

**Mojave Trails National Monument
Pre-Planning Information Sessions April 2022
Summary Report**



Contents

Overview	1
The Monument Planning Strategy	1
Values and Issues in the Monument	3
Communications and Engagement with Partners	7
Suggested Actions for the BLM	10
Appendix A: Acronyms	12
Appendix B: Information Session Participants	13
Appendix C: Information Sessions Agenda	16

Overview

In April 2022, the BLM hosted three virtual Information Sessions to help engage partners for the Mojave Trails National Monument (MTNM) Planning process. The purpose of the sessions was for partners to learn about the upcoming planning process, to discuss desired participation, and to become familiar with input received during the BLM's 2016 MTNM Envisioning Sessions. Input shared by partners will inform the planning process, help the BLM further develop their partner list and begin to create requested information resources to facilitate partners' understanding and knowledge of the MTNM. Southwest Decision Resources facilitated all sessions and developed this summary report.

The Information Sessions were structured into three main topics: overview and background on the Monument Plan, important considerations on values and experiences on the Monument, and desired methods for partner engagement. The agenda and presentations for each Information Session was the same (see Appendix C).

This document presents a synthesis of participants' questions and comments across all three Information Sessions, along with BLM responses. It is not a transcript. The purpose is to share an overview of the primary issues important to participants, as well as areas where more information or clarity is needed. Participants' questions and comments appear in bullets, with responses from BLM summarized in sub-bullets as *italics*. Recordings of the sessions will be available soon on the BLM's website [here](#).

The Monument Planning Strategy

Monument Plan Overview

Noelle Glines-Bovio, MTNM Manager, presented the history of current MTNM management and related plans, decisions, processes, and planning guidance involved in the upcoming Monument Planning process. The presentation can be viewed [here](#).

Summary of Participant Questions and Comments

- Does the WEMO RMP have to be reconciled with the DRECP and incorporated/reconciled in the plan for MTNM?
 - *Yes, the MTNM is legally bound by the WEMO and the DRECP. BLM is cross walking the information from all plans and identifying where they diverge. Many resources and decisions that already exist (such as Lands with Wilderness Characteristics and Visual Resource Management) will be revisited in the Monument Plan, but the plan will draw on existing information.*
- What is an Environmental Assessment (EA) vs. an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)?
 - *An EA is a planning tool that will be used for the Monument Plan. A lot of the information and conservation decisions in the DRECP, WEMO, and NEMO cover what will be identified in the Monument Plan, and much of this will be included in the No Action Alternative of the EA. BLM will analyze the existing information and assess what it means in relation to the original 1980 California Desert Conservation Area plan, the DRECP, the WEMO, and the NEMO.*
 - *An EIS is normally a larger document than an EA, and used when there is a decision that will cause a significant need for a high level of documentation. If the BLM entered an EIS process for*

- the Monument Plan, it would require more time and resources than are currently available. Additionally, changes in the decisions associated with MTNM's Resources, Objects and Values are not anticipated to be significant changes.*
- What will be the role and decision-making authority of the Monument Advisory Committee (MAC)?
 - *MAC members have not yet been selected. The DAC (Desert Advisory Council) will present information on the MAC at their next meeting. The BLM provides information to the DAC. There is a DAC webpage with agendas, notes, and meeting schedules ([link](#)). The MAC is anticipated to help advise the BLM as representatives of the public who represent specific interests.*
 - How will BLM consider the America the Beautiful initiative and the concept of protecting 30% of land and water in this planning process? This could include considering whether to expand the Monument boundaries to enhance biodiversity and avoid habitat fragmentation, and if any land acquisition is needed.
 - *The America the Beautiful initiative generally does not pertain to the Monument planning process because the MTNM is already a National Conservation Land unit. The expansion of the boundary is not a BLM decision - it is up to the public, Congress, or the President.*
 - *Regarding the Biden administration's new priorities, considering topics such as climate change, biodiversity, and carbon sequestration will be part of the Monument planning process. The BLM can only consider managing resources within the current Monument boundary, but BLM will work with other partners that manage resources such as wildlife habitat and linkages that have implications beyond the Monument boundary.*
 - When will participants provide input in the planning process?
 - *The BLM is hoping to publish the Notice of Intent (NOI) this fall or winter, but the start date of the planning process is dependent on funding.*

Desert Renewable Energy Conservation Plan (DRECP) Overview

Amy Fesnock, Resource Advisor for the BLM California Desert District Office, presented on the DRECP and its relationship to the MTNM Monument Plan. The presentation can be viewed [here](#).

