

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

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

LOCATION: Victorville Hilton Garden Inn
12603 Mariposa Road
Victorville, CA

DATE AND TIME: Friday, March 25, 2011
8:08 a.m. to 5:17 p.m.

REPORTED BY: JUDITH W. GILLESPIE, CSR, RPR, CLR
(CSR No. 3710)

JOB NO. : 69578JG

A-P-P-E-A-R-A-N-C-E-S

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Chair THOMAS ACUNA
RANDY BANIS (Elected
Chair during Meeting)
MEG GROSSGLASS
PATRICK LLOYD GUNN
BRAD MITZELFELT
ALEXANDER SCHREINER, JR.
(Absent)
APRIL SALL (Elected
Vice Chair during Meeting)
DINAH O. SHUMWAY
RICHARD RUDNICK
MONICA ARGANDONA

REPRESENTING:

Renewable Energy
Public-at-Large
Public-at-Large
Wildlife (Absent)
Elected Official
Renewable Resources
Public-at-Large
Nonrenewable Resources
Renewable Resources
Environmental Protection

BLM STAFF PRESENT:

TERI RAML, District Manager, California Desert
District (CDD)
STEVE RAZO, External Affairs Officer, CDD
DAVID BRIERY, External Affairs Specialist, CDD
JENNIFER WOLGEMUTH, Administrative Assistant, CDD
MARGARET GOODRO, El Centro Field Office Manager (afternoon)
ROXIE TROST, Barstow Field Office Manager (afternoon)

I-N-D-E-X

ITEM	PAGE
Welcome (Acuna) /Pledge (Banis)	5
Introductions	
5	
Approve October 2, 2010 Minutes	6
Review objectives for business meeting	7
Important Roles for the DAC (Raml)	7
Review of February 9 work group discussion	21
Emphasis on effectiveness, timeliness, and significance	22
Update on developments affecting topics for DAC	23
Discussion about BLM's Story in the CA Desert and DAC (Maruska)	35
Morning Break	66
Creating Focus to Enhance DAC-BLM Effectiveness (Maruska/Raml)	67
Key themes for meetings	86
Targeted objectives for DAC input	87
Advance preparation	105
Review of DAC Strategic Work Plan for 2011 (DAC/Raml)	118
Lunch Break	133
Revision of Bylaws to Fit with New Charter (Razo, Ext. Affairs)	134
Public Comment (Note: DAC will report results from this meeting on 3/26/11 and provide opportunity then for public comment before taking final action at that time.)	
Election of Chair and Vice Chair for 2011 (DAC)	151
Review of Existing Subcommittees and Roles in 2011 (DAC)	154
ISDRA (Holliday/Goodro)	157
Dumont Dunes (Banis/Trost)	184
El Mirage	191

Review of Existing Ad Hoc Subgroups (DAC/Raml)	193
Renewable Energy	194
Afternoon Break	201
Special Recreation Permit	202
Formation of a Special Recreation Permit Subcommittee (DAC/Raml)	206
Key Factors for DAC-BLM Success (DAC/Maruska)	247
Adjournment	264

Friday, March 25, 2011

Victorville, CA

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

CHAIRMAN ACUNA: Welcome, everybody, to the Council meeting here in Victorville. I would like to start out with Randy leading us in the pledge of allegiance.

(Pledge of allegiance.)

Okay. So let's start out with introductions. And Richard Holliday, please start from your end.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: What's that? Dick Holliday.

MS. SALL: April Sall.

MEMBER HALLENBECK: Tom Hallenbeck, representing transportation rights-of-way.

MEMBER BANIS: Randy Banis, public-at-large.

CHAIRMAN ACUNA: Tom Acuna, representing renewable energy.

DIRECTOR RAML: Teri Raml, Designated Federal Official, BLM.

MEMBER ARGANDONA: Monica Argandona.

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

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Dinah Shumway, nonrenewable

resources.

MEMBER RUDNICK: Richard Rudnick, renewable resources.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: Meg Grossglass, public-at-large.

CHAIRMAN ACUNA: So that we today -- that's for the introductions. Monica, welcome on board.

We don't normally have two days of conference meetings. Normally, obviously, we are all going out into the field with BLM staff. Today is a little different. We are utilizing our Friday to conduct business in a different way, at least this one time.

And just wanted the DAC members to know that the BLM staff have put together some materials for you so that we can look into our future and figure out how as a DAC we can do a better job. And I will let Teri illustrate that in a moment.

But I wanted you all to know that Randy Banis and I have been working closely with BLM and reviewing the materials, and what we are hopeful is to get your input and make tweaks, adjustments, and then I don't believe that we are going to approve any of the things we are going to see today. We are going to take care of that tomorrow. So today is to roll up your sleeves, look at materials, and I'm hopeful that Teri

will give us an opportunity to review some of the materials more closely as we go through so we can provide you good comment.

So with that, I would like to turn it over to Teri before I go any further. Are there any other comments from the DAC on this approach? Teri, it's yours.

DIRECTOR RAML: I will introduce Don Maruska. He is going to be our facilitator and my coach through this business day. Maybe what we can do, why don't we do a quick agenda review. Does that make sense? And then we will delve into the pieces of it.

So as Tom said, welcome to an indoor meeting. Thank goodness it's cold and windy outside so we won't feel bad. But maybe a cold day in the desert is still better than a day indoors. But thank you for participating in this business meeting.

And I guess a little bit by way of introduction: I have been here a year now, and sometimes I feel like it's a statement of how I still have this wide-eyed look on me, but yes, it's been an entire year. And one of the highlights of the year has been working with the DAC and with you. And I think it's the potential of this group of people to play even a different role and greater role that has

kind of led us to this meeting.

And very encouraging every time we get together is your dedication to the DAC commission that has led us down this path. And I thought with all of your support, I thought we should be a little bit more strategic. We are going to spend a day inside, which will maybe make our future days in the field even more productive.

So today's agenda -- the screen will help you. We are going to talk about the role of the DAC. We will talk about -- can everybody see the screen? Then we will do a little bit of, I call it a good exercise to get us all -- we will talk about the BLM story in the Desert District, which will be kind of an interactive exercise which will get us all thinking. We will talk about the focus, kind of our approach to developing this business plan. We will develop the business plan and then do some of the business, which would be the revision of the bylaws, election of Chair, and get into subcommittee and ad hoc work and formation of a subgroup. And then we will talk about what makes success.

So that's kind of how the day is laid out. So -- to be sure, it feels overly formal, but please feel free to interact. Not that you have ever been

shy before, but don't let the formality of the group intimidate you from saying, hey, wait a minute, or what the heck, or whatever expression you need to kind of get our attention. So Don and I will probably -- and Steve will have a role in this and we are looking forward to it.

MR. MARUSKA: We might just check with the DAC members if there are any other items of sort of DAC business nature, how the DAC functions and how you work together, that you would like to bring up that you didn't see in the materials that came out to you. So that if there are, I can make note of that and we can find an opportunity to address those.

I really appreciate the work that Tom and Randy did in reviewing the agenda and giving input and feedback on it to prepare for today's session as your Chair and Vice Chair. But other members of the DAC, if any topics or things about how the DAC functions and how to make it more rewarding for yourself and the public that you would like to find a home for in the agenda or add to the agenda?

MEMBER SALL: I just want to add a little discussion about how we run our meetings and having some consistency on public comments especially. So -- okay.

MR. MARUSKA: Process for meetings.
Especially public comment. And maybe a good way to do that is we can take a look at the end of the day and review what the plan is for the larger public meeting tomorrow. And Teri and the Chair can talk with you about the process planned for tomorrow and see if that satisfies what you think would be the most productive way to be informing and engaging the public. So good. Anything else that you would like to highlight?

If other things come up --

MEMBER HALLENBECK: I had a question about the elected official.

MR. MARUSKA: We are going to be studying that in the revisions of the bylaws. I think that's scheduled to be hit under that fifth bullet point. Does that work for you on the schedule?

DIRECTOR RAML: Are you getting at if this is a valid meeting without one?

MEMBER HALLENBECK: We haven't changed the bylaws.

DIRECTOR RAML: The charter never made it a requirement.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: Didn't our charter change in the last few years?

MR. RAZO: Brad is scheduled to be here.

DIRECTOR RAML: When he shows, that part of the question becomes moot.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Just so we are clear, this is an official meeting, even without our elected official?

MR. RAZO: That is correct.

MR. MARUSKA: Thank you for that clarification. Any other item?

CHAIRMAN ACUNA: The only thing I would ask, we have been pushing renewables and there has been a lot of discussion about how the DAC approached that. I want you to know that the DAC members -- that this DAC meeting will discuss how to move forward on that. We will wrap it up now.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: I really like that the last few meetings we discussed having the next meeting and the next meeting out. That's really good for people like me.

MR. MARUSKA: Forward planning is something you would appreciate.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: I would like to see the schedule a year in advance, but at least two meetings out, have this mandatory.

MR. MARUSKA: Actually, as you will see from the suggestions of Teri, she is actually offering to

you a strategic work plan that would lay out the year for you so that both the BLM staff and the DAC could do more in preparation. But that's sort of the jumping ahead, too. But thank you for bringing that up.

Any other topics or items you would like to be sure to get addressed at this point? If there are other things that pop up along the way, I will add them to the list and we will get them covered as we go forward.

DIRECTOR RAML: I wrote all my notes on the potentially older version of the Power Point -- so I'm all right, good. I'm on track here.

So I will start real briefly to talk about -- and I think we can certainly have an interaction on this slide, too, the role for the DAC. And I think we have talked about it in our past meetings. For us, it's a valuable tool -- well, I will back up and say, I have always, as you probably suspected by my enthusiasm, I consider having an Advisory Council a tremendous asset to the Bureau. It's always been a tremendous asset to me in my experience with the Bureau. And I think it has made us a stronger agency.

And if you watch the Forest Service struggle -- and we will get to that later -- with

Advisory Committees, they don't have them and don't know how to utilize them. And I think there is some real effectiveness that we have benefited by having the DAC. So I personally have considered it a luxury to have the advice of citizens so readily available to me. And maybe that's -- so that's important.

So -- I think the opportunity for the DAC to receive public input and I think we will see that tomorrow and maybe April, that's one of the things you would like to make sure we handle that well. I think one of the things that's a little bit invisible to me is how you communicate with your constituencies, how you interact with the people you represent, whether it's kind of a functional area or public-at-large. I think it's very important that it happens. And I think that's a critical function for the DAC and the key part of it to provide advice to me as the Designated Federal Official, and as appropriate, it goes up the chain to the State Director and Secretary of the Interior. So those are the functions of the Advisory Council, and that kind of sums it up.

Did I miss something or would you like to express it differently?

MEMBER HALLENBECK: It was in order of priority to you. To me it's inverse. When I looked

at the charter and I got involved with this, it was strictly an advisory body to you. That was the objective as stated.

The public input was one of the duties that we do as we hear public testimony. Not necessarily one of our objectives, it's just a duty that we have. It was silent communication out. You are highlighting it up front so -- is this your view of how you want us to operate with you as your Advisory Council? That's fine if it is.

DIRECTOR RAML: I don't think we need to over-emphasize this particular slide. It's not in order. And I think if we were to -- I like thinking through those sorts of things too. If you are right, it could probably be reversed the way that you gather information and formulate thoughts to provide advice is through receiving public input and through -- how you gather that input could either be by communicating with your constituents. But we could spend more time on that. That was just kind of a formation slide. And I think as we continue through the day --

MR. MARUSKA: I have actually been working with BLM for about 15 years with Resource Advisory Councils throughout California and Wyoming. I first began working with the Desert Advisory Council in '99.

What I am going to be sharing are the best practices that the Resource Advisory Councils are highlighting. And you are absolutely right, Tom, it's not particularly spelled out about channel for communication, but I think the Resource Advisory Councils that work especially well have found ways to help and support the RAC members in having the information and having the tools to get information out to the constituencies because there are a lot of things going on and changes happening and fast-moving developments. And you are an important vehicle for input in as well as out. So that's something that high performing RACs have picked up as a key to do.

And maybe you want to talk about other tools that you need from BLM to help you serve in that role because you are talking with the constituencies all the time, not only listening to them, but conveying to them what you see happening in the DAC.

CHAIRMAN ACUNA: To me, this slide, what it really means is that moving forward, how do we measure the impact of our discussion with the DAC. And we have talked and had a little preview, and I'm sure Teri is going to hit that. What is the measurement tool whether we are making a difference? And I would just hope, Don, that in that discussion today, we can

show success, that we as a DAC do something. What does it result in? Does something happen effective to our constituencies, or does it get lost? So I'm hopeful that we can hit that.

DIRECTOR RAML: Maybe what we can do with this particular slide or point, maybe when we get to the bottom, talking about our meetings, maybe one of the things we should do is have just a brief overview of that. And this would be something of course I would tackle and maybe with Don's help, but maybe we should start our meeting with sort of the goals of the Advisory Council. There is the goal of the Advisory Council because this is a "pros." If we can turn it into pros.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: As far as input from constituencies and everybody, we have the Web page for the DAC and it has the minutes on it and everything. I'm wondering if there was a way, a mechanism for people to comment on those -- back to the whole group but through the Web page or through maybe some kind of an e-mail address that was DAC@BLM or something. I notice that we got a lot of input on the comments on the SRPs that came in. They came in to a whole bunch of places: Some of them to you, some to the state office, and they were kind of all over the place. It

seems like it would be helpful if we had a comment for the DAC-type place where people that were not necessarily tied to one of us personally could have some input.

DIRECTOR RAML: That's a good idea. And why I'm laughing -- I started with the idea that the first year here, I think -- my enthusiasm for working with you is because we have tried some things and through those various lessons, learned in both cases. Our approach to renewable energy, we tackled that and how we thought that it fits in the business of the DAC.

And then this effort with the Special Recreation Permit, which we tackled, which has been of tremendous benefit with you also, I think I learned some lessons in terms of how we rolled that out, speed. It wasn't a full package, a lot of confusion, and yet the input we read on it had a lot to do with the outreach of the DAC to make that clear. And Randy -- poor Meg and Randy really stepped up and made that communication effort and feedback we received a lot more effective than it would have been on my own because we didn't package it as well as we could have. So I think we learned through the year, and that will be captured on how we move forward.

CHAIRMAN ACUNA: April.

MEMBER SALL: One more question. Is there a place in today's agenda where we are going to talk about the -- I guess reelection or election of DAC members? Is it going to be discussed at some time?

CHAIRMAN ACUNA: It's on the agenda.

MR. MARUSKA: The election of Chair and Vice Chair?

MS. SALL: No, no. I was thinking about new members in general, and we can talk about that system and tweaks to it.

DIRECTOR RAML: It's in between -- after the introduction and before we do the story exercise, we will tackle that then, and we will put Steve on the hot seat.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: He is so uncomfortable there.

MEMBER HALLENBECK: I know it's only the second slide, and I will have further opportunity. But Dick really hit upon one of my concerns, and that's the public input. And I want to explore that thoroughly as we go through today because I know the BLM is a large federal organization. And I'm part of a state organization. A lot of them are mandated by law. It's a search for trying to get effective communication with the public.

And we want to serve you and the public as well. And I want to make sure that you want the public input to come to the DAC that you can receive it and appreciate it timely and appropriately versus the other ways you get information, such as the environmental process. I would hate to set up a public input opportunity that isn't followed through and effectively received.

DIRECTOR RAML: Yes.

MR. MARUSKA: That's going to be a key issue, actually, as Teri and your Chair and Vice Chair and I have spoken about this. How to, in fact, create things that both the DAC and BLM can deliver on so you are not creating an expectation beyond what you can deliver. And there are existing public processes for a variety of issues for planning in the desert, like renewable energy, a whole EIS process, and you don't want to be trying replicate that or interfere with that or lead people to believe that somehow they got into the formal processes that are underway for the EIS, because that would misguide people and then they think they gave their comment and I'm done.

But that comment can't go from the DAC to the EIS because the EIS has to have a very formalized process. So being clear about what you are and what

you are not is very important, because otherwise, this could come back around and be a disservice to the public rather than an enhancement to the public. So that's a very fine point of having that clear, and having that communication spelled out is important.

And that's why I think as you go through the course of the day thinking about what do you take on and how do you take it on and how do you message to the public is going to be very important. So that's going to be a theme we will be coming back to. So please help yourselves and one another by checking in on that topic to see if you are, in fact, addressing that appropriately.

DIRECTOR RAML: I want to do a little bit of -- this will be a little bit of stage setting for both when we talk about the story and also to talk about kind of how we got to here.

So how we started down this road to develop this business plan or strategic work plan or whatever the final descriptor of it is, I provided a lot of information to you. I provided you with the Arizona's business plan. Primarily, I provided that mostly to see how another RAC works and also to look at the verbs associated with how we did that. And I also provided you the California Strategic Plan, and I

basically summarized what the State Director has on our Web site as the year's strategic plan.

And the small group that was gathered there, we walked through all the items, and we selected some topics. And you will see them when we go down the road. So I will talk about the process part of it, but one of the interesting things in the course of the discussion of walking through the topics and deciding in what the DAC was interested in focusing in in terms of BLM's strategic work and how to be effective, came these kinds of key interests or what turns out to me to be a very -- just the descriptors of what was important, how we should measure the effectiveness -- I'm not using the term properly -- how the DAC wants to evaluate and get involved in and how to measure success in a way. To get involved in a topic, the DAC needs to feel that it has an opportunity to be effective, to provide input or advice in a timely manner, and to work on things of significance.

Tom or Meg, one of you came up with this. And as we talked through it, it seems like that was a really good metric for success, but really in terms of how to approach our business. And the DAC wants to engage in topics or issues or in programs of work where those three things, the critical three, are met.

And as we go through this, it seemed like for me it suddenly became a good screen on, okay, should this come before the DAC? Does the DAC have an opportunity to affect it and be effective on providing comment on that topic area? Can we do this in a timely manner with the schedule of the DAC and the subgroup? Has the issue got the longevity that you can learn meaningfully, cogitate on it and provide in a timely manner, or does the issue escape you?

The other is because of the desert-wide DAC, you want to work on things that are significant. But for the limited amount of time and your expertise, that you want to be involved in things that matter. So kind of stuttered through that, but those three topics seem to be a very good expression of how to approach our work.

CHAIRMAN ACUNA: I love it. I'm all about -- I think as a DAC, what we want to do, there are going to be some times that those little issues aren't worth bothering with. We don't have time to chase that down and even the discussion. What I'd like all of us to think about is, so what? How many steps does it take to take care of that little issue? We don't have time for it.

So if we can focus on the stuff that really

matters and we really can make a difference, that's what this slide is about. And it's a theme that I think we need to stick with and somehow keep that as we move into the future, whether it's this group or the future DACs. That has to be a key thing because I have seen instances where we could have been more effective in the past.

DIRECTOR RAML: So do those descriptors work for you? Or would you frame them -- this I do think of as prose. I thought these are three good words. Would you phrase them differently or do you want to come back and work with them?

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: Looks good.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: That's fine.

DIRECTOR RAML: This may seem like a little bit of a sideways in the flow, but it's not. And Steve will talk about changes in the charter and something that we get a heads-up on that will have a significant impact on the work you do.

MR. RAZO: Right now we are on a roller coaster ride with the charter. Washington is currently going through a process of redoing the charters, and in the latest go-around of redo, they didn't realize that you guys are really special. You are congressionally mandated, specific language in our

charter that's not in other charters in reference to what your mission is and what you are about, although other RACs do have similar functions. And the elected official part of it is being added into the charter.

If you notice on the current charter, the list of representatives, there isn't an elected official listed. It will be on -- we were hoping to have it by today, but it didn't happen. There will be an elected official listed, and it will not be a requirement to have the elected official present during the vote. That definitely is also a change.

So the biggest change is the elected official will be added to the charter. Language that they had inadvertently deleted on their redo this week or last week will be put back in, and you will be getting a copy of that as soon as it shows up regarding the elected official.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: So the charter you sent out wasn't really final?

MR. RAZO: Yes. We will present it now rather than keeping you up with updates.

You also had indication of the proposed fee increase responsibility handed down to this level. Just yesterday, that changed. It so happens that apparently the California RAC, R-RAC, is still

operational. To be honest with you, a little bit of a surprise to us and the state office. We are trying to find out -- I will put it this way: Washington indicated to us that in California, there is an R-RAC. It's operational, so the fee increase authorization to make recommendations on that stays with the R-RAC, does not come down to the DAC level or the Northern California R-RAC, Central California R-RAC level. I think you have data that says that's coming. It's not. Apparently it's going to stay with the R-RAC.

I have requested a list of what is the current California R-RAC. I don't even know who is on it. The state office couldn't tell me who is on it. So we will try to find out. As you know, Roy Denner was on that R-RAC and since his passing, I'm not aware that he was replaced.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: Don Amador replaced him.

MR. RAZO: So we do have a representative on the R-RAC. So that's the latest on that part of it, and that still will be part of our bylaw discussion.

MEMBER BANIS: My understanding is that their charter has been expired and they have not been able to constitute their seats, and also, as I understand it, never filled all the seats.

MR. RAZO: That's the impression we were

under, but we are being told that it is operational and we are trying to get confirmation on that.

MR. MARUSKA: So a fluid situation to be further illuminated. And that may have some input later on some of the areas in the strategic work plan about the degree to which and the role, if appropriate, in the DAC in the user fee question. So that will probably be coming back and something you will be talking about a little later today. Comments from you?

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: How in this process -- let's assume that the R-RAC is still in place and it's the ultimate approver, if you will, for California. Doesn't that flow from, say, the subgroups -- and I know we are going to talk about that -- to the DAC, to the R-RAC? Does the DAC have a place in this stream of approval or processes? Should the DAC give a recommendation to the R-RAC?

MR. RAZO: I believe that would come through your ISDRA subgroup, because that would come through and you would come and report to the DAC as far as what your recommendations or advice is and then that would go forward.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: So what I am trying to say, is there the requirement, then, for that process for

the DAC to make a recommendation to the R-RAC for a fee increase or change?

MR. RAZO: I think that will come when we figure out just where is this R-RAC. And now that the alert is off, where does that leave the DAC in terms of that flow. That's a good question.

MR. MARUSKA: It sounds like a general point at this juncture to address Dick's question is that there isn't presently a requirement for the DAC to play that role. I think one of the questions for you a little bit later in the agenda, is that an issue that the DAC would like to take on -- not on a required basis, but on an advisory basis? And if so, how? And I think we will be doing a deep dive into that and having an opportunity for you to discuss the degree to which you want that priority and how you want that discussion to proceed.

(Brad Mitzelfelt joins the DAC.)

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: Are your ears burning, Brad?

MEMBER BANIS: There is another point. There are more fees than just user fees at Dumont Dunes or El Mirage or ISDRA. The review and input on fees also applies to campground fees and new camping areas. And as the BLM develops more amenities for the public,

those reviews also need to take place. That's actually the hottest issue on the Forest Service side is the changing and alteration, increasing or addition of fees for those kinds of small area services.

MR. MARUSKA: So we will make a note that the fee issue is beyond the OHV activity. It moves into some other arenas. And that's a topic as you discuss how you would like the DAC to be engaged and what would be helpful from an advisory point of view, whether you want to engage those fee issues or not or other processes underway, to deal with that. Those will all be questions that you will be coming back to.

DIRECTOR RAML: Like Don said, we will deep dive into that topic a little bit later. Belly flop into it.

CHAIRMAN ACUNA: I like belly flop.

MR. MARUSKA: Belly flop is a good approach when you don't know how deep the water is. You don't want to do a deep dive with a shallow pond with a rocky bottom. You are making the transcript to this more lively rather than the typical ones.

DIRECTOR RAML: Was there anything else we wanted to say on the charter?

MEMBER SHUMWAY: I have a quick question. This might have been talked about before, but were

there some errors in the charter just discovered?
What is driving this wholesale change to the charter
that's making everything so complicated?

MR. RAZO: The drive was to redo all the
other charters, and the DAC got thrown into that. And
in the process, our charter got changed, although we
did want to add back the elected official.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: My question is, What is
driving the change to the charters? Are there some
major issues? Is this a make-work thing?

MR. RAZO: Someone in Washington decided they
needed to be looked at.

DIRECTOR RAML: Was it based on the fee
discussion?

MR. RAZO: That was part of it.

DIRECTOR RAML: Just a little bit more
background. There have been a series of coordination
meetings between the agencies, meetings between the
executive leadership team of the BLM and Forest
Service and also at the state level.

And I think at the higher levels of the
organization, they have been looking at the
effectiveness of the R-RACs. And there was this kind
of announcement that they were going to part ways.
That this idea of the Forest Service hosting these

RACs wasn't working so well. But what I may be surmising -- and I'm surmising -- as it rolls downhill, there may be some different input received from a local perspective because that was definitely a top-down sort of discussion. And it sounds like we are revisiting it. So as they said, it's a fluid topic. But that would prompt a bunch of changes. So we will see how that plays out. But meanwhile --

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: At this point in time is there any change in the status of the members? I know there is a list of -- you got a thing out on the thing to ask for members, new members. But I don't see a cut-off date there. Was there?

DIRECTOR RAML: You mean for our DAC that's on the Web site?

MR. RAZO: Talking about nominations?

MR. MARUSKA: I think Teri was asking you to address it now.

MR. RAZO: Believe it or not, I haven't checked the Web site, but today the Federal Notice should be published, and we are calling for nominations for the DAC. So now the period has opened today to get the nominations in. Of course, I have already received from you your packages, and if you haven't completed yours, those that want to return

please make sure you get them in. That is a battle that we are constantly battling in terms of that timing to the point now that apparently now your three-year term actually begins from the moment you get your letter, where it would used to be you would be nominated and you wouldn't get anything until the next March, April.

You kept coming to meetings, but the three years started in January and you really only had to serve two and a half years or for some of you, even two years. Now it's from the date you get your letter is the three-year term, which makes it very complicated for us in terms of tracking who is off and on. So now instead of, okay, you five are off this year, it's almost you and you, this is your next-to-last meeting.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: Is that retroactive?

MR. RAZO: So that's it.

MR. MARUSKA: Steve, could you summarize the categories, if you will, in which you are requesting nominations currently? I think that was part of what they were asking.

MR. RAZO: It's on your charter, your package, the list of all the people -- the categories.

MEMBER HALLENBECK: So the whole DAC is going

to be renominated?

MR. RAZO: Well, we always take nominations for everything, really. At this point I can't off the top of my head know -- remember exactly which -- well, you all know who is up. Recreation, public-at-large, nonrenewable resources, those are the obvious. But we always take anybody who wants to nominate themselves because we do have the ability to put -- if we think a public-at-large might be a good addition here or not, we can do that. Flexibility.

MEMBER SALL: Can you review the time line for nominations as far as when you open up packets generally, when we are due, and we all know when we get letters, but --

MR. RAZO: It used to be 45 days, but because of the way things have been in terms of timing, we never know when the federal notice would come. I think this Federal Register notice states 60 days. We decided to add another 15 days just to ensure that we got plenty of time, so the current one is 60 days.

MEMBER SALL: Does it usually start in March or wherever we are at here?

MR. RAZO: Normally we start the process in the fall because we always went by calendar year, so right now --

MEMBER SALL: So this is earlier than it has ever been.

MR. RAZO: I don't know where it is. All we know is it got published today, and we have 60 days of nomination period.

MEMBER SALL: These are for the members that are sort already expired, almost?

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: Dick has expired.

MEMBER SALL: So what about the ones due in seven months? When do we start that process?

MR. RAZO: As soon as the 60 day ends, then we start the next process.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: I don't know if this will work for you. Now there is going to be a rolling time frame for different people, when you put out your request for nominations, if you get a pool of people that you agree on, and it would seem like maybe you could use those without having to go through a whole Federal Register process for each one.

MR. RAZO: Well, we actually are required to go through a Federal Register process each time we call for nominations. We don't have a choice.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: You are going to have to do that five times during the year.

MR. RAZO: There are a lot of elements of

this which will be uncomfortable.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: Mostly for Steve.

MR. MARUSKA: This may be something you would like to summarize for the public -- but not take questions.

MEMBER RUDNICK: I have one question for Steve, and probably I missed it and I didn't read anything in the packet. Are these categories set in stone?

MR. RAZO: Yes.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: By the charter?

