, Mark.

23 And any other members with any comments?

24 Hearing none, I just also want to acknowledge the DRECP
25 signing and essentially the commitments at that

1 presentation by the secretary and by Jerry Perez, our
2 State Director, to have the DAC and the public be as
3 much involved as possible in the implementation of the
4 DRECP -- it's fair to say that I think as a DAC we had a
5 number of concerns with the DRECP and expressed those on
6 a number of occasions. But we're now moved on to the
7 implementation stage and the opportunities for the
8 public to understand what the implementation of the
9 DRECP is and to help, you know, to bring up questions,
10 help influence how it's moved forward, and we're here to
11 assist in that.

12 And essentially that is the function of our
13 group, is the opportunity for the public to bring their
14 issues forward to the BLM in a public forum. So we have
15 a commitment that we can participate actively in the
16 DRECP from the implementation stage, and we're here to
17 assist in that in any way we can. Thank you.

18 With that, no other comments from the DAC
19 members, I believe now we can move on to public
20 comments. With that -- and please forgive me if I got
21 the public comments not wholly in order, but I'll do my
22 best from the cards that we received. Thanks, Steve.
23 So these are specifically items not on the agenda, and
24 the first is John Stewart.

25 Thank you, John.

1 MR. STEWART: Good morning, council, and
2 welcome, Beth Ransel, for your introduction and first
3 meeting of the DAC.

4 My name is John Stewart. I'm a resource
5 consultant for the California Four-Wheel Drive
6 Association. And I appreciate some of the comments that
7 you mentioned, Beth, about some of the new projects
8 coming up. And I keep hearing words about stakeholders'
9 involvement and working with the public.

10 But I'm also acutely aware that BLM has
11 recently engaged in what they are terming as
12 Planning 2.0. And one of the things I don't see on the
13 agenda and I would like the DAC to consider for a future
14 agenda item is to actually explain to the public and
15 provide something where everybody has a common base of
16 understanding of what is going to be implemented as far
17 as Planning 2.0 with respect to the major planning
18 efforts coming forth.

19 As noted, DRECP, the Mojave Trails and all
20 these others they're talking about implementation
21 stages, these will have a massive impact on the public.
22 And being able to reach out to the public, being able to
23 get ahold of the appropriate public people that can
24 provide comments and work with this to lessen the impact
25 on the public would be greatly appreciated. So again

1 knowing how BLM is going to work within what is their
2 latest plans for Planning 2.0 is going to be a critical
3 point of developing a common understanding as we move
4 forward.

5 I would also like to take this moment to just
6 provide an informational point to the council having to
7 do with the State of California and their Off-Highway
8 Motor Vehicle Recreation Program. That program is set
9 to expire within another year. This is a source of
10 funding for grants that have been used by many of the
11 field offices for projects within the -- you know, to
12 help for recreation and restoration. From the
13 recreation community, we are committed to having that
14 program extended.

15 There's going to be a lot of false information,
16 incorrect information as it moves forward and a lot of
17 efforts going through over this next year, but please be
18 assured that from the recreation, the OHV community, we
19 are committed to seeing that process through, and our
20 goal is to achieve a renewed program by the first of
21 July of next year. Thank you.

22 CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, John. And I do want
23 to acknowledge that I have the speaker cards for the
24 remainder of the agenda items as well. So thank you.

25 MEMBER ALGAZY: Leslie, I would just like to

1 say that John's summary can be called "2.0 for Dummies,"
2 and I'd appreciate a "2.0 for Dummies" also.

3 CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, John. Thank you,
4 Mark. And we have a few more speakers.

5 Lynne Miller, perhaps. Thank you, Lynne.

6 MS. MILLER: Good morning. I'm Lynne Miller
7 from California Historic Route 66 Association, and we
8 are the non-profit organization that works to promote
9 and preserve and educate about Route 66 in California.
10 I see lots of familiar faces. We had the opportunity to
11 address the DAC in May about our work on the Needles to
12 Barstow Corridor Management Plan. And today we are here
13 twofold, one, to welcome Beth to your new position. And
14 we have a Route 66 information kit for you that I'll
15 give you in a moment. And also to thank the DAC and the
16 BLM for your support.

17 On September 30th a cooperative agreement that
18 we had with the BLM terminated, and that was a wonderful
19 partnership that had been established that provided
20 funding for us to work on the Corridor Management Plan
21 and also to do some outreach and capacity building.

22 Excuse me. I wanted to acknowledge the support that we
23 received from the Barstow Field Office, specifically
24 Duran Sanchez, who was our project liaison, and
25 Zachary Pratt, who was our program officer. And in the

1 Needles Field Office, Mike Ahrens was very helpful, and
2 we've got a longstanding good working relationship.

3 Excuse me. I don't know where my voice is
4 today. Beth had mentioned the importance of
5 partnerships, and that is one of the things I wanted to
6 stress is that, even though our cooperative agreement,
7 our formally signed piece of paper, ended on
8 September 30th, you can be assured that the partnership
9 between California Historic Route 66 Association and the
10 Bureau of Land Management will continue. I think
11 especially with the designation of the Mojave Trails
12 National Monument, the role of CHR66A and the BLM, we
13 are inextricably linked as we are promoting both our
14 Public Lands and Route 66. So thank you so much for
15 your support, and we look forward to that continued
16 partnership.

17 CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you. Thank you, Lynne.

18 DISTRICT MANAGER RANSEL: Great. Thank you
19 very much.

20 CHAIR BARRETT: Lynne, I know it's very
21 difficult to follow Lynne with a presentation like that.
22 So if you don't mind.

23 MR. DUNCAN: Yeah, but I agreed for her to
24 speak first. Thank you very much. I'm Glen Duncan.
25 I'm president of the California Historic Route 66

1 Association. We are very happy to support the new
2 national monuments. I'd like to announce our -- we're
3 having our annual dinner celebrating the 25th
4 anniversary of our organization on October 29th, and
5 we're still -- we have a -- we're still looking for --
6 and it's still opened until next Thursday -- for
7 reservations. We are very happy to have as our keynote
8 speaker Aimee Awonohopay, who is the Public Lands
9 Partnership Manager for AIANTA, which is the American
10 Indian Alaska Native Tourism Association.

11 I was happy to go to the American Indian Travel
12 Association convention in Tulalip, Washington a couple
13 of weeks ago and was just absolutely amazed how many
14 tribal groups across Route 66 and across the whole
15 country are really doing a great job to develop tourism
16 and economic development along the road. They're
17 involved in tourism, and they're increasing -- their
18 attitude is being hospitable. And the amount of work
19 that's being done across the country is absolutely
20 amazing, and the creativity.

21 At the convention the Department of Interior
22 was there. The Department of Commerce was there from
23 Washington. There was some really great information.
24 And we're very happy to have Aimee as our keynote
25 speaker two weeks from tonight. She's obviously very

1 involved in Public Lands partnerships, and so there is
2 some information on our annual meeting and about Aimee
3 in your packets, and we'll have some available if some
4 of the people in the audience would like to go. And if
5 you want more information, you can always go to our
6 website, which is www.route66CA.org.

7 I'd like to say also that, as an item for
8 future agendas, our relationship -- the public funding
9 through the Parks Service is due to expire in 2019, and
10 we are now working very hard and will want your support
11 to become a National Historic Trail. And we'll have
12 some information for you. Hopefully that can get
13 agendized next month.

14 CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, Glen. Thank you so
15 much.

16 Next speaker is Bob Ham. Bob, thank you.

17 MR. HAM: Thank you. Bob Ham. I'm on the
18 board of directors with the ASA and CORVA, and I also
19 serve on your subgroup for the Imperial Sand Dunes. And
20 it's about those dunes that I'm here to talk to you
21 today.

22 An issue has come up. As you know, the dune
23 season is pretty much getting underway. It formally
24 starts probably Halloween weekend. But a longstanding
25 issue that we've been working on in the area ever since

1 the Union Pacific took over from Southern Pacific a
2 number of years ago, they closed all of the access from
3 the dunes side on the west to the east side where
4 there's some open trails and so on and actually trails
5 all the way to the Colorado River that are accessible by
6 non-highway legal greenstickered vehicles.

7 We've had some incidents. Needless to say the
8 inability to have a legal crossing hasn't stopped the
9 desire to cross, and occasionally that has happened,
10 with at least one incident with some fatalities. City
11 of Brawley on Monday signed a letter to Union Pacific.
12 The board of supervisors in Imperial County heard it on
13 Tuesday. They will have a letter that will be approved
14 next Tuesday.

15 What they want to do is get all of the parties
16 together. There are some solutions. Union Pacific is
17 now getting ready to double track the railroad, and
18 they're going to take out the existing washes, one of
19 which was -- ten was a big one that used to be legal,
20 and it used to be -- it's big enough to cross vehicles.
21 This time they want to put a series of tubes in that
22 will essentially wipe out any future of being able to
23 access that with vehicles. It probably also has some
24 implications for migrating animals, and we do want to
25 take this to the Fish and Wildlife Department.

1 But the issue right now is, we need to find a
2 legal crossing as soon as possible. They do have to --
3 as part of the double tracking, Caltrans is going to
4 redo Highway 78 so that it can cross the second set of
5 tracks. They're going to have to pave a temporary
6 go-around while they're doing that construction. It
7 would be very easy to come in, put K-rail once they open
8 the new highway, put K-rail there, put in longer arms so
9 that traffic can stop. And that's one solution.

10 There is money available to help Union Pacific
11 do Wash Ten with a trestle kind of crossing,
12 under-crossing, and that needs to be done. I'm just
13 asking that this board stay on top of this issue when
14 you're asked to come to meetings. Beth, please be
15 supportive of this effort. I think in the long run it
16 will save lives. Thank you.

17 CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, Bob. And I want to
18 acknowledge I got a copy of the report from Tom Acuna as
19 well, and hopefully that will come up later in the
20 discussion this afternoon. Hopefully you will still be
21 here. So thank you.

22 MEMBER BANIS: Leslie?

23 CHAIR BARRETT: Yes.

24 MEMBER BANIS: Do you recall we had at a DAC
25 meeting -- I don't think it was the last DAC meeting.

1 Maybe it was the March DAC meeting. Gosh, maybe it was
2 all the way back in December. But we had a visit from
3 the state office, the safety representative from the
4 state office, and talked about their desire to partner
5 with some kind of an initiative for improving the safety
6 of recreational activities on Public Lands. I wonder if
7 this is an issue that we can bump through that channel,
8 since that channel was -- came down to our meeting and
9 offered to us. And I think this truly is an important
10 public safety issue.

11 MEMBER MITCHELL: I think that was last
12 meeting.

13 MEMBER BANIS: Was it the last meeting?

14 MEMBER MITCHELL: There were two people, I
15 think, was it? Three.

16 MEMBER ALGAZY: I remember two also.

17 MEMBER BANIS: Thank you.

18 CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you. Thank you.

19 Sophia, I see comments for everything. Would
20 you like to comment on items not on the agenda? Thank
21 you so much, Sophia.

22 MS. MERK: Yeah. I usually do that. Welcome,
23 Beth. I was just in your neck of the woods a couple of
24 weeks ago celebrating my 70th.

25 I've got two letters I want to submit to the

1 DAC. One is in regards to Section 106 and why aren't we
2 using 110? The second one is also on the 2.0 rules, and
3 I will submit this to our clerk instead of trying to
4 read through all that.

5 I also have a request by a very good friend of
6 the desert, Mr. Ed Waldheim. He wanted to know if
7 you're going to continue the OHV leadership meetings and
8 when is going to be the next one.

9 CHAIR BARRETT: We'll have to discuss that. I
10 think we'll give Beth an opportunity to research and to
11 confirm back with us all on that. Thank you.

12 MS. MERK: I really appreciate the DAC taking a
13 look at the safety issue down there in the Dumont Dunes.
14 It is quite a safety issue. Saying all that, I'm on the
15 agenda for later on, so I'm just going to submit these
16 two letters.

17 CHAIR BARRETT: I only have one more card. If
18 we have anybody else, Steve is still over here. But it
19 will be Gerry Hillier.

20 Thank you, Gerry.

21 MR. HILLIER: Good morning, and thank you,
22 Mr. Chairman.

23 I'd like to say once again welcome Beth,
24 District Manager. As one of the alumni of that sat up
25 there with the federal presence, you're in a hot seat,

1 and we welcome you joining the challenge that many of us
2 have been through on both sides of the table. And thank
3 you to the BLM particularly there for including me in
4 the program yesterday. I really appreciated the
5 opportunity to speak formally and to the assembled
6 guests and the DAC regarding the background of FLPMA and
7 the integration of the California Desert Conservation
8 Area.

9 As those of you who know me, I've been
10 intimately involved for some 40 years with just really
11 the existence of both, and I didn't have sense enough to
12 ride off into the sunset when I retired as DM, so I'm
13 still around.

14 Currently I serve both as the Federal Lands
15 Consultant to San Bernardino County, and then separately
16 I serve as executive director of an organization called
17 Quad State Local Governments Authority, which is a
18 nine-county interstate joint powers authority in the
19 Mojave and a couple of counties in the Sonoran Desert
20 there, and we organized around desert tortoise issues
21 but have extended our interests to a broad range of
22 public land issues in both Mojave and Sonoran Deserts.

23 Two or three things I wanted to bring up very
24 quickly and just to file away. First I mentioned
25 tortoises. You probably haven't been told yet, but

1 welcome to the management oversight group, and it will
2 be meeting in Las Vegas in December. And I'm sure that
3 you'll need to get briefed on that and get ready for it.
4 My reason for bringing it up here is the fact that I
5 think that the council needs to have some briefing on
6 the status of desert tortoises, desert tortoise
7 management and the issues still associated with it and
8 concurrently the Recovery Implementation Teams that are
9 developing action plans. And Fish and Wildlife Service
10 and the MOG have adopted some priorities for
11 implementation, and I think, since it involves
12 investment mostly of BLM funds and BLM management, I
13 think it's well that the council get up to speed on
14 those.

15 The RITs will be having a conversation by
16 teleconference at the end of this month. I think it's
17 on 27th or 28th. I don't remember offhand. But at any
18 rate, you need to get briefed to get up to speed on that
19 because the tortoises really in the -- well, in the high
20 and low desert, both are an overriding issue.

21 I'd also like to bring to your attention the
22 Desert Landscape Conservation Cooperative, which is
23 another area that the DAC has probably not been
24 adequately briefed on, and there is upcoming a pilot
25 program that includes Inyo County and San Bernardino

1 Counties. They adopted this a year ago. They've been
2 moving very slowly. They've had three pilot programs,
3 and this will be the third one. And I still, although I
4 ride herd on their meetings, they will not let local
5 governments become part of their steering committee, but
6 I still attend.

7 Do I need to stop? At any rate you need to get
8 on top of that. The BLM representative to that steering
9 committee is Julie Decker out of Arizona, and I do not
10 know, and I've never had a good feeling -- that's not
11 the right word to use. I've never had a sense of how
12 much she coordinates with the other states in terms of
13 passing along information. This pilot program, the
14 first was in southeast Arizona. There's one in
15 West Texas, and there's the one out here in the
16 Mojave Desert. And hopefully they're having a steering
17 committee meeting the end of this month.

18 I'm going to Asilomar, and hopefully I'll get a
19 better handle on that, and I hope BLM gets a better
20 handle on how that's going to integrate, because that
21 again is a parallel landscape planning effort
22 associated, and I have raised the question frankly, and
23 comments will be made how that integrates with DRECP,
24 and we still haven't got a clue. So that's going on.

25 The third thing. Just I echo John Stewart's

1 comments on getting a briefing on 2.0. I have no idea
2 what the schedule for adoption is going to be, but it is
3 going to be big time when it comes down the pike. And
4 so the council is going to have to be brought up to
5 speed. The Route 66 people reminded me I need to say
6 something about RS 247, which is a topic that
7 probably -- most of the council, their eyes glaze over
8 and they don't know what it means. I've been working on
9 two pieces of legislation that are pending. I have a
10 feeling the department would oppose both.

11 But we've been working on trying to develop an
12 administrative means to provide for approval of
13 rights-of-way, and interestingly enough Route 66 has
14 been the iconic example of why this legislation is
15 needed. The two pieces are H.R. 4313 from
16 Congressman Cook co-sponsored by Kirkpatrick out of
17 Arizona, and the Senate bill is the S.3334 from
18 Senators Flake and McCain, senators out of Arizona.

19 The interesting thing in Route 66 is, if you
20 look at the master title plats, Route 66 does not appear
21 on the master title plats in Arizona or California, the
22 only park with one exception -- and there is about a
23 20-mile part through Goffs that appears, so it's a
24 legally recognized right-of-way, and that's only because
25 San Bernardino filed Quiet Title Action for those county

1 roads that were in this Mojave National Preserve. And
2 there was the surrounding roads, like the Nipton Road
3 and Route 66, that were included in that.

4 And the last time I checked the master title
5 plat, that part through Goffs was noted on there, and it
6 says right on the plat "RS2477," but it starts in the
7 desert east of Goffs and ends in the desert approaching
8 Essex, and that's it. So that's the only part of
9 Route 66 that's actually on the master title plat, and
10 it's important that those get on there. And I can talk
11 much longer on that subject there, but I won't take the
12 time here.

13 One final thing, Strategic Habitat Conservation
14 Planning. It's a program of Fish and Wildlife Service.
15 They dropped it on the Mojave -- on the management
16 oversight group, and at the last meeting something that
17 the Fish and Wildlife service is doing in the
18 Mojave Desert just generally, again landscape planning
19 by another agency. We have no idea of its integration
20 with BLM programs, BLM management. They just said,
21 "We're doing this." And so I think the DAC and the
22 public both need to be briefed on this. It's an
23 independent effort by another federal agency. Frankly
24 I'm at a loss to explain other than Fish and Wildlife
25 Service is doing it, and I don't know of its integration

1 with BLM, but I am concerned. Thank you.

2 CHAIR BARRETT: Gerry, thank you. Thank you
3 for all the information. And I do want to acknowledge
4 Ms. Carson and Dr. Hughes. You've asked to speak at a
5 later part of the agenda. So thank you.

6 MEMBER ALGAZY: Leslie.

7 CHAIR BARRETT: Yes, Mark. Thank you.

8 MEMBER ALGAZY: Just to give Beth a little
9 historical perspective, the tortoise recovery has been
10 something that the DAC has talked about having a report
11 on for quite some time. It actually almost became a
12 running joke because it took over two years to get it on
13 the agenda, but it actually was on the agenda at our
14 Palm Springs meeting last year, which unfortunately
15 Gerry was not able to attend. So instead we got a very
16 dry report from a gentleman inside the bureau, whose
17 first name was Mark, and I can't remember his last name.
18 But it was kind of like listening to Ben Stein give a
19 lecture to a high school class, and I doubt that anybody
20 in this room remembers what Mark had to say during that
21 presentation, whereas if we had gotten a presentation as
22 expected from Gerry, I'm sure we would have remembered
23 it. So we did try to get Gerry on the agenda before,
24 and it just hasn't worked out yet.

25 CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, Mark, although I do

1 remember from that presentation the quite dire
2 consequences for the desert tortoise through inaction.

3 And does anyone else wish to make a public
4 comment for items not on the agenda? Hearing none, any
5 other DAC member wishing to comment on any of the
6 discussion points brought up? And hearing none -- and I
7 think we're very much on schedule, which brings us to
8 Mr. Scofield, Russell, who's going to give us a
9 presentation on the DRECP and specifically the next
10 steps.

11 MR. SCOFIELD: Good morning. It's certainly
12 good to see many folks that I have not seen in a while.
13 Good to be with you here today. So, as Beth mentioned,
14 I am at a transition from my current job up at the state
15 office down to the desert to coordinate implementation
16 of the DRECP. So I am as excited as the rest of you to
17 see how that's going to work out. But we have lots to
18 do and lots to talk about. So I'm not going to talk
19 specifically -- sorry. I hate standing behind lecterns.

20 I'm not going to talk specifically about the
21 DRECP. We've all seen the DRECP presentations
22 ad nauseam, and there was a briefing that Vicki Wood did
23 just before the ROD was signed, which the DAC
24 participated in that, discussed the differences between
25 the final EIS and the ROD, so I'm not going to cover any

1 of those type of details. What I am going to talk about
2 today is implementation and where we are planning to go
3 with implementation, and then I've got some things that
4 I would like for the DAC to think about.

5 So I prepared recently for Beth and Jerry a
6 draft hundred-day plan. We have some things we would
7 like to get accomplished within these first hundred
8 days, give or take a handful of signing of the ROD, and
9 of course keep in mind that was a month ago, so we're
10 really talking now about a 60-day plan. I'm not going
11 to say whether that's 60 business days or 60 calendar
12 days.

13 So certainly we have internal communications.
14 That is the highest priority. We want to make sure that
15 all of our BLM field offices are up to speed on the
16 DRECP, exactly what it says and exactly how they can
17 implement our new Land Use Plan Amendment. Also local
18 government, we need to reach out to the counties to see
19 how the DRECP -- and we really already largely know
20 because we've been working with the counties, but we
21 need to -- now that we've got a final Land Use Plan
22 Amendment, we need to talk to the counties about how
23 that will mesh with the county plans and a path forward
24 for implementation of both the county plan and the DRECP
25 on Public Lands.

1 Of course travel outreach will be a high
2 priority, and we're talking about several opportunities
3 both through government-to-government consultation,
4 which will of course continue with the local line
5 officers but also through the DRECP Programmatic
6 Agreement and those signatories.

7 Stakeholders. This is really the big one that
8 I would like to talk to the DAC about. So we've
9 identified a number of different groups that we would
10 like to outreach to, and as I discuss how we outreach
11 with the stakeholders, I really have some things that,
12 as I said, I would like for the DAC members to think
13 about. So let me talk about kind of the different
14 groups we want to reach out to, and then we can talk
15 about how that might work.

16 So first let's talk about recreationalists. I
17 certainly intend on reaching out to some of the
18 recreational-oriented groups. The OHV Leadership
19 Roundtable was mentioned a moment ago. Also seeing
20 John Stewart again brings back memories of working with
21 John in the past through the desert managers' group.
22 But I also wanted to talk to the DAC about ways that the
23 DAC can assist in reaching out to recreationalists.

24 We certainly have a number of CMAs within the
25 DRECP, as you know, that protect recreational

1 opportunities. We have obviously other aspects of the
2 DRECP, the SRMAs, the ERMAS that protect recreational
3 opportunities. But we still need to understand from the
4 recreational community how we can best implement those
5 actions to protect those recreational issues, and
6 obviously we can't do that unless we hear from you. So
7 recreation, I think, is a key component that the DAC can
8 help us on on DRECP implementation.

9 We're also going to be reaching out to the
10 various environmental groups. I think that we have some
11 opportunities with them to partner, in particular, with
12 some of the land trust groups. We will be reaching out
13 to the other federal, state, local and tribal agencies
14 to coordinate implementation of the DRECP with other
15 planned activities in the desert, the idea being, "A,"
16 communication with those other agencies and, "B,"
17 looking for synergies. What are these other bureaus
18 doing on their land that we want to do on public land
19 that, as I said, we can build a synergy with?

20 And then lastly -- and again this is another
21 biggie that I would like assistance from the DAC or at
22 least like to discuss how the DAC might provide
23 assistance -- is just public land users. We talked
24 about several different user groups in particular, but
25 what about all those other user groups, the public land

1 users? So again how do we reach out to the wide variety
2 of constituents we have out on the Public Lands? So
3 those are the basic categories of stakeholders we would
4 like to reach out to.

5 As far as other activities that I think would
6 be of interest to the DAC that we will be engaging in in
7 the first hundred days, there's been lots of discussion
8 of disturbance caps and how the disturbance caps upon
9 the conservation lands will apply to projections, so BLM
10 recently let a contract and had a pre-work meeting with
11 the contractor to start mapping disturbance caps. So
12 then we know how much disturbance is already out on the
13 landscape. How much more disturbance can we allow
14 within that particular landscape?

15 Another big one for the DAC. We will be
16 developing an implementation strategy. As I said, I've
17 written, like, a hundred-day -- an initial kickoff
18 strategy. At least it's in draft. And what we're
19 talking about here with development of an implementation
20 strategy is something more long-term, and the idea being
21 here that we will pull out all the actionable items from
22 the DRECP. We will then prioritize those actionable
23 items, and then we will start developing budgets and
24 scheduling when we might be able to start getting those
25 action items done.

1 So BLM is going to engage in the identification
2 of the actionable items, basically identifying what work
3 needs to occur. And then for the prioritization, there
4 will be a BLM internal prioritization phase. I would
5 like to again talk to you about how the DAC would then
6 like to weigh in on what BLM recommends as priorities.
7 And then there will need to be also a public scoping
8 phase to involve the general public and to better
9 understand what their priorities are for DRECP
10 implementation as well.

11 Talk a little bit about renewable energy
12 permitting. It's often easy when you look at all of the
13 other aspects of DRECP to forget the reason we started
14 DRECP in the first place, was the demand and the need to
15 permit renewable energy upon the Public Lands. So we
16 will be outreaching to the industry. We will be
17 identifying projects that are within DFAs and those
18 projects within the DFAs that will fall under the DRECP,
19 those projects we will begin working on under the DRECP,
20 and those projects will benefit from the streamlining
21 within DRECP.

22 What does that mean? It means that we will be
23 able to use the DRECP biological opinion. It means that
24 we will be able to use the DRECP Programmatic Agreement
25 with the prescribed timelines. So we're looking to do

1 lots of outreaching with the renewable energy industry.

2 And then lastly I plan to develop a DRECP
3 action plan. And this will really add more specificity
4 to this sketch of the first hundred days that I've
5 pulled together. Basically how do these actions
6 continue into the future, and how do we build in these
7 other actions that will come out of the implementation
8 strategy development?

9 So let's pivot around to how we would like to
10 engage the DAC, how you would like to become engaged and
11 have a little discussion around that. So I guess the
12 things that I would like for you to think about is,
13 first, is the DAC you have had in the past a DRECP, I
14 think, subcommittee, subgroup.

15 MEMBER BANIS: Committee.

16 MR. SCOFIELD: Committee, yes, yes. Steve
17 knows I always get the subcommittees and the subgroups
18 mixed up, so forgive me if I misspeak on those two.

19 So you had the DRECP Subcommittee. So what I
20 would like for you to consider is, would the DAC be
21 interested in standing up a permanent DRECP Subgroup
22 that would help inform us with actions related to the
23 DRECP?

24 And again I'm thinking that you could certainly
25 add benefit in helping us reach out to recreationalists,

1 to the public-at-large, to folks like that. There might
2 be other areas, other resource areas that I'm not
3 mentioning that you could also add value to as well. So
4 I'm here to listen to your ideas on that as well.

5 So if that's not the direction that you want to
6 go or potentially even in addition to standing up a
7 subgroup, how can the DAC as a forum provide stakeholder
8 communication regarding DRECP? Can the DAC help us
9 identify synergies? You know, I talked about synergies
10 with other agencies, but how about synergies with other
11 groups? What are other folks out doing on the desert?
12 How can we build a synergy for that? And what areas of
13 expertise can the DAC provide? Can you provide
14 additional expert expertise? Yes, that's redundantly
15 redundant. Sorry.

16 Can you help provide feedback, for example?
17 And this is really looping back to my first two
18 questions. But can you help provide expert feedback in,
19 for example, the area of recreation? Can you help
20 provide expertise into development of monitoring
21 strategies? Monitoring within the DRECP is a key
22 component, as you know. Adaptive management is a very
23 key component of DRECP, and we will need to develop a
24 monitoring strategy that fits into the DRECP adaptive
25 management program. So are there opportunities for the

1 DAC to provide expertise into that program's
2 development?

3 We will obviously be working with folks like
4 the USGS, the UC system, folks like that. But that
5 certainly doesn't capture a hundred percent of the
6 knowledge base.

7 And then I talked a little bit about the
8 development of the implementation strategy. So I
9 suggested that certainly BLM will need to go through
10 first and identify what its priorities are, once we
11 identify what the work. But then how can we best
12 solicit your feedback on BLM's identified priorities?
13 You might know of circumstances or instances where those
14 priorities should be rearranged. So that's another
15 question for you to think of, think about.

16 And then, as I said, once we work through that
17 prioritization, we will definitely need the public
18 scoping phase. It would not be unlike public scoping
19 for an EIS or any public scoping-type exercise that BLM
20 does.

21 So those are my initial thoughts about
22 implementation and, as I said, a few items for the DAC
23 to discuss. So I guess I'll turn it back over to the
24 DAC members, hoping to get a little bit of feedback. Or
25 maybe you want to think about it and then give us some

1 feedback.

2 CHAIR BARRETT: Russell, thank you. And I just
3 want to preface everything, but the most important
4 discussion, of course, will be the public comments. And
5 after we've had our discussion points here, please send
6 those cards forward to Steve. And after our discussion
7 we'll take those public comments on this particular
8 subject matter.

9 And thank you, Russell, again for the
10 presentation. And perhaps following your order -- and I
11 know we'll have a number of comments up here -- we'll
12 take recreation first. And then no intention that that
13 be the highest priority up here, but I think there's
14 been a number of discussions on that before.

15 So, Mark? Thank you.

16 MEMBER ALGAZY: Even though I don't directly
17 represent recreation, my comments go directly to
18 recreation. I think that we could use a little more
19 discussion from you before we can move forward. I don't
20 know if it's everybody's understanding in the room, but
21 it's been informally discussed that WEMO will need to be
22 revisited wholesale in the aftermath of DRECP to the
23 extent of having another round of EIS. And it's in the
24 context of WEMO that the DAC has had a longstanding
25 commitment to the process.