Summary of Participant Questions and Discussion

- It's not clear how much OHV management is involved in the Monument Plan, whether components of the DRECP pertain to OHV or not, and whether the Monument Planning process will include components that might have an eventual impact on travel management/OHV.
 - *Route-by-route evaluation and decisions are not part of the Monument Plan, but Travel Management Areas (TMAs) will be. The NEMO, which covers a large portion of the monument, did not create decisions in association with TMAs, and the Needles and Palm Springs Field Office portions of the MTNM do not have TMAs. However, the WEMO did create TMAs. Resources, Objects, and Values (ROVs) that are found within the TMAs, as well as desired outcomes and goals for TMAs, will also be identified in the Monument Plan. These elements of the Monument Plan will set the stage for future activity level-plans that make route-by-route decisions.*
- Will surveys (archaeological, environmental, wildlife, etc.) be done as part of the Monument Plan?
 - *Yes. The BLM has a lot of fairly new data from the DRECP process that can be used for the Monument Plan on topics such as habitat and sensitive species. The BLM is also trying to fill data*

gaps on topics such as cultural resources and will conduct a Class 1 cultural report for the Monument Plan. More intensive cultural surveys may be completed when activity-level planning occurs.

Values and Issues in the Monument

Envisioning Sessions Overview

Noelle Glines-Bovio described the 2016 MTNM Envisioning Sessions, at which members of the community provided input on Resources, Objects, Values, and key planning issues for the MTNM. Information gathered at those meetings will be carried forward into the MTNM planning process, and partners will have the opportunity to build upon already identified key values and resources at these Information Session and beyond. Noelle also outlined the general schedule and milestones for planning. The presentation can be viewed [here](#).

The 2016 Envisioning Session Report can be found [here](#).

Summary of Participant Questions and Comments

Off-Highway Vehicle Routes

Route Designations

- When in the Monument Planning process does road designation occur? Can partners participate in making route decisions either through a TMP or EA to help maintain access?
 - *Route-by-route evaluation is normally considered an activity level-plan. The Monument Plan will include Travel Management Areas (TMAs) (not route-by-route), and will discuss the Resources, Objects, and Values that need to be conserved in different areas. This information will feed into a future activity-level plan (Travel Management Plan) after the main Monument Plan is in place.*
 - *The Monument Plan has time limitations and a limited staff. The BLM has been directed to finish a Monument Management Plan within three years of the Proclamation, and for the Secretary to maintain a Travel Network Plan, but were not able to meet the defined timeline. Just recently the BLM was able to make this plan a priority. The BLM would like to get this plan accomplished before those priorities change.*
 - *The BLM needs to assess the different levels of routes and other data including cultural resources. Adding a TMP with the Monument Plan would make it hard to do a good job on the route-by-route analysis.*
 - *There are three current plans in place that provide established management of routes in the MTNM (WEMO, NEMO, and NECO).*
- Some long-standing travel routes were closed on the MTNM this year. While adjacent routes were kept open, these are not well worn, so wear is now being put on new areas. Is there a way we can encourage BLM to re-open routes?
 - *Land use planning amendment decisions that are not within currently designated Travel Management Areas will be discussed during the Monument Planning process. The Monument Plan will not cover route-by-route decisions. It would likely be impossible to review all routes on the 1.6 million acres of the Monument; every single route would need to be inventoried.*

