

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

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

LOCATION: CAL WEST BUILDING
2895 South Fourth Street
El Centro, California

DATE AND TIME: Saturday, December 1, 2012
8:11 a.m. to 4:36 p.m.

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

JOB NO.: 71364DM

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

MEMBERS PRESENT:	REPRESENTING:
RANDY BANIS, CHAIRPERSON	Public-at-Large
DON HOUSTON	Nonrenewable Resources
MARK MURRAY	Public-at-Large
PAUL R. O'BOYLE	Transportation/ Rights-of-Way
AL MUTH	Wildlife
KIM CAMPBELL ERB	Recreation
APRIL SALL	Public-at-Large
DINAH O. SHUMWAY	Nonrenewable Resources
MEG GROSSGLASS	Public-at-Large
RONALD V. JOHNSTON	Public-at-Large/ California Desert District

BLM STAFF PRESENT:

TERI RAML, District Manager (CDD)
 TIM WAKEFIELD, Associate District Manager
 STEPHEN RAZO, External Affairs Director
 DAVID BRIERY, External Affairs Staff
 ROLLA QUEEN, Cultural Resources Specialist,
 JENNIFER WOHLGEMUTH, Staff Assistant
 HOWIE VOGT, Student Intern, District Office
 PAMELA MATHIS, Deputy District Manager, Resources
 MARGARET GOODRO, Field Manager, El Centro
 TOM ZALE, Associate Field Manager, El Centro
 CARRIE SIMMONS, Resources Chief, El Centro
 NEIL HAMADA, Dunes Manager, El Centro
 MICHELLE PUCKETT, Vendor Compliance, El Centro
 IAN CANAAN, Chief Ranger, El Centro
 CARL SYMONS, Field Manager, Ridgecrest

I-N-D-E-X

ITEM	PAGE
Welcome (Banis) Pledge of Allegiance (Houston)	5
Introductions	5
Approval of April, 2012 Meeting Transcript, Review of Agenda and Procedures for Public Comment	8
Public Comment on Items not on Agenda, including requests for DAC to consider items for future agenda	10
Advisory Council Member Reports	39
State Director/CDD District Manager Report	53
Focus Topic Briefing - ISDRA Draft Business Plan Briefing	56
ISDRA Subgroup Report (Grossglass)	64
DAC Discussion on ISDRA Brief	75
Focus Topic Briefing - CDD Cultural Resource Management Overview	114
Lunch	138
Focus Topic Briefing - Desert Training Center briefing (not reported in transcript)	138
Public questions on Cultural Resource Management/ DTC briefs (not reporter in transcript)	138
Report from WEMO Subgroup (Shumway)	139
Report from Dumont Dunes Subgroup (Banis)	149
Report from SRP Subgroup (Johnston)	151
Public Comment on Subgroup Reports	154
Council Questions on Field Office Reports	214

I-N-D-E-X - (Continued)

ITEM	PAGE
Public Comment on Field Office Reports	241
Discussion on Calendar Year Program of Work	247
Wrap-up and Summary, including discussion of theme (renewables) and agenda topics for February meeting in Barstow	251
Adjournment	259
Motions	261

EL CENTRO, CALIFORNIA SATURDAY, DECEMBER 1, 2012

-000-

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

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Good morning,
everyone. I call the meeting to order at 8:09 a.m.,
please. I'd like to briefly introduce Don Houston and
ask that he lead us in the recital of the pledge of
allegiance. Will everyone please stand.

(The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.)

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Thank you, Don.
Ladies and gentlemen, my name is Randy Banis. I'm
chairman of the DAC, and I'd like to go to the other
side of the table for introductions and start with
Ron, please.

MEMBER JOHNSTON: My name is
Ron Johnson representing the public-at-large. I live
in San Diego and Joshua Tree, California.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: I don't need a
microphone. There's a new lady here, so we'll be
nice. My name is Meg Grossglass. I live in Temecula.
I represent the public-at-large. And is it time for
member reports yet?

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: No. Introductions.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: Okay. I'm here. Go

ahead, Dinah.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: I'm

Dinah Shumway. I represent nonrenewable resources,
and I live in the High Desert.

MEMBER SALL: April Sall,

public-at-large. I live in Pioneer Town.

MEMBER ERB: Kim Campbell Erb. I

represent recreation, and I live in Anaheim.

DIRECTOR RAML: I'm Teri Raml. I'm the

District Manager for the California Desert District,
and I'm the designated federal official for this
meeting.

MEMBER MUTH: Al Muth representing

wildlife, and I live under a rock.

MEMBER O'BOYLE: My name is

Paul O'Boyle. I'm a real state and land-use attorney.
I live in San Diego and represent transportation and
rights-of-way.

MEMBER MURRAY: My name is

Mark Murray, and I represent the public-at-large.
Happy you're here today.

MEMBER HOUSTON: Welcome, everyone. My

name is Don Houston representing nonrenewable
resources. I live in San Diego, California, another
kind of desert.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Thank you, Don.

Thank you, everyone. The DAC is privileged to have new members in attendance today. First I'd like to report that April Sall has been reappointed to the Desert Advisory Council. Thank you for reapplying, April. Congratulations.

(Applause.)

MEMBER SALL: Thank you for your support.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: And we have two new members to the DAC today to welcome, please. That's Don Houston and Paul O'Boyle.

MEMBER O'BOYLE: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Thank you. We look forward to hearing from them today and throughout the rest of their term. May I remind everyone to switch their cell phones to off.

We have three public comment periods today. We have one coming up almost immediately for items that are not on today's agenda. Then we have a public comment period before lunch on the reports that we'll be hearing this morning from the BLM. And finally we have a public comment period reserved for the subgroup reports that will be midafternoon and may take us to the end of the day. I bring that up to help manage

the public comments and know how much time we have to allocate.

I'd be grateful if those wishing to speak before the DAC would complete a comment request card and bring that to the side table and they'll deliver that card to me, and I'll make announcement again after lunch. I'd like to see all the comment cards, please, for this afternoon's comments in by 2:00 p.m., if I may. We have a public comment period scheduled on subgroup reports at 2:30, and I really would like to have a count of how many people will be asking to speak so we can allocate our time. I'll wait for that for the report.

The next item of business. In my e-mail to the DAC, on Monday I urged everyone to take a look at the transcripts of our previous meeting, which was in April of 2012. I hope you've had a chance to look them over and double-check your comments to see the accuracy. Do I have any corrections or changes or additions to those transcripts? May I have a motion to approve?

MEMBER MUTH: So moved.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Moved by Al.

Second?

MEMBER SALL: Second.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Second by April.

Any opposed? Hearing, seeing no opposition, the transcripts are approved. Thank you.

Let's take a look at the agenda today, please. We have reports coming next followed by presentations, public comment. We'll have lunch, and then we'll pick up from our subgroups and hear their additional reports. And in the afternoon we'll be hearing primarily from the public. At the end of the day we'll discuss our work calendar and work schedule for 2013.

Are there any additions or changes to the agenda today?

MEMBER MUTH: Just a question. Where would it be appropriate to insert action items at the end of the minutes, in particular Items 7 and 8?

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Let's take care of that in the chair's report. It will be coming up in just a moment. Thank you, Al. Continue.

MEMBER MUTH: That will be it for the time being.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Very good. Thanks, Al. Any other additions, changes? That's okay. Anybody opposed? Hearing and seeing none, this will be our agenda for today.

The next item on our agenda is public comment period for items that are not on our agenda. Just one moment, please, while I sort through a couple of the cards, please. I have nine speaker cards, and I'm not sure if all nine are interested in speaking in this first session. I'm going to call the names, and if you'd like to speak in this first comment period, please do. Otherwise pass. As it stands, I think we'll be able to work in the in the usual three-minute comment period. Thank you.

I have ten cards. I'd like to start, please, with a former DAC member, Mr. Preston Arrow-Weed. Mr. Arrow-Weed, would you like to comment this morning on items not on the agenda?

MR. ARROW-WEED: How did you know I was in the DAC before?

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: I remember your presence very well. I used to sit in the audience.

MR. ARROW-WEED: Oh, you did, ha?

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: And I remember you from this head table. Welcome again. Nice to see you.

MR. ARROW-WEED: I remember the cowboy that used to sit there, but we had an agreement: He didn't hit me, and I didn't hit him.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: I think that's a good agreement.

MR. ARROW-WEED: We backed off away from each other every time we got close. We could hit anybody we wanted around us but not each other.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Well, welcome back.

MR. ARROW-WEED: Thank you.

THE COURT: You have three minutes, please.

MR. ARROW-WEED: Wow, three minutes to save the desert? It doesn't change, has it? What I want to know is that I heard -- well, I know you went out to look around. Are you aware of some -- there are very many important sites in Imperial County. Are you aware of that? You know, there were many of them that were destroyed, especially cremation sites. Why were they destroyed without any consideration to the Quechan people? Are there more that's going to be destroyed, because you will find more. You will find sites all over this area.

Why do they go to the place that has these sacred sites? There are other places, but they don't. They always seem to go to the same thing. BLM should be aware of all these sites. They should be familiar with it, but that's the first place they hit. When

are they going to stop that? I know if I was there, I would show up and try to put a stop to it.

It's very important to us. To me it's a form of genocide when they start doing that. This goes from that to the people. And our very existence, what we believe, will be destroyed. Not only us, it will destroy you too in the long run, but you don't seem to realize that. Whatever you do to us will come back to you, everyone, not just you, everyone. And are my three minutes up?

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Keep going.

MR. ARROW-WEED: Two? Wow. Thank you very much. Oh, I see. Is the clock going?

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: It's right there.

MR. ARROW-WEED: Well, I don't know what else I can say. I'll ask you -- you went to the Fort Yuma Indian Reservation. You didn't go to Pilot Knob?

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Oh, yes. Thank you. We did, very much so.

MR. ARROW-WEED: You did?

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: About an hour and a half, two ours.

MR. ARROW-WEED: That's one place. And Indian Pass?

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Yes.

MR. ARROW-WEED: That's an example there. There are more. But the most important thing is cremation sites. And I do know that you did find some bones out here. You offered the tribe to take it, and we will, and we will. And we'll have a ceremony on that. It has never been done. I don't know how many thousands of years out in the desert, but we're going to do that.

And I think that that should show you that we do have a belief, and the Quechans of Colorado lived there. My grandmother was from Imperial Valley, and she was from New River. So that's why I'm still passionate about saving Imperial Valley, because my grandmother's people came from there.

I still sing their songs. I still speak the dialect of the old Imperial Valley, Colorado. I still speak their dialect, and I still sing their songs, and I understand what I'm talking about. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Thank you, Preston. It's good to see you again. Thanks for coming today. I appreciate that very much. Terry Weiner, do you have a comment at this time or for later? This would be for items not on our agenda.

MS. WEINER: Terry Weiner.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Good morning, Terry.

MS. WEINER: Good morning. Good morning. It's working now? I just wanted to remind the Desert Advisory Council that there's a huge issue with cultural resource management in an area called Ocotillo north -- west -- south of town. It's virtually an extension of the Yuha cultural ACEC. It is a cultural landscape, and I would like to suggest that at the very first opportunity you as individuals or as a group go out there and visit the Ocotillo area and see what a hundred wind turbines have done to the cultural resources there.

I am not qualified to speak on how to protect resources, but I know that a cultural landscape cannot be preserved by just putting fences around certain sites and destroying the rest of it. So I just wanted to express my severe outrage and sadness.

Another item that I'd like to take up for investigation -- I'm not sure what subgroup this would be, but in addition to working for the Desert Protective Council as the Imperial County resource person, I also chair Alliance for Responsible Recreation Coalition, and we have been concerned about

type of land called unclassified BLM lands. And Teri Raml and I have and others have been discussing this, but we still haven't found an answer.

And I was wondering how you can help us investigate what is the status, what does that mean and what kind of uses are allowed, because at this point unclassified lands are presenting a problem in areas where the BLM lands are mixed in with, say, residential use, and off-road vehicles are using these lands, and we are not sure whether this is allowed. It's creating problems for neighbors. So those are my two concerns at this time. Thank you.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: Can I ask Terry a question.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Thank you, Terry. Meg, sure, briefly.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: Are you talking about Tule Wind, the hundred windmills?

MS. WEINER: Ocotillo Wind Energy facility, which is on 12,400 acres around Ocotillo. Tule Wind is absolutely the same kind of situation. Thank you.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: Thank you, Terry.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Thank you, Terry, for coming today. Is it Eddie Harmon or Edie? I'm

sorry. Edie Harmon. Thank you, Edie. Pleasure to have you here today.

MS. HARMON: Edie Harmon, and I live outside of Ocotillo, which I think should be changed to "Ugly," California, 92259. I've been horrified about seeing the damage to public lands that were limited use where vehicle travel for decades has been limited to approved routes of travel, and it's just been trashed by the wind project.

I've heard from people that are monitors on archaeological resources and biological resources. If people complain too much about violations that's going on, they lost their jobs. The reports are not accurate. How BLM or anyone can believe that there are no violations out there makes no sense at all because residents have been documenting, photographing, video, GPS.

I can see from my house. I'm maybe five and a half, six miles southeast of Ocotillo. I've gone sometimes when the dust in the air has been terrible, and I feel just devastated for what this project is doing to the community that lives there, their health and people downwind and what it's doing to Native Americans from a wide variety of different places.

I've worked with people, and it is heartbreaking. When you continually work with people, you know them, you listen to their perspectives, you go out in the field with them. I've looked at health impacts, and this is going to be a devastating project in terms of people's exposure to cyanobacteria toxins, the blue-green algae, the desert crust that gets disturbed. In the Gulf War Syndrome they found it was causing Parkinson's and Lou-Gehrig's-like symptoms when people were involved in clouds of dust after the desert surface was broken. There's the fungi in the soil that can cause valley fever.

There's a lot of people right now -- there were people that were going to come to this meeting but are too sick to come. I'm really concerned. I know Ken Burns has had a program on the dust bowl. I look at the trashing of the desert and the public lands as the beginning of the next dust bowl. A lot of people, not just in Ocotillo, but everybody downwind is going to be exposed to whatever is in that dust, in that air that gets carried.

I was telling Tom I looked at the vegetation, because I do dishes outside. When I was outside washing dishes the other day, I was appalled that some of the vegetation on my property, better

than 50 percent of the leaf surface seems to be covered by such heavy layers of dust that it's not possible for light to get through for this photosynthesis.

When we had heavy rains -- we had two and a half inches of rain in an hour this summer -- it certainly washed out all the dust off the vegetation. There's a lot of problems. If I'm that far away, I can't even imagine what the dust and the air pollution means to the people close by. And there's plenty of documentation on problems of wind energy and what it does to the communities in terms of EMF, shadow flicker, vibrations. Sorry. Running out of time.

But we've given BLM and everybody a lot of information on the health impacts, and I feel really sad to see the California Desert Conservation Area being turned into a national sacrifice area.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Thank you for coming, Edie. Very nice of you today. Thank you.

MEMBER MUTH: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Yes, Al, please.

MEMBER MUTH: Just a quick -- Edie, can you give me that health information.

MS. HARMON: I would be very happy to. I'll talk to you afterwards.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: I have just one question. Has the ROD already been signed on that? Someone from El Centro.

MS. HARMON: Construction is underway. If you go west, you can't miss it.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: I'm just curious where it was on the NEPA process.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Good morning.

MEMBER O'BOYLE: Yes. You said you have some documentation or video of the dust clouds. Have you reported that?

MS. HARMON: Yes, they have been reported. They have been photographed. There's a YouTube site where residents are documenting and putting photographs. Right now my computer is not working, but I have seen the videos of the dust. I was out there one day. There were tremendous clouds of dust being generated by vehicles, and it was only when I guess they realized they were being watched by members of the public that water trucks finally came along. But there was no water trucks. I mean, I went because I could see the dust from my house.

MEMBER O'BOYLE: Are you reporting this to the Air Quality Board?

MS. HARMON: It has been reported to the

AQCB.

MEMBER O'BOYLE: Any enforcement action taken?

MS. HARMON: I think there have been some enforcement actions taken, but I think the position of the County in a lot of enforcing people is, they have to see it themselves. They don't want to -- I mean, I don't believe it's possible to manipulate what people are seeing, because I see it with my own eyes, and I've seen photographs. But I think that there's not been enforcement unless somebody from the appropriate county, department or state department happens to be present when the violations are occurring.

And that's tough because the County does not have a great budget. They do not have a lot of people, but people have been reporting things to APCD, Environmental Health and the Department of Toxics because there have been spills. There's been a lot of problems.

MEMBER O'BOYLE: Thank you.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Can I ask one very brief question, Edie, and this is kind of a general question. Did you and your neighbors know that this project was coming down the pike in the NEPA process?

MS. HARMON: Believe me, I spent --

MEMBER SHUMWAY: You protested early on?

MS. HARMON: Yes, I did. I commented every step of the way. I did protests and worked with others that were doing it. And right now it's either four or five federal lawsuits are in court. I believe there's also one lawsuit in superior court.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Thank you. I wanted to just find out if your neighbors knew about it ahead of time. Thank you.

MS. HARMON: We did everything we could to stop it.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Very good. Thanks again, Edie. Jerry Hillier -- I have an opening for you for items not on the agenda -- followed by Jim Bramham. Good morning, Jerry.

MR. HILLIER: Good morning, Randy. Mr. Chair and members of the council, thank you for allowing me to come forward. I needed to touch on one point this morning. Some -- oh, gosh. Time flies -- six, eight months ago, maybe even a year ago after Fish and Wildlife Service released their revised recovery plan for desert tortoises, I appeared before the council and made a request that at some point down the road the council receive a comprehensive briefing

on that Tortoise Recovery Plan just basically for your own awareness because I didn't know whether you would weed through the volume and depth of the document and its implications, which is really the important point. That hasn't happened, and so I extend my urging to do that.

Fish and Wildlife, at the time it was deferred and maybe appropriately so as being a Fish and Wildlife Service matter. But of course most of the work in terms of implementation that's going to be required is going to take place on public lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management. So I think it's entirely appropriate that BLM actively engage in that and actively engage this council, because I think this council -- I firmly believe that this council probably would have some input and some thoughts that need to be brought to bear.