MR. RAZO: Yes.

MEMBER RUDNICK: Which is being redone.

MR. RAZO: In fact, a renewable energy position was recently added, but that was directed from Washington. So they directed that addition. And that's been the only addition.

MEMBER RUDNICK: You mentioned you take applications from all categories.

MR. RAZO: Right, because it goes with what Dick was saying. If we get an eligible candidate in an area that is not vacant, we keep contact with those individuals and say, could you hang on for the next cycle and then we can put you into the next cycle.

MEMBER RUDNICK: They wouldn't replace Dick

in recreation.

MR. RAZO: Well, we don't make the final decision. We might recommend Dick but --

MEMBER SHUMWAY: But Washington might want something better -- or different.

MR. MITZELFELT: I have a question. I might have missed it because I was late. On the elected official thing, is that being reviewed because of the legislation?

MR. RAZO: The elected official is being added back into our charter, and there isn't a requirement that the elected official be present when a vote is taken.

MR. MITZELFELT: All right. I like that.

DIRECTOR RAML: But stay here.

MR. MARUSKA: What we want to do now is take a moment before you dive into the details to look at what are some of the perspectives that you have about BLM's story in the California desert.

DIRECTOR RAML: I will add a little introduction to this, too. The idea of BLM telling its story has certainly -- it's the communication from Director Abbey. And he has been using that terminology that we need to do a better job of telling our story. And particularly when renewable energy

came up, the idea that BLM has a wonderful mission, a broad mission. We pride ourselves on having the broadest mission of any of the land agencies because of the nature of our enacting laws. So part of it is a real emphasis on telling the story.

Jim has asked Steve and I -- actually asked me, and I keep trying to do a better job of telling the story of the California Desert District. And so when we were brainstorming kind of this meeting, we started talking about the cycle of the Advisory Council, the topics that we would tackle, and the idea of telling the Desert District's story in the way we focus our meetings and the way we approach our agenda.

It's a good exercise for several reasons. One is particularly after this discussion down into the administrative nature of the DAC, to focus on why we are all here, which is to manage the resources and to talk about providing advice on BLM's mission. So this is a nice way for us to talk about what the desert means to us and have an exercise to get us thinking.

MR. MARUSKA: You have some paper and some bold markers in front of you. So -- I'm not sure what colors of paper or were they just plain paper that went around? Colored paper, all right. So what

color -- let's pick green here. So pick the green sheets of paper in your folder, pull those out, and obviously the story of the desert, California desert is multifaceted, which is why you have multiple sheets of green paper. But we ask you to write down one theme or element of what you think the story is per sheet of paper. Use the bold markers and see what you come up with.

And we will take a few minutes after you finish coming up with your list of one theme or element per sheet. So if you have five or six themes that come to mind, five or six sheets of paper, we'll ask you then to star the ones where you think BLM needs to give the most attention in terms of helping to fulfill its mandate.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: This doesn't have anything to do with us?

MR. MARUSKA: This is not your personal story.

DIRECTOR RAML: There were not enough pieces of paper for that.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: What the BLM's history and role is?

MR. MARUSKA: What are the facets of BLM in the California desert and what you think needs more

development, more attention, to put a star on that sheet. But just write a phrase, a sentence, a few words, whatever, per sheet. But come up with your ideas, and we want to catch the thoughts from each of you and some sense on your part about what particularly needs attention going forward.

This is your sort of free-form chance to express something about the California desert efforts and where you would like to see attention focused.

So what I suggest you do is I don't think we will put it on the wall, but we will turn to each of you to comment. What did you come up with and star as most important? And we will see what collectively you come up with. So the green sheets are in your packet.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: I vote we start with Dick.

MR. MARUSKA: Is everybody clear about what I am inviting you to do?

MEMBER BANIS: Could you give me, Teri, could you give me one example, if you had just one?

DIRECTOR RAML: The one that came to mind right off the bat was manage its vast landscape. What would that mean? But the CDD to me is a beautiful, vast landscape.

MR. MARUSKA: If you would mark with a star

the one or ones that most need attention or most compelling out of your list. We will start with those and turn to each of you and have you tell us what was most needing of attention in your view and have you speak to that. And after that we will see if others on your sheets got attention from somebody else.

So who would like to begin with a theme about the California desert that is part of the BLM's story here?

MEMBER ARGANDONA: Cultural and historical importance or values.

MR. MARUSKA: Tell us a little bit about why that is important to you. What is behind your thinking.

MEMBER ARGANDONA: I think it's a place of incredible Native American history. Even before that, geological history, then history of peoples, from Native Americans forward. Sometimes that's lost. When we are thinking about current things, we forget about the past tense.

MR. MARUSKA: There is a lot of history. Good. Thanks.

Do you want me to just go around the horn with you here, or would you like to do it on a volunteer basis? I can see you looking at me, Ron,

like you are sort of ready to say something.

MEMBER JOHNSTON: But I can add something.
In fact, I had worked up --

MR. MARUSKA: What was the most compelling to
you? If it's exactly the same or very similar --

MEMBER JOHNSTON: In my mind the most
important element that we bring as a responsibility to
the table is to help protect the legacy of the
California desert for its citizens and future
generations.

MR. MARUSKA: Tell us a little about why
that's important to you.

MEMBER JOHNSTON: I think without question,
no one could argue that once the pristine environment
of the desert has been disrupted or destroyed, it
would be impossible to bring back within our lifetimes
what it was before, having been dismantled. So it's
an irreplaceable resource that we keep finding, as
science progresses, more uses for the valuable assets
that exist there all the time. And I think we take
great risks by changing or destroying what is there
today for today's short-term objectives when we may be
missing the long-term objectives that we don't even
know about today.

MR. MARUSKA: Okay. Good. Teri, I think you

are getting with these first couple quite a rich story evolving here. Thank you. It sounds like you are on a roll.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: In contrast to Ron, actually, I also value, of course, the legacy of our desert but for another reason. The BLM mission may have changed in the decades, but its original mission, along with the Forest Service, was to provide resources for the development of communities. And so with that, I would say that its a multiple use mission, combined with providing a value to the owners. And the value to the owners is -- I think scenic is fairly recent in the history of uses in the BLM because its original mission was to provide resources of all kinds. And one of those is mineral resources. And the only way that you can have a value with mineral resources is to develop them for the benefit of communities. So that is determined by a lot of things.

But it is a necessary development that, contrary to what Ron would want, does change the landscape, maybe not profoundly, but certainly in areas. But we also have additional laws of mining, especially in this county, the best county to mine on earth because we have to reclaim to a compatible

nature any mining that takes place. So I think that we can't forget that that was one of the original and still is a mission which is to provide resources for communities as part of its multiple use. Maybe multiple use would be a better thing.

MR. MARUSKA: In your first few descriptions, you are identifying some of the challenges that come with this story.

And Richard, let's go to you next.

MEMBER RUDNICK: I think mine is -- encompasses both thoughts or all three thoughts that we have had already. And that's simple respect for the desert. And consideration for all the parts of the desert, the uses of the desert, all aspects of the desert.

MR. MARUSKA: Tell us why that's important to you.

MEMBER RUDNICK: Because I see with population growth, especially in Southern California, we see a lot of disrespect for the desert and a lot of people that don't understand either the historical values or the uses that are placed on the desert. Now it tends to be different than they were, of course, years ago.

MR. MARUSKA: So there is a renewed need for

people to have an understanding of what that resource is and what the impact of their activities would be?

MEMBER RUDNICK: Exactly.

MR. MARUSKA: Meg.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: I have a couple. Good use of tax dollars.

Mine is education. I don't know -- I probably just look at this from an OHV perspective. We don't have -- this is because BLM doesn't have a lot of money -- we don't have a lot of interpretive programs and things like that which happen in our OHV areas. We do have them in our state park OHV areas, and I think it's an important element that is probably left out because the more we educate them about the critters and animals and the history of the area, the more they will gain a respect for it. And I think it's a shame that it doesn't happen in our OHV areas.

In the Ocotillo Wells we have programs to teach them about all the touchy-feely stuff, but it definitely teaches the next generation respect for the environment and for the history, cultural and archaeological. And I think that's kind of important, and I think that's left out of our OHV areas. They do a much better job at National Parks with that kind of stuff. But it should be something that the BLM should

focus on.

MR. MARUSKA: So we are moving on to Dick here. What is the most compelling one on your list.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: I think from all the comments, my basic thing is what is the BLM story? That's really a balanced management of the resources. We have cultural resources, mines, natural resources that should be used. And I think that as you go back, as Dinah says, you go back to the BLM's origin, which I believe was to manage grazing; it really goes way back. So the idea is it's moved along all these years to manage the whole spectrum of the uses.

And each of us has their own area that they were most interested in. But it's really the BLM's responsibility to manage the desert -- to manage the resources for multiple use. That's their goal. And what I see happening now is when you say what is the most important thing, I see the pendulum swinging from one to the other. And now we are into this renewable resource thing, which is driving us to drink. It's just taken over everything. It's just overwhelming the cultural resources, the recreation, the -- everything.

And I think from the standpoint of the BLM's management of the resources, balanced management of

the resources, I think you need to take a real good look how that affects all the other resources.

MR. MARUSKA: The importance to you is the need to sort of keep centered to avoid these pendulum swings that can be disruptive in trying to keep a balance.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: And I fully understand that the local district office is being driven by entities above them and may not have a lot of choices, but I think we need to look at that realistically.

MR. MARUSKA: April.

MEMBER SALL: It's hard to focus on one. I think for me part of what it comes down to is the uniqueness of the desert and not only in the aspect of all the different uses, but in the actual desert ecosystem itself from an ecological perspective, which also brings in the cultural aspect. But I think as Dick mentioned here, our largest threat in my view now is the renewable energy discussion and how much should the California desert take on as its burden for this new challenge. But because it's such a unique ecosystem and it's older than we knew, the more science that I guess we learn about and the more scientific studies have been revealed, we are learning more and more about just how unique this ecosystem is

and thus, how fragile it is. And it's important to revisit that balance of uses whether it's in the CDCA plan or some other management plan.

MR. MARUSKA: Good. So this idea of having a sense of what the carrying capacity in the desert while still maintaining the integrity of what the desert is. Good.

MEMBER HALLENBECK: From a more technical perspective, the federal government's land office, GLO, they are the surveyor for all the federal agencies and keeper of all the land records. And historically, that's been important for granting of deeds, land ownership and the special use permits. It's an important function that they need to pay attention to.

MR. MARUSKA: The institutional knowledge about what is permitted and what is not. Tell us why it's important.

MEMBER HALLENBECK: Land ownership is important to the people that are the owners and the neighbors, where that is. The surveying of the desert is a huge task. It's important to keep those records intact and up to date and in one place, which they may not be right now. It becomes a big issue when you are trying to do any of the things we are talking about in

terms of mining or grazing or OHV use. Where are you and whose land is it and what constraints are on it? Or deed restrictions.

MR. MARUSKA: So great, you are all doing a wonderful job here. Randy, what is most compelling on your stack?

MEMBER BANIS: Variety: One word. And it's important to me because there is something for everybody, even for someone who never visits the desert. You sit at home on your couch eating popcorn and what are you watching on TV? Car commercial filmed in the desert, movies filmed in the desert. You read magazines about desert stories. There is something for everybody here.

MR. MARUSKA: So you don't just measure the desert in terms of how many people come out and recreate directly; it's also what are its sort of larger and cultural and iconic presence.

Okay. Tom, how about you.

CHAIRMAN ACUNA: I just wanted to say a couple thoughts. I am much like Randy. It's all about -- land is for the people in a general sense, and that sounds fine, but you just can't open up the desert and say go have fun. It's about responsibility.

So with that as the foundation, I think the most important thing I would add is regulatory complexity that is inefficient for even the most minor things and just leave it at that, because I will share with you -- and this is a renewable industry story.

There is this project that wants to be just evaluated. And to do that, they need to get six cores for geotechnical work; that takes Catex, category exclusion. And I won't belabor it. But it takes six months, minimum, just to get this very important information. It's not project approval. Now, you take that same theme and you apply it to Special Recreation Permit or a special camping event or some exploratory thing. You just want to look at something. So that's my point. If I could just leave it at that: Regulatory complexity.

MR. MARUSKA: If you might add, why is it important to you to address that?

CHAIRMAN ACUNA: I think that all good ideas -- there are a lot of simple ideas I think that the DAC would like to see Teri move forward with. But because of the regulatory complexity, she can't. Not without making -- taking significant resources to carry it out.

MR. MARUSKA: So you are hopeful that you can

find a way to make things that need to be simple, that ought to be simple, to be simple?

MEMBER ACUNA: Exactly.

MR. MARUSKA: Especially if those are not significantly invasive.

CHAIRMAN ACUNA: Exactly.

MR. MARUSKA: Things never seem to get simpler; they get more complex. So how do you over time create systems that are clear and easy for people to follow versus increasingly more complex and difficult? Why don't we skip over, and I will give you the final word, Teri. But we will move to Brad. What would you like to add to this story?

MR. MITZELFELT: I don't want to be a jerk here, because so many positive things have been said.

MR. MARUSKA: That's okay. Like every good story, there are strong parts of the story and there are other dynamics of the story.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: We were not here to be nice.

MR. MITZELFELT: Three things. One of them was very positive, and then there was a "however," and then the third one is a "therefore," and the "therefore" is the knock-out punch. And unfortunately I'm going to go with it because I think it's the most substantive. But it's very negative. I just don't

want to take it out of the context, because I'm not all negative about BLM, but this is negative.

It's entirely my opinion. BLM has become susceptible in my opinion to political agendas such as arbitrary mandates for public lands to accommodate utility, renewable energy. And another example being a single U.S. senator's ability to influence an agency for a project, for example, Cadiz. Another example, refusal to follow controversial regulations such as (inaudible). In contrast, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service seems to be impervious to political pressure.

I think the pendulum swings only one way. I have been involved for 18 years, and I have never seen it swing the other way. So that's a frustration that's built up over many years. And I don't know how you put it up on that board because it's a lot of words.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Susceptibility to political pressure. Would that summarize it?

MEMBER BANIS: Political agenda.

MEMBER MITZELFELT: I just think an administrative agency should not be susceptible to political pressure, but it can be. And unfortunately, for all its positive aspects, this agency is susceptible to political pressure, in my opinion.

MR. MARUSKA: So the reason this issue is important to you -- just to flesh it out a little bit more, Brad -- would be what?

MEMBER MITZELFELT: Would be -- as a local government having a job to do such as maintaining roads, and I mentioned the recordable disclaimer. When the Secretary issues a regulation that would be beneficial to local governments in their ability to maintain roads, because there was a controversial regulation, it was never implemented. And the county was left waiting for years until finally county had to sue to get their application enacted on. So, yeah.

MR. MARUSKA: It makes it difficult to have consistent management or coordination with other agencies? Is that part of it? I want to be sure I'm capturing your thought.

MEMBER MITZELFELT: What do you have so far?

MR. MARUSKA: Susceptibility to political pressures (concurrent speaking) --

MEMBER MITZELFELT: To have fair and equal treatment.

MEMBER JOHNSTON: Question. It almost seems like you are saying that because the BLM is a bureaucratic body, which it is, that it is not receptive enough to political input from the

constituency and the people who elect the politicians.

MEMBER MITZELFELT: That's another aspect of it. The "therefore," "however," was dealt with in this tremendous pressure to be more of a conservation agency and tremendous pressure, largely fought out in courts and through legislation.

So -- but in the interest of trying to keep it brief, I think he has the basic idea.

MR. MARUSKA: I'm trying to turn down the heat a little bit because they are cooking us in here.

Does that capture your concerns about susceptibility to political pressure makes it difficult to have fair and equal treatment. Is that a reasonable shot at it?

MEMBER MITZELFELT: I suppose so.

MR. MARUSKA: If more clarity comes around, add it later or write it up there yourself or whatever.

So Teri, some reflections on the story that you are hearing from the DAC.

DIRECTOR RAML: Well, very interesting. I mean, and I guess it is what I should expect: How complex the story is. And I think it runs the -- yeah, it's fascinating to me. Part of it is it captures, from the expression of almost -- I almost

got the expression of the spiritual value of the desert. To me, you are sitting on the couch and you were talking about how you are watching television and you are looking at desert landscapes. And he also thought about the desert experience for a lot of people, that's the terminology, like I said, kind of the spiritual aspect: They go to get in touch with themselves.

So you run the gamut from the importance of the landscape for certain folks on how they process information and how they feel centered. And then you run from the idea of the value of this landscape through time starting before time and then through how people have utilized it. You end up with the educational value that this desert could provide to people. Then you kind of end up with your crazy history.

I'm obviously very interested in all of it, but going back to what we originally were, we were the disposal agency, and that's the fascinating part of it. BLM was the agency created because it was finally recognized that no one wanted the rest of these lands, plus we have always been a keeper of that legacy for the Homestead Act.

So the legacy of our history versus of the

people that were trying to get rid of it and now of the folks that still continue to have values for commodities, people are not going to make a living on these lands but they have mining for mining, grazing, other reasons. And then you end up in this bureaucratic nightmare where it's an agency charged to manage these lands that people care about for different reasons. And from the frustrations of trying to get something enacted locally to the frustrations of top-down policy, it's all there.

MR. MARUSKA: So what you are highlighting as you are listening to the story and experiencing it yourself is just how diverse and multifaceted that is.

DIRECTOR RAML: Yeah, the thing that's fascinating to me is that time and space stuff.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Could I interrupt you, Teri? Just to keep us all on track in anticipation of this kind of discussion, I went to the Web site and I downloaded the mission. But the important part is, the BLM mission statement: "Management is based upon the principles of multiple use, sustained yield of our nation's resources within a framework of environmental responsibility and scientific technology."

And I think that says it all. Everything we talked about is listed as a resource in that mission

statement. But we have to remember that the mission dictates it will be a multiple use and scientifically, technologically robust approach to managing the resources of the desert.

DIRECTOR RAML: Where did you get that?

MEMBER SHUMWAY: From the BLM Web site.

DIRECTOR RAML: I have another vision statement on a little card that's a little different than that.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: And I agree with Brad. What we have seen is the BLM management, and probably this is dictated politically from the federal government, has moved -- not conservation, because conservation has a legal meaning, meaning multiple areas. It has moved to a preservational approach. We want to preserve everything that's here. That means no development. Preservation means preservation for what? Our culture? Our time? Since the white men came here? Since the Indians? Since the Mesozoic? I mean, that's not logical, but that's where the BLM management has moved toward preservation.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: I always get a kick out of the environmentalists. They want to preserve this area for future generations. And so what I would like to see is a kind of a sunset provision that says,

okay, in 2050 we get to use that area because now the next generation gets to go out there and do what the last generation didn't get to do. At what point in time is the future going to get to use it? Do my grand kids get to go out and ride on it --

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: He is talking about the area north of 78.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: -- because we saved that for the future? And like you say, it's there. The whole point has changed to a conservation-type thing which has become the focal point -- preservation. At what point in time does the future -- we get to use these areas that we have protected?

DIRECTOR RAML: One of the challenges -- one of the reasons that Jim Abbott has asked us to work on the story of the California desert is to try to do a better job of putting all these things in context. So for me everything is always is -- I'm the victim of everything-is-always-connected. So this exercise was to help look at what we focus on, where that fits in the theme of things, but to understand the context by which-- you know us better than most people. The majority of people.

So hearing how you view our story helps me try to put it in context. 12.2 million acres adjacent

to this many people and what your feeling is of the story of the California desert, and particularly with the renewable energy piece of it which per acre is a very small part of that 12.2 million acres, less than 2 percent. And that's at build-out, less than .2 percent right now of acreage dedicated to renewable energy. But the emphasis on renewable energy is all-consuming.

MR. MITZELFELT: Are you talking about the energy zones?

DIRECTOR RAML: If you were to build out to the kilowatts that would be permitted.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Kilowatts produced or installed?

DIRECTOR RAML: If we were to build the approved applications. But that part of it.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: That's given the landscape. That's the number of acres. But when you look at the effect of that from the standpoint of a visual effect, let's say a lot of these things is visual. You drive through the pass there before we put all the wind farms in Palm Springs, and I used to see the mountains.

DIRECTOR RAML: That shows how difficult the story is to tell. Because if you summarize the story

into affected acres, it misses a lot of this. Yeah, so that's why we have been very challenged to try to figure out how to tell it. Because no matter how you frame it, you do a disservice to somebody's vision of where BLM fits in its importance.

That's why I think when we talk about -- yeah, that's why I said it's a time and space thing. It has meaning through time and it has meaning, depending on the landscape you are looking at and how to do honor to it. There is no piece of the story that's inaccurate. There is no piece of the story that deserves less respect. So to be able to tell a story that does service, honor, justice to people's view of the BLM or the story, it's more than one page, isn't it?

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Maybe, then, one way that the BLM could go forward is to, taking your analogy that it's not only two dimensions but also time, because the whole principle of multiple use is that time thing. Just as an example, you find an ore deposit. You determine if it's economic. By definition, it has to be economic. You develop it. Sometime maybe 20, 30, 50 years, you reclaim it to some compatible use depending on geography and geology. You can't say all mine pits are going to be

waste dumps or ponds or skateboard parks.

Actually, I had a bunch of kids who thought a skateboard park would be a great reclamation for a mining spot. But it's a time thing, too, so you have to look at how do the landscapes change? They are changing all the time. They are going to change tomorrow and they changed a million years ago. If we never did anything to it, they are not going to be the same.

Even multiple use dictates that those landscapes and uses are going to change. Our uses are going to change as technology progresses and changes. So it's not only for now or the next generation, but what is it going to look like 100 years from now? So you have to look at how are these uses going to change through time and technology, advances in technology.

MR. MARUSKA: Well, this is a very robust discussion that you have launched, and it's clear why you are each here, because you each have a piece of the story.

And the invitation to you as well as your challenge is how do you weave these threads into a fabric. And that's the tension that you are talking about and the tension that sometimes cause that fabric to fray and sometimes causes it to get woven back

together more strongly. And that's really what you are about.

So it's not surprising there are so many different dimensions with this. I will talk with Teri and see, Teri, if maybe you would like to have some development of this that would help develop this story, if you will, over the course of your meetings this year. This is a start at it.

The suggestion on the approach for your strategic work plan is that each of your subsequent meetings, while having an opportunity for you and the public to bring up other topics, is to take a look at a particular facet of the story is to get into more details. I do want to thank you for that exercise.

One of the things that I observed with the exercise is something that I think would be valuable for us to take just a moment to check in with you about: What is the most effective way for you to be getting and exchanging information. I observed, and just as I was giving the instructions for the exercise, some of you were reading and others were listening and others were asking, can you give me an example. Those reflect the three very different ways that people prefer to learn. And we all learn in all ways. We like to read things and hear things, we like

to walk through things with an example. It will be helpful in figuring out how to communicate most effectively.

There are many models about how people learn. I simplify it into a more easy framework. People like to learn by seeing, hearing or doing. So if you think about it for yourself and a simple example would be if you got a new DVD player, some read the instruction manual. Other people would say, yeah, I looked at the instruction manual but I'll call up a friend and say can you tell me how this works? And they would want to listen to what that person was saying. If that person was a visual learner, why doesn't the person just pull out the manual and read the manual?

There are some people who actually learn better by hearing, and yet there are other people who say, I'm not going to bother with the manual. I have four plugs and sockets, and I'm going to stick them in and hopefully the thing won't blow up. And that's a kinesthetic learner. I have heard you talk about it, but could you walk me through how to do it? That means they really prefer to learn in that way.

I think it would be useful for you as a team to discuss how do you like to learn and what your preferences are. What are they going to need to do to

flex and help you gain value out of this experience.

So if you take out a sheet of paper and write for yourself what is your preference, first, second or third, I am going to ask you for that so we can see what that is, and that will help us in the rest of the day and subsequent meetings to figure out how are we going to exchange information so we all really get it. Multiple ways of learning enhance attention, so it isn't just one way or another. Everyone clear on what you need to do? 1, 2, 3, whatever that order is.

MEMBER HALLENBECK: Could you give me an example?

MEMBER MITZELFELT: Show me an example.

MR. MARUSKA: Who would like to lead out?

MEMBER BANIS: There is a saying called R-T-F-M, read the freaking manual. When I was a kid, when it came time to play a new board game, they would say, hey, let's play this game. I'd say, let me see the box and I'm not going to even put a thing on the board until I have read every single rule in that thing. And I'm very much of a visual person. My Pad has software manuals for my first software, and during TV shows I'm thumbing through and learning new things. It's in that order, 1, 2, and 3. I like doing, but I just -- when I'm ready to do it, I want to feel like I

have the tools and I want to feel like I'm prepared.

MEMBER ARGANDONA: So when I have the board game and the instruction manual, I read all the instructions, but I had to play it as I read it. I'm a kinesthetic learner.

MR. MARUSKA: That's why BLM has field trips. What is second?

MEMBER ARGANDONA: Visual.

MR. MARUSKA: Next?

CHAIRMAN ACUNA: 3-2-1.

MEMBER HALLENBECK: 2-1-3.

MEMBER SALL: 3-2-1.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: 2-3-1.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: 2-3-1. Don't even bother telling me, just throw it in front of me.

MEMBER RUDNICK: When I went to school the motto was "learn by doing," so I will start there, and it would be 3-2-1.

MR. MARUSKA: Did you go to Cal Poly?

MEMBER RUDNICK: Correct.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: I like to multi-task. I will say 2, 1, 3.

MR. MARUSKA: If you are doing something, you can do something else at the same time?

MEMBER SHUMWAY: I do a lot of the things

while I'm listening.

MEMBER JOHNSTON: 1, 3, 2.

MEMBER MITZELFELT: I guess 1, 3, 2.

DIRECTOR RAML: 1, 3, 2.

MR. MARUSKA: Okay. So what do you take away from this?

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: A lot of different people.

MR. MARUSKA: You have a lot of people on the doing side of things. It looks like the doing is your key. It looks like hearing is among the ones that have 3. Sort of like the least preferred. This is quite common. That's one of the reasons why you noticed today we made the effort to give you a Power Point, some things to read beforehand and a Power Point to guide you through the discussion. I am taking notes up here. I think that's going to be key to your success.

Learning by hearing is the least effective way of acquiring information. As you think about the people who are going to respond to the tom-tom drums to show up tomorrow, just having talk is going to be challenging. So BLM is doing things to give them printed information and give them an idea to write down ideas to do other things than the standard public hearing approach, which doesn't bring out the best

learning capacity for people.

But clearly, having a diversity of ways in which you act around this is going to be important. So I encourage you when we are doing something to say, here, walk me through an example. Or, gosh, I hear what you are saying, but could you write that down and put that on the screen so we can look at the language. All of those things are useful to help you to be a high performing team. Any other observations?

MEMBER MITZELFELT: Yeah. I don't think anybody had theirs in the order that the group has it in. 3-1-2?

MR. MARUSKA: You mean, if you look --

MEMBER MITZELFELT: The group had it 3-1-2, but no single person had it 3-1-2.

MR. MARUSKA: Where are the most ones and threes? The doing leading, visual second, and then hearing has the fewest ones and the most threes. So that looks at how you are. But again, that's the average. But the most important thing is you are different and there needs to be multiple ways. This is multiple learning for you.

So with that in mind, we are going to be carrying that theme forward in the course of the remainder of the day and using not only the Power

Point, but your discussion and walking through some examples of how these ideas in the strategic work plan may come forward.

And I think we are right on schedule here, so why don't we do this. Teri, did you want to kick off with the discussion about your thoughts on focus for the BLM and then in about 20 minutes we would take a break?

DIRECTOR RAML: Probably take a break first.

(Brief recess was taken from 9:52 a.m. to 10:10 a.m.)

CHAIRMAN ACUNA: Where we left it off, Don, you want to pick it up?

MR. MARUSKA: Just on reflection and an opportunity to talk with Teri about your prior exercise here about the BLM's story in the California desert, we were both impressed with the thoughtfulness of your comments. And so I wanted to offer as an idea that one thing I might do is in my spare time tonight is summarize this a bit, and maybe we can bring that back tomorrow and say this is a work in progress of the DAC in terms of identifying themes and interests of importance around the desert so that the public appreciates the variety of perspectives that the DAC brings to this and some of the issues at play here. And that might be a beginning of starting to create

some -- if you will, a work product around this California desert story.