- *After the locations of Travel Management Areas are established through the Monument Planning process, then activity-level plans like the Travel Management Plans, will occur. This is when route determinations can be discussed in more detail.*
- How did routes on the MTNM get closed in the first place?
 - *There are many reasons for a route to be closed. They could have been closed in compliance with the WEMO plan, which is managed by the Barstow Field Office, includes a Travel Management Plan that covers a portion of the MTNM. For the rest of the MTNM, route-by-route decisions need to be made, but this will not occur during the Monument planning process.*
- Beware that Monument planning could result in some activities being permitted in certain areas of the MTNM, but with access routes occurring outside of those permissible areas.
 - *The BLM does its best to edge match with policies of adjacent lands. Boundary matching is not always possible, especially as the MTNM abuts a different state (NV). The DRECP and TMP would need to be amended to allow for a significant change in access made in past decisions. For right now, BLM is looking at how the Resources, Objects, and Values fit into the Travel Management Areas. TMAs will need to be created in the Monument where they do not yet exist. Currently there is about 1.5 million acres that have no Travel Management Areas (TMA) assigned. The first step to good planning is to create those Travel Management Areas (TMA) and the resource goals on how they will need to be managed.*
 - *The WEMO, which has TMAs and route designations, is a very new plan, and BLM will try its best not to be duplicative with it and other existing plans. The NEMO is older and does not have TMAs. The area of the MTNM that falls under the NEMO is an open space with a current route network that must be managed.*
- Since 2016, there have been one historically significant route designations: the National Scenic Byway Designation of Historic U.S Route 66 Needles to Barstow, and soon the entire Route 66 will hopefully be designated as a National Historic Trail. This designation overlaps the Monument.
 - *The BLM is aware of the possibility of Route 66 becoming a National Historic Trail. If approved by Congress, it will become part of the MTNM planning process. BLM currently Manages the route with partnership from San Bernardino County who is the assigned administrator through federal highways. There is a Byway plan that the BLM will use as reference for the planning process.*

Additional comments related to OHV routes

- There should be a public review process each time a road is closed, in addition to a petition process to open previously closed routes.
- Signage is needed to make route numbers visible.
- It is important to communicate why closures occur and when routes will be reopened. The closures appear arbitrary when explanations to the public are not provided.
 - *Clarification by BLM after the meeting - The decisions of the Travel Management Plans should have identified open, closed, and limited.*
- There are roads that lead to open pits that need safety signage.
 - *Clarification by BLM after the meeting - it would be useful for partners to share information about locations.*

Multiple use access

- Note from the Envisioning Session presentation that 100% of the uses require vehicular access (on or off-highway routes).
- OHV users are often seen as an isolated group, but these interests overlap with almost all other users because roads are required to access almost every resource of interest. Off-road routes provide access for people who otherwise would not be able to access areas because of physical disabilities or other prohibitions. Cal4Wheel is a strong proponent of shared and responsible OHV use, and how that relates to travel plans and what is permitted in travel management scope. There is concern about route closures, particularly that they are closed in perpetuity.
- Rockhounding clubs hope to have access to rock collection sites, some of which are not on the main road or side roads.
- A preferred spot is seven miles off-road and recently Route Closed signs have appeared here. Is that part of this current planning process?
 - *Any roads with a closed sign on them have been closed through the WEMO or NEMO.*

Rockhounding

Interests and priorities of rockhounders

- Good to see that in Envisioning Sessions 22% of participants noted rockhounding as a key value of the MTNM. Rockhounders strive to be sustainable. They make as small of a footprint as possible, use tools to remove rocks, and are an educational group who get people involved in geological sciences.
- Collections are mainly for education - taking what is needed for the day and leaving the rest for people who need it in the future.
- Rockhounders are a loose-knit group of people and don't have paid staff to represent our interests. Planning processes like this are overwhelming and time consuming.
- The rockhounding community did not realize how much weight would be given to Envisioning Sessions input - this is good to see.
- Note that rockhounders also enjoy many other uses (camping, scenic views, etc.).
- Rockhounders were involved in very productive conversations about multiple resources and rockhounding during the development of the DRECP. Refer to this information.
- It is important to maintain the ability to collect minerals in general, not just in specific sites. It is hard to know what will turn out to be an interesting area in such a big place.
 - *The BLM knows the MTNM is a very valuable area for rockhounding, and that certain areas are favored over others. While rockhounding is generally prohibited in National Monuments, right now, rockhounding is allowed as a casual use and the BLM sees this as an important monument value. The BLM is trying to figure out how to weigh the conservation of paleontology and rockhounding. The Plan will need to identify a measurable goal related to rockhounding, with help from the rockhounding community. The BLM staff geologist wants to meet with the rockhounding community and figure out how to meet the needs while understanding that this is a National Monument.*
- Rockhounders are especially concerned about the Cady Mountains and Afton Canyon. Although there are many important rock collecting areas adjacent to the Monument, we were promised certain accommodations in 2016.