1 Back in 2012 we had a West Mojave Route Network
2 Subgroup that was formed specifically to deal with WEMO.
3 As opposed to the 30,000-foot view of the desert that
4 the DRECP has, WEMO is something with
5 on-the-ground-access that we can all understand. Any of
6 us that use the roads in the desert for access, for
7 rockhounding or any other form of recreation, that's
8 where everything hits the ground. That's where we all
9 have the understanding. And it's also something that
10 the DAC has had, as I say, a longstanding commitment to,
11 an interest in, and has expressed interest in possibly
12 revisiting the route networks subgroup to provide input
13 to the BLM.

14 And I would say before we overcommit ourselves
15 to having a DRECP Subcommittee and trying to
16 reconstitute a West Mojave Subgroup, that we should have
17 some more information from you about how you see the
18 WEMO Plan going forward so that, if there are multiple
19 choices for being involved, we make the best choice,
20 since we are not people that don't have anything else to
21 do with our lives.

22 MR. SCOFIELD: I appreciate that you have other
23 things to do with your lives. I would hope so. I would
24 hope that would be the case.

25 CHAIR BARRETT: Sorry, Russell. Just a point

1 of clarification, perhaps, or even an addition to the
2 topic?

3 MEMBER MITCHELL: I just had a question. Are
4 you saying Russell Scofield didn't want to drive
5 downstate Rattlesnake Canyon about ten, 20 years ago?

6 MR. SCOFIELD: I've driven down
7 Rattlesnake Canyon before, so I don't know.

8 MEMBER MITCHELL: I was in the car with you.
9 You said you would never do it again.

10 MR. SCOFIELD: Probably so. Yeah. That's
11 because it was a new government vehicle. That's why.

12 MEMBER MITCHELL: Anyway, on a more serious
13 note, it highly disturbs me that the ranching industry
14 was not mentioned whatsoever in this, and they're one of
15 the main stakeholders, what's left of the industry.

16 Second thing is, I didn't know -- and maybe you
17 guys can help me. Were any of these leases on these
18 subcommittees before I was involved with this that were
19 taken out: Black Ranch, Harper Lake, Crescent Peak, and
20 June Lake. Were any of that mentioned or discussed
21 prior to my being on here?

22 There's a 40th anniversary. And the ranching
23 industry created this. Well, first of all, I'm years 14
24 years younger than the Taylor Grazing Act, and the
25 Taylor Grazing Act, this board, and Gerry Hillier --

1 he's about as old as I am or a little older -- can tell
2 you. Probably met once a year, and it was a grazing
3 advisory board. Then the FLPMA came along, and that's
4 why we're mandated here doing what we are today. All
5 right?

6 None of this was brought up, these leases, for
7 this board to advise why did the DRECP retire over half
8 of the cattle industry in San Bernardino County, which
9 brought over \$2 million in the '80s to the RIAC Board
10 that I chaired for the last 15 years?

11 And for this board and the public to
12 understand, what FLPMA was designed to do was to utilize
13 sustainability and viability of industries, mining and
14 ranching, and every AUM that's paid for the Federal
15 Government under Section 15 the Taylor Grazing Act comes
16 back to the county it's generated in, which that money,
17 the board I sit has distributed out to projects, water
18 projects, fencing projects.

19 Bob might even want to comment on this.
20 Ranchers dug these without backhoes, Fresno, in the
21 early days. I'm fourth generation. My grandparents
22 were one of the oldest families here and had six of the
23 major ranches. I only have one now, and obviously
24 they've all passed. It disturbs me that these leases
25 were applied for and have -- what do they call it? --

1 proposed -- shit, I forgot -- decision and never got a
2 final decision, these families.

3 There is probably four families, Williams -- I
4 can name them all for you -- but applied for these
5 leases two years ago. The Moon family ten years ago,
6 almost 12 years ago got a proposed decision but never a
7 final decision. Now, how does that fit in the
8 regulations that we have here? I've read the Taylor
9 Grazing Act. I've read FLPMA. I've read NEPA. There
10 was no NEPA done.

11 Last meeting I asked for specific things
12 from -- and believe me, this is not directed at you.
13 There was a different person there. I asked for
14 specific things on these ranches, and I got one thing
15 back from Barstow resource, a lady that retired it when
16 there was no avenue to retire a lease, and in Gerry's --
17 when Gerry was on the BLM, if a lease came up, it went
18 to the next rancher. I know that for a fact because my
19 uncle lost one, and Dave Fisher picked it up. These
20 leases were not advertised to anybody. And they had
21 direct people asked to take these off.

22 So for me it's very disturbing that when these
23 regulations are put before us and only the rancher has
24 to be accounted for, and the BLM didn't have to do
25 anything. And this is not against any one of the area

1 managers that step into this, or you, so I don't think
2 there's nothing that can be done about it.

3 The family that had these had two days left to,
4 I guess, protest it or go to IBLA. You know, it was
5 going to be too expensive. But it just appalls me that
6 there was no discussion whatsoever on this. And for the
7 secretary to be mandated for sustained yield and
8 viability of industry and then turn around and kill the
9 cattle industry that's been here since the 1900s before
10 the Taylor Grazing Act, that's very disturbing to me,
11 very disturbing to me.

12 And to sit representing the last five people on
13 this board, it's -- I just am beside myself to see why
14 the Secretary of the Interior would allow this. I don't
15 even know why this energy plan would even retire leases.
16 But answer me that. There is no NEPA done on any of
17 this, and it's a change. We asked for cattle for two
18 extra months on a ranch, and we got denied since nine or
19 2007 because they couldn't get the NEPA done. Two extra
20 months. You can take 60 head off one lease, take 200
21 head off another lease, a change of the whole thing.
22 Not required to do a NEPA because the excuse I got was
23 it's called it's casual use.

24 Two hundred head, casual use, taken off an
25 allotment that's been there since -- well, my

1 grandparents had it probably in the fifties. You know,
2 casual use. Well, we're asking for two extra months for
3 40 heads of cows? How much more casual can you get?
4 And if you read NEPA, I cannot find it. And, please, if
5 somebody can direct us to it. There is nothing in there
6 that says casual use. But yet through Barstow resource
7 I've got the paper right here from the specialist, the
8 range specialist now, they didn't have to do it because
9 it's casual use. That don't fly with me.

10 And I'm sorry, Beth, that you stepped into this
11 thing and Katrina too. She knows what's been going on,
12 and Mike Ahrens. They all know. There's major issues
13 with the cattle industry for the last ten years that's
14 been totally neglected, totally neglected. And I didn't
15 know the right time to bring all this up. I'm glad when
16 we get back to the resource reports about the ranches
17 you did put in.

18 On that note, Mr. Chairman, I worked very
19 diligently with Tom Pogacnik, which is going to retire.
20 He guaranteed me -- I came up with real high aspects of
21 Beth. And like I told you yesterday, so she's got a
22 real good deal in ranch. As I talked to Mike and the
23 area managers now, which I've been involved with
24 numerous area managers in my life, as Gerry Hillier
25 knows. These are some of the best that we have right

1 now to resolve these issues.

2 The reason I'm saying all this is the families
3 that I represent wanted this to be in the congressional
4 records of the wrongdoings for them and the annihilation
5 of the cattle industry that is responsible for why we
6 sit here and why these BLM jobs are created. So for the
7 40th anniversary, it's not too happy with this old
8 Billy.

9 But by that token, we're going to try to do
10 things better for the last five families that are left,
11 at least as long as I'm alive, and there's no
12 impeachment process, I don't think. It doesn't even
13 affect the OHV use on it. I mean, if there's no
14 cattle -- obviously the springs are gone. Obviously all
15 the work the county did for the wildlife, it's all gone,
16 all gone. A couple of groups like Bob go out. People
17 try to keep springs going. The cattle would have no one
18 left, you know. Nobody is going to keep them going.
19 These bighorn sheep people, the burden falls on them,
20 you know?

21 And why and how this happened -- and I probably
22 dropped the ball on it. I thought the county was
23 working with me on it. I thought Congressman Cook's
24 office would. I've reached out to Senator Feinstein
25 because it's her desert. She saved two other families

1 in perpetuity, and hopefully the last five she's going
2 to help. But without opening those leases back up --
3 and that was part of her request when I went to
4 Washington, D.C., how to save the industry. And it just
5 got blown away, just, "Hey, we're going to do it whether
6 you like it or not."

7 I've been told that, "If you want to go to
8 court, we'll see who runs out of money first." Well,
9 obviously it's going to be the ranchers. So with that
10 I'll give it back to Mr. Chairman.

11 DISTRICT MANAGER RANSEL: Can I just make one
12 comment?

13 CHAIR BARRETT: Yes. Thank you, Beth.

14 DISTRICT MANAGER RANSEL: Just one comment. I
15 want to thank you for bringing those concerns up and
16 raising them in this forum, and I definitely look
17 forward to learning more about the history there. It
18 sounds like there's a lot that's happened, and I
19 definitely look forward to hearing more and learning
20 more about this going forward.

21 MEMBER MITCHELL: You better ask Mike and
22 Katrina about that because they've been dealing with it
23 a lot. Mike doesn't want to go out to dinner with me
24 anymore. Just kidding, Mike.

25 DISTRICT MANAGER RANSEL: Thank you.

1 CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, all.

2 Russell, perhaps I will give you an opportunity
3 to respond to some of these more serious concerns, but
4 not to preclude that there will be a number of other
5 comments as well.

6 MR. SCOFIELD: Yeah, sure. And, you know,
7 Billy, yeah, I don't know where to begin. As I said,
8 and as you brought up, the planning decisions in the
9 DRECP have -- I mean, those have been made. That was
10 made, and that's been made. The ROD has been signed.
11 So what we need to do now as far as implementation is to
12 design a process so we could still implement those
13 planning decisions made in the DRECP but yet recognize
14 those grazing privileges that those families have.

15 MEMBER MITCHELL: That's my main concern.

16 MR. SCOFIELD: So I think that's where we need
17 to look for the common ground between your industry and
18 the other goals within the DRECP, and that's where that
19 common ground exists. Those will be our priorities, I'm
20 pretty sure.

21 MEMBER MITCHELL: That's where the solar plans
22 or wind plans are probably going to take out the
23 ranchers, because all what's left on Public Lands are
24 ranchers, you know? I mean, there's probably not too
25 many areas. And these other ranches I don't think now

1 if they've been retired and going to conservation or --
2 I don't know exactly how or what they've done. They
3 obviously probably can't put solar on them.

4 So the other five families, like the Moon
5 family having their ranch gone, you know. But we did
6 get a bill passed, A.B. -- I think is it 112? --
7 through Senator Feinstein's office and Congressman Lewis
8 before he retired that the rancher does -- they have to
9 deal with the rancher. They have to compensate them.
10 They have to use the mitigation part of it so the
11 families can pick up their pieces and take their
12 families and obviously buy a ranch in another state or
13 California, which there's only five left in the
14 Mojave Desert right now.

15 But I knew you wouldn't be able to answer a lot
16 of these questions, but please in the future just --
17 it's not just recreation. There still is a little bit
18 of a cattle industry left.

19 MR. SCOFIELD: Right, right. And as I said, I
20 talked about recreation, but then, you know, I
21 recognize, as you know, there are many other uses in the
22 desert.

23 MEMBER MITCHELL: Right.

24 MR. SCOFIELD: And we don't want to lose sight
25 of those uses.

1 MEMBER MITCHELL: Thank you very much.

2 CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, Billy. We'll get
3 back to Mark's comments with respect to WEMO.

4 Do you have some additional information on
5 that?

6 MR. SCOFIELD: Yeah. So WEMO -- and I might
7 lean on Katrina, if I may, to help me out here. But
8 WEMO is proceeding, and a lot of the disturbance mapping
9 that has been occurring for WEMO is the same type of
10 disturbance mapping that I mentioned that we will be
11 doing for DRECP. Obviously the DRECP -- by preceding
12 WEMO, DRECP is amending the California Desert
13 Conservation Area plan. And WEMO then would be --
14 because it is also a Land Use Plan Amendment, would then
15 further amend DRECP.

16 So I don't know if you have more or want to
17 correct me more. To be honest, I haven't really
18 started -- as I said, I'm in a transition now, so I
19 haven't really started diving fully into WEMO, and
20 you're the expert.

21 MS. SYMONS: Right. So the timeline that we're
22 working on right now to complete the disturbance
23 baseline will be May. That's May of 2017. As each of
24 the Areas of Critical Environmental Concern and
25 Conservation Lands -- as each unit is being completed,

1 we have another step in place in order to actually do
2 field verification. That's supposed to be done by June
3 of 2017. But we're getting these interim products.

4 So for purposes of moving forward with WEMO,
5 since we are going to be putting out a new Draft
6 Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement, I welcome
7 if the DAC wishes to stand up the WEMO Subgroup again, I
8 think that would be a really good step forward in order
9 to help to explain to the constituents, the general
10 public, of the complexity and implications of whatever
11 that final answer is about the baseline, the disturbance
12 baseline. Anything different?

13 So Ridgecrest field manager and Barstow, you
14 know, WEMO has got the four field offices. The bulk of
15 WEMO falls underneath Ridgecrest and Barstow. So do you
16 have anything else to add, Ridgecrest?

17 MR. SYMONS: The only thing I can say is that,
18 as with Katrina, you know, welcome the subgroup involved
19 in WEMO. And some of the hard decisions that will
20 probably come up due to disturbance cap issues is what
21 routes that we have open, because we'll have a limited
22 amount, and there is a mitigation aspect to DRECP for
23 actions in areas that are over the disturbance cap.

24 So those might be another hard decision that
25 we're going to make. How much budget do we have? How

1 much do we physically mitigate in order to allow access?
2 You know, the decisions between things that we have to
3 do like right-of-ways, access to grazing improvements,
4 access to mining as opposed to access to recreation
5 areas, those are all decisions that we're going to have
6 to make.

7 And I think what a lot of it's going to boil
8 down to is, we're going to have a request or feel the
9 need for this much, but we only have resources to do
10 this much (indicating). So there's going to be a lot of
11 hard decisions, and that's something that the DAC can
12 really help with because of your wide range of interests
13 and stuff to help balance that so that we get a fair and
14 equitable decision at the end.

15 MR. SCOFIELD: And the that, too, brings up the
16 point Billy had made a minute ago. If you're talking
17 about the WEMO group, what I'm looking for in the DRECP,
18 again, as I said, I specifically mentioned recreation
19 because that's a constituency that I feel you can add
20 value to. But for DRECP, we're bigger than WEMO, and
21 we're bigger than recreation or routes of travel,
22 period.

23 MEMBER ALGAZY: What I saw with the West Mojave
24 Route Network Subgroup was a template for interfacing
25 with the public so that, rather than reinventing the

1 wheel, we already have a template in place with a proven
2 track record where we were able to have outreach
3 meetings with the public. I think we had eight
4 meetings. I'm not exactly sure.

5 MEMBER BANIS: Twelve.

6 MEMBER ALGAZY: Twelve meetings during the
7 course of the route network project. And we had some
8 wonderful -- I'll pat my colleague here on the back. We
9 had some wonderful interfacing volunteerism from the
10 Sundance Media Group to actually bring digital maps to
11 the meeting, and it really helped the public to help the
12 DAC interface with the BLM. It worked. It had some
13 glitches in it, but the glitches were mostly because we
14 couldn't get maps fast enough to be able to give the
15 public the information they needed to make good
16 comments.

17 But other than that, I don't know why we would
18 need to necessarily reinvent the wheel. If we could
19 lean on that subgroup and somehow maybe expand it, it
20 would really help to, in my opinion, make a lot of the
21 fuzzy concepts of DRECP more real-world to the public,
22 because there is an actual on-the-ground thing that
23 people can understand using the WEMO process.

24 CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you.

25 And Billy?

1 MEMBER MITCHELL: Ridgecrest -- I don't think
2 I've been introduced. Is it Mr. Symons?

3 MR. SYMONS: Yes.

4 MEMBER MITCHELL: Do you have any ranchers left
5 up there? I know P.K. is gone because I was the last
6 one there.

7 MR. SYMONS: Yeah. Well, down in more the
8 DRECP area we mostly have sheep grazing.

9 MEMBER MITCHELL: You still have sheep grazing?

10 MR. SYMONS: Yeah, we still have quite a bit of
11 that. But we do up in Fish Lake Valley area. We still
12 have grazing operations, and we have the college.

13 MEMBER MITCHELL: I didn't know Fish Lake was
14 yours.

15 MR. SYMONS: So we actually have about 28
16 permits, I believe. We actually have the most permits.

17 MEMBER MITCHELL: Great. Thank you.

18 CHAIR BARRETT: Randy, thank you.

19 MEMBER BANIS: Of course. First I want to
20 thank the bureau for getting the shapefiles for the
21 DRECP out so quickly. Wow. I mean, that was fast. I
22 didn't expect that. I expected -- I mean, it was like
23 No. 50 on the list of things to do, ask the bureau for
24 shapes. I just didn't expect it to come out less than a
25 month after the ROD, and we have them. Thanks for

1 putting those out.

2 MR. SCOFIELD: We have to know where we are;
3 right?

4 MEMBER BANIS: It's awesome, and I really
5 appreciate that. Again it goes back to the Obama
6 administration's executive order to make public those
7 kinds of data to stimulate entrepreneurial spirit and to
8 foster economic development and so forth. So thanks for
9 doing that, because next month we'll be releasing the
10 CTUC Panamint Valley map, and it will be the first map
11 to reflect DRECP ACEC shapes, so we're really quite
12 proud to be able to put those out immediately.

13 Thanks, Mark. Touching with the other
14 regulation communities with rockhounds here, that will
15 have a strong voice DRECP planning. Hunting and
16 recreational shooting will have a strong voice, I hope,
17 in the recreational planning. Friends groups that do
18 work on the ground under MOUs with the BLM that --
19 friends groups are actually there on the ground with
20 putting in shovels and running excavators, so it's
21 important that they be involved in that planning.

22 Another issue I would like to see with respect
23 to recreation is, there were so many, so many very big,
24 complex issues in the DRECP. One that I don't think
25 recreation, and I know I, didn't have the ability to dig

1 deeply into was an analysis of those lands that were
2 identified for exchange with the state.

3 I'd like to see an analysis of how these lands
4 that are I.D.'d for exchange might impact the route
5 network. There are cases where a single BLM parcel
6 might be the only thing that is in reality keeping a
7 road open for access. Just as an example, in the
8 Ridgecrest area along the Red Rock-Randsburg Road, along
9 both sides of the road are private property and mixed
10 ownership, but deeper off the road is all contiguous BLM
11 property. The access roads emanate from the highway
12 into the hills. But they have to be able to get through
13 that mixed ownership parcel in order to get to the
14 recreational activities that are in the hills.

15 So in the event there are parcels identified
16 for exchange with the state, we'd like to have them
17 mapped with the designated route networks to see if
18 there's some impacts.

19 Also what would be interesting is, we left one
20 question unsettled with respect to mitigating effects of
21 renewable energy development on recreation within the
22 DFAs. The DRECP brought recreation a first-time
23 mitigation requirement to mitigate for lost recreational
24 activities. We're proud of that. But we didn't really
25 get to figure out all of the ways or potential ways to

1 conduct that mitigation for some kinds of recreation.
2 It's kind of a no-brainer. If it impacts a campsite,
3 well, maybe we can just move the campsite. Or if it
4 impacts a road, maybe we can just route the road around
5 it or something.

6 But what do you do if it impacts a rockhounding
7 site? You can't really move the rocks. And rocks are
8 where rocks are, so we never really figured out how that
9 would be mitigated. But those are things that, as we go
10 forward and as projects apply within the DFAs, I hope
11 that we can turn those attentions -- and again I'll be
12 honest here. We may not want to go through some big
13 process of, how do we mitigate this specific thing in
14 the event it happens? It might not happen.

15 You know, we may want to see where these
16 applications are coming in in the DFAs, see how they're
17 sitting, and we may want to work even closer with the
18 rockhounds to see if they would be generous enough to
19 show us their favorite fishing spot, so to speak, within
20 those DFAs so we can kind of put the X's on the ground
21 before the applications come in. Thank you.

22 Gosh, that's all my checkmarks. But thank you,
23 Mark, for touching on all the other stuff. It was key
24 and important. Also thank you to Billy for -- actually
25 I want to thank you for ending your comments in the air

1 of optimism and hopefulness, and I think that's kind of
2 just a reflection of all of us that participate here.
3 We may start out a little gruff at times, but we are
4 optimistic, and we are hopeful. We wouldn't be here
5 otherwise, if we didn't think that change was not
6 possible.

7 MEMBER MITCHELL: Exactly, Randy.

8 MEMBER BANIS: Thanks. Good to have you.

9 CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, Randy.

10 Other comments from DAC members? Hearing
11 none -- oh, actually, thank you.

12 MEMBER KENNEY: I don't see why we can't
13 incorporate all of that into a WEMO group, because then
14 it could be expanded to see how that works. And since
15 WEMO will be the first, we can interact with all of
16 these groups in our meetings. We had separate meetings
17 from the BLM before, and that worked pretty good to get
18 some people out that didn't bother to come to the
19 official BLM meetings. And we had good dialogue with a
20 lot of interested people who, to coin the phrase, didn't
21 want to hear the same stuff from the BLM that they've
22 been hearing for years, working mostly one on one.

23 I think that could still be accomplished, and
24 it would be a lot more involved than just route
25 networks. We could do pretty much everything you're

1 talking about in separate, small, intimate meetings
2 where we actually meet the people. I don't think the
3 big meetings where they all get together have to go
4 someplace to a meeting just to go recreate in the
5 desert.

6 As they said in the California parks meeting,
7 "The guys that go to the beach don't have to go to a
8 meeting. Why do we?" And the same thing for a lot of
9 people that recreate in the desert. Why do they have to
10 go to a meeting to ride a horse or go hiking or all
11 this? That should be already there somehow. And I
12 think we can do that with a committee separate, you
13 know, from the DAC to do that.

14 MEMBER ALGAZY: To pick up on what Jim was
15 saying, when we held our previous subgroup meetings, we
16 were basically looking to put together a baseline of
17 route network opportunities which was put together with
18 the BLM's own GTLF mapping effort to create basically a
19 master route list on which the WEMO was finally proposed
20 the 15,000 miles of routes.

21 But to be fair to the public, we always had a
22 doubt in our minds as to if we were really telling the
23 public the whole truth about what we were doing and the
24 information that we were gathering. And even at that
25 time the public was saying to us, "Well, we've already

1 done this once before or twice before or three times
2 before. How many times are we going to have to do
3 this?" And obviously now we're going to have to revisit
4 yet one more time.

5 But now rather than asking the question in a
6 vacuum of saying, "What are the roads that you use?
7 Give us all the information you have," this is the time
8 where we would go forward saying, "Okay. Now there's
9 this thing called a disturbance cap, so we're going to
10 ask you for the first time to prioritize. If you can't
11 have it all, what do you want most?" And that's the
12 honest question that we should have been asking from the
13 beginning. And that's really what I think we should be
14 looking at doing now.

15 CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, Mark. Thank you,
16 Jim.

17 Anyone else? Hearing none, I'd like to open it
18 up for public comment.

19 MR. SCOFIELD: Thank you.

20 CHAIR BARRETT: Sorry.

21 MEMBER ROBINSON: We were just talking about
22 recreational.

23 CHAIR BARRETT: I'm sorry, Bob. We did drift
24 from recreation to other subject matters. My
25 apologies -- that was me -- for misleading you. Let's

1 open it up for all discussion items.

2 Sorry, Russell. If you can come back. My
3 apologies.

4 DISTRICT MANAGER RANSEL: Bring Russell back.

5 CHAIR BARRETT: Sorry, Russell.

6 MEMBER MITCHELL: Another trip down
7 Rattlesnake.

8 CHAIR BARRETT: The car has got a lot older by
9 now.

10 MR. SCOFIELD: I think that car is probably
11 beer cans by now.

12 CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, Bob. Thanks for
13 your patience.

14 MEMBER ROBINSON: What I would like to address
15 is on tribal issues. Virtually the whole desert when it
16 comes down to it, all of them include cultural resources
17 on them in one level or another. And also another issue
18 that gets overlooked is cultural landscapes. You know,
19 there's -- a lot of the professional community likes to
20 refer to native people in the past tense. But we're
21 still very much there and very much active on the
22 desert.

23 And our tribe personally is not a recognized
24 tribe. We're actively looking for reinstatement. We
25 used to be recognized, and we're trying to get

1 reinstated right now. But we're active on these
2 renewable energy projects with monitors working on these
3 projects.

4 We have a real serious problem getting the
5 companies to have our monitors present for the
6 walkthroughs on these projects. And these individuals
7 that -- or these companies that do a lot of these
8 Phase 1 walkthroughs miss huge amounts of cultural
9 resources on their walkthroughs.

10 And in instances where companies have included
11 our tribal people, they are doing a much better job and
12 have tended to continue to use tribal personnel because
13 they're real familiar with what their resources are,
14 because a lot of time the archeologists come from
15 different places, and there's been an attempt by the
16 Society for California Archeology to have -- at least
17 the leads of these projects to have a certain amount of
18 experience before taking on the projects, but that's
19 never been instated.

20 So I guess what I was looking for is, have
21 something in the directives to these companies that are
22 doing these projects to do some of the -- and have
23 native people out there, because they're available. All
24 the tribes have staff and have offices, tribal historic
25 preservation offices, to direct to and receive personnel

1 that are trained. And a lot of them have had their
2 archaeology field school, and a lot of our monitors
3 have, and they have been involved from the beginning of
4 the project.

5 And it would be a much greater ability to plan
6 around these projects and maybe do more avoidance
7 instead of always going out and laying out this property
8 and everything that is found is boxed up and taken to a
9 museum. And what's happening is our footprint on the
10 property, our tribes, is being removed. And with these
11 huge projects, it's becoming to be a lot because a lot
12 of wind areas that are especially -- and the solar areas
13 are also areas where people tended to be a lot. And I'm
14 talking about with both private property and BLM,
15 because it's a cumulative effect. It is affecting us.

16 And so the companies like to minimize the
17 cultural resources that they deal with and the amount of
18 resources that they put out to protecting those cultural
19 resources, so it needs to be spelled out in their
20 instructions from day one that that's what they're
21 dealing with and so that we aren't constantly trying to
22 play catchup and we wind up with a lot of cultural
23 resources being overlooked or damaged or not recognized
24 at all. And that's basically what I had to say.

25 MR. SCOFIELD: Okay, yeah. And those are good

1 comments that I appreciate. I talk a little about
2 cultural landscapes and the cumulative first, and
3 within -- I didn't spend a lot of time talking about it
4 when I was going through our hundred-day strategy, but
5 within the DRECP Programmatic Agreement, as I'm sure
6 you're aware, one of the action items with a defined
7 timeline on it is to develop a mitigation program that
8 will address those cumulative, indirect impacts to
9 cultural resources, which, of course, a cultural
10 landscape would be a component thereof.

11 So I don't know. Is your tribal signatory to
12 the Programmatic Agreement?

13 MEMBER ROBINSON: Yeah.

14 MR. SCOFIELD: Okay. So you should have
15 already gotten -- your tribe should have already gotten
16 a letter from our archaeologist asking if you're
17 interested in consultation on that particular project
18 and the archaeologist.

19 MEMBER ROBINSON: I get about this much mail a
20 day (indicating).

21 MR. SCOFIELD: I'm sure. Yeah, let's have some
22 follow-up on that. But then also the other action item
23 out of that Programmatic Agreement is development of a
24 sensitivity model, which would not -- it would not be a
25 decision-making tool. It would be more of a

1 decision-support tool that in the sensitivity model you
2 would be able to predict where cultural resources were
3 more likely to be found.

4 That's not to say that they either, "A," would
5 be found there or that they would not be found somewhere
6 else. It's just a tool to help us to know where to look
7 first. And again we're asking for signatories to the
8 P.A., reaching out to them to determine their level of
9 interest and consultation on the development of that
10 model, that tool, as well. You know, as far as having
11 tribal members serve as cultural monitors for projects,
12 that's the idea that you're capturing.

13 Did I get that right?

14 MEMBER ROBINSON: We presently are on projects.
15 We've got over 20 people right now working.

16 MR. SCOFIELD: Okay.

17 MEMBER ROBINSON: But on Phase 1 when they're
18 actually going out and doing the planning for the
19 project, instead we also hear about it after the notice
20 of preparation is completed and everything, they've got
21 their plan in place and they're going on the basis of
22 what the archaeologist they sent out there. And a lot
23 of these companies have a conflict of interest. They're
24 owned by large international engineering firms, and
25 everything continues to get minimized, you know, at

1 every step. And that's the part where we want to be
2 involved and have a voice from the beginning of the
3 project.

4 I don't have a huge amount of confidence in the
5 model because even in the areas that -- because of the
6 age of a lot of these sites, today it looks like -- when
7 they start moving dirt, they're finding the 16- to
8 18-inch level or 12-inch level that flash floods have
9 covered up everything, and then they're starting to find
10 dozens and dozens of sites within the project areas
11 after the fact, and it's pretty consistent. It keeps
12 happening.

13 MR. SCOFIELD: Okay. As I said, a model is
14 nothing more than a tool, just one of the tools in the
15 toolbox.

16 MEMBER ROBINSON: It's only as good as the
17 information you put in it.

18 MR. SCOFIELD: Yeah, it's as good as the
19 information and doesn't replace pedestrian surveyors.
20 So the Programmatic Agreement also sets forth basically
21 a flowchart of what's going to happen on conservation
22 for renewable energy projects and the -- I'm trying to
23 remember. It's been a little while since I read the
24 Programmatic Agreement, probably a month, and I don't
25 have a flowchart in front of me, but there is a phase

1 early on before BLM actually accepts the plan of
2 development where tribal consultation and consultation
3 with the signatories to the P.A. will occur so that we
4 are building in an opportunity up front before BLM even
5 accepts the plan of operation -- not plan of operation,
6 plan of development to offer a consultation period with,
7 as I said, the tribes and the other signators.