Does that sounds of interest or at least are you willing to see what that looks like, and you can figure it out from there?

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: As long as it doesn't take a whole bunch of time, because it's going to be an action-packed time tomorrow.

MR. MARUSKA: A lot of people with a lot of energy around those issues.

Sort of to cycle back, the agenda is moving through to talk about really how to create focus, what the DAC's strategic work plan is for 2011.

The idea is between now and the break for lunch, we would essentially work through the key components of that. And then the idea would be to address the bylaws and then the election of officers when you return from lunch. So that's the basic plan. And I think in the context of that, we will be able to address -- we have already addressed the elected public officials topic that you had here. This process will come up a little bit later, and you will see in the discussion that will come in the remainder this morning how these topics of forward planning, metrics for success, and how these key issues will be

addressed along the way.

Teri, I know you wanted to highlight your thoughts about creating focus for how the DAC and BLM work together.

DIRECTOR RAML: I will talk a little bit about the process, and then we can talk about the content. Don brought this as a concept to our discussion, our internal discussion about the idea of having a theme for each meeting, kind of a selected topic. And it made -- it registered strongly with me because of some experience that I had internally.

We have our District Management team meetings and the agendas had tended to be check on this and this and this. And recently I picked themes and we blocked it out, and that's what we talked about. And it was a very -- I got lots of good feedback from my colleagues about the idea of having single focus and exploring it deeply and kind of keying in on that rather than this just scattered sort of approach.

So I was already kind of appreciating the idea of rather than hitting everything lightly, establish a theme so it lent itself to the work that we had started in terms of having the DAC identify -- our little DAC work group identify the priorities of the CDD and narrowing it down to a vital few.

If these are the topic areas, how do we want to move forward on those? So the process of focusing each meeting on a key theme seemed to be a really interesting approach and perhaps a very productive way to proceed. And I think part of it was theme -- there are so many good reasons to do this. One is it gives us -- I will speak from the BLM's perspective -- if we set these themes out far in advance, it gives us an opportunity to do the appropriate staff work rather than only thinking three months out. We can put the time and energy and effort to prepare for it and actually prepare you for it so you are not coming to a meeting and getting things two weeks before the meeting.

I think it would give us an opportunity to target our meetings in a location where these themes make sense and reach out to certain constituencies and try to lure them in with our theme, and if we do it for a couple years out, this whole story thing and the entirety of the BLM mission, if we do it far enough out in advance, we can make sure that we touch on all the topics that are a priority for CDD. So we just don't stick with one, but if the public is interested in certain aspects of it over a two-year cycle, we will hit and then cover that topic.

The last part of that, well, the other two components is with adequate prework and thoughtfulness. I think we can be -- we can guide the discussion and really identify objectives. And that's kind of a mutual process. I could be thinking about what sort of advice we are seeking on certain things and you can be thinking of what sort of advice you would like to offer.

Of course, the end of it is also important, which is after we do that is to be able to circle back around and talk about what difference did it make. How did we move anything forward on a particular theme. So that's kind of setting the stage for that. Did that cover it?

MR. MARUSKA: So the general thrust of that make sense to folks? These are actually best practices from other RACs that have been very successful. What has helped them get more traction with providing useful advice to BLM and more satisfaction about the productivity of their role, we would like to carry that over to you. Questions or comments?

MEMBER RUDNICK: Well, I think the planning process is very important to prepare ourselves as BLM DAC for certain issues. I would hate for us to lose

the flexibility to be able to react to current events and current things that are something that's just happened. With that in mind, I don't see a problem with leaving -- if you would leave some room for those kinds of current events to have in our plan and have a well-balanced roundtable of events.

DIRECTOR RAML: I should have touched on that, too, because we did talk about that. And I should have highlighted that also. It's not a matter of being rigid. This is the theme, this is what we are going to talk about, and everything else is -- whatever meeting terminology, in the parking lot or on the side board. I think we will build the agenda in such a way that the flexibility is in it and that you are invited to identify things that you want to bring forward for discussion. That could be included. If it's important to all of us, then we will be flexible enough to change. But we will be preparing along the lines of these themes.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: I can see a themed meeting would really work, especially in publicity, encouraging, say, a local media to highlight the meeting based on a theme. Especially if they highlight it a few weeks ahead of time. Has your experience with themed meetings at other RACs actually

increased public participation, which is one of the stated goals of this DAC?

MR. MARUSKA: It's improved the quality and the satisfaction of public participation because it's allowed -- it's enabled people to know there is going to be a thoughtful and in-depth discussion about this topic. And that subgroups get prepared to present.

Other agencies that BLM may work with on the topic have an incentive to come, because they are not just coming and sitting through a whole day for their 15 minutes. They are there because they are integral to that topic, so they are prepared and they have a commitment to be present. So it improves the quality of the public engagement and experience.

And also, as Teri has identified, each of the other RACs does have a time for other topics and other comments from you or from the public to come forward. So it's a balance, but there is a clear theme and there is preparation so the quality, and therefore the satisfaction of public interaction, is increased because the public feels like okay, the BLM is prepared, other agencies are prepared, the DAC and subgroups are prepared to have this discussion, and it seems really meaningful. Versus, oh, I brought up my topic and nothing happened kind of experience, which

is very frustrating for the public. Any other reflections on this?

MEMBER SALL: Yeah, I just had a thought. I think there are so many documents going on right now that the public has a chance to engage in and comment on. And I felt like the intro to NEPA, kind of 101, that Meg gave was really helpful. And I would like to see maybe something like that happen every year because I feel like the public is constantly challenged with how to engage on these documents and how to get through that process with any sort of assistance and sanity.

So I feel like maybe every December or our first meeting of the year, that that is a part of every annual meeting and that the BLM could decide if they feel more comfortable giving that presentation or a DAC member, but I feel like we should keep revisiting that and get more public attendance. So it tends to be helpful for me.

MR. MARUSKA: There are a couple of different approaches. You can have sort of "just in case" instruction to the public, which is we are telling you just in case at some point you want to get involved in a NEPA process, which would be like an annual process.

Or what really education has been more

turning to these days is "just in time." So, like okay, if you need to interact with a NEPA process, here is where you can go or here is a link from the DAC Web site to a recorded Webinar about how to participate in a NEPA process so you are not using up a whole DAC meeting to explain that process, but you are providing "just in time" knowledge and access to the information.

So there are a variety of ways to achieve your objective. And I think one of the things you need to do is think about what is the best way to do that and how to get that done and accomplished. And I think more and more with the NEPA processes, they have their whole process of how they need to engage and show up and what they need to do. And it may be the best that the DAC can do with BLM is to direct people to those processes and make sure they know about them and how to plug in versus trying to give them a partial experience of that with you, when you are not where the action is on that particular formalized part of the element.

MEMBER SALL: The only thing I would say to that is I agree it's time consuming, but I feel like we also have an audience that providing just a link on line further compounds the problem. So maybe we hold

a separate workshop day or something attached to a DAC meeting so it's not in the public meeting. But I feel like a face-to-face actual presentation reaches an audience that on-line will not.

MR. MARUSKA: You are talking about multiple learning styles. But other people might need to be walked through how that works.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: I'm following up on April's comment. I didn't think my NEPA 101 took more than ten minutes. It didn't take a lot of time, so I'm not sure if that's our biggest concern.

The other thing I was thinking about is maybe we want to include a little five-minute education thing on NEPA. So in our meetings, this is scoping, this is how it works. This is how a draft EIS works and this is how you should make comments on it, little bits and pieces, because I had to give them the whole thing which is probably overwhelming in ten minutes.

But if you go through what an EA is, one time you do ten minutes on EA. Then what an EIS is and how to go through it. I truly see it's our responsibility to educate the public on how to be a part of managing our lands.

And there are so many people even in my community that have no clue how to be an effective

part of the process. They can come and yell at us, but they are not effectively communicating their needs on what is going on. Let's give them the tools. I think it's our responsibility to give them the tools to be effective in helping BLM manage the lands. So April, great.

MEMBER BANIS: If I may make a specific suggestion. Perhaps as we discuss specific issues and proposals that are in front of the BLM, that we ask that there be a brief component within that presentation as to how to participate specifically in that issue at that time. As an example, tomorrow we will hear about the Johnson Valley expansion, and correct me if I'm wrong, but in evaluating that project, comments such as, A, we need the most robust national defense we can have, or a comment of, we can't afford the money to do this right now, those are not the substantive kinds of comments that will affect the BLM's decision on such a project.

To help essentially guide the public on a project-by-project basis briefly as to what the next step is for inserting your comments into the project.

MR. MARUSKA: These are the kinds of issues on which your comments could have traction and value.

MEMBER BANIS: And when.

MR. MARUSKA: And in what form. So that, boom, they can figure out where to go.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: It doesn't have to be time consuming.

MR. MARUSKA: So what I am hearing is some kind of combination. Maybe you have this NEPA 101, but you either do it at a shot or dole out over time. But when an issue or topic comes up and people have a lot of energy around it, direct them to the means and avenues of how to apply that instructively.

MEMBER BANIS: I made a presentation on a solar power project recently, and I explained where it was in the process. But I failed to explain how people could get involved and when it would be appropriate for them to get involved. And in retrospect, that would have been a valuable component to my presentation.

DIRECTOR RAML: I think to really do it well, I think ten minutes doesn't do it. I think it has to be a little bit longer than that. Sure, it takes ten minutes if you are against something, to tell someone to go to this document and say why. But if you really want people to understand where parts of the document are that they can apply to it, I think it takes a little bit more time.

So you are starting from a -- I'm not saying it has to be exhaustive, but I think for my goal, is I would like them -- these documents are getting so darn huge so part of it is to even say here is this document and this piece of it, even if you were just to walk them through chapter 1, it would take a little bit of time.

I would like to do it and explore ways to do it with the field offices, because I think the hard part -- tomorrow for us to try to guide the group that's here about how to influence the Marines as they are doing Twentynine Palms, I don't think the NEPA 101 will do it.

MEMBER SALL: The last comment -- I would totally agree with that. But my point in raising this is I feel it's something that continues to be an issue and a concern, so I would rather see us at least address it briefly than not address it at all and to address it briefly frequently, if we don't address it at length at some point in time.

DIRECTOR RAML: I think that's a good idea.

MEMBER HALLENBECK: I'm going to make a statement and tell me where I'm wrong. So this NEPA education is not for the DAC to understand what NEPA is. It's to tell the public here how the DAC fits

into the NEPA process or doesn't, what we are or what we aren't?

MR. MARUSKA: It's more how the public can connect and input into the NEPA processes that are happening, not necessarily that that happens through the DAC. But you are providing an informational resource to the public how that NEPA process occurs and how they can plug into that process happening elsewhere.

MEMBER HALLENBECK: I don't feel comfortable that that's our role to educate the public in NEPA. I can't sit here and say I'm giving good information. The BLM has a role in that maybe to take that on, and our advice is you need to have better --

DIRECTOR RAML: Get on it.

MEMBER HALLENBECK: Unless you see that as our role.

MR. MARUSKA: Actually, what I am compiling here are some ideas. And what I would -- these ideas, let these ideas simmer a bit, and Teri and her team are going to need to think about them a little bit and maybe there would be an opportunity to come back to these ideas.

Why don't we see how this list sort of fills out and come back to it at the end of the day. And

Teri will have a chance to reflect and Steve and the rest of the team here and sort of comment about which ones of these do you really want to sort of move forward, based on how you have heard the whole picture, because we are rolling out pieces of the picture for you to chew on. And I think that would help you reflect that.

Dick, you had a comment and then Ron.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: Perhaps somebody very familiar with this process could put together some kind of a written primer, if you will, on the NEPA education, and that could be laid on the table at one of our meetings. And somebody could then say, if you want more, as Randy likes to look at things written, somebody wants to go and pick that up, they could take that home and use it. And if the primer turned out to be very successful, it could then be maybe put on the BLM Web page and they could refer to it in our documents.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: It might already be on the Web page.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: I'm sure it is.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: Maybe a document more user friendly.

MR. MARUSKA: All right.

MEMBER JOHNSTON: That pretty much mirrors what I was going to suggest.

MR. MARUSKA: So on this fourth bullet point, provide clear reporting on how the DAC's work has made a difference or why advice could be not be applied. I know some other RACs put advice from the RAC up on the Web site, and BLM responds like the little chart, here was the date, here was the advice, here was the response from BLM, and anybody could take a look. You may chose to address it more informally, however you wish, but I think this whole idea of actually having an explicit feedback loop is valuable to you, and in turn, to the public that in fact this doesn't just all go into the ether.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: I would like to make a comment. I think it would be very helpful if there was some kind of historical references to -- at one time I asked that we have a list of motions or recommendations from the DAC and how those have been completed, if they were, or how they have been handled.

One of them, I like to bring to account that the DAC asked for consistent rules within the desert for firewood and those types of things. So the DAC asked for that. The BLM went out and provided a

committee to do that. They went through a whole bunch of hoops through Washington and everything else to get that generated, and they completed that task.

And that was something for the users and the visitors to the desert. So I think that there is success stories, and maybe that's the term you want to see. We would like to see some success stories that the DAC is not just a -- it does have some bearing and some positive results.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: I like the idea of having a place on the DAC's Web site for recommendations or comments from the DAC. Maybe based on a per-meeting kind of thing rather than a category, because unless you go back and read all of the minutes, most of the stuff that we recommend or comment on, whether it goes back and forth as positive, is lost. If you want to go back and read the minutes, fine, but there needs to be -- I think that's a very good idea that the public can go there and find out what specific recommendations. And then it's not only on the record, but it's on the very public record.

And the whole idea going back to our stated goal is to provide information, to be a sort of resource for the public to help manage our public lands, to help the BLM managers manage the public

lands. So I think something like that, which goes a little further. Once the meeting is done, unless something actually comes out of that meeting like the firewood thing, it's gone. It's gone until somebody reads it and says, oh, yeah, I read it. I don't remember a lot of it unless I go back and read it again. So that's my comment.

MEMBER ACUNA: I'm going right where you were going. It's not easy to go through the minute notes and then figure out what we said we were going to do. Most of the time it's forgotten.

For the future Chair, maybe that's what that person could do at the end of the meeting -- we call it the update -- and say, okay, what three things did we say we wanted Teri to follow through with before the next meeting? And we just agree and then we come back to the next meeting and we ask Teri, how did you do on those three things? So we don't make a big deal out of it; we don't write letters. We just say what is it that we want her to do and we check in some fashion so you can help us fashion an idea if that's something that works.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: A lot of these recommendations take a huge amount of time, and it may be into the next person's -- there may be a whole

other group of people on the DAC before the results of our motion was finished.

DIRECTOR RAML: We can authorize where on the minutes these were located.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: That's why I would like to see some historical data there.

MEMBER HALLENBECK: We are talking about a myriad of things to benefit Teri. We have a motion and we have a vote and we come to a consensus on an idea for the BLM. That's easy. But I think she is also gaining value listening to our different viewpoints. There are some we are never going to come to consensus on by design, and those are advices that she hears in her decision making but doesn't necessarily document through formal actions here. Just a statement. Is that accurate? How you appreciate what is happening around you?

DIRECTOR RAML: Yes. And thank you for saying that because I do. That's one of the things that I struggle with is I'm very much influenced by the discussion at the table. And because of the nature of just how we process information, sometimes I know I'm influenced by it because I listen, I hear, and I know that it influences my thinking and the way I express certain things. And it's hard to quantify

those.

When someone says such and so, I mean, there were some actions that we take, but that's partly my personality, too. I'm kind of the journeyer, so I picked up something on this journey and I altered my path a little bit. So part of it is not all about me. So some of these recommendations do need to be really concrete, and they need to be displayed, but I like to recognize that what's really valuable to me is the dialogue.

MR. MARUSKA: In terms of metrics for success, it isn't how many resolutions the DAC passed and how many got adopted by the BLM; there is a lot richer interaction that happens here and other dimensions that's providing useful input and advice.

DIRECTOR RAML: This exercise would be an excellent example of how I have been influenced by listening to what themes you have seen on the Desert District and how complicated and rich that story is. And that's influenced me already. And somebody remembered the GLO. It's like, hey, agency history matters to folks.

MR. MARUSKA: We are moving on here, Teri, to your discussion about the strategic work plan.

DIRECTOR RAML: So the topics that we came up

with, and it's been a combination of processes, but it certainly goes to the work group that we had is that continues to be a priority for us to talk about renewable energy. And as we have struggled with it in several meetings, I think we need to spend some time in renewable energy, and since there are so many public processes, what is the appropriate role for the DAC in the renewable energy topic.

One that's also important is the recreation opportunities, safe, quality, cost effective recreation opportunities in partnership with others. I think that will build on the work with special recreation permits, but it's a very important aspect.

User fees, that will be -- it sounds like it's a topic in motion, but I do think there is a role for the DAC in understanding user fees. And whether there is an official role associated with approval of increases in user fees or just because we have subgroups focused on the open areas that collect fees, understanding user fees and how they are collected and utilized there is certainly a role for the DAC there.

And the last one was -- so National Landscape Conservation System is really a big, important part of the Desert District story. So I think about -- I said boil it down, but in spite of the richness of the

story, renewable energy, recreation and NLCS. And a whole dialogue about what is the National Landscape Conservation System, what role it plays, recreation is a piece of it, but just the landscape system itself is important.

So kind of spending some time talking about is the Bureau doing everything we can in terms of the context and management of those important units. So that's kind of the topic areas.

MR. MARUSKA: Those are the suggested big four from Teri where she, as the Designated Federal Official, would want to get focused advice and input from the DAC in the course of the year. And the suggestion that would be to take some time on each of those four and talk about what advice she is looking for, what topics and issues she is seeking to get your comments upon, and then what would be the preparation that the BLM and the DAC and its subgroups would undertake to have a quality discussion around that. And then when and where that would be occurring.

I'm going to work with you to see if honing in on those issues and the preparation, to see if that's in alignment with how you as DAC members want to play and contribute. And if that all works for you. So that would be our approach.

So we might just roll into that and give you an idea of how that's working. And then you can come back at the end and after going through those four areas and what would be the four meetings tomorrow and other meetings. And find out what would be involved in putting them into practice and how that would work. Comments before going there?

MEMBER BANIS: Where in these major topics would route designation fit in? If I may suffix my question, I don't see route designation as being purely recreational. I see route designation as being very important to grazing interests to be able to access, and for mineral exploration, and to upkeep claims. I see it important to the scientific community to be able to do monitoring and to be able to do research. I see it as important for transportation issues for the general public. I don't think all users of the motorized route system are necessarily doing it for recreation, though it might be the 800-pound gorilla out there.

MR. MARUSKA: So what we are going to do as we go along, and sort of capture here, what are some things that you are concerned about and wanting to know where would they fit in the strategic work plan that Teri is going to lay out for you. And we will

come back and say, do they fit someplace naturally, or do they need to have additional confirmation? We will figure out where they go.

So the first one here, renewable energy. Teri, you wanted to highlight key issues for the DAC. What are the areas that you are looking for them to focus on, what your thoughts were on their preparation and what you see happening.

DIRECTOR RAML: As you see it up there on the screen, the renewable energy topic has been a challenge for us as a DAC, and I think all of us referred to it. A big part of the renewable energy program is being managed in other public processes. So we have the applications that we are processing, we have the PEIS, we have the desert renewable bill, renewable energy conservation plan. So we have all those other processes where I think that public and the DAC members have access to those public processes.

So I have struggled with this one, but where I ended up thinking it could be helpful, the advice that I would appreciate is where do I need to be spending more attention? And not I, like Teri, but where are the gaps in how we are approaching renewable energy?

And the past year one of the things that

obviously came up was recreation. And Randy played an important part of that. And the idea that the recreation opportunities, the whole recreation and importance was being neglected in our EIS process. So I think it's not so much this particular project in this landscape, but kind of based on your observations of the process and what you are watching and what we can continue to try to provide to you in other forums, what do you think we need to be paying particular attention to?

And part of it is we could certainly have that be a feedback loop. We have a pretty good read on the stuff that we need to pay attention to. But I would appreciate that continued advice from you. And if it's explanation on the linkages between these processes, it would be more a matter of that kind of advice. The thing is moving fast, as you know, those of you watching it. And we get new policy, time lines for the projects are out there, but I think that would be helpful.

MEMBER BANIS: One thing I can say is I am very grateful and very pleased to see you regularly at the DRECP stakeholder meetings. And I truly mean that. You have been there at the recent meetings, and much of this desert is managed by the BLM and it's so

wonderful to see you there as a collaborative partner in that stakeholder process. Thank you for taking the time on your schedule.

DIRECTOR RAML: Yes, it's important. I think the idea of perspective. And this may be how we weave our story and how we communicate the role of renewable energy. Maybe BLM, also from a more public perspective, I know there is a continued perspective in seeing how to guide some of this development of previously utilized land. Maybe we should have a more active role in that arena that we need to play. But those would be some of the issues or ways to provide advice.

I'm a broken record on this, the adequacies of public input opportunities. And then also how we can continue to encourage more participation. It's still amazing to me -- I don't believe -- we have left the vast majority of the public behind in renewable energy. We are talking to ourselves. And we think we know it, but in the grocery store or in the dry cleaners, if you were to ask someone what photovoltaic was, they would say, Huh? And if you say we are putting big solar plants in the desert because rooftop solar is not going to work, they would say, Huh?

So I'm really concerned about the impact of

renewable energy desert-wide, the impact of transmission and all that stuff. We are reaching such a small segment, so it's an education issue for me. The Bureau has a piece of that, but if there are some things we should be doing Web site wise or education wise.

MR. MARUSKA: Let me make a process comment here about what the DAC is attempting to deal with on this issue at the moment. The idea here is really to give and have some discussion about, is this an appropriate topic? Are these the kind of issues that would be appropriate for the DAC to be advising the DFO about? Is that preparation on target? And actually the discussion about the substance of this issue, I would suggest be occurring at 11 o'clock tomorrow when it's scheduled on the agenda.

So rather than having you dive in about the answers to these questions, it's more at the moment, are those the right issues? This is what Teri would like to get input from the DAC about. Is that on target or do you want to provide advice about some other aspects of this, and is that sort of preparation and so on appropriate so that you feel like you are engaging at the right level and the right form.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Are you sure you want to ask

that question?

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: I think to answer your question, I really think that as you said, there are so many different ways for the public to respond to the individual projects. I really think that the DAC's position, they should have some little primers on what these things are and not be so concerned about any individual project, per se.

I think that they should be giving comments about -- just as we usually have it, we have a gentleman who comes and gives us an outline of the projects that they are working on, which is very helpful. But not get into the worrying about one particular project. There is enough other public ways for people to comment on them, and maybe that's one of the things we need to make sure we explain to them. If you want to comment on X, Y, Z project, here is how you do it. Because we don't have the ability to go through and look at every one of these projects and give advice on the projects.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: I totally agree with that. What a shock.

MEMBER HALLENBECK: I agree too. I think the issues are spot on. I think the preparation has been a little off center. I think if we have the staff

look at what the issues are and rather than specific project impacts, we will be able to talk about the public process and was it effective or not and give you some advice on how you might be able to better connect with people out there and better educate them and get their input.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: If we see some hole in this educational process, that would be one of our advices to the BLM would be how to fill that particular hole, not advice on one particular project.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: I also think the project approach is counter-productive. These things are already in the works. Speaking as a citizen, not part of the DAC, I think, at least in my industry, one of the feelings that the public has for my industry, a lot of the public feel no matter what they say, these projects are going to go forward.

But I would go back to the mission of the BLM, which is based on scientific value, these projects in my opinion are not -- this is an issue I track almost every day -- are not based on sound scientific issues. I don't think that we should be using open space land for utility scale projects which deliver only 20 percent of what they say they are installed for. But I think that a lot of the public,

including me, feels that no matter what we say to the BLM, this is coming down from Washington. And no matter what we say, these projects are going to go forward.

And just to follow up with Brad's comments, in my industry, these projects would not go forward because they are not marketable. They are not standalone projects. They depend on public subsidies, public giving up access to their lands, and they are going to pay more for all of it.

So these are not viable economic enterprises. So I don't agree that we should be looking at these things unless they are on disturbed land or private lands. So it's very frustrating to comment on them when I don't think they are viable things to be commenting on. I am not here to be nice.

MR. MARUSKA: The basic thing that I'm hearing from Teri here is that if that's a viewpoint that you are -- I think you stepped out of the DAC role -- consistent with what Dick and Tom are saying, if that's your view, then the best place to posit that view is through the existing processes, although you feel that it won't change, versus the DAC trying to take on all that analysis, make that scientific assessment, come back and provide advice, which would

be very, very hard to do. You would have to spend all your meetings, plus, in the course of the year, to get there. So at the moment, the idea, is this sort of how you would like to interact?

MEMBER HALLENBECK: I would say she is in a position where she just got her point across, and Teri heard it.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: I'm on the record. This is one good thing about the DAC, we are on the record. But one of the things I would like to say, my previous comments being said, I realize that the local managers of the desert are required to do this. Whether it's scientifically viable or not, they are required. And I think in that role we can help.

But as I said, I think this is a not sustainable kind of process. At least logically, I understand where Teri needs it and if I can be helpful, I will do so. But I am philosophically opposed to these projects, so that doesn't apply very much to me because I think on their face they are not logical. Have I made myself clear?

MR. MARUSKA: Very clear. Are these the appropriate issues and is this the appropriate engagement of the DAC around this topic? And Ron, you had a comment and I think I saw April and Tom.

MEMBER JOHNSTON: Kind of a question and comment. It kind of seems as far as renewable energy -- and this has come up before -- that the public isn't fully aware of the ramifications, benefits, costs, that are involved in renewable energy projects and don't really fully understand what is going on with them. Would you say that's a consensus? Yes.

Why doesn't the DAC -- or not the DAC, but the BLM maybe on the federal level consider just doing some PR. That's something our government seemingly has fallen down and fallen short in, in the last decade especially, of informing the public. We have talk shows and public service shows sitting there all the time. Why doesn't the BLM provide a speaker's bureau to do some educational work with half-hour radio shows? I do them for community events in San Diego for fundraisers to do a new library. And I have no problem getting a forum on radio to do that.

Why doesn't BLM put some time in and set up a speaker's bureau to inform the public as to what this is all about?

MR. MARUSKA: So part of what you are actually doing, Ron, you are actually doing part of tomorrow's work today. These were the questions and

you are starting to answer the questions. You are answering question No. 1 that here is an idea you have about how to answer that question. How to get renewable energy information out there.

So we sort of have to balance here. How much you dive into this now versus talk about this and share your comments tomorrow in the half hour allocated for that. And then engage the public a bit around it and decide how you want to go forward. Other process things you have?

CHAIRMAN ACUNA: I would just like to say that those questions on the wall there, they really make the most of what I think people have illustrated is a bad situation. And the fact is, Ron, that the folks in D.C. developed a national energy policy. They said this was going to be good.

And even though we disagree with it, the best we can do is continue to advise the BLM, I think, especially in light of what has happened in Japan, the nuclear industry. I don't think they are going to go away. So I think they were good questions and they will help Teri and the BLM.

MEMBER SALL: First of all, I guess, I will just start with saying I agree with everything said on this topic so far. But I guess it goes back partly to

the assumptions that have been made by BLM about this program and about this objective. And I don't know if it's appropriate to ask this question, but is there a way to challenge and/or change some of those assumptions? And is that our role through the BLM Desert District, I guess? And part of why I ask that is you bring up the disturbed land component, Teri.

Is there a way to check in on that process, because from my perspective, part of why this is so frustrating for all of us is because there are other viable alternatives for renewable energy, not only in the technology, but in the sites themselves.

So I feel like we are really missing the mark if we look back in five or ten years and there is just hundreds of thousands of acres that were developed with poor technology, and we just go, Oops, oh well.

So I guess can we continue to check in on that process in some way that is appropriate? So I will just leave that. But I feel like as a DAC, we are really missing the opportunity not only to engage in the issue, but to engage the public in the issue if we are just saying this is the set of the assumptions and criteria that we are starting with and are going to accept with 1,000 megawatts or whatever in this particular boundary, for example.