- *The BLM wants to properly record rockhounds concerns and priorities during the Monument planning process. There are no plans now to change Development Focus Areas (DFA) designations adjacent to the Cady Mountains or Afton Canyon. The current administration stopped the land use amendment process and does not want to significantly amend the DRECP; existing land use designations in the DRECP are not expected to change such that major development would prohibit rock hounding in the Cady Mountains and Afton Canyon.*
- Many rockhounds worked well with the previous Monument manager and would love to take Noelle into the field soon.

Land Use Designations

- Many accommodations for rockhounds were made in the DRECP. There are Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACECs) designated in the DRECP. Is the planning for these done?
 - *Management plans for ACECs were done when the DRECP was completed. Appendix D of the DRECP includes all of those plans. However, to fully provide for the conservation language of the proclamation ACECs will be reevaluated to align with the Resources, Objects, and Values of MTNM.*
- Will nothing additional to what is mentioned in those appendices be done for planning of ACECs?
 - *Some consider the plans in the DRECP Appendix to be only outlines of plans, but they do identify allowable/not allowable uses, resource values, and management goals. All requirements of a plan are achieved in that Appendix.*

Cultural Resources

- The Community Alternative created for the Monument Plan includes valuable perspectives and voices of communities, including indigenous peoples who call this area home. Some tribes are not in California. How are you working with field offices outside of California?
 - *Out-of-state tribes that may have an interest in Monument Planning are in BLM's Southern Nevada District and Las Vegas Field Office. Noelle has not yet communicated with Moapa Band or Southern Band of Paiutes, but is working with the BLM archaeologists at the Barstow and Needles Field Offices who have been there for a long time and are immersed in local tribal communities. The BLM is eager to work with whomever has interest and can send additional letters to reach out to more tribes.*
- The MTNM has spiritual significance for a broad swath of Californians and Americans. How does BLM balance the input from smaller groups versus the broader interests that may not be local?
 - *The BLM is a federal public agency, so questions or comments relevant to the scope of the plan, are all considered, regardless of where they originate. The BLM must comply with general policies and procedures, which can include government-to-government relations that are separate from public comments and administered under a separate set of rules.*

Climate Change

- The Monument Plan needs to consider climate, especially given Biden's goal to conserve 30% of America's lands and waters by 2030. The stakes of conservation and climate are high; an EIS is preferable to an EA.

- Climate change is an important consideration for this plan. Can carbon sequestration as a desert resource be explored here?
 - *Climate change is part of many conversations about the open desert, including air quality and soil health. The NRCS has not done a lot of research in the area around the MTNM, but information from partners who have done work in the desert is welcome for the Monument planning process. Planning is an opportunity to identify needs and opportunities to find new information. Noelle is working closely with BLM's minerals staff who are very interested in this conversation. BLM is still struggling a bit about how to measure this as part of the plan. Information on climate change would end up in the BLM's science plan.*