8 So hopefully that will help address some of the
9 concerns that you're bringing forth and tap into your
10 area of expertise of exactly, you know, what you know is
11 out there and that we don't know about.

12 MEMBER ROBINSON: A lot of times we don't
13 either until they actually start.

14 MR. SCOFIELD: Exactly.

15 MEMBER ROBINSON: But we have people that can
16 recognize it, and when they see something, they
17 immediately know. Other people may be an archeologist
18 that are not even familiar with it will even argue with
19 them.

20 MR. SCOFIELD: I think at that up-front meeting
21 is a good place to start that conversation as to how the
22 tribe can then become involved. Certainly, as you know,
23 we already talked about tribal monitoring or cultural
24 monitoring, but then, you know, avoidance, you know.
25 Can we reconfigure a little bit and still meet the

1 developer's goals while meeting your goals?

2 MEMBER ROBINSON: Avoidance. And the other
3 issue is to start including -- returning items removed
4 from the projects back into the project area in a
5 preselected area and return those things instead of
6 everything being boxed up and being put into a museum
7 and away where it's really warehoused. And some of
8 these collections are in horrible condition. The
9 paperwork has been lost. Their scientific value is
10 pretty much gone. And we find that over and over again,
11 even in the university settings.

12 MR. SCOFIELD: Okay. And I can -- well,
13 obviously your tribe is a signatory. You already have
14 it. The Programmatic Agreement is on the DRECP website,
15 but, you know, I'll definitely work with Steve Razo, and
16 we can make sure that you and your tribe are involved in
17 the consultation or at least notified of it, and you can
18 choose your involvement at the consultation of these
19 tools and the Programmatic Agreement.

20 MEMBER FRANCIS: Just on the note of cultural
21 heritage, I would like to highlight, too, is
22 Legacy Mining with some of these locations in particular
23 with the company I work with, there's a lot of that that
24 have aged enough they consider themselves cultural
25 heritage, and we do internally look at our stuff as

1 well. But through the BLM's mine site location when you
2 get to recreation, those no longer really become
3 warnings as they become attractions. And so I know a
4 lot of our legacy sites recreation has taken a heavy
5 impact on our properties, some of them being private,
6 some are public. But you would see a considerable
7 amount of damage to those cultural heritage sites as
8 well from the artifacts that would be on that site for
9 the mining.

10 MR. SCOFIELD: Just the point, don't lose sight
11 of the historic.

12 MEMBER FRANCIS: Yeah. There's more than
13 tribal. Even as a mining company, we were having a
14 tough time wrapping our heads around, when we talk about
15 cultural heritage internally, we look at tribal issues.
16 But because of the age of our company and the rich
17 history of mining in this region, that we too have
18 become a cultural heritage.

19 A lot of times when you have recreationists
20 coming out there, they're picking up the tin cans, the
21 glass bottles, mining artifacts that may be of value and
22 of importance.

23 MR. SCOFIELD: Thank you.

24 CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you. And no other
25 comments. I didn't want to let you go, Russell, without

1 acknowledging your desire to get some input on the
2 renewable energy permitting. And I don't speak too much
3 about renewable energy here, but specifically many of
4 the projects that have happened in the past have had a
5 number of issues, questions and concerns with -- and I
6 think some of the issues brought up here are in respect
7 to projects that started many, many years ago. But when
8 the DRECP came around, by and large the renewable energy
9 industry left the arena primarily because of the risk
10 associated with and the unknowns associated with the
11 DRECP. And that's not to say in any way that their
12 projects aren't impacting currently the desert. They
13 clearly are. These are projects that were started many,
14 many years ago.

15 But my understanding is for the last three
16 years there has not been one project, renewable energy
17 project, on BLM lands that has won the solicitation to
18 the investment to own utilities in California. There
19 have been hundreds that have won solicitations from
20 private lands. Private land is much more
21 environmentally sensitive than BLM land, and so these
22 projects are continuing. They're just not continuing on
23 BLM land.

24 And the DRECP was intended in part in trying to
25 facilitate renewable energy in specific areas. And so

1 in reaching out to the renewable industry by and large
2 the response I've gotten is that they're lost with
3 respect to what that means on BLM land and whether
4 they'll come back to the table for projects in those
5 specific areas that are considered less environmentally
6 sensitive.

7 So I welcome your involvement in this because
8 as an industry it's by and large now focused on private
9 lands, lands that in many cases are more environmentally
10 sensitive than the isolated areas that are now available
11 for renewable energy on BLM lands. And once again it's
12 not to say that the current projects aren't an impact.
13 They are, but with respect to new projects, projects
14 that are being initiated now or in the past couple of
15 years, they've extensively died off awaiting the Record
16 of Decision on the DRECP and how to implement new
17 applications. So I look forward to that discussion
18 again. Thank you.

19 MR. SCOFIELD: And I will just say that in the
20 past several weeks I've gotten phone calls from three
21 different developers on projects, two transmission, one
22 solar. So the whole idea of developing projects within
23 DFAs using the DRECP, hopefully even being able to
24 develop those projects under a lower level of NEPA than
25 an EIS tiering off of DRECP, utilizing the DRECP

1 biological opinion and the assurances of the mitigation
2 within DRECP, I'm optimistic that the industry will find
3 those assurances of the B.O. and the mitigation
4 assuring.

5 So I look forward to starting to see some
6 projects within DFAs that we can show the others in the
7 industry that, yes, we can do this efficiently utilizing
8 DRECP on Public Lands within the DFAs.

9 CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you for more on that.

10 Any other comments with respect to the DAC?
11 And I do apologize, public. I've left you a little bit
12 late, but perhaps a few questions. Don't go too far,
13 Russell. You may very well be able to answer any
14 specific questions or comments the public has. So we'll
15 open it up for public comment.

16 And, John, you must have got in here early. So
17 I thank you so much.

18 MR. STEWART: Good morning, council. And
19 welcome back to the desert, Russ. It's good to see you
20 again.

21 MR. SCOFIELD: Good to be here.

22 MR. STEWART: DRECP. Where do I start?
23 There's a number of issues that have been brought up. I
24 appreciate the focus that Russ is bringing to the table
25 to help put some sideboards on this issue to get it

1 moving forward.

2 There's a discussion about WEMO. I understand
3 and fully accept that the WEMO is completely, wholly
4 within the DRECP area, and as an issue it will have a
5 major impact. DRECP will have a major impact on WEMO
6 and vice versa. But when you start looking at the
7 subject of WEMO being a Travel Management Plan process,
8 I'd like to point out that the Travel Management Plan
9 extends throughout the entire DRECP area and the same
10 issues apply not just within the WEMO. So any subgroup
11 that is spun up has got to have a larger focus than just
12 WEMO, because that's a short circuit and shortsighted in
13 its approach.

14 I'm glad to hear that the concepts of adaptive
15 management are going to be looked at. And adaptive
16 management means that you come up with an alternative,
17 you implement an alternative, and then you monitor it in
18 order to then make decisions, go back, and as he said,
19 in a cyclic fashion, as it's something that is never
20 complete.

21 Within that concept, industry has found out
22 that, when they're monitoring, correlation is not
23 causation. And that bleeds over into this land
24 management area, especially when you're looking at this
25 concept of disturbance caps. Concentration of routes,

1 concentration of recreation, concentration of impacts is
2 not really conservation. At some point in time in this
3 adaptive management process, we'll have to look at
4 possibly looking at the concept of, well, two percent on
5 disturbance caps is just a potential minimum. In other
6 words living with the fact that, yes, it can go up or be
7 more, depending upon the need, depending upon the issues
8 involved in order to accommodate the wide variety of
9 uses and, as it's been noted, that recreation is a major
10 thing.

11 Then lastly when you're looking at the state
12 lands, look closely at the concept of making sure that
13 the state is involved with especially the OHV Commission
14 and/or Division. Specifically in Ocotillo Wells SVRA
15 area there is a large segment of BLM land that the State
16 of California has a surface management Memorandum of
17 Understanding to manage the surface estate, and yet BLM
18 maintains mineral rights to the subsurface estate. That
19 is where geothermal is. And this a point where the
20 state has got to be involved and is one of the major
21 stakeholders within Ocotillo Wells and also up within
22 the Jawbone area. So thank you.

23 CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, John.

24 Sam, if you would like to comment on the DRECP?

25 MS. MERK: Yes.

1 CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you.

2 MS. MERK: I was listening to what the
3 gentleman Russell had to say. I was wondering if there
4 was a place that the audience could look at the
5 hundred-day plan that he has and where we can find it.
6 You know, if you bring something up, you need to show
7 us.

8 One of the other things I need to know, too, is
9 why Section 110 is not being applied to the DRECP. It
10 was not applied to the WEMO, and it wasn't applied to
11 the DRECP. However in other states they are using 110.
12 And it would give a little bit of helpful
13 interrelationships with the tribe using 110.

14 As we all know, in the Desert Plan, which is
15 basically our RMP, it talks about historical values.
16 And it's Element 3, but the farming in this community
17 and all that was because of historic, the tribal. And
18 if we over look it just for one purpose, that's not
19 good. FLPMA says sustainable yield. And that's what it
20 really should be about, not just for one purpose.

21 Another group that Russ needs to look at are
22 the snowbirds. There's a lot of them. And their
23 information is valuable. Another state agency that they
24 really need to be looking in on the DRECP is under the
25 GSA, the Groundwater Sustainability Act. There's

1 just -- the ranching, the tribes. There are so many
2 different purposes in the desert. We can't be focused
3 on just one purpose. And, yes, it is an executive, but
4 you know, FLPMA was more than just an executive. I
5 mean, it's a public law. Thank you.

6 CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, Ms. Merk.

7 And Ms. Thoresen. Lisbet, thank you.

8 MS. THORESEN: I gave you several cards. Which
9 one may I speak on first?

10 CHAIR BARRETT: This is DRECP, but thank you.

11 MS. THORESEN: There are two DRECP comments I
12 have. My name is Lisbet Thoresen. I'm the Public Lands
13 representative for the San Diego Mineral Gems Society.
14 And I'm the chair of the Public Lands Advisory Committee
15 South for the California Federation of Mineralogical
16 Societies, in total representing 8,000 members.

17 My first comment was to Mr. Robinson and
18 Mr. Scofield. Thank you for your comments and for your
19 solicitation for outreach to other groups. As a
20 representative of rockhound groups, we're one of those
21 groups who want to engage very closely with you and are
22 really concerned with how the DRECP is going to be
23 implemented.

24 But my first comment is to Mr. Robinson. Based
25 on your question Mr. Scofield about asking for

1 identifying areas within tribal lands that were
2 sensitive because of archeological value and cultural
3 patrimony that may be under the surface and based on
4 your response that the way that seems to be found is not
5 by surface features but by sticking a spade in the
6 ground and stumbling upon it, is it possible that no one
7 has done or is aware of Landsat technology and
8 multispectral imaging analysis that would give you
9 subsurface information about the potential existence of
10 archaeological artifacts that are underground without
11 actually disturbing the ground?

12 These are mapping technologies that are being
13 produced by JPL; have been for many years. And these
14 maps can be purchased. If you're an independent
15 scholar, you have to pay for them, and they're
16 expensive. But I expect if you are affiliated with a
17 Native American tribe or with the government, that this
18 map information would be free to you and available and
19 that this is a resource that would help you efficiently
20 identify a lot of lands and where sensitivities may
21 exist without willy-nilly sticking a spade in the ground
22 and stumbling upon it in order to find it. That was the
23 one comment.

24 Can I start the clock over for the other one?

25 CHAIR BARRETT: Go on.

1 MS. THORESEN: My next comment responds
2 directly to Mark and Randy. And I was going to bring
3 this up later in my comments with regard to the
4 Mojave Trails National Monument. But, Randy, thank you
5 for the comments you raised about rockhounds and the
6 concerns that we have, that you can move campsites, you
7 can move roads, but you can't move rocks. You can't
8 necessarily know where the rocks are, even, unless you
9 do some exploration. And therein lies an educational
10 value that mineralogists and scientists and geologists
11 find valuable, understanding what the geology is of the
12 Mojave Desert in particular, which is one of the richest
13 geological resources in the entire world visited by
14 mineralogists and scientists and recreational rockhounds
15 from around the world for decades and decades and
16 decades.

17 To your point about knowing where the rocks
18 are, there is a resource that gem and mineral
19 researchers, such as myself, use when we do our reserve
20 to prepare scholarly publications and articles for
21 professional journals. It's a recognized authority.
22 It's known as Mindat. Mindat.org is an online archive
23 resource, if you will, that contains mineralogic
24 information and identifies localities with G.P. or
25 lat long coordinates for minerals throughout the world.

1 And I'm preparing a comment letter right now for the
2 San Gabriel Mountains Management Plan and using this
3 reference where there are hundreds upon hundreds of
4 sites listed in Mindat.

5 My question then is, is this a resource that we
6 can provide Mindat information, if you will, provide the
7 URLs, because the information is already there, or do we
8 have to transcribe this information from Mindat,
9 incorporate it into a letter in order for it to be
10 incorporated into a management plan or into the planning
11 that we're discussing with regard to WEMO and these
12 other activities?

13 And then with regard to the DFAs, I was on the
14 conference call the day before the ROD signing, and
15 Vicki Wood Campbell advised us that, in light of the
16 comment letters from rockhounds, changes were made to
17 the DFAs so as not to impinge upon the rock-collecting
18 areas. But my concern is that some of the ERMA's or this
19 land exchange which you brought up in your comment
20 earlier today, Randy, might again adversely impact and
21 withdraw some of that access to those collecting areas.

22 This then goes to Mark's comment about access.
23 It's no good to have access -- you mentioned this,
24 too, Randy, that it's no good to have access to an area
25 if the road to it is then made inaccessible. So I don't

1 expect a complete answer today, but I'd like these
2 considerations to be incorporated into further
3 discussion and study going on. Thank you for your kind
4 attention.

5 CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, Lisbet.

6 And Ruth Hidalgo. Ruth, please. Thank you.

7 MS. HIDALGO: Lisbet pretty much covered most
8 of what rockhounds -- most of our concerns or most of
9 what I had to comment on. Rockhounds are a huge
10 recreational user of the desert, and I do appreciate
11 your reaching out to recreational users and making that
12 a priority when you go to implement the process of the
13 DRECP. We did make many comments on the DRECP and, as
14 Lisbet said, where there were so many levels to it. A
15 lot of rockhounds aren't even clear as to how the full
16 impact will be.

17 The NCL overlays on our SRMAs are of a major
18 concern and then, of course, the disturbance caps on top
19 of those. How that will impact our hobby? We don't
20 know, and we would like to be involved in this process
21 so that we can get a better understanding as you move
22 along.

23 If the DAC decides not to create a subgroup,
24 which I hope that you do. Even though I know you do
25 have lives and I see how much time you put into all of

1 this, we certainly hope that you will reach out to us
2 outside of that. Thank you.

3 CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, Ruth. Kathy?
4 Kathy Ip.

5 MS. IP: Good morning, Chairman Barrett and
6 members of the DAC. I appreciate the opportunity to
7 make comments.

8 One of the things that I think would be helpful
9 is to make that hundred-day plan and any of the other
10 implementation plans available for public input and
11 discussion. So that would be helpful all around.

12 One of the concerns that utilities and industry
13 expressed during the DRECP process was the level at
14 which transmission lines were discussed and accounted
15 for in the DRECP. Those lines, by virtue of their
16 purpose, will cross both public and private lands. And
17 so we would encourage that, as part of the
18 implementation plan and development of strategy,
19 utilities are involved in the process.

20 In addition to connecting any potential new
21 developments from the DFAs, we also have existing leases
22 and infrastructure. And so it would be helpful to
23 understand to what extent things like disturbance caps
24 would apply to our normal O and M activities. Thank
25 you.

1 CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, Kathy.

2 And last but not least, if there's any other
3 comments, get them to Steve.

4 But, Gerry, I do apologize. You were actually
5 a little earlier, but I waited until the end so we can
6 ease into our break. Thank you, Gerry.

7 MR. HILLIER: No problem, Mr. Chairman. I
8 appreciate the opportunity to be called on for this.

9 The counties, several of them, commented,
10 protested on the DRECP, raised issues and middle of
11 September received basically a summary rejection letter
12 without addressing any of the details. So I urge BLM to
13 do some outreach, given the direction in Section 209 of
14 FLPMA, for coordination with the counties just because
15 the protests were rejected. And I don't think because
16 of the costs involved there will be any appeals. But
17 there are concerns. They're legitimate concerns, and
18 there does need to be outreach.

19 One specific area that I have -- I think it was
20 raised in the San Bernardino protest and all -- is the
21 relationship with WEMO, and it's been talked about
22 today. But I think it's well to remember that the
23 counties -- Kern and San Bernardino and
24 Imperial County -- are all intervenors in that
25 litigation. You have probably forgotten that it was

1 filed back in 2007, but we're still around.

2 And so we do have a special relationship with
3 BLM relative to that going forward. And when you say
4 amendment of an amendment, and I think where there's a
5 lot of uncertainty in terms of how the court has been
6 involved in the DRECP process and the integration of
7 that lawsuit, I think probably the plaintiffs in that
8 suit probably look on DRECP as a further crunching down
9 of things like access and the remediation BLM is
10 currently doing. But I do think the counties need to
11 have a special coordination, given that they were
12 recognized as intervenors in that. And so we need to
13 know that.

14 Second -- and it was an issue we raised in the
15 protest -- the DRECP provides for expansion and change
16 in designation of some ACECs to NLCS and expansion of
17 ACECs and all. And the one thing we don't really
18 understand is all of that. Did those expansions and
19 changes take place with the secretary's signature, or
20 are they going to be implemented by an area-by-area
21 decision? And that process needs to be spelled out, how
22 that's going to occur.

23 And if they were expanded upon the secretary's
24 signature last month, are they expanded, and is this
25 mitigation going to occur regardless of the extent to

1 which the areas are needed for specific project
2 mitigation? In other words, what we see -- may I
3 continue for just a minute or two?

4 CHAIR BARRETT: Yes. Thanks.

5 MR. HILLIER: Are these areas expanded with our
6 without additional renewable energy development that
7 will occur on Public Lands, and how will this be, and
8 more importantly how will it be accounted for? At least
9 one of the county comments suggested that there be a
10 step by step, in other words expand -- apply to the ACEC
11 and expand it if needed for a specific development
12 project and all.

13 It appeared to us that all of the mitigation
14 was front loaded and regardless of the extent to which
15 these areas would be needed, and since ACECs and NLCS
16 units drive further protection measures, removal of
17 uses, tighter management of uses, further elimination of
18 livestock use and whatever, this is of concern to the
19 counties as far as their economic well-being.

20 And so this needs to be spelled out, I think,
21 in some detail of how this is going to move forward and
22 the accountability of who's going to track the amount to
23 which these are used for mitigation.

24 Two other points of mitigation. One, the
25 counties have consistently raised the issue of land

1 acquisition and opposition to it. Remember that solar
2 energy is not subject to property tax assessment,
3 possessory interest and so forth. The wisdom of state
4 legislature is that it should be tax exempt. By the
5 same token, counties -- so counties can't select
6 property taxes. And when land acquisition is involved
7 as part of mitigation, they lost the tax base. And all
8 of the counties in the desert are capped out on PILT,
9 and so there's kind of the underlying assumption, well,
10 the counties will lose it on one end, but they'll get
11 PILT money on the back end. It is wrong. You don't, or
12 the counties don't.

13 And lastly I would like to raise the issue --
14 and it's another specter that's haunting out there --
15 Fish and Wildlife Service has proposed a really
16 extensive change in regulations involving mitigation of
17 landscape scale mitigation, and it's a very
18 comprehensive proposal. The comments -- it hasn't been
19 finally adopted. The comments close Monday,
20 October 17th. And a lot of people are commenting
21 adversely, particularly the regulative community, as my
22 organization is.

23 The key part of that, though, is that it
24 appears that Fish and Wildlife Service will adopt this
25 or something pretty close to it as this administration

1 leaves in January, regardless of the outcome of the
2 election. And how that's going to be applied and
3 mitigated in terms of landscape-scale mitigation needs
4 to be addressed probably in this hundred-day period but
5 certainly in the coming couple or three months. It will
6 be a major change. It will be a major further burden
7 both on the regulated community and on local
8 governments.

9 So I raise those specters in which the council
10 may not be fully aware, but I think it's things to keep
11 in mind. Thank you.

12 CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, Gerry.

13 We're running a wee bit behind schedule. But
14 I'm encouraged by the fact that we have the Needles
15 Field Office manager here, who's going to be presenting
16 before and after lunch. And there is nobody better at
17 managing the time and getting us back on schedule than
18 himself. So with that in mind, I think we can take the
19 full 15 minutes. It's been a very detailed session so
20 far, and we should be back close to a quarter to or so.

21 MEMBER ALGAZY: Mr. Chairman?

22 CHAIR BARRETT: Yes.

23 MEMBER ALGAZY: Point of order. If we stick to
24 our proposed agenda as it's been printed and move on to
25 the next discussion topic, we will be abdicating an

1 enormous opportunity here, because I think we need to
2 stay on this topic and move through to a discussion or
3 resolution of whether the DAC is going to be involved
4 with this specific subgroup. We haven't reached a
5 conclusion on that point yet. And as the presenter
6 Mr. Scofield has pointed out, the hundred-day clock is
7 ticking, and if the DAC wants to be involved, we do need
8 to make a decision on that now.

9 CHAIR BARRETT: Yeah. So with respect to that,
10 I think there has been a general consensus from the
11 folks here to be very much involved, and we've been
12 involved in the past. And I think Russell has been kind
13 enough to invite us to continue to be involved. The
14 process by which we are involved I think we can discuss
15 a little bit. The vote unfortunately we can't have, and
16 not that it may need a vote, but I think that we have
17 been involved in the past and would like to continue.

18 Does anyone object to being involved in the
19 DRECP? Does anyone object to the continuation of
20 subgroup/subcommittees as necessary?

21 Randy?

22 MEMBER BANIS: I think the only thing really
23 that is sticking with me is just thinking through the
24 notion of reconstituting the WEMO group and having that
25 be a DRECP group, I'm not there yet. I'm not totally

1 convinced, just looking at some of the personalities in
2 my head and the positions we had on the WEMO and the
3 narrow focus of it and the geographical location. But
4 on the other hand, WEMO is the guinea pig. It's the
5 first one out the door that's going to be the test.

6 You know, maybe we form some kind of a hybrid,
7 because we can't really talk DRECP unless we do have
8 renewable energy involved, tribes involved, unless we
9 have others involved. And our WEMO Subgroup did not
10 have that. Our WEMO Subgroup was based upon planning
11 for recreational access, and therefore it was heavily
12 loaded with recreational-access individuals. We did
13 have the presence of conservation representatives, but
14 it was still, again, for the purposes of deciding which
15 lines on the map will be red and which will be green.

16 But I just would like to talk a little more
17 about this specific hybrid. And I'm okay with leaving
18 some of that or maybe after the break getting into the
19 specifics, but fine.

20 MEMBER ALGAZY: I don't want to leave it yet.
21 Let's talk about it after the break.

22 MEMBER BANIS: Thank you, Mark. Thank you,
23 Mr. Chair.

24 CHAIR BARRETT: Excellent. Thank you. And so
25 with that, we'll defer that until after the break and

1 perhaps lunch break, given that we have a very full
2 agenda item between now and lunch. And with that we're
3 still on for a quarter to, and we'll be back here for an
4 excellent presentation on Special Recreation Permits.
5 And thank you, all. See you in 15 to.

6 (Morning break was taken.)

7 CHAIR BARRETT: I've been advised that I missed
8 the most important thing, which was that there is
9 excellent cake at the back of the room for those folks
10 who are not feeling sweet enough already. This was from
11 yesterday, I believe, from the event yesterday, and it
12 still tastes excellent. So please avail yourselves.

13 And our next presentation -- I do apologize.
14 We're running a little late, but we may catch up -- is
15 from Sandra McGinnis. Sorry.

16 MEMBER BANIS: Point of order, if I may. I
17 believe we were going to return to the discussion.

18 CHAIR BARRETT: I indicated that we would do
19 that after lunch.

20 MEMBER BANIS: Oh, very good. Okay. Very
21 good. Thank you.

22 CHAIR BARRETT: Full agenda. So for Special
23 Recreation Permit program, Ms. McGinnis, if she's here.
24 Well done. Thank you.

25 Well, we have one another, and I do apologize.

1 It's not on my agenda. Would you mind introducing
2 yourself.

3 MS. MCGINNIS: I would not mind at all.

4 CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you so much.

5 MS. MC GINNIS: Good morning, everybody. I'm
6 Sandra McGinnis, and I'm going to be giving this
7 presentation with Dorothy Morgan. I'll let her give an
8 introduction for herself as well. And when we get to
9 the discussion or questions or comments that we want to
10 be able to respond to, we also have Brian Bellew here.
11 He's our state recreation lead at the California state
12 office.

13 So my name is Sandra McGinnis, and I'm the
14 Branch Chief For Resources, which includes -- I always
15 have to write this down. I can't remember all of
16 them -- planning, lands and realty, recreation, National
17 Conservation Lands and Travel Management Plan.

18 MEMBER ALGAZY: Do you get five salaries?

19 MS. MC GINNIS: It's a good idea. I'll give
20 you my boss's name, who's actually retiring.

21 I have done a lot of different jobs in the BLM,
22 but the two that -- you know, when you say you're from
23 the state office or the Washington office, like Dorothy
24 and I were talking about earlier, sometimes people have
25 no clue what kind of actual qualifications you have to

1 be talking about what you're talking about. The areas
2 I've had the most experience in prior to being at the
3 state office as a branch chief include range management
4 and National Environmental Policy Act.

5 So, Dorothy, would you like to introduce
6 yourself.

7 MS. MORGAN: Yes, please. Hello. I'm
8 Dorothy Morgan, an Outdoor Recreation Planner for the
9 Washington office in Washington, D.C., and I'm on a
10 120-day detail in the California Desert District, so I'm
11 here until mid January.

12 A little bit of my background. I started as an
13 outdoor recreation planner in Arizona on the San Pedro
14 Riparian National Conservation Area, where we had no
15 OHVs, no mineral development and an amazing river that
16 was primarily protected for riparian resources. I
17 worked very closely with partnerships and volunteer
18 groups. We had an active friends organization, so it
19 was very unique and interesting introduction to the BLM.

20 From there I went to Glenwood Springs, Colorado
21 also as recreation planner, where I worked very closely
22 with the OHV community on recreation permits and some
23 very small competitive permits and a very large
24 recreation permit program for river guiding. From there
25 I went on to Carlsbad, New Mexico as an assistant field

1 manager and supervised the resources staff, where we
2 dealt with thousands of APDs for oil and gas
3 development. We also had mining issues there and a much
4 smaller but important recreation program.

5 So I share that with you to give you a little
6 bit of perspective on my background and, like Sandra
7 said, some of the qualifications. I do currently work
8 in Washington, D.C., and I'm very excited to be back --
9 or to be in California doing some fieldwork and working
10 more closely with the people who are enjoying and
11 utilizing the resources.

12 MS. MC GINNIS: I failed to ask ahead of time,
13 how do I advance the slides?

14 MR. RAZO: You have the keyboard right there,
15 and hit the arrow.

16 MS. MC GINNIS: Okay. Thank you. I can do
17 that. I apologize. The slides are behind you all. If
18 you want to turn around, we are okay.

19 CHAIR BARRETT: We'll actually move, if you
20 don't mind. If you're ready, we'll move.

21 (A PowerPoint presentation entitled "BLM CA Special
22 Recreation Permits Program Review was given by
23 Sandra McGinnis and Dorothy Morgan.)

24 MEMBER ALGAZY: Mr. Chairman, if I may.

25 CHAIR BARRETT: Yes.

1 MEMBER ALGAZY: The thing that strikes me for
2 familiar places to start the discussion on, in the
3 Ridgecrest Field Office we have a beautifully simple
4 tri-fold for people that are interested in doing casual
5 mining out in the desert that, just taking one
6 eight-and-a-half-by-11 and making it into a tri-fold
7 will highlight the differences between casual mining and
8 the kind of mining that requires more advanced
9 permitting, the size of equipment that you can use and
10 the length of your stay.

11 I'm wondering if you have in place a very
12 simple tri-fold to explain to people that are interested
13 in recreating in the desert what the dividing lines are,
14 the bright lines between casual recreating and
15 requirement of an SRP.

16 Several of us were humored recently to find out
17 that one of our own who is a member of the Sierra Club
18 was told that they needed to have an SRP to go on a hike
19 because of the number of people that were involved, and
20 it somehow became an organized event. It seems to me,
21 if you don't have one, it would be appropriate to have a
22 very simple bright line tri-fold that highlights for
23 people coming into the office without having to give
24 them an entire handbook what those bright lines are.

25 MS. MC GINNIS: Brian, if you want to take

1 that.

2 MR. BELLEW: Yeah. This is some of the piece
3 that Dorothy mentioned about the outline. The
4 application process is trying to get up into the 21st
5 century with getting more automation and everything
6 else. And that in particular with the online
7 application will have those pieces in there: What
8 constitutes a permit? What are the types? How do I get
9 one? You click on the button, and it pops up the
10 application form, so they're not having to get on the
11 phone, call the office, wait for something to come snail
12 mail, when the whole rest of the world is automated.

13 And so that's definitely where we're going with
14 that, is to be able to put together a means that up
15 front trying to get that timeline down of getting
16 complete applications, the application form, the
17 operating plan, where do I want to go? Click. Here's
18 the offices -- the office or offices. What's the next
19 steps, so that when they pick up the phone, call the
20 office, get the recreation staff person, they've already
21 got a handle on what all they're expected to do. Is
22 this something they want to do? And that will really
23 help that way. But that would be the type of thing like
24 you have with the tri-fold that would be available
25 electronically.