Fish and Wildlife Service, to bring you up to date, has initiated recovery implementation teams called RITs on a desert-wide basis. Across the desert they're moving ahead. There's a meeting in Barstow of the California RIT composed of three work groups, and that's going to be in Barstow next Tuesday and Wednesday, fourth and fifth I think.

What I wanted to bring before the council

today first off is, you know, the urging to brief the council on that. Pardon me while I get my glasses on so I can read my notes.

The second is to make some kind of a public statement, since most of these projects are going to be on BLM land, to discuss with the council and have perhaps some interface with the council in terms of how decisions are going to be made as those RITs work is brought forward and developed into some kind of an on-the-ground implementation plan. Clearly much of that work is going to be on public lands and would be appropriate for review. And I think the public and the council deserves at least some -- if not input, at least an opportunity to know what is being committed.

More importantly -- and I guess this is a question for BLM -- who is going to and what criteria is BLM going to use to decide whether these RITs are going to -- you know, how much of their work is actually going to be carried -- thank you -- carried forward into on-the-ground work and how that decision-making process is going to be done, because each one of these work groups has about eight people on them combined of agency people and local government and four or five non-government organizational representatives: Sierra Club, Desert Protective

Council and so on.

It's an amalgam. There's agreements and disagreements, and there's a way to resolve disputes. We don't know how that's going to work, but at least they've put it in place.

I also think that it's important for us to know the degree to which BLM management has instructed its biologists in terms of making recommendations. Are the biologists being supplied with direction in terms of what's practical, what's not practical, what's doable, not doable, or is this becoming just a biological plan that is then going to have to have a management overview at some point and how that process is going to work?

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Let me get you on my time, because I'm going to interrupt for a question.

MR. HILLIER: Sure.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: You mentioned Barstow and a date. What was that again?

MR. HILLIER: Fourth and fifth, not an open meeting.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: That's of December?

MR. HILLIER: I don't recall. April, are you on the RIT? You're not.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Dr. LaPre made a

presentation for us on the Desert Tortoise Recovery Plan at PRIM in our February, 2012 meeting.

MR. HILLIER: It's very general. I was present.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: It might be that given this update here, you may want to keep this on our radar for an upcoming DAC meeting agenda, on Jerry's advice.

MR. HILLIER: That's why I raised the issue now.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: It might be appropriate to follow that up in 2013. You're on my nickel now.

MR. HILLIER: Okay. And I just have one more comment. As I go through the preliminary recommendations that have come from the work groups -- and the people on the RIT have made these. I just wanted to give it from my standpoint. And by the way, I'll get you my business card so you'll have the correct spelling of my name. There's a couple of proposals there.

This is kind of an example of the kind of way-out thinking. There's a proposal, for example, that affects Kern County probably, fencing the entire Garlock Road. It's 20-some miles, both sides of the

fence, \$15,000 a mile, BLM public lands. I don't think BLM has that kind of appropriation, and certainly the County doesn't. Fencing Route 66 through Gloss, another, you know, 20, 30 miles of tortoise fence.

Those things are out there. They're going to be negotiated. I don't know whether they will be scratched or not or whether we can, you know, bring economic reality to the biologic needs and evaluate how that's going to happen or whether it is economically justified.

And while, you know, we can stand and argue on that here and it's not appropriate, those are the kinds of things that are in the preliminary recommendations that I think you guys need to be aware of and on top of.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: That's what we'd like to see.

MEMBER SALL: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Preliminary recommendations.

MR. HILLIER: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Jerry, thanks very much. I appreciate that.

MEMBER MUTH: Mr. Chairman, I concur

with Jerry's request to follow this issue. Perhaps put it on the agenda for next time for an update, because what happens with that implementation, it will have an impact on everything that is going on with BLM lands in the desert.

And also following up on from the last meeting with Jerry, the revised renewability energy chapter for the Tortoise Recovery Plan was supposed to be published. I guess, question, was it?

MR. HILLIER: I don't even think it's been written yet.

MEMBER MUTH: That answers my next question, is it available? So okay.

MR. HILLIER: I'm on fairly regular communication with Fish and Wildlife Service, and to my knowledge, just so that it's not put down as a flip comment, I'm not aware it's even been written yet.

MEMBER MUTH: Right. That's something we also need to keep track of.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Will you help us with that?

MEMBER MUTH: Sure.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Thank you. I appreciate that. And April. Any other questions, comments?

Hi, Jim. Welcome to the microphone,
Jim Bramham.

MR. BRAMHAM: Good morning to you all.
I'm Jim Bramham, Desert Advisory subgroup member at
Dumont and at Imperial. First off I'd like to thank
the BLM staff for the tour yesterday. It was really
well done and very informative, so I appreciated that
tour. Appreciated how many DAC members were there and
the interaction that was available on those tours.

But I'd like to use my three minutes,
Randy, to ask you to define to the public what it is
their role is today in the comment period. We have
received multiple communications from the BLM on
whether the subgroup members will be able to
participate in the subgroup discussion at the subgroup
time, whether the public will be able to participate
at the time, whether the public comments were not
allowed at all, which was put out at one point, to
discourage folks from coming today. Then it was said
that they could come. Now we're saying that their
comments aren't available until 2:30 in the afternoon.

I just want to, please, have clarification.
The folks that are here for the DSG as members, will
they be able to comment during the comment period as
requested by our chair, Meg, that we would be here to

do that, or are our comments only valid at 2:30? And is the public going to have to wait until 2:30 to comment on something? And that's my question. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: The answer is, you answered your question. It will be at 2:30. All the comments on our subgroup discussions will be at 2:30, and we have a solid hour for that. And if I can even save a little time along the way, we may have more than an hour for comments on that. So I'm more than happy to accommodate that.

MR. BRAMHAM: I'm disappointed.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: Hold on. Did I miss something? In an e-mail --

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Meg?

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: I'm sorry.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: What's that?

MR. BRAMHAM: Meg, you sent to us an e-mail that requested that we as members of the subgroup come to this meeting with proposals and have them read into the minutes at the period of time when this discussion was going on. And there's two subgroup members here, and the comments from each of those subgroup members is available to be read into the record or given to the record. And I think that

at least if you're going to put the public off until 2:30, you can put us off until 2:30, but the confusing amount of information that was given to all the subgroup and the public is of great concern.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Sure. Yeah, Meg, go ahead. Our plan is, as soon as we finish the reports section, we'll be having a briefing on the ISDRA Business Plan followed by the report of the subgroup that you'll deliver. But you have the floor for questions.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: Okay. So do I need this? Is it on? Okay. So I guess I'm confused. I saw e-mail traffic that said first something that said it wasn't going to be public comment. Then I saw e-mail traffic that said we were going to have public comment, so I didn't bust my nose in, because I thought it was decided. So explain to me -- I don't get it. So are you saying that the public comment on the Business Plan is going to be during the time of when?

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: At 2:30 with all of the subgroup comments from public comments. That's right. I know there's been some chatter in e-mails back and forth among you all, but the agenda, when it was finalized, is the final agenda that came out in

the mail, and that would be the one that would guide us and we all received.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: I guess I was confused about that. So I can get this clear, so my subgroup members at that time they still get to make comment, they can still read their comments. I know Glenn came. They have to wait until 2:30?

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: That is the time. That's when we would like it.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: They still get public comment. We're not cutting public comment.

DIRECTOR RAML: I think maybe just kind of a clarification, so the subgroup has a meeting and they meet together, and then there's a subgroup report to the DAC, and when your chair of the subgroup makes a report, there are members that also feel that she may not represent the results of your meeting. And so you want to have an opportunity to report in addition to Meg.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: And I don't care when that is, but they need that time.

DIRECTOR RAML: Randy, I'm stepping on your stuff. But, Meg, as the chair of that subgroup, if you want to during your time ask your subgroup members to make additions or corrections to your

report, that would be appropriate. If you are going to speak not consistently with what your role on the subgroup is and you want to also chime in as a member of the public, that would be at 2:30. So if there's a miscommunication among the subgroup, you know -- and let's welcome ourselves to the information age, Twitter, Tumbler, e-mail, hard copy, websites. So yes, there is the potential for a lot of confusion.

And there's also -- when you look at an e-mail train, there's a potential of trying to figure out what is the thread through that communication that is the official word? So hopefully that will clarify. And my position is that as the subgroup -- well, I'm stepping on you.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: No.

DIRECTOR RAML: Our position is that the subgroup chair has some latitude within their report to call on their members. Maybe that will help a little bit.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Beyond that, a DAC member can yield time. That's their time to yield. So Meg, that time for your report is yours to do with what you think is best for the subgroup.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: I'm so glad I have my big girl pants on today.

MR. BRAMHAM: Thanks so much.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Thanks, Jim, for clarifying that. I appreciate that.

I'd like to call Helena Quintera.

MS. ARROW-WEED: Quintana.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Quintana. I'm sorry. Thank you. Welcome, Helena. You have three minutes, please.

MS. ARROW-WEED: Thank you. My name is Helena Quintana Arrow-Weed. And one of my concerns today -- I have a lot of concerns about the same issue that Preston talked about and Edie talked about and Terry Weiner talked about. I'm concerned today about the Ocotillo project. And I just wanted to let you know one of the issues that we have there is the use of the aquifer by the project. They promised during the hearings that they would not use water from the aquifer, and we have evidence that shows that they are using water from the aquifer. That's against the law. They promised they wouldn't do that, and they're doing that.

The other concern that I have is concern for the wildlife that's going to be damaged there. I just want to know why. What is the rationale why these projects are being approved? Number one, wind

energy is so far away from where it's going to be used, is already known to be not economically feasible or it's too expensive to run telephone lines for long distances. It's too expensive. It's not the cheapest way to do it.

Number two, the wind in Ocotillo is not enough to power those turbines. Why was it approved? Why? What rationale did BLM have for approval this?

The project promised the supervisors that they would provide 300 jobs. When the supervisor asked point blank, "How many jobs can you really promise us to provide the County? Can you promise us a hundred jobs?" They said, "No."

"Can you promise us 50 jobs?" They said, "No."

"Can you promise us one job that this project, this \$300-million project, one job for the County?" He said, "Yes, I can promise one job."

This project in Ocotillo is destroying pristine desert for what? No energy, no jobs, just a lot of money thrown around, and it's your taxpayers' money too. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Thank you, Helena. Thank you for coming and telling us this today.

Next again for items not on the agenda,

Dan Williams, followed by John Stewart. Dan? This is for items not on the agenda. Thank you.

MR. WILLIAMS: Mine will be reserved until 2:30.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Thanks kindly. I'll keep that handy. Welcome Dan. Thank you.

Hi, John. Good morning.

MR. STEWART: Good morning, council. John Stewart, California Association of Four-Wheel-Drive Clubs. A couple of things I want to talk about kind of briefly have been mentioned, and I will for the record concur with Mr. Hillier's comment that the Recovery Implementation Plan for the desert tortoise needs to be on the DAC's agenda. I'm also on that recovery implementation team. So it is very important and will have a major impact on the desert and BLM's budget.

Also I'd like to really stress communications and a couple of instances that have happened within the past couple of months that have created a level of confusion. To start with, the announcement that came out for this Desert Advisory Council meeting, it came out in a nice, timely fashion. And it cited a sentence in there that -- to visit a website in order to see the meeting or about

the agenda item.

The agenda for the field trip yesterday, that field trip item was never posted to the website as was advertised to the public. This is important communication. This is a failure in here that a lot of public did not have accurate and timely and correct information that may have wanted to attend the field tour. I'd like to see a step be taken to correct these kinds of oversights in the future.

Second on communication -- and it deals with something that will be on the agenda later, being the Business Plan, the ISDRA Business Plan. Request for comments from stakeholders came out with a short-fused time to get comments in. That same announcement also allowed comments at the next DAC meeting, but there's conflicting information in there that in order to be considered your comments had to be in on that previous date. Now you're asking for comments at the public, you know, through a public input at the DAC meeting? Are those comments going to be considered, or have all the comments already been considered?

So this is a matter of confusion in the way the information is put out and requested from the public, and it's something that really should be

carefully considered and looked at for verbiage that goes out to the public, because it's very important and it has an impact on the public.

Also notice that there's a big stack of papers back there on the counter with all the field managers' reports. These field managers' reports at one time were posted to the website for review prior to showing up. It would be appreciated if those could be posted to the website in order for members of the public to have an opportunity to review the information before arriving at the meeting. So thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Thanks, John. We were fortunate to have the reports posted -- sorry about that. Something is talking to me. They were available to us at the same time they were made available to the public, and they were posted.

MR. STEWART: They were not posted.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Yes, they were posted. You can go to the website. They're there. I downloaded them three or four days ago, because the BLM gives us -- excuse me, John. The BLM gives us Word documents that are a little hard for me to deal with. So as soon as they're e-mailed to me, I go directly to the website and I download the PDFs. And

they were there at the moment the DAC received our e-mails.

MEMBER MUTH: John, they were on the DAC page, because I downloaded them right there.

MR. STEWART: I looked Thursday night, and I didn't see them.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Hit "refresh."
Pardon me, Nicole. Nicole and followed by Lloyd Misner.

MR. MISNER: I'll pass until 2:30, please.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Thank you.

MS. GILLES: You can put mine in that stack as well.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Thank you. I'll put that right there.

MS. GILLES: Nicole Nicholas Gilles, American Sand Association. I'll be commenting at 2:30.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Thank you. We're all set. That is the end of the public comment. Did I make sure I got everybody's card? I believe I did. That closes the public comment for items not on the agenda. At this time I'd like to move to the next item, and that is the Advisory Council Member Reports.

I'm going to start around this side of the table and reserve going last. So Don, do you have anything to report, please?

MEMBER HOUSTON: No. I'd like to say that it's a privilege to serve on the Council. Given the fact that I wasn't made aware of my appointment until Monday afternoon, I'm completely unprepared for this meeting. But in the future you can count on me to be very prepared and be an enthusiastic participant. And finally I'd like to compliment Mark's team on a very well-organized and informational tour yesterday. Thank you.

MEMBER MURRAY: Thank you, Don.

DIRECTOR RAML: I'll jump in here for a minute. I want to thank Don. Don was a member of the public that joined with us for several meetings before he became a member, so he may be unprepared for his role at this particular meeting, but he has certainly made himself aware of how the DAC operates, and I appreciate that.

MEMBER MURRAY: Don is always prepared. I would echo Don's comments regarding the field trip yesterday. It was great. I think that we were in the best bus. Thank you very much. It was great to hear the BLM law enforcement's viewpoint on management of

the recreation areas, and I really appreciate that.
Thank you very much.

MEMBER O'BOYLE: Thank you. I don't have anything. I just got my nomination, my appointment, this week, so I apologize. But I am interested in all of these issues, and I understand the cultural sensitivities. And the field trip was great. Thank you.

MEMBER MUTH: Al Muth. I'd like also to concur with my colleagues here about how nice the field trip was. It was well organized. It was informative, and y'all done good, Margaret. So thank you, staff.

I have nothing specific to report, just one question for Dinah. Are you going to follow up on the Sawtooth Trail project?

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Dinah Shumway, nonrenewable resources. At the second-to-the-last DAC meeting -- I'm not sure where that was -- we had talked with Roxy about that, and I was going to actually ask Katrina this morning about it in the Barstow report. But we had deferred the Sawtooth Trail to the Afton Canyon Trail, which was just starting a NEPA process. I didn't see anything in it in the report, so let's follow up when Katrina

gets up for questions on the district offices.

MEMBER MUTH: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Great. Thank you.

Kim?

MEMBER ERB: Kim Campbell-Erb

representing recreation. I too wanted to express my appreciation for the field trip yesterday. It was very informative and very interesting. I missed the bus yesterday, and I was lucky enough to have someone from the BLM pick me up and drive me out to the first stop. And on the way out we passed a cattle ranch, not a very large one, but it had some new solar panels that had been erected where they have shade structures for the cattle. And I was thrilled to see that.

And I would love, love to see the projects that are being planned when they're thinking of the locations for these projects. Maybe they need to think outside of the box like that so they're not out there destroying pristine areas of our deserts. I really think it's going to be important. I don't think that the projects that are coming have really adequately considered what the ramifications are. And a lot of people, their eyes won't be opened until they've been built. And I'm afraid that when the DRECP process starts expediting the projects, that

it's going to be far worse and we're going to regret a lot of the things we do. So think about that, everybody, please. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Hi, April.

MEMBER SALL: Good morning. I'd also like to thank the El Centro Field Office for the great field trip yesterday. It was really great to talk about some of the other resources and opportunities throughout the District besides what we often talk about, which is renewable energy and the impacts that that's having. So it was nice to take kind of a fresh look at what those resource values are. So thank you again for that. I would like to echo Kim's comments about the solar panels on the roofs and the shade structures. I think it's really an opportunity to take the impact off our public lands.

And with that in mind, I'd like to alert the public to, I guess I'll say, what's a rumor at this point. But the DRECP is supposed to release a document in about mid December that is the next set of alternatives. It is not quite the draft document, but it will likely have either a 30- or 45-day comment period, and it's really going to be important for folks to keep an eye out for that document.

Unfortunately I know it's probably going to be right

before the holidays, so that's why I'm making this time available for people to think about making time to read that document and get some of your comments in. So look for that in December. And again please make comments on that document. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Thank you, April.
Dinah.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: I don't really have a lot to say because I'm going to be making a report on what's been taking up a lot of my BLM time, the WEMO report, the WEMO subgroup report, later this afternoon. And I'd really like to thank the El Centro Field Office for our field trip. It was really great. And I'd like to add something that wasn't in the book, and one of them is nonrenewable resources, of course. And the Imperial County, which is in the El Centro District -- El Centro is in Imperial County -- hosts the third or fourth largest gypsum deposits in the world as a result of the evaporation of Lake Cahuilla. So that's an important thing to remember.

Geological resources is what -- mineral resources come from geology. There is no other way. We can't move them, and they're a result of geological processes. Thanks.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: Meg Grossglass. I

really don't have official report. I'm very disappointed that I couldn't come to the tour yesterday. It was my company's Christmas party and year-end party, so I couldn't skip it. But I was lucky enough to go out to Panamint Valley Days up in the Ridgecrest Field Office, I believe, and it was a great event, some great trails, some great desert. And I encourage you all to get out there and enjoy the California desert. And Eddie did a great job, by the way. Thank you. We saw him, and he visited us.