Future Development in the Monument

- Are solar energy facilities not allowed anywhere on the MTNM, or are they allowed in specific areas?
 - *Solar energy development is not allowed within the MTNM. It is considered a non-compatible use.*
- Rockhounds are concerned about the amount of renewable energy permitting and the Development Focus Areas (DFAs). There were considerable accommodations for rockhounding in the DRECP. There is now concern that the BLM may change the DFA decision that was designated in the DRECP but not designated in the Final Decision.
- Please make sure that the Monument Plan contains limitations on the types of development that are permissible.
 - *Permitted uses are right-of-way actions under the Title 43 CFR 2800 -Rights-of-way, Principles and Procedures, which are managed by BLM's Lands and Realty. Realty actions are permitted on the MTNM, but not large-scale renewable energy or commercial-grade mineral extraction. Pipelines, access roads for pipelines, and transmission corridors are allowed. These projects involve large conversations, especially as the power grid is currently being updated. The BLM is not discussing a permitting process for small-scale facilities in the Monument Plan. Traditional values of how the Monument has been and is currently used need to be considered.*

General

- The night sky resources of the MTNM are very important. You cannot see the stars in Los Angeles, so having a dark sky to go to is important.
 - *The BLM recognizes the value of night sky resources and will consider them in the Monument Plan.*
- Support for the Community Alternative was expressed by multiple partners

Communications and Engagement with Partners

Participants shared their preferred communication methods, who else should be engaged in the planning process, and improvements for future meetings.

Communication Preferences

Participants shared their preferences through a Zoom poll. Responses from all three information sessions are presented here.

1) How would you like to participate in Monument planning?

- Online surveys (80%)
- Provide written comments (67%)
- Field trips (58%)
- Smaller focus groups/topical discussions (56%)
- Webinars (56%)
- Receive a presentation from the BLM at my own organization's meeting (56%)
- Partner workshops (44%)
- Share relevant resources with the BLM (39%)

2) How would you like to receive communications from BLM?

- Email (97%)
- E-Newsletter (47%)
- Social media (28%)
- BLM MTNM webpage (25%)
- Newsletter (hardcopy via mail) (3%)

3) What type of meetings do you like?

- Virtual (94%)
- In-person, in the field (50%)
- In-person, at a central meeting location (e.g., District Office) (39%)

Discussion

After reviewing the poll results partners shared additional thoughts and preferences for the planning process.

Information sharing

- Don't just post announcements in the Federal Register - need more ways to learn about what is happening.
- Publish survey questions online ahead of time and allow a window of opportunity to respond.
- Write regular columns in papers/journals locally or with interest.
- Provide quantitative information with visual representations such as flow charts and pie charts.
- Give plenty of time for commenting and announcing meetings.
- Give more than 30 days to comment because of the size of the Monument. Suggested time for submitting comments is 60-90 days.
 - *The BLM agrees with the timing of scoping and giving people the time they need.*
- Give equal weight to competing interests. The rockhounding community understands that there will be compromises.
- The rockhounding community has given extensive input on planning (such as the WEMO and DRECP) for over 10 years and would appreciate not having to re-submit comments again and again.
 - *The BLM will do their best to build on the existing information from the community.*

- Will everyone on this meeting be contacted about the Notice of Intent?
 - *Yes. If you received an email from the BLM or Colleen Whitaker about this Information Session, the BLM has your email and will send you information.*
- The language in the plan is hard for normal people to understand. Please provide clarification the public needs as the planning process progresses.

Coordination with Tribal Communities

- Describe the collaboration and cooperation with Native American tribes.
 - *The BLM sent a letter and emails to tribes inviting them to participate in the Information Sessions. The purpose at this point is simply informal coordination and it is not considered government to government consultation since the planning process has not officially begun. The BLM will continue reaching out to Tribal members and leaders before and throughout the Monument Planning process.*
- Involving tribal communities is very important.
- Good to hear that tribal outreach and communication will be ongoing.

Coordination with the Desert Advisory Council and Monument Advisory Council

- How will the BLM work with the DAC in this process?
 - *The DAC recently solicited applicants for new DAC members. That solicitation closed at the end of February 2022, and the DAC will soon identify new members.*
 - *The MAC will be a sub-group under the DAC. Since it is under the DAC (a public advisory council), the BLM does not influence how members get picked.*
- Communicate about the Monument Planning process via the DAC. MTNM should be on all DAC agendas.
- Please use the DAC contact list to share information. Some members did not receive the information about this meeting.
 - *Noelle has briefed the DAC about these Information Sessions, and there is a standing agenda item on DAC agendas about the MTNM.*