1 CHAIR BARRETT: Billy, please.

2 MEMBER MITCHELL: Yes. Under recreation,
3 what's the regulation right now for how many vehicles?
4 Through my allotment I have one major thoroughfare. And
5 I might have 25 jeeps in one group, motorcycles. I
6 mean, some three-day weekends it looks like the I-15,
7 you know? And what are the regulations for that? Maybe
8 Katrina knows. I never have even asked. Who is our
9 person? Zack?

10 MS. SYMONS: Zack and Debbie Flores.

11 MEMBER MITCHELL: I met Zack. I haven't met
12 Debbie. Do you happen to know what is the -- before
13 they have to get a permit, I guess, how many people in a
14 group, like jeeps?

15 MR. BELLEW: Years ago it used to have a
16 certain number was the threshold. Now it's based on
17 that organized group, what's the duty of care that would
18 be with them? If you have five people, there's probably
19 not a lot of agency responsibility with them being out.
20 Fifty people, there is a great deal more in terms of
21 duty and care that the agency has with it. So it would
22 vary.

23 MEMBER MITCHELL: The next question. I mean,
24 obviously, how do the people get -- they click online
25 and figure that out. But how do you get the message out

1 to the people and tell them you got too many people
2 there; call Barstow because you need a permit? How do
3 you regulate that, I guess, is what I'm trying to say.

4 MR. BELLEW: It's compliance in the field, that
5 contact made with, whether it be law enforcement or the
6 recreation person that comes upon them or somebody else
7 in the field. But basically it's the meet and greet,
8 basically, with them.

9 MEMBER MITCHELL: Last year I had 100 vehicles
10 those -- what do they call? -- side by sides. An
11 organization down in Orange County that sells them put
12 on this big deal I didn't even know about it. Barstow
13 didn't even know about it. You know, actually a friend
14 of mine through District 37, Billy Courtney and
15 Harvey Baumann (phonetic spelling) in District 37 --
16 actually Harvey was with me while the vehicles were
17 there going through the ranch running my cattle off the
18 springs.

19 I mean, it was kind of a nightmare, but they
20 actually went online and found the advertisement, which
21 we got ahold of the field office. It was kind of a
22 little bit too late because they obviously pulled it
23 off. But I think they got to talk to him. I don't
24 really know. I don't think he's going to try it again
25 this year, but hopefully he doesn't. I was just

1 wondering if there was an actual five or ten or 20.

2 MR. BELLEW: No. It's depending on what
3 they're doing, basically.

4 MEMBER MITCHELL: On what they're doing.
5 Right. Thank you.

6 MS. MORGAN: From a national perspective
7 there's not a number associated with when a permit is
8 required or not. It's more defined as, if there's a fee
9 being collected would make it commercial. If it's
10 advertised and organized in some ways, then it falls
11 into the organized category. And that may or may not
12 require a permit, depending upon the specific
13 requirements of the field office. So some of that is up
14 to the field office, and some places do have a decision
15 in their Land Use Plan Amendment or in a recreation plan
16 that says that over a certain number that a permit would
17 be required. I'm not sure if Barstow has right now.

18 MS. SYMONS: No, CDD does not.

19 MS. MORGAN: It doesn't exist.

20 MEMBER MITCHELL: Katrina is diligent with me
21 on making sure they don't plan events through the ranch
22 because the canyon and obviously the safety with the
23 cattle and running into them was the issue I had. And
24 they've done a really good job, just to let Katrina
25 know. So I was just curious about that. Thank you.

1 CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, Billy. Good
2 questions.

3 And Bob?

4 MEMBER BURKE: I represent the public-at-large.
5 I'm also a hunter, and I'm a member of an OHV race team.
6 I commend the Barstow office on their ability to monitor
7 during the off-road races. There's been a couple of
8 minor glitches. There were some fatalities with another
9 organization that is no longer with us anymore. But I
10 guess where I'm going with this is, the third-party
11 monitoring. I'm also a retired cop, so I understand the
12 law enforcement aspect behind it. What exactly are you
13 looking for in third-party monitoring?

14 MS. MORGAN: That's a good question. And right
15 now --

16 MEMBER BURKE: That's not the answer I was
17 looking for.

18 MS. MORGAN: I think that the specifics of that
19 are yet to be determined. But right now in very general
20 terms, what some people have expressed is that there's a
21 desire to have an impartial party, someone who can be
22 comfortable reporting on violations or potential
23 violations, that -- I guess I want to say that there is
24 a concern that someone too closely associated with the
25 racing community would be less likely to turn in their

1 friends, so to speak.

2 MEMBER BURKE: That's not true, is it? Because
3 I have -- I personally have made phone calls during an
4 event -- I personally have made phone calls during an
5 event where things were going on that shouldn't be, and
6 the appropriate action was taken.

7 MS. MORGAN: That's awesome, and thank you for
8 that. And I have heard that same sentiment expressed
9 from the racing community and from the permit holders.
10 They have assured that me that that ability to be
11 impartial does exist within their communities. At the
12 same time I'm also hearing from some other people that
13 something -- a little more neutral party would be
14 preferred. Right now it hasn't been decided yet which
15 way it will go or if we can even move in that direction.
16 I think there's opportunity to consider all options at
17 this point.

18 So during the pilot project right now what
19 we're looking for are people who are willing and able to
20 volunteer. And we have someone out of our El Centro
21 Field Office organizing that, so in the present moment
22 we're open to all possibilities. And where that ends up
23 going in the future, we encourage ongoing input for
24 that.

25 MEMBER BURKE: Thank you.

1 CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, Bob.

2 Randy?

3 MEMBER BANIS: Thanks. In this review was
4 there any revisions or changes with respect to the
5 definition of advertising? The old definition of
6 advertising failed to recognize social media, online
7 websites. The old definition was pretty much just
8 taking out an ad in a newspaper or a flier as such. Has
9 that definition of what constitutes advertising for an
10 event been -- because I think that was extremely,
11 extremely important, because many of the groups feel
12 that a notice for an event that's behind a website
13 log-in is not a public advertisement, but posting on
14 some public board that a group is going to go out in
15 some manner might be, and you know, how that could be
16 clarified.

17 MS. MORGAN: That wasn't specifically covered
18 in the review, but Brian can speak to that.

19 MR. BELLEW: Having worked on the revision of
20 the handbook as part of the team -- and monthly we meet,
21 all of the state leads and Washington office and others,
22 and talk about issues, and this is one of the issues
23 that's emerged with social media and the like.

24 MEMBER BANIS: Good.

25 MR. BELLEW: And one of the things we've found

1 with it is, if we just are going by the basis of how is
2 that advertising happening -- you know, maybe it is
3 something that you have to go through several
4 steps -- there are usually some other components with
5 it. If there's a component in there with that
6 advertising that says, here's the fee to join and go do
7 this, here is what we're doing and this complexity to
8 it, that's a duty of care that the agency has. So I
9 guess the short answer would be typically it's not just
10 advertising alone that does that but those other things
11 that go along with it. But it is. It's a whole
12 different world --

13 MEMBER BANIS: It is.

14 MR. BELLEW: -- than years ago, even how things
15 are purchased now. So much is done electronically.

16 MEMBER BANIS: And also in your review did you
17 have access to the SRP competitive template that the
18 Desert District put together with our first SRP group?
19 That was the thick document that had all the questions
20 and answers and the forms to fill out and so forth. You
21 saw that; right?

22 MR. BELLEW: Yes.

23 MEMBER BANIS: When we first developed that
24 with Jerry several years ago, the concept was, is to
25 move that into an online interface, because immediately

1 once you start turning pages and seeing questions and
2 answers, you start thinking, wow. I can just fill that
3 out on the computer. So thanks for taking that to the
4 next step.

5 By the way, it was that SRP competitive event
6 template that was given to the Sierra Club
7 representative when they asked for it, so it was just
8 like, huh? But whether it's competitive or not, it
9 still asks all the right questions.

10 If I could, Mr. Chairman, if you wouldn't
11 object, I would like to hear how the independent
12 third-party monitoring events went, perhaps from our
13 subgroup member, our new group member, Jerry Grabow.
14 Jerry is the president of the American Motorcyclists
15 Association District 37 Dual Sport. He is former chair
16 of the first SRP Subgroup. He's been named to the
17 second SRP Subgroup. And Jerry was very, very closely
18 involved with the BLM's staff members that ran the pilot
19 event in the south and ran the pilot event in the north.

20 So how did it go?

21 MR. GRABOW: It went really well, and, you
22 know, I mean, I was very impressed with the amount of
23 effort that the BLM put forth. And for that I'm
24 grateful. Beth was great, and Neil Hamada out of the
25 El Centro office has been my main contact.

1 You know, it went off well. I think there's
2 things that could be improved upon, like with
3 everything. This was a concept that I came up with
4 probably five years ago and floated the idea locally,
5 you know. And, as to be expected, you know, it was met
6 with, you know, some resistance, as you would expect,
7 because it's -- you know, I know that it's done in other
8 parts of the country, and I know it's done in other
9 forums.

10 But to touch on the questions that -- the
11 statements that you had made, you know, the racing
12 community as a whole -- and I'm only going to speak for
13 AMA District 37, because I'm the president of that, and
14 I know that it carries on over into the off-road
15 community as well, being the car and truck world. And
16 you know, there is a definite concern for public safety,
17 because the majority of the people at these events are
18 our friends.

19 And, you know, whether -- you know, my last
20 name being Grabow, and the other individuals in my
21 family are also as concerned about public safety because
22 they see the effects of the tragedy of the MBR wreck on
23 August 14th a number of years ago. And AMA District 37
24 had the benefit and also the burden of being the very
25 next event the very next weekend. And the event went

1 off as you would have expected it to be any other event.
2 You know, we had 20 -- I think the count was 26 BLM
3 employees at that event. And, you know, like Roxie had
4 made the comment, you know, the pendulum swings from one
5 side to the other. And right now it's swinging all the
6 way, you know, to the extreme side.

7 And, you know, I've been a huge champion for
8 what has to happen, and I've become very familiar with
9 the Code of Federal Registry and what is required to put
10 on a permit. And I think that an independent monitoring
11 project or program, you know, if it got lucky enough to
12 be a permanent program, you know, if it was a -- all of
13 our clubs are non-profit events. The events do not
14 really generate a profit, you know. So that part of it,
15 you know, is -- we're not a race promoter. We're not a
16 King of the Hammers type of an event. You know, these
17 are smaller events, two, three, maybe 400 now and in an
18 extreme case for an entry fee -- not a fee but
19 participants, typically we're around the 250 to 300
20 range.

21 But a program like this would allow us to go
22 back to doing two-day events. And the two-day events
23 not necessarily are two-day competitive events. The
24 first day may be a family event, you know, a training
25 ride. With the SRP project, as it's become, you know --

1 and I was very active on the initial SRP program, and in
2 fact one of our clubs created that very first handbook
3 that was presented, and it's changed into what it is
4 today. But we take a very active role in that. And we
5 have to get back to two-day type of events.

6 And with having an independent company come in
7 to help monitor the events, that will allow us to be
8 under that 50-hour threshold. That will help us to keep
9 the costs down, you know, because, like I said, the cost
10 recovery -- for some of the cost recovery that we got in
11 the initial stages, the cost recovery was more money
12 than the actual event would have generated in -- not in
13 profit but in gross sales.

14 So if our entry fees are between -- depending
15 on the type of an event, let's say, from 40 to \$58,
16 that's an entry fee. We're not talking hundreds. And
17 at 200 entries or even 350, you do the math. And we got
18 cost recovery estimates in the initial days post the MDR
19 tragedy of \$11,000. That was more money than the events
20 would have generated eight years ago.

21 So I applaud the BLM for what they're doing and
22 the fact that they're open minded to the project. And I
23 really am grateful. I mean, even if it is doesn't go
24 anywhere, you know, it can -- and again, it's just my
25 opinion that it can benefit all forms, whether it be the

1 rockhounds or if it could carry over into an extreme
2 event like the King of the Hammers. And it could also
3 carry over into a simple equestrian event. So thank you
4 again.

5 MEMBER BANIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

6 CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, Jerry. Thank you,
7 Randy. Actually, Bob had a couple of questions.

8 MEMBER ROBINSON: My question is, you're
9 talking about a third party monitoring these projects.
10 And the purpose for monitoring in the first place is to
11 make sure everybody stays in compliance with whatever is
12 going on, in the event somebody whether they're invited
13 or not invited does something they're not supposed to
14 and causes a dangerous situation. And these third
15 parties would need to be there, one or more people, that
16 have the ability to make a case in case something
17 happens, like a ranger would -- like a BLM ranger would
18 have that NETI training that he knows how to collect
19 information at the site and the situation that whatever
20 it be happens that this person could turn that over to
21 the ranger and they need to call him and he needed to
22 come out because of whatever went on, you know. And
23 that information would be adequate to prosecute that
24 person that need to be prosecuted.

25 And I would think that you wouldn't want to

1 lose that ability in the event that you're having people
2 come out and acting, you know, third party or, you know,
3 it would be -- I think that one thing you would want to
4 make sure that you have that capacity.

5 MS. MC GINNIS: So if I understand what you're
6 saying, is that we wouldn't want third-party monitoring
7 to replace the need for BLM law enforcement and other
8 staff to be there?

9 MEMBER ROBINSON: Well, no. I mean, it could
10 be an off-duty policeman that's volunteering, but he
11 would have that -- he would have that knowledge and
12 ability to -- let's say somebody got to drinking or
13 drugs or caused an accident and hurt somebody and be
14 able to collect that information at that time, because
15 it may be two or three hours before a ranger or somebody
16 could even get there, you know? And you know, if it
17 wasn't having a third party, that ranger would be
18 onsite.

19 MR. GRABOW: Can I touch on that for a second.
20 So getting back to what your comment is, per the CFRs,
21 it specifically states that BLM must be present at all
22 events. And by no stretch of the imagination am I
23 saying that -- or I don't feel that anybody has said
24 that it will replace BLM. BLM plays an important role,
25 you know, in -- I question their staffing matrix, you

1 know, but that's for another conversation. But BLM
2 plays an important role, and they need to be at the
3 events.

4 I'm just saying that an independent monitor or
5 third-party monitor, whichever way you want to refer to
6 it, it only replaces a portion. And all you're doing is
7 going through and making sure that the safety zones are
8 set up, road crossings are in place, the checkpoints are
9 in place, making sure that the spectators are in the
10 areas that they're allowed to be in. I mean, so there's
11 only specific roles that an independent or a third party
12 could do.

13 And by saying this, that the third party could
14 be a non-profit organization, doesn't necessarily have
15 to be a retired law enforcement, just so long as
16 somebody that's familiar with off road or the type of
17 events that you're monitoring. I wouldn't know anything
18 about an equestrian event, but I can tell you intimately
19 how a motorcycle race goes or a dual sport ride. So I
20 mean, that part of it I want to make sure that they're
21 perfectly clear we're not replacing the BLM, or this
22 project is not replacing the BLM.

23 MEMBER ROBINSON: Okay. I guess I
24 misunderstood, because my understanding was that BLM,
25 because of, you know, funding reasons and getting people

1 out there on the site was -- this was away to alleviate
2 some of that on the BLM.

3 MR. GRABOW: If it's okay for me to touch on
4 it, BLM -- let's say at one of my events -- and we're
5 going to say -- we'll take the event that we had the
6 first monitors at. There were two groups of two, so a
7 total of four, in vehicles monitoring the two different
8 race courses. And the BLM would have had an equal
9 amount of staff or maybe three, two to three people
10 doing that same job. Well, that freed the BLM up to
11 only maybe have one or two.

12 So if you see the ratio where it cuts down the
13 hours, that's billed to a specific event. And I'm sure
14 that, when they're doing their audits -- it's no
15 different than a construction project -- they're billing
16 time to that SRP project or that SRP application, and
17 they are going to do some auditing at some point. And
18 that's all we're trying to do is cut the BLM's hours,
19 not to replace them.

20 CHAIR BARRETT: As much as I appreciate Jerry's
21 explanation on that, but I want to be sure to answer
22 Bob's question specifically from BLM. Is Jerry's view
23 on that consistent with your plans?

24 MS. MC GINNIS: Yes. It's never been the
25 intention that the third-party monitoring program, if it

1 were adopted in some way, shape or form, would
2 completely replace the need for BLM monitors. I think
3 one thing that you're asking, though, is, can those
4 third-party monitors have some of those skills that
5 would allow them to collect information in the event
6 that there's some violation that's been observed?

7 MEMBER ROBINSON: I guess my question is, make
8 sure someone at the event is always there that has that
9 ability, whether it be -- be it BLM or whatever.

10 MS. MC GINNIS: Okay.

11 MEMBER ROBINSON: My understanding was that you
12 were maybe at some of these events that all the
13 monitoring would be done by volunteers. And that was my
14 misinterpretation.

15 MS. MC GINNIS: I think we corrected that view.
16 Yes, it would not replace the need for BLM staffing to
17 be at the event.

18 CHAIR BARRETT: Excellent. Thank you, Sandra.
19 Mark.

20 MEMBER ALGAZY: We had the opportunity to get a
21 little preview on the pilot program at our Roundtable
22 meeting in Ridgecrest this last month, and one of our
23 more imaginative members asked a question about the
24 possibility of monitoring the monitors, because you are
25 in the infancy stage and you're wondering how well the

1 third-party monitors are going to do their job, and
2 there are interested citizens that live and recreate in
3 those same areas. And this one gentleman proposed that
4 there be an outlet or an inlet or some component where
5 individuals might be able to monitor the adequacy of the
6 third-party monitors. And of course I think, if there
7 was a financial component involved in there, you'd have
8 a few people that were in the area that would be
9 interested in being watchdogs of those third-party
10 monitors.

11 It's just kind of a wild idea, but those kinds
12 of things surface at our meetings, and I wanted to get
13 it on the record that it was an interesting idea. And I
14 thought it deserved to be thrown out on the table.

15 CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, Mark. And I think
16 you actually have to be imaginative just to participate
17 in some of these events. And so thank you for that.

18 But Billy, perhaps.

19 MS. MORGAN: Can I respond quickly. Just so
20 you know, during the pilot projects, we have BLM staff
21 onsite doing just that. We're there not doing the
22 monitoring ourselves but observing the process and how
23 they're responding to anything that comes up.

24 CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you.

25 MEMBER MITCHELL: It's a pleasure to meet you.

1 I am one of the two remaining ranchers between these
2 areas, so where the hammers almost completely destroyed
3 my ranch. So I guess the first question is, is there
4 any way possible -- or do you -- and you may already do
5 this -- on your meetings to notify your members what
6 happens to us the ranching industry, it's not during the
7 race. It's the day after. Or if it's Saturday, it's
8 Sunday, and the people obviously want to get the roads
9 open. They wanted to haul up there as fast as they can.
10 I've had cattle hit by motorcycle, the rider airlifted
11 out. I'm not saying it was, believe me, your people.
12 But is there any way that you can put that to all your
13 people?

14 MR. GRABOW: And just so -- I mean, part of my
15 job as president -- and I've kind of really morphed
16 into, you know, not just the president of for
17 District 37. I've become the BLM liaison, you know,
18 that has the same authority as a race referee and so on
19 and so forth. And, yes, as far as being -- we
20 understand that we're guests in these areas, you know,
21 whether it be in the Ridgecrest or the Lucerne Valley
22 area.

23 MEMBER MITCHELL: Right, right.

24 MR. GRABOW: And in fact Billy lived in a
25 gentleman's house -- it might have even been yours -- on

1 Rabbit Springs Road -- that -- and the complaint was
2 that the race traffic would use Rabbit Springs Road.
3 And this gentleman that owned the house was concerned
4 about the safety of the houses on that road. And I have
5 encouraged, and I've written articles and put it into
6 our newsletter and put it on the message board and at
7 the meetings, you know, that we should go Highway 18
8 down through the town and out Old Woman Springs Road
9 rather than use Rabbit Springs Road. So, I mean, by all
10 means, yes. And, you know, I know both of the gentlemen
11 that you spoke of, Billy and --

12 MEMBER MITCHELL: Exactly, yeah.

13 MR. GRABOW: So, if there's an issue, by all
14 means, you know, have them get ahold of me. Or I have
15 my card. I can give it to you, and you can get ahold of
16 me directly. And if there's concerns and if our members
17 or racers or families of our members are misbehaving,
18 you can ask Katrina, I have, like, a zero tolerance
19 policy of putting up with people's nonsense, you know.

20 MEMBER MITCHELL: I live on Rattlesnake Canyon.
21 I have no neighbors. I have one to my -- it's limited
22 use area, yeah. And the things that's happened to us --
23 and it's more of the hammers. You probably have people
24 out getting ready for an event this weekend. I know
25 Harvey and Billy Courtney very well. They spread the

1 word to everybody about the canyon, go slow.

2 But as far as the hammers, there might be
3 70,000 people. And when they finish up Friday, there's
4 people going everywhere. And with Katrina last year,
5 the BLM Katrina, Mike Ahrens, everybody, those rangers,
6 sheriffs, highway patrol, all three, I think, were
7 involved, if I get it right. Stayed the weekend after,
8 and it was the first weekend since they started that
9 event that I had no -- I had maybe one encounter with
10 one person, and that was it.

11 MR. GRABOW: I would be surprised if we -- if
12 we got as many people as the King of the Hammers get for
13 one day, if we get that many to attend our events all
14 year.

15 MEMBER MITCHELL: Right.

16 MR. GRABOW: We host 40-plus events a year, and
17 we probably don't get the numbers that they get for just
18 one day.

19 MEMBER MITCHELL: If you get that out and you
20 have got it out, the cattle industry really appreciates
21 it, you know.

22 MR. GRABOW: No problem.

23 MEMBER MITCHELL: Thank you.

24 CHAIR BARRETT: And thank you, all. And thank
25 you, Jerry, for your input on that as well. I didn't

1 want anyone to think because of Jerry's assistance on
2 that we were precluding other public comments. I just
3 have two. If there's more, please let me know. And for
4 Sandra and Dorothy, thank you, Dorothy, for coming. If
5 anyone lives in Washington, D.C. in the fall, you gave
6 quite a sacrifice to be here. So thank you. And of
7 course, Brian, thank you as well.

8 And public comment cards I have are from Sam.
9 Sam again. Thank you.

10 MS. MERK: Yes. I really like the idea that
11 Mark had as far as a tri-fold goes because not everybody
12 that lives in the desert has access to computers. I'm
13 sorry. They really don't. If you get off into some of
14 the far-reaching places, they don't have access to
15 computers. Sure, they can come in and use the library,
16 but that's about it.

17 Also I was wondering if we could get a copy of
18 the summary report from Washington, and where can I
19 locate the 2014 hard book? And also as far as
20 advertisement goes, that is an important question
21 because there's a lot of little websites that don't
22 charge anything for a little walk in the desert. That
23 might comprise of some Brownies. And then you're using
24 the same analogy for a competitive race where they're
25 charging. So I think we really need to look at the

1 smaller users a little bit. Thank you.

2 CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, Sam.

3 And you might have a response, perhaps. Thank
4 you.

5 MS. MC GINNIS: That's a good suggestion that
6 we make some of those materials available in hard copies
7 so that not everybody has to go online, and that
8 shouldn't be difficult to do to take some of what we've
9 put online and make it in a handout format. The review
10 is very new. It's hot off the presses, so we are going
11 to make it available through the DAC chair shortly, I'm
12 thinking soon, a week or two.

13 CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you.

14 MS. MC GINNIS: Did I miss a third question
15 there?

16 MR. BELLEW: The handbook. Real quick and
17 easy. You can Google it if you want, BLM recreation
18 permit handbook. There is on one of the slides the link
19 to that.

20 MS. MC GINNIS: The website.

21 MR. BELLEW: The website. Basically called the
22 2930 Manual.

23 MS. MERK: Okay. Thank you.

24 MR. BELLEW: Perfect.

25 CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, Brian.

1 And sorry, John.

2 MR. STEWART: Good morning, council.

3 John Stewart, California Four-Wheel Drive Association.

4 First I've got to thank the BLM for the effort
5 that they've put in on the permit process. My first
6 exposure to the permit process was about 2000, 2001
7 timeframe when I worked with another lady on comments to
8 the rulemaking that BLM was entering into, along with
9 Forest Service, both dealing with how to implement rules
10 for the use of Public Lands for a financial gain by
11 groups. And that point in time, BLM did have a hard
12 number limit on what was there and then something about
13 a daily fee was charged.

14 But then, when I really got in here with
15 looking with Cal Four-Wheel in the Desert District, we
16 found that within the five different field offices
17 within the desert area, each one had its own separate
18 permitting process. I began an argument with
19 Linda Hanson at the DAC meeting in Ridgecrest in
20 September of 2003, which morphed into a forerunner for
21 the SRP committee meetings.

22 And out of that, District 37's handbook, along
23 with Las Vegas' BLM handbook for permit process was used
24 and something that was created that helped. And I think
25 it was Dave Tonkiss and Jim Preland (phonetic spelling)

1 and Keith Huff, maybe, from the motorcycle committee,
2 but we represented kind of a cross-section with the
3 commercial side, the dual sport, the two-wheel drive or
4 the motorcycle competitive events and the four-wheel
5 drive, which are family fun. And within that, from
6 Cal Four's perspective, we've always recognized that we
7 are a non-profit organization, and yet we do admit that
8 we will go through the permitting process.

9 But within that, though, I would like to point
10 out a couple of things I would like to see really looked
11 at, is this cost recovery in 50 hours. If you exceed
12 the 50 hours, generally they have gone -- backtracked
13 and also included in the 50 hours on their cost
14 recovery. How about just give a flat 50-hour credit and
15 anything over 50 hours is what becomes part of the costs
16 that you're going to recover.

17 Permits are generally done for a single year.
18 I know from Cal Four-Wheel's perspective a lot of our
19 events that are set up on a already designated OHV
20 trails, we'd like to see kind of reducing some of this
21 paperwork and run out to a five-year permit process
22 rather than just a single year at a time. Also would
23 like to see about getting a permit, signed permit,
24 received in a reasonable period of time before the
25 event, not the day before or the day of the event, but,

1 say, 30 days before the event because a lot of us have
2 suppliers who we have to commit to without knowing that
3 we have a formal permit.

4 Lastly looking at the online process, yes,
5 great, wonderful. I've got no problems with that check
6 sheet that's come up there that's been looked at. There
7 is something that's boiler-plate throughout any type of
8 event, but there's also some that for some events is
9 extraneous information. And having an online system
10 just if you're at this point, what is your answer here,
11 then that will then drop you down into some more
12 detailed questions, or you can bypass a whole bunch of
13 non-applicable stuff. So thank you.

14 CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you. And, Sandra, do you
15 have a comment on that?

16 MS. MC GINNIS: Well, you echoed the concerns
17 that we heard that triggered the review, and hopefully
18 we were able to show you through our presentation that
19 those are exactly the types of things that we're
20 targeting with our online process and our early frequent
21 collaboration with the applicants.

22 Did you want to add anything?

23 MR. BELLEW: Just a real good example that
24 standardization statewide, because you may have
25 somebody -- let's say they're a hunting guide and

1 they're up in Arcata and they may also want to be down
2 in the desert operating, that they have all of that.

3 But one of the other things we do now, we talk
4 about stipulations. It isn't going to do us much good
5 to have desert tortoise steps on somebody that's a
6 fishing guide in Northern California or vice versa. So
7 that's why, when you get to the point about picking out
8 the office or offices, there may be specific things that
9 are dedicated to that office itself. So, great
10 thoughts.

11 CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, all. I think this
12 permit program presentation highlights not only the
13 opportunity to present to the public but in this
14 particular case the opportunity for the public to
15 actually provide very solid feedback to a program that's
16 underway. So I think that shows the value of, you know,
17 timely presentations. In this particular case it's
18 worked out quite well. So thank you, all, for coming.

19 With that, we're just a little behind schedule.
20 But God bless Mike. He's going to present before and
21 after lunch, I believe. So that will give us all the
22 opportunity to think of lots and lots of questions
23 during our lunch break and tackle them again after
24 lunch.

25 But with respect to that, Mojave Trails

1 National Monument Visioning Sessions Review,
2 Mike Ahrens. Thank you.

3 MR. AHRENS: Yes. Thank you for the
4 opportunity. And message received. I will attempt to
5 be succinct. So, Mike Ahrens, Needles Field Manager.

6 So what we did want to do today was give you an
7 overview. The first major milestone in the
8 Mojave Trails planning process was these envisioning
9 meetings. We had an opportunity for the public to start
10 to get involved in the dialogue about the Mojave Trails
11 National Monument and its forthcoming plan. So there
12 were three sessions that we held: Barstow, Yucca Valley
13 and Needles California. Tried to use the most local
14 communities surrounding the monument to provide good
15 access to the public for that.

16 The meetings were done in an open-house format,
17 so persons came in, were registered so we could keep
18 them engaged in the dialogue and then were presented
19 with a questionnaire, which tried to tease out their
20 thoughts about the monument, its qualities, kinds of
21 experiences that they would want to have, specific
22 places that they use and enjoy and how those are
23 important to them and what have you.

24 So with that questionnaire then in hand, they
25 had an opportunity to review posters that explained a

1 little bit about each of those values and portions of
2 the program. And then we prepared kind of work areas
3 and tables and chairs where the participants could sit
4 down and write their reflections on those different
5 topics. And so, you know, without going into great
6 detail on that, I would say there was 85 total of those
7 questionnaires that were turned back in. So a pretty
8 good sampling.

9 So, yeah. So just as a way of overview, you
10 know, the questionnaires kind of started out with, you
11 know, what does it mean to you? What does Mojave Trails
12 Monument mean to you? And the most general -- we got,
13 of course, a broad range of comments. Summing those up,
14 generally the input was that it was a natural area,
15 meant to be protected for generations to come. And so
16 that's pretty across. Certainly about experiences,
17 again, a very broad range of recreational, camping,
18 hunting, hiking, you know, sightseeing, really the whole
19 gamut.