MEMBER JOHNSTON: Good report.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: I'm sorry. I'm done.

MEMBER JOHNSTON: That's okay.

Ron Johnston representing public-at-large. I'd like also to thank the El Centro Field Office for just a great field trip yesterday. Carrie was a marvelous tour guide and driver. Ian and all the staff members just were terrific. In addition a great lunch was provided, I believe, compliments -- not compliments of but as a result of the efforts of the Chamber of Commerce for Imperial County, or was it El Centro? El Centro, I guess.

MR. ZALE: United Desert Gateway.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: United Desert

Gateway. Thank you.

MEMBER JOHNSTON: United Desert Getaway -- Gateway. Anyway it was terrific. Learned a lot and became, I think, more respectful of some of the sacred sites that I was not aware of that exist and things like the planning road. And also, as Kim has already mentioned, I was really impressed with the dual use of the grazing lands, the feedlot lands for the cattle using that for power generation.

And personally not as a DAC member but as a constituent, I am going to write the senators from California as well as my local congressional people suggesting that they encourage Ken Salazar as well as our president as well as some congressional committee members on energy projects to come out here and actually take a tour of our desert, because I don't see any of these alternative energy projects being put up in Chesapeake Bay, on the Potomac River, at Lake Superior or Lake Michigan and, by golly, our desert is not just for the use of the rest of the country to hither and yon scatter projects without regard to what the long-term implications are going to be.

And if they want to put some of these projects in their backyard, too, I think that's fine.

That's a personal comment, not a DAC comment.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: I hate to say I told you so, Mr. Chairman, but I told you so.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: She did. I was here way back then.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Thank you very much, Dinah. Thank you very much, Ron, and other council members for your reports today.

The first item on my brief report is, I'm saddened to report that a member of our DAC family, our extended DAC family, is ill, and that would be our regular stenographer, Judy Gillespie. And April, would you like the floor?

MEMBER SALL: Thank you. I'd like to make a motion that in addition to the card that we've got here for Judy, that we also put together a care package, and we could talk about that at lunch in the details. But I would like the DAC to put together something. She's been such a part of our team for many, many years.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Do I have a second?

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: I second. She's awesome. She puts up with me.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Thank you, Meg. A first and second. Are there any objections? Calling

for consent, hearing and seeing no objections. Thank you, April. It is passed by the DAC.

In the meantime I welcome today's stenographer. Diane is with us today, and thank you for filling in. It's very nice of you to help. And she's no stranger to the DAC either. Just how big of a family we can draw in, well, now she's part of our family too. Stay healthy. So I'll pass this card around. Sign it when it comes to you, please.

And the other item is, at our December meeting of last year, the Desert Advisory Council passed a series of recommendations relative to recreation issues, and we have a response from the BLM that has been circulated to the DAC members. I'd like you to make note of that and take a few minutes when you can to review and let us know if you have questions.

The last item that I have on my report is to defer to Al for us to discuss the follow-up on some of the action items for the previous meeting. You brought it up.

MEMBER MUTH: Here I am trying to read a sympathy card. So I'm not sure what I'm doing here. What am I following up on?

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: This is the action

items that you had circled.

MEMBER MUTH: Yeah, the action items.
Okay. Was there any action taken by the -- he knows them better than I do.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: So Nos. 7 and 8.

MEMBER MUTH: Nos. 7 and 8.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: We have recommendations. At which meeting was this? Last one, April? This is from April meeting. No. 7 suggested a simplified chart for interconnection between DRECP and solar PEIS. We have not had that particular chart. And I know that there is a lot of concern and discussion about how DRECP and solar PEIS will meld together. I'm sorry. Steve, do you have an update for that?

MR. RAZO: Yeah. We are working on that. That is being done, and we're planning to have that at the February meeting.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Right.

MR. RAZO: Where we will talk DRECP.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Federal meeting renewable energy topic. Very good. Thank you. And we had a request for No. 8 requesting to know how DRECP and WEMO can interact, since the WEMO Plan is still under jurisdiction in the Federal Court. And

that is also an open and regularly talked about item from many of us here on the table, is how will DRECP and WEMO merge together? I don't think we have any further information on that yet. The DRECP stakeholder process concluded in the fall, and that has left us not as up to date as we had been in the past 18 months as DRECP stakeholder members, so I'm going to have to defer to the BLM if they have anything to add.

DIRECTOR RAML: Not at this time.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Nope? Let's see if we can get some information on this also for the member meeting, because it's a DRECP energy meeting. I think hopefully by February the Bureau will have a little more of a feeling about how DRECP, solar PEIS and WEMO will all come together. That's going to be a good topic in February. Thank you. Thank you. Thanks. That concludes my report.

We're moving on, if there's no objections. What is it? What I'd like to do, please, is take a very brief break while we set up for the -- well, we're going to move to the State Director and the CDD Plan, but while we're taking our brief break, we'll get ready for our presentations as well.

We'd like to give the court reporter just a

few minutes. We get to the next reports. Is that all right, because we want her hands to be fresh for your report.

DIRECTOR RAML: Let me do one part of it.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Thank you.

DIRECTOR RAML: I wanted to do this part of it because during the break obviously there's time for people to mingle and meet each other. And so what I'd like to do at this time, because the State Director Report will be very brief. My report is -- this part is, I'd like the BLM staff that's here to introduce themselves, starting with Tim Wakefield.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Thank you.

MR. WAKEFIELD: Good morning. I'm Tim Wakefield. I'm the Associate District Manager for the California Desert District. I really appreciate participation here, and the interest in the public lands is so important that we hear from all of you. So thank you so much.

MR. LEE: Rusty Lee, Field Manager, Needles.

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

MS. MATHIS: Good morning, and welcome,

everybody. I've had the pleasure of meeting some of the small subgroup folks about a month ago. I am Pamela Mathis, the Deputy District Manager For Resources, acting, for a little more time. And I'm really thrilled to be here with you today to see the entire DAC process.

MS. GOODRO: Good morning. I'm Margaret Goodro, the El Centro Field Office Manager, and I'm glad everybody had a wonderful trip. I can take absolutely zero credit for it. And so I would like to acknowledge the staff and also district staff Rolla and Carrie, who worked so closely together to plan this trip. They're the ones that made it happen. They're amazing. I get the pleasure to work with them. Thank you for being here. We're excited about all this participation.

MR. ZALE: I'm Thomas Zale, the Associate Field Manager for the El Centro Field Office.

MR. VOGT: Good morning, everyone. I'm Howie Vogt. I'm an intern with the California Desert District with Public Affairs.

MR. BRIERY: David Briery with BLM Public Affairs.

MR. RAZO: Steve Razo with External

Affairs on California Desert District.

MS. WOHLGEMUTH: I'm Jennifer Wohlgemuth. I'm the Staff Assistant to the District Manager.

MR. CANAAN: Ian Canaan with BLM Law Enforcement.

MR. HAMADA: I'm Neil Hamada, the Acting Supervisor Outdoor Rec Planner.

MS. PUCKETT: I'm Michelle Puckett, and I am the Vendor Specialist for El Centro Field Office. I don't know what else. Whatever you want.

MR. KALISH: Good morning. I'm John Kalish, the Field Manager for the Palm Springs South Coast Field Office. Good to see all of you here today.

MR. SYMONS: Carl Symons. I'm the Field Manager for the Ridgecrest Field Office, and I really appreciate everyone coming out today. Thank you.

MR. QUEEN: I'm Rolla Queen, District Archeologist and the Program Lead for Cultural Resources in California Desert District out of Moreno Valley, California.

MS. SIMMONS: Hi. I'm Carrie Simmons, Acting Resources Branch Supervisor for the El Centro Field Office. And I just want to say thanks for the

nice compliments from everyone. I had a great time with all of you out in the field yesterday. It was a great day.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Thank you, Carrie, again for all your help yesterday. Thanks to the BLM for introducing yourself. Can we then defer the rest of the reports, and we'll take a brief ten-minute break, and we'll set up for the presentations. Thank you, all. Recess for ten minutes.

(A brief recess was taken.)

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Thank you. Call the meeting back to order at 9:30 a.m. Next item on business before our focus topic briefing will be the State Director and CDD Manager Report. Teri, please.

DIRECTOR RAML: I will be extremely brief on this report. The State Director Report, the written report, is available for you back there. I think the District Manager Report, really, I led with it with the introduction of the CDD management team. It's my great pleasure to welcome Tim. You haven't had a chance to be formally at a DAC meeting. Welcome, Tim, Associate District Manager, my sidekick. And if you can't reach me, you can reach Tim. That's the role he plays. So there he is. So all things of importance -- like I said, I try to be responsive, but

if you don't hear from me and if you think it's district manager business, talk to Tim.

Also I'm very happy to welcome Carl Symons back to the CDD. He was with us earlier on a leadership development detail and, we liked him, and he liked us. And the Ridgecrest people have been very welcoming, and I am extremely happy to have him as part of the team. And I also am very pleased to welcome Katrina. She comes from a great background in Oregon, where she was a district manager. So now I've got kind of a colleague field manager too that has great ideas. And we look forward to her tenure in Barstow.

And then unfortunately what I have to add is that my team is changing. That's how it goes in BLM. I think California Desert District is unique in that it offers people tremendous opportunities in short time. Someone I think it asked -- maybe it was April. Someone asked me yesterday what it was like to work for CDD. Well, I was the district manager in Phoenix before I came here, and CDD is Phoenix district, which is a darn busy district in and of itself, on steroids. Everything is five or six times what you learn -- you know, what I was involved in in my previous management position.

So people come here and in a very short time can make a significant impact, and they can move on and move up. And we saw that with Roxy Trost, and unfortunately we're going to see that now with Margaret Goodro. I've had to ask her to keep reminding me the name of the national park is she's going to because I think I'm in denial. It's like, all right. So you're going where again? So Margaret will have a few words to say. But she's leaving the BLM and going to the National Park Service as a park superintendent in Alaska.

And I will take great pride in the contribution we made here at CDD to advancement and success in her position. And she'll leave a gap. Everybody leaves a gap. No one is replaceable in and of themselves. But we will quickly move forward to bring in another great field manager and keep the El Centro team up and running and keep the CDD leadership team. We'll do a little bit more in the Field Manager's Report, but that's the District Manager's Report.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Thank you. Very good. Questions, comments from the DAC? Very good.

MEMBER MUTH: Is somebody going to give time for the State Director's Report?

DIRECTOR RAML: No. It's two pages in writing.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Two-page written report from the State Director's Report, and we will have comments from the DAC on the reports right after lunch. Okie dokie. The next item on the agenda is our first Focus Topic Briefing, and that's a briefing on the ISDRA. That's Imperial Sand Dunes Recreation Area Draft Business Plan. And I'd like to introduce Margaret Goodro and welcome Neil Hamada. Thank you for joining us today too.

MS. GOODRO: Good morning again.
Margaret Goodro.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: I'm sorry, Margaret. Can we have just one moment. A few of us are going to relocate so we can see the pictures.

MS. GOODRO: Got it.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Thank you, Margaret.
The floor is yours.

MS. GOODRO: Good morning again.
Margaret Goodro from the El Centro Field Office. And so we're here to give a short presentation of the Imperial Sand Dunes Recreation Area Draft Business Plan. As you were out on your tour, you passed through the Imperial Sand Dunes to the left and to the

right of you. So the Imperial Sand Dunes are 164,000 acres of OHV recreation. The Dunes receive over one million visitors, and they provide world-renown recreation opportunities. This is one of the busiest recreation areas for OHV's in the nation. It's truly phenomenal opportunities.

So with the folks coming out to recreate in Imperial Sand Dunes, there's over \$200-million economic benefit to Imperial County. So how we manage the Dunes and the visitation is through a special recreational permit. It's called an Individual Special Recreational Permit. And we sell about 57,000 permits a year. Now, these permits are for a family or a group that come together. And so that permit provides them the opportunity to come out and have public safety with law enforcement and EMS there to protect them. They're able to camp, access to the Dunes, to ride over that 164,000 acres, riding, bathrooms, garbage collection.

And then those Dunes move. Sand is constantly moving and shifting, and so we spend a lot of money and a lot of time keeping those roads open and maintained so these millions of visitors can access the Dunes.

So what's our goal in looking at managing

the Imperial Sand Dunes? The number-one priority for the BLM is public safety. We want to ensure that the public is safe, and so the Secretary of Interior did come out two years ago as part of America's Great Outdoors and celebrated that the American public comes out to areas like the Imperial Sand Dunes to come recreate, enjoy the outdoors and making sure that they're safe and protected.

What's another goal is keeping the Dunes open. Ten years ago or a little over ten years ago Imperial Sand Dunes was one of the most dangerous places in America. Because of the BLM's actions, along with the County, to promote safe recreation using law enforcement and educational tools, it is now a safe, family-friendly area that people are continuing to visit. And again this provides that economic benefit to the County. So we have to keep it open and safe.

Another goal is zero deficit. We've been operating the Imperial Sand Dunes in a deficit. The federal government has been absorbing about a million-dollar deficit for Imperial Sand Dunes. And we can no longer sustain that. As you know, this is a tough time for everyone. It's a tough time for people at home. It's a tough time for local governments,

federal governments.

And so how do we get our funding? We have three main funding sources. We've got federal dollars, and everybody sees that federal dollars out there are decreasing. We've got the permit dollars that we're talking about here in this presentation. And then we get state grants, greensticker funds, and that has already been reducing. And we received notification from the State of California this year that said next year expect less than 50 percent in grants. And each year we compete for those grants. And so from year to year we don't know if we're going to get them, and we don't know how much they're going to be, and those grants have been essential to keeping visitors safe in the Dunes. We count on those to protect over a million visitors.

So what have we been doing? We've reduced spending drastically. We have been cutting back. We've also requested additional federal funding. And I've also requested assistance from the County in any way that they can help to continue to support EMS and law enforcement and any funding that they're able to provide.

So the Draft Business Plan. How did we get to a Draft Business Plan? Well, three years ago when

I came on board, I met with the subgroup, the DAC subgroup for ISDRA, and they basically said, hey, you need a fee increase to keep Imperial Sand Dunes open and safe. And so right away we had another subgroup meeting, and we did a brainstorming session, and they came up with a lot of ideas to incorporate into the Business Plan. One of those ideas was they wanted it to have alternatives and to be somewhat like an environmental document and use an environmental format.

So the Draft Business Plan was developed, and that went through an internal review at the state level and the national level in the BLM before it was able to be released. And then that draft was released in October 18th, and Neil Hamada presented that at the OHV leadership meeting in Moreno Valley. And then we also had a subgroup meeting this last October, where the main focus of the meeting was to discuss the Business Plan.

We have also had extensive public outreach, and being here and utilizing the subgroups is part of that outreach. And here's a list of the different outreach that we have happening, and it's ongoing.

Now, there was a question about the comments. Some of the things we heard right off the

bat was, people wanted more time to comment. We want comments. We want ideas because we want the Dunes safe. We want them open, and we want to be able to keep it moving forward. So we extended the comment period, as the subgroup had suggested, and that closed on November 30th, which was yesterday. And we received about 236 comments. Now, someone mentioned comments here. This is all part of the comment process. Everything that we hear in this forum will also be incorporated into the Business Plan.

And so what are the next steps? Oh, excuse me. So what we heard. So looking at what we've done in our outreach so far, and some of those comments, some of the things we heard is, fees aren't really popular right now. No one is looking at paying more fees. They're saying, hey, it's tight. Why would we support a fee increase? A lot of what we've heard is, yeah, we understand you need a fee increase. We want these Dunes to be open and safe, but how about phasing it in, which is understandable, because we haven't had a fee increase in about ten years, and so phasing it in is a fabulous idea.

Some folks said, hey, what about a smaller increase? And that's a suggestion that we heard from a number of folks. Some people said, hey, just

decrease the cost and decrease the services. But again we are responsible to keep the public safe, so there's an element that we have to continue to do.

And so a comment, kind of a thread throughout the comments was, they wanted us to improve the Business Plan. And one of the things was that the Business Plan is a little bit confusing. And I think incorporating that environmental format may have made it a little bit more confusing. And so taking these comments and all the outreach that we're doing, including the outreach here, that's what we're going to do in our next steps.

So for the next steps we're going to be analyzing all these comments, working to improve that Business Plan to make it a stronger document, and then we'll be finalizing the Business Plan. What we are looking at is implementing this Business Plan for the 2013-2014 season.

And so in closing, our goals are to keep the Dunes open, to keep them safe, but we can't continue to be running this deficit, not in this time. And so what has been so amazing and what I want to thank everyone for is their feedback and input. We want the best plan, the best ideas coming together to make sure that the Imperial Sand Dunes provides this

safe opportunity for recreation into the future. So I want to thank the DAC, the subgroups and all the public for their participation to make this a better document, to make the Imperial Sand Dunes safe into the future. And that's all I have. Randy.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Thank you kindly. Very good. Thank you, Margaret. Much obliged.

MEMBER MURRAY: Randy, are you going to take any comments on that?

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: You bet. In fact I'd like to turn the floor over to you, my friend. Mark Murray, you have the floor.

MEMBER MURRAY: Thank you very much. Just a couple of comments that I observed yesterday in the tour that we had of the Imperial Sand Dunes. Observations, it looks like almost a free-for-all out there with the recreation that's taking place. And I was happy to hear it looks like there's some type of a cost-benefit analysis that's taking place in the Business Plan, because I would assume that regardless of the 53,000 permits a year --

MS. GOODRO: Fifty-seven thousand were sold last year.

MEMBER MURRAY: And I mean, looking at the current fees, I can't see you're getting anywhere

close to supporting the resource it takes to manage that when you have a hundred thousand people out there on the weekend in those Dunes. And I'm sure it's a major resource management issue, especially for your law enforcement folks.

And you know, I support that something needs to be done, and I'm sure it's being addressed in the Business Plan. But it was good to really see what was happening there. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: DAC members, questions, comments?

MS. GOODRO: I'll reserve.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Yeah, let's reserve the rest of our comments if we can. Let's hear from our subgroup, and I think once we hear from our subgroup chair, Meg, we'll have more to chime in on. Thank you. Meg, the floor is yours.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: I really hate this thing.