And I guess just quickly speaking to the questions, one thing I will say on Question No. 1 is yes, we have had a briefing, but I, for one -- and I'm involved in the process -- but I'm still not clear how the BLM is going to accept the recommendations or the preferred alternative in both processes and allocate that onto the landscape.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: She can sit up and say that five times. It was the most confusing thing on earth, and I understand that stuff.

DIRECTOR RAML: I will answer real quick. What will happen with the DRECP is it will become a planning process for the California Desert Conservation Plan. So we will end up with that dialogue. It will become a public process, and it's murky right now. And the PEIS -- I think there is going to be a tremendous influence on the PEIS by California CEC. So I think there will be some merging of that sort of stuff.

I think there is going to be very strong feedback from California, the state of California and counties. So I think part of that will be that education part that we need to continue to bring forward and kind of share information at each meeting or a piece of it.

MR. MARUSKA: So I think the other part I heard in discussion with Teri is that, then, how does the DAC working with BLM go forward on this topic? And I think if I heard you correctly -- and correct me if it's off from your intention, Teri -- was that it would be in the format of giving you and the public updates about the processes that are underway, the opportunities to input things that are going on in those processes. And that would be maybe kind of a standing item that would occur at your scheduled DAC meetings.

And that given that those processes all have their own schedule and dynamic, processes and scoping meetings and public comment meetings, et cetera, that it seemed like it made sense at this juncture to thank the DAC members who had gone forward and gotten information about projects and come back and shared it, but not to create like a special subgroup on this topic because that subgroup couldn't shape and keep up with this process and do more than that.

So the idea, I think, here is to test and to give Teri feedback, is her sense of that on target with you and does that feel okay on this issue, recognizing that it is an important issue to you and to people who care about the desert. And there are

limitations on what can get done in this process, given that there are many other processes? Is that a fair depiction?

DIRECTOR RAML: Yes.

MR. MARUSKA: Is that on target for you folks? So relative to the action item for tomorrow, what I was hearing from Teri is the action item on renewable energy on your agenda would be to have the DFO and her staff continue to provide updates to the DAC and opportunities in identifying and alerting the public for opportunities to participate in those ongoing processes. I'm doing a temperature check.

MEMBER HALLENBECK: I would like to request sort of a self-assessment of the BLM on how they are meeting the test of public participation on these projects. There is a legally mandated component that they can check the boxes, but they have heard from us all that more is required. And then rather than report on the nuts and bolts of the project and what the schedule is, what is the self-assessment that the Bureau has of how they have educated and received input. I'm making this up as I go along.

Give us a starting point on how they have achieved some of the things that we are asking them to do. Maybe starting with we have had five public

meetings and 500 people attended. But some indication of where they are on this.

DIRECTOR RAML: Yeah.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: It may be helpful if in this educational process, what are some of the parameters that the BLM uses when they look at one of these things? Not just yeah, you could probably go through the whole document, but from a layman's point of view, what are the important aspects that they look at that? Do they look at the viability of the project from a technological standpoint, economical standpoint, as to the amount? Number of acres that are going to be taken from public use? And are those some parameters that they look at within their assessment?

Rather than getting into the details of that, if we could have that periodically as part of the update. I mean, we get into these, like DRECP. I don't know what that means, let alone know what it's going to do. But from a public standpoint, what is the BLM really looking at, very simply, if that could be done.

DIRECTOR RAML: It's probably worth -- one of the things that I -- we could share, too, is the new instruction memorandum and the derivation of those --

the potential difference they have to make in the application process, which is really a significant change in terms of our preapplication process.

That's one of those things I think people who have been engaged in providing advice to the Bureau need to declare some victory on. The reason we are doing that has to do with providing up-front opportunities to provide input to BLM and the operator on optical thermal search, so those are the sort of the things that we can try to continue to bring to the table and discuss.

MR. MARUSKA: Is there a rough consensus on this approach that Teri has outlined how the DAC would engage around this topic? So then just to illustrate, while we are on this, but after you hear the rest of these, you can sort of assess -- this is kind of like with the renewable energy being a theme for tomorrow's meeting, we are kind of turning this process around for a strategic work plan into a reality tomorrow.

So what I would propose, if this serves you, Teri, as the DFO and the DAC, we can highlight that these are the issues, these are the things that the DAC has done thus far or BLM is doing and just to help tee up the discussion for tomorrow, I could summarize, here were some ideas and concerns and opportunities

that the DAC identified in this discussion today. And then, Teri, you might speak to if, when, and how you can respond to those? Would that make sense as a way to have this discussion? And then the public can weigh in, and this is how we intend to move forward. Is that tracking? All right.

So, Teri, you want to tee up the next one here?

DIRECTOR RAML: Recreation. So -- and this was -- again, this is our brain forming thought. We felt that this was -- that there would be some pretty meaty, I guess, things that -- advice we could get from the DAC in terms of recreation. And really, it was talking about assisting us in increasing the use of volunteers and how to expand our partnerships.

So part of it is -- starting with No. 1, recreation is a very broad topic for the Desert District, and it ranges from solitary hiking all the way to competitive motorized sports. So rather than tackle it that way, what we were thinking about is recreation delivery and some of the challenges and opportunities we have in terms of safety, quality. And then when it comes to part of the -- particularly the recreation event process, the cost effectiveness of the work we are doing.

And one of the ways for us -- and this really does spring out of the event promoters -- is opportunities to use partnerships and volunteers. This is not a high priority for funding, internal funding, so how can we continue to meet the recreation demands and do a good job of it. Maybe we need to be more creative on volunteers and partnerships. Maybe there is a lot more we should do. So that's just a whole arena that we can look at.

And the other thing is to make sure that -- I said the spectrum was from here to there. Do we actually reflect that in how we communicate about recreation opportunities, and are there some things that we should be paying more attention to than we are? So are we not highlighting the opportunities for nonmotorized recreation? So that sort of dialogue. So preparation for that.

We will talk more about that a little bit later, but this SRP ad hoc group is a phase. So we are going to do a lot of the work on that this afternoon and get a report from them and transition. The other is -- I think this is a way to kind of incorporate the work of the subgroups, subcommittees.

MR. MARUSKA: Subgroups.

DIRECTOR RAML: So right now we have the

subgroups, but I don't think we have made -- I will speak for myself because I think there is a long history -- so I will speak for my snapshot in time. I haven't really done a good job of understanding the work of the subgroups, and I know they were effective at their level. But how do we make that part of the DAC work and make sure that we are all informed about it and how do we capitalize on it and incorporate in the work of the committee.

And then we will just continue to work on the SRP task force. That continues to be a focus for us. And I think we will learn this afternoon and tomorrow, I had a vision that there was -- I misjudged a little bit the story on the SRP task group and our approach to special recreation events. I thought we had an unfortunate accident, we learned some things. We thought we would learn what it was, but we are continuing to learn.

So there is additional work needed in that whole arena. I don't like surprises, and I continue to be surprised. Let's put it this way: If I don't like to be surprised, I can't even imagine being a participant in that activity or trying to promote or organize that activity. We are the administrators of that activity and we were surprised at nuances that we

didn't understand or things that came up, so I can't even imagine the people that were trying to make a living doing it or those trying to plan their vacations around it. So that's a whole arena of how we can increase our communication to be more effective.

And the perfect location for this thematic meeting would be -- San Diego would be a good place to do it. A lot of folks that recreate in the desert come out of that location, so we could have the discussion there.

MR. MARUSKA: One of the implications from the proposal that Teri has before you is that actually the ISDRA, Dumont Dunes and El Mirage subgroups would be tasked and asked before that meeting to be providing input where they see potential for better use of volunteers and creation of partnerships. And they would be asked to provide that as one of their tasks of those groups to be reporting back to the DAC to help carry forward this theme.

So that's the idea here of linking in specific requests that ripple down to subgroups to help the DAC get its job done here. So question for you here is, Does that seem like appropriate issues? Do people see this as being a good part of the

strategic work plan for 2011?

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: I don't know if we are going to get into the review of the committee role.

MR. MARUSKA: Yeah, we are in the afternoon. You have very thoughtful suggestions about that which we will get into in some significant detail. Wait until then.

DIRECTOR RAML: User fees. We won't delve too deeply in that because it's a changing role. We have a preliminary part of it. But certainly I do think it's an area rich for discussion, so what we would be looking about is what is working and what needs improvement for the fee policies.

MR. RAZO: Number D might be of some interest.

DIRECTOR RAML: No matter what the outcome of the -- we can close on this later. No matter what the outcome of R-RAC, I still think there could be a role for discussion on the DAC of user fees. What feedback do you have about our current fee schedules? We would not spend as much time on that, but certainly the elements of just the fee collection program, how they are used, that sort of stuff.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: I think there has to be feedback from the Desert Advisory Council just from

the standpoint, before it goes to the R-RAC, there is a certain requirement for the communication. And I hate to see that public communication come from the Sacramento office. It seems more logical for that public communication to come from the subgroup and the local area and to come through the Desert Advisory Council for fees in their particular area.

DIRECTOR RAML: As those of you that are closely involved in it know, it is significant. Everything about fee collection is significant. How we do it, what we do with the money. And particularly in any kind of type of static or declining budget, how we use those dollars. So it's an important topic.

MR. MARUSKA: Part of what I heard from Teri and the staff was in the sequencing of this, the idea of having the discussion about volunteers and partnerships occurring and the potential for that -- to use that even more. But having that discussion in June before you have the discussion about user fees at the September DAC meeting would give an opportunity to see how much can be picked up from volunteers and from partnerships in helping this whole thing work. And to what degree can that void or forestall changes in user fees in order to keep the quality and safety of the experience at an appropriate level. So how to

sequence these so they would make some sense on how the DAC is learning and how it's building its understanding of these recreational and fee issues.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: The fees, we are talking about recreational use?

DIRECTOR RAML: Just the ones associated with recreation.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Does that include camping?

MEMBER BANIS: Afton Canyon has six dollars a night.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Sawtooth doesn't have one.

MEMBER BANIS: I don't believe so, because it didn't go through the R-RAC.

DIRECTOR RAML: It's past my knowledge. I haven't had to get involved in the fee program yet, other than the Special Recreation Permit fee.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: The virtues of a variety of experience.

MR. MARUSKA: So again, this work plan would have implications in terms of those subgroups would be needing to do some work in advance of this September time so you would have something to be sharing with BLM and with DAC for that meeting. So just trying to begin, sort of the connect-the-dots here of what people would be working on.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: One of the issues is a time frame issue as far as the R-RAC and other things. As far as public comment period and things like that required by the law, there are certain time constraints that are in there. So --

MR. MARUSKA: You are giving some advice and input, so check on required notice and information steps re fees.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: Public notices are required.

MEMBER BANIS: Dick, do you Chair ISDRA subgroup?

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: Yes.

MEMBER BANIS: I don't Chair the Dumont subgroup, never have. The reporting for the subgroups through the DAC is done from the Chair of that subgroup through to the Chair of the DAC. And we have a structure for the subgroups that there is to be a DAC representative on each of those subgroups. And I just want to point out that that can create a little of a disconnect as to responsibilities for reporting. And that might need to be clarified.

MR. MARUSKA: I don't know if you notice -- and Steve, help me out if I misinterpreted this. I noticed in the bylaws that you put forward that the

role of the Chair of the DAC, with the concurrence of the DFO, in the establishment of who is, in fact, the Chair for the subgroups. So that gives an opportunity for the DAC itself to be more direct or directive about the leadership of those subgroups and the fact that the subgroups work to serve the DAC, which they have to under FACA. They can't just be spinning out as their own entities.

So that means, and in fact we will come back to this this afternoon, about how are the subgroups working and communicating with the DAC. You may want to address that issue of, okay, do we have a linkage question? Do you have a linkage question with the DAC, and is there something you want to do, given that the DAC has the prerogative about the identification of the chairs of the groups?

MEMBER BANIS: I'm under a different understanding of what was just stated. It's my understanding that subgroups elect their own chairperson, but subcommittees of the DAC have their chairperson appointed by the DAC's chairman. And I'm not saying that my understanding is correct or not, but it's something I think we should resolve and make sure we all understand at some point.

MR. MARUSKA: We have an agenda item where

Steve is going to come up and give you all the nits and grits of the bylaws, and let's dive in there where he can do a more complete job.

MEMBER BANIS: I like grits.

MR. RAZO: With butter and salt.

MEMBER BANIS: Yes, and maple syrup.

MR. MARUSKA: Does this look like a good, reasonable and appropriate element in the strategic work plan?

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: Are we going to at this meeting, to answer one of Dinah's question -- are we going to specify a date for the September meeting?

DIRECTOR RAML: Yes.

MR. MARUSKA: So this is the fourth proposed meeting for the DAC.

DIRECTOR RAML: Talking about the National Landscape Conservation System. And I would like to spend time focusing on it and the importance of all those landscape units in the California desert and talk about them and then kind of check in with the DAC and see what you think. Are we doing a good job of communicating their role? Are we highlighting their value significantly? What could we be doing there? And then -- so a lot of it is about familiarity and communication.

I'm open to other things. I think we can continue to talk about it, but even just the wilderness component. For example, we have more wilderness in the Needles field office than the rest of the Bureau. So the role of NLCS units in the Desert District is huge. And do we do enough to communicate that, and what should we be doing?

And then Steve should be excited about that because every time we talked about where the meetings are, this would be an opportunity for us to go to Palos Verdes peninsula for our November/December meeting, which would be nice because it's a diversity of the landscape, and it would be a good time to take advantage of the BLM's mission out there on the coast.

MR. MARUSKA: This would be an opportunity to round out the picture of the California desert and other dimensions that might not have been getting as much attention in the prior sessions.

DIRECTOR RAML: Yes, definitely.

MR. MARUSKA: Do those issues and that preparation look appropriate? Some of you that are involved in some of the other dimensions of the California desert landscape that may not have been the focal points of renewable energy or of recreation or the fees issues would certainly have an opportunity to

identify and provide information or reports of other things that you think would be helpful to the DAC and to the public at a session like that.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Can I ask a quick question? I confess -- and I think that everybody knows -- that landscapes really aren't as critical to my philosophy of multiple use. So my question is, How does the other multiple uses of BLM lands work into the NLCS units? How does that work in? Do the NLCS units allow other uses?

DIRECTOR RAML: It depends on the unit. And so --

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Does it depend on the biology of the unit or the geology of the unit?

DIRECTOR RAML: It depends on the structure of the unit (unintelligible). That's the nice part of it. These landscape units, they range from wild and scenic rivers to wilderness to national scenic trails. So they are in and of themselves national monuments, so we have different pieces of the landscape system.

So that would be one of the things that would be fun to talk about is -- I'm not as familiar as I should be of all the ones in the CDD, but we can talk about how existing uses continue to be allowed in, depending on unit, wilderness. So not a short answer,

and I'm botching it.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: When you use the word "conservation," are we looking at conserving recreation areas as well as geology areas, or is it only a wilderness-type thing?

DIRECTOR RAML: No, because we have trails, Pacific Trail. What are the messages that we need to do to better communicate? My lack of being really crisp and articulate is the issue, and the other is what is known and unknown about these. I have until December to get schooled.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: If I can follow up with a question. Since the NLC units -- so the NLC system which is comprised of these NLC units are often comprised of various other units, for lack of a word, like monuments or trials, wilderness areas, so actually, it's sort of another level of management on top of all these other managed things like monuments or the parks?

DIRECTOR RAML: National monuments.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: So it's another level of management on top of all these other things? The system is comprised of all these other things?

MR. MARUSKA: It sounds like that's a good question for that discussion.

DIRECTOR RAML: The management descriptions are developed through law, policy, planning regulations, and it varies from unit to unit depending on the type of unit it is and depending on what was in the enabling -- and sometimes they were created differently, too. They are fascinating.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: It sounds complicated.

DIRECTOR RAML: It is. The concepts are more complicated than, let's talk about this wilderness area or this national monument or this wild and scenic river. When you get to talk about the units, it's a nice, clean story. But that's one of the challenges we have with this topic: What does this mean?

MR. MARUSKA: So what you have been doing here is something that would be very helpful for Teri and the BLM staff is you are highlighting what are some of the questions and concerns and things that you would like to have raised and addressed so they can prepare and have answers for that. They can inform you and you can inform others of what you learned. Okay. So that's this topic.

So we are going to wrap up this section here with some discussion about, okay, how do you put this plan into action? So the suggestion to you is that if this meets with your approval is that Teri would put

this strategic work plan forward tomorrow with a brief presentation for the public's benefit of these thematic areas and what you are going to address and how you are going to do it.

And then that you would organize the DAC meetings to receive updates from BLM, theme issues, and preparation for the next meeting and gain input from the DAC and public about other concerns. That's what you were raising earlier, Richard. When you have these meetings, can you be sure to have space for other things that need to come up and might need to be prioritized. So that would be a basic plan of how to put this strategic work plan into practice. Sound on track? Thoughts, ideas, suggestions to help us be more successful, or works for you?

MEMBER HALLENBECK: Where does the advice come in? Is it at the last bullet?

MR. MARUSKA: The advice is really on the selected themes and key issues. The advice could even come on an input about other topics that aren't the theme for the day: Hey, BLM, please give more attention to X because it just popped up as a big issue. Or please provide information about Y, because people are concerned about Y and want to have more information about that topic. So your advice function

works across.

MEMBER HALLENBECK: What does our advice look like? A resolution? An informal discussion that she takes back with her?

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: It can take the form of a motion?

MEMBER HALLENBECK: Do you have a preferred?

DIRECTOR RAML: I haven't thought that far into it yet.

MR. MARUSKA: My experience with the RACs elsewhere is that, you know, you weren't elected by anybody to play this role, except Brad was elected, but he was elected in a different context. So you are not really a legislative body. So spending a lot of time doing motions and having nine to six votes on something doesn't really help the BLM a lot because nine people think this way. We knew that before we started.

Where you really provide value is in helping to figure out, okay, how do you seek to reconcile or find win-win solutions across these different stakeholder groups? And when you have something that you feel like you have really crafted very, very thoughtfully and carefully, I think that would really lend itself to a motion because then you are saying we

really thought this through and are highlighting that this is significant enough to make a motion and put that forward.

So that's certainly a formal version of advice. But the other forms of advice are the kinds of advice you are giving here. Here are ideas about reaching out to the public or here are other thoughts about how to do things.

Teri, you may want to think about when the advice is more informal, how do you want to get back to them? The notes and results of the session could highlight that the DAC provided -- had discussion about renewable energy and provided a series of ideas and suggestions about possible approaches that BLM might take to quantify and enhance its public outreach efforts.

She could come back and she could say, I heard you last time talking about that, and here is what we can do to address that topic and respond. It's not a formal motion. It's not saying NEPA education has to happen in some precise way that you are dictating that by a motion in terms of your advice, but you are highlighting that topic and the ideas you have offered, and she is going to come back and say, Here is what we are doing on that.

Does that sound like that would be workable enough so you can have some hard areas of formal areas of advice that you developed through very thoughtful deliberation and expansive review? Maybe that might happen around advice about fee issues if the DAC has a formal role in fee issues. But otherwise, that sort of softer context like, Here is a topical area. We provided ideas, BLM. Let us know what happened with that input.

DIRECTOR RAML: One of the forms that it could take is endorsing best management practices. If I am thinking ahead a little bit, like the recreation meeting, one of the ways we will talk about stuff is like what are our successes. So if you hear something, particularly if you have experiences in the subcommittees or with the field office and you are, like, when I think of this topic of volunteers, I'm familiar with how this person does that at this location, and I think that's a concept that should be endorsed. So then we capture that as a best management practice and we send it to the field managers and they look at it and kind of come back with, that was a great idea. We took a closer look at what they were doing at the National Monument and we moved it on.

So I think that's one of the things that would be really helpful because how we will talk about this stuff is probably with examples. Because otherwise, this will be philosophical and more tedious than we are going to be interested in. So part of it is bringing people forward saying this is what we do in this arena and building upon it. That's a big term for BLM. We love "best management practices." We communicate them all across the Bureau.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: As far as the documentation from these meetings, rather than -- if there was a way -- and I don't know how you guys would go about doing it -- but put some of these ideas where there was a topic and we had some suggestions or ideas, if somehow those could be put in as an addendum or something to the minutes. When I go through and read these minutes, we have pages and pages and pages of minutes. You are trying to find something to go through there and for the public to try to find, what was the results of this DAC group's two-day meetings, unless you are really looking for something special, it's a chore.

MR. MARUSKA: That's where actually the best practises of other RACs are to, in fact, have the staff jot down the topic and the key advice as you see

it and you see if they got it accurately. And then that becomes the summary of the session. And then you have a chance to see exactly what it is, if it's what you thought. And they actually create that summary on the spot. And then you know exactly what it is and they are able to post it to the Web site immediately.

And in fact, this RAC is the only one that I know of that has a court reporter. So this is really the exception, and frankly, from my experience with the DAC, it came out of an old litigious history of the DAC that is past and gone.

MEMBER BANIS: We are the most important one.

MR. MARUSKA: You are special. Yeah, but I think having some way, whether you continue to have the court reporter minutes, documented in that way or not, but having some way that you've got any formal motions or any list of key topics and ideas offered so that then, just like you came up with a whole bunch of ideas that I jotted down here that you had about renewable energy, Teri is going to come back and say these are ideas that I could implement and these are ideas that I couldn't and here is where we are.

MEMBER HALLENBECK: It helps BLM from the standpoint -- helps them to show that this group was useful. If we give a list of ideas and we see some of

those ideas implemented, then that's part of this thing, how do we feel about spending our time and effort on this, to actually see some of those ideas. And the public can see these people went there, they gave ideas, and they were implemented.

DIRECTOR RAML: Yeah, I totally agree.

MEMBER BANIS: Is it appropriate or possible for the DAC to participate directly in the NEPA process for something? For example -- and I like examples -- the solar PEIS is currently within the public comment period. Would it be appropriate for the DAC to say that the analysis on the effects on widgets was incomplete and we recommend that it go back for further analysis? Or are we best left up to doing so as individuals or through our constituencies?

MR. MARUSKA: I think on that question it really goes back to your charter. And your charter is to provide advice to the Designated Federal Official. So the charter does not charter you to develop legislative positions that you advocate as the DAC to other public processes than the Designated Federal Official him- or herself.

But that in no way constrains any of you individually from putting forward your own views and roles in that regard. My experience is that when RACs

have attempted to sort of go off into that other area, they quickly get bogged down because they have multiple perspectives, can't really reach consensus, have trouble meeting what are the time schedules that were required for those other things. And it doesn't work at a practical level and doesn't fit with the charter. So whether you take it one way or the other, it doesn't work.

MEMBER SALL: Could I ask a follow-up question on that? I guess just in this case using your example, because the PEIS is California and further, the California Desert District; right? Or is it further than that?

DIRECTOR RAML: California's are just in the desert.

MEMBER SALL: I was just wondering if because it's that particular, that changes it at all, is all I'm saying. Because by their nature, they are our responsibility of lands, I guess. They affect the lands that we have been elected to sit on the DAC for.

DIRECTOR RAML: We will see if Steve has a particular read for this one now. In other advisory councils and committees, you can write a letter to me about a document that's open for public comment. You can do that. The DAC can do that. And more, it

speaks to Don's point in that it can take a lot of time for you to do that. So that's kind of -- that's the issue to grapple with.

And I think the other thing, too, the relationship you have as individuals when you are participating in public processes and that sort of stuff, I am really interested in your observation. You can write me a letter as an individual if you attended a meeting or something. I'm not talking about this kind of like -- it's public information. But you can -- you know, April Sall, DAC member, I attended the public meeting. And if you want to make a comment about that, I will repeat that as a member of the Advisory Council that expresses his personal opinion. If you want it to carry the weight of the group, then that's that time issue.

You have that avenue of access to provide the information that highlights your observations or your feedback or your input, and it matters because I know that you have taken on this role to provide advice and that you are taking -- and that you have the advantage of being really interested in what we are doing, learning about what we are doing, and you put extra energy into it.

Any letter that I get that way, it doesn't go

into the Bureau official file and end up in scoping. So it's kind of that kind of call. I think it more speaks to Don's point, if you want to speak as a DAC and you want to put it in the letter, then there is an implication to reach consensus, which is hard to find. If it's procedural, it's pretty hard to find a consensus.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: You almost need a majority and minority opinion.

DIRECTOR RAML: In Arizona, there was a land use subcommittee, and they would be briefed on our plans and they would comment on them. And they would put that extra effort into forming almost a consensus document that commented on the resource management planning processes. These folks were retired. Couple of them retired BLMers.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: Can you explain to us if it was a subcommittee or subgroup? I don't care about the name. I want to know how it functioned.

DIRECTOR RAML: It was members of the committee itself.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: So it was members of just what would be us. And explain how it functioned in giving you advice.

DIRECTOR RAML: The meetings, the structure

that we did have here, the Arizona RAC did it that way every time. They weren't field-going folk. They were in the office -- it was a state-wide RAC. So what they would do, they had subcommittee structures and they would meet the day before the meeting. The subcommittees would meet the day before the meeting and the field offices would come in and present a briefing to the subcommittee. And they would deliberate on it, craft a letter, and send it to the State Director.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: I love this.

DIRECTOR RAML: Oh, no. Don.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: I didn't ask the proper question, obviously, at our meeting a couple weeks ago. So does that letter that this land use committee worked on then go before the bigger DAC?

DIRECTOR RAML: Yes.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: Explain how that process went.

DIRECTOR RAML: They did it off line. So basically there would be a subcommittee; they would listen to the briefing; they would formulate their thoughts. And next day at the public meeting, they would report out to the rest of the Advisory Council. They would reach agreement; then they would draft the

letter, send it around to each other. They put some pretty heavy legwork into it and reach agreement on the wording of the letter, and then deliver it.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: Did they comment on project level ideas? Or larger, over-arching --

DIRECTOR RAML: Land use planning.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: So PEIS.

DIRECTOR RAML: That's right. It would be like a review letter. So it would start out: We commend the Bureau for doing the following. Of particular interest to us is the following. Particular attention should be continued to be paid to the following. That's the form it would take. So it wasn't necessarily, You should make the following decision. It was more framed in the "good work."

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Continue to look at something else.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: They still got -- you understood what was a priority to them and what maybe was lacking in those planning processes and what they would like more attention to. So it's a fine line --

DIRECTOR RAML: And the way Arizona was -- why they paid special attention in Arizona was because Arizona has seven National Monuments. So what that land use committee was formed around was the fact that

they were required to develop resource plans for the NCLS units. They were looking for sort of a -- and remember, this was statewide, so they were also providing advice to the State Director about consistency of planning approach across the state. So the subcommittee would hear what a particular area was doing. So they were also doing a little bit of a broad scope.

MR. MARUSKA: So what you are hearing from Teri -- and there is some change happening, where there aren't -- like in Arizona, they only had a statewide RAC. They didn't have any more area-specific RACs. And those statewide RACs have a different charter because they have a different set of things they are looking at and responsible for dealing with and different tasks they have to take on to fulfill this role.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: This would be very helpful if the CDPA of 2011 comes to fruition and gets passed, because we are going to have a very unique monument where there is going to be a huge amount of OHV recreation in a monument. And I'm not sure that has ever happened. So having us keep our pulse on that resource management, whatever the hell it is --

DIRECTOR RAML: Then Don can help us make

sure we all get to lunch before we faint.

I think one of the things that comes forward on these proposals often is the creation of an Advisory Committee. So they are considered valuable. So the other thing that would come forward is this particular Advisory Council could try to position itself as proposing to play that role. So there are lots of things down that road you could think about because then -- so we have one right now for the National Monuments, an Advisory Council. So if that legislation were to pass, would the Desert District have three? Or how would we -- and then all these subcommittees, so that would be a whole -- then it would be an interesting deliberation for all this group.

MR. MARUSKA: All this is beyond the 2011 strategic work plan.

So where we are here is, if you are looking at your agenda, we didn't get to the revision of the bylaws. We will hit that right after lunch. And as required of all public meetings, there is a provision for public comment. I don't know if we have anyone from the public wishing to make a comment at this stage.

MR. BATES: Later.

MR. MARUSKA: Okay. So then, Steve, what is the plan from here?

MR. RAZO: We have an option for lunch, if you'd like. There is the Steer and Stein just right down the road. It's close. They got everything -- burgers, pasta, salads, soup, and it's close. They don't serve lunch here.