20 Rockhounding was certainly well recommended.
21 We had those. OHV access, vehicle access in general,
22 really strongly. Obviously people are concerned. And
23 let's face it. It's 1.6 million acres of land. You're
24 going to need a vehicle to get around there to some
25 degree. So certainly a big concern. We heard that

1 very, very clearly.

2 Had interest in facilities. And by "interest,"
3 I mean both pros and cons. It's always fun. That's
4 always a fun question at these kinds of things because
5 there are folks that want a swimming pool if they can
6 have it and folks that don't even like to have signs.
7 And so somewhere in the middle is where we'll end up.
8 And as I said, had a pretty good representation from the
9 hunting and wildlife water communities. Certainly I
10 think that's an issue that we'll want to talk about as
11 we go into the management plan as well.

12 And then our law enforcement and resource
13 protection and our ability to really be present and
14 provide a presence in visitor services there within the
15 monument.

16 And so that's really kind of a very quick
17 overview. Open to questions, if we'd like to do that.

18 CHAIR BARRETT: Mike, bear with me just for a
19 second.

20 MR. AHRENS: Certainly.

21 CHAIR BARRETT: Because of the discussion
22 before and after lunch and this is more on the
23 envisioning sessions, and then after lunch we'll talk
24 more about the management process, can you give me a
25 little bit more, give the group a little bit more about

1 the sessions per se and the questions that you would
2 like from us as they pertain to the sessions so that we
3 can hold off on some of the more detailed questions that
4 we might have with respect to the management process
5 until later on. How can we help you with respect to the
6 process to date so that we do our best to distinguish
7 questions that we should actually be asking you after
8 lunch?

9 MR. AHRENS: Yes. So as far as the
10 envisioning, this report on the envisioning meetings, I
11 think it really is just a status report, an overview
12 that they happened, they occurred, generally here's what
13 the comments kind of were. And I don't know that I'm
14 necessarily expecting any -- it's not something I need
15 help on necessarily, you know, because it's occurred.
16 We're compiling those data, which we'll use as we move
17 through the planning process, so really not anticipating
18 any action from the DAC.

19 CHAIR BARRETT: Okay. Thanks. And on that,
20 then, so we do have the opportunity to talk after lunch
21 on the management process per se. So we'll do our best,
22 then, to focus on this particular session review and
23 perhaps other mechanisms by which the public-at-large
24 can provide more input, and then we can talk about the
25 management afterwards.

1 But in this particular case, Bob, you had a
2 question, perhaps.

3 MEMBER BURKE: Mike, you said you only 85
4 responses out of the three meetings?

5 MR. AHRENS: Correct.

6 MEMBER BURKE: Did you get any faxed responses?

7 MR. AHRENS: Yeah, we actually did.

8 MEMBER BURKE: They're counted into that 85?

9 MR. AHRENS: That's part of that number;
10 correct.

11 MEMBER BURKE: I would have thought there was
12 more.

13 MR. AHRENS: If you ever do surveys --

14 MEMBER BURKE: Because I know how many people
15 were at Yucca Valley from Terry's group. And I know how
16 many rockhound people were in Barstow and put their
17 comments in. I sent comments in.

18 MR. AHRENS: I agree. I'm sure we had 150, 200
19 people between the three meetings represented.

20 MEMBER BURKE: Right. I just thought there
21 would have been more comments turned in in that
22 timeframe. Thank you.

23 CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you. Thanks, Bob. Any
24 other?

25 Billy, perhaps?

1 MEMBER MITCHELL: Yeah, Mike, we don't have
2 this or anything on. But after lunch, after you do all
3 this, can we discuss a little about the one ranch with
4 the ten-year lease and the others coming up for renewal
5 after lunch? After lunch would that be okay?

6 MR. AHRENS: Yeah. Perhaps during the
7 managers' reports we can bring that up. I'd be happy to
8 talk about that, sure.

9 MEMBER MITCHELL: Thank you, sir.

10 CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, Billy.

11 And any other questions from our group per se?

12 MEMBER BURKE: Is it lunchtime?

13 CHAIR BARRETT: It's getting pretty close. But
14 before we run away, the most important thing is the
15 public input. And we have some folks over here who are
16 welcome to take additional public speaking cards. We've
17 come up with some unique ones. So please take advantage
18 of that. But don't run away, Mike.

19 There's no more questions up here. We do have
20 a few from the public, and, Lisbet, if you don't mind.
21 Thank you.

22 MS. THORESEN: Thank you. Lisbet Thoresen. I
23 attended the Barstow envisioning session. I want to
24 compliment you on giving a really nice presentation. I
25 think it was really useful and helpful to have the

1 posters and people there to discuss the different
2 specialty interests of different groups, particularly
3 because some of these groups' interests are perceived
4 amongst one another as conflicting sometimes. And I
5 think that helps produce a productive dialogue for
6 appreciating each other's concerns. That is, I think,
7 really terribly important, and I hope this kind of
8 quality of engagement continues all through this
9 process. So thank you for that.

10 The thing that I had asked, actually, was -- in
11 an email to Mike, was, you know, we would like to get
12 our community contributing a lot more comments. We know
13 that we want to contribute comments based on that
14 questionnaire. I turned it into an interactive PDF. I
15 literally created a PDF form and was ready to post it.
16 I asked permission if I might do that and was told yes.
17 Then a few days later I asked. "Well, we don't really
18 need any more comments. We've got a lot of comments
19 in."

20 So we would have submitted many more comments,
21 had we had a better vehicle to do that. So in the
22 future I'd like to suggest that, in addition to taking
23 written forms and faxed forms, to create an interactive
24 PDF that you can actually input it, print it or you can
25 put in the mail. It would be easier for you to read

1 than to read a handwritten form. Or you can take it in
2 a digital format. And if you put check boxes and radio
3 buttons, you can then tabulate statistical data, and
4 then you get something really meaningful about aggregate
5 numbers of what kinds of interests and values are
6 overlapping and being repeated over and over and over
7 again without trying to parse through this really robust
8 narrative, such as what I would be given to write.

9 So that's my suggestion going forward. Thank
10 you.

11 CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, Lisbet.

12 Mike.

13 MR. AHRENS: Let me offer that in the
14 afternoon's session where we start talking about the
15 planning process, you'll see that there will be many
16 more opportunities for public comment. But thank you
17 for that.

18 CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, Mike.

19 And I'm going to ask a question, I suppose.
20 Both John and Sam, you're on multiple. But is your
21 intent to speak with respect to public comment on this
22 afternoon's session, or did you have something specific
23 to this session?

24 MR. STEWART: I'll pass on this one.

25 MS. MERK: I'll pass on this one too.

1 CHAIR BARRETT: Excellent. Make sure we get
2 that on the record they're passing the opportunity to
3 speak.

4 With that, I'm not so sure I have any more
5 public comments. I did see a hand back here.

6 DR. HUGHES: Yes. I did submit a card.

7 CHAIR BARRETT: My apologies. Please come up.

8 DR. HUGHES: I'm not sure whether it's relevant
9 right now or whether it would be better this afternoon.
10 My name is Nigel Hughes, and I'm professor of geology
11 here at the University of California of Riverside, so
12 I'm very pleased to in some sense welcome you all to
13 meeting today.

14 We are very pleased that the Mojave Trails is
15 going ahead, but there is a particular concern that we
16 have about accessibility to continue to select fossils
17 that occur particularly in the Marble Mountains. This
18 is being submitted as part of the various and
19 envisioning events. I talked to Phil Gensler, who is
20 the paleontologist. In terms of envisioning, I wanted
21 to point out that there are additional contacts that
22 have been made that are separate from those that are
23 going on in the meetings, so that we hope that those
24 will be taken into account.

25 Perhaps I might have more to say after lunch

1 when we've had the management plan side.

2 CHAIR BARRETT: Dr. Hughes, thank you. And
3 from someone from across the pond, you're always
4 welcome. So thank you.

5 With that, I have no more public comment cards
6 for this morning's session. Mike, you outdid me with
7 how much you managed to narrow down your presentation.

8 MR. AHRENS: We serve to please the chair.

9 CHAIR BARRETT: And perhaps it was lunch. But
10 with that in mind, I think we're adjourned for lunch.
11 Steve, are we okay schedule-wise to come back as
12 originally planned in the agenda?

13 MR. RAZO: Well, that's kind of long. I wonder
14 whether we should move it to 1:30.

15 CHAIR BARRETT: 1:30. We can pull back the 15
16 minutes that we gained at this morning's session. Does
17 anyone have any objections to being back by 1:30?
18 Hearing none, shall we be back at 1:30? We're adjourned
19 for the morning. Thank you so much.

20 (A lunch recess was taken.)

21 CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, all. Hope you had a
22 good lunch, and we're coming back to Mojave Trails
23 National Monument. But now Mike is going to talk a
24 little more about the management process.

25 MR. AHRENS: Right. So a little, again, kind

1 of an overview. I will try to be succinct still.
2 Really we kicked that off with those envisioning
3 meetings. That's actually preplanning, but it was that
4 first effort to try to garner some information and get a
5 sense of what folks thought about the monument.

6 Next step is -- actually we're working on it.
7 We've talked about this before, the Collaborative
8 Incentive Program that we applied for through DOI and
9 received some funding and support to provide some
10 collaborative facilitation and support expertise to the
11 discussion and help us really do more of that
12 preplanning, mining, if you will, of opinions and
13 thoughts and what have you. So that's going to
14 actually, we think, have two phases in it.

15 The first will be what we refer to as a
16 situational assessment. In that case what that does is,
17 really, we'll take that information from the envisioning
18 sessions, information from ourselves. We'll likely
19 interview many of you, other interested group leaders
20 and what have you to try to get and really synthesize
21 that information and put that into a report that we can
22 then use in the future planning efforts.

23 The second part of that that we think we'll do
24 but to some extent to be dependent on how the
25 situational assessment goes, and what we find through

1 that, is then have those facilitators, that expertise
2 work with the DAC subgroup, once established, to help
3 define those roles, confirm the -- they're not roles,
4 but confirm the issues to be resolved in the management
5 plan itself, to confirm the situational assessment
6 information there and help that group work out a way to
7 work with each other.

8 I've worked on several of these work groups
9 like this, as I know many of you are, and I'm sure
10 you'll all recognize that anytime you bring a group of
11 people with different backgrounds and interests and what
12 have you together, there's a certain period of time
13 where there's sort of like mandatory posturing. They
14 just all have to sort of find their own position and
15 understand what everybody is about. And until you get
16 through that, a group can't really work forward. So
17 we're hoping to speed that up with some facilitative
18 collaboration, what have you.

19 So of course all of these steps, not
20 necessarily one at a time. Some of them will be
21 happening consecutively and what have you. So along in
22 that same timeframe, we'll also be working on what we
23 refer as a planning assessment. It's different from the
24 situational assessment in that situational assessment
25 really deals with opinions, thoughts, interests, those

1 kinds of things. Planning assessment is more dealing
2 with what we currently know, what our current plans, you
3 know, say and the direction we have there, direction
4 mandates, legal regulatory mandates, those kinds of
5 things. Bottle all that up into again a succinct kind
6 of report that we can then help guide the future of the
7 planning efforts.

8 So with those things done, we'll actually start
9 the formal scoping process. Of course that begins with
10 a Notice of Intent. We require a Federal Register
11 Notice, and the climate for that is a little slow. But
12 we're already preparing for that, or certainly that will
13 be one of the products that will come out of the
14 planning assessment and what have you. And the
15 situation assessment will be helping to build that
16 notice so we can get that started and move into the
17 actual formal scoping process.

18 Then next step that's identified at this point
19 is, we actually want to share -- develop some
20 preliminary alternatives and share those publicly. And
21 we're going to get feedback on those, actually, even
22 before we actually go into a formal alternative process.
23 So that would happen. And then from there, develop a
24 draft plan, public review in there as well, and then
25 incorporate those thoughts and comments and what have

1 you, where we would then move to a final plan.

2 So pretty much those are the steps, kind of the
3 big steps. There are many steps in between. And, you
4 know, as I was saying, of course we envision the DAC and
5 the public having a role in all of those and stepping
6 all the way through that process.

7 CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, Mike. And I do want
8 to acknowledge that we are going to come back to the
9 DRECP and the subgroup discussion on that after the
10 presentation here immediately after we finish this. But
11 since you started before lunch, we took the opportunity
12 to finish this up as well.

13 MR. AHRENS: Okay.

14 CHAIR BARRETT: Let's open it up for some
15 questions.

16 Billy.

17 MEMBER MITCHELL: Yeah, Mike, would you like me
18 to wait on that ranch issue, or you want to do this real
19 quick? I have no questions on what you just said.
20 Whenever you want to take care of it.

21 MR. AHRENS: Why don't you bring that up in our
22 field manager reports.

23 MEMBER MITCHELL: Okay.

24 MR. AHRENS: Towards the end of the agenda,
25 where they ask us questions about our reports. Let's

1 ask about that then.

2 MEMBER MITCHELL: All right.

3 CHAIR BARRETT: Mark?

4 MEMBER ALGAZY: I'm listening to the management
5 part of your presentation. Now it gives me a little
6 clearer picture about the -- what do you call -- the
7 envisioning part that you brought up earlier. And I'm
8 wondering if you're looking to get feedback from the DAC
9 during the envisioning phase, if you might make
10 available to us those 85 comments that you received,
11 along with maybe just a "yes" or a "no" on whether BLM's
12 preliminary assessment is that those envisioning ideas
13 are within the scope of the monument or not, because, as
14 you say, swimming pools could be a little farfetched.

15 So maybe if we could see those 85 comments,
16 along with some provisional just "yes" or "no," it would
17 give us some guidance as to other things that -- it may
18 spark ideas from us, as well as things that we could
19 submit for you.

20 MR. AHRENS: Yeah, sure. I would be happy to
21 do that. We actually are compiling that into a summary
22 report that will help, rather than wading through all of
23 that. So I think we'll be able to make that available
24 to you, absolutely.

25 I should also address, too, because we did have

1 ongoing requests after the envisioning sessions to
2 provide more information, we're going to want
3 information all the way through this in one form or the
4 other. The envisioning session really was a moment in
5 time. That was an exercise we went through to try to
6 garner that information. And so, you know, we had folks
7 that -- and thank you for the enthusiasm -- wanted to
8 try to generate more information. And there's going to
9 be more opportunities. You can see that. And we do
10 want that information, but at some point you've got to
11 kind of compile what you have and move to the next step.
12 So, yeah, thank you.

13 CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, Mark.

14 Jim, thank you.

15 MEMBER KENNEY: Is this stuff going to be
16 available to the public before the Notice of Intent so
17 we can follow along, or is it going to be kind of secret
18 until it's published?

19 MR. AHRENS: Quite the opposite. We want to
20 have a very ongoing, transparent kind of dialogue. More
21 than us just reporting to you, "This is what happened,"
22 we want you to all be engaged and the public be engaged
23 in this conversation about the Mojave Trails Monument
24 and how the planning --

25 MEMBER KENNEY: So where will we find that?

1 Where will that be?

2 MR. AHRENS: Where will that be?

3 MEMBER KENNEY: Yes.

4 MR. AHRENS: It will probably come in a lot of
5 different ways, I suppose. I guess we haven't worked
6 through that, Jim, to be honest with you. I'm sure we
7 will use our web pages. You know, we'll do some
8 certainly reporting and involvement with the DAC, you
9 know, all of the normal sources. From our perspective
10 the more engagement, the better.

11 MEMBER KENNEY: Okay.

12 MR. RAZO: If I may, we do now currently have a
13 Mojave Trails National Monument web page. It's already
14 there available. However, it's being transitioned into
15 the new format of the BLM web pages, and hopefully we
16 can get through that process quicker than later so that
17 we can start populating that with whatever information
18 we can.

19 MEMBER KENNEY: Right.

20 MR. AHRENS: And I guess I would also say --
21 you know, it was announced -- we have a national
22 monument manager now. We've made the choice to locate
23 him down in Moreno Valley because we think that makes
24 him more accessible to all of you. And so that makes
25 our communication with him more difficult, but we think

1 it will make it better for you all, and that's a part of
2 that process.

3 DISTRICT MANAGER RANSEL: Maybe I can just add
4 that we are in this weird limbo with our web pages right
5 now, so that's where the uncertainty is coming from.
6 But if it does take too long, we will find another
7 avenue to make sure that we disseminate information that
8 folks are interested in. So we'll be getting back to
9 you shortly on that, on where you can find these
10 documents once they're ready to be posted.

11 CHAIR BARRETT: Thanks. Thank you. Thanks,
12 Jim.

13 Any other questions from DAC members with
14 respect to the management process? Hearing none, I do
15 have a couple of requests or comments from the public.
16 If there's anybody else, feel free. Grab a card over
17 here.

18 And, John, you're first on the list. Thank
19 you.

20 MR. STEWART: Good afternoon, council.
21 John Stewart, California Four-Wheel Drive Association.
22 Thanks, Mike, for the information. I and Cal Four-Wheel
23 and the four-wheel drive community have a number of
24 concerns. Some of the specifics -- and one of the
25 specifics of high priority is the Mojave Road, which

1 actually starts in BLM land, goes into Mojave Trails
2 National Monument then further into the Mojave Preserve
3 then comes out in Mojave Trails National Monument on the
4 western side and on into the other BLM lands.

5 One of the things that we want to ensure is
6 that -- connectivity is extremely important, especially
7 a through-route connectivity. And any other routes --
8 like I said, the Mojave Road is just one of a few that
9 go in and out and wind around out in the desert region.
10 We are concerned that not all of those are adequately
11 identified and designated into the current maps because,
12 of all of the attention that has been placed on WEMO, a
13 lot of this particular area, especially on the eastern
14 side, has been somewhat ignored. And therefore we
15 believe that we have a lot of routes that should be
16 included in a viable recreation access point into the
17 new Mojave Trails National Monument.

18 As it sits, any parking off of Route 66 segment
19 in most places is virtually non-existent, although there
20 are a number of spur roads that take off from the main
21 highway. And some of those spur roads are the ones that
22 you cannot really identify on route-designation maps.
23 So I'm hoping that, as this process moves forward, is
24 that we can look at having some of these routes
25 designated, as they are important and they are used.

1 And the one thing that people like out in the
2 desert region is a dispersed camping opportunity, and
3 this is something that is scarce in the desert. And
4 because of the geographic distribution of the monument,
5 this is about the only way you can actually see the
6 monument and experience the monument, is with this kind
7 of thing.

8 But again, like I say, connectivity of routes
9 across multiple management agencies or land-management
10 classifications is extremely important, and also is that
11 I'm hoping that this does not get rolled up into some
12 disturbance cap discussions within the rest of the
13 desert area. So thank you.

14 CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you. Thank you, John.

15 And, Sam, I have your card for each area.
16 Okay. Thank you. Thank you for doing it.

17 And, Lisbet, also have your card. So if you
18 have a few comments, please.

19 MS. THORESEN: Thank you for indulging me with
20 extra time this morning for my comments that carry over
21 this afternoon, going back to comments that Mark and
22 Randy made related to efficiencies and priorities, which
23 is going to be the real challenge for our group, the
24 gem, minerals societies. SDMG, San Diego Minerals and
25 Gems Society and the CFMS, California Federation of

1 Mineralogical Societies. I'm going to try to coordinate
2 gathering information about localities. This is going
3 to be extremely helpful. We have this wonderful
4 resource, Mindat. If we can submit this as a valid form
5 of information, as an authoritative reference in our
6 comment letters rather than having to include it by
7 laborious transcription, that would be a very desirable
8 thing.

9 But the real challenge for us is that the
10 access to those localities and the roads to them,
11 because it makes no practical use from the point of view
12 of collecting to have access to an area that we cannot
13 reach via motorized vehicles.

14 And then so my question for the DAC, for the
15 BLM is, given that you have already a lot of route data,
16 if we provide our GPS coordinates for localities, is
17 that something that BLM will take responsibility for
18 overlaying, or do we have to also be responsible for
19 connecting the dots for access to these areas?

20 And then I also want to make the comment that,
21 as I've mentioned, Mojave Trails National Monument
22 within its footprint has more collecting areas possibly
23 than any other place in California of concern to
24 rockhounds. As such, it's going to be a massive
25 undertaking for us to include all the sites we should

1 like to keep. We understand that anything not
2 articulated within or enshrined within that final
3 management plan will be excluded forever, even though
4 some of these sites have been places that people have
5 been going to for over a hundred years and these are
6 well-known.

7 So we would respectfully request that we have
8 adequate comment period, not 45 days or 60 days but
9 really an adequate comment period, in which to provide
10 useful comment and that we will then be able to look at
11 that draft document and comment again upon it to ensure
12 that everything that we're looking to see if it is in
13 fact in it in the way we would like.

14 And then there was one further thing I forgot.
15 So thank you for that. And I don't know to whom I
16 should expect a response with regard to those questions
17 about what would be an acceptable format for presenting
18 comments in a comment letter, but hopefully that will
19 come from the DAC or a BLM field office in the near
20 future.

21 MR. RAZO: We can do it. I'll make a note.

22 MS. THORESEN: Thank you.

23 CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, Lisbet.

24 MEMBER ALGAZY: Leslie, if I might respond.

25 CHAIR BARRETT: Yes, please.

1 MEMBER ALGAZY: We had a very informal
2 discussion about just this matter just before we
3 returned to the formal meeting format, and I don't have
4 a crystal ball about how the future is going to lay out,
5 but as I'm visioning the process of a potential subgroup
6 moving forward, I don't think that we are operating
7 under the same time constraints that we had when we had
8 the West Mojave Route Network Subgroup when we had 14
9 months to deliver a fine product and had that feeling
10 also that anything that wasn't captured at that point
11 was going to be lost forever because in the West Mojave
12 project, we were trying to aid the BLM within the
13 constraints of a lawsuit.

14 And as far as we know, there aren't any
15 lawsuits involved in DRECP. So we're looking at this
16 point again without a crystal ball at a more open-ended
17 process. So I don't think that they're under the same
18 time constraints of having opportunities lost forever.

19 MS. THORESEN: Okay. That's somewhat
20 heartening. One further comment, and that -- you made a
21 reference this morning up in Ridgecrest about mining,
22 and I want to be -- take care to note and differentiate
23 commercial mining from rock collecting and as an amateur
24 recreational activity. We as a group now are under the
25 aegis of recreational activity, and we want to be sure

1 that whatever language is enshrined in that final
2 management plan, that we are not ensnared in any
3 interpretation or constraints that really were designed
4 with commercial mining activity in mind, you know.

5 We use hand tools. Yes, it's definitely a
6 surface-disturbing activity. Most of this activity is
7 effaced by natural erosion and weathering processes and
8 done in a responsible way and in an amateur collecting
9 manner and doesn't involve power tools and backhoes and
10 dredges and the like. So we just want to be careful
11 about making that distinction and using that term
12 "mining" as it applies to us. Thank you.

13 CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you again. And no
14 further questions from the DAC on that, but we do have a
15 few more from the public.

16 Dr. Hughes, you have the opportunity again.
17 Thank you.

18 DR. HUGHES: Nigel, please.

19 CHAIR BARRETT: Nigel, thank you.

20 DR. HUGHES: I'd just like to echo what our
21 friend said here from the mineralogical perspective.
22 The Marble Mountains has long been known as a site
23 available, easily accessible from the L.A. basin, which
24 both kids who are being educated formerly in geology but
25 also just hobbyists can go and crack open a rock and see

1 a fossil and look it in the eye and know that the last
2 thing that saw it was living 512 million years ago. And
3 that is a really powerful thing for people to do.

4 The actual practicality of going and finding
5 fossil and having that experience is something that is
6 really tremendously impactful, and it's a very real
7 thing. And this is something that, as the Mojave Trails
8 plans develop, we would really like to be able to
9 maintain in as freely accessible away as possible.

10 So we have submitted some materials to
11 Phil Gensler, the BLM paleontologist for this region.
12 We've also transmitted it to Mike's group, I think, and
13 we look forward to being part of this ongoing dialogue
14 with other groups as we develop the plans for this
15 important new national monument. Thank you.

16 CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, Nigel. Thank you.
17 And we have just two more, and so if there's others out
18 there that would like to speak, we've got
19 Edward Platzer, if Ed is here.

20 Yes, Ed. Thank you.

21 MR. PLATZER: The comments I have to make echo
22 those of Nigel Hughes. I'm a member of the Southern
23 California Society of Paleontologists, and it's a
24 relatively small group compared to some of the other
25 groups that have issues with the new plan for the

1 Mojave Trails. The group is only about a hundred, but
2 they're a diverse members of seniors all the way down to
3 eight-year-olds who are interested in paleontology and
4 collecting fossils.

5 And many of you know that with urbanization,
6 for example, which is well epitomized by the L.A. area,
7 many of the very rich fossil locations that were once
8 available are now disappearing rapidly. And if you
9 compare our bulletin -- our society does publish a
10 bulletin, which is well-known throughout the
11 paleontological world -- the sites that are available
12 now in Los Angeles are a minimum of what was available
13 at one time.

14 And our members also like to go out to the
15 Cambrian fossil locations in the Marble Mountains, and
16 we're very concerned about losing this additional
17 resource and hope that in the wisdom of the BLM and the
18 other subgroups that are considering the rules that some
19 compensation or some format is developed that fossil
20 groups can continue to visit Marble Mountain.

21 And, as mentioned by our mineralogy groups,
22 there's very little disturbance of the soil by these
23 members. They're strictly hobbyists, children who are
24 interested in looking at signs of ancient life and
25 perhaps collecting a few samples of this. So hopefully

1 some way will be found to continue this access. Thank
2 you very much.

3 CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you.

4 Randy, please.

5 MEMBER BANIS: I'm hoping my understanding of
6 the collection of fossils is correct. My understanding
7 is that generally on BLM lands, you are allowed to
8 collect invertebrate and plant material fossils without
9 permit?

10 MR. PLATZER: Correct.

11 MEMBER BANIS: That's what we're talking about
12 by and large?

13 MR. PLATZER: Yes.

14 DR. HUGHES: Yes. No vertebrate remains.

15 MEMBER BANIS: Bingo. I think as I understand
16 the rub with respect to this activity and the new
17 monument is the attention that the president paid in his
18 proclamation to the importance of fossils as a resource
19 within that monument. And I think what's going to be
20 the challenge for not just fossil collectors but the
21 rockhounds as well, is, how do those activities continue
22 to occur without increasing the likelihood of negative
23 impacts on the protected fossils, which would be the
24 vertebrate fossils that are going to be in an extra
25 state of protection, which is kind of at that -- it's

1 not a good word for me to say.

2 It's not like -- if you were to pick up a
3 vertebrate fossil in a national monument and were to be
4 charged with it, the penalty is the same for picking up
5 that vertebrate fossil outside the monument. There is a
6 law against it with a certain thing. It's just that the
7 BLM will have to make special -- pay special attention
8 in its planning process to seeing that those protected
9 fossils or the vertebrate fossils can remain collected
10 and how we can still allow the collecting of
11 invertebrate.

12 That's the rub. And I just kind of wanted to
13 share that. As we move forward and start talking about
14 this, then we can start hammering it out and so forth.
15 But if I don't understand at this point, then help me.

16 MR. AHRENS: No. You're exactly right. And I
17 think, as we work through the plan, that's what we'll
18 want to do, is talk about how that happened, consistent
19 with it.

20 The other thing, though, I think I did want to
21 just daylight for you is there is also currently
22 underway a rulemaking process for how the bureau manages
23 paleontologic resources. I'm not necessarily seeing
24 that as being an issue, but I know it's out there. And
25 we'll have to see what comes out of that process and be

1 consistent, obviously, with our plan.

2 MEMBER BANIS: Good. I just would add that, if
3 you just Google "BLM fossils," you'll come up with a
4 really nice PDF brochure that has some neat stuff that I
5 learned in just two minutes. Thank you.

6 DR. HUGHES: Could I just say one happy aspect
7 of the Mojave Trails is that the rocks that are
8 preserved there, Cambrian rocks, as Ed mentioned, are
9 pre the occurrence of vertebrates with skeletons that
10 would preserve, so we are happily saved very easily from
11 that particular very opposite concern.

12 MEMBER BANIS: Now I get it. Thank you.

13 DR. HUGHES: Perhaps.

14 MEMBER BANIS: Perhaps.

15 CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you. Thank you, Randy.

16 MEMBER BANIS: Now I got it until the next
17 question.

18 CHAIR BARRETT: Before we leave the subject, I
19 do want to, I suppose, touch again on the whole
20 educational side of the last two points of view and
21 presentations. And the ability to protect the
22 California Desert in generations to come, as in any
23 other environmental resource depends highly on educating
24 our youth, our children, to be able to understand and
25 appreciate the resources that are out there.

1 And so, although we come up with management
2 plans and we work diligently on protecting our
3 resources, the long-term viability of that protection is
4 largely dictated by how well we're educating our youth.
5 And for those educators that are here and for myself as
6 well trying to work with L.A. Unified, we need to do as
7 much as we can to get that message out, because
8 everything else is just a point in time, and it's our
9 children that will lead the charge into the future. So
10 thank you again, doctor, for your efforts in that.

11 We do have one other. Gerry, if you wouldn't
12 mind. Thank you.

13 MR. HILLIER: Thank you very much,
14 Mr. Chairman. I, like several of the others, have made
15 several trips up to the podium today. I've got my
16 San Bernardino County hat on now rather my Quad State
17 hat on.

18 First off I'd just like, for background
19 information, to indicate the Cady Mountains, which is an
20 integral part and really the largest unit in this area,
21 has been controversial going back to the Desert Plan.
22 It was a Wilderness Study Area but was originally
23 recommended nonsuitable for wilderness primarily because
24 of its rockhounding resources and need for access to
25 those areas.