Additional information requested

Participants thought it would be helpful for the BLM to share information on the following topics for partners to engage effectively in Monument planning:

- An explanation of why the BLM believes an EA is the appropriate level of environmental review for this planning process.
- Easily accessible maps of current OHV routes, as well as historical OHV routes that are now closed. The Data Basin program could be used to share maps.
- The legal sideboards for the Monument Plan.
- A graphic about the process and timing of the Monument Planning process (such as a Gantt chart).
- Information on how to access and navigate relevant plans. Include information about and hyperlinks to:
 - Travel management plans
 - NEMO
 - WEMO
 - DRECP

- Guidance on what types of comments are helpful to the process

Other partners to include in Monument Planning

Participants suggested that BLM engage the following organizations in the Monument Planning process. Those that were not already on the contact list have been added.

- American Sand Association
- Basin and Range Watch
- Blue Ribbon Coalition
- California Desert Coalition
- California Federation of Mineralogical Societies
- Native American Lands Conservancy
- The Oxnard Gem & Mineral Society (National Fossil Day Partner with the National Park Service)

Meeting Evaluation

At the end of each Information Session, participants were asked to share what they thought went well about the session and what should be changed in the future.

What Went Well

- Seeing all the questions and concerns from different people was helpful in understanding the entirety of this plan.
- Opportunities for Q&A intermixed throughout the session.
- Good that BLM is building the contact list.
- Please continue to get the word out about this topic and please have more information sessions in the future.
- Great presentations.
- Overall well done; thanks to BLM for hosting pre-scoping meetings. These pre-scoping meetings demonstrate clear commitment to collaborating with partners.

Changes for Future Meetings

- Provide closed captioning.
- Provide an acronym list that people can download at the start of the session.
- Provide a closing statement identifying the next steps and approximate schedule.
- Provide more time/notice prior to meetings.
- Provide the agenda prior to the meeting - that way, taking notes on the specific area would be easier.
- Include opportunities for public response to the polls online (outside of the sessions themselves)

Suggested Actions for the BLM

Participants recommended the BLM take the following actions to meaningfully engage partners moving forward into the planning process.

- Add all participants to the BLM's contact list for the Monument planning. Contact representatives of organizations suggested by participants about getting involved.
- Send the presentations from the Information Sessions to participants.

- Develop and distribute FAQs about the planning process, including links to DRECP and the Envisioning Sessions report.
- Develop a glossary of acronyms related to the Monument planning process.
- Attend DAC and MAC meetings and provide updates on the Monument Plan.
- Notify all participants and suggested contacts when the Monument Planning process begins in multiple types of communication beyond the Federal Register notice.
- Request for BLM to present to:
 - California Off Road Vehicle Association (contact Jared Macleod)
 - Antelope Valley Gem and Mineral Club (contact Ruth Hidalgo)
 - Kern County Mineral Society (contact Anita Anderson)

Appendix A: Acronyms

ACEC - Area of Critical Environmental Concern
BLM - Bureau of Land Management
DAC - Desert Advisory Council
DFA - Development Focus Area
DRECP - Desert Renewable energy Conservation Plan
MAC - Monument Advisory Council
MTNM - Mojave Trails National Monument
NECO - Northern and Eastern Colorado Plan
NEMO - Northern and Eastern Mojave Plan
NRCS - Natural Resource Conservation Service
ROV - Resources, Objects and Values
RMP - Resource Management Plan
TMA - Travel management Area
TMP - Travel Management Plan
WEMO - West Mojave Plan