DIRECTOR RAML: You sound so good.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: You're so nice. I'm Meg Grossglass. I'm the chairperson. ISDRA. Geez, oh, man. I'm the chairperson of the ISDRA DAC subgroup, and as you can tell, this is probably one of the most controversial things that's come along in a

while. They're proposing to double fees. We didn't actually go over the fee structure, so I'm going to try to remember it. I think right now, if you buy the pass offsite, it's \$90 for a season and -- Neil?

MR. HAMADA: Twenty-five.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: -- twenty-five for a. Week actually can you buy the year pass onsite? It's 120, and then it's 40 for the week. So they're proposing to raise it if you buy it offsite for the season \$180, and if you buy it offsite for the week, it's 70?

MR. HAMADA: Forty.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: See, I don't have it memorized. So needless to say, this was an extremely controversial issue at our last DAC subgroup meeting, although I am very proud of the work that we did at that subgroup meeting. We analyzed this thing for four hours. I think we broke it down in three or four separate categories to discuss how you collect fees, how you talk about visitor data, the amounts, the Business Plan. So we discussed it to death.

We did not come to a consensus as a subgroup. I'm not sure if we all sat there for five years, we could come to a consensus, but I have faith

that Margaret and Neil know exactly how that subgroup feels.

Now I'm going to give you my personal feedback on the Business Plan and the fee increase, and then I'm going to welcome my members of the subgroup to come up and have their hopefully three minutes each, and then they won't recomment again during the public comment period hopefully just out of respect for all of us.

I obviously read the Business Plan. It was a little bit confusing. But as I told Neil, I'd just like you to dumb it down a little for me. I wasn't around when we talked about the environmental, making it with alternatives. I kind of just wanted to see here's the money we have now, and here's the deficit we're running. That was the kind of portion that I didn't see in the Plan. So if that part -- it's a no-brainer that if you have not, in my opinion -- if you have not raised your fees since 2004, everything has -- I mean, gas has doubled in price since 2004, so, yes, we obviously need a fee increase. But we also obviously need a good plan to justify that to the people who don't necessarily think about things from a management perspective. They just think, oh, my fee is doubling. We just need a little better

justification.

There are many parts of the Business Plan that I thought were great. I loved having the alternatives saying, if you only want to pay this much, then we don't have trash service or have this or that. I just need a little piece of pie that says this is what we got this year. The federal government had to give us a million bucks or has had to give us a million bucks for the last three years in order to do this, and they don't have the money to do that. They can't essentially supplement our recreation anymore.

So those are probably my comments. I would encourage members of the public and members of the subgroup that, if they do not want to see a fee increase, they come forward with suggestions on how we solve the funding problem, because there's obviously a funding problem. We all know greensticker money is going away. We all know federal money is probably not going to be around for much longer. So I would encourage our members of the public and subgroup members to try to work towards a solution.

I know we have a problem. I think we've identified that problem. And honestly, I've known Neil for 19 years. I think he'll probably do his best to fix that problem.

So let's see. Who do we have here? Let's bring Glenn. Glenn, if you could come up and give us your perspective on it. And are you also going to read Chuck Hattaway's comments into the record?

MR. MONTGOMERY: Yes.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: If you could just keep it to three minutes for each you, I would greatly appreciate it. Glenn?

MR. MONTGOMERY: Glenn Montgomery.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: I'm sorry. One more time?

MR. MONTGOMERY: Glenn Montgomery.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Glenn Montgomery.
Thank you.

MR. MONTGOMERY: I'm a DSG subgroup member.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Thank you, Glenn.
Welcome. It's nice to see you here today.

MR. MONTGOMERY: My role on the subgroup is representative for Arizona OHV. And so what I'm going to do today is, I actually submitted comments through the e-mail address. And so what I was going to do is to read that. My comments are based on my personal views as well as input that I have from other Arizona OHV users that go to the

Dunes.

It is my opinion that the BLM has not presented sufficient budgetary data to support the need for a fee increase of any kind. Until the BLM includes this information into the Business Plan, as a member of the DAC advisory subgroup for the ISDRA and a Dune user, I can't support it.

Although the timeframe for public comment on the Business Plan was extended to 45 days, I do not feel it was sufficient time for Dune users to read, digest or formulate a proper response to the BLM. I'm further concerned that the 15-day extension was added only at the urging of the DSG at our October 24th meeting. Repeated requests from the public, the DSG and the former TRT regarding the need for second-vehicle permits and one-day permits has again been disregarded by the BLM in this Draft Business Plan.

Something that is not in the notes, my comments, is that the last detailed budgetary data that we had for the Dunes was January of 2010. Prior to that at every meeting that we had for the DSG and prior for the TRT, we received detailed budget data that showed where the spending was going, where it was coming from. And that hasn't been provided since

2010.

As part of that meeting group, we also shared that information for the Dune users. So since that time Dune users have not had any information other than what the DSG -- the UDG puts out in their pamphlet, and that doesn't show where the dollars come from. It shows where the dollars are spent.

I also have comments for Charles Hattaway. He is California OHV representative.

"I have watched the cost to run the Dunes rise and the money coming in go down over the past couple of years. Because of this I'm in favor of a fee increase. With our government in its current state, I am confident we will see less money from them. This means that we will have to do something. But I also feel that the BLM needs to show us a Business Plan with more realistic numbers that we have been provided." Thank you.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: Thank you very much, Glenn. I appreciate it. Mr. Bramham, would you like to go next?

MR. BRAMHAM: Jim Bramham, and I appreciate the opportunity to be before you. I think that I want to go to the point that the DSG subgroup members take their responsibility extremely seriously.

They look at being the bridge between this group, the field office and the visitors to the ISDRA. And that is a very important role for us.

And we want to make sure that as this moves forward -- and it will move forward; we understand that -- what has happened here is that we have become into an adversarial position. And that is absolutely not what we want. And so we have a, for lack of a better term, battlefield. And our choices here are to continue to ban that do death or decide what the assets are and what the sideboards of the conversations are going to be moving forward.

And I just want to ensure this group that the subgroup members want to see something move forward out of this process that is clear, that's concise, that has the support or the ability to defend it to the public.

And I would just turn your attention to the wall back here where there's a graph and a pie chart that shows that it costs -- that the income was what? -- 2,500,00, and the expenditures were two million, nine. That's \$500,000 difference. The termination of the contract for that which gathers this money is coming up, and it is universally concluded that that cost of collecting fees in the

fees in the Dunes and because we ask that current contractor to do some things that they have absolutely delivered on, increasing compliance, moving the sales offsite so that there's less onsite sales and less burden on the BLM. They have accomplished everything that they've asked.

The cost of that, the new contract, is assumed to be pretty much 500,000 or more less than the current contract. So if you were to just add that 500,000 back in, you would actually have more money as revenue than you have as expenditures noted on that board. So if they were making two-million five, if you had that 500,000 that you would save on a new contract, you'd have three million on two million current expenditures in the status quo.

The Business Plan, though, is based on an only \$500,000 contribution of appropriated dollars, which has been at a level, depending on where you ask and when you've been informed, between 1.8 and three million a year. So we didn't just take a ten-percent cut or a 20-percent cut. If you lose the lowest terms, we went from 1.8 million down to 500,000. That's a two-thirds' decrease in appropriated dollars.

And so the public is being asked that they can go anywhere else in the desert with their OHV's

and basically not pay a fee. So if they go to Johnson Valley instead of the Dunes, they can do that for free. And you are asking a Dune user to say that it's 40 times the impact to visit the Dunes than it is to go to Johnson Valley, that it costs zero to go to Johnson Valley and it costs \$40 to go -- you're basically saying we have an impact that's 40 times greater. It does not work.

So we are asking that we can sit down, determine how this thing can move forward. We want to see a successful conclusion to this. We have been shown data that disagrees with this document that says that we are deficit spending, that we do need to do this. And the subgroup members have actually gone to the State Director and asked, how can we help with this? Don't worry about it. It's going to get paid for. Now the message is, it isn't going to get paid for. How do we make that happen, and how do we move forward, and how do we create a document that doesn't just address the current expenditures but has avenues in it that will allow for future ideas and future ways to manage?

And that goes right to the second-vehicle pass. It was just dismissed as this is something that has been highly important for years.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: I'm going to discuss that when I wrap up.

MR. BRAMHAM: We're good. My only comment to that is, put something in the Plan that says that you will indeed study this in the future, take a public subgroup that only looks at that subject and make recommendations to incorporate that. Don't just dismiss it.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: Thank you, Jim. I don't think I have any more subgroup members here; correct? Okay. I kind of wanted to wrap up, if that's okay, Randy.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Yes.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: I might be stepping on your toes. I don't know.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Go right ahead.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: The other, I think, important things that happened at our subgroup -- and besides spending four hours dissecting the Business Plan -- is, we made a motion -- and it passed -- to bring to this DAC that the BLM look at a one-day pass. And let me -- I think that needs a tiny bit of explanation. So if you're someone like Dick Holliday or Jim Bramham, he has family or friends that just come out for one day. They don't typically

recreate. They might get on a quad or do something, but that person, if they come out for dinner, drive out from El Centro, come out to have dinner with them at the Dunes, sometimes Thanksgiving, sometimes on holidays -- a lot of us spend holidays out at the desert -- they have to pay the \$40 to park because there is no one-day pass, and the users in the subgroup have asked for that in the past.

Well, I encouraged them, and we did make an official motion to ask the DAC to ask the BLM to study a one-day pass. I'm not quite sure if it takes a whole bunch of studying, but, you know, I don't work in bureaucracy.

So I would like to make a motion that the larger DAC ask the BLM to study a one-day pass for the sand Dunes.

MEMBER MURRAY: I'd second that.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: I think now I'm really stepping on Randy's toes.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: We'll have some discussion. Let's have some discussion. We're not being asked today, and we don't have the purview to thumbs up or thumbs down an Individual Special Recreation Permit fee. And so we want to couch our advice to Teri appropriately, and it may or may not

require a motion to do so today.

But we have a motion. We do have a second. But I do want to open the rest of the comments. I want to open up to the rest of the subgroup. We may find that there may be other advice or amendments to that. So before we go too far, but I'd like to have you continue to have the floor as long as you need to exhaust your items.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: Please, you don't want to go that far, Randy, please.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Go ahead.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: I want to ask the DAC to ask the BLM to study this. That's all we are allowed to do in our advisory capacity, and it's something that the Dune users have asked for for a long time. And I would just ask for your support in that.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: It's moved, and it's seconded. You all set?

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: I'm done. I'm happy.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Thanks for the report.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: No, no. There's other things here that I have to talk about. That was

one.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Continue with your report. Then we'll go on with our motions and rest of the discussion. Go right through the report, and hit all your items, please.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: I do want to thank Neil. He has been doing a lot of outreach. He's gone to two San Diego Outreach Coalition meetings. If anybody has any meetings, I'm sure Neil would be glad to come out and visit them. So I think the amount of outreach has been commendable. I know that after our DAC subgroup meeting there was an open house at Imperial Valley Cycles. So if anybody else has suggestions on where you think that they could go to explain this, I know the public comment period is over, but I couldn't think of anywhere else to send Neil or to have people, you know, come out. So I think that amount is appropriate.

I have one more motion that I want to make, so I don't know when it is appropriate to bring that up.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Why don't you run through all the items on your agenda, and then we'll conclude with the motions.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: Okay. The other

thing that the DAC subgroup made a motion on and passed was, they would like the BLM to look into getting a second-vehicle pass. So let's say -- and I'm going to give you an example of. Some people come out with their dune buggy and their motorhome and it's all in one vehicle. So you buy one pass for the one vehicle. But as we all know, sometimes we have more than one vehicle. Sometimes your husband or your wife can't go with you. Sometimes there's a teenager driving a Jeep. Scares the heck out of us.

So the thinking behind that was, there should be a smaller fee for a second vehicle for the same family instead of a full price because it's all the same -- it's all the same family. So for years I know that the DAC subgroup and the users have asked for the BLM to look into studying a second-vehicle pass, and I don't think it's unreasonable, but I'm not the one who has to implement it. Sorry, Neil. Sorry, Margaret. But I definitely think it's something worth studying, and I would like my DAC members' support in moving.

I officially move that the BLM study a second-vehicle pass for Dune users.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: I've got a note. Keeping going on your items, and we'll get the

motions.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: That's it. Then you're done with me, if I can get a second.

MEMBER ERB: I second.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Let's handle the motion and second that's on the floor. But first before we do so, may I hear from other DAC members their comments, their concerns, and then we'll handle the specific motion after we've concluded our discussion.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: I have a question.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Dinah, you have the floor.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: I'm Dinah Shumway, nonrenewable resources. So Meg, the reason that you're coming to the DAC to ask for the motions is because the subgroup is unsuccessful at making these motions in working with the BLM Dunes management?

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: No. I don't know if I would couch it that way. What I would say is the proper way that subgroups work is that they bring motions to the DAC and then the big DAC brings motions to the DFO; correct?

MEMBER SHUMWAY: It's a procedural

thing. Okay. Then I have a comment. May I go on, Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Continue. The floor is yours.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: A one-day pass, I think, is incredibly reasonable. As all of you know, I'm not an OHV person. But it seems logical to have a one-day pass for almost any facility. But it should be set at a level so that it doesn't preclude getting a week's pass. It should be more expensive to get a seven day one-day pass than it is for a one-week pass so there's a benefit for having a week pass. So if you're staying for two days, it should be better get the week's pass. It should be beneficial to the lead agency, and that's what we're discussing right now. So I'll leave my comment there.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Continue all the way. The floor is yours. We'll handle the motions at the end.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: As far as second-vehicle pass, if you're promoting family things, this is a reality of modern families, especially with seatbelt laws and everything else. Some people have big families and you need two cars, so I think that's reasonable, too, to get a

multi-vehicle pass or something like that that allows -- I don't know -- up to three vehicles. Once again it needs to be set at a level so that it doesn't preclude getting three single-vehicle passes. I'm done.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Thank you, Dinah.

April?

MEMBER SALL: I just had a question.

And maybe Margaret or Neil should answer this. But there was a comment by Jim, I believe, made about next year's contract will be -- I think he said \$500,000 cheaper than the current contract. Is that true, and how would we know that? And if you can comment on that.

MS. GOODRO: So what happens is our contract is up at the end of this season, and so we develop a scope of work, and then that gets let out for bids. And so the Business Plan was based off of a projection, but until we let the contract and get the bids and then a selection is made, it's an estimate. We are hoping to reduce that cost.

Right now, in the past it's been about a million dollars for that contract, about 800,000 this last year. And one of our goals to help save money is to have a more efficient contract, since the users are

trained. And so we're hoping that that will be a cost savings.

MEMBER SALL: Okay. And so it's not related to a reduction in services per se at this point; it's related to other things?

MS. GOODRO: It's going to be a different type of permit sale, and so it would be that the BLM staff do more of a role selling permits at the ranger stations and then the contractor look at focusing on offsite sales and permitting through vendors. And so there wouldn't be as much contract staff on the ground to help save money.

MEMBER SALL: Okay. Thank you. Okay. Then just a couple of comments. I guess I don't know obviously if there's been discussion already with the DAC subgroup and the BLM in terms of if a second-vehicle nor a one-day pass is appropriate or feasible. It seems like it certainly could be. As someone who's a land manager myself in a non-profit sector, I can certainly speak to the fact of increasing services and prices overall. And so I guess I think it's definitely time to revisit this issue.

And with regard to which services are provided, I mean safety obviously is, I think,

non-negotiable, so I don't really see many opportunities to cut the services. The only thing that can be argued could potentially be cut would be the trash services. And speaking from experience again on this topic, unless you implement like a leave-no-trace, pack-it-in, pack-it-out trash philosophy and you try that for a year and it actually works, I don't see how you could cut trash services.

The BLM is tasked with protecting these lands to a certain degree in addition to providing the recreation, and trash is an impact and an issue that they are tasked to deal with. So unless there are some preemptive measures to try and creatively eliminate that problem and those are successful, I don't see how there could be any cuts.

So I guess I certainly understand the ask for a fee increase. I do support the concept of a phased increase, but it doesn't sound like it's the DAC's purview to get into the use of improving or wanting to increase the rate. That is the job of the RRAC. So I will leave my comments there.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: I have a speaker's list. I have Al and Don. Any others to follow while I'm making a list? I have Kim, Ron, Paul. Okay. Al, you're next.

MEMBER MUTH: Okay. Let's start off by turning on the mic. I've got a question on the report itself on Page 22.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: I don't have the Business Plan memorized, just to let you know.

MEMBER MUTH: You don't?

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: No. Hard to believe.

MEMBER MUTH: I'm shocked. What the question is regarding -- it's under the Financial Analysis. And there's an example of a \$2 million variance depending on the type of fee that's collected. But the point that I'm concerned -- well, I have questions about, "There may be a need to implement biological monitoring studies during years of significant rainfall events. It is unknown what these monitoring projects will cost and how frequently they will occur. However, they have cost up to \$1 million per study in the past and could occur every five to ten years."

Can somebody elaborate on that million bucks? That seems fairly excessive for the kinds of biological studies that I think go on there. And following up to that, where does that data go, and is that available for review?

MS. GOODRO: So areas within the Dunes have the Pearson's milk vetch in critical habitat, and so our RAMP was contested in court. And part of that was to ensure that the critical habitat was closed, and so it's under a temporary court closure right now. And so part of the requirements that the court has of us is environmental monitoring.

And so for example, the 2003 Business Plan looked at those years when we're having to do monitoring that the costs are about 6.1 million for Imperial Sand Dunes. And so instead of rolling that cost in year to year with the Business Plan, it wasn't included, but we wanted to let people know that we do have costs that come up in managing the Dunes to keep them open.

So the court has done these temporary closures of portions of the Dunes, and they require us to do this environmental monitoring, and then that gets reported to the court. And it's kept obviously in the BLM records. But part of our balance is balancing use and balancing nature, and it's expensive. And this monitoring and having folks travel throughout the Dunes and monitor the Pearson's milk vetch is very labor intensive. And so it is very costly.