This evening there is dinner served here, and Teri would like the opportunity for us to maybe have a little social. As you know, there is a little bar there. And they have appetizers and dinner. And we have a copy of that menu here. We could all hang out and socialize and then whoever wants to sit and have dinner could do so.

DIRECTOR RAML: Knowing that our group tends to be a mix of extroverts, after a day like this, if we could close -- and this is always voluntary -- the idea is to sit together for a little bit, have a drink, and I have seen enough of you folks to know that for some of you, see you tomorrow; and other folks, let's continue this discussion or let's break off into groups because it will be a nice day, hopefully, relax, and then split.

(Lunch recess taken from 12:06 p.m. to 1:44 p.m.)

MR. MARUSKA: Just a little update on where

we are. We are picking up on the bylaws, revision of the bylaws. It was a topic for the morning. Then there will be the election of Chair and Vice Chair for 2011, and then review of the existing subgroups and their roles in 2011: Dumont Dunes, ISDRA and El Mirage. So we have Margaret joining us, and Roxie is going to be here for that discussion.

And then a review of your existing ad hoc subcommittees on renewable energy and recreational permits and formation of the Special Recreation Permit subgroup, and close with some discussion on your part about what you think some of the key factors for success will be in having this program move forward.

So that's our program for this afternoon. We we are a little bit behind the program schedule, but I think with focus and attention, we can get there and get there by 5:00.

DIRECTOR RAML: We will introduce Becky. She is the Deputy District Manager of Operations, so she will be here -- she is here of particular assistance when we get to the Special Recreation Permit part.

MR. MARUSKA: Steve.

MR. RAZO: In your package you should have several copies of the bylaws. Some have yellow highlighted areas, and I will explain. Look at the

top right, the dates. You will see an adopted 3-21-2009. That was the last time this group looked at the bylaws. And at that time the way these were put forth were pretty much in concert with the charter.

As I explained earlier today, the charters are going through some revision, and in fact, ours is not done yet. So I have made changes anyway, which would be both the 3-25 -- you have a 3-25 copy with some yellow on that as well as the current -- I don't think there are any markings on it -- a full copy of 3-25-2011 bylaws.

What I will do is explain what I removed from the '09, and that's what is highlighted on the '09 in the second paragraph on page 1. Those particular references are really not relevant at this point, so I took them out, especially the reference to technical review team. Those, of course, have been redone as subgroups or as other things and didn't need to have that language there to confuse.

On page 2, you will notice that Section 2, subgroups, that's highlighted only to show that that particular subject was probably the most thorough of redones, which we will look at in the 3-25-2011 version. The rest of it is really good; we are okay

with it.

Important thing to know is that these bylaws are local bylaws. You do have the flexibility to amend, revise or whatever. The Washington office was considering this past week also taking possession of the bylaws of the various RACs. But apparently that's not going to happen. The bylaws are still ours to operate under as long as, of course, they are appropriate to the policies and procedures that we operate under FACA.

If you go to the copy that's got -- it's a one-pager, 3-25-11 is the date, all we needed to look at really was my removal -- I'm sorry. In the second paragraph where it states, "Council members may serve concurrently on council subcommittees, subgroups, technical review teams" -- technical review teams should not be there. TRTs are only federal employees and/or contracted specialists that might come in to become a part of a TRT. A TRT is a specific subject, specific project, or specific issue that the BLM will look into and then come back and give you the results of that.

Now, we turn the page over to page 2. You will see what I did was I separated out subcommittees, subgroups, and technical review teams because, again,

we have gone back and forth. Is it a subcommittee or subgroup? I think the answer is really pretty simple. The charter only references subcommittee because pretty much the norm is across the rest of the RACs in the country, they only go as far as the subcommittee. You guys are so special, you come up with a new category that you like to take advantage of called a subgroup because you like to bring in outside entities as part of your discussion groups. And the only way we can do that is to create the subgroup and have a process for the subgroup.

So I put in on letter A, subcommittee. What is there in yellow is what is in your charter. That's how the charter references subcommittee. It's right there.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: You lost me now.

MR. RAZO: You are on the wrong --
subcommittees will be made of just you.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Restricted to current DAC members.

MR. RAZO: Right. For instance, your ad hoc renewable really was a committee. You chose to participate at your own direction, how you were going to do that. You didn't have any outside people part of that, and you certainly spoke with outsiders,

whatever, but the bottom line is it was made up of you. That's a subcommittee.

Now, so I put that in there to distinguish subcommittee from subgroup. Subgroup, then, is letter B. And there now it becomes a little bit more -- yes.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: I could be totally wrong because you know that happens all the time. But it doesn't specify here that subcommittees are only DAC members.

MR. RAZO: That's an interpretation that's consistent across the board.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: If it's committee terminology, that implies DAC members only.

CHAIRMAN ACUNA: Can you add that?

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Just as clarification.

MR. RAZO: Yes, we can.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: I wasn't the only dumb one.

MEMBER RUDNICK: Dinah is dumb, too?

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Thank you, Meg.

CHAIRMAN ACUNA: On the previous page where it says technical review teams, you might as well say BLM employees only, something like that. Whatever words you want to use.

MR. MARUSKA: They can be other than BLM

employees.

MR. RAZO: Federal employees/contractors.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: On the first page we are taking off TRT.

MEMBER RUDNICK: Is that interpretation of a TRT bureau-wide?

MR. RAZO: That is the definition of the technical review team according to policy.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: It also includes consultants?

MR. RAZO: Right.

Now, back to subgroups, letter B, you see it's a lot more of a formal process because you are involving outside individuals. In this case, later on this afternoon you might be forming a new subgroup. Well, as part of that process is that there will be a nomination process on who would be on that subgroup. You will decide, okay, we are going to have a subgroup. Some of you will volunteer to be on that subgroup if you want to. And then you might have outside individuals who you feel would be beneficial to bring in input to that subgroup.

Because you are involving the public, we have to have a public process; that would be nominations. We would put out a press release announcing the

formation of the subgroup, No. 2, call for nominations for anyone who might be interested in being part of it. We have a time frame for those nominations to come in. You as the Council will look at those and decide who will be on that subgroup and then formalize it and create a chairman of that group.

MEMBER HALLENBECK: On the second paragraph you start using the word "committees" and "committee Chair" versus "council." Is that --

MR. RAZO: I'm glad you brought that up. And to be honest, I left that in there because I knew you would ask. And it was a reminder for me. There also was a question, while the charter is being redone in Washington, why is this not called the Desert Advisory Committee. Because that's what FLPMA calls you. Within 60 days of this act, the Secretary will create California Desert Advisory Committee. But the feeling is we have never -- because we have never called it a committee, it's always been a council. I wanted a distinction. Let's do it now. Shall we change it back to committee or can we continue to call it council? The opinion of the state office is leave it as a council, it doesn't matter.

MEMBER RUDNICK: I agree.

MR. RAZO: So if that's okay with you, you

will continue to be the Desert Advisory Council and not the committee. One thing to consider, the way things are in Washington and the way legislation moves about, are they a committee? But because you are so different from everybody else, I think everybody knows who the DAC is, what you are all about. So I will change that and where there is reference to committee, when it means this group, it means this council.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: Everything is different in California.

MEMBER HALLENBECK: In paragraph A should we call them subcouncils?

MR. RAZO: I did ask that question, but because the charter addresses subcommittee, that's what we will stay with on subcommittee.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Just to be clear, then, "committee" in section B really means "council."

MR. RAZO: Yes.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Thank you.

MR. RAZO: You have already gone through that process. You have done that with the ISDRA TRT when you converted and with Dumont Dunes. So all we are doing now is formalizing that process into these bylaws and separating out subcommittee to subgroup. And I left TRT there to show that's an option also

when you want to have research or analysis done. That's the third option, but it would not involve you as members.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: Where it says "committee" in B, we were putting the full "council," "council Chair," just so I'm not left behind, mentally slow.

MR. RAZO: You know all your comments are public record.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: I don't care. I left my car running in the parking lot of the restaurant last night.

MEMBER ARGANDONA: I didn't tell anybody, Meg.

MR. RAZO: Any questions?

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: I'm wondering, just throw this out, would it be a good idea to have these subgroups, the DAC representative be designated as the chairman, just from a logistics standpoint of passing on information? I happened to be elected to the ISDRA subgroup as the chairman, but maybe there would be some advantage to putting that into the rules because we do have in here that there will be a DAC member for each one of those. Or would you rather not do that?

MR. RAZO: Well, I think it's possible that the DAC member could be the chairman of that, only if

the rest of that group decided that that would be the best course to go. As long as the decision is made between the DAC rep and the DFO, if that's what that subgroup wants.

I think the more important thing is there is DAC representation and report directly back to the DAC. If the chairman of that subgroup happens to be the DAC member, I'm assuming that's because that's what the subgroup wanted, with the concurrence of the DFO.

MEMBER BANIS: Section 3-C?

MR. RAZO: Yes.

MEMBER BANIS: Section 3, item C, "Council officers: The Council will elect its own officers. Chairpersons and members of any subgroup formed by the BLM will be appointed by the Council chairperson."

So this is saying -- this says that chairperson of the DAC will appoint the chairpersons of the subgroup.

MR. MARUSKA: With the concurrence of the DFO.

MEMBER BANIS: Yes, as opposed to the subgroups electing their own chairperson. I'm not arguing the point.

MEMBER RUDNICK: I think that makes sense.

MR. RAZO: In other words, Mr. Acuna might get a recommendation, and it might happen to be the DAC member, and he might decide, yeah, I agree, with the concurrence of the DFO, that's the way we will go.

MEMBER BANIS: That the groups do not elect their own; that the chairperson of the subgroup would be appointed by the chairperson of the DAC, with the DFO's concurrence.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: Let me get this clear. So we have the El Mirage subgroup. They elect someone.

MR. RAZO: No.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: I thought they elected, with concurrence.

MEMBER BANIS: The chairperson of the DAC will appoint the chairperson of the subgroup, with the concurrence of the DFO.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: That means the chairperson makes a decision. Now, that's not the way it works. Right now the ISDRA elects their own person.

MEMBER BANIS: I'm not arguing one way or the other. Just trying to make sure we all know.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: The way the mission or the --

MR. MARUSKA: Maybe I can speak about that for just a moment. Steve and I didn't speak about this. And, yes, you are correct, that would be a change from how the subgroups have been formulated previously. I think, though, as I looked at the change -- and Steve and I had discussed it -- I think that would be a positive change in the following regard: And that is that the subgroups really only exist as creatures of the DAC itself. They exist to serve the advisory purposes of the DAC.

And I think it would help in clarifying that role that if in fact the DAC Chair with the concurrence of the DFO made that designation, because I think it would make it clearer to the subgroup that the subgroup isn't sort of existing in its own world. It's existing, as you will be talking about later on this afternoon, to fulfill certain purposes that the DAC has established. And the DAC is the only FACA-approved entity. You are the ones that are responsible for it versus it kind of operating out there on its own.

I think the other advantage would be since the members of any subgroup are selected by the chairperson with the concurrence of the DFO, those two are going to have the opportunity to have looked

through all the applications, know something about the people involved, and of course, they would be checking with people that they think would be appropriate for that leadership role to determine in advance if they were willing to serve that Chair role of the subgroup.

But I think that that could operate quite effectively versus people kind of showing up and saying who wants to do it. So I think there would be advantages for you moving in this direction, and I would recommend you doing so. It's a change. You are absolutely correct.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: That portion of our bylaws have not been changed. Just the way we are operating on the ground is not meeting up with the bylaws?

And just to clarify, I like Dick's suggestion that the DAC members be the chairperson of that group because there is a lot more accountability that way. And that person 99 percent of the time comes to these meetings, and that gives them a direct connection.

If you are not the chairperson from the DAC but you're the one that shows up, you are essentially the one who is giving that information over to us. So I liked that suggestion.

MR. MARUSKA: I think as a practice, that

would probably be the typical way that you would go. I think writing it down and requiring it in your bylaws might be more constrictive than you would wish because you may encounter a situation with a subgroup where the DAC member who is on it may not be available to Chair it or other circumstances.

So I think as a general plan, I'm sure that the DAC Chair and the DFO would certainly consider that very strongly. And I think you would also want to leave some flexibility if that didn't happen to be the best choice under the circumstances.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: I agree.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: This whole policy wouldn't preclude the subgroup itself from recommending to the chairman the appointment. So the group would still have some input if they chose to do that.

CHAIRMAN ACUNA: The chairman would not be a dictator.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: The group itself, they may feel because of availability or maybe even expertise that somebody who is not the DAC member might be a better chairman for that group and then the group could recommend to the chairman that he or she be appointed as the chairman of the subgroup; right?

MR. MARUSKA: I think certainly you would

want to have a chairperson of a subgroup that would be respected and accepted by the subgroup for that leadership role. But I think if you start inviting recommendations from the subgroup -- I mean, it's challenging enough to get these people identified and positioned and everything else.

I'm a little more concerned for you in making that more complex, because then you are going to have a process by which they propose somebody and then it comes to the DAC Chair and the DFO. There is another loop, and I'm concerned about you having too many loops.

So I'm advising, keep it simple. And I'm sure the Chair and the DFO would be looking at who could garner the respect and support of the subgroup members and who would fulfill that role effectively.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: I don't think I'm proposing to make it anything other than the group meets, they choose someone, and the chairman appoints that person. You could do it by e-mail. I'm not proposing to make it an official process.

MR. MARUSKA: But once the group recommends to the Chair, it makes it harder for the Chair and the DFO to have the flexibility to make a different choice if they feel it's in the best interest of the DAC.

MEMBER BANIS: A more realistic scenario might be that a chairman would appoint a chairperson, go to the first meeting, and realize that there is a super star on that subgroup that really wants to rise to the top and that DAC member doesn't have that time, can't make the next meeting. And maybe at that point the chairman could appoint someone else to take over.

MEMBER RUDNICK: Fire him. Where is the disagreement?

MEMBER BANIS: Through the course of the time. It's more than likely.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: I think the way it's written just works fine.

MEMBER BANIS: The way it's written satisfies all these scenarios, so it's more flexible than it reads.

MR. RAZO: I will make these changes and send them out to you and ask for your final. And then I have to put out a public release that says that the bylaws to this Council have been changed and they will be posted on the Web site. There will be public comment and then become official after a certain time.

MEMBER BANIS: This won't be an agenda item for the public tomorrow?

MR. RAZO: Well, I think I was going to.

MR. MARUSKA: Just to get moving with business, Steve, why don't you make the changes, note those in the report out tomorrow, and if the DAC is willing, I would encourage the DAC to take action because that will help these subgroups and all figure out what's going on and where they are going next.

MEMBER BANIS: Would you be willing to repeat the song and dance tomorrow?

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: So you are just synopsisizing the changes quickly, because I don't want to take an hour to do this tomorrow.

MR. MARUSKA: To make it even simpler, why don't we just transfer the cleaned-up document onto the Power Point. We will just show it up on the screen and say these are the changes made, invite the DAC to consider them, see if there is any public comment, close that out, you take action, and you are moving forward.

CHAIRMAN ACUNA: Get her done.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: Ten minutes, max.

MR. MARUSKA: So thank you, Steve. And if you want to just make those changes, we will get the Power Point working for tomorrow and make sure that's all in shape for you.

So the next item on your agenda here is per

the bylaws that you were just reviewing, you have the election of a Chair. And although the bylaws don't specify it, you have the liberty if you wish to have a Vice Chair. And that this is something you determine each year at the first meeting of your year. So this is an opportunity for any DAC member who wishes to put themselves forward to do so and then for you to choose.

CHAIRMAN ACUNA: So let's select candidates for Chair, and I would like to make a motion that Randy be considered for or nominated as chairman.

MEMBER MITZELFELT: Second that.

CHAIRMAN ACUNA: Do we have any other folks on the DAC interested in being the Chair? Candidate? No? Shall we take a vote on it? All those in favor, raise your hand.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Can we all vote? Some of us aren't official.

CHAIRMAN ACUNA: Do we have any nays? I think Randy is going to be very benevolent.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Not a dictator?

PAST CHAIRMAN ACUNA: I have to say, I had the pleasure of working with Randy on a lot of issues this year. And he has been very collaborative, we talk a lot. I feel like I could trust him. You all

feel the same way and are excited to have him, fresh blood running the meetings. And I am just happy that you are going to take it.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Thank you, Tom. Thank you all very much.

MEMBER ACUNA: Randy, I think you can actually run the meeting from here on.

MR. RAZO: Passing of the gavel.

MEMBER ACUNA: So done. Pass the gavel to you.

DIRECTOR RAML: It's not his gavel.

MEMBER MITZELFELT: I think we should thank Tom.

(Applause from the Council.)

MEMBER ACUNA: I really enjoyed it. This is a wonderful opportunity.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: Are you leaving now?

MEMBER ACUNA: No, just moving over.

(Photo taken.)

MEMBER ACUNA: I recommend everyone trying to be Chair as an experience.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Before I call for nominations of Vice Chair, I would like to thank Tom for his hard work that he has done all the year. He has done the real hard work. No. 1, he has had the

opportunity to break in a new Desert District manager, someone from out of state, as a matter of fact, and someone who might be new to our ways. And I think that the result is obvious, that we are really working together well and I think we are sharing our vision all together as we move forward.

And two, he has also done the hard work of doing a tremendous amount of organizational work on behalf of the DAC. We spent a good amount of time finding our strengths and identifying our focus. And I would like to thank you, Tom, for taking that task on. It was really more than running meetings. And thank you.

Now, I would like to call for nominations for Vice Chairman, please.

MEMBER RUDNICK: Do we need a Vice Chair?

MEMBER BANIS: I think it's a wise move, just in case. I think it's a good idea for this body to have a Vice Chair.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: I will nominate April.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: I second that.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: April, do you accept?

MEMBER SALL: Sure.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Are there any other nominations for Vice Chair? Seeing none, all those in

favor of electing April as Vice Chair of the DAC. Any opposed? It passes. Congratulations, Vice Chair of the DAC.

(Applause from the Council.)

CHAIRMAN BANIS: If there are no objections, Don, I appreciate, since this is a planning session and you are facilitating, continue forward, please.

MR. MARUSKA: Moving forward.

DIRECTOR RAML: There is a little bit of business. I concur. And don't forget.

I will say something else, too. I will concur with everyone's praises of Tom. Tom, you have been a pleasure to work with, and I think without his leadership, we wouldn't be where we are today. And I certainly, like all the compliments I pay to the DAC, have to go with Tom and experimenting this year with all the things we have tried with renewable energy and everything else.

MEMBER ACUNA: Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: You might want to review your packet. We were moving onto the subgroup items. Subgroup review. Okay.

MR. MARUSKA: When I last visited with you here at the DAC, we had the discussion about how to make stakeholder groups more effective and in

particular, the subgroups more effective.

So there came from that a 10-page guide about working with subgroups. That was from 2009. So when it refers to the guide book, that refers to the document that we developed together with you two years ago. And what that called for is that each year the DAC would review how the subgroups it has established were functioning, where there might be opportunities for improvement, what are the tasks and issues that you would like to direct the attention of that subgroup to in the future, and other things important in terms of making sure the subgroup has the right people on it, given how the issues have evolved. And in fact, each subgroup is serving the purpose for which you established it.

So those are the questions, the five questions that are relevant for each of the subgroups to be addressing. And to assist us with that, we have Margaret on behalf of ISDRA and Dick Holliday is Chair of the ISDRA subgroup. And Dumont Dunes, maybe with Randy being able to offer some commentary. And Roxie, if she arrives. And check in about the status of El Mirage, which I guess is in formation.

So the basic purpose of this discussion at this point is not only to see how they are doing, but

also, if you will, to establish what would be, just as Teri worked with you this morning on what are the topics and issues that she would like to have the DAC address in the course of the year, what are the topics and issues that the DAC wishes to have these subgroups address to provide information for you which, in turn, is helpful in your advisory role to BLM.

So what I would like to do after you hear a report from each of these subgroups about where they are and so on, is to have a focused discussion for a few minutes about what are the three things or whatever that you are going to task each of the subgroups to do in the coming year so they know what are they supposed to do and get it done.

Some of those came up this morning when there was a discussion about the recreation and user fees, some things you were identifying then these subgroups would be desirable for them to speak to and to advise you about. Anything else that you might see.

So with that in mind, let's turn to Dick and I know, Dick, you were very helpful as Chair of the subgroup in sending out notes and ideas that you had about these specific questions in a very organized way. Maybe you could summarize that for the DAC members briefly.

And Margaret, if you could speak to what you see going forward after Dick's comments for this coming year. And then let's see if we can consolidate that into what are the several takeaways for the ISDRA group to be doing in 2011.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: I think that these subgroups, these user groups, I think, are real important especially in the area where user fees are being expended for operations in these areas. I think that's why we generated the El Mirage subgroup was because of the fees there. I sent you out a copy of -- our subgroup has not had some meetings, and that's due to a lot of different reasons. One is the availability of BLM employees to generate the data and get the data ready that we need. And a lot of that goes back to the renewable resources effort that seems to be stymying a lot of advancement. But for our subgroup, we obviously have -- the biggest issue we have --

MEMBER RUDNICK: You meant renewable energy, didn't you? You said renewable resources. Just clarification. I was listening.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: I see, your renewable resource could be cows and land -- right? And hay and stuff?

MEMBER RUDNICK: Could be.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: Renewable energy. But our focus is obviously on safety and user amenities, if you will. I don't like to use that term, but maintenance of our facility and the fees that the vendors pay -- fees that the users pay. So from that standpoint, those are our three major issues.

One of the things I would like to see from the DAC's standpoint, as Teri has done with the recommendations, is that all the managers' reports all come in in the same format, which really helps us look at those. I would like to see reports back to the DAC on the uses of the fee money in a standard format from the different areas. I have asked for those in the past, and I have gotten data from the different locations all in different formats. And it makes it very difficult to have any kind of coordinated review of those.

And our dunes manager, Neil Hamada at the Dunes, does an excellent job in producing a budget in a format that we worked on for many years. I'm not saying it all has to be like that, but it would be nice if we had a consistent approach.

But from our subgroup, obviously fees are one of the biggest issues because the users want to see

something for their money that they are paying. I really don't know what more to say. I think I sent a copy of this to everybody. And it kind of addressed each one of the issues on there. I do think it would be helpful if the subgroups set up a consistent -- as Dinah says, has a consistent scheduling meeting, schedule so that we know ahead of time. I would like to see that done a few weeks ahead of the DAC meeting so that people can respond to the DAC on the current issues. Because the way it is now, it might be months before a DAC meeting or we might have a subgroup meeting right after the DAC meeting, so we lose some of that continuity.

MR. MARUSKA: Before we hear from Margaret here on some of the issues she is looking for out of the ISDRA group, and in turn Teri, there were two things that came up from your discussion this morning.

One was providing input on the successes, challenges and opportunities of the recreation component. And remember, that was for that June meeting. You were going to have some discussion about that. And about volunteer and partnership potential. And the date for that is -- to get that for the June DAC meeting.

And then the second thing which really Dick

was highlighting was the review of BLM fee policies and fee schedules. And you recall that that was for your September DAC meeting. So those were two tasks that carry over from what you reviewed this morning.

And so that begins to set a bit of a schedule for what the DAC needs to be attending to and when. So again, we need to check in with both you, Dick, as representative of that ISDRA subgroup, and then we will turn to Margaret about, can BLM support that in preparation for those things? Can that work? And are there other items, Margaret, that you are looking for or Teri, to get advice about that you would like to have the ISDRA subgroup work on to bring to the DAC so that advice could come forward to BLM? Points to add?

DIRECTOR RAML: The third bullet that was on the theme recreation might be a good one for ISDRA, and I will refer to Margaret on that final call. But also, it's a recreation area, so are there other forms of recreation in ISDRA that need attention, because that would be a good discussion for that.

MR. MARUSKA: In preparation for the June time.

DIRECTOR RAML: Yeah. Because then the subgroup would actually tackle all the topics for that June meeting for the recreation. I'm not as familiar

with Dumont Dunes in terms of its size and expanse, but I know for sure that ISDRA has got plenty.

MR. MARUSKA: Anything else, Teri, before we turn to Margaret?

Margaret, other elaborations or major categories of things you are looking for out of the ISDRA subgroup?

MS. GOODRO: One thing I wanted to take a look at, because this was what I did when I came on board is look at the subcommittees and their role. So in reading that, it has specific forms for compiling information and conducting research. However, such subcommittees must act under the discretion of the DFO and must report their recommendations to the Council for consideration. The Council Chair, with the approval of the DFO, will appoint subcommittee members. Subcommittees will meet as necessary to accomplish their assignments, subject to the approval of the DFO and availability of resources.

So when I came on board, one of the things that I noticed with the subgroup -- and it might have been kind of a leftover -- is that it was working more as a board of directors than as a subgroup. So I think we are still in that transition.

And so I would like to see -- and one of the

reasons -- we had two meetings that were very close together because I needed ideas for the fee structure and possible revisions of the fee system, so anything out there. So we had a brainstorming session, and everybody brought any idea they could possibly think of.

But one of the things that came out of that is that there was assignments to BLM members to rework the business plan and to come up with all these alternatives in a format similar to an environmental analysis, and that takes a lot of work. And so I'm still, for me, struggling with making sure that we are using the resources well to get to a desired outcome.

Right now we are still in the part where subgroup members are assigning work to BLM folks. And that might not be the direction we are headed in. So to take a step back and see where we are looking at going.

We had a meeting for the fee program and to look at all those. So in our next meeting we will be going over that, the suggestions for the fee program and what we find would be most likely, but that's the top priority. But in general we need to look at how the subgroup is functioning, and it's difficult. Dick and I talk very closely, but theoretically,

recommendations should be going through the RAC -- the DAC.

MR. MARUSKA: So do you have any major topics that are in addition to the two that were identified here and that came up from the discussion this morning? Or is this basically the key things that you are looking for out of ISDRA's subgroup this year?

And what I am hearing from you is while that might be what the DAC and the DFO are looking to get out of this, it sounds like it would be valuable for perhaps the DFO and in turn with the DAC to give some format or structuring of how these roles are to be executed so you have some consistency between ISDRA and Dumont Dunes and that you have a workable level of effort to undertake in supporting these analyses.

One of the challenges is what it means to one person about review, BLM fee policies and fee schedules, to you might mean something quite different than it would mean to a subgroup member. You all have to get on the same page about that or else, yeah, they are going to be asking you to do more and more analyses because they have a different conception of what that is than you do, or that maybe your time permits you to do.

MS. GOODRO: Right. That's where that rub

comes in.

MR. MARUSKA: So would it be, Teri, useful to you if one of the things that's sort of a takeaway out of this meeting today is that where you are asking a subgroup to take on a task, and in particular, where that task is similar across subgroups as it might be with Dumont Dunes as well as ISDRA, that BLM will provide some template or framework of what you are looking for so that the subgroups can work with that and you know that you have got an analysis that you have staff time and whatever to support that, would be sufficient to carry that forward. I think that's sounding like that would be useful. Does that seem like it would be -- your office could give that kind of direction?

DIRECTOR RAML: Yes, I think we sure can.

MR. MARUSKA: So that would mean, under that example, with the June DAC meeting, addressing these recreation issues that sometime in the next couple of weeks, probably, you need to give those subgroups some template of, how do you want us to report back on successes, challenges and opportunities? What would you like us to be addressing on volunteer opportunities and partnership opportunities so that they can set up a meeting between now and June and

work through that and give you a product. Not you a product, but give a product through to the DAC that you can discuss at the June meeting. I'm thinking that that's going to be kind of the flow that will need to happen here to get something that you can work with in June.

DIRECTOR RAML: Definitely, and I'm so glad Bekki is here.

MR. MARUSKA: I guess I turn to Margaret and Dick here. Does that sound like that would be a helpful way to navigate through here? And so to prepare for the September DAC meeting, there will be helpful templates and support from the district office about, okay, here are BLM's fee policies, here are existing fee schedules, here are the some analyses available. And these are the things that we would like you to look at through the ISDRA and Dumont Dunes and El Mirage as it forms subgroups to come back and report through to the DAC in September.

So again, you have a template for what you are looking out of this. Does that work? Bekki, you are looking a little quizzically and since you were implicated by Teri, do you have a question or something you'd like to clarify.