1 It became a congressionally designated
2 Wilderness Study Area, which is a new category that was
3 never envisioned, but that's what it became in the
4 desert bill in '94 and how has been at least partially
5 resolved with the president's proclamation.

6 The county was concerned about rockhounding and
7 maintenance of that. And in fact we had a fairly
8 comprehensive letter written balancing the operation of
9 the mining law and the rockhounding recreation aspects
10 when we became aware of the fact that State Director
11 initiated a directive that rockhounding would remain
12 within the Mojave Trails, or the national monument.

13 We urge that whatever can be done to enshrine
14 that through this entire planning process be done. I
15 would hate to have -- having been around the block more
16 than once, I would hate to have somebody from Washington
17 cut the legs out from that directive and decision.
18 Rockhounding is a completely separate activity from
19 exploration under the 1872 Mining Law. So we heartily
20 even endorse that.

21 I was unable to attend the envisioning
22 sessions, having some other conflicts. But
23 Josh Candelaria, the county's director, did attend the
24 Barstow session and got the sense there was going to be
25 some kind of advisory committee or something formed and

1 all and wrote a formal letter over the signatures of
2 Supervisor Ramos and Supervisor Lovingood urging that
3 there not be a doubling up of interest, that there be a
4 concerted effort to be sure that interests are balanced
5 and, more importantly, that there be some outreach to
6 include somebody from the business community and
7 particularly the visitor and hospitality industry
8 segments, that that was important, and also outreach to
9 the Victor Valley area.

10 Yucca Valley was included in these envisioning
11 sessions, but Victorville, Hesperia, Apple Valley area
12 was not. So that's another area that certainly is going
13 to have an interest in the operation of this.

14 One of the things -- and the professors have
15 spoken about paleo resources, and I whispered,
16 "Perhaps," and so -- and it really is a "perhaps."
17 Somebody from Washington very likely could say, "Well,
18 you know, a fossil is a fossil is a fossil."

19 And I know of an area -- in fact I was involved
20 in it for a while there -- called Fossil Field in
21 Wyoming pre-FLPMA, but it was taken away from BLM
22 administration precisely because people were collecting
23 fossils. And so there is a precedent. Granted,
24 Fossil Field is under the National Park Service, and BLM
25 is a different operation. But a precedent does exist

1 for putting fossils absolutely out of reach of the
2 public for anything but what can be done under a science
3 permit. And so this is a question that probably needs
4 to be resolved.

5 And along with that firm binding statement
6 that's in effect until the management plan is signed off
7 on, fossils probably ought to be included in that
8 general directive and guidance that the collecting that
9 the professors advocate remain and supported through the
10 process. Thank you.

11 CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, Gerry. And
12 excellent comments. Thank you, all. Thank you, all,
13 public, and all very, very good comments I'm sure Mike
14 much appreciates. Thank you, Mike, also for keeping us
15 on schedule. Thank you for the presentation. And with
16 that I think we conclude that part of our agenda item.

17 Earlier this morning we talked about coming
18 back to the DRECP and specifically for discussion with
19 respect to our continuing involvement, representation,
20 support of the implementation of the DRECP. And with
21 that I would like to open up with some questions.

22 Billy?

23 MEMBER MITCHELL: I did have one for Mike.

24 CHAIR BARRETT: Okay. Please.

25 MEMBER MITCHELL: Yeah, Mike, I did have one

1 question about the Horsethief Springs, the ranch named
2 Horsethief Springs. I was visiting with a rancher, and
3 we did get the ten-year permit. Also we have Section 4
4 permits that were against the CFRs taken out against the
5 rancher's wishes. And can you give a short update on
6 that with him. You guys are looking for a spot. We
7 talked about it yesterday, and obviously he wants the
8 same footprint that they've cut off the measurements,
9 yada, yada. And you guys are also looking for a place
10 to restore everything.

11 And I do have to say -- and I want to keep it
12 really short -- Mike stepped into a very bad situation
13 that was unallowable, and he's done a very good job
14 working with, that it's been ten years that that ranch
15 has been year by year. And this ranch was from my
16 family back in '58 we started, and he has done a very
17 good job with this person developing the AMP, finalizing
18 it maybe here a month ago or so.

19 MR. AHRENS: In the last few.

20 MEMBER MITCHELL: You do have the one issue
21 about Section 4 permits that were removed against the
22 CFRs, so maybe by next DAC meeting could you put that
23 where you'll be with that.

24 MR. AHRENS: I'll go ahead and include that in
25 our future progress reports.

1 MEMBER MITCHELL: If you would. And the
2 ten-year, whatever you have coming up for -- I don't
3 know. Maybe you have the Blairs. I know Jay Murton
4 (phonetic spelling) is not up you for a while yet.

5 MR. AHRENS: I will.

6 MEMBER MITCHELL: I appreciate it. Thank you,
7 Mike. You do a good job.

8 MR. AHRENS: Thank you.

9 CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, Billy. Actually we
10 have a couple of comments before the motion just for a
11 second, a couple of comments.

12 DISTRICT MANAGER RANSEL: I think that Russ has
13 probably left already, but I just wanted to bring back
14 the topic that Russ -- or what Russ was asking for from
15 the group. So certainly we're about 30 days into the
16 implementation of the DRECP, and he is our lead for
17 that, and I'll be working very closely with him.

18 And so part of the ask for the group today was
19 just, you know, what type of involvement does the DAC
20 see that they want to have as we move through that
21 implementation? There's a lot of pieces to that, and we
22 would certainly welcome the involvement of the DAC, but
23 I leave it to you guys to figure out what type of
24 involvement you would like to have.

25 CHAIR BARRETT: Thanks. Thank you, Beth. And

1 we do apologize about your term, "all you guys," and we
2 hopefully would --

3 DISTRICT MANAGER RANSEL: I hadn't even noticed
4 that, that it's all gentlemen.

5 CHAIR BARRETT: I'm not so sure they're all
6 gentlemen, but we're all guys.

7 MEMBER MITCHELL: Well, today we are.

8 CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you. But let's open it
9 up for some questions or motions.

10 Mark, please. Sorry. Randy.

11 MEMBER BANIS: This guy would like to move that
12 we establish a DRECP implementation subgroup, the
13 mission, to assist the BLM with DRECP implementation
14 using the WEMO route designation process as the template
15 for soliciting public input. Membership will represent
16 broad stakeholder interests. The function will be in a
17 manner similar to the former WEMO Subgroup. End of
18 motion.

19 CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, Randy. Shall we
20 open the motion up for questions?

21 MEMBER BANIS: We don't have a second.

22 MEMBER MITCHELL: I'll second it.

23 MEMBER BANIS: We've got a second.

24 CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you. I'm sorry. Back to
25 you, Mark.

1 MEMBER ALGAZY: Okay. I thank Randy for taking
2 the time to really nail down the motion. I wanted to
3 make it clear that my earlier comments about
4 reconstituting the WEMO Subgroup weren't intended to
5 actually reconstitute the WEMO Subgroup.

6 What I felt really was the net purpose of that,
7 that we not go forward to the public under any false
8 pretense, because we understand very much now that all
9 the information that was gathered in the WEMO route
10 network planning process is now subject to this very big
11 disturbance cap. And so anything that we would do going
12 forward obviously has to be vetted with the public to
13 help them understand how it's not the wide-ranging
14 solicitation of information that it was the first time
15 around and that we need to ask the public to help in
16 prioritizing, if we can't have everything on the
17 Christmas wish list, what's at the top of the list?

18 But I don't feel that we can legitimately go
19 forward without having all of the maps that were
20 generated during the WEMO process. And that's really
21 what I was trying to focus on when I brought up the WEMO
22 Subgroup, and all of the informal discussions that we
23 had between this morning and now helped me to nail that
24 down.

25 And I wasn't really trying to reconstitute the

1 subgroup as much as I was trying to make sure that, when
2 we went forward to the public, we didn't just give them
3 this fuzzy idea about concepts but we gave them real
4 maps that can help them focus on their access issues.
5 And as far as I'm concerned, the only real maps that we
6 have are the maps that were produced by the process of
7 the WEMO Subgroup and the subsequent SEIS that came out.
8 So I want to make sure that, whatever the DRECP Subgroup
9 utilizes, that it gives the public real maps to work
10 with.

11 CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, Mark. Any other
12 questions?

13 Randy, I'll try one. And by the way, thank you
14 so much for putting it all together.

15 MEMBER BANIS: Please.

16 CHAIR BARRETT: Focusing just on the last
17 sentence.

18 MEMBER BANIS: Yes.

19 CHAIR BARRETT: Can you repeat that. It seemed
20 like --

21 MEMBER BANIS: Of course. I'll repeat the
22 sentence and then maybe expand it. It will function in
23 a manner similar to the former WEMO Subgroup. My
24 attempt there was to capture some of Mark's thoughts
25 with respect to how the WEMO Subgroup operated. It used

1 a unique combination of internal subgroup meetings
2 regularly scheduled but also went out to the general
3 public periodically to actually secure facilities that
4 were donated to us.

5 A hotel gave us a meeting room for free so that
6 we could engage the public in Ridgecrest. Jawbone
7 Station hosted a meeting. Lucerne Valley hosted a
8 meeting. So it would be not only a model of us holding
9 meetings and having the public come to our little
10 meetings but that we would actually be holding listening
11 sessions in different places to be able to engage the
12 communities. Thanks.

13 CHAIR BARRETT: Excellent. Thank you, Randy.
14 And I thought it was important to help explain to all
15 how the success of the previous could be a model for the
16 future. So thank you for that.

17 MEMBER BANIS: I'm sorry to do this, but just
18 to tag on with the maps, an example. At the last OHV
19 leadership, Katrina got up this -- on an easel, and she
20 said, "Okay, guys. This is how it works. We've got
21 this area. We've got a mine up there, a road here and a
22 road here. Then this mine goes here, and this mines
23 wants to do this. If you did this, this one is okay,
24 this one is not. And the cap is this and this, then
25 this one would be good, but that one wouldn't."

1 And we're all just going, "Oh, I get it." And
2 so with respect to the maps, we could go, then, from
3 this theoretical example to real, on-the-ground
4 examples. So get some maps and see how it would flow.
5 And I think that's great.

6 CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you. And are there any
7 other questions, comments or such from the DAC?

8 And Randy and Mark, is this an item that before
9 the vote that you would feel that the public could
10 assist us in any way or give any comments on it? I know
11 it's a little informal, but we don't really have the
12 opportunity for anyone to speak.

13 MEMBER BANIS: I'm always in favor of hearing
14 from the public before we vote.

15 CHAIR BARRETT: I don't have any speaker cards.
16 But John or if any of the public would like to comment,
17 I think it's an important subject.

18 MR. STEWART: John Stewart, California
19 Four-Wheel Drive Association. I don't disagree with the
20 concept of setting up a subgroup. I'm a little bit
21 concerned about the language that is being used. And I
22 was also going to refer you back to what Russ Scofield
23 brought to the council early this morning. He is the
24 one shouldered with the responsibility to implement the
25 DRECP, and he is looking to create something, some

1 outreach format. And I think that somehow this language
2 should represent that this subgroup is tasked with or
3 chartered or directed to work with the BLM management
4 team in order to implement DRECP across the scope of the
5 DRECP without restrictions as to just up in the Northern
6 Mojave, Ridgecrest but also look at down in the
7 Imperial County area and throughout, you know, and then
8 also look at the scope of the stakeholders that would be
9 involved in trying to create a point where there is a
10 wide range of interest groups involved in order to
11 assist the BLM in communicating with and obtaining
12 information from the public that would help them move
13 forward. So thank you.

14 CHAIR BARRETT: John, before you sit down,
15 clearly, clearly that should be our intent. Was there
16 anything in the language that you felt didn't promote
17 that?

18 MR. STEWART: I think I'd have to sit down and
19 really do a wordsmithing run through it. But the
20 continued reference back to a WEMO-like, I think that
21 would put some artificial constraints on it. I would
22 essentially drop the reference to a WEMO-like and
23 actually spell it out that this is going to be a
24 subgroup that would meet in various places throughout
25 the range or throughout the boundaries of the DRECP in

1 order to assist the agency in moving forward with the
2 implementation plans and actually soliciting information
3 from the public.

4 And it's like the charter for the DAC itself is
5 to be a vehicle to solicit input from public, from the
6 stakeholders, from the interested parties. Then this
7 particular subgroup essentially would be an extension of
8 that particular group. So, like I said, look at it as
9 using a broader and not so much trying to throw us
10 preconceived words in there that might short circuit or
11 box somebody into thinking, oh, well, this is what it
12 has to be, but just to actually spell it out and open it
13 out into a much broader scope as to what you really
14 intended to do as far as for an accomplishment. So
15 thank you.

16 CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, John.

17 Bob, a question or comments.

18 MEMBER BURKE: Correct me if I'm wrong, but
19 weren't part of us already on a DRECP subcommittee?

20 MEMBER BANIS: It was April and I and
21 Tom Acuna.

22 MEMBER BURKE: Myself.

23 MEMBER BANIS: That was monument --

24 MEMBER BURKE: No.

25 MEMBER BANIS: -- that we formed two months

1 ago.

2 MEMBER BURKE: Randy, I have the floor.
3 Myself, Mark, Leslie, we were all part of that
4 subcommittee with April, and our first meeting that we
5 had, we were bombarded with the North Peak Wind while we
6 were trying to discuss the DRECP.

7 MEMBER BANIS: That was the second one. Thank
8 you. I was thinking of the first one. We had two
9 subcommittees. You're right. You're right.

10 MEMBER BURKE: We already have a subcommittee.

11 MEMBER BANIS: We have a subcommittee.

12 MEMBER BURKE: Right.

13 MEMBER BANIS: A subgroup involves outside
14 members.

15 MEMBER ALGAZY: I would like to respond to
16 John Stewart's point. And I understand John's point.
17 My specific reasoning for using the WEMO Subgroup is one
18 of the things that became very clear to us very early on
19 with the WEMO Subgroup was making sure that we
20 understood not only what our goals were but making sure
21 that we could make a deliverable goal. And I feel that,
22 while it's also admirable to try and take on lots and
23 lots of different things, at some point it dilutes your
24 ability to have a deliverable work product.

25 And I think that all the -- I could be wrong,

1 and you don't all have to agree with me on it, but I
2 think that our strong suit is delivering information to
3 the BLM on access, on route networks. And that's why I
4 focused on a WEMO Subgroup-like new group, because that
5 group was a group that was focused on helping to put
6 together maps, focused on access, and that was a
7 deliverable goal.

8 CHAIR BARRETT: And John and Gerry, I'll hold
9 off just in a second. I am, I suppose, a little more
10 troubled now, Mark, because what Randy was talking about
11 was a process that would be similar and what you're
12 talking about is a subject matter that would be similar.
13 And this gets back to John's point. I don't know that
14 we've been asked to curtail our subject matter to be
15 something similar to WEMO. And I'm not sure that, since
16 this subgroup is an extension out to the public, that we
17 should be giving that impression. Otherwise we won't
18 get a full range.

19 Whether we come up with enough material or not,
20 the key aspect at this stage is to have a broad
21 understanding as to what the responsibilities of this
22 subgroup will be. And I think John 's point is very
23 well taken there.

24 MR. STEWART: Again, John Stewart,
25 Cal Four-Wheel. I think that there is a certain amount

1 of a legality in establishing this as far as the use of
2 a term being a subgroup or a committee, how many DAC
3 members are on it and the composition from the public.
4 And that goes back in dealing with a FACA Act and
5 establishment of something under FACA, and that I'd
6 leave that up to Beth as far as something that says,
7 what is the -- what are the administrative, the legal
8 administrative processes in order to do that?

9 But I think the one thing to address and that
10 this motion and this discussion should really address is
11 assisting Russ Scofield as the project manager for
12 implementation of the process and addressing his thing
13 is, how can we do it? what is the scope? can the DAC
14 help? and what's the DAC's advice? And this is
15 something that should be that kind of a frame of
16 reference. So anyway, that's it. Thank you.

17 CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, John.

18 Gerry, you had a couple of minutes as well.

19 DISTRICT MANAGER RANSEL: Can I jump in really
20 quick?

21 CHAIR BARRETT: Yes.

22 DISTRICT MANAGER RANSEL: Just one thing -- and
23 maybe this will help just a little bit -- is that in my
24 briefings with Russ, I know that one of our initial asks
25 or one of our initial things that we're going to need to

1 tackle in order to get further underway with the
2 implementation is, we are going to be pulling out all
3 the action items that have been identified in the DRECP,
4 and we're going to be prioritizing them within the
5 agency, but we're also going to want feedback from the
6 DAC on that prioritization and what you think about
7 that, what your feedback is.

8 And so it is -- it's a broad -- it's broad
9 assistance in what we'd be looking for from the DAC that
10 probably will be very crosscutting across programs.

11 CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you.

12 MR. HILLIER: Hi again. Gerry Hillier. And
13 I've got my Quad State hat on for this comment. Pardon
14 me for having two.

15 One of the things that I think needs to be
16 explicit is that in essence this is at least initially,
17 with what Russell laid out this morning, this is going
18 to be a plan-to-plan, in essence. And so nothing herein
19 should be looked at as going around the provision of
20 Section 209 of FLPMA, which requires specific
21 coordination with local governments and local government
22 officials. And so whatever the DAC decides to do, they
23 really need to carve out that coordination
24 responsibility.

25 One of the criticisms I would have to say

1 unanimously from the National Association of Counties to
2 individual counties throughout the west was that
3 Planning 2.0 seemed to diminish the role of local
4 governments and reduce county government participation
5 to that of a stakeholder, whereas in the law they are
6 separate and there is an elevated role, because local
7 governments do have responsibility for health, safety
8 and general welfare.

9 And virtually all the counties -- I know
10 San Bernardino probably better than the others -- are
11 doing renewable energy elements in their local
12 government plans now. And so those plans -- BLM has a
13 responsibility to coordinate its planning with those
14 plans.

15 And so whatever you spell out in this
16 resolution ought to specifically state that nothing
17 herein excludes the coordination requirements of
18 Section 209 of FLPMA for separate and coordinating
19 between the BLM and the local governments.

20 Do you have any question on that?

21 MEMBER BANIS: I'm still thinking.

22 MR. HILLIER: Individually I think it's a good
23 idea to have the DAC intimately involved. That's not a
24 bad idea. But I have to speak for the four counties
25 that are in the area that are here in California that

1 are members of our organization -- Imperial, Riverside,
2 San Bernardino and Inyo Counties -- which covers most of
3 the area.

4 MEMBER MITCHELL: Gerry, I have a question.
5 What you just said under FLPMA, I kind of got lost for a
6 minute. How would what he proposed exclude the
7 counties?

8 MR. HILLIER: It doesn't. It is just means --
9 Beth is going to have the management responsibilities to
10 determine that, whether the DAC subgroup would meet
11 separately with the counties, whether they would call
12 the counties in for a separate meeting.

13 My statement here should be interpreted as
14 meaning that there needs to be a separate and distinct
15 and explicit coordination with the local governments and
16 the local government entities and the elected officials
17 within the DRECP area that, in essence, is required by
18 law to assure that the BLM planning is consistent with
19 local government planning.

20 And it's interesting that the law is worded
21 that way and not the other way around, that the local
22 governments must conform to the BLM plan. And so the
23 local governments feel rather strongly, and of course
24 their protest letters were framed in that direction
25 there, that you told us what you were going to do but

1 you haven't really fully coordinated with us, and we
2 still have some concerns and they were summarily
3 rejected.

4 This is another means of coming back and saying
5 "Okay, BLM, as you plan the plan, come back and at least
6 visit with us, coordinate with us, see what we've got in
7 our county renewable energy elements that we're doing."

8 MEMBER MITCHELL: I get it now. And you're
9 definitely right. I totally agree with that. I got a
10 little confused about what you really meant there. But,
11 no, you're definitely right.

12 MR. HILLIER: The comments that I drafted -- it
13 was interesting. The comments that I drafted on
14 Planning 2.0 in one of the opening paragraphs there's
15 about four terms, and they all are "C's," coordination,
16 collaboration, cooperation, and there's another one
17 there that escapes me right now. And BLM has almost
18 fallen back on using the four terms interchangeably, and
19 they each really do have a distinct meaning,
20 particularly coordination, that has a distinct meaning
21 that comes from FLPMA Section 209. And so, you know,
22 whatever else they adopt, local governments have a
23 definite stakeout in the process.

24 MEMBER MITCHELL: Thank you.

25 DISTRICT MANAGER RANSEL: I just wanted to

1 respond quickly in that Russell discussed it a little
2 bit this morning, but I just also want to assure you
3 that, as part of our strategy for the implementation, we
4 do have on our list that we do need to do outreach with
5 our local and state governments.

6 MR. HILLIER: I appreciate that.

7 DISTRICT MANAGER RANSEL: And so hopefully --
8 and, you know, we're a little bombarded, my first week
9 here. But hopefully in the near future there will be
10 some outreach to those counties, and we'll be meeting
11 with them regarding the DRECP implementation.

12 MR. HILLIER: Thank you very much, Beth. Yes,
13 I did pick up there would be that outreach. I just
14 wanted to state for the record, though, that that
15 coordination needs to be explicit and not just be lumped
16 upped with inviting the counties to stakeholder
17 meetings. Really under the law it needs to be a
18 separate effort.

19 And parenthetically and as a subpart, welcome
20 to the California Desert. You are getting bombarded
21 with a huge diversity of you issues, and that's life in
22 the desert.

23 DISTRICT MANAGER RANSEL: I appreciate your
24 comments. And, duly noted, and we'll definitely be
25 doing special outreach with the counties.

1 MR. HILLIER: Thank you very much.

2 MEMBER ALGAZY: Mr. Chairman, I think that
3 because of what Bob Burke brought up, I realize now that
4 we have an assumption going on here that needs further
5 clarification. I, for one, never assumed that our
6 DRECP Subcommittee was over with. I assumed that we
7 were talking about a different entity. So I think that
8 we have preserved our ability to fully engage with the
9 BLM on the full range of things that Russ Scofield
10 envisions for the DAC to be involved in.

11 What I was talking about was a second entity, a
12 subgroup to go forward for engaging the public. So
13 we're actually talking about two different entities
14 here, but I dismiss the other one as not being an issue
15 at the moment. Then after Bob brought it up, I
16 realized, oh, maybe you guys think we're trying to lump
17 everything into the subgroup, but that wasn't my
18 intention.

19 We have a standing DRECP Subcommittee in which
20 we can engage fully with the BLM on the full range of
21 things that Russ wants to talk about. But in terms of
22 going out to the public, I think that's what we're
23 talking about with the subgroup.

24 CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, Mark. And thank
25 you, Bob. And I'll have to wait, Bob. I'm not sure

1 whether that committee was terminated. Did April
2 terminate it?

3 MEMBER BURKE: It was never terminated. It
4 never ended. It's just that most of us are gone. I
5 mean there's you, me and Mark.

6 CHAIR BARRETT: Not physically, hopefully.

7 MEMBER BURKE: The three of us, and then of
8 course the district office. And I don't --

9 MEMBER ALGAZY: Well, Seth reapplied.

10 MEMBER BURKE: Yeah. It was just that we're
11 the only ones left from there.

12 CHAIR BARRETT: Right.

13 MEMBER BURKE: But it was never terminated,
14 finalized or anything like that.

15 MR. RAZO: There was no sunset.

16 MEMBER BURKE: Yeah. What he said.

17 CHAIR BARRETT: Perhaps we'll leave the
18 subcommittee discussion for further investigation. But
19 it still, I suppose, doesn't take away from Mark's point
20 that we're really discussing the subgroup here, the
21 difference being the subgroup opens up to the public.

22 MEMBER BURKE: It sounded like they were trying
23 to --

24 MEMBER ALGAZY: It was not my intention.

25 CHAIR BARRETT: Right. Randy, I'll get you

1 real quick.

2 With respect to the subgroup, I think, once
3 again, John's point is well taken. And I think Randy,
4 from how he explained the intent, was that a previous
5 process might very well be helpful to realize progress
6 with respect to the subgroup.

7 And if that was your intent with respect to the
8 verbiage you used, you know, I applaud it for that
9 intent. But I don't want to limit the subgroup's scope
10 of work to just WEMO or to just trails.

11 And so, you know, if there is anything in that,
12 Gerry -- and I do appreciate your comments on that
13 because I am a little bit nervous that future public
14 individuals who might want to be on the subgroup might
15 see too much WEMO language and think it's all to do with
16 WEMO. And so, you know, I truly do support the language
17 provided. It's very clear that this is, you know --

18 MR. HILLIER: Amazingly the way I understand
19 what Randy is saying, and Mark, is that you're going to
20 maybe look at the WEMO template but apply it
21 desert-wide.

22 CHAIR BARRETT: Right, right. And so, Randy,
23 with what Gerry is indicating, is there any tweaks you
24 would do to the language to make it clearer to the
25 public that it's desert-wide and using the WEMO

1 template?

2 MEMBER ALGAZY: It's DRECP Subgroup, not a WEMO
3 Subgroup.

4 MEMBER BANIS: First -- and mind you, I'm not
5 walking away from the language. But the key intent here
6 was to provide administerial service, to take in what I
7 was hearing from my colleagues and try to at least get
8 something into words. I'm not as attached in a sense
9 emotionally to that which is here. I'm more than happy
10 to discuss and mold my opinion accordingly.

11 And, yes, I have detailed out the function.
12 Instead of relying on a colloquial familiarity of just
13 saying function and similar to the former WEMO Subgroup,
14 I say function through a combination of regular subgroup
15 meetings and periodic remote community outreach meetings
16 throughout the desert.

17 CHAIR BARRETT: Billy, you seconded that.

18 MEMBER MITCHELL: Right.

19 CHAIR BARRETT: Would you be comfortable with
20 that change?

21 MEMBER MITCHELL: I'm comfortable with that.

22 MEMBER BANIS: Now, one tiny thing -- I'm not
23 quite confident. It's a question I have, please, from
24 for the BLM. Implementation of DRECP -- forgive me. I
25 wish I thought of this when Russ was here. But DRECP is

1 applied when an action is proposed and analyzed.

2 Therefore implementation at this point is getting ready
3 for when those actions, those applications come in.

4 When we get an application for a DFA, how will
5 it work? When we get an application for a mine to
6 expand in an ACEC, how will it work? When we have a
7 route designation process, how will it work? So as I
8 understand from implementation, it may be, number one,
9 getting ready for those actions. And, number two, it is
10 implementing on the actions that are on the table.

11 As I understand it -- and I may be wrong
12 here -- is that WEMO is the only action currently
13 under -- or that will be the first one out of the gate,
14 the first action out of the gate to be analyzed with
15 respect to DRECP. If it were a renewable energy
16 application and a DFA was the first one out of the gate,
17 well, boom, there we are. Let's talk about that one.

18 So my thought about the WEMO thing is just that
19 that is the -- as far as I understand, is the first real
20 test or real action that will be analyzed according to
21 the sideboards of DRECP. But there may be places in the
22 desert where the on-the-ground effects of DRECP may
23 actually never, ever be felt. There may be a place in
24 the desert where they may not be proposing a mine or a
25 solar power plant or a route designation process or a

1 something, and nothing -- who knows? It could not even
2 change.

3 So that's my question is, am I anywhere near
4 the right track?

5 DISTRICT MANAGER RANSEL: So I am going to be
6 getting a much more in-depth briefing from Russ in the
7 very near future, so it's unfortunate that he's not
8 here, because I think he would be able to tackle this
9 question very well.

10 But my intuition tells me there's plan
11 conformance, which is kind of what you're talking about,
12 when an action comes in and you need to bounce that
13 against the plan to see if it conforms with the plan or
14 what effect it has, because it's within the planning
15 area. But then there's also a lot of administrative
16 tasks, and there's items that we've committed do just
17 because the plan is now in place.

18 And so I think that a lot of that is what we
19 will be pulling out and trying to prioritize the work of
20 the agency, because we didn't receive any additional
21 resources for DRECP implementation, and so we're going
22 to need to sort of eat the elephant one bite at a time.
23 And there might be pieces that are more important to eat
24 first or more important to prioritize first.

25 And some of that, like you mentioned that you

1 just got the mapping layers, that's one of those types
2 of tasks that we don't have an action necessarily right
3 in front of us, but we have administrative things we
4 need to do to ensure that we're implementing the DRECP
5 so that it's ready to go, it's on the ground.

6 I welcome any of the BLM folks that are here,
7 if you have anything to add, because you guys have been
8 touching the plan a lot more than four days or five
9 days, whatever it is now.

10 MEMBER BANIS: That's helpful. I think that it
11 hits the nail on the head. That was helpful. That was
12 the answer I was looking for, and I appreciate that.
13 Thank you.

14 CHAIR BARRETT: And, John, if you don't mind,
15 Gerry behind you had his hand up a little earlier.

16 MR. HILLIER: I get to go first. The
17 Stewart-Hillier tag team.

18 MEMBER KENNEY: The guy with the gray hair;
19 right?

20 MR. HILLIER: When I was at Beth's chair, I
21 didn't have all this there. It's been a number of
22 years.

23 MEMBER MITCHELL: I remember those years.

24 MR. HILLIER: Randy -- and clearly probably
25 both of us need to be brought up to speed in terms of

1 the intricacies of this. And you looked on what the
2 implementing actions were and talked about WEMO and the
3 specific renewable energy application there. And my
4 reading is that, with all these designations and the
5 changes in designations and boundary expansions and the
6 implementation of the caps, that that is going to be the
7 implementation action.

8 And that in effect -- and frankly, from what I
9 asked this morning, was the question, do all of those
10 changes in the conservation -- Designated Conservation
11 Areas, whatever their title, did those all take effect
12 with the signature of the secretary on the DRECP even in
13 advance of their need for mitigation for a specific
14 project?