And then there's also things like signing closures and enforcing the closures, and that has to be done to be able to allow for the OHV use. And so these things need to always continue parallel. But we do have costs that come in and not in an annual way but sometimes in, you know, a five-year cycle or depending on litigation.

MEMBER MUTH: Okay. So --

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: Just one quick comment. Fee money can't be used for that monitoring; correct?

MS. GOODRO: Correct.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Got that?

MEMBER MUTH: Yeah. Fee monitoring cannot be used for that.

MS. GOODRO: Monitoring for critical habitat.

MEMBER MUTH: Yeah.

MS. GOODRO: Yeah. So that means we have to come up with those funds to cover that separate from the fee dollars.

MEMBER MUTH: So that million-dollar figure includes signage and patrolling and all that. It's not strictly biological monitoring in the strict

sense of the word.

MS. GOODRO: For that the strict sense was biological monitoring in the report. The signing and enforcement is another cost separate from that.

MEMBER MUTH: Okay. And are those data posted on your website somewhere, or how does the public know the results of the monitoring under that court order?

MS. GOODRO: I can check with Neil and get back to you and see when that monitoring is done where it's posted at.

MEMBER MUTH: Okay. Having thrashed through that, with regard to the one-day pass, I think -- I support that recommendation that it be looked at by the Bureau. The two-day vehicle pass, I can see implementation enforcement nightmares having to do with that. But again at least it deserves study by the Bureau that may help resolve some of the issues. With these sorts of issues, though, it will never be fully resolved, I'm sure. But I would support that motion to recommend that study to the Bureau.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Thank you, Al. Don, you have the floor.

MEMBER HOUSTON: Don Houston

representing nonrenewable resources. The idea of a second-vehicle pass has been around for quite some time. I'm not so sure about the one-day pass, but I would guess it's not a new idea either. And the fact that Meg has to bring these motions to the council, I'm inferring there's some reluctance on the BLM's part to consider these two ideas. And so I'd like to hear from the BLM if there is that reluctance and why.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Hi, Margaret,
please.

MS. GOODRO: So the BLM over the years and through this process is continuing to look at the option of a one-day pass and a second-vehicle pass. And so and some of the questions that you brought up, which are exactly correct, is the cost of incorporating that, making it happen, and then enforcement. One of the things, like you'll see with National Park Service sites when you show up, you're getting a weekly pass, and so basically enforcement costs are limited because you don't have to do the daily enforcement also.

So we've got 57,000 passes out there. It costs a lot of money to have folks going out and checking passes. And so we have to look at that cost-benefit analysis of what it would cost to

institute it and then what it would cost to enforce it. And that's the tricky part. It's the enforcement end of it that sometimes it ends up being much more costly with those one-day.

And then also with the second-vehicle pass, realize that, when we have families come in, how are we going to document whose family is connected to whom? And are these second-vehicle passes just going to be handed to somebody else? And each vehicle that comes and each group of people that come are having an impact on the roads, the restrooms, the toilets. And so is it going to be a family of 20 and then they're going to want three second-vehicle passes?

And so these are all things to look at in the management. So would the pass itself have to be more expensive to cover the second vehicle connected with it, or would a one-day pass help with that concern?

And so we have heard you, and Neil has worked on that over the years, and we continue to look at that and run the numbers. And this is exactly the type of dialogue that we love is, how can we make this work and be the least cost -- you know, the least expensive program so that folks can go out and recreate?

But we're managing it in an efficient way, and so each of those ideas has to be looked at of how expensive it is to incorporate, and we're continuing to do that. We're continuing to do that. And, like Meg said, keep bringing those ideas forward or any specific examples used in other agencies.

Did I answer your question, Don?

MEMBER HOUSTON: Yep, you did. Thank you. But sounds like the BLM will continue to consider these two ideas?

MS. GOODRO: Yeah. We're continuing, unfortunately for Neil, even today, running numbers on looking at what are some options, what are some avenues, what are other agencies doing that we can try to adopt and then having to, you know, look at what are the enforcement costs and how can we make it work on the ground with -- you saw the remote area out there and how long it takes to get there, and it's a huge area to be contacting visitors and checking their passes.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Regarding the question on second-vehicle passes, I would call your attention to the Business Plan, Page 4, a matrix of ideas and issues that were suggested and a response from the BLM with regard to the disposition. Also in

the end of the Business Plan are lists of other recreation areas that were sampled for their fees and whether or not they have second-vehicle permits. Some of those were listed.

And lastly I call your attention to the letter that was e-mailed to the DAC of the response from the BLM from our recommendations of December. Recommendation No. 4 that the DAC has already passed recommended the study and institution of a second-vehicle pass. So those are a few more resources. When you take this home later and think about this more, look at those as well and when you recount Margaret's comments back to you, and I think you'll have a picture there.

MR. MONTGOMERY: Would it be possible for us to comment on that?

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: We'll see how unanswered these questions are when we get to the end.

Kim, the floor is yours and then followed by Ron and Paul.

MEMBER ERB: First I'm going to comment on this, the daily passes. There are times when you can only go somewhere for a day, when you don't have enough time in your life for the entire weekend. And I think a one-day pass is probably important for those

people. It really isn't fair to make them pay for a multi-day pass if they're going to be there for one day. Maybe you can add administrative fee for the cost of that one-day pass to pay for the additional cost of that pass. I'm not certain, but I do think it's important that there be single-day passes.

On second vehicles, I don't know how the vehicle passes are sold, if it's done online, if you pay when you get there, because I don't engage in these type of activities. But I would think if you do them online, you could include all the possible vehicle licenses that that family owns, and then you've got that covered. You don't have to worry that there's going to be other people that are given the passes who shouldn't be given the passes for that household. But I do think it's important. There are a lot of people that go out to the desert and go camping and they tow a second vehicle. So I think that that is appropriate and it should be considered and looked at. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Thanks, Kim. Ron?

MEMBER JOHNSTON: Kim, I think that's a terrific idea. Ron Johnston. If they go online -- and I think if this were to seriously be considered by the RRAC and by the BLM -- that they have to get these

passes -- family passes, if you will -- and this has been brought up at three previous meetings -- that they have to put in the license numbers in advance so that there's no surprises where people at the gate have to figure out who's part of this family and who's not. And I think that would make the administration of such a program much easier. So that I think makes a lot of sense.

And I don't know how many folks are here from our SRP subgroup, which is scheduled to speak this afternoon, but a couple of things that I continue to hear coming up that really kind of trouble me, and that is some of the subgroups feel, it seems, as though they should micromanage the budget for the BLM to administer these properties. Frankly I don't think that's an appropriate role for the subgroups personally.

BLM knows, as Margaret has pointed out, what variables come into play in trying to protect and manage these properties for the safety and benefit of all the citizens. And they can't outline all of this in a budget that's going to be subject to the purview of a subgroup that meets on occasion by telephone or possibly in person, and the roles are somewhat dissimilar in that regard, and the responsibilities

are somewhat dissimilar.

I spent 20 years professionally racing, myself, in Off Road, in SCCA and through SCORE. And all of those associations run their races without government bailouts, without federal subsidies. They pay their own bills. All of the participants paid their own bills. And I think that these off-road groups just have to step up to the plate at some point and say, if this is what it costs, this is what it costs, my personal opinion.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Thank you, Ron. Margaret, one more. Then I'll give you the floor again. I'm sorry. I missed your hand before. Paul?

MEMBER O'BOYLE: Thank you. I guess my feeling about it is this: Is that when the government imposes a fee, there has to be a reasonable and proportional nexus to the impact that's being occurred. And you know, in our DAC tour I was fortunate enough to talk to some law enforcement people. A hundred thousand people on Challenge Hill or whatever it is is a crazy amount of people, so there's obviously a need for that enforcement.

Doubling the fees, I think, overnight is not good. I think if anyone had any bill double overnight, they would not be happy with it. I think a

phasing in of 20 percent per year over five years would actually be a higher number but probably more palatable to people going out there. I think a one-day pass and the preregistration is a great idea. I also think a lot of these resources are needed on the busy weekends, the five or six weekends that go crazy. Maybe there should be a surcharge on holiday passes for those holiday weeks to accommodate that.

And also if the impacts from law enforcement standpoint are taking place in certain areas such as the north part by Glamis, maybe on certain dates that you come in, you pay a higher fee. For example, I think a lot of this stuff probably happens at night. A lot of craziness goes on. People don't drive too, too far at night, so people drive where their RV's are parked. If the crazy activity is in the north, they should pay a little more, but if you're a small family going down someplace quiet, there should be a reasonable pass. You shouldn't have to subsidize the party crowd. Those are things I would take a look at.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Thanks, Paul.

Thanks very much. Margaret, do you have anything to add? I have a few comments after that, but if you want to take the floor now before you forget.

MS. GOODRO: I wanted to hit a few of those. And this is wonderful. This is what I like. I like open dialogue, and so thank you.

Kim, I just wanted to mention that we do offer a free tow-in vehicle, so all the vehicles that are towed in actually get a free pass. We don't have any entrance stations or gates, and so we have access roads all throughout the Dunes for folks to come in, and that leads to areas -- I'm going to pull out Dumont Dunes, for example, with a single-access road is much less expensive to manage. That's the easy fee model. But when you have several areas that people enter over 164,000 acres, it's much more costly, no matter what organization you're in, to manage a fee program. And so that's part of the issue in looking at how much it costs.

As for online passes we sell -- again, 57,000 passes last year -- less than one percent is done online. Eighty percent of that is the local gas stations and convenience stores as you drive out to Glamis. And so that's part of looking at is it feasible to be having requiring license plates and that sort of thing?

Remember these businesses are selling the passes because people are stopping to maybe pick up

some ice and some beer and some snacks. But they want that to be a quick transaction, and so 80 percent of those sales are at those convenient stores. Kim?

MEMBER ERB: Because I don't do this and I'm not familiar with the permit process, what goes into a permit? What is required? What is on a permit?

MS. GOODRO: A permit is a hang tag, and they purchase it. There's a lot of counterfeit permits. And so they have numbers on them, and they'll have a reflective seal on it. And then we have our regulations listed on the back about the Individual Special Recreational Permit.

MEMBER ERB: What information does an individual give when they get the permit? Anything at all?

MS. GOODRO: Nothing.

MEMBER ERB: They just buy it; it's not like a fishing permit? That's my question.

MS. GOODRO: They just buy the permit, and so that permit is good for one vehicle or the main vehicle. Their tow-ins are free, and so that vehicle can contain two people. A motorhome sometimes has five, ten people, and so that's another thing with visitation and expenses. It has to be just rounded

out because we don't know if that vehicle is going to have one person in it or ten people in it, but we know how many medicals we respond to. We know how many toilets we're cleaning. We know how much we're paying for the trash collection and to keep the roads open.

MEMBER ERB: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: I have a couple of comments before I turn it back to Meg. Margaret, when you first took the microphone, not very first, but you said, so how did we get to a Business Plan? The way I got to the Business Plan was by clicking on the BLM website then clicking on the California website then clicking on the CDD website then clicking on the El Centro website and then clicking on the link that says "ISDRA" and then finding a little link on the type of the side that said "Sand Dune News, What's Happening," and then I found the Business Plan. My preference would be that subsequent drafts are final so they put -- we can have a link maybe on the home page for the CDD office for the DAC things would be great, too, for the public.

I love the fee-free-day ideas. I thought that was -- that was the biggest smiling point throughout the whole Business Plan. I really appreciate the fee-free days. Originally my role with

the Dumont Dunes subgroup was as non-motorized representative. We know how much non-motorized activity happens in the Dumont Dunes, not a whole lot. But part of that issue, the reason for that is there were so many people that weren't duners but liked to come in and take a look at the Dunes or pass through on the way to Death Valley National Park and take a look and just see or maybe have just a lunch. And it's been harder to do with the increase in the fees and so forth.

And also the social justice aspects of it. Our fee areas are not located in the middle of urban high-income areas. Our fee areas are kind of out in the remote, rural areas that have lesser economic opportunities for the residents there. And having a chance for the locals to enjoy their local resources at a level that they can afford, I applaud that very much, and it can't get more affordable than free, you know. I'll say, yeah, sure, it's not the peak Halloween weekend, it's not the peak Thanksgiving or whatever. It might not even be in the best of the temperature times, but nonetheless the public could still have access to the Dunes on fee-free days.

Occasionally the secretary deems fee-free days in national parks and other units. Are those

also included in the -- those are not. So your fee-free days are in lieu of those, because otherwise they're not provided by the Interior, and so again I applaud that, and I thank you for that.

The holiday surcharge, it brought up a good issue. Was it you, Paul?

MEMBER O'BOYLE: It was.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: It's a good issue. I don't want to, you know, batter around too much, but I just want to say, okay. Dumont Dunes and ISDRA, they both have a lot of sand. One has a heck of a lot more than the other, but they really have a lot of differences. Margaret explains one key difference, a choke point, one way in and out on Dumont, many ways in and out on ISDRA. But nonetheless I'm still going to try to compare the two in some way.

The Dumont Dunes a few years ago implemented a fee structure that provided for a holiday surcharge. The concept that was initiated by the users was that, if the bulk of the expenses are on the big visitation weekends, then that should be the bulk of the revenue to offset that, and so it was a neat idea. Everyone went along with it. Let's have two different price structures; we'll have passes that include the holiday weekends and passes that do not

include holiday weekends.

Well, that has turned out to be a real pain in the neck to implement, and in reality very, very few people are buying the non-holiday weekend passes. And this may not be entirely accurate, but it may be that the cost of printing and administering those non-weekend passes may even be in excess of that which we get back from having that dual price structure.

So I'm not saying that it couldn't be done in a different place, but it has not worked at Dumont and the Dumont Dunes subgroup. And I don't want to get ahead of the agenda, but we're chomping at the bit to find a way to work with the BLM to solve that problem. But that is an out-of-the box thought, and I hope the BLM will consider that in the context.

The last question I have -- and I'm sorry, Margaret, but can you help me just a little bit. Where is the hole?

MS. GOODRO: So we take the fee dollars that are spent, and we have an annual report that's on the website, and then it's also in the UDG guide and posted onsite at the Dunes. So that is reflecting the fee dollars spent.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Fee dollars only spent?

MS. GOODRO: Fee dollars. So if you remember we've got three funding sources. We've got federal funding, which is decreasing. We've got grant fundings, which are decreasing and now we've been told will be less than 50 percent, and each year we don't know if we're going to get them. And we have the fee dollars. And so that's one piece of the bigger pie. And so the hole is the deficit that the field office has at the end of the year.

And as for the federal funding for the field office, the field office receives about 2.2 million to manage 1.5 million acres of land, which contains several open OHV areas. The only one that has the fee is ISDRA. We also offer OHV recreation in open areas that are free.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Right. The grants issue is just growingly troublesome. I mean, it was \$26 million in OHV grants that were available to agencies and non-profit organizations only in the prior fiscal year. That was a cut from over 30 million from previously.

These are competitive grants. I mean, I don't wish Margaret and her office any ill-will in their grant applications. I wish them all their success, but I'm with non-profits that are going to be

applying for the same pot of money, and I'm going to be writing a darn good grant this year too.

So now the grant money from 21 million is now down to ten million bucks, \$10 million across the whole state for agencies, non-profits. The Friends of Jawbone alone, I think, raked in almost two million last year in some of these grants. Not next year, that's for sure.

So that's a bigger issue, another problem, another can of worms. But you can see how this is just affecting all of our different -- everything that we're doing out there in the desert in one way or another is tied to that grant program, and we really need to -- there's not much we can advise Teri to do about the grant program, but certainly on our own I think there's things that we can do to see that program get life breathed back into it.

Thanks, Margaret. I think that I'm going to go around. I just want to make sure I've had all of my -- okay. That's my items. I've taken enough time there. Al would like another crack, and again you get last shot. Al?

MEMBER MUTH: It's not really a crack but a personal comment on all of this. We're all being dabbled to death by ducks economically. We all

know that. And we all have a knee-jerk reaction to any fee increase, any tax increase, but I think this issue really needs some perspective. If you look at what we saw yesterday, some of those units that were out there are my house in what it costs people.

If you look at the proposed fee increase down -- you take the yearly and you go down to the bottom to 2.57 a person, that's less than the cost of a gallon of gasoline. So to put in that perspective, these do not seem to me to be irresponsible proposed fee increases. I don't mean to sound arrogant about that, but those are my observations.

And I have to agree with Ron, you know. All of our recreation should pay their impacts on public land, and I think, you know, if there's a cost to bird watching, well, we should pay that too. Just my observations.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Good. Any last comments? One more time around before we get to the business. April?

MEMBER SALL: I would just second Al's comments.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Thank you, Meg. Feel free to close. Then we'll move into the business of the -- oh, I'm sorry. Kim?

MEMBER ERB: I have to say I represent recreation and am very ignorant on this issue. I would really love it. This is to the public. Please contact me if there's something involving recreation that you want me to deal with, because there's areas I don't know. I don't know this. I'm a rock hound. I have a Jeep because I'm a rock hound, and I explore the desert to find rocks, but I really don't know much about this particular subject, and I would like to be able to participate more.

And I didn't get involved with the subgroup because I'm so ignorant on the issue I felt like I didn't have really anything to contribute. But I might have ideas that are unique because I don't have involvement in this particular form of recreation. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: I would beg the recreation community to make better use of their capable representative that we have. Kim is so willing and able to put in the time and energy in what it takes to learn and grow into being the advisor, and let's make sure that we include Kim as much as possible in the recreation issues. I know I've been reached out to. Meg's been reached out to, but I don't know that anybody else on the DAC has been

reached out to by users on this issue, and there's many of us here. So Kim would be another strong ally.

So thanks very much, DAC members, for your comments. We'll get back to business in a minute.

Meg, it's yours.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: I'll be very brief.

One, I want to say we probably have two of the best grant writers here, Neil and our esteemed chairperson. The second thing that I wanted to address -- and there's only three. Someone made a comment -- I don't remember who -- about Johnson Valley and saying it was free to go to Johnson Valley. Johnson Valley does not provide any services. There's no trash cans, no dumpsters, no bathrooms to my knowledge. So that in my mind is just kind of apples and oranges and not oranges and oranges. So just wanted to throw that out there.