MS. LASELL: No, I'm thinking that I will be

participating in this template creation.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: Bekki would be tasked to give the BLM templates that they would report information to us, to the DAC subgroups, like a budget template or whatever? No? So I'm lost.

MS. GOODRO: Let me know if I get this right. Basically some side boards, because you can get a group of people together who all have different interest areas. And each of those are looking at their interest areas and assigning that work to the BLM folks. It might not be lining up in tune with what the BLM is looking for, through the DFO and through the management, for what input we are seeking.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: You said it exactly. I got it.

MS. GOODRO: Side boards for that.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: This is your frame of work. We are supposed to work together so tell me what to do. I'm more blunt.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: I think that's well and good and what we want to do.

My concern is some of these things, the way we have set up these focuses for the subgroup or for the DAC meeting, and then we want to look at fees. I think we need to put these things together in such a

way that we may have to address a fee structure and fee recommendation to the BLM prior to, say, the September meeting. Or at least have it in place from the standpoint of the -- if the fees are going to be raised, we need to go through certain procedures within the federal recreation aspect that includes getting the information, having public comment that gets information to the R-RAC, and then obviously implementing that.

But by the September time frame, that will be too late for our next season, which we start selling permits in September. So we have to have all that stuff done ahead of time if we are to have a fee increase. If we just wait until September to do that -- I'm not saying we shouldn't report to the DAC then -- but we need to have these templates for more than one thing at a time for the subgroups to look at.

DIRECTOR RAML: Yeah, and I agree. I think the internal work that needs to be done before we bring it to the subgroup is -- right now neither of my field managers have said that's on their field of work this year. When Margaret says, Hey, Teri, BLM is looking at this fee structure, I want to get your thoughts. And we talk to our State Director and say this is the path we are heading on. So I think the

idea that we are going to come up real quickly with the fee increases, we are not. And I haven't heard that anything is on the horizon, and if it is, we will be slowing it down.

MR. MARUSKA: So if I'm hearing the pieces here and tying them together, Dick was raising the concern there is a whole set of timing process associated with fee increases. Would the September DAC meeting accommodate that? And what I am hearing from you is given that a fee increase is not currently contemplated, this schedule would still work.

DIRECTOR RAML: Yeah, I think the environment hasn't changed much. It's a fluid environment in terms of what is going on with the R-RAC. So at least certainly -- when Roxie gets here she can verify that, but I don't believe -- we thought we had the mechanism to have the fee increase. So the idea that we suddenly do, it wouldn't happen that quick.

MS. GOODRO: Just to clarify, when I was speaking about for the ISDRA subgroup and we looking at restructuring our fee system, what we meant is what we spend to collect fees.

MR. MARUSKA: Not changing the amount of fees charged to the users, but rather, how you go about the collection and the management of that process

administratively.

MS. GOODRO: Yes, and that would be the first step before anything else.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: Also as part of this structure, to have an issue that the group will look at. I think there are also other aspects of the group other than this.

For instance, we get input on current planning, current operations of the area, things that are affecting the recreation area. For instance, down at the Dunes there we had some things on the landfill and on the canal widening and things like that. So those are additional things that are specific to that particular area. So maybe specific area informational items would also be part of this process in addition to this one issue-based issue.

MR. MARUSKA: So discussing area-specific operational issues; right?

DIRECTOR RAML: Since I'm kind of unfamiliar with the subgroups and I really haven't even made it a point of coming to a subgroup meeting, so I'm a little ignorant on the purpose, the objectives, the direction that they are headed to. So that's something that I can also get a little more engaged in that. I haven't done it to date.

So the way the question is framed, has the subgroup met its purpose, and I would like to get engaged and be more informed about. Obviously there is always a lot of on-the-ground issues associated with these areas. So we can talk about that too.

MR. MARUSKA: Each of the subgroups has a template for itself, a mission, what the membership needs to be to fulfill that mission, and those are posted on the Web site. So there are opportunities to loop through and double-check that.

If I'm hearing from Dick and Margaret, that sort of original mission and template for ISDRA seems to continue to make sense. And what you are doing here, I think, is just identifying what are the three things you are looking for from this subgroup in the 2011 year and the tasking for them.

DIRECTOR RAML: I'm not entirely sure.

MS. GOODRO: I would say with the mission and those that were developed, it's still in the TRT era. So it needs to be revised just as the charters and other things have been revised.

MR. MARUSKA: That was revised post TRT era in 2009.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: The focus of the user's group, it's a user's group and subgroup of this

organization. And the idea was that the users would have some input, hopefully the BLM, if they had multiple challenges to, say, spend some of the fee money on, they could come to this group and say here is a couple of different operations we have. What do you guys think is the best solution, so the users would have some input as to how their fees are being spent.

The focus was having these subgroups associated with fees to help and give guidance to the BLM on how those fee dollars are spent. That was the basis of the generation for these groups to begin with.

DIRECTOR RAML: So I think the situation we have is we have got a brand-new field manager and the function and purpose of the subgroup is not transparent to her. And I haven't been engaged, so I'm saying it's not transparent to me. Maybe it's revisiting. But it certainly seems like a dialogue is necessary because it's not clear to us.

MR. MARUSKA: That's part of the purpose of this annual review is to say, are you clear about what your subgroup is doing on your behalf? And are things lined up for its success? Tom, did you have a comment?

MEMBER HALLENBECK: I don't have a dog in this fight and I'm new to this organization. I think it's important that the BLM have some connection with the users, like you suggested, but just based on what I have been educated by today with the charter and the bylaws and earlier warnings that we don't want subgroups out there spinning away, it seems like you might have one that's rotating when they are giving assignments to BLM staff and prepared to provide feedback on operational issues to this group versus investigating and studying and tracking down information that we are asking them to do. So just on the face of it, it's a little backwards from just the reading of the bylaws and the charter.

I think it's important that BLM have some sort of connection with users, but whether the subgroup is the way to do it or not and through the DAC.

MR. MARUSKA: Other comments from DAC members, and then see how you -- what you were hearing in here is the tension about these subgroups. They are not intended to really be captives of a user interest or whatever. And that's why in fact when this ISDRA subgroup was established, the DAC did go through what was the expertise needed and who they

were calling on to provide that expertise. So there was an effort made to sort through and figure that out.

But, yes, you are on track: These are live questions for how you want these subgroups to serve the DAC and its function of advising the BLM. So other comments that are here? I guess you have a couple. I see Meg and Dinah and then April.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: I think that this subgroup might have gone astray a little bit. But I think that between Dick and Margaret, they will handle it. I don't think it's something that we need to worry about. If you had Dick and Margaret in charge of you, wouldn't you straighten up a little? They will get them under control. Not to worry.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: I think I might be saying what Tom said, but Margaret, so you are getting assignments from ISDRA, but the assignments are not going through the manager -- I mean, the DFO, Teri, yes. They were not going through Teri. So you were kind of getting direction from two different places. Is there a process where, as the recommendations from ISDRA, are they supposed to go through Teri and then to Margaret? Or do they go directly, with Teri being informed?

MR. MARUSKA: Actually, it's neither of those. The subgroup per FACA can only provide its input and advice to the DAC, which is a formally FACA-created group, which in turn can provide it to BLM.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Or request information through the DAC to the district? Because requesting information requires some work on Margaret and her staff. So if they are going -- if there is a lot of information that is not already out there that needs to be generated, then that's a -- I don't want to say it's a hardship, but it's additional work. So it needs to be approved by Teri and through the DAC.

MR. MARUSKA: And that's where I think -- that's what I was intending to suggest here with regard to the BLM staff to establish templates on information and advice desired. Sort of go to the subgroup and say, here is the form of the information we can provide. Here is the kind of advice or input that we are seeking.

And then, of course, the subgroup can say we think they need some additional information or whatever in order to provide that advice effectively. I think that's where some of the rough points have arisen. And that's where that needs to cycle through the district manager to determine if that's workable

or not, because it's made explicit in the federal regulations that these subgroups or even the DAC cannot direct staff, cannot commit or direct actions that would commit resources of the BLM, because that's beyond the advice role.

So this is a fine dance here of how do these groups get enough information to provide effective advice, and what is BLM's capacity to respond to it? And that's where I think if at the operational end of things at the district level, you can work with the field folks and come up with, hey, here are some templates and questions and things you can do to help support. And you can do that in a way that will provide consistency across your subgroups, that will really be of help to everybody.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: Perhaps if the district office would put -- maybe we could put together a generic agenda for these groups so we would know what the BLM had to provide for them. We would like to know -- we have one of these groups. One of the issues we get is how many medicals have gone. Some of the history of the facility. How many fatalities were there. How many visitors were there.

They give us that kind of information so we have some feedback to the members of the subgroup from

the managers in the area. Some of the things we may have asked for, I may have sent an e-mail asking for some data that should have been provided that I think is applicable data. As part of Federal Land Recreation Enhancement Act, if you look at the fee structure, part of the thing that the BLM is supposed to provide is business plan, budget, listing of -- hit all the data where the fees were spent. So all that data should be provided.

Now, at the end of the fiscal year in October if we are going to have a meeting prior to say, December, maybe if we have a list of things that need to be provided to the subgroup at that meeting, then we can have also one of our special issues that we may take up. But essentially, these meetings tend to be a history of what has gone on at the recreation site.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: April.

MEMBER SALL: I just wanted to ask a more historical question, I guess. I'm a little ignorant to the subgroup discussion. So maybe Steve would best be served to answer this.

But could you tell me a little bit more about, has there ever been a subgroup created for anything other than motorized recreation areas? I'm just trying to provide a broader context for this

subgroup discussion.

MR. RAZO: Not that I'm aware of, but it's certainly possible to do.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Our historic cabin subgroup did involve some non-DAC members.

MR. RAZO: That was originally a TRT. In fact -- let me rephrase. They used to be TRTs.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: They were for more than motorized.

MR. RAZO: The decision was made on the majority of those when we were converting to subgroups, that they went ahead and dissolved themselves or there was no need for them anymore.

MEMBER SALL: While you have the floor, could you list a couple of others?

CHAIRMAN BANIS: There was a signing TRT that was chaired by Gerry Ferguson. Or subgroup. It was named a TRT then. There was a subgroup or TRT that was to help Hector implement the Rand Mountain education program.

MR. RAZO: Those were TRTs.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: But they were not carried on. Right now there are really only two subgroups.

Are there any last comments on this before we move on? I think I will have the opportunity to get

us a little closer on schedule with the Dumont Dunes.

MS. GOODRO: With both the subgroups, each area does have nonmotorized recreation, so the subgroups will be looking at recreation as a whole, which involves all types of recreation.

MEMBER SALL: So are there members currently on the subgroup to fit that criteria?

MS. GOODRO: We have one vacancy right now on the subgroup, and we hope that vacancy will help fulfill that.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: On the Dumont Dunes, Brian Brown represents that community.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: On the ISDRA subgroup, there are representatives from local governmental and communities at large, essentially.

MEMBER HALLENBECK: Well, with your -- I don't want to belabor it, but what was the original purpose of the ISDRA subgroup?

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: Originally set up to give advice on the use of the fees. Actually, it probably started before the fee structure, before they put in fees. But it was to give advice to the BLM on how to manage the recreation area.

MR. MARUSKA: Not to belabor this, but just the issue about fees has evolved. When the ISDRA area

was first established and BLM started charging fees, there was no structure. There wasn't the Off-Highway Vehicle Commission and everything else that is more effectively in place now. There wasn't the R-RAC, which has come in and may be not as active.

So it came in initially with much more specifically a fee focus because there was a vacuum. That vacuum has been filled to some degree by other entities, so its purpose has broadened. In 2009 when you created it as a subgroup, it had a broader mission than that original user fee issue.

MEMBER HALLENBECK: This is creating some friction, though. The group is saying they want to be told all this information of the business plan and the use of the money and where is the budget. And I'm not sure that was their charge. These things have to be provided, but not to the subgroup. And they are acting like they are monitoring the performance of the BLM in that regard.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: Essentially the feeling of the members is that they have oversight of where their fees are going to. Again, this may generate some friction, but as part of the law there are some requirements for the BLM to provide this information. Now, they can provide this information just out in the

newspapers if they want, but it seems more reasonable for them to provide this information to a user's group or group of people set up like the subgroups for the TRTs to get this information and pass it on to their constituencies.

MEMBER HALLENBECK: Then they are going to be doing communication out from the subgroups to the constituencies rather than back up to the DAC. We are the ones who are supposed to be charging them with finding information out and bring it back to us so we can deliberate and give out our advice. So that's a different purpose. It's a great purpose. I'm not saying it's not -- doesn't have value, but that's not what I have heard what subgroups are for.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Also, I must say, to understand a little bit of the history, the idea of charging fees is still a relatively new concept. It was a new concept. It's happened within ten years, and when that happened there was concern about essentially buying in the support of the users to create a structure and a system by which the users could recognize that there were benefits to actually reaching into your pocket and putting money into the collection slot; that there was going to be a return for that.

And rather than fighting this through Congress, continuing to fight it in other contentious forms, this was an intent to create some harmony and provide outreach to the users who were facing, for the first time in their lives, having to reach into their pockets to access public lands.

That was something that people really were not used to. And at least there has been some growing pains. No question about it. But I think in some places it's perhaps been more effective than others.

MR. MARUSKA: Let me just turn for a moment here to you, Teri, as the Designated Federal Official in terms of how you are managing these areas and particularly the fee areas and so on.

Do you see a continuing value and role for the ISDRA and Dumont Dunes subgroups to be doing this work? And do you wish that to carry forward? Or are you seeing concerns and so on about the friction points that are evident and that Tom is highlighting, and you want to revisit that?

DIRECTOR RAML: Yes, I definitely see -- I definitely see a role for a subgroup for ISDRA, I really do. But I think part of it is what we are talking about is a transitioning to a broader role. And maybe that has to do with kind of the focus of the

DAC and the role of the DAC as a whole and how the subgroups report to the DAC.

I understand that it came from fees and that that was certainly a concern, and maybe fees could still be a part of it. But I think -- it's bigger than fees, and I don't think we ought to be focused on fees. And I think we can be accountable how we utilize fees without that being the whole focus of a subgroup.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: If I may, not to interrupt, Teri, but it says, under subgroups, "Such groups may gather information, conduct research, analyze relevant issues and facts, and draft proposed position papers and/or recommendations for deliberation by the full committee/council."

MEMBER BANIS: Are you looking at subgroup or subcommittee?

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Subgroup. But that doesn't preclude getting information from the BLM but also from their constituent users and professional groups, which the DAC itself cannot do. So I look at it as an additional way to bring information on these big issues on areas that get high use to the DAC for deliberation or approval. So I see it as an additional way for us -- I'm like April. I'm not an

off-road vehicle rider, so these issues are unfamiliar to me. But if we were supposed to be deliberating on them, I would like somebody who knows what they are doing giving us information besides the BLM. We want information from users as well. So in a way, it's sort of an extension of getting public information, assuming that the user group has -- that the subgroup has a wide constituency itself.

MR. MARUSKA: So am I hearing kind of an overall focus then, I guess from you, Teri, since this is about advice to you, that you would like these subgroups, ISDRA and Dumont Dunes, to continue, but that you would like them to focus on these topics that link into the DAC meetings? And that they forward-plan their subgroup schedules so they do, in fact, match up with when you hit those issues on the DAC. And that the idea of providing some templates and some guidance on the timing and processes involved would fit with how you would like to go forward?

DIRECTOR RAML: Yeah. And I think with also that same -- the same structure we are looking at in terms of the DAC, that it's not just a one way, that the meetings and the building of this program also has that spot that allows the subgroup to say, hey, we really would like to do that. And we would reach

concurrency.

Like I said, it's a collaboration in that aspect. Because there is an opportunity at that level to go down a level lower than the DAC would in terms of projects and implementation and certain things. And I don't think we want to lose that, but I also think we want to -- in any situation recognize who is the dog and who is the tail.

MR. MARUSKA: With that in mind, Randy, if we might turn to you since you serve on the Dumont Dunes subgroup, would this same template work for Dumont Dunes, or do you have other issues or things that you think Dumont ought to be addressing beyond these things here? Or Teri, do you have other things from Dumont Dunes or Roxie about her requests?

CHAIRMAN BANIS: The Dumont Dunes operates as a slightly different animal. There are challenges, but I have got to say we have had a tremendous number of successes in my opinion. And they have come about as being collaborative.

For example, improving access to the users to the Dumont Dunes areas. It was through the subgroup that we jointly crafted a plan and a priority to widen the stream crossing and make it so that people could go both ways. It was only a one lane before. And

that was brought up by the users as something they thought would help them because getting out at the end of the day, it took hours to get out sometimes.

Also, issues of making -- improving the road itself. We brought in loads and loads of crushed asphalt over the course of the last few years to pack that road down and compact it so that the RV's can make it in. And that's -- really, we have had wonderful comments from the users on that. They are getting out of there with much less stress on the RV's and creating less dust. And we all realize that keeping the dust down has some good advantages from the ecological standpoint and community relations standpoint.

And we have been consulted on issues such as where to place a helipad so that emergency services could be brought in better and have better response to medical emergencies. We are regularly consulted on ideas for what grants to apply for and what things might be needed and helpful for the users. And we have been pleased to collaborate on those.

Fencing projects -- there is something interesting about Dumont Dunes. Dumont Dunes is right smack in the middle of an extremely environmentally sensitive area. It sits immediately adjacent to Death

Valley Nation Park and several wildernesses, a wilderness study area, and an ACEC. And it's difficult to create boundaries in the middle of dunes. Things shift and things move around. And where would be the most effective place?

If you only have a grant to put in X number of miles of fence, where is the most effective place to put those fences? And coordinating with the users has been really quite beneficial. And I have to tell you, too, that the users have been essentially informing on the bad guys, the ones who won't stay within the boundaries, the ones who do stray off on their own little adventures into the wilderness. And we know that the greater we can have compliance in those areas, the less pressure it's going to put on opposition from the environmental community and from the local community.

Another one was the trash dumping problem. The users were coming in with their RV's, spending their week, collecting all of their trash, driving out and stopping at the county trash facility, the dump stations, and were just dumping all their trash in there. And the community had nowhere to put their trash. And the BLM responded due to a collaborative effort, managed through the subgroup. They responded

by stationing staff there on those big holiday weekends and putting up signs and keeping those users out of that area.

We also helped with a problem with dumping of RV waste along the highways that was occurring. And that ended up -- there ended up being a surprise sting operation by CHP and Inyo County sheriffs. And now that problem seems to have been brought under control.

There is also -- the community relations is very important there because the local community doesn't receive a real financial benefit from that activity. People load up with everything in Las Vegas or Los Angeles and drive out to the dunes self-contained. They don't even stop in Shoshone for gas or motels or any of the services. And Dumont Dunes is really in the middle of nowhere. If you need a gallon of milk, you are driving an hour and not even a local place to pick up ice.

Even the location of vendor row, and vendor row got bigger and bigger. We needed a better location, a more accessible location, a safer location for it.

The last one is Dumont Dunes is home to the fringe-toed lizard, which had been suggested for listing as a threatened or endangered species. And we

are fortunate that our Chairperson, Dr. Presch, is a renowned expert on this type of wildlife and has been conducting his own formal studies. And we were able to essentially collaboratively develop a sort of voluntary habitat conservation protection program. And we found where were the best places to keep the users out of in order to ensure the future success of those lizards.

So I think those are, I think, some very good places where we have been able to work together and seek buy-in from the users. It hasn't come without our challenges. It's been fun telling you the good news.

But the fee modification process that we attempted to put in place last year really fell on its face due to a lack of public involvement that is necessary in order to have a fee modification. And these are areas, I think, where we can -- the subgroup could actually help in that outreach and to help bring in comments so that people feel that they have had an opportunity to be heard. And so when these -- this proposal, should it go forward to a fee committee, that it will -- that they will see that it has had significant and substantive public comment.

I think another place where we could really

do better is in our relationship to the DAC, in our reporting to the DAC. This is the first time you have kind of heard this good news and heard all of this stuff. And I think we need to do better and work more at creating a nexus with that subgroup.

Now, part of this, maybe this lack of communication and perhaps the success of our operation has been due to the chairman, Dr. Presch, because he is a former DAC chairman himself, so he recognizes and understands this, how the system works, so to speak. And he has been able to keep us focused in working within the boundaries and guidelines that a subgroup should operate within.

Another thing that, though, has helped -- and I'm going to go back for a second to good news. It was good to have Dr. Presch as a scientific person on the group. And it has been good to have a community representative in the group. We don't always sing Kumbaya, and we have alternative outlooks and things to consider now, and we really appreciate that.

And also it's been good to have -- the representative of the county has been Gerry Hillier. He knows the DAC, he knows the BLM and the structures, and he has been able to help keep us on track. So those have been all valuable contributions.

We do receive budget reporting. We don't get involved in the micromanaging. We credit Roxie with how hard it has been to make do with much less due to the downturn of the economy and the reduction in users. That's really had a huge impact on the incoming fees, and they have had to do some very smart and difficult staffing miracles in order to meet some of these budgetary constraints.

And I think by sharing with each other as much as we can, we don't so much tell the BLM what to do and the BLM doesn't so much tell us what to do; we share our information and we share our goals and objectives, and we find that the solutions fall in place.

Maybe there are some lessons that we can learn from ISDRA and better reporting to the DAC and better involving the DAC. And I would like to help with that if we can as we move forward. So thanks for a chance to at least give another perspective of how subgroups can work.

MR. MARUSKA: Okay. So from your vantage point, Randy, from the Dumont Dunes subgroup, I'm thinking it would be desirable, if you felt it fit, to map over these same items from ISDRA over to Dumont Dunes and have it work in that way.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: We do. The reporting of budget, we went through a frustrating period when the federal accounting system went through its long blackout period. And now that it's come out of that blackout period, I agree, and as do my fellow subgroup members agree that a standard reporting system would be great. In fact, we have seen reports that have actually come from ISDRA, circulated them, and asked Roxie, can you meet this particular format because we think this is a good way to do it. So I do agree with that.

MR. MARUSKA: Then checking in with the DAC as a whole, and I guess do we have any update about El Mirage. Is it in formation? Maybe happening or not happening? Do you have a feel for what the status is of it?

DIRECTOR RAML: I do have a feel for it and this discussion makes me want to have a further discussion with Roxie and the DAC. She has been very pressed for time. She has a lot of things on her plate. So she is in the process, but she is not ready yet. And I certainly, with what I know she has on her plate, am supporting her in taking her time.

MR. MARUSKA: I guess just as you have an opportunity to check in with her, it would be valuable

for you to be able to get back to the DAC and let them know whether for the recreation meeting of the DAC and for the user fee discussion in the September DAC meeting, whether El Mirage is going to be a player or if that's going to come more directly through Roxie and her team.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: We voted to have a subgroup, so that's not something we are going back from. She just hasn't had the time to establish it. That would like so not make me happy. Because we voted, we had a motion. She just hasn't had the time. And you are not shaking your head or saying anything affirmative, so now I --

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Then to follow up with Meg's comment, I have a question. There was a controversy about establishing the El Mirage subgroup, was there not?

DIRECTOR RAML: It's pre-me and it's not formed.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: There was some opposition from the user's group, as I recall. So besides Roxie having time, the formation of the subgroup has to come first from the DAC, but you have to have a user group interested on meeting on the subgroup.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: I understand we do have

interested users. And I wish Roxie was here because I believe -- we will talk about it when Roxie gets here.

MR. MARUSKA: So I think we can move forward at this juncture, unless there are other comments from the DAC. And these are reports from two of the existing subgroups that you have launched and what their game plan is.

Is that in concurrence with the DAC members about where you would like that to go for the 2011 program? Okay. So then --

CHAIRMAN BANIS: We are further behind schedule. We picked up about five or ten minutes here, so thank you.

MR. MARUSKA: So now there is the opportunity to review the existing ad hoc subgroups. In this case it's really more subcommittees because they have been members of the DAC that have been acting on your behalf. You had one on renewable energy. Another one on the special recreation permits. The question is what did they accomplish? What form, if any, is needed going forward?

I think from the discussion about renewable energy this morning, it sounds like the various DAC members that were on an ad hoc basis have depleted that phase. I think I'm reading from that that the ad

hoc subcommittee of the DAC is sort of complete and that you will fold that back into the DAC and have updates from Teri and her staff about the status of renewable energy things as you go forward. Is that the read from the discussion this morning?

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Before -- first, Meg -- Tom charged me with the responsibility to lead this ad hoc subgroup. And I'm sorry to say if I have failed on anything, I think it is providing adequate leadership to that subgroup to be able to regularly get together and to really delve into that issue like we had expected to. And that being said, I would like to turn the floor over to Meg and others to see if that's also their take on where we are on this.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: I couldn't disagree more. I don't think Randy failed in any way, shape or form. That's a bunch of BS. But it was just simply something that was too big for us to get our hands around. Once it comes to project area analysis, that project level analysis, the deadlines and how often we meet and getting our hands into these documents and NEPA analysis kind of wasn't our purview. We all agree it's very important, and it's going to have a huge impact.

But we really need to focus on -- we have

very few resources. We need to focus on the over-arching land use documents, the PEIS, the DRECP and maybe the projects that we know are going to have a huge impact on this. But I don't think you failed in any way, shape or form.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: One of the things we all learned from this -- I wasn't at the last one -- but I think one thing that we did learn that the focus for us to go out and study one project and bring it back really wasn't solving the big issues. That's what we have other groups for. That's what the BLM is supposed to do, look at these individual things.

And I agree with Meg. We need to look at the whole over-arching implications of installing these on public lands, whether it's a good use of public lands, whether it brings value to the owners of the public lands, which are the citizens. And I agree, we should be looking at these big documents that are going to affect things in the future. I mean, as I said before, a lot of people -- these things are already on track. There is almost nothing you can do to derail this train.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: When we formed this ad hoc group, it was really before we were aware of the DRECP train. And since that time, a majority of that

subgroup has found its way onto the DRECP stakeholder group. Meg had a time with it. I'm on it. Tom has found his way on it. And April has found her way on it, and Teri has started attending meetings. So the focus has shifted to that arena. Tom and April, please.

MEMBER ACUNA: I think it served a good purpose. Let's go back maybe three, four meetings ago. Randy, Meg, and a number of others put together some presentations, and we found out how difficult it was. It wasn't that the information they put together, the presentations weren't good. It just wasn't good timing in relationship to making a difference.

I think it was helpful in pushing us towards a new strategic direction right now. I think that's why we are here today as a result of that. And I think Teri, to her credit, she recognized we needed to move forward with maybe a different tool. And we heard earlier today that there will be focus on renewables.

I'm still hopeful and I hope we can still all push the idea of let's have meaningful discussion while it still matters as we move forward. So I think, Randy, it worked out just fine, and we should

move on and give this next thing, the strategic plan, a try.

MEMBER SALL: Yeah. The only thing I was going to add is, you know, I think we did learn a lot of lessons in the approaches that we were trying and talking about. Personally, of course, I still feel that this is one of the biggest issues right now facing the BLM and facing our public lands.

So my thought would be maybe we could have one more meeting before it dissolves, so to speak, to discuss, are there any other avenues that we could be looking at this from in terms of providing advice to you, Teri, or to the BLM on this topic that would justify continuing to have an ad hoc group or not, because it takes up so much time to discuss this.

We don't want to keep bringing it up every DAC meeting, but that's why maybe we should have another off-line group and decide if there is anything else we could do that would be meaningful or not. Anything from your Arizona lessons learned, et cetera, et cetera.

MR. MARUSKA: Other perspectives from the DAC?

MEMBER ACUNA: Well, we could get back together. I think that's a good idea as a subgroup.

And I'm happy to participate in that, and I think the focus should be timing. I think, Teri, you recognize we are not letting this go. This renewable will always be a part of what the DAC is doing now until a long way into the future. So, yeah, that's probably a good idea. Reconvene and figure out a couple more ideas that we would give Teri would be my suggestion.

MR. MARUSKA: Teri, do you have a perspective about this?

DIRECTOR RAML: Yeah, I would welcome another meeting just to kind of talk through the new instruction memorandum. I think another -- I am such a waffler on this topic because it is important. And I think tomorrow might not feel like good enough closure because I honestly know I'm not as prepared for tomorrow's short discussion on renewable energy as I would like to be. It won't be a good transition. And I know Don and Steve and I were talking about it. I think we recognize the full -- the futility of the DAC trying to tackle it in that way does not work.