Appendix B: Information Session Participants

Name	Affiliation
Anita Andersen	Kern County Mineral Society
Jeff Aradahl	Defenders of Wildlife
Joe Atherall	US Marine Corp
Monica Ammann	
Judy Branfman	Friends of Mojave Trails and Hills
James Bramham	American Sand Association
Susy Boyd	Mojave Desert Land Trust
Kyle Beucke	
Bryan Baker	Sierra Club
Jenny Binstock	Sierra Club
Kelsey Bosch	Twenty-Nine Palms Band of Mission Indians
Marek Chorazewicz	Southern California Friends of Mineralogy
Linda Castro	California Wilderness Coalition
Moises Cisneros	Sierra Club
Christine Carraher	
Michael Cox	California Federation of Mineralogical Societies
Russ Chung	California 4 Wheel Drive Association
Steve Cady	Pasadena Lapidary Society
Susan Chaisson-Walblom	Antelope Valley Gem and Mineral Club
Andrew Cyr	USGS
Ryan Crow	USGS
Dick White	Antelope Valley Gem and Mineral Club
Steve Duncan	Searchers Gem and Mineral Society
Sue Dekany	
Breanne Dusastre	Visit 29 Palms
Dave Duncan	
Justin Delemus	

George Ellis	USMC - MCIWEST-MCB Camp Pendleton
Teoman Elker	Palomar Gem Club
Clayton Ehman	Victor Valley Gem and Mineral Club
Katie Flahive	BLM California
Pamela Flick	Defenders of Wildlife
Amy Granat	California Off-Road Vehicle Association
Dower Jai Gervais	
Angela Guzman	Mineralogical Society of Southern California
Evan Hoffman Jastermsky	Morongo Resident
Lucy Howell	
Jennifer Haley	California Federation of Mineralogical Societies
Nicole Honstead	San Diego Off-Road Coalition
Ruth Hidalgo	AV Gem Club
Vicky Hoover	Sierra Club
Phil Hanceford	The Wilderness Society
Dave Johnson	BLM Tribal Liaison
Michael King	29 Palms Marine Corp Base
John Lindquist	
Gregor Losson	Southern California Friends of Mineralogy
Jay LaPlante	BLM California Tribal Liaison
Kim Loureiro	Native American lands Conservancy
Kristen Lalumiere	BLM
Christopher Lesso	
Glen Miller	Retired BLM
Dave Miller	Retired USGS
James May	Kern County Mineral Society
Jared Macleod	
Rob Milner	Santa Cruz Mineral and Gem Society
Jessica Mauck	San Manuel Band of Mission Indians
Lynne Miller	California Historic Route 66 Association

Michael Mora	Mojave Desert Land Trust
Chris Rowe	
Ronald Rackliffe	Sierra Pelona Rock Club
Marla Reagle	Yucaipa Valley Gem and Mineral Society
Maricela Rosales	Conservation Lands Foundation
Mona Ross	Pasadena Lapidary Society
Ed Stovin	
Elyane Stefanick	Conservation Lands Foundation
Mike Splain	Resources Legacy Fund
Joan Taylor	
Lauraine Turk	
Lisbet Thoresen	San Diego Gem & Mineral Society
Harrison Tasoff	
Rose Winn	California 4 Wheel Drive Association
Janelle Williams	Sierra Pelona Rock Club
Elizabeth Weston	Pasadena Lapidary Society
Tina White	Sierra Pelona Rock Club
L Zemin	

Facilitation and documentation: Julia Sittig and Colleen Whitaker, Southwest Decision Resources

Appendix C: Information Sessions Agenda

April 16, 2022 (10am-12pm Pacific)

April 19, 2022 (5:30-7:30pm Pacific)

April 21 (9:00 - 11:00am Pacific)

All sessions were held via Zoom

Welcome by BLM - *Noelle Glines-Bovio, Mojave Trail NM Monument Manager*

- Agenda review and Zoom reminders
- Meeting agreements/ground rules

Overview Presentation - *Noelle Glines-Bovio and Amy Fesnock, BLM*

- Overview of current management, relevant and related plans, and the planning process
- Introduction to the Desert Renewable Energy Conservation Plan (DRECP) and how it is related to Monument planning
- Q&A

Partner Input: Important considerations for the Monument planning process

- Presentation: Summary of 2016 Envisioning Sessions outcomes - *Noelle Glines-Bovio*
- Discussion and feedback: Are there additional important issues or topics for the BLM to consider during planning?

Partner Engagement

- Feedback from partners on how you would like to engage in the planning process, communication preferences, and who else should be involved.

Wrap up and next steps