Second of all I wanted to thank all of my fellow DAC members for listening to all of this. I know it's probably new to a lot of you, maybe not all of you. I want to make a point. I'm not saying that we take a position on a fee increase yet. I want to give the BLM enough time to take all of our input back, edit the document, bring it back at our February meeting, which has really got to be February, and we

can decide whether we want to take action or not. And I would really encourage all of your support the two motions that I made. I'm done.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Thank you. Now we're on to the business component. We have a motion on the floor and a second to request that the BLM study the possibility the offering of a one-day pass.

MR. MONTGOMERY: Can I make a comment on it?

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: How about before the vote? Hang on. We're not at the vote yet. We still have a little more business. Just a second.

So I have a motion and a second. Is there any discussion on that specific item of that, to study a one-day pass?

Meg, do you mind me yielding to a subgroup comment for last comment on that?

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: I have faith that Glenn will be brief, because he's wonderful.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Thank you, Glenn.

MR. MONTGOMERY: Glenn Montgomery, and I will be brief. Several comments came up while you were doing the discussion that have a direct bearing on the one-day pass as well as the second-vehicle pass. One of the comments was, has the BLM been

discussing this issue with the DSG? And yes, they have, very much so.

I was appointed to the TRT in 2003. That's when we started talking about it, as far as I know personally. I know Jim was on before I was, and they were talking about it before then. So yes, they are discussing it, but it's going nowhere. Since the change from the TRT to the DSG, we don't have the role to go directly to the BLM and say, "Can you do this?" We have to go through our DAC representative to bring it to you, so that's what we're doing right now.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Exactly.

MR. MONTGOMERY: Okay. Another question was, if somebody doesn't have a second-vehicle pass right now, what are they doing? I can tell you what they're doing. They're borrowing one from someone else. And it's a big community. "Hey, anybody else not going out this weekend, I need my mother-in-law to come out with us," or, "My wife can't come. We're going to be there for the week. She can't come until Wednesday." So they borrow a pass; okay?

So if we have a second-vehicle pass, that's an additional revenue. Specifically to the point that they're trying to get to with the BLM, they're trying to generate more revenue to offset the costs.

Okay. The one-day pass, one real quick.

Okay. The one-day pass, that's another thing that we've been asking for for a long time. One of the complaints that keeps coming back is, how do you enforce it? You enforce it just like you do a season pass or weekly pass. They enforced it by contacting the Dune users, and so whether the Dune user has a weekly pass, a daily pass, a seasonal pass or anything, they're going to make contact with those people or attempt to validate they were supposed to be there and they paid the fees to get in.

One more thing I did forget. I have a Jeep. That's what I recreate in out there. I tow it in, so I do have the free pass for the towed-in vehicle. The thing is, it's a street-legal Jeep. So I have been told directly by law enforcement people if my tires touch pavement, then I can be ticketed for not having a pass because the pass that I'm getting is for an off-road vehicle only.

So that means that, if I want to go -- if I'm at Glamis and I want to go to Boardman Ville, I can't get on Highway 78. If I want to go from the ranger's station over to the Glamis Beach Store, I can't drive 78. If I'm at Gordons Well, I can't do anything. If I'm at Gecko, I can't cross; okay?

So Kim, if you had your Jeep out there and towed it in, you could drive it all over the ISDRA, but if you want to drive it on pavement, you can't do that. Second vehicle, you can't.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Thanks, Glenn.

That's off our motion, but thank you for that. The motion to restate is to request that the BLM study the implementation of a one-day pass. Those in favor say, "Aye." Opposed, "No."

(Voice vote taken.)

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: No opposed. Motion passes. Thank you. Meg, you have a second motion to make?

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: Yes. My second motion is that I ask the DAC to support their subgroup in asking the BLM to study a second-vehicle pass. And I thought we already had a second by Kim.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: We only have one motion on the floor at a time, so that motion was not made. You are now making the motion, but before we have a second, I am going to ask this. In my opinion it would be poor parliamentary procedure, since this issue has already been voted on by the DAC. We made the recommendation in December of last year that we would like to see a second-vehicle pass. So if the

maker of the motion would agree, I would just call for a consent from our DAC that we still feel the way that we felt last year in our recommendation.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: Even more strongly. Can I make it even more strongly?

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Well, I think doing it twice will have that weight.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Do I have any --

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: I give, Randy.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Do I have any objections to consent of us reiterating our recommendation No. 4 from last December asking the BLM to implement a second-vehicle pass? Comment?

MEMBER SALL: Comment. I don't have any objection, but I guess maybe we can track where the BLM weighs in on this and what their decision finally is and then go forward with that. They have the expertise to recommend if these things should be considered or not, so let's this time around just track what that answer is and move forward. Thank you.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: It was really mired in a whole bunch of other issues before, so it probably kind of got lost.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Be upfront in this one.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Mr. Chairman, if I may, also April's comment goes to resolve that we made more than a year ago about tracking recommendations meeting to meeting, and we haven't really done that because we missed our September meeting, whichever meeting it was. But we should continue with doing that because it keeps us all kind of on track with where we've been and where we're actually going. So we need to have follow-up on what has happened with our recommendations one way or the other.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Thank you for that nexus. Again I'm going to call for objections to consent.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: I think Mark might have a comment.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Do you have a comment?

MEMBER MURRAY: I think I would like to follow up on Dinah's comment. I think we need to level set the committee with the recommendations that are made to BLM and get an update of some type so we can stay in step with where we are, where we don't have duplicative motions that come out.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Great. I think we're getting just a little more off on the discussion. I'm trying to keep us on here. If we want to get back to tracking, we can talk about tracking after this. I'm still calling for consent on reiterating recommendation No. 4 from our December, 2011 meeting.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: Do we give you an "Aye"?

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: I'm just looking for any objections. Any objections? Hearing and seeing none, by consent of the DAC we reiterate our recommendation No. 4 from December. Thank you.

Do we have any other calls for action or any other motions to make? Hearing and seeing none, we need a break, don't we? This is a time for a brief break. May I also keep this one to ten minutes, because we kind of snuck in two this morning, so a ten-minute break and recess. We will be back at 11:05.

(A brief recess was taken.)

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Thank you, ladies and gentlemen. Thanks for observing our short break. It's 11:05, and I'd like to reconvene behind schedule on our Focus Topic Briefing, please, for CDD Cultural

Resource Management Overview. And it's my pleasure to introduce to you Rolla Queen, Chief Archaeologist, well one of them, you know.

MR. QUEEN: I got promoted, Chief Archaeologist.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: You did? Let's go with it. Rolla Queen is going to make a presentation for us, and I appreciate your attention. Thank you very much, Rolla. The floor is yours.

MR. QUEEN: Thank you. As Randy said, I'm Rolla Queen. I'm the program lead and district archaeologist for the California Desert District. I apologize for the makeshift podium and stuff like that, but part of my presentation is going to be free-form. The other part of it is going to be very structured.

THE REPORTER: You need to slow down, please. I'm trying to make a record with every word.

MR. QUEEN: I'm going to try to do this. I will slow down. Everybody who knows me knows I speak with a very slow southern drawl, so we'll get through it.

Just a little about myself. My background is, unlike most of the archaeologists working in the California desert, I'm a historical archaeologist and

a historic preservation specialist. My research interest as well as my expertise is mostly in 19th and 20th century American west. So historic mining, Desert Training Center, historic military use of the desert, western settlement, that sort of thing, that's where my bread-and-butter niche is sort of made.

I would like thank you, Teri, and the district management team for using the DAC meeting at this time to profile the Cultural Resources Program.

THE REPORTER: You've got to slow down.

MR. QUEEN: Okay. I would like to thank Teri from the district management for profiling cultural resources. It's becoming an increasingly visible and high-resource profile issue, especially as it relates to renewable energy and other management issues that we're having to deal with in the desert across the board.

Included in your packet we've given you a couple of commissioned studies, one on Route 66 and one on the Desert Training Center. That's for your personal library to enjoy, so I hope you enjoy them.

So I want to talk a little about what we're going to do for the next hour. First off I'm going to give a brief introduction overview of the Cultural Resources Program followed by just a real cursory

summary of the regulatory environment in which we work in. After that we were going to let the field offices do a little presentation on Cultural Resources Program in their office. We may reduce that in the interest of time, if they have some comments and stuff. And after that we're going to go into a special presentation I'm going to do on the Desert Training Center. Then after that if we have program questions or answers, we'll take them at the end.

So without further ado, first place we need to start is really talk about what cultural resources are. And everybody seems to think they know what it is, but oftentimes when we start talking about it, it almost comes back to being archaeological sites. Once again we want you to understand when we're talking about managing the cultural resources program -- I'm slowing down -- the cultural resources aren't really defined anywhere. It's sort of a program term that sort of developed within the profession back in the 1980s primarily driven by BLM and Forest Service cultural resources managers.

So the best definition that we've actually got is one that's been developing and we've sort of been now including in our discussions of cultural resources when it comes to the renewable energy

projects. And I'd like you to take a quick look at it.

Cultural resources is an object. It could be an artifact or a definite location of human activity, occupation, use or significance identifiable through field inventory, historical documentation or oral evidence. It includes prehistoric.

Am I too loud or too fast?

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Fast.

MR. QUEEN: Oh, I'm sorry. It's prehistoric, historic, archaeological, architectural sites, buildings, structures, places, objects, locations of traditional cultural or religious importance, use, gathering areas to any specified social cultural or social group. Cultural resources include the entire spectrum of objects, places and properties across the landscape without regard to value or significance or who they're important to. It's just the stuff that humans have created out there. That's what we manage.

We manage those for a variety of uses: Research, interpretation, and in some cases we make decisions to discard those resources from further use in the future. Okay? Within the category of cultural resources, there's a very specific subset of resources

that are referred to as historical properties. These are properties that are included in or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. There's a defined process by which these properties are identified out of the larger set of cultural resources and are brought into or determined eligible for the National Register. And it's in this subset of properties we have very specific management responsibilities for as well as regulations that we have to move through in various processes when these properties tend to be affected by projects or other actions that the BLM is taking.

Okay? So the term "eligible for inclusion on the National Register" includes both properties both formally determined as well as actually listed to the National Registry. And this is an important distinction in the program from the regulatory legal framework in terms of what we do to manage the broad resource base as well as the specific historic properties that are eligible for the National Register.

It's very important also that within BLM cultural resources are specifically identified as a core mission of BLM's Organic Act, the Federal Land Policy Management Act and more so than probably any

other federal agency, including the Park Service, BLM manages an incredibly diverse and important array of cultural resources across the landscape and probably more so than just about any other federal agency, except maybe the Forest Service.

When you look at the program district wide, this is sort of to understand where we were and where we have come and what we know about the program in looking at the resource base. In 1980 CDCA Plan, at that time if you look at the general land base including public and private lands in the California Desert Conservation Area, about five percent of the general land base had been formally served by that time of 1980 of the 25 million acres. That resulted in about 14,000 cultural resources of various types, archaeological sites buildings, that sort of thing, that are actually recorded within the CDCA boundary. Of that about three percent of the public lands have been surveyed, and of the 14,000 sites, about 9,000 of those were actually on public lands managed by the BLM.

By 2004, 24 years later -- and the reason for this baseline is, there was a major effort by the BLM and other agencies to try to bring some of this information into a DIS management database. What we

know is by that point about 10 percent of the general land base had been surveyed with a result primarily on private lands driven by CEQA, and as a result of that there are 39- or 40,000 sites that have been recorded within the CDCA planning document. Of that about six percent of the public lands have been surveyed, resulting in about 18,000 regarded cultural resources on public lands.

So that's sort of where we're at in 2004 prior to what's been happening with renewable energy. So prior to 2008 we were averaging of bringing about 500 new sites a year either through proactive cultural resources survey carried out in terms of our general planning or through project-required surveys as part of our project review. We were averaging about 500 new properties a year desert-wide on average and about 2500 acres of new surveying.

In 2008 with the beginning of renewable energy projects coming to the desert, we started averaging about 2,000 new sites per year desert-wide. So a four-fold increase, five-fold increase. And since that time we've probably done somewhere between 125,000, 150,000 acres of what we call intensive survey, actually on-the-ground looking for resources. Probably more survey done in the last four years than

probably was done in the previous 24 years combined. Okay? Very focused block survey kinds of stuff. So we've really increased our knowledge base over the last four years about the kinds of resources and diversity of resources on the ground.

Between 2010 and 2012 BLM also carried out nationwide American Reinvestment and Recovery Act survey looking at national trails, of which in California, 28 miles of the Old Spanish Trail, segments of it were systematically surveyed. The resource has been identified and recorded, and it gives us a better management tool for that resource in the future. So that's sort of what what's been going on district-wide.

When it comes to staff, we have five field offices managing the 10.2 million acres of BLM land. And the way the staffing is sort of distributed through the District is right here. So Barstow has one archaeologist and student archaeologist that's working specifically on the Old Spanish Trail.

In El Centro we have one field archaeologist, another student archaeologist who's learning the ropes coming into her own. We have also GIS specialist with an archaeology background and one communication specialist serving as tribal liaison.

El Centro is staffed up primarily because of the renewable energy. In Needles we have one archaeologist and a position that is vacant. That office is being serviced by the District office, the Barstow Field Office and the Lake Havasu Field Office in terms of how they get their work done.

Palm Springs has one archaeologist, and Ridgecrest has two archaeologists. One of those archaeologists serves as a statewide GIS data coordinator. It's a position that I would like to see funded full time that be dedicated.

As we move into the future, cultural resources are places and properties. It has had a spatial component. We know where they're at. For us to be able to keep up with demands of processing applications and doing expedited reviews of cultural resources for applications of their effects of cultural resources in the future, the only way we can effectively handle that information is to be brought in from electronic digital environment. So this is really something we need to put emphasis on as we move in. We have a wonderful person up in the Ridgecrest office working on that now. It's sort of part time. And we really need to focus her energy more and more on that, and the whole District needs to be focused on

that.

And then the California Desert District, there's one archaeologist, me, as well as an archaeologist that serves on our RECO team, our Renewable Energy Coordination Office, who's helping process a lot of big applications going on in the desert. Okay.

So our legal and regulatory framework. We operate under several laws and policies and things, the most important of which are the Archaeological Resource Protection Act, the Native American Graves Protection and Preservation Act and the National Historic Preservation Act. Those are the ones that really govern our sort of day-to-day operations.

Under the National Historic Preservation Act, BLM has signed a National Programmatic Agreement with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and the --

THE REPORTER: You're not going to be on here much if you don't slow down.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: It's the jargon. It goes quicker when you say the jargon.

MR. QUEEN: The National Historic Preservation Act really governs our program. Okay? Are you getting it down? That act is actually

implemented in BLM specific to how we do things like a project review by a national programmatic agreement that is signed with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and the State Historic Preservation Office, and that in turn is then implemented in California by what's called the Statewide Protocol Agreement, and that is signed with both the California State Historic Preservation office and the Nevada State Historic Preservation office for those lands, California lands and in Nevada. Okay? Should I let her catch up? Okay. Now?

THE REPORTER: Now.

MR. QUEEN: That really is the nuts and bolts of how we do our program. The protocol is extremely important to streamlining, review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and basically allowing our program to move forward with -- in an expedited manner and getting some of our 106 work done for normal and routine projects. Sorry.

So it's very important to understand a little bit about the National Historic Preservation Act. It really governs two aspects of our program. The most important aspect is actually Section 110. Section 110 does many things. I'll put them up here. What's important to understand about Section 110 is it

really is is the part of the National Historic Preservation Act that governs our responsibilities to deal with cultural resources within BLM's management framework.

It requires that federal agencies have a proactive management program for historic preservation. It requires that agencies proactively identify, record and evaluate sites that are on the lands they manage. It requires that we -- most important -- this is the one where it sort of drives everything. It requires that all of those properties be managed in a way consistent with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, which I'll talk about in a minute.

This is the place where it says why BLM has to deal with the properties off our land. We must consider the effects of cultural resources historic properties off of our land from projects that we may be approving, permitting, licensing.

And finally the most -- this is the crux of the preservation program -- all activities that we do must be carried out in consultation. We have a variety of partners in that consultation process we have to deal with: The Advisory Council, the State Historic Preservation Office, individuals and

organizations that have interest in historic properties on public lands and basically the general public. So consultation is sort of the underpinning under which the Cultural Resources Program operates. Okay?

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Pardon me.

MR. QUEEN: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: I'm sorry. DAC members, we have this presentation in our folders. This is not groundbreaking controversial items. Is there any objection from DAC members to suspending the recording of this presentation? Hearing and seeing none, thank you.

(Addressing the reporter) You can go off-line if you'd like, and it will help us. Thank you.

MR. QUEEN: You don't know how hard it is to restrain myself.

(Mr. Queen continued his presentation off the record.)

MR. KALISH: I'm John Kalish, Field Manager for the Palm Springs South Coast Field Office. As was covered in Rolla's presentation, within our field office we do have a very diverse cultural landscape that covers really three counties

of Riverside, Los Angeles and San Diego counties. And that includes numerous tribes as well as a multitude of cultural sites and a very wide range of cultural-type resources that really go from the near present all the way back to well over 10,000 years ago.

The program, as Rolla has said, is really focused around our single archaeologist, George Klein. The overall cultural workload is dominated right now by solar projects, by renewable energy, although we do have the capability of utilizing contracted archaeologists to be able to kind of fill in for all of the workload that George Klein cannot get to. And in addition George has been able to squeeze in some of the more proactive-type cultural work, including we have a very active site-steward program in which we seek volunteers that go out in the field and kind of adopt some of our major cultural resource areas and monitor those areas for disturbance and report back to us on what's going on out in the field, kind of fulfilling some of our monitoring and compliance responsibilities.

But overall we do manage a very extensive program that includes a very high value cultural resources, including a number of areas of critical

environmental concern that were designated through our land use planning process within the CDCA Plan. One of those areas is the Alligator Rock ACEC located along I-10 in the Desert Center Area. It's a National Register Archaeological District out in that area, so it's some very key resources.