On the other hand, I do think that there is a really good reason to share another round of information and then go from there, because we have made some substantial changes in approach and policy and process that I think it would be good for the DAC

to understand and then figure out how to make that meaningful. Those pre-application meetings are pretty significant and people need to know about that.

MR. MARUSKA: How about this: You spent some time this morning quite productively discussing this renewable topic and the three issues that the DFO was looking for advice on, those being the existing EIS and DRECP process, how it relates to the overall California desert, and the adequacy of public input.

And maybe this ad hoc subcommittee could meet and come back with commentary about those three issues and bring that to the DAC. And in turn, offer whatever you consider appropriate from that discussion as your advice to the DFO. Would that be a way to pull this together?

And do you have a time frame that you want to do that in because, again, part of the idea here is to target how you are going to slice these discussions into future meetings. So is this something that you are looking to do in June or September or November or December? Again, back to your critical three. What is effective, what is timely, and what is significant?

DIRECTOR RAML: I think it would be helpful if maybe we were to time that ad hoc meeting in connection with the next DRECP stakeholder meeting

maybe? And that's going to be in May. So we would have -- that would be, timing-wise, that might be really super because then we can tie into that and then we will have the DRECP process, what's going on there, and maybe we could have a closeout at the June meeting.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Do you know when that is?

DIRECTOR RAML: May 15, 16th.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Around the second Wednesday.

DIRECTOR RAML: April is going to be another Webinar and May is going to be the meeting. And we could find a time in that context.

MR. MARUSKA: So then the charge to this ad hoc subcommittee would be to report at the June DAC meeting --

DIRECTOR RAML: Yes.

MR. MARUSKA: -- on those three issues and what the update is about those topics. Will that work?

DIRECTOR RAML: Yes, I think that would be great.

MR. RAZO: For the sake of providing a comfort level for the Washington and state office management, could we not use term "ad hoc." That really scares -- it bothers management. Let's just

call it a subcommittee and take the term ad hoc out of it. That way when they read what you are doing, that won't be the problem.

MR. MARUSKA: The concept that I think the DAC is trying to capture with this is you are creating a subcommittee, but not with the idea it's going to live forever. But the subcommittees may have short lives and be in and out pretty quickly.

DIRECTOR RAML: We will find another term.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: We are going to create this little subcommittee, and that's something we can do. It's just us. We create a subcommittee, we dissolve it, it doesn't need to be a whole bunch of formality. DC and Sacramento won't get their panties in a bunch. In the future that's the type of vehicle we will use when that happens.

MR. MARUSKA: So all good on this?

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Very good. Thank you.

Thank you all.

MR. MARUSKA: So we are moving on now to the next topic, which is addressing special recreation permits. Roxie was going to cover that.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Actually, I would like to call only a five-minute break. Just a rest room break, please.

(Brief recess was taken from 4:30 to 4:40 p.m.)

MEMBER BANIS: The floor is yours, Don.

MR. MARUSKA: This is the opportunity to review the DAC subcommittee associated with special recreation permits. I think Teri as the DFO is going to share with you some of her perspectives about it, and then we will turn to Meg and Randy, the two members of that subcommittee, to comment about their recommendations and move from there.

DIRECTOR RAML: So let's revisit a little bit. So after the Johnson -- actually before, it became very obvious that BLM, the California Desert District needed to take a closer look at the processes and procedure for issuing special recreation permits, particularly for events. We knew it right after the initial inquiry team that our State Director formed and reported out.

So we knew it internally before the Johnson Valley Report, and of course, when the report came out it became public knowledge that pretty much the CDD, for all sorts of reasons, mostly good, really, had evolved into an entirely different approach to issuing these permits. And it had to do with the popularity of the report and the safety record we had of doing the events, and just the participation and

collaboration between event promoters and the field managers.

But when something that serious happens and you take a look at your processes and procedures and you figure out that you have migrated quite a distance from the official processes, it's time to take a sharp turn and implement change of practices. So that's that top bullet. We have no choice. We had no choice but to do it internally. And we had no choice because we were directed to change our practices to conform with our requirements.

And so making that abrupt change of course at the beginning of the season caused a lot of ruckus for people that had been planning these activities, these events and holding these events on BLM lands for, gosh, 30, 40, 50 years in some cases. So we abruptly changed operating procedures to a group of users. Or we were about to abruptly change. So it caused a lot of confusion and consternation, and it caused a real need on our part for clarification and communication.

So having a DAC available -- like I said at the introduction, I consider having an Advisory Council a wonderful tool -- I enlisted the help of the Advisory Council to advise us on not -- this was the part; these processes are messy -- but to advise us

not on the application of our rules, but, you know, the federal regulations that we needed comply with. But there are a whole lot of other processes and procedures associated with that that I wanted the advice of the DAC on. First off, how to communicate those changes, and also to provide us advice on how the changes affected the OHV community.

And that's when we solicited Meg's help and Randy's help and lots of meetings' help.

So where am I going with this now? We will hear from Meg kind of the outcome of the -- I will step back a little bit.

So the communication process associated with having the DAC work on it and then also soliciting the opinions and the feedback of primarily the event organizers was sloppy. But it was effective. And it was effective because we held a lot of meetings and calls, and they held a lot of meetings and calls. And Meg and Randy -- a lot of people put a lot of energy into seeking feedback and transmitting it to the BLM.

So we ended up with comments, which we have taken -- Bekki did some of the staff work of taking these letters and boiling it down into comments, which we provided to Meg. So we will do that part of it. We will continue to do that part of it. That will be

a report out as soon as I get through this slide.

So kind of the other part of this is I kind of at the outset, I thought that this -- I will call it an ad hoc because that's what it felt like, it would have kind of a beginning, as sloppy as it was, a beginning. This is what BLM is planning to do and these are the areas where we have some flexibility and we are looking for your input on the matrix, the blackout schedule. But there was just this place where we were looking for feedback. We would receive that feedback.

Meanwhile, during the time we are doing this, we are busy holding events, working on events, so we had some parallel processing. But we would get to a point where we processed this feedback, we made changes. We took into account the recommendations. We made some changes. We explained why we couldn't make other changes.

Lo and behold, along came our insurance issue -- which I'm not going to go into today; we will go into it in great detail tomorrow -- which indicated to me that our work is not yet done because it's a fluid environment. I think Meg had the best analogy, the bad marriage analogy or good marriage analogy.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: It's the first year of

marriage.

DIRECTOR RAML: So we dated all along. But because of the nature of how racing events evolved on the district, how we reached a point where we needed to change our process and procedures, some of it we have no flexibility. We have some, but we are still learning and growing. Then it came to my attention that we need to continue this work.

So that's what we are going to talk about. And the "we" in this case, the continuing of the work is "we," the BLM and also the event organizers and promoters, sponsors, and also the participants of these events, that's the "we," because it takes everybody. And then we really have, I think, kind of indirectly received feedback from other affected users. But we really -- the people that have really been most involved in informing the process have been those directly affected. So as a result, I want to continue this work. It's not an ad hoc group. I would like to continue to ask the DAC to form a subcommittee and continue to advise us on this.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: I kind of want to explain, first of all, a little bit -- two seconds on me -- is you guys might not know that I'm a member of Desert Daisies, a race club, and we put on a race. So

I am intimately familiar with the permitting process. We put on Desert Daisies. We put on a race right after the Johnson Valley accident. I help permit the L.A. B to B race -- L.A. B to B Tour, and with the State Parks for events for years with the Ocotillo Wells. So I'm probably, I would say -- I don't know if Randy has gotten any permits -- but I'm probably most familiar with it than anyone else on the DAC.

This has been an extremely controversial subject in the OHV world. They are very passionate about what they get to do. So it's been very important. So I think forming a subgroup like Teri suggested, I think we kind of have to do it. When we first had this ad hoc DAC group, the users in my group, the people that put on events, they were very -- they weren't happy because they said, what do these DAC members know about how to put on an event, how to put on a race dual sports, so how can they be giving the BLM advice? So that's one of the reasons why I think it's important to have this subgroup.

Another reason why it's important is because we have a unique subset of people, and I'm going to call it my world and you guys know what I'm talking about, and we definitely have to give them a venue to be heard. Even though these events have been

happening for 40 years on BLM land, honestly, the BLM hasn't really monitored them. So even though Roxie and Margaret have been closely monitoring them for the last six months, there are still so many things that the field offices don't know about our events, so things are definitely going to continue to change.

The BLM might find out something that we do that we have done for 40 years that they might want to change. So we need to have this ongoing communication. It doesn't mean that the BLM has to take our advice, but having that venue for people to be heard I think is extremely important.

So one of the suggestions we took away from the meeting -- we had a meeting a couple weeks ago with Don Maruska, myself, Teri, Bekki, and I can't remember who else -- I think Steve and Dave -- to decide where we should go with this group.

Some of the things that we kind of thought would be a good idea is that we have seven members, no more than that. And that they went through a nomination process. Steve and Bekki can talk about that. They meet four to six times a year -- I don't remember if I got this one okayed with you guys. But I thought that even though there are seven members, that they should be open to the public. I'm looking

for Bekki or somebody to acknowledge that that's okay.

That way, obviously we can't get every single promoter, but at least they could bring their concerns to us. And I just think that is very, very important. So I am hopeful that this group will support the formation of a subgroup. I'm not sure how long this subgroup should last. But like I said, it's the first year of marriage. Everybody is getting to know everybody. And everything is going to continue to be very fluid and very changing.

The other things that we walked away from that meeting with is that we were going to have on the CDD's Web page a Frequently Asked Questions page about permitting. So when issues -- like you are going to hear a lot about insurance tomorrow -- when this issue comes up, we as DAC members can say go to the DAC's Web page about Frequently Asked Questions about why the BLM requires this insurance. And it will be there, and you can talk about all of those things.

And one of the things that I probably stressed too much was that I would really like a better amount of communication about these changes. When these changes happen, I know it can't happen immediately, but when changes happen, I would like there to be something that goes out to people. You

call it the list serve.

So when rules are changed for permits or not even rules, but when guidelines, policies, whatever changes, whatever you want to call it, that we send something out. So there is a good amount of communication. You would not believe the amount of rumor control that all of us have had to go through because this kind of stuff is not set up yet. A portion of it can't be changed immediately because like they are the government. You can only work as fast as you can go.

But I think definitely some communication can be streamlined around this. And this might be kind of a unique subgroup to have because it's not associated with an area. But the history of events in the Southern California district is very important to the users. So I would hope you guys can be supportive of that.

Did I forget anything, Bekki?

MR. MARUSKA: What is up on the screen there, that's the action plan that came from Meg and from Randy. So this is the situation of, you know, you had a subcommittee. The subcommittee is now reporting to you at the DAC about what their suggestions are. That, in turn, is being offered to the DFO. And so

the questions for the DAC are, does this sound like a good action plan? This is the action plan.

The next slide is this would then be, if you will, the template or the charter for the creation of the subgroup. What you are asking them to do, who would participate, how it would work. The reporting to the DAC has got a format similar to what ISDRA and Dumont Dunes have in terms of they are also operationally oriented. Input needs to be provided more quickly than the June meeting, for example. And this provides a way for that information to come to the DAC for the DAC to have two weeks to chew on it and the public, in turn, before that gets forwarded formally to the DFO.

Of course, if there is something happening that's critical with regard to special recreation permits that needs to be decided more quickly, that's always the DFO's prerogative to take action on any information to protect public health and safety and manage the resources effectively. But this would be a basic template for it.

So as part of the idea from the subcommittee was, if you had an action plan like this and you had then an opportunity for people to start applying for this, it would be a way for the DAC to respond to the

strong energy and interest that I understand is shaping up for tomorrow's meeting on this topic and say here is the plan, here is the direction, here is the pathway. Plug in here.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: If I had my say in it, which I obviously don't necessarily, I think our first meeting would probably be kind of looking at -- it seems like we always do these things backwards. We deal with the immediate issue and then develop a plan. My first meeting I would like to have some type of -- I have spent some time on a business plan for this group. Instead of doing it backwards, let's spend half a day or two hours on a business plan for this group with the help from the BLM. So this is what we want to tackle.

And we need to be very clear with these people that you run through the DAC so that what's happened with the other subgroups doesn't happen. So they give advice to the DAC member and that goes to the DAC so everybody is clear on that, so it doesn't go astray like the others have gone astray.

DIRECTOR RAML: Let me speak a little bit about -- where is Roxie? Roxie is working on other high priority stuff that I'm glad she is working on that and not here. But one of the things that

happened in parallel was that Roxie -- I asked Roxie -- actually, she volunteered also, to kind of lead the internal BLM look at how we were going to proceed, particularly for the upcoming events season.

So Roxie, along with Margaret, Bekki and the other field managers, primarily Hector because we have some events in the other two field offices but not near as many, have been meeting since -- monthly, but have had several meetings and conference calls to examine our processes and procedures and to make sure that internally we have the same look at what we have to do and what the regulations say and really try as best as we can, have if not a consistent approach from one office to another, at least really clear, concise rationale why one office might do one thing and another office do another.

And that work has been ongoing. So one of the other benefits that this particular subcommittee will have is they will have an already formed BLM task force. So I think that the working together of the information exchange between those two entities is going to be absolutely critical because BLM is tackling a lot of things because we have to. We don't want this subgroup to recreate the wheel if we are on that path. But yet on the other hand, I think that

the community has a lot to offer us in terms of particularly measuring impacts and if there are ways that we can address our impacts on the community.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: I would like to see this subgroup to be very open to the public, and we encourage things. I think that sometimes OHV use and maybe even this subject in the coming months and years is going to take up a lot of our time at DAC meetings. And if we get them flushed out at the subgroup meetings, then that would be more effective of our use of time and of the SRP subgroup's use of time because we are going to find a huge crowd tomorrow, I think.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: If I may, I would like to state my intent that tomorrow I intend, pursuant to Section 2 of the bylaws and with the concurrence of Teri, to establish a subgroup for this purpose.

And I also intend, concurrent with Section 3 of the bylaws and with Teri's concurrence, to ask Meg to chair this subgroup. And what I would be grateful for is any comments from the DAC that might be in opposition to, cautionary, or something -- or perspective that we may not have considered.

Are there any thoughts to add?

MR. MARUSKA: Before you go quite there, Mr. Chair, we might turn to Steve, and Steve will

describe what the process would be for taking applications for other members. And then you have this subgroup and then you will have sort of the whole picture and people can comment about the whole picture. Is that good?

MR. RAZO: Because you are including public in this process, you have in your packet a copy of the nomination for the subgroup or subcommittee. It's supposed to be subgroup. We tried to catch them all. Subgroup. And that will be available also to the public.

We have to put out an announcement that the subgroup has been formed, and we need to then give time for people to submit their nominations. So before you get even to the point of appointing a chair or whatever, you actually have to formally form the group in accordance with policy. So there has to be some time here for this process to work itself.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: You have to put out the public announcement saying they are asking for nominations. How long does that run?

MR. RAZO: The Federal Register notice --

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: We don't have to do a Federal Register notice for a subgroup.

MR. RAZO: For a subcommittee. Subgroup you

don't have to. Which is good.

We will put out a release, a news release announcing that this group has been formed and are now soliciting nominations for this. Normally it's a 30-day time frame for people to -- do you want to change that or do you want to make it less time?

MEMBER SHUMWAY: For the announcement?

MR. RAZO: For people to submit the announcement.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: I thought it said 45 days.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: It's a different time frame. I only want to make it 30. My community is really, really, wanting to be heard. And we need to give them a venue to be heard. And if I can help you in any way -- I have no job, and I will help you. But really, I think it's important that we try to do it in 30 days.

MR. RAZO: We won't get any flak for 30 days.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: My intentions remain the same, but my time line has been adjusted.

MR. MARUSKA: I'm not exactly sure. I think under your bylaws -- and Steve, correct me on this because you are the expert on the public interaction on these things -- but if you wish, and if the DAC feels it appropriate to designate a member of the DAC

as on this committee which you need to have a DAC member, so you ought to get that squared. And if you want to declare at this meeting because this subgroup is going to get formed between now and your next meeting, whom you wish to have as your chair, I think that that's certainly within your purview. Unless other DAC members think that sounds too precipitous or problematic.

MR. RAZO: This is a volatile and sensitive subject. You have a lot of stakeholders out there very interested in this -- in the formation of this. For one, I think any pre-move like that might be construed as negative.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: I agree.

DIRECTOR RAML: So you will serve and then we will go from there.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: We need to do it in a public venue. Randy needs to make the motion in public. I don't want to do anything behind closed doors.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: That's why again I'm just stating my intent. I'm not making an edict. But I'm in concurrence with all of the work that the BLM and Meg has put into this. And thanks to Ron for lending the wisdom of a Baja racer to the process. I

appreciate your comments as well. It was kind of you to take the time do so.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: When we had our meeting internally about this at the Moreno Valley office, we talked about -- you know how in our DAC and normally the public groups, we have one representative for each different type of use. Well, it's not as clear with OHV events. I'm not sure how we would go about doing that. But I think we should discuss how we are going to deal with this before we get out to the public. Am I doing something wrong, Dick?

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: There was some wording up there on how the group was going to be formed.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: I just want to have you guys all think about it and we can have a discussion. Do we want one person from competition? Do we want to wait until we get applications and see how we want to round it out? I'm nervous of putting ourselves into a box that we have to have these named representatives because I'm not sure how that's going to work out, depending on who applies.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: I agree. Are there any other ideas of expertise that we should seek and add to the list of potential representation that we might want?

MEMBER HALLENBECK: There is another viewpoint from like the Sierra Club or the desert keepers who aren't looking to facilitate the process.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: I don't think we should exclude them. If they hold events and would like to --

MEMBER HALLENBECK: What if they don't hold events and they want to monitor how BLM is going down this road? Maybe they want to stop events from happening, and they want to be on the subgroup.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: I'm still thinking it through.

MR. MARUSKA: That's really where, if I could -- not to direct you in one manner or another, but that's really where your mission is very important. So you want to clarify, what are you asking these folks to do? Are you asking them to evaluate whether such events should happen or not? Or are you asking them to identify aberrational issues in the application required, how are you narrowing or expanding this focus? You could have a much more expansive focus than what was provided from your subcommittee.

But the subcommittee was suggesting it be quite a targeted, sort of surgical focus. And the

surgical focus will be to help identify operational issues, provide comments, and current and proposed action and communicating these out to interested parties. That's a much more narrow focus than the focus of should there be such events or not. Not saying it should be one way or another, but if the DAC feels that broader perspective should be in there, then you have to rewrite the mission.

If that's your mission, who is appropriate and what expertise do you need to fulfill the mission. And then okay, how many slots do you need to have to cover the expertise that you are seeking. So that's where actually these things all need to be linked in. And in fact, the application form that Steve has asks people to describe, well, what expertise are they bringing that speaks to this charter for the subgroup. And how could they help contribute to what the mission is of this subgroup.

So it all needs to be linked closely together. So this would probably be a good point at which to have the DAC discuss what is the scope of this group that you are looking at? Is it the one that your subcommittee came up with, or do you want to make it more expansive? What are the druthers of the DAC about what you are looking for and ultimately what

is the concurrence or the direction from the DFO about what she needs through the subgroup and the DAC to get the advice that she is looking for. So maybe we might start there.

Teri, are you looking for a subgroup that's kind of weighing the merits of having special recreation events, or are you looking --

DIRECTOR RAML: I will make it quick for us. No, I'm looking for a fairly narrow focused group.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: I started a list with April and Monica and Ron, please.

MEMBER SALL: I was going to say, this seems like a question that we should ask not only of Teri, but because she is new, also of all of the field office managers, which they are not all here, but what their needs are for special recreation permits and what they currently have that's working and not working, and what other types of events that may not be addressed in order to answer those questions. I feel, for one, under-prepared to address that question given the current information that I have.

MEMBER ARGANDONA: Well, and I was going to say, maybe not the merits of having an event or not having one. And I do not claim to know very much about permitting at all, so correct me if I'm wrong

here. But in the permitting process, is part of the consideration for giving a permit, like, for instance, there was a race back in November and --

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: It's a tour, not a race.

MEMBER ARGANDONA: Okay. And we had concerns about the route that was going to be used in that race. Is that something that's considered during the permitting process? And then it would make sense to have somebody outside of those four-wheel dual sport, those groups, somebody else represented also who can say something about that. So it's not so much having an event or not, but where is the event being held? There might be concern there from another representative from an outside group outside of the people doing the race or tour.

MEMBER JOHNSTON: Just to add on what Monica said, bullet No. 4 specifically does not restrict the people that participated in a subgroup to those involved in motorized recreation. Specifically, it says equestrian groups as well, and there are rides that are promoted. And there is, I think, if at all possible there should be representation from that group as well.

MEMBER BANIS: Richard and then Tom.

MEMBER RUDNICK: To kind of go back to what

Tom brought up and Monica expanded on, the fact to have somebody else, environmental group representative, concerned citizen group representative -- at that level, I think will quell a lot of problems down the line and maybe grease the wheels to promote these kinds of events, which I think are some of the more responsible uses of the motorized desert. Equestrians are always responsible.

MEMBER JOHNSTON: You aren't biased at all.

MEMBER RUDNICK: But in forming this committee out, I don't know much about it, but I would defer to somebody like Meg to come up with who she thinks would make a good committee and to do a lot of the ground work that we are being asked to do right now. That's all.

MEMBER ACUNA: With regard to routing, and you brought up a good point, Monica. But I'm not sure that's really what the focus should be on with regard to the SRP group. The routes are established already. We were not trying to build a group to challenge the routes.

If they utilize routes under the normal BLM designation process that's approved, put that aside. This is all about safety and implementation of the permit conditions. And that's what really needs to be

improved upon. So I would try to steer this away from a routing issue.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Dick and then Meg, please.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: I think that this is more on a procedural issue, how the permits are handled procedurally rather than operationally. The operational part of a permit is the responsibility of the BLM and the local field office as to whether the routes are right or whether they want to send in a monitor. But this particular group to me is set up to help the BLM set the procedures up for the routes or the permits.

And again, we can have lists there. We have mountain bikers, we have people that are putting on other things that are not motorized recreation. And I don't know how many other types of things, but from poker runs to weddings, all kinds of things need permits if they are going to have so many people on them. But it's a procedural issue, not an operational issue.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Before everybody has another round at it, I would like to say that I believe this committee should address the problem at hand that caused us to take on this issue. And I believe that problem was the difficulties expressed by promoters

and event organizers in obtaining SRPs under the strategy that has been offered by the BLM.

I have Meg, Tom Hallenbeck and April.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: I would not personally be opposed to someone from the environmental communities being on this group at all. Just as long as it's aware that our surgical look and focus is the permitting process. We are not going to be looking at routes. That happens in the land management plans. I mean, I'm certainly not opposed to, if the environmental communities wants to do something else with routes and all that kind of stuff, that's another process.

It's very surgical how the permitting process has become difficult and confused and miscommunicated, so that's what this group should be focusing on. If someone from the environmental community wants to give us input on that process, I'm fine with that.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: That was my point. I think the fourth bullet is misleading and you should take it out and allow the people to apply that are interested, whatever their background is, and have the chairman and the DFO evaluate their qualification and build a team that's diverse and appropriate for the task at hand.

That was my point is to open it up just a little bit more than what is listed there. I'm also drawing from the matrix of comments that we were sent to look at, and there were people that were feeling left out because they weren't motorized.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Thanks for that advice.
April.

MEMBER SALL: Yeah. Similar point as the last three speakers. I guess I didn't articulate my first comment.

There are several different types of events and user groups that may either currently need an SRP or in the future might need it. And the BLM should help us with that list of what expertise is needed to redefine and review that guideline and create that subgroup.

I was just saying I don't have the expertise that the BLM and all appropriate field managers and maybe they have already weighed in on this decision, but reiterating that they help guide whatever expertise is needed for the subgroup so we don't revisit this again in the near future.

MR. MARUSKA: May I just suggest that before you kind of wrap on your direction here, Roxie and Margaret, are there perspectives that you want to add

about what you are looking for in engaging people from the public in working with your internal SRP task force on working out these procedural issues and SRPs that would be helpful here?

MS. TROST: From my perspective, I think it could be a diverse group to help us get the word out to all the interested parties when some discussions occur in the group. And I think that's an issue that we are facing now, that there are some discussions going on and it takes a while for that information to get out to everyone.

Also, I think there are some specific tasks that that group can take on as well. And I don't know if there has been discussion about what some of those tasks might be. But there is a real line between what we have decision points on. And I think we need to work closely with the subgroup and be able to work out what those decision points are. What is it that the SRP task group is working on compared to what the SRP subgroup is working on?

MR. MARUSKA: Do you have thoughts about -- you know, here is a fairly broad mission. Three bullet points there at the start about the mission. Do you have more specific issues in mind that you would like to task this group to? Before you arrived,

Roxie, the DAC went through a process of identifying some specific issues, for example, the ISDRA and the Dumont Dunes subgroups to be addressing in 2011.

It would be appropriate here if the DAC has specific issues with your guidance and Teri's about issues you would like this group to grapple with, I think it would be valuable to list out what are those issues that you want people to work on, then people would know whether they wanted to sign up to work on those. Do you have any ideas off the top of your head.

MS. TROST: Is this the point that you wanted to go in this direction?

DIRECTOR RAML: Yeah, I think so. I have a thought, and I'm not sure that the best time to offer it is now. I don't know if you want to get closer to the end.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: I think we are getting closer to the end.

MR. MARUSKA: The focal point here is what is going to serve the advisory needs of the DFO.

DIRECTOR RAML: So now is as good a time as any.

When we are talking about a diverse group, what I am hoping I am hearing is diverse group of the

people looking for special recreation permits. I don't want -- I will just be blunt. I don't want to have this group get bogged down in defending the validity of the use. There is another -- we have recreation theme. We were asking for all sorts of input on, are we discussing the diversity of recreation? There is a place for that discussion about the different forms of recreation in the CDD and their value and are we giving them enough attention.

This particular subgroup is really designed to help give a voice to the community of users. And they do range from equestrian to -- we are learning about one size does not fit all. And they -- we don't know what we don't know sort of stuff. And this group is to really give those diverse groups a voice and to make sure everybody understands. So it's a narrow mission but it's fairly -- if you are in the communities, it seems fairly broad. The difference between a poker run and a hare and a hound and equestrian -- it's fascinating the diversity of the people who want permits.

MR. MARUSKA: So if I'm hearing you correctly, you would actually like to essentially, if you will, keep the focus of that fourth bullet point because you are seeking advice from people who are

familiar with and use special recreation permits on how procedurally and operationally to make those specific things of insurance or whatever else work and sort through. And that you would like to have a discussion about broader recreational uses and conflicts of uses or whatever happens at that June meeting on the recreation topic overall.

DIRECTOR RAML: Yes. Our changes have had a dramatic impact on the user groups. And there is a fear, probably appropriately placed in a way, by the way that -- sometimes by the way we are doing business and by some of the communication that their sport is going to be permitted out of business. And I really want to have a forum for those folks to come and participate in a discussion.

And I think it would be -- for me it would be counter-productive for that particular group who is grappling with how we are going to alter the way we are doing business to have to fight for the validity of their activities. That to me would be a counter-productive forum for that use group. Not that that discussion shouldn't happen. But I don't want it to happen with the context of how do I get a permit for my event and what hoops do I need to jump through and how do I do cost recovery. That's the focus of

this group.

MR. MARUSKA: Let me focus the question for the DAC. Per the charter and per the DAC bylaws, such subgroups get created by the direction of the Chair and with the concurrence of the Designated Field Officer. So I think you have two ways you could go with this. You could go with what your Designated Field Officer is asking for. Or if you feel that that is too narrow, you could give her advice and say that's too narrow.

But I think it's sort of like you choose A or B. And I think it would be valuable for you to see if you have concurrence on the advice that you would give her about which of those avenues to go. So are there others that have not yet spoken who wish to opine about that?

MEMBER SALL: Can someone from BLM give, like, a list of the other types of activities requiring SRP's besides OHV races so that everyone has the perspective of that?

MS. TROST: It could be a foot race, anything that's advertised or a fee is charged for. If it's advertised in the local places or if money is collected, even if a donation, those require some sort of SRP.