15 And if that's the case, then that planning
16 priority is in essence a plan to plan in essence there
17 and deciding on that priority of how fast you're going
18 to move to actually start putting stakes in the ground
19 and how fast are you going to move on that, even in
20 advance of having specific applications.

21 The integration with WEMO I see as being an
22 entirely separate issue of how the DRECP and WEMO are
23 going to be integrated together into one plan -- or into
24 one action that will be consistent with what the
25 plaintiffs want and what the Court is willing to accept

1 also.

2 So, you know, that's two readings of the same
3 thing, and I'm not sure whether anybody is here that can
4 sort that out for us. But at any rate we're both on the
5 record with our questions, and at some point need to
6 have them answered.

7 MEMBER BANIS: If I may, I asked that question,
8 and I was told the answer was, "Yes, you're going to get
9 your answer." But I was told that, "Yes, as of the
10 Record of Decision, those polygons are the lay of the
11 land." And now that's probably a short answer. There's
12 probably much more nuance to that, but that's what I was
13 told.

14 MR. HILLIER: I believe it is true, but moving
15 ahead to implement and do the activity plans is going to
16 be a plan to plan.

17 MEMBER BANIS: Bingo.

18 MR. HILLIER: There's going to be further
19 planning.

20 MR. STEWART: John Stewart. Randy, a point of
21 definition here is that the DRECP is a programmatic
22 document. In other words, it's an overarching plan that
23 provides guidance for future site-specific plans. Now,
24 to that extent, is that any committee, group or whatever
25 that you set up does not apply or look at the entire

1 desert but only the boundaries of the DRECP.

2 Now, when you look at WEMO and what it is, WEMO
3 being -- like Gerry said, it's a separate plan that will
4 be decided and analyzed in its final outcome under the
5 guidelines and the guidance as an overarching
6 architecture that DRECP, along with the California
7 Desert Plan, have established.

8 So -- and I'll go back to what I said earlier,
9 is that Russell's comments, you know, the way he stated
10 it today, earlier today, I understand it to be that he
11 is looking for a way to essentially plan how to plan and
12 plan how to set these sideboards up so that everybody
13 knows what the sideboards are when these future actions
14 are discussed, are analyzed and looked at now a matter
15 of rolling them all together and doing it. And anything
16 doing with WEMO essentially will probably maybe
17 reconstitute the WEMO Subgroup in order to see, how does
18 that mesh with the DRECP?

19 CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, John. Any other
20 questions?

21 Oh, Lisbet, please. Thank you.

22 MS. THORESEN: So there were 16,000 comment
23 letters on the DRECP, many of them critical, many of
24 them critical because of inconsistencies throughout this
25 voluminous document. Is it within the scope now that

1 it's a Phase 1 LUPA, having been recorded, that the
2 DAC -- or has a mandate or charge to render opinion or
3 recommendation as those inconsistencies are brought to
4 light on a particular issue?

5 And will the subgroup as you're envisioning it,
6 perhaps, one, be advised that such inconsistencies might
7 exist on a particular issue and has the right to render
8 comment about how such inconsistencies might be
9 resolved?

10 In other words, who's going to be the ultimate
11 arbiter in deciding how those inconsistencies are
12 resolved if, in fact, they still exist within this LUPA?

13 CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, Lisbet. And clearly
14 the DAC and the subgroups and so forth by and large were
15 established to be a vehicle for which people can bring
16 comments and note inconsistencies and so forth. Our
17 power to resolve many of those inconsistencies can be
18 limited, but certainly we're a vehicle by which you can
19 bring them forward, and we encourage that.

20 Jim?

21 MEMBER KENNEY: It's obvious that you can't
22 specify the duties of the DAC committee or the subgroup
23 because we really don't know. I see it as the
24 opportunity for the subgroup to work with the Desert
25 District to define what we're actually going to do down

1 the road. But you've got to do the subgroup first so we
2 have the power to do that.

3 CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, Jim. And any other
4 questions?

5 Randy, I'm going to rely on you again, and I
6 hope you don't mind.

7 MEMBER BANIS: Of course.

8 CHAIR BARRETT: But could you repeat the
9 motion.

10 MEMBER BANIS: Absolutely.

11 CHAIR BARRETT: It will give Billy and others
12 the opportunity to second it again. Would you mind.

13 MEMBER BANIS: The only item that was changed
14 is the last sentence, the only item that was changed.

15 I move we establish a DRECP Implementation
16 Subgroup. The mission is to assist the BLM with DRECP
17 implementation using the WEMO route designation project
18 as a template for solicitation of public input. The
19 membership will represent broad stakeholder interests.
20 It will function through a combination of regular
21 subgroup meetings and periodic remote community outreach
22 meetings throughout the desert. End of motion.

23 CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you.

24 MEMBER MITCHELL: I'm fine with it.

25 CHAIR BARRETT: You second that. Thank you.

1 Is there anybody else?

2 Jim.

3 MEMBER KENNEY: Do we actually need the WEMO
4 reference? That's what's going to screw some people's
5 portion of that up.

6 MEMBER BANIS: Ask them.

7 MEMBER MITCHELL: I mean, that's -- obviously I
8 wasn't here then. That's just format; right? That's
9 just a guideline. It was done before. It doesn't just
10 mean the terminology. Isn't that what you're saying?

11 MEMBER BANIS: The format was addressed in that
12 last sentence, as I envision the language of the
13 mission, was actually using the West Mojave route
14 designation project that's currently occurring -- well,
15 these are our words -- as a template for solicitation of
16 public input.

17 Can you help me with that a bit more? See how
18 I threw that on him? But no. I'm actually --

19 MEMBER MITCHELL: I was just trying to, you
20 know --

21 MEMBER ALGAZY: It goes back to my comment that
22 there's a difference between our DRECP committee and a
23 DRECP Subgroup, where I don't feel that it's appropriate
24 to go out and try to engage the public about everything,
25 when the public wants to talk about access. The public

1 wants to talk about access that's based on looking at
2 maps, the places they've traditionally gone to, and
3 that's what they got with the people subgroup.

4 So I'm trying to make sure that we're focused
5 on deliverable product through the subgroup, that we're
6 going to interface with the public on access and maps.
7 We still have the full range of opportunities as a DAC
8 through the DAC committee to fully engage the BLM on
9 every aspect of the DRECP.

10 CHAIR BARRETT: And I suppose -- I don't read
11 that view in Randy's motion. And I wouldn't support
12 that view in Randy's motion. And it's a template. But
13 the motion to me is quite broad, and its intended to be
14 broad. Russell asked us to be broad and not just be
15 focused on maps.

16 Now, maps and routes could be the first
17 priority, as I think Randy pointed out. But to just
18 constitute -- reconstitute WEMO again and call it a
19 different name, I didn't get that from that motion.
20 And, Jim, I think your point is well taken, but I think,
21 as a template, it's a valid template, and I would
22 support the motion as I understand it, I suppose.

23 MEMBER BANIS: Then I call the question. Any
24 objections to calling the question?

25 CHAIR BARRETT: Anyone else? Questions,

1 comments, otherwise? None from the public. Motion is
2 on the table. It's been seconded.

3 All in favor?

4 (A voice vote was taken.)

5 CHAIR BARRETT: Any objections? Thank you.
6 Thank you. And it's carried. Thank you.

7 Public, I do apologize. We now are behind
8 schedule again.

9 THE REPORTER: I think he needs to have a
10 verbal response, because he raised his hand and everyone
11 else did a voice vote.

12 MEMBER BURKE: Okay. Nay.

13 CHAIR BARRETT: Do we need a break, or we ready
14 to move on?

15 MEMBER BURKE: I need a drink.

16 CHAIR BARRETT: I assure you that they're not
17 all like this. But we do have an OHV management
18 presentation before our afternoon break. Do you think
19 we can still get that in? And if so, let's move
20 forward. Thank you.

21 MEMBER BANIS: Actually, the title should be
22 "OHV 101." It's very basic, very, very, basic, basic.
23 It's really not about management, and I don't think it
24 will lead to a big conversation. It's more of an
25 introduction for some of our new members about some of

1 the nuances with respect to OHV. That's all. So we
2 have a PowerPoint. And we should take a minute while it
3 loads.

4 DISTRICT MANAGER RANSEL: Can we take five
5 minutes?

6 MR. HILLIER: Could I make a one-sentence
7 request while he's doing this, please, on the record.

8 CHAIR BARRETT: You're always welcome.

9 MR. HILLIER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just
10 wanted to make a correction for the record. I have made
11 several references today to Section 209 of FLPMA. The
12 correct reference is 202 of FLPMA.

13 CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, Gerry.

14 MR. HILLIER: I said it was one sentence. I
15 think I did it in two.

16 CHAIR BARRETT: Let's take a five-minute
17 stretch break. And thank you so much for those who
18 remained with us. Five minutes.

19 (A brief recess was taken.)

20 MEMBER BANIS: Ladies and gentlemen, this is a
21 presentation I do at Cal State Long Beach once a
22 semester for the Environmental Sciences class just to
23 give them the basics on OHV. And we have some new
24 members of the DAC, and even some old members might
25 benefit from a little more information about OHV.

1 Please, OHV leaders, don't be too rough on me today.
2 Some of the corners are rounded off in order to just get
3 the point across to college students who are just really
4 dipping their toes into the subject.

5 But the first thing that I would ask is, what
6 is an OHV? First thing I do is, I ask everybody in this
7 class, "Who is an OHVer?" And you might get one or two
8 people who actually raise their hand. Then I say, "How
9 many people have ever used your motor vehicle on a dirt
10 road, like to go camping in the National Forest?"
11 Everybody raised their hand.

12 So I get to say, "Well, then you are an OHVer,
13 because an OHV is simply a motor vehicle that is
14 operated off road." And I'm going to break this up into
15 two types of vehicles. You've got your street-legal
16 vehicles and your non-street-legal vehicles, and there
17 are different rules for them. A non-street legal
18 vehicle is like your off-road motorcycle and your quads,
19 your UTVs and your dune buggies. Snowmobiles are a
20 non-street-legal OHV. They have a sticker.

21 Non-street-legal jeeps and four wheel drives
22 and then things, those are your non-street legal
23 vehicles. And some of the limitations with them is that
24 they can't travel on the roads and highways for
25 long-distance travel. So a lot of your non-street-legal

1 OHV activity emanates out of RV's and camping and out of
2 a base. You base somewhere and go out for the day and
3 come back.

4 Now, then you've got your street-legal
5 vehicles. Those are your jeeps and your SUVs,
6 four-wheel drives. That's me getting a little help from
7 my friends. And then even two-wheel drives can be OHVs.

8 MEMBER BURKE: That's not a very smart car.

9 MEMBER BANIS: Not a very smart car. And
10 dual-sport motorcycles. These are motorcycles capable
11 of going off road and on the highway. And even nana's
12 Camry is an OHV when you take it out on a dirt road into
13 National Forest and onto Public Lands and BLM and
14 Park Service.

15 So OHVers, who are we? Well, we enjoy
16 motorized recreation and motor-dependent recreation.
17 Motorized recreation, jumping and racing and skills
18 building, having a blast out there. Motor-dependent
19 recreation is more your touring and camping,
20 rockhounding and hunting and those kinds of activities.

21 Now, where are OHVs used in the desert? Well,
22 we know that they're used in the urban interface zones.
23 We know it when we drive through the communities of the
24 Antelope Valley and the Victor Valley and Lucerne Valley
25 and all throughout the edges of town, in those near the

1 communities where there's lots of private property or
2 mixed ownership lands. We do see a lot of OHV use
3 there. And that is a big challenge. The urban
4 interface zones, in my opinion, are the most difficult
5 of the lands to manage.

6 OHVs are also used in OHV open areas. This
7 means that you have open riding in the area. You don't
8 have to stay on designated trail, although you cannot do
9 wanton resource damage. There are still some rules, and
10 there are speed limit requirements around campsites and
11 things like that. By and large open riding, no
12 designated trails, about three percent of the
13 California Desert, and this acreage is dedicated OHV
14 open area acreage. And there's approximately 20 of
15 these state and BLM OHV areas in the desert.

16 But the majority of the land in the
17 California Desert is covered by backcountry designated
18 routes. These are the roads where you must stay on the
19 legal designated trails. Those are the trails that are
20 signed for motorized use. It is not legal to use roads
21 and trails that have not been designated for that
22 purpose.

23 The backcountry designated routes, nearly
24 16,500 miles of roads and trails in the
25 California Desert. They've been designated through

1 formal land use planning amendments, public processes.

2 Now, how did OHV begin? This is where you'll
3 be a little rough on me, but I point OHV as basically
4 right after World War II. The veterans came home after
5 having enjoyed the use of the Jeep. They found great
6 potential for that in the great outdoors. We started
7 seeing a lot of the Jeep and outdoor use around the
8 cities and moving out into the desert. Also the
9 commercial roads and trails were really the first OHV
10 roads and trails. Those roads and trails were blazed by
11 the miners and by the ranchers and by the people who
12 worked the land. And so when OHV first came onto the
13 land, they were using the roads and trails that were
14 created by those before them.

15 We evolved our OHV use through a series of
16 plans. Also important is the California OHV
17 Registration and Fuel Tax Program. Without those
18 resources, the agencies would not be able to manage OHV
19 travel on our Public Lands, certainly not to the extent
20 that they do today. Route designation and Travel
21 Management Plan was also an evolutionary period for OHV
22 use. There was a time where you could go wherever you
23 wanted. And we know that that is not sustainable today.
24 Now we have route designations and Travel Management
25 Plan.

1 But OHV is very, very important. It's
2 important because it gets people outdoors and gets
3 families outdoors. That's the thing. I'm getting
4 goosebumps about this part, because I don't have kids --
5 you guys know that -- but when I go out to the desert
6 and I see the families and I see around El Mirage
7 Dry Lake, papa will be on his big motorcycle. Then you
8 got the little ducks behind him on these teeny
9 motorcycles, and mama will be riding up the rear. It
10 just makes me just smile. I just love it. So getting
11 families outdoors is wonderful because sometimes that's
12 the only place that some of these families actually do
13 get together is when they go out together to go camping.

14 OHV recreation is important because it serves
15 people with limited mobility and it provides safe public
16 access to backcountry lands with limited impacts. And
17 it's also important because it's an economic driver for
18 our desert communities.

19 The picture down on the bottom right is from
20 King of the Hammers. We hear a lot of numbers thrown
21 around about the economics. One I've heard is
22 \$70 million. That's a huge influx of money for that
23 geographic area each year, and they're coming to depend
24 upon it.

25 Now, the threats to OHV recreation are the

1 competing uses. In 2002 dedicated OHV open area acreage
2 was about -- I think it was 485,000 acres. But over
3 subsequent congressional actions, OHV open areas have
4 lost considerable acreage. And where is that going into
5 the future? OHV recreation's competing uses are
6 development, such as wind, solar and expanding
7 communities, as well as military expansions. But OHV is
8 also threatened by environmental legislation and
9 management policies, and it is also threatened by our
10 own user conduct. Some of us are our own enemies.

11 But can OHV recreation be sustainably managed?
12 I say yes, through signing and maps and law enforcement
13 and especially through the Cooperative Grants Program of
14 the State of California State Parks OHV Division. It
15 funds the information and education campaigns, the route
16 maintenance and signing and the restoration of
17 undesignated trails that have sensitive resource issues.

18 And so OHV can also be sustainably managed by
19 mitigating the impacts of development, such as in the
20 DRECP we have a first-time mitigation requirement for
21 impacts on recreation due to renewable energy
22 development. That's nice. That's good. We're seeing
23 something in our favor.

24 And we can also manage or retain OHV areas
25 through legislation, which is why we work closely with

1 Senator Feinstein and Congressman Cook to try to get OHV
2 open areas in the desert designated permanently for the
3 use of the recreating public.

4 And that's my pitch. It doesn't have a big
5 ending, does it? But I hope that just those few basic
6 slides can help put into perspective that, just because
7 you see an OHV somewhere, you have to know where they
8 are and what the rules are on that land, limited use,
9 open area, urban, private. It really all depends. And
10 so it's complicated, but I hope this helps simplify it a
11 little bit for my colleagues. So thank you for this
12 opportunity. Thank you.

13 (Applause.)

14 MEMBER BURKE: So where do hovercrafts fit in
15 there?

16 MEMBER BANIS: They don't touch the ground.
17 Can you take a hovercraft into the wilderness if it
18 never touches the ground?

19 CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you so much, Randy. And
20 needless to say it didn't need a big ending because it
21 was big all the way through.

22 MEMBER BANIS: Thank you.

23 CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you so much. And I can
24 see why the students are captivated by your
25 presentations. And you should continue. That was

1 excellent.

2 MEMBER BANIS: Thank you.

3 CHAIR BARRETT: If you don't mind, Randy, just
4 purely procedural. Is there any questions from the DAC
5 with respect to the presentation?

6 MEMBER ALGAZY: Randy's presentation reminded
7 me that at a previous DAC meeting about a year ago I had
8 made a request that hasn't been followed up on yet. But
9 I'm still the hippie, hopelessly optimistic person that
10 still hopes that it will happen, that when we go out on
11 our field trips, it often amazes me and befuddles me and
12 befuddles most of the public that we can be standing on
13 a piece of ground somewhere out in the middle of the
14 desert and it will have one classification and yet at
15 the top of the hill or the other side of the draw, the
16 land has a completely different land use classification.

17 And I asked that in the future when we go out
18 into the desert that we be given the opportunity to
19 stand at a crossroads and have a BLM manager explain to
20 us why, when we're standing on a mound of dirt, it's one
21 classification on this side of the mound and another
22 classification on the other side of the mound.

23 It would make it a lot easier for us to do our
24 jobs in terms of interfacing with the public to get a
25 better understanding of where the rules come from, where

1 these lines come from out in the middle of nowhere.

2 CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you. Thank you, Mark.

3 And if there's any further public comments,
4 please, and a few over there. I do have John, who very
5 early on got his comment card in just in case there was
6 a lot.

7 But thank you, John, for that.

8 MR. STEWART: Good afternoon, commission.
9 John Stewart, California Four-Wheel Drive Association.

10 Randy, that was a very good preliminary
11 discussion. I did pick up two glaring errors from my
12 perspective. Number one, when you look at Green Sticker
13 vehicles as respect to being a Jeep, the reality of it
14 is you should look at the fact it's not just a drop Jeep
15 but a four-wheel drive vehicle that does not meet,
16 number one, state or federal smog standards and, number
17 two, does not meet Department of Transportation safety
18 standards in order to obtain a license for that vehicle
19 in order to be driven on a public road.

20 Cooperative grants. Not really. It is
21 Cooperative Agreements and Grants Program. Cooperative
22 agreements have a certain legal terminology to them, as
23 do the grants have a certain legal terminology to them.
24 So, like I said, those are two glaring errors that
25 should be corrected.

1 MEMBER BANIS: Thanks.

2 MR. STEWART: Other than that, yes, it is very
3 good. But also look at the fact that watercraft also
4 fall into this discussion, motorized watercraft as a
5 non-street-legal or as a Green Sticker because they do
6 have their own sticker required on watercraft based on
7 certain engine criteria. So it's something that is an
8 off-road vehicle itself.

9 And Robert brought up hovercraft. Yes, the
10 hovercraft are an off-road vehicle. And when you start
11 looking at the fact is also within this regulatory mix
12 are the use of drones as they apply to Wilderness Areas,
13 National Parks and monuments, structures, as far as
14 right now the National Park Service is coming down hard
15 on rules on that.

16 But you did point out one thing about the
17 diminishing amount of land available for OHV recreation
18 in the California Desert. And I'd challenge you to
19 extrapolate this out statewide and look at recreation
20 opportunities now under the overall opportunities
21 category versus approved areas through a designate SVRA
22 state vehicle recreation areas or designated OHV areas
23 with respect to BLM or Forest Service, and you'll find
24 that by some estimates, although it's kind of hard to
25 get a real number, that probably 90 percent of the

1 recreation opportunity occurs on lands managed by the
2 Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management.

3 So to that extent, yes, the Grants and
4 Cooperative Agreements Program is very important to
5 keeping the recreation alive and helping it, but you
6 know -- and I realize that the title of your thing was
7 in the California Desert, but it is a much bigger deal.
8 And when you extrapolate your numbers out statewide, OHV
9 recreation is massive, it's huge. And when you look at
10 the numbers of participants in the California Desert,
11 I'd offer up that's something the council should look
12 at, is probably constituting an OHV subgroup in order to
13 begin to address and look at the scope and the depth of
14 the OHV centric recreation opportunities.

15 And the issues that cropped up when you look at
16 what Billy Mitchell was talking about earlier, the
17 impact with the grazing and ranchers, when you look at
18 others, this would be something that's a dedicated forum
19 to look at that, begin to address those and begin to
20 express or develop the outreach to the OHV community in
21 order to build this relationship in order to correct
22 some of these behavior issues. So thank you very much.

23 MEMBER BANIS: Thanks, John. Thank you kindly.

24 CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, John. And no
25 further public comments. Would you believe we're

1 actually back, even a few minutes ahead of schedule, and
2 we're going to even do better than that by maybe
3 cancelling our afternoon break. Hopefully you had that
4 afternoon break and that will allow us to go straight
5 into the subgroup reports and we'll all be out of here
6 much earlier. And so, if you'll oblige me, I think we
7 can move on to the next, DAC subgroup reports, and if we
8 have some folks.

9 Randy, you have something you are reporting.
10 Thank you.

11 MEMBER BANIS: We have the ISDRA Subgroup, and
12 we have the Dumont Dunes Subgroup that are standing
13 subgroups. The Imperial -- I'm going to defer on the
14 Imperial.

15 Tom, would you be able to help with that?

16 MR. ZALE: Tom Acuna sent a written report, but
17 I don't have it on my phone.

18 CHAIR BARRETT: I do, Tom.

19 MEMBER BANIS: Would you, please?

20 CHAIR BARRETT: Yeah, we do have the reports.
21 Then, Tom, if you want to at least introduce the
22 highlights, I'll give it to you. Excuse me.

23 MEMBER BANIS: Thank you. Good. I don't serve
24 on that committee.

25 CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you for your indulgence.

1 And I think it's important just for the record alone, a
2 few comments from the subgroup.

3 MR. ZALE: So our chairman, Tom Acuna, writes
4 as follows:

5 "Dear honorable chairperson Leslie Barrett, to
6 this point in 2016, our group of eight members --
7 Tom Acuna, Karen Bradley, Ray Castillo, Nicole Gilles,
8 Bob Ham, Chuck Hattaway, Dick Holiday, Ed Stovin and
9 Charlotte Teeters -- have had three public meetings and
10 one public workshop. We also had the great honor to
11 greet Jerome Perez at the Cahuilla Ranger Station this
12 past February. Taken together there are some highlights
13 that we would like to share with you at the Desert BLM
14 Advisory Council.

15 "Reconstruction of the Cahuilla Ranger Station.
16 On January 29th a meeting was held to develop a
17 conceptual schedule to design, obtain funding and
18 construct a new ranger station. The meeting was
19 attended by BLM staff, subgroup members and project
20 management professionals from San Diego Gas and
21 Electric.

22 "The schedule with key milestones was
23 developed. The bottom line was our perfect-world
24 schedule would require 43 months from start to finish
25 with a move-in date. I should add that the existing

1 station is operative but far below standards normally
2 expected to serve nearly one million visitors a year.

3 "The list of inadequacies is far too long for
4 this update, but I will tell you even having reliable
5 electric power was an issue within the past year. The
6 good news is, since our meeting the BLM has directed
7 Sacramento staff to set aside architectural and
8 engineering funding so that initial work can begin soon.
9 We should be able to give you a schedule impact early in
10 2017.

11 "Also we received valuable advice from
12 director, Jerome Perez, about the value of not over
13 enlarging a new ranger station and thereby causing
14 unsustainable operation and maintenance cost."

15 Next topic is one-day permit proposal. "There
16 has been a continuous discussion on developing a one-day
17 permit, which would accommodate many one day users who
18 live in Imperial Valley. My report is we've been
19 unsuccessful thus far. At issue is the high BLM
20 administrative cost to effectively implement a one-day
21 pass. This is due to the high levels of resources
22 necessary to enforce, especially when there are higher
23 priority needs.

24 "Visitor services. The subgroup finds BLM
25 staff and dedication to be outstanding. For example,

1 BLM has implemented effective emergency services, access
2 road maintenance, dust control, campsite delineation,
3 trash service, vendor management, environmental
4 compliance, OHV driver safety, suppression of dust, user
5 fee collection and law enforcement.

6 "Also last year negative complaints about BLM
7 enforcement tactics seem to have diminished in 2016.
8 For example, enforcement has taken steps to reduce
9 visitor travel delays by eliminating checkpoints near
10 locations deemed to be bottlenecks."

11 And then finally, "Other. We trust El Centro
12 BLM staff will provide more detail about our ISDRA
13 activities within the report to the DAC on Saturday,
14 October 15th." And that is addressed in our field
15 office report.

16 "I will say that BLM has effectively worked
17 with us to improve public noticing of our meetings,
18 agendas and meeting notes. The leadership and support
19 of the staff in El Centro, including Neil Hamada, is
20 much appreciated."

21 And that's his report.

22 CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you.

23 MR. ZALE: Any questions?

24 CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you so much. Sorry for
25 putting you on the spot.

1 MR. ZALE: So that's all right. I'm not a good
2 reader.

3 CHAIR BARRETT: No, no. Very good.

4 Randy, please.

5 MEMBER BANIS: The Dumont Dunes Subgroup.

6 Well, let me say that I think one of the reasons that
7 the ISDRA Subgroup is so effective is that that subgroup
8 is fully constituted. All seats are filled, and it is
9 active. Our Dumont Dunes Subgroup has run into
10 attrition. I'm not going to get into the -- some of the
11 details because what the Dumont Dunes group has been
12 doing, you'll find it in the Barstow Field Office
13 report.

14 But I do want to touch on the fact that the
15 remaining subgroup members and Katrina feel that we want
16 to continue moving forward with the subgroup, and
17 therefore we've committed to going to Dumont Dunes on
18 the day after Thanksgiving, and we're going to hold a
19 subgroup meeting at Dumont Dunes. And we're going to
20 show people what it is, have a table with a bunch of
21 empty seats and say, "These seats could be you. You
22 could be sitting here."

23 And the thing that we're missing the most from
24 our subgroup are the actual users themselves. And
25 that's why we feel it's important to go to Dumont to see

1 what help that we can get from those users. And that's
2 all I have for the report for Dumont Dunes.

3 We have another subgroup that has not met yet.
4 It's the BLM's -- I mean it's the Special Recreation
5 Permit Subgroup. The DAC voted to reconstitute its
6 SRP Subgroup at a previous meeting. The BLM put out a
7 call for applications. We received applications.
8 Chairman Barrett has appointed Jerry Grabow, Bob Koch,
9 Linda Koch, myself. Let me see here. I printed it out
10 so I wouldn't forget. That was off the record. I'll
11 get that before the end of the meeting. My apologies, I
12 forgot who the fifth was, but I'll get that.

13 The group has not met yet, and we're hoping
14 to -- the BLM probably hasn't yet assigned a designated
15 federal official for that subgroup, and we're hoping,
16 once a person is named to work with that subgroup, we'll
17 be able to call a meeting date, Steve will be able to
18 publish it and we'll have our first meeting soon, I'm
19 hoping. And that's all the subgroups we have.

20 CHAIR BARRETT: Randy, thank you so much for
21 that.

22 Bob, you had a question.

23 MEMBER BURKE: What happened to the Connecting
24 People to the Desert Subgroup?

25 MEMBER BANIS: My interpretation is that it

1 completed its mission.

2 Steve?

3 MR. RAZO: Actually it's an ongoing
4 collaboration.

5 MEMBER BANIS: Good.

6 MR. RAZO: However, upon Seth Shteir's, who was
7 the chairman and the DAC rep -- he is now off the DAC --
8 we are trying to request another DAC member to become
9 that representative so they can meet again.

10 MEMBER BURKE: So I'm volunteering.

11 (Applause.)

12 CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, Bob. And,
13 Mr. Chairperson, thank you. And you're very welcome.
14 Thank you for taking on the position.

15 Steve, do I have to do anything formally?

16 MEMBER BURKE: And I have nothing to report.

17 MR. RAZO: I would just suggest to the new DAC
18 representative to the subgroup to contact me so we can
19 come up with dates and a procedure to get that group
20 going again, because there's lots of things they want to
21 do.

22 CHAIR BARRETT: Steve, Bob, thank you both.
23 Thank you.

24 And with that I think we'll open it up next
25 with respect to your question.

1 MEMBER MITCHELL: I don't see where Barstow,
2 Katrina, is going to be able to talk a little bit.

3 CHAIR BARRETT: Yes. It should be next. So
4 that concludes the DAC subgroup reports.

5 MEMBER BANIS: The fifth member, Jim Woods from
6 CORVA.

7 CHAIR BARRETT: Yes.

8 MEMBER BANIS: Thank you.

9 CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you. And so we've had
10 questions. Are there any public comments with respect
11 to the subgroup reports?

12 John, I have kind of an outstanding one. So
13 please.

14 MR. STEWART: I appreciate the information on
15 the subgroup reports. One thing that I would like to
16 see somehow be incorporated -- and I don't know if this
17 would be appropriate for the subgroup reports or through
18 the field office reports, but these particular areas,
19 such as Dumont Dunes and Imperial Sand Dunes, are
20 high-visibility, high-traffic recreation areas. I think
21 it's appropriate to look at what kind of visitor counts
22 they're seeing at those areas.

23 A lot of the discussion, you know, with land
24 management planning looks to come up with the social and
25 economic impacts of the recreation opportunities with

1 various opportunities within the discussion -- within
2 planning. So knowing that there is a viable tracking
3 for the number of users on the social side is important,
4 and it also begins to help quantify what the economic
5 impact, because the economic impact is not only within
6 that local community area, but it extends back to the
7 home area where they are from because they all buy their
8 toys and their supplies at someplace other than always
9 out in the remote areas.