Much of what I get involved in tied into the Cultural Resources Program is consulting with the various Native American tribes that do have interests or are affected by the various cultural -- excuse me -- the various solar energy projects throughout our field office. And we do meet on a government-to-government basis with the tribal councils as well as the various elder groups within those tribal organizations to not only bring in their input, hear their concerns, try and address their issues tied into the cultural projects and be able to provide that mechanism in a way that they can formally provide input into those projects. So it gives you a little rundown as to our program. Any questions?

MS. SYMONS: Hi. I'm Katrina Symons, the Barstow Field Manager. You know, John had mentioned, you know, the Section 106 and 110 surveys. Just to give you some idea, so Barstow we did about 22,000 acres of surveys under Section 106 and about

500 acres under Section 110.

We're very busy on tribal consultations. We had about 40 tribal consultations this year. And the other interesting part is that we worked with the tribes on the development of a tribal participant training program, and we delivered two of those trainings, and we touched folks from about 15 tribes. In the development of that program we worked hand in hand with the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians in order to make sure that that training program would be meaningful for the participants.

We also conducted a couple of presentations at the 2012 Society for California Annual Conference, where we talked about the use of GIS and satellite imagery to locate historic and prehistoric trails, as well as we also discussed about the tribal participant training program.

We've also done some preservation, you know, and that preservation was at 14 sites, and it ranged from replacing damaged fencing to some reapplying mud to seal adobe walls or refilling holes dug by vandals. We also have a very active site stewardship program as well, just like Palm Springs.

And I'm really looking forward to working with folks. If you know of folks that might be

interested in joining our site-steward program, have them get ahold of me. We have so many acres to manage, and it helps when you have those extra eyes out there on the ground.

Any questions? Here comes Carrie.

MS. CARRIE SIMMONS: I'm not a field manager, but Margaret said that it would be great if I would come up and say a few words about El Centro Field Office. So I am in an acting resource supervisor position right now, but I'm also an archaeologist, and I'm really proud of the program that we have in El Centro. We're lucky enough to have a very strong team of archaeologists.

Currently we have three folks working in that department, as Rolla has said. One of those persons is a GIS specialist, and in this day and age with all of the data that's coming in, we are really lucky to have that person who's helping us manage all of the GIS and spatial data that we're accumulating now with the renewable energy projects.

We also do have a tribal liaison who is not an archaeologist but has been instrumental with the work that we do as archaeologists and outreaching to the tribes, sharing information with them about the projects that we're currently amidst dealing with as

the majority of our workload in a day-to-day fashion. So that's something really about the El Centro Field Office.

I did want to just briefly mention one of the programs that we're most proud of is in the middle of all of this renewable energy work that we've done, we started an audio tour podcast that you can download online. You can also pick up CD's in our office. And it actually gives people an opportunity to get out and visit some of our resources and hear an interpretive talk just on their own when we don't have a ranger available. And I think that that's something we'd like to develop more of in our field office.

And I would encourage other people to utilize that idea because it really does give you an opportunity to reach out to more of the public in a little bit of an unusual way. We're really proud of that. You can download that podcast out of the El Centro Field Office website, so thank you.

MR. CARL SYMONS: Carl Symons, Field Manager in the Ridgecrest Field Office. I just saw in the presentation we have two archaeologists at work, and one of the people in our office is doing the GIS spatial data for the statewide project. We're really happy with her. She's been able to put on a number of

trainings and help other archaeologists who are there.

Besides the normal stuff we have with WEMO, renewable energy, some of the other things we've been working with is partnering with the Forest Service, and we got a grant in which this enterprise team is doing surveys the Last Chance Canyon District that -- actually fieldwork should be starting today on it starting December 1, so we're excited about that.

Also trying to get things together. We have a lot of cabins and other structures that are out there. We're starting to monitor and starting to put together a plan in order to address those issues that are out there on the land. They're really popular with the community, and we're really trying to get a handle on some of that stuff.

The other things that we have is, we have an active program of trying to get stewards in the resource area to help us with monitoring the sites. We've put on some training, and we were very successful in getting quite a few stewards for different sites across the field office. And that's really helped us as far as trying to keep an eye on them keep, monitoring them, that as more and more people are going out there, as you just saw on the field trip, that it's really easy to have things

happen to sites without even knowing it, not malicious. There's obviously some of that, but even without that of trying to recognize them and how do we document and get all that together? And we've been trying to put efforts towards that this past year, trying to get more documentation and record the sites that we have out there.

MR. LEE: My name is Rusty Lee.

Everyone else talked. I might as well. I'm field manager, and a different approach to this. It's a desert out there, and sometimes we can get across in two and a half hours, four hours. We forget what it was originally like. My part of the world, Colorado River, is the center. We go east-west nowadays because that's where our culture is. The original culture was north-south. That was how they got around, and that was where they settled. That's where the tribes are.

And when we think about -- well, even today, Mexico, the original inhabitants in this area went all the way from the gulf up to around Las Vegas. So we have tribes along the river, Colorado Indian CRIT, Colorado River Indian Tribes. In my area we have the Fort Mojave Tribe. They've been there. They have cultural lifeways basically built around that

water source, and it was their pathway.

We also have tribes that migrated in the uplands in the dryer areas, and their life focus was around going from spring to spring to food sources. And that's important for us in Needles because we have some of the original high-value sites for -- the southern Paiutes were in the area, Chemehuevis, and you can see that from the original. They would have long-term habitation sites, and then they'd have temporary camps. The long-term habitation sites, you know them, Pahrump, Las Vegas, Kingston Springs, Tecopa. Kingston area is pretty much the one in tact.

At least one of our significant features is, we have a site that goes back 2,000 or more years. Those are the numbers I've been hearing, and it's the only site that's untouched because obviously Las Vegas, there's nothing left there. Pahrump, nothing left there. So we have residue or something of significance for them.

Other significant features, Old Woman's Mountains. Horse Thief Springs is there. There are some native American springs there, long-term-use sacred sites to many of the tribes in the area. The 29 Palms have actually purchased inholdings, private lands that are sacred to them. I work with Native

American Lands Conservancy on access issues, protection. They have six square miles they have protected in there. They're one of our partners.

So those are just some of the things we deal with. Of course right now we don't have an archaeologist. Looking forward to getting one. To just give you sort of a feel for the patterns where people lived, what was significant to them, and I deal with two very different groups of tribes with two different historical pathways.

We're very focused on culture because of renewable energy. The other thing, there's desert out there. You want to get across it. That's what our ancestors did. Third Continental Railroad, Santa Fe. That's why Needles is there. Barstow, it had a river. It had a water sources. When we started driving and the federal government and the states started paving roads, Route 66, very significant.

I shouldn't miss -- you know, recent, these are historical realms but very, very significant still. Pretty much you have to get across Needles if you have to get somewhere you want to be.

MR. QUEEN: I also want to mention, just so the DAC understands, the Cultural Resources Program actually has responsibilities for more than just

cultural resources, so our staff is focused on a lot of things that fall around our program even though they aren't things archaeologists didn't necessarily go to school for training. We are basically responsible for paleontology, which is precultural resources, and permitting and reviews of things that come on that.

Paleontology falls under our program.

Tribal consultation at a governmental level is something this program supports, even though it isn't something that is ordinarily part of our background and training. So it puts a lot of -- it is a lot of the work requirements that goes into the cultural staff.

And all of the field managers have mentioned that oftentimes cultural resources sort of has a silence out there. The resources don't necessarily speak for themselves, and with other resources that we have in the desert where there's recreation or racing, there are constituencies for these resources. And so one of the things we try to do is build constituencies for the resources that we manage.

Some of those resources are very evident. They're sort of sexy, and it's easy to build

constituencies for them, such as Route 66, where you have the rendezvous in San Bernardino. There's a way to sort of tap into that and to build constituencies and build a support for the preservation and protective actions that go with those resources.

Other resources are much more difficult to tap into constituencies. So Teri was reminding me that it's very important to understand the site-steward program and if we use those to not only monitor sites but also to help build constituencies for the preservation and protection of the historical resources out there. I often will sometimes say if we can't build a constituency, it's difficult to argue why we need to preserve or protect something.

So I would like to leave you with that. And then I'm also going to turn it over back to Randy at this point for an announcement, and then we will see where we go from there.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Wonderful closing of that item, by the way, Rolla. Thank you very much. If there's no objections from the DAC, I'd like to break for lunch as scheduled, and we'll resume with the presentation when we return as scheduled. Any objections? Hearing, seeing none, recess for lunch. Thank you.

(A lunch recess was taken.)

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Thank you. I'll call the meeting back to order, please, at 1:07 p.m., and we'll resume on our agenda with the presentation on the Desert Training Center briefing. I'd like to turn the floor back to Rolla for him to move on to the next round.

If there are no objections from the DAC members for the presentation, we'll continue to allow the stenographer to relax on the recording, relax her recordation.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: Great idea.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Thank you.

(Desert Training Center Briefing
presented by Rolla Queen off the record.)

MR. WAKEFIELD: I figured this was a good time. Rolla is leaving the Desert District after 18 years, and the institutional knowledge and expertise that he takes with him is going to be sorely missed. He's represented us well. He's able to bring presentations to people who are interested. And so I just wanted to take this time to say thanks, Rolla, for the wonderful presentation and the 18 years of really good, dedicated service.

MR. QUEENS: Thank you.

(Applause.)

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: What a way to end. Thank you very much, Tim. That was nice. Thank you, Rolla. That was very kind you have to spent so much time with us today educating us on the cultural resources of the California Desert District. Thank you.

If I may, if there's no objections, we'll move on to the next item of business, please. That would be the report from the WEMO subgroup, and that's Dinah Shumway. Dinah.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Yes. I'll try not to be real long, and I don't have any fancy things. You're just going to have to listen to me talk.

DIRECTOR RAML: Mic.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Dinah Shumway, nonrenewable resources. This is mostly for -- well, actually we've never really had a big presentation on it. And you won't until the report is done either. One year ago exactly at this meeting, which was the first weekend in December, Edy Seehafer gave a presentation to the DAC about the court decisions that have come down the previous year about the West Mojave Plan in their suit, the Center for Biological Diversity suit against the BLM for the West Mojave

Plan, which had a Record of Decision in 2006, something like that. That's close enough.

Okay. So I've been around this effort for nearly 25 years, and finally when this record of decision came down, suits immediately started. Okay. So it was always part of the landscape, part of the wallpaper, you might say, about the West Mojave Plan, so now that we have the court mandates, the BLM was charged with coming up with alternatives to meet the court's mandates within two years. Yes, two years. 2014, 2014.

So since the WEMO is pretty much in my backyard, I decided that -- I kind of was coerced a little bit, but I decided to go ahead and take the DAC nexus chairmanship of this effort. And thanks, Kim Campbell and Randy Banis, for being co-DAC people on this group.

So in short order we circulated an application to the public, and we had several applications. Our chairman chose from a variety, and those from that variety is -- I have it right here. I'm sorry. I have to read off these notes or I'll forget, and I can't print it out because I did it in the last two days.

Okay. So the areas that are represented

are motor-dependent activities, biological resources, motorized recreation, nonbiological resources. Of course, of course, I'm nonrenewable resources. And we have 13 members, which includes the alternates. We have alternates for biology and recreation.

Okay. So we set up -- we decided the best way to approach this was to look at the root network, and it took us a couple of meetings. We meet once a month, second Tuesday of the month. We start promptly at five, and we end promptly at eight. And one of the advantages of being a chairman is, you get to choose when it is and you get to choose the hours. I love that part.

So the original mission statement as on the website caused a lot of consternation right up front. We had some people who wanted to provide a specific set of alternatives similar to the what the BLM had ended up with in the WEMO Plan. Well, with only a year, there would be no time to do that. And the reason that we decided it would only be a year is because, if we want to prepare a report or product for the BLM to consider for their deadline, we had to finish it and have it approved by the DAC before they started their final work effort.

Well, this was complicated by a really big

thing. At the same time this effort is going on, the BLM -- is it just California BLM moving to TMA, to the GTLF or all BLM? Just California.

DIRECTOR RAML: Yeah.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: We'll pretend it's just California. So the California BLM is moving to a new database system which is based on our info-type data, layered data. This is kind of what the rest of the world uses. This is a good thing. It's kind of an inhouse program, but because everybody is transitioning from the old 2006 maps to now the GTLF maps, this is a big problem because, as the BLM found in their scoping sessions, which were held from January through April of this year, 2012, the maps that were available are the old nomenclature, and part of the court mandate required the BLM go out and number all of the roads in the West Mojave area. The numbering is the new numbering system, the GTLF system, so the number in the field is not the same number as in the available maps.

So the group decided the best way to proceed would be to examine the GTLF maps. Why examine the old maps? So as each map became available, the BLM was going chronologically. So TMA 1 through 8. So we were able to get those maps.

First couple of months went okay. We got them just fine. Well, then we had staffing problems. We had pregnancy problems. We had sickness problems. We had pull everybody off to work on another WEMO effort. We had what -- was the other one? -- doing the judge, informing the judge, DRECP problems.

So the staff that we were relying on to provide us our basic tools to proceed to help the DAC in which we were requested to help were being pulled off, so we ended up pretty much getting everything. But we had to set up an extra meeting, which will be held this Tuesday, December 4th. It will be our last meeting. We're extending that meeting. It starts at 4:30 now, but we'd better be done by eight because I've got stuff the next day.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: In Barstow?

MEMBER SHUMWAY: It will be in Barstow at the Discovery Center because this is the big tortoise meeting -- isn't it? -- that's being held in Barstow. It's taking up everybody. So anyway that's the basics on how we proceeded.

One of the problems that we've had besides the GTLF and availability of basic tools is from our members themselves. Now, I cannot say enough about the dedication of the members on our group, all 13 of

them. Almost all of them come to every meeting. That's a lot more than the DAC members come on. Almost all of them come with assigned homework and get assigned homework, which they e-mail to me constantly, which is a good thing. I get it.

Most of them travel a long way. Some of us only travel -- I travel an hour. I usually carpool. Bob Reynolds travels at least two hours. Tom Laymon travels from Palos Verdes from his job in L.A. These people are the most dedicated people you could ever imagine.

Almost all of them have a huge, though, distrust of the BLM and the possibility that our work product will be considered. This is a big thing. They are extremely concerned, and we've had I don't know how many numbers of e-mails saying, well, this is going to be a waste of time. Are you sure? They're still doing it, so that gives me something. But I spend a lot of my time -- I'm trying to think of the right word. It's not "coddle" -- convincing people to stay with this because their expertise -- I am a piker compared to these people.

These people know every road. These people know every closed road. These people know -- we have a guy that -- I mean, you should see his paleontology

stuff. He's a volunteer for the BLM. He knows every paleo thing, every geologic unit that should have access. I mean, we have had people from the rock-clubbing groups who have written books on rocks. I'm sorry. I'm a minerals person. I mean, these people, they write books. Some of these people are famous. We have an archaeologist who runs Calico. He knows every single mine, every single adit, every single historical place in Calico. And they have showed up to our meetings.

We decided also to set up some limited task group meeting, and at first we were going to set chairmen for each task group. That was really not practical with our timeframe, so we set up some basic task groups kind of ad hoc as we went along. I think we had five altogether. And for that we have our DAC chairman to thank because besides donating his time and mileage, of which I will mention nobody gets compensated. So this is a citizens' group that is doing a lot of work out of a dedication to the goals of the project.

So Randy had brought his staff, really capable staff, and take testimony, and they put it in realtime on maps and photos with the numbers, with the new numbers, the GTLF numbers, so we have an

incredible database of roads that are important to the users. These are people that know these roads and know WEMO intimately.

Now I'm getting back to our goals. After convincing our group that if we can produce a report with recommendations with a lot of public input and our own knowledge, we can prepare a report that will have a list of recommendations with some specific recommendations, though limited, of each TMA, travel management area. There's eight of them.

So our goal in preparing the report is to provide some kind of narrative about how we got started, to document the public input part, which will include comments from the scoping sessions, which a lot of -- not people here, but a lot of people here were not here in the scoping sessions. We will provide a list of recommendations based on all of the testimony that we've taken, the data that we've taken, the people that we've talked to, our own special prejudices, our own perspectives from using the desert.

I'm a mining person. I maintain a lot of claims. I do work on potential mining areas, potential areas useful for resources. Bob Reynolds, who is famous in his own right, he has had a mineral

named after him, Reynoldsite. Bob Reynolds is intimately knowledgeable about specific mineral occurrences, and he is also a paleontological expert, as I explained, and volunteers for the BLM too.

So based on those recommendations we will make a set of recommendations for management strategies, and they will include but not be limited to things, like a big one, marking roads that are closed with a sign that says "Closed." Hello? Believe it or not, there's a lot of people in the public who, when they don't see a "Closed" sign, think it's open. I think this is kind of logical.

So these are the kinds of things that we will be recommending. We'll be recommending ways to manage limited areas for people like me who maintain claims or people like Bob who do academic work. We have had input from USGS geologists specifically in areas that they are working. This was never a part of the WEMO process.

So because of Randy's choice of the people on this group and our continued efforts to encourage them to stay with the project in spite of their reservations about whether it's really going to be worth something, we have had input from a variety of users, not just the OHV people, not just the rock

hounds, not just people like me who become a thorn in people's side because I'm so noisy and mouthy but people who do academic work and who know the desert intimately and have some idea about where the future of academic studies in the Mojave Desert should go.

So with that I will say that I'm done, unless you have specific questions, and I will be hoping to get everybody together to present a report hopefully for our -- it's not going to be February. Probably not for a February meeting. We'll try to get it for the February meeting. If not, it really needs to be approved by our next scheduled meeting after that so when the report comes to you, I really would hope and expect that you would read it and have some comments for us. Thank you. I'm done.

(Applause.)

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Bravo. May I express thanks of all of DAC members for the enthusiasm that you've shown in picking up this project. We can't wait to give you the next one.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Remember the part about the NEPA project?

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: There we go. Seriously, thank you, Dinah. Thank you very, very much. It's been quite a task.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: It's been quite a year, yes.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Yes, it has.

DIRECTOR RAML: I definitely will speak for Carl and Katrina and the Desert District. We look so forward -- we cannot overstate our gratitude for the amount of work that you have led, Dinah and it is incredible. And I also recognize the frustration, the distrust. I think we'll be hearing some of that we have heard -- some of that today about will the BLM listen? Will the BLM take these comments? But I tell you, we look forward to your work coming to the DAC and the DAC's work coming to us, and we have every intention of using it.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: I will relay your comments to our group.