MEMBER SALL: Let me ask a follow-up question. So would it be appropriate, because it sounds like one of the issues that many of us are kind of discussing is how many other representation seats are appropriate, would it be appropriate to maybe say there should be ten seats, for example, and three of them are from other event permittee groups or something like that? I'm just trying to get at this broad representation thing without belaboring the point. My point is not about should a race happen or not, but is a broad constituency that has to get permits represented in this group? Would something like that be appropriate?

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: This is what I wanted to focus on. I want us to get on the same page about what this is going to look like and what the members of this are going to look like because I don't want to hash this out for three hours in public tomorrow. And April has a great point, that for other SRP people that are not OHV people, that we need to have them represented also. But I'm very reluctant to put a number down on paper, because what happens if we don't get anybody from that community? I more than welcome them.

MEMBER SALL: Maybe a percentage.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: But what happens if we get nobody, and I don't want to have this two-hour discussion.

MR. MARUSKA: Let me give a historical perspective. I know in the past there were designations even in the ISDRA subgroup. But the environmental representative, when seeing the mission and the topics and the direction of what the ISDRA subgroup is supposed to come up with, you didn't get people stepping forward because they said, that's not the mission that that environmentalist and that organization is pursuing. So they are not interested and they don't apply.

And I don't think you would want to hamstring this group, subgroup forming to get its immediate task done by requiring it to have some proportion that you may find, based on the mission and the narrow focus that Teri is giving you of her request, would result in people not coming forward to fulfill that because that isn't what they are after.

I think, extending this, would it work for you -- and I'm just offering it if it's helpful to you; I'm not trying to direct you -- but rather than just saying event permittees who are familiar representatives from those different areas or any

other participants that have organized -- have events that require an SRP, and then you are picking in whatever the rest of that universe is. And then whoever applies, applies.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: We will attempt to make it as balanced as possible. To get people from -- I don't think any of us are against that.

MS. SALL: I'm just trying to avoid any unnecessary criticism, if possible.

MEMBER JOHNSTON: Just open the door and advertise it that way that it's an open door.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: This will come back to the DAC because Section 2-B, No. 1, says the selection and appointment of subgroup members is by the DAC with the concurrence of the DFO.

MR. MARUSKA: So it comes back to the whole DAC.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: So what I would expect would probably happen is that applications would be solicited. A body would match those applications against the plan, the desires of the plan, and that they would be nominated and brought back to this body, and this body would have the opportunity to have a final say.

MEMBER JOHNSTON: And time to balance it, if

possible.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: I thought the Chair and the DFO would select.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: The Chair, with the concurrence of the DFO -- the Chair can establish the subgroup. That doesn't say that the Chair appoints them. The Chair doesn't name them. The Chair establishes and says that there will be, with the concurrence of the DFO, that there will be a subgroup. Everybody apply. They all apply and through the process, a group of nominees is developed and put forward to the full DAC. The full DAC would act on that with the concurrence of the DFO. And then I and Teri would find a Chair for that.

MR. MARUSKA: Just to clarify so this is absolutely on target, then. So the selection of people for subgroups is different than the process for the selection of people for subcommittees. In other words, in the subcommittee, the Chair and the DFO can pick them. For subgroups, you are laying out a public process and a full DAC solution to that.

So just from a practical point of view, you will have this process go on. It will take the month or whatever to get the applications. So this means that you wouldn't actually form the subgroup and it

wouldn't be formally constituted until the June meeting of the DAC. Is that correct? Because it would be coming back to the DAC to review. Because that would be problematic in the viewpoint of getting this.

MEMBER BANIS: Dinah. I'm sorry. Please. First, Roxie, please.

MS. TROST: What we did when we initiated the Dumont Dunes subgroup, rather than wait for the next meeting of the DAC, the nominations went forward to the entire DAC, and you guys all came back with concurrence through the DFO.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: Through e-mail.

MS. TROST: Yes.

MR. MARUSKA: You could specify, given the urgency of moving that forward, you are going to use that procedure.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: I think that's probably in one of our minutes, maybe the first meeting that I ever attended was that we resolved that the DAC could make decisions that come from the BLM by e-mail or phone call or whatever. So the thing, the process is already established.

MR. MARUSKA: So that's all clear.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: We don't want to wait

that long.

MR. MARUSKA: So what I am hearing, then, is that this slide would be revised to indicate that it would be not only representatives from those specific groups, but from any other groups or individuals that have knowledge, experience, or interest in SRP events that require SRPs. Is that right?

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: Are we all in agreement that we were not going to pigeonhole ourselves in naming seven people, one from each thing? We are going to make an attempt to make it balanced, but we are not going to name one from dual sport, one from competition, one from this and that. And hopefully this won't be a five-hour conversation tomorrow.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: Do we want to move the number of seven to give yourself some flexibility?

CHAIRMAN BANIS: I think it's just a goal. I don't think it needs to be too large or unwieldy. Seven, nine if it happened, but we are not looking at 15. We were not looking at anything like that, are we?

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: I disagree. I think seven is a good number and workable. But I think because these meetings will be open to the public, so even if you don't get on this subcommittee you can

still come and attend. But I have been doing this for a long time, and when you get a large group it's very hard to come to consensus or do anything. So I think seven is a nice, easy-to-corrall number, but I could be wrong.

DIRECTOR RAML: Maybe a range, maybe six to ten or something because it would be terrible to end up with some kind of Solomon's choice.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: I want that one to be definite. It can't be 15.

DIRECTOR RAML: I will differ to you for advice on that. What if you had eight folks come forward and then we said seven. So it's the same thing of not locking in.

MR. MARUSKA: If you say seven to nine and then you choose seven, but there were other people who could have been eight and nine, but you would be doubling up on other interests, they say then, you could have appointed me, why didn't you? So you get into the negative backflow on it. And generally smaller groups are more workable than larger groups.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: He is saying we need to pick one number. If you say seven to nine, someone could say, well, you could have picked nine. How come I didn't get picked?

MEMBER RUDNICK: Because you didn't want them. Easy.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: Richard, behave yourself.

MR. MARUSKA: So does this -- we will change 4 there to be identifying, to broadening out representatives, and parens, not just those specific limited areas, but others with experience or interest in securing SRPs. And that will be your basic program going forward. And you will have 30 days for people to submit, and you will make a decision by the recommendation from the Chair and the DFO, with confirmation by the DAC as a whole. Does that work?

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: And that we agreed seven was the number we wanted to stick with.

MEMBER BANIS: Seven sounds good.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: So the other thing that I was going to suggest for you tomorrow, again, to assist with this idea of encouraging and kind of giving people an opportunity to direct their voices in a constructive manner, because if you do have, as I'm hearing you may have, upwards of 100 or so people tomorrow -- I have heard rumblings to that effect -- one thing that I found useful elsewhere is to provide them with sheets of paper on which to offer any ideas that they have or suggestions they would like to

submit to this subgroup that's in formation. So that whatever thoughts they have at the moment, whatever suggestions, solutions or issues they need attention, they write them down.

You say, good, we are going to get that over to the subgroup and so your thoughts and concerns aren't being lost here. And all hundred of you don't have to talk because you have a process for the DAC to get these things addressed in another forum.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: I will be happy to do so.
4:35 -- we can still do this. Okay. We can still do this by 5:00.

MEMBER SALL: This is a preventive question. So in the attempt to I guess look at potential issues tomorrow, if we did have 100 or 200 people wanting to give public comment on this one issue, has that ever happened before? And has there been a procedure for dealing with this?

MR. RAZO: Yes, we have had more than that. But unfortunately, they have to fill out a speaker card. But we do stick to the -- you can make it less than three minutes, two minutes, and insist that whatever comment they are going to make has some worth to it rather than just get up and be emotional.

MEMBER SALL: Has there been a situation

where that has happened and it started to become very uncontrolled?

MR. RAZO: The Designated Federal Official has the authority to suspend the meeting. If that happens, she has the authority to take a break, cut the meeting off, and in a sense have them calm down. Or she has the authority to cancel.

MEMBER SALL: That's what I was wondering.

MR. MARUSKA: The other thing I found to be useful, when you do have a large group, you thank them all for coming. You encourage them to select a spokesperson. And when that spokesperson speaks, to have the rest of the people that have come for that issue, if they want to identify themselves with that position, to raise their hands.

And I think the degree with which you have done the work today to identify a vehicle for these issues to get resolved, I think you have an opportunity to redirect that energy in a constructive way.

And I also suggested that you give them something to write ideas down. They don't feel like they came all the way here and didn't get the chance to stand and deliver, which you could appreciate if you drove an hour or two hours from somewhere and

didn't get a chance to do something. That's pretty frustrating.

So I think, Steve, you intend to have application forms for this SRP subgroup available for people. That's another thing they can do if they feel like they have an important qualification to contribute to this, they can do that.

The application form, to your point, Tom, does ask them so that the Chair and the DFO can evaluate the application, does ask them to identify which area of expertise do you have so they know which it is that they are trying to represent. So you can judge that to balance it out. Does that sound like a game plan for tomorrow?

DIRECTOR RAML: We have lots of good meeting techniques that we will employ if things start to -- for our benefit, the field managers are here, so if it needs to be a big meeting and people want to say something, we can quickly determine to have our field managers be available in a smaller group because if the meeting is going long and people really feel they have something to say but they don't want to be here until late, and with that many people, we can actually break them up into smaller groups, and they can speak to a DAC member with the field manager present.

So there are lots of things we can do to manage the fact that people have made a tremendous effort to be here, they want to be heard or they want to hear what other people have to say.

You all know this, too. We will work on our body language, because one of the things that helps is when people are talking, for us to look and catch other people's eye to show that we acknowledge that we see they are in agreement with the point being made so people don't feel they need to come up. So part of it is for us to watch talking, then look, and then acknowledge and make eye contact with someone that's nodding their head to give them that acknowledgment that you hear, you see that they are in agreement.

There are all sorts of stuff, and we will huddle if it seems like -- because it's going to be a double whammy, because when the Marine Corps talks about Twentynine Palms, my goodness. And if it goes anything like it did yesterday at the DMG, it could be quite a meeting.

MR. MARUSKA: So just to clarify that and maybe we could turn to Steve and David, if, in fact, a large number of people are here with very particular concerns and issues about the SRP opportunities, since you do have the benefit of BLM's internal SRP task

force, is there even a room available adjacent or space in the hallway or something where they could go while the DAC goes on to other topics and get into an opportunity to have some dialogue about this topic and what the status is of things?

DIRECTOR RAML: Yeah. I know I am beating this topic to death, but I think it's really important that we -- that the meeting is constructed in a way that it doesn't look like we are trying to manipulate them into not talking. So that's important to me that we don't look at the time, look at how many people and somehow indicate that their effort to come and speak to us, we are going to make it so it's quick and painless, and I think we will work hard on that and I'm hoping -- we will see how it plays out, but I consider this really important.

MEMBER RUDNICK: Isn't it unfair to the other topics?

DIRECTOR RAML: That's why we will look for other meeting tools.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: If we do have a good turnout, that goes to our stated goal of getting public participation. I mean, it's sort of good side and bad side, and I agree with you, Teri, we need to have other ways to do that. But we definitely want to

make people feel heard. That is our goal.

But I like Don's idea, especially in this brand-new subgroup. It might be more useful to the group to pin down their ideas and sort of take the attitude of public participation where every concern is addressed in some way. It doesn't have to get back to them, but at least they have to understand that this is the very beginning of this process. So their suggestions, either by paper or by voice, are going to be considered by the group. But they are not -- the group is not ready to do anything right at this point.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: I think that's why it's important for me to state early on in this agenda item that this is a subgroup that we will be forming and that we are already acting on this, because their comment is to specifically what the group is going to do and what comments it's going to take. There will be that forum for it, and they will have that opportunity in all the subgroup meetings. This isn't the end for them. This will be just the beginning for them.

MEMBER HALLENBECK: This is a published agenda. There is only 15 minutes for public comment on SRP issues.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Ten seconds each.

MEMBER HALLENBECK: That might give people -- you walk in the door and see that. Is there a way to adjust that?

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Is there a way to make it like 90 seconds or something like that?

CHAIRMAN BANIS: If necessary, I think what we would like to do as far as these what-ifs, Teri and I can make eye contact or she can kick me under the table. I can call a very brief recess. We could do a quick kibbutz and make a plan B, and we will adjust things accordingly.

DIRECTOR RAML: That's why we kept Don here to assist us.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: It may be important to emphasize that this group will be formed quickly, not going to take the normal three months to get done, and that we understand the importance of it.

MR. MARUSKA: One other idea I have for you -- and I don't know, Roxie and Margaret, if this would work for you or not -- is that you could if you wish consider during the lunch break -- we would bring in food for you -- but to have that be an informational time. If you see that a lot of people are here for the SRP issue is going to be coming up after lunch, people may have questions, things they

would like to know before we go into that topic.

You know, Roxie and Margaret will be here and will be glad to talk to you during lunch time. You will back at 12:30 and you will be available for a half hour or so to talk about the topic before you get into it so people are maybe more informed and up to date about what is going on. And that's another way that they can feel like they have had a little face time with you before all of a sudden, they are going to jump in. We need to read the group in the morning and if you are willing, I think that could be very helpful.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Thank you.

MR. MARUSKA: So you have an action plan here.

We have one more item to cover: What are your thoughts about key factors for success? And what can you do to help this effort be successful in your strategic work plan for the year.

Before I go, I want to clarify with the DFO and with the DAC, I propose to take the key items that you are bringing over as action items from today, as modified by your discussion and so on, and prepare those on the Power Point slides so that you can, as you go through each segment tomorrow, put up what

those were and what you came out with to help facilitate that discussion, if that would be useful for you. And so then we will be prepared to be as effective as possible in the session tomorrow.

So, I think that just to check in, there has been -- I think there is some forward plans covered here. Steve is working on your question, Dinah, about what those future September, November, December dates might be.

I think that you have covered the other fees and such as they might be used in the discussion you had on fees.

We didn't really particularly get to where route designations might come into play, but that might be a segment of the theme topics and you would have to turn to that route designation effort to figure out what meeting that would slot into.

And we talked about the consistent information on the fees. And I think the metrics for success you covered a little bit earlier today in having a way to log and track what advice, formal and informal, you give and what the response has been from BLM, either through the DFO's report or through some way to log that on the Web site. She will be coming back to you on that.

And I think to your comments and the question in the morning, did you have an opportunity to look at the agenda for tomorrow, April, and see that you have -- public comment is by topic so that people can plug in on each topic as you go along.

MEMBER SALL: My last concern, I guess, is more about the management of public comment. I think we already talked about that because I want to make sure everybody has a chance for public comment and that it's enforced across the board.

DIRECTOR RAML: We will task one of those three able people over there with being our timekeepers tomorrow, and they can't get distracted, because that's what happens to us, and that bothers all of us.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: One of my other pet peeves is that someone will get up there and they will talk for two seconds about what they are supposed to be making public comments on and then go on for the next two and a half minutes for something that's not relevant. And even if it's someone that historically has been able to get away with it, we need to be polite but firm.

MR. MARUSKA: We have one final item. That is, I would like you to reflect for a moment on what

you think is going to be -- you talked about the strategic work plan, about where you want to go and what you want to get done.

I want you to think for a few minutes about what is going to be important for the DAC and BLM to work together successfully in executing this. What are going to be the key factors for success. I think there is a different color sheet of paper. Take out the blue sheets and jot down what you think would be a key factor for success, one per sheet.

Jot those down, and any quick thoughts that you have about what you could do to help implement those suggestions. And what I would like to do is just have us close this session with your commentary about what do you think is going to be most important and what do you think you can do. What is most important for being successful as a DAC, and what do you think you could personally do to help that go forward. So think about that for a moment and jot down a couple notes, and we will see what you have got.

Who would like to start? Tom, we will go with you, and I think we will go counter-clockwise and come around.

MEMBER ACUNA: Mine is very simple. Don't go

silent. Communication: Not to go silent between now and the next meeting because what happens is we wait until the last minute before the meeting starts and we start sending out e-mails and start talking. It's too late. And my personal contribution, Randy, if you send me an e-mail and you say, Tom, I need a yes or no, let me know that and let me know if you want my opinion and I will respond to that. So I will contribute to the communication. Just keep it simple, yes or no. You want my opinion.

MEMBER RUDNICK: Ditto.

MR. MARUSKA: Continue communication and prep in advance. And that you will be glad to respond promptly especially if you were given yes, no, or an opinion request.

MEMBER HALLENBECK: Communication feedback. Was the advice that the BLM received timely, effective and significant?

MR. MARUSKA: And what would be your contribution?

MEMBER HALLENBECK: I will tell you what I think if you tell me what you think. I will tell her what I think if she tells me what she thinks.

MR. MARUSKA: You will be directive in your advice. You want a direct response about what

happened. Okay. April.

MEMBER SALL: The first one is similar to the two: Clear communication and suggestions from the DFO or field office managers what helpful advice would be and helpful recommendations from the DAC would be. And the second was opportunities for out-of-box thinking and brainstorming about potential solutions in reference to current BLM issues.

MR. MARUSKA: The first one was clear request from the DFO so you know exactly what you are being asked for. And the second one was --

MEMBER SALL: Opportunities for out-of-the-box thinking and brainstorming about new potential solutions to issues BLM is facing, because clearly these issues have been ongoing. Time to think about them differently.

MR. MARUSKA: What can you contribute?

MEMBER SALL: I'm available for all of the above. Personal commitment.

MR. MARUSKA: Randy may be coming to you with ideas or requests that he has about how you can be of assistance in your Vice Chair role to leverage the efforts here.

Dick, what do you think is going to be a key factor for success?

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: Just for the BLM to show that they act on our suggestions, give us feedback on whether they can complete them or not.

MR. MARUSKA: What can you do to contribute?

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: Be available to answer questions and write e-mails.

DIRECTOR RAML: He does a lot of staff work for us. I'm not being sarcastic.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: Oh, no, I have seen it. I have lived through it.

This is going to be very unpopular: Work group meetings and less tours. I kind of think that -- I know, you guys, but it's been so helpful for us to be more productive to get on track strategically and get organized.

And my personal thing, I will try to be brief and more politically correct.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: Fat chance of that.

MR. MARUSKA: Is there a general feeling about the level of field trips you take relative to meetings? Meg tossed that out there. I don't know if you want to look at that question or if that's something you want to come back to or think about.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: We can mix it up.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: If you planned your field

trips to be local to where you are meeting, you could do a morning business meeting and an afternoon field trip. That's not too much of a thing to ask. I mean, keep the field trips. Going out to these places is really nice. But I think since you asked, Don, that most of us -- I know I'm one of them -- I feel like I would rather go out to a place that seems to be relevant to BLM issues. Hey, listen, I do a lot of field trips. I love them. But I feel that I would like to go on a field trip relevant to our DAC business.

MS. LASELL: One of the public comments was that they would like to have the DAC attend an SRP event. So I want to throw that out there.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: That would be an argument of which one.

MR. MARUSKA: Richard.

MEMBER RUDNICK: Just the opposite of Meg. Less work groups and more tours. But I am serious, and I agree with Dinah that to have relevant tours and relevant on-the-ground seeing of conflicts, say, or BLM issues, something that we are going to discuss at the next day would be very helpful. And I'm sure there are a few conflicts out there.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: There may be at some point

in time an opportunity to have a hybrid where on the field trip, we are at a visitor's center that might have a back conference room where we could engage in a 90-minute discussion on an issue. So that's possible.

MR. MARUSKA: So Dick, what can you contribute directly yourself?

MEMBER RUDNICK: Well, to be available and to add whatever small part I could. I think there is much need to see exactly what is happening on the ground and react to it.

MR. MARUSKA: Dinah.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: I hope I'm not reiterating what everybody said, but I would like recognition or confirmation in some way of the advice that the DAC gives at our official meetings. And that could be, as we said, a brief summary, bullet points at the end of the meeting, like when we determine the next meeting date. And I also wonder how difficult it would be to post those bullets on the DAC Web site in a matrix, perhaps, which has a progressive sort of documentation of how that advice gets implemented in some way. Or a response from the BLM on why or why not the advice cannot be implemented in some way. So you have to be circumspect about which bullets points we have at the end. And my participation would be to review that

summary before two weeks before the meeting.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: Positive feedback.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: Four minutes before happy hour. I thought I would remind you.

MEMBER JOHNSTON: Very simply, just keep suggestions that I should make focused, constructive and germane, and not run off into the woods somewhere and get off track. And that's how I will best contribute that is by using a little bit of self-discipline, like Meg.

MR. MARUSKA: Was there any other key factor for success that you thought overall? You identified something you are personally going to contribute. That's great. So do you think that's something for the whole group?

MEMBER JOHNSTON: I find the tours very constructive and very good in creating a partnership between the DAC and the BLM, just so we are all up to speed on what the issues may be as we perceive them.

MR. MARUSKA: Monica.

MEMBER ARGANDONA: Well, I had said good and timely communication also. But I'm new, so any kind of communication is important; knowing what people want responses to is important; setting deadlines is important and not getting something two days before.

Like this helps me so I can process. But I think also communication between field offices and issues, concerns that are coming up for them, knowing those and keeping that communication going, just ongoing.

MR. MARUSKA: Was there something you were thinking of that you could contribute yourself?

MEMBER ARGANDONA: I will be asking lots of questions.

MR. MARUSKA: Brad.

MEMBER MITZELFELT: Well, mine is really similar to a lot of the others. But now I was just thinking about changing it when you called my name, basically. So don't start writing yet, please.

BLM response to every concern that generates significant discussion, whether immediately or later on. But there are really two things I look for. One is to get answers or responses from the district. And, two, is to know that the Bureau is getting that information up the chain, too. That the higher-ups are also hearing from us. So that's a two-parter, I guess.

MR. MARUSKA: Okay. What would you like to contribute personally?

MR. MITZELFELT: I commit to resolve issues through the committee whenever it's possible, as long

as it's responsive to the concerns that we bring.

MR. MARUSKA: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: I would like to suggest exploring additional communications tools. Perhaps Webinars, list serves, on-line comment forms, and I would be able to help by lending my experience and expertise with those.

MR. MARUSKA: All right. So --

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: Could we hear from Teri?

DIRECTOR RAML: I also handed to my colleagues over there, so do you have anything that you wanted to contribute to the discussion?

MS. GOODRO: Yeah, I will go ahead.

I had the DFO setting clear direction of needs to the DAC. And then No. 2 -- sorry. That's what happens when you ask. And then No. 2, and that was already up there, and so DAC following direction from DFO to achieve deliverables until you move on to the next one. And I will continue to be as direct as possible to promote ongoing communication.

MS. LASELL: The DAC feeling they have made a contribution to BLM and BLM receiving DAC's advice and feeling like it's a contribution. My term is politically direct.

MR. MARUSKA: How about what you would

contribute?

MS. LASELL: I would provide side boards/
ground rule templates to facilitate mutual
contributions.

MS. TROST: Mine is similar to Margaret's,
but not quite as direct: To have a common
understanding of the objectives, not that we always
have to agree, but to know what the objectives are at
the end of the day.

And my commitment was to do more listening.

MR. MARUSKA: To you, Teri.

DIRECTOR RAML: What I thought would be
helpful is good preparation by the BLM. So part of
this is certainly -- we are kind of setting a bar a
little high. And so I think a commitment from me is
to really be prepared and to do my best to bring the
best that we have to offer.

I am so privileged to have the quality of
staff that I have. They are totally stressed by time,
but I will do my best to enlist their help early so
they know expectations and that they can bring their
expertise. I know one of the things about the field
trips that people enjoy is BLM's resource expertise.
I always hear comments from people when our folks
start talking about what they know about public land

management. It's inspiring, and I get a lot of feedback from DAC members. I will do my best to tap into this and bring it to this table also, because that's the best we have to offer.

I think secondly, too, we will try to do our part. We will get it out early and all of you have made a commitment, and you will do your best to be prepared also.

MR. MARUSKA: Well, I want to thank you for all the energy, attention and effort that your leadership provided, your Chair and Vice Chair provided in the preparation for today's meeting, all the work that the BLM staff did in that regard, and to all of you as DAC members in helping this to be a successful day and look forward to you having a productive day tomorrow.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Thank you for your help, Don.

(Applause from the Council.)

DIRECTOR RAML: Jennifer got them to set aside a table for us. 5:30 for happy half.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Before we adjourn -- she didn't yet. I didn't hear her say the word "adjourn."

We have had a guest here today that's been very kind and patient in listening to all that we have

to say, and I would like to grant three minutes to Mr. Bates. Would you have a moment to lend us your thoughts? Gerry Bates, please. Three minutes.

MR. BATES: I will give you a little resume. I have been an SCTA member since 1980.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Southern California Timing Association.

MR. BATES: Yes. This is speed trials on El Mirage Dry Lake. I have been a BLM volunteer since 1995. I assisted Brad Mastin in the concept of the El Mirage park. And I am currently an active BLM member or volunteer doing night patrols at El Mirage.

So with that, I'm going to turn it around a little bit and at the ground floor level, ask me questions. Anything you need to know. If not, we are done.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Explain timing for us, please. Many of us don't know what it is. How do you hold an event?

MR. BATES: Safety procedures have become the purview of BLM recently, and BLM came back to us as a model on how to put on a safe event. I set it up. I'm actually the course temp. So our timed event is a mile and a third. And there is a mile-plus shutdown area for our cars. And they accelerate from a

standing start, maximum speed at a mile and a third, and then shut down with a parachute. And course area is 90 feet wide.

Probably quarter of a mile or more on either side of that is a perimeter which is manned by our personnel to keep other people out of that area entirely, plus we have people monitoring the event as it's proceeding. So the event is self-contained within a permit area. You get my drift. Permit area is this big and our event is this big. And race cars confined to an area that big (illustrating).

They are a nonprized, record-only events. They pay their fees. They get nothing for it except an entry in the book if they succeed in breaking a record. Basically SCTA is an umbrella over a club-sanctioned structure. The clubs compete against one another by membership, by points.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: Do you restrict access to the lake bed to the rest of the public?

MR. BATES: No. Just to our permit area.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: So yes, you do. So we are not precedent-setting there. Am I getting that wrong?

MS. TROST: It's not an exclusive use permit, but they do an excellent job of maintaining their

perimeter.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: There is no Federal Register notice on that?

MS. TROST: Yes.

MR. BATES: We have recently upped our penalty for cars that exceed our perimeter, up to exclusion for cars that exceed our perimeter. I was involved in that process.

MEMBER ACUNA: Gerry, thank you for all the things that you guys do at El Mirage. I was able to go there one time to see the visitor's center at El Mirage.

MR. BATES: That was Friends.

MEMBER ACUNA: It just looks great out there. You have the insight with your own group, the users that support El Mirage. What is their message to us that they would like us to do if we could do one thing?

MR. BATES: I will give you my personal. When Brad and I were doing this initially, we saved two lives before there was ever a park. There was never any formal procedure for Medivac or anything. It was a very cumbersome process. I ended up being Medivaced myself, so I have been on both ends of this.

Overview would say that without a park

structure or any kind of a structure, you have undesirables that create more problems than they solve. I will leave that -- you kind of know where I am going with that one. With a park fee structure, the undesirables go somewhere else. They are still her problem and hers (pointing), but they are not my problem.

What we get now are families. We don't get very many incidents other than silly accidents. The down side to that is the fee structure drives away people, and the higher the fees go, the more they go somewhere else. If they were short of funds, are they going to El Mirage or Johnson Valley?

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Will we see you tomorrow?

MR. BATES: No, my elected treasurer will be here. That's what I've got this pile of paper for.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Thank you for spending time and answering our questions about events and your sport. Are we ready to adjourn?

MEMBER RUDNICK: Let's go another hour.

DIRECTOR RAML: Meeting adjourned.

(The proceeding was concluded at 5:17 p.m.)

-000-

R E P O R T E R ' S C E R T I F I C A T E

I, Judith W. Gillespie, a Certified Shorthand Reporter, No. 3710, for the State of California, do hereby certify that the foregoing pages comprise a full, true and correct transcription of the proceedings had and the testimony taken at the hearing in the hereinbefore-entitled matter of Friday, March 25, 2011.

Dated this 18th day of April, 2011, at
Riverside, California.

JUDITH W. GILLESPIE, CSR, RPR
(CSR NO. 3710)