10 So anyway, coming up and being able to have the
11 agency quantify what some of the social and economic
12 impacts with numbers of the participants and possibly
13 the areas that they come would be very helpful and
14 informative. Thank you.

15 CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, John. Thank you.
16 And we do have a public comment, please.

17 MS. HIDALGO: Just a question with respect to
18 the subgroup that you graciously agreed to take the lead
19 on. Can you explain what that subgroup does.

20 MEMBER BURKE: Connecting People to the Desert.

21 MS. HIDALGO: I understand the program, and
22 I've spoken with the Barstow office about --

23 MEMBER BURKE: Please. I'll defer to the
24 information person.

25 CHAIR BARRETT: Great question. Thank you.

1 MR. RAZO: Yes. Thank you for asking.
2 Hopefully maybe you can join us. The current
3 membership -- well, the purpose of the Connecting People
4 to the Desert Subgroup was to gather folks from
5 different areas, such as the arts, photography, those
6 types of graphic people, people who write books, those
7 kinds of disciplines that could help the BLM reach out
8 to those types of audiences, those people who follow
9 those kinds of activities and in that are connected to
10 the desert in some way.

11 We have some very distinguished people on the
12 committee who currently have books out on the desert,
13 who have websites that have photographs on there,
14 award-winning photographs about the desert. We even
15 have a graphic artist who is a professor of graphic arts
16 at San Diego State University. So that's the emphasis
17 of it.

18 And where we have tried to utilize them as best
19 we can is, how do we get our BLM message of discover the
20 desert into their venues, into their areas in
21 collaboration? And that's what we're trying to do.

22 MS. HIDALGO: Thank you.

23 CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you. Thank you for the
24 question.

25 And Gerry, please.

1 MR. HILLIER: Thank you again, Mr. Chairman.
2 Just a brief comment. I serve on the Dumont Dunes
3 Subgroup as a public member. And I appreciate their
4 service, and I just want to reiterate what Randy already
5 said, that the group as it is currently composed does
6 feel that we do serve a purpose. One of the issues that
7 we have raised -- and I just wanted to put it on the
8 record with Randy's permission. He can quarrel with me
9 if he doesn't want it on the record -- is how the
10 Recreation Resource Advisory Council functions in the
11 state and the slowness with which they undertake
12 actions.

13 And I realize I'm not speaking to the right
14 audience. I probably ought to be speaking to the state
15 office. But the fact of the matter is that Dumont has
16 proposed fee adjustments that have been pending for some
17 three years, and no action has been taken. And so part
18 of stimulating full participation is the fact that,
19 well, we get together, we talk, we agree on a program
20 moving forward, and then nothing can get done because of
21 this bureaucratic roadblock in front of us.

22 And so I would urge whatever way you can lend
23 to it, Beth, in getting this thing off the dime so that
24 we can move forward. We do need some fee adjustments to
25 make it easier on the public and make it easier on BLM

1 to do fee collection. And ISDRA obviously has some
2 similar issues in terms they've addressed, anyway. We
3 were told as soon as ISDRA got theirs done, Dumont would
4 move forward, and it hasn't. So I'd like to put that on
5 the record.

6 While I've got a stage, I've got a non-subgroup
7 notice that I would like to just share with you because
8 most of you have driven I-15. Yesterday was the 40th
9 anniversary for the CDCA and FLPMA, and this coming
10 Friday will be the 40th anniversary celebration for the
11 Desert Study Center out at Zzyzx. And that originally
12 started as a BLM facility, and it was there until
13 somebody decided that it ought to be within the boundary
14 of the Mojave National Preserve. I have been sorry that
15 BLM's participation not only ceased but also their
16 continuing interest in desert research out there has
17 also diminished. But at any rate, they're celebrating
18 their 40th anniversary.

19 Katrina, I don't know if you got an invitation
20 or not to it, but certainly it would be worth a drop-in
21 out there at the end of the road. You'd be surprised of
22 the millions of people who have driven I-15, see that
23 funny sign for Zzyzx, and wonder, what in the hell is
24 that? Well, it's a unit of the United States
25 Government, now under Parks Service administration, and

1 the California State University system consortium of
2 seven campuses here in Southern California and is an
3 important adjunct in terms of desert information,
4 teaching and research. And they're celebrating their
5 40th anniversary.

6 I signed the agreement, literally my first act
7 when I walked in the door July 4th of 1976. So I've had
8 a personal attachment to it. But I thought the council
9 ought to be aware that it, too, was celebrating its 40th
10 anniversary. Thank you.

11 CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, Gerry. Obviously we
12 were hiring very young way back then.

13 And, Bob, you had a question?

14 MEMBER BURKE: And it's a great place to see
15 desert bighorn sheep all the way down and all the way
16 back.

17 CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, Bob.

18 And I think that we closed the public comment
19 period with respect to that, but with respect to the
20 last item, I would like to take the last part of it
21 first, which is the field reports, field office reports.
22 And thank you again, everyone, all the field managers
23 for putting all those together. I actually do read
24 them. Sometimes I repeat my questions, Katrina, but I
25 do read them. And is there any questions or comments?

1 And I know there's one here from with respect to the
2 DAC.

3 Billy, you've been waiting a long time for
4 this.

5 MEMBER MITCHELL: A long time. Katrina, I know
6 we saw this yesterday. Believe me along with what
7 happened to Mike, Katrina stepped into a bad situation
8 for the last ten years and is doing an excellent job
9 trying to resolve issues we've been going through. So
10 we did establish with the pictures, the water on
11 Round Spring, so we're still on schedule for the
12 November 1st turnout?

13 MS. SYMONS: So that's the one thing I need to
14 coordinate with the range management specialist on
15 Monday when I get to work to make sure we are on the
16 same page.

17 MEMBER MITCHELL: All right. Great. And I
18 know we're getting close here. Actually I did -- after
19 we talked yesterday and solved most of these problems,
20 the Stone family will be contacted will be working a
21 little bit closer. It's hard to keep these ranchers on
22 a specific path for the things they do. And they drop a
23 lot of stuff, you know, but I do appreciate everything
24 you've done and they do. And you're doing a very good
25 job.

1 MS. SYMONS: Thank you.

2 CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, Billy.

3 Bob?

4 MEMBER BURKE: My question is under the
5 Afton Canyon Wildlife Habitat enhancement efforts, I
6 don't see anything in here referencing the sheep that
7 are in Afton Canyon.

8 MS. SYMONS: That's because right now my staff
9 is not doing any specific work in Afton Canyon itself.
10 So if we're going to start talking about the Cadys, I do
11 have --

12 MEMBER BURKE: I know about that.

13 MS. SYMONS: So right now in Afton Canyon we
14 have the tamarisk treatments. We had a burn, a
15 prescribed burn, that was scheduled to take place
16 yesterday, and that had to get cancelled because of the
17 wind, the red flag warning that we got. Crossing our
18 fingers, and hopefully we'll be in prescription this
19 coming week so that we can burn.

20 Then also, you know, we have the ongoing
21 research that's going on. So we had the fish surveys,
22 the western pond turtle surveys. We're also looking
23 into the potential or the feasibility of re-introduction
24 of the tui chub, as well as the western pond turtle. So
25 there's some really exciting things that we're looking

1 forward to being able to implement in Afton Canyon. And
2 certainly when we start talking about the riparian
3 habitat, there's still a considerable amount of work
4 that needs to get done there.

5 MEMBER BURKE: There is a group out there that
6 will be more than happy to help you eliminate or at
7 least reduce the tamarisk out there.

8 MS. SYMONS: Yeah. And we also have the
9 beetle, too. So I mean, we're also doing studies on
10 that one so that we can use a natural component
11 potentially to also help treat the tamarisk infestation.

12 MEMBER BURKE: Thank you.

13 CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, Bob. Any additional
14 questions? You're good with me, Katrina.

15 There's actual a council member missing today
16 who is even more arguably more eloquent than Randy, and
17 Al Muth had a question on Palm Springs and emailed me.
18 So I apologize.

19 Specifically, though, the question related to
20 comments he had at the last meeting of the DAC and
21 specifically was on Palen solar. And he wasn't sure
22 that you had the opportunity to be able to pick up on
23 those questions that he had. And, if not, he will be
24 back at the next meeting. But essentially if look back
25 at the last minutes, unless you've already seen them and

1 have answered, he has a couple of outstanding questions
2 he wanted me to remind that he still was waiting for
3 responses on that. So thank you.

4 MR. HERREMA: Excuse me. I don't have a copy
5 of the minutes. I'm sorry. I'm Doug Herrema,
6 Palm Springs. I don't have a copy of the minutes in
7 front of me, but if you would like to read the
8 questions, I can hazard answers.

9 CHAIR BARRETT: There's no chance because he
10 didn't actually quote me the questions. But he just
11 wanted to make sure that -- actually he was really
12 apologetic for not being here today, given that locally
13 he's so close, and so he suggested that perhaps the next
14 meeting we'd have he would be here and looked forward to
15 answers.

16 MR. HERREMA: I look forward to providing those
17 answers at the next meeting.

18 CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you. And hearing no
19 further comments from our DAC members, and on the field
20 office reports -- thank you for that. Do we have one
21 more?

22 MEMBER MITCHELL: No.

23 MEMBER BURKE: I thought you had to talk to
24 Mike about the range stuff.

25 MEMBER MITCHELL: No. I already did.

1 MEMBER BURKE: You did?

2 MEMBER MITCHELL: Yeah.

3 MEMBER BURKE: Mike, is he still here?

4 CHAIR BARRETT: Yes, please. Bob.

5 MEMBER BURKE: Mike, I just have one quick
6 question. Interconnect towers, where at in the
7 Halloran Springs area and the Blind Hills area?

8 MR. AHRENS: So Blind Hills is right adjacent
9 to the 40 freeway west of that, so that tower is
10 actually already in place, which is -- actually what the
11 issue there was, that was authorized in 2000, if I
12 recall, and constructed in 2010 -- finally constructed
13 in 2010, and it was shortly thereafter that we figured
14 out that site had no legal access, which made it
15 unusable. And so we went through a process to -- we
16 accepted an application for the development of a road
17 and have gone through the process to approve that
18 application.

19 MEMBER BURKE: Halloran Springs, where at? I
20 know where the spring is at. I know where the exit is.

21 MR. AHRENS: Yeah. I would want to look at a
22 map again myself. It's on the north side of the freeway
23 and farther north from the springs. It's well up into
24 the hills.

25 MEMBER BURKE: Up by Turquoise Mountain?

1 MR. AHRENS: I believe it is. Yeah, I believe
2 so. I can certainly get back with you and give you some
3 more detail.

4 MEMBER BURKE: Just give me a call and let me
5 know. Thank you.

6 CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you, Mike. Thanks, Bob.
7 Excellent.

8 And with that I think that concludes our
9 comments with respect to the field reports. And I don't
10 have any -- well, I have John. If you don't mind
11 commenting on field reports, you're very welcome.

12 MR. STEWART: Give me a chance, and I'll always
13 speak. John Stewart with Cal Four-Wheel. I would like
14 to pose a question to the field offices managers, and
15 this has to do with the law enforcement. I know several
16 of them that have applied for law enforcement grants to
17 the state Cooperative Agreements and Grants Program
18 specifically for law enforcement. And through the OHV
19 community the question that has come up is, well, how
20 many citations, or what kind of activities are actually
21 being looked at and used?

22 And, you know when this question was put -- the
23 question was put back to the OHMVR division -- that's
24 the Off-Highway Motor Vehicle Recreation division of
25 California State Parks -- we asked, "Do you have any

1 report on the number of citations issued by BLM and
2 Forest Service rangers that are receiving grants?"

3 And they said, "No, we do not have that
4 information." So my question here to the -- to you,
5 Beth, and to the field managers is, is there some way
6 that you can get the numbers and start reporting the
7 number of citations that are issued with respect to law
8 enforcement activities? It seems a lot of law
9 enforcement is paid for by the Green Sticker funding and
10 just a matter of knowing what our money is being applied
11 for and if it is being applied effectively. Thank you.

12 CHAIR BARRETT: Thank you. Thank you, John.
13 And I think that concludes on the -- oh, do you want to
14 respond?

15 DISTRICT MANAGER RANSEL: I can respond to
16 that. We do have a system our law enforcement uses, so
17 there is a tracking system where we could pull reports.
18 Of course I don't have the reports with me today, but we
19 could identify that as a follow-up action item and see
20 about providing some additional information related to
21 that request.

22 I saw Carl's hand up or Katrina, if either one
23 of you want to also comment.

24 MR. SYMONS: Yeah. One of the things that we
25 have -- and this issue has come up in the WEMO

1 process -- is that we do correlate quarterly reports to
2 the Court, and we do list citations and other stuff that
3 goes into there.

4 The only thing that I'm bringing up is that
5 citations is the last resort. It's a very small, small
6 part of what our law enforcement does. Our law
7 enforcement -- I think for some of you historians
8 originally that law enforcements are ambassadors,
9 they're our first line of greeting people, they are
10 education, rescue, just all sorts of stuff that the law
11 enforcement does in order to gain compliance and ensure
12 an enjoyable recreation experience out there on the
13 desert.

14 But, yes, we have been reporting for probably
15 two years now in a table in the quarterly reports. If
16 you wanted to go back, we can provide that information
17 at least within the area. It's broken out into each
18 individual unit how many tickets, both federal and then
19 state citations, because of the fact that in Kern County
20 our law enforcement has the authority to write state
21 citations.

22 So, yes, that information is there, but I just
23 caution that trying to justify what we do with law
24 enforcement based on citations would miss the mark
25 tremendously.

1 DISTRICT MANAGER RANSEL: I'll just piggyback
2 on that too, and then Katrina. That's very true. And
3 our tracking system, that doesn't track at all the
4 number of contacts and the amount of education that is
5 done by our law enforcement team. And really that's
6 more what they do than writing a citation, like Carl
7 mentioned, that writing a citation is really the last
8 resort.

9 MR. STEWART: That's understood. But I know
10 the one real question is that, once a citation is
11 issued, now you start getting into what are the fines
12 for forfeitures, dollar value, and who is the ultimate
13 recipient of those fines and the forfeitures and that
14 type of thing. And that now starts getting into a
15 question of -- that just snowballs other questions in
16 there which deal with, what is the effectiveness of the
17 entire statewide OHMVR program itself?

18 So, like I said, I just thought I'd pose this
19 question out there just to see if there is a collection
20 and if it be possible to essentially obtain some not
21 really detailed but some specific things but a lot of
22 high-level information is that -- are these the number
23 of citations? This is it. Then I understand that you
24 did not record all the contacts, you know, but it's just
25 for pure informational purposes in a lot of respects.

1 Anyway, thank you.

2 DISTRICT MANAGER RANSEL: Katrina wanted to say
3 something too.

4 MS. SYMONS: So as part of our OHMVR grants and
5 when we wind up asking for first payment, second
6 payment, then the final payments for the law enforcement
7 grants, we do submit an overall report of how our law
8 enforcement rangers utilize the funding that was
9 provided to us. It is certainly in generalities as in
10 how many contacts those law enforcement officers made as
11 well as in general context as to if any citations were
12 issued.

13 We do not have any information related to the
14 fines associated with these particular citations. And
15 when the fines are paid, it goes to the general
16 treasury. We do not get that money back.

17 MR. STEWART: Understood.

18 CHAIR BARRETT: Excellent. Thank you, all.
19 And with that, that concludes that comment period with
20 respect to the field reports.

21 Taking this in reverse order and continuing,
22 future agenda items and meetings. I know, Beth, you've
23 taken an awful lot today. But, you know, from members
24 themselves, perhaps even from the public, if there's
25 some outstanding issues that we'd like to see go into a

1 little bit more detail on future agendas, I think that
2 would be helpful.

3 Billy?

4 MEMBER MITCHELL: Actually I would like to
5 thank Steve for helping me look for some documents.
6 They do a really good job when I have a problem. I just
7 would like to see -- we're on ten-year renewals that
8 every time we meet, if there's a progress like what
9 Katrina did and maybe Mike could -- I think you have a
10 couple more coming up maybe. I don't know exactly when.
11 If that could be on there, I'd appreciate it. Thank
12 you.

13 MEMBER ALGAZY: Two things. I do have an item
14 of old business I would like to discuss when we're done
15 with future agenda items. But going all the way back to
16 the beginning this morning, I want to reemphasize
17 John Stewart's early comment that I think we could all
18 use a "2.0 for Dummies" presentation.

19 Listening to Mike Ahrens' envisioning process,
20 it sounded very much to me like the rollout for the
21 monument is in conformity it with the 2.0 planning
22 process because there is a lot of pre-dialogue going on.
23 There's a lot of pre-notice things going on. It all
24 seemed to me to be very much in alignment with what we
25 saw in 2.0, so this looks like the BLM is already

1 attempting to integrate that.

2 But rather than making those kinds of
3 assumptions, it would be really good for the BLM to be
4 reinforcing how all subsequent planning efforts are
5 moving in that direction and making that point clear to
6 us.

7 MR. AHRENS: Yeah, Mark. So that was
8 insightful of you to see that. You know, obviously the
9 Planning 2.0 regulations are not complete and so
10 certainly not the process we're following today. We're
11 following our current regulations. But those items, you
12 know, like the draft alternative reviews and envisioning
13 sessions, are really best management practices that
14 we've identified over the years. That's why they're in
15 Planning 2.0, and we wanted to include them in this
16 process as well.

17 MEMBER ALGAZY: That's going to old business.
18 So are we done with future agenda items?

19 CHAIR BARRETT: Let's make sure. Any
20 additional items on the future agenda?

21 MEMBER ALGAZY: Okay. The piece of old
22 business goes back to our last meeting, and I can
23 reference a page number on that. And that would be
24 Page 164, and that had to do with the timing of the
25 closing of the SEIS on the ACECs of the DRECP and the

1 fact that the comment period closed 12 days before our
2 DAC meeting.

3 This was a source of enormous frustration, and
4 we wanted to make sure that it went on the record that
5 it flew in the face of what we felt the DAC's charter
6 was in providing advice to the BLM to be cut off from a
7 very, very important opportunity. There has been no
8 more significant change to the CDCA in the last 36 years
9 than the DRECP. And we reached a high watermark in my
10 opinion in terms of involvement because Teri Raml gave
11 us every opportunity at every stage of the game to be as
12 involved as we wanted to be.

13 And then all of a sudden at the last turn in
14 the process, we were -- the gate was closed. And it was
15 an enormous sense of frustration, and there was
16 grumbling about conspiracies. I'm not a big conspiracy
17 theorist, but rather than just dwelling on the
18 possibility of that -- and we thought it would be very
19 proactive to reemphasize our vision of the DAC's role to
20 the BLM. Of course it's still up to some discretion of
21 the district manager how much input she wants from us,
22 she or he, as the time goes by.

23 But you are now in the hot seat, Beth, and
24 we're supposed to go through you and make it known that,
25 for each subsequent planning process, that Sacramento

1 should take note of the DAC's schedule and, I think, to
2 the fullest extent possible, try and make planning
3 efforts work in conformity it with the DAC's schedule so
4 that we have those opportunities to provide you with
5 quality input.

6 So that was my specific point to be made to you
7 and on the record for procedure. That preserves the
8 role of the DAC, regardless of who's on the DAC.

9 On a side note, two pages further down in the
10 transcript we discussed having a specific letter written
11 about that, and never did get an answer about whether
12 that letter was written. So Leslie can answer that
13 question.

14 CHAIR BARRETT: Yes. The letter was not
15 written, and specifically similar request for
16 information that would have assisted on that letter was
17 not written -- was not provided. I think, although I
18 echo everything you say and support everything you say,
19 I'm very hopeful that the implementation stage of the
20 DRECP and the opportunity to participate in that will be
21 something that's supported by all.

22 And, you know, when you look at everything that
23 we do on the DAC, when you look at even the public here
24 today, you know, many of the presentations presented
25 here today were information to be presented to public.

1 But what was most interesting to me was the feedback
2 that those were presenting got. And I'm hopeful to
3 think that the feedback provided really solid
4 information that would help the BLM in their planning
5 process and their day-to-day management processes.

6 When we talked this morning about Special
7 Recreation Permits, when we talked about the DRECP, it
8 was the public comments that were largely those that
9 drove the discussion. And so we're very, very grateful
10 for that. I think, as I say, I share with Mark the
11 concerns with the past, and I'm very, very hopeful that
12 we can move on to a new phase that not only the public
13 comments but our comments will be well received. Thank
14 you for that.

15 And with respect to that, if there are no other
16 new or old agenda items, we've only a few minutes left,
17 I wanted to finally acknowledge also all the support
18 folks from the BLM who put this together every couple of
19 months or every sometimes four months. And sometimes we
20 rush out of here without saying thanks to all of the
21 above. So thank you. We really do appreciate it.

22 (Applause.)

23 CHAIR BARRETT: Quick comment on Ed,
24 Ed Waldheim. We all wish him very well, and we look
25 forward to seeing him again real soon. I do have a

1 request from the public for a photograph, and so I'm so
2 glad we all got dressed up today. But apparently before
3 we leave, we've been asked to take a photograph.

4 But before we do that and adjourn, Beth, if you
5 don't mind if there's a couple of closing comments you
6 might add. Thank you.

7 DISTRICT MANAGER RANSEL: Sure. Thank you,
8 Leslie. I do want to say, I guess, just in closing that
9 it's not lost on me the sacrifice that people take when
10 they give up their Saturday to spend the whole day here
11 with us to provide comments and have these valuable
12 discussions.

13 This being my first meeting, I'm really, really
14 truly impressed and moved by the value of all the
15 discussions that have taken place on the different
16 topics that we've talked about today. And I look
17 forward to continuing to work with this group and also
18 with the -- obviously we have very passionate public,
19 and so I'm looking forward to continuing to work with
20 all of you as well. And I do want to give just a
21 heartfelt thank you, because it really is not a small
22 thing to give up your Saturday to come and spend the day
23 with us here. So thank you.

24 In terms of our next meeting, you know, we have
25 four vacancies right now that we're working on filling.

1 We have some work to do to stand up some subgroups and
2 to fill them in. I guess our next meeting would be just
3 a little over 30 days away. I'm just wondering if we
4 might want to consider a cancellation of that meeting
5 but still have -- I guess there's a working session that
6 we do normally?

7 MEMBER BANIS: Planning session.

8 MEMBER BURKE: December.

9 DISTRICT MANAGER RANSEL: Planning session.

10 Yes, December. Is it the beginning of December, Steve?
11 Is that when it would be? So it's, like, about six
12 weeks?

13 MR. RAZO: We have it between Thanksgiving and
14 Christmas, somewhere in there.

15 DISTRICT MANAGER RANSEL: Somewhere in there.
16 So it could be a little longer than 30.

17 MR. HILLIER: I have December 2nd and 3rd
18 written down, in Needles.

19 DISTRICT MANAGER RANSEL: December 2nd and 3rd.
20 It's coming up really darn quick. But I welcome
21 discussions on that. If folks want to meet in December,
22 I'm happy to have that meeting. But if we think we may
23 not want to meet until January -- it's in January. Is
24 that right, Steve? Or February?

25 MR. RAZO: You determine that in the planning

1 session.

2 DISTRICT MANAGER RANSEL: Until the early part
3 of next year, when hopefully we would have the four new
4 members on board at that time. But I welcome any
5 discussion on that.

6 CHAIR BARRETT: Perhaps with respect to
7 Needles, I think there was quite a bit of interest of
8 having a meeting in Needles, as there was an interest up
9 in Ridgecrest as well. So, you know, unfortunately this
10 one wasn't there. So irrespective whether it's
11 postponed or cancelled and we pick up one early in the
12 year and do look forward to picking up on those other
13 areas as well. So I don't have an objection to an
14 early-year meeting, but I leave it up to others.

15 MEMBER BANIS: I concur. I really like the
16 value of those planning sessions. The beauty of the
17 planning session is that it allows us to coordinate an
18 issue with a time on the calendar and a place on the
19 ground. And I really like that. And it also lets us
20 get our calendar fleshed out for most of the year, and
21 generally our planning sessions are held at the district
22 office.

23 So if we did something in the timeframe of that
24 second and third, or that first week in December,
25 traditionally that is at the Moreno Valley office. Many

1 of us attend, and a few of us phone in on that. Then
2 from there we can pick the dates for our first meeting
3 in 2017.

4 CHAIR BARRETT: Bob, please.

5 MEMBER BURKE: I think that we should have the
6 meeting in Needles as it was scheduled, as it's posted
7 on the DAC website. Besides that, I want to go fishing.
8 In fact with all the monument stuff going on and the
9 majority of that is going to be handled out of the
10 Needles Field Office, I think it's appropriate that we
11 go ahead and have that meeting.

12 CHAIR BARRETT: Mark, please.

13 MEMBER ALGAZY: My concern with postponing the
14 meeting is that, as Russ Scofield pointed out, we're on
15 a hundred-day timeline, and those next six weeks are
16 going to eat into the majority of the rest of that
17 timeline. So, again, in order for us to stay relevant
18 in the discussion of the implementation of the DRECP, I
19 think we need to stay engaged right now. And putting
20 the meeting off until the new year isn't going to help
21 us reach that goal.

22 CHAIR BARRETT: Excellent. Beth, I'd like to
23 think you've got some good feedback. So we look forward
24 to working with yourself and working with Steve and
25 others to confirm the schedule or amendment thereof.

1 It's important, of course, being so close to December,
2 that we get the meeting notices out to the public.

3 So, Gerry, please.

4 MR. HILLIER: I just have one observation. It
5 looks like you're moving toward keeping the Needles
6 date. And I concur with that. If you have a planning
7 session, how does that stay consistent with the
8 direction of FACA, having to still go through the
9 Federal Register announcement and allow the public in?
10 I mean, even if you have it in your conference room in
11 the office, it's still an open meeting. And, obviously,
12 you know, you won't be in a position to really conduct
13 much business, and I think you'd have to have Mike in to
14 talk about the hundred days. So I really --

15 MEMBER ALGAZY: We're just planning meeting
16 dates.

17 DISTRICT MANAGER RANSEL: There's no advisement
18 occurring.

19 MR. HILLIER: FACA is still a factor that has
20 to be addressed.

21 MR. RAZO: FACA does allow for a planning
22 session not in public, as long as no decisions that
23 affect the public are made.

24 MR. HILLIER: So technically in a planning
25 session you couldn't address some of the issues of Mike

1 and the national monument at that session?

2 MR. RAZO: No. You're just planning your
3 calendar.

4 MR. HILLIER: Okay. Certainly from an outside
5 standpoint, I would say keep the December date for a
6 meeting.

7 DISTRICT MANAGER RANSEL: Were there any other
8 council folks that wanted to weigh in on whether or not
9 to have a December meeting?

10 MEMBER KENNEY: Keep the date also.

11 DISTRICT MANAGER RANSEL: I'm hearing a vast
12 majority of the council votes we'd like to keep the
13 date, so we'll go ahead, and Steve will be coordinating
14 so that we can get something.

15 Is it already scheduled, Steve?

16 MR. RAZO: It's tentative. If we go with
17 December 2 to 3, which I think was the original, is that
18 still a good date, or do you want to move that?

19 MEMBER KENNEY: It's what we've been planning
20 on all along, so, yeah, I think so.

21 MR. RAZO: So 30 days prior, so basically we've
22 got to get the Federal Register Notice in, like, next
23 week. And what about agenda items for that meeting?

24 DISTRICT MANAGER RANSEL: Yeah. We'll discuss
25 that further.

1 MR. RAZO: Maybe there might be some input.

2 CHAIR BARRETT: I think some of the agenda
3 items were discussed already. So Mike is eager to
4 present at Needles, I expect, again, and we look forward
5 to that. Plus the DRECP, we may have on the
6 hundred-day -- we may have an update to that too. Thank
7 you.

8 MR. AHRENS: I might ask if there's any input
9 regarding the field trip suggestions. I know Leslie has
10 had a desire to go to Copper Basin and Bob wants to go
11 fishing. So I would be open to any input like that as
12 well so we can be planning.

13 CHAIR BARRETT: Certainly we will. I'll follow
14 up with friends at MWD with respect to Copper Basin. I
15 think it would be a need opportunity to get in there, so
16 thank you.

17 Hearing none and no more, we'll take the
18 photograph when we're set up to adjourn. And no further
19 comments from anyone here. And, Beth, no further
20 comments from yourself. We are very thankful to have
21 you here.

22 And, as I say again, I think this was an
23 excellent meeting because of the amount of feedback and
24 what we learned and so forth. So thank you, public, for
25 coming. It's a big take out of your day, and we truly

1 appreciate it, though, and please tell all your company
2 and friends to come to the meeting in early December.
3 Thank you, all.

4 And hearing no more further comment, I think
5 we're adjourned. Thank you.

6

7 (The meeting was adjourned at 4:28 p.m.)

8

9 ---o0o---

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 MOTIONS

2
3 Maker: Banis
4 Second: Burke
5 Motion: To approve minutes from the last
6 meeting of the DAC with two corrections
7 noted by Member Algazy
8 Result: Carried

9
10 Maker: Banis
11 Second: Mitchell
12 Motion: To establish a DRECP Implementation
13 Subgroup. The mission is to assist
14 the BLM with DRECP implementation
15 using the WEMO route designation
16 project as a template for solicitation
17 of public input. The membership will
18 represent broad stakeholder interests.
19 It will function through a combination
20 of regular subgroup meetings and
21 periodic remote community outreach
22 meetings throughout the desert.
23 Result: Carried
24
25

CERTIFICATE

I, Diane Carver Mann, C.S.R. No. 6008, in and for the State of California, do hereby certify:

That the foregoing _____-page 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 _____, 2016.

Certified Shorthand
Reporter in and for the
State of California