DIRECTOR RAML: Yes, yes.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Thank you, Dinah. I wish I could give my report with the same vigor. The Dumont Dunes group does work hard, meets a little less frequently. We've been meeting approximately quarterly. We had a meeting in May, and we had another meeting in the fall, approximately September.

The thing I'd like to bring up is Dumont Dunes. The Dumont Dunes we spoke about a

little earlier, about the fee schedule that is at Dumont, and the structure is of concern to the subgroup. And at our September meeting we tried to advance an action on Dumont subgroup fees that might help streamline the fees by eliminating the holiday surcharge option and save money and staff time on implementing it.

And we had hoped that there might be some way we could piggyback onto the ISDRA fee process. And quickly right away, though -- quickly right away the BLM -- I think it was that following Monday or Friday-after-Tuesday meeting -- let us know that, one fee proposal at a time, please, and ISDRA is first in line, and Dumont would be best to wait. I delivered the news to our members, and they took it fairly well. They took it pretty well.

But the thing I'm most proud about of it, frankly, is the go-get-'em attitude the subgroup had when we had the vision. We sat there. We had the vision, shared with representatives, BLM representatives. We had a shared vision, and it was kind of neat scheduling all the meetings and the plans and the whole deal about the outreach.

And so I just look forward to the opportunity when the horses can get out of the barn

again up there, and that subgroup is ready to do its job when it comes time to reconsider the fees.

So our next meeting of our subgroup, the Dumont Dunes subgroup, is February 12th, 2013. Chairman Bill Presh, former chairman of the Desert Advisory Council, sends his best, says hello and asked me to make the presentation for him today. So thank you all. It's not as exciting as Dinah's, but --

MEMBER SHUMWAY: We'll see.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: --we'll see. I'd like to move on now, please, to a report from the SRP subgroup by Ron Johnston. Ron, thanks very much. It's nice to see you back on the road.

MEMBER JOHNSTON: Oh, I'm back on the road. That's not a major problem.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: That's good.

MEMBER JOHNSTON: Anyway, I don't think that I can hold the candle either to Dinah's intense and exhilarating presentation. It was excellent, Dinah. Nor to yours, Randy.

The SRP group has not had a meeting now in the past, oh, six, seven months. But they did have numerous meetings, both on-the-ground meetings as well as telephonic meetings, going back to the beginning of 2011 originally involving Tom Acuna as the DAC

representative, and I became involved in it only at the end of last year through the first part of this year.

But the bottom-line project that they were focused on and did, I think, really, a yeoman's job on putting together, which you have in your packets, is the SRP Motorized Event Operating Plan, which is a blueprint, which has now been back and forth to the DAC for review, to the BLM for review and has been nursed, tweaked slightly but really maintains the original flavor as developed by the SRP subgroup headed by Jerry Grabow and his team.

There were, I think, ten active participants in this whole project who represented motorized four-wheel vehicles as well as two-wheeled motorcycle event participants. So there was input from a number of sources. And the document itself, which now numbers, I think, 15 pages in length, is designed for the competition events and addresses all of the issues that all of us as well as the DAC and BLM members could anticipate would be issues that should be considered for safety, for environmental protection, for crowd containment and control, for participant safety and has incorporated them all into a plan that is a fill-in-the-blanks plan, where

participants are required to provide information regarding safety measures, doctors, vehicle safety checks, driver information meetings, trash pickup, remediation of damage or changes to the property being utilized and I think at this point should be ready for adoption by the DAC and recommendation to use it as a blueprint for events that are staged in the future.

That's really all I have to report.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: I'd suggest after we hear from the public and council members that we might want to entertain a motion accepting the report of the SRP or the Operating Plan Template of the SRP. Let's hear some comments first.

If there are no objections, I'd like to continue pressing forward. Though afternoon break would be the next on the agenda, I'm going to continue pressing and move on to the public comments for the subgroup reports.

Just a moment. Pardon me. The folks in the audience, are there individuals that you're expecting to be here that are expecting to testify or comment at 2:30 that are not here at this moment? Do you know of anyone that's not? Okay. Well, very good, then.

The first public comment I'd like to call

up, please, John Stewart.

MR. STEWART: Good afternoon, council. John Stewart, California Association of Four-Wheel-Drive Clubs. And this is in reference to the Imperial Sand Dunes Business Plan. I understand that the topic is to provide for public safety and there's an effort to look for a zero-deficit operating point. But at some point in time you have to realize is that, even if the recreation did not occur, there is going to be a certain amount of recreation, a certain amount of expense. What is not defined in the Business Plan is, what is the residual, overall expense that will have to be maintained without recreation as a component?

To that extent that Business Plan, after looking through it, I find it lacks clarity of purpose and it needs a clearer statement of purpose followed by a clear definition of the expectations. Yeah, it's somewhat buried in there, but it really has got to be out there front and foremost as to what it is all about and what the expectations are.

And then there has to be a clear definition of the expectations which require more concise costing with respect to current cost and projected cost. In other words it does not look like there is any

rationale behind what the current costs are that would support an increased cost, just the fact that, oh, well, we might get a budget cut; therefore we need an increase in fees.

Now, I have one major concern that has should be addressed in there and is not. And that is the unintended consequences. If you increase the fees, what is the so-called flee-the-fee individual going to do? Where are they going to go? In other words factual evidence shows that when the fees were implemented, a large percentage of users left the Dunes and went somewhere else and they carried problems somewhere else.

So yes, the fees helped bring more law enforcement in, but also the fees helped push some of the, quote, you know, the lawlessness out of the area to another management area. In other words, you didn't solve a problem; you just moved the problem somewhere else. And that's -- you know, really, let's look at providing for public safety and a good recreation experience.

And rather than coming up with an immediate fee increase, I'd like to see an implementation on a phased approach with gradual increases. Rather than hit the people with it all at one time, let's look at

it and do it over time. And day use, yes, there should be provisions for a day-use plan in there. That should definitely be part of the discussion. Second vehicle, yes, a second-vehicle pass has got to be in there. It's not included in there.

And I'd like to point out the FLREA, the Federal Land Recreation Enhancement Act, prohibits collection of fees from being used from monitoring, and yet this Business Plan talks about using funding and the funding from monitoring as part of the cost. That should be either clarified as that the fees will not be part of there, or it should be stricken from the plan as that is a residual application that the BLM must do anyway.

Throughout this is some of the discussions that occurred today. There's an excessive concern over enforcement. Now, this is enforcement of making sure that you have the correct pass. Well, if you provide the individuals something that they would buy into such as what they've been asking for over ten years, is the second-vehicle pass, and even the day-use pass, provide that at a reasonable cost, and number one, you're going to increase the income that you would get, and you'll find the compliance is a lot -- probably a lot higher. And rather than

enforcing -- you know, doing a major enforcement on compliance, let's get reasonable and actually enforce and look for problems.

And then finally is that when you look at having to do airlift and all of these and some of the heavy enforcement actions out there and that you issue the citations, why not go into -- let's set something that is going to be a cost-recovery fee to cover the actions there so the ones actually responsible for the problem, whether it be an accident or whatever is, that, yes, let's get the expenses paid by them rather than by the ones that are recreating responsibly. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Thank you, John. I appreciate that. Thanks for those, for having your notes ready. Thank you. Jim, do you have a comment as a member of the public? We appreciate your earlier comments as a member of the subgroup.

MR. BRAMHAM: Well, in the sake of non-brevity, I did not bring forward the comments from the other DAC subgroup members that they wanted read into the agenda -- or into the minutes. So I would ask that either I am allowed to read them or that, if I provide these to you as a document, you will forward that document to each -- There are four letters here.

If I were to supply these to you electronically, would you forward them?

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: What's the desire of the DAC? Would that be acceptable to you all?

MEMBER MUTH: Yes.

MEMBER MURRAY: What's the protocol on this?

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Here we are. This is it. Yeah. Very good. And also do me a favor. Leave those with the court reporter before you leave so our reporter has that information. Forward those comments directly to me, and if I have those early in the next week, I will promise to have those to all of our DAC members by the end of next week.

MR. BRAMHAM: Okay. I would bring forward specifically for your reading -- this is a letter from two County Board of Supervisors members. It is not an official action of the County. One of their problems is that they did not have enough time to comment and they were not part of the collaborative process to design a Business Plan that incorporated the County's desires, so I would really appreciate it if you would read this.

There are three other member of the DAC folks who will supply everything to you

electronically, but please take time to read this document. It is a very eye-opening document.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Very good. Thank you. I've got buy-in from everybody. Everybody has nodded their head. Thank you for that suggestion.

MR. BRAMHAM: Okay. Moving forward, we would really ask the DAC -- and this is as a subgroup member. I'm asking the DAC how you want us to proceed moving forward. The subgroup obviously has an amount of frustration. We shared Dinah's groups's concerns that, golly, are they even going to listen to us? Why are we going through this process? And so there's a lot of that shared angst and anxiety.

And I have to point out, Randy, that I really appreciated your comments on the Dumont subgroup here. At the Dumont subgroup we came up with a proposal to adjust fees. Not only did we have buy-in from the subgroup. We had the agreement that the subgroup would informally meet with the users at the Dunes to try to sell that process. That is so much different than what we have at ISDRA.

Where is the disconnect that allows one group to be so understanding of what is facing them that they want to walk arm in arm with management and support that and on the other side we can't at this

point?

The moving-forward situation is that we would really like the BLM not to create this new document in a vacuum, that they include DAC subgroup members, at least run drafts by us. Somehow or another, you know, make us part of that process so we can be part of the solution, that they reach out to other stakeholders.

The very first slide Margaret had up this morning was a picture of a Reach Helicopter. The manager of Reach Helicopter is on the DAC subgroup, and you'll see his letter. He has some great ideas and would like to incorporate some of those. The County feels left out of this process. They certainly would like to be part of this as we create a new document.

What we're asking for, I think, is to provide a clear, regulatory baseline. This is, what is it going to cost to do the absolute minimum required by law to manage the Dunes and then on top of that a preferred future-conditions costs so that people can analyze, okay. This is the absolute minimum we have to do. These are the other things we can do. These are the things we'd like to do. This is what it's going to cost so that analysis can be

done so that the Plan is developed from the reality of costs and regulatory compliance and not from, gee, how much will you pay, and let's see if we can make a document that will justify how much you're willing to pay.

We want a plan that looks forward, that allows for modification and new technology, that addresses things like the second-vehicle passes in a way that says we're going the move this; we're going to forward; we're going to set up a pathway to make that happen.

And based off of John's comments, yes, there's been a lot of comments, and I think you're going to hear from the ASA about the amount of work that was done in a local survey at the Dunes. I recognize those are not votes. We all recognize it is not everybody putting their hand up, will I raise the fee, do I want the fee, et cetera, et cetera. It is an absolute trend teller to the Bureau that there's going to be some frustration about this, but the real vote will come, as John Stewart said, when people decide what their recreation dollar is going to do and is it going today at the ISDRA, or is it going to go to some other place in the desert where they can do the same or similar activities for no money? And so

the pocketbook vote, I think, is extremely, extremely important.

So I'm asking this body to give, through Meg, directions of what they want to see because we haven't yet defined what the moving-forward situation is going to be. Is it going to come back to the DAC for approval? Is it going to come back to the DAC subgroup for approval? Are you asking the subgroup to give you a recommendation to approve? Are you asking for no approval? If we don't approve it, are you going to take it up? If we approve it, you approve it, is it going to go to the RRAC? Are you going to be the final arbiter? Those are all questions we cannot seem to get, so I'm asking this body and the Bureau to go through our DAC sub-chair and explain that to us.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Thank you. And thanks for all your time with me last night. Thank you. I appreciate it. Meg?

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: That's okay, totally okay. I just wanted to add to Jim's comments. Oh, sorry. A couple of things. I believe how I've been explained the process is going to happen -- and I'd like someone to clarify this after I lay it out -- is that provisions are going to be made to the Business

Plan. That will be available at the subgroup meeting on the 17th. And then the part that I'm not all that clear on is that then it will come and be on the agenda for our meeting in February, hopefully.

But I don't think that the DAC actually has the power to say -- to approve or disapprove, and I don't think it is -- it's my understanding that the subgroup doesn't have the power to disapprove or approve. I think we're just here to give public comment. We can say we don't like it, we do like it. We can say whatever the heck we want basically, but I am not sure that is within our purview apparently. And I want to get to the next part.

So once it leaves us in February, if that is the way it goes, then it goes before the RRAC? So explain that process for me.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Yeah.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: So we're all on the same page as we leave this meeting.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: The RRAC, as I understand it, and the communications I've seen with RRAC members is that the RRAC is awaiting a proposal to consider. And at the time -- I'm sorry. RRAC. RRAC -- thank you, Teri. That stands for Recreation Resource Advisory Council. It's a RAC, a resource

advisory council, just like the DAC is a resource advisory council. We are a RAC also.

But the RRAC was a specific advisory council that was established by the laws that allowed the agencies to charge these fees. And it said that fee proposals will be reviewed by a recreation resource advisory council before they're implemented and if their advice is not taken, it will have to be reported to them as to why and so forth.

So the BLM fee increases or fee proposals for campgrounds or individual special recreation permits, such as at the Dunes, those fee proposals go to a California RRAC that considers fee programs for both Forest Service and BLM. And so the DAC does not have review authority through its charter for individual special recreation permits such as those that we're speaking about at ISDRA, but the RRAC does. And they are awaiting a proposal to be submitted so that they can convene their meeting and consider that.

So we're not being asked nor put in a position of approving or disapproving the fees. The RRAC fully intends to consider this. We, however, are occupying a position prior to that final document so that we can offer advice and input as DAC members before that document goes into final and goes out to

an RRAC.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: Okay. And part of our purpose here and part of the subgroup's purpose is for public comment; correct?

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Yes.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: That's part of our FACA; right?

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: It's public comment for us.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: Which is what's happening here.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Correct.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: I just wanted to make sure that was clear. And I want to kind of touch on what Jim Bramham mentioned. He said that at the Dumont Dunes subgroup, that that subgroup came up with a proposed fee increase and then they brought it forth to the BLM. The ISDRA was free to do that also, and I had no -- it's been talked about for two or three years, but that ever did happen? I think the BLM would have been open to that, but that never happened. So I don't want it to be -- I don't want it to seem one-sided. And that's just kind of the way I look at it, because I came into it just six months ago, but to my knowledge the users didn't come up with a proposed

fee increase as did happen at Dumont, so that could be one of the reasons why there is a little bit more tension there.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Thanks. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Randy?

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: I'm sorry. I'm not going to do the back and forth on public comment. Let's keep going through so other people have chance.

Let me continue with public comment, please. We will get back at time permits, please. I will also have Nicole next. Would you care to take the microphone at this time and make a presentation on behalf of American Sand Association.

MS. GILLES: Yes, absolutely. But one point of clarification. Charla Teeters from the United Desert Gateway was unable to attend. I know many of you met her yesterday. But I have her comment, and I was wondering if I can include her comment as well, if that's like a separate three minutes, or do I only have three minutes total?

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: What I'd like you to do, as Jim said, if you could leave that copy you have with the court reporter, and could I beg you to e-mail me a PDF version of her letter.

MS. GILLES: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: If I can have that early next week, I will promise to include that with what Jim forwards me. And all of our DAC members have nodded in agreement that they will review those letters. Thank you, Nicole.

MS. GILLES: Thank you. My name is Nicole Nicholas Gilles, and I am the Executive Director of the American Sand Association. And I'm here today speaking on behalf of the ASA, which is a non-profit organization representing over 35,000 members and 225 businesses. And our primary focus is to protect the rights of the public to recreate on public lands. I also served previously on the ISDRA DAC subgroup, formerly the technical review team, for many years and helped found the Desert Gateway when I was the CEO of the Brawley Chamber of Commerce.

The ASA hired an independent consultant to conduct a thorough analysis of the Draft Business Plan. I would like to submit into the official record of today's meeting a copy of the analysis an opinion record from McClure Consulting LLC that addresses a number of the ASA's concerns.

There are nine aspects of the ISDRA Draft Business Plan we feel need attention, some of which include the level of visitor services suggested in

Alternative 1 is greater than the majority of visitors desire; the lack of transparency of the data upon which the Business Plan is based; cost reduction measures are not evident; the Business Plan is not consistent with the provisions of the FLREA, which is the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act, for those of you that are not familiar, and we also feel that it does not sufficiently address impact on the Gateway communities.

It is unfortunate that the ISDRA Business Plan was not developed in a collaborative business-like fashion. The ASA stands ready with qualified volunteers to work with the BLM and the impacted stakeholders in the redrafting of the Business Plan to fulfill the BLM's management goals while providing the public the desired level of visitor services.

Developing a redraft of the ISDRA Business Plan based on a zero-based budget and a bare-bones approach to visitor services would be a reasonable starting point for a collaborative effort.

I hope you keep in mind these comments in reviewing the Business Plan, and I appreciate the opportunity to speak to you today. Also as part of Charla's comments I'm going to include the results of

the survey that she did in conjunction with the BLM. The ASA was able to assist Charla in putting that onto an online type of survey.

And I just wanted to bring to quick point that there are 695 people that responded to the survey that was on the ground and online. And number one is, they don't feel that they know where the fee dollars are being spent. Five hundred and thirty-two out of the 695 didn't really know. Also 462 of the respondents said they do not feel that an increase in service is needed and they'd rather just keep it as is or prefer not to increase it at all.

And finally there were 222 respondents who said they would go to another area to recreate, and 178 of them would prefer to visit less or take fewer trips. And I just think that speaks volumes. So that will be information that I will be forwarding to you so you can forward it out to the reviews of the DAC.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Thank you. That will include the McClure report?

MS. GILLES: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Thank you, Nicole.

MS. GILLES: I have a hard copy I can leave with you.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Could you leave the

hard copy with our court reporter, please.

MS. GILLES: Absolutely. I will do that. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Thank you. I appreciate that, Nicole. Dan Williams. Are you here, Dan?

MR. WILLIAMS: I am.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Oh, there you are. Thank you for your patience all day.

MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you very much. My name is Dan Williams, and I'm here on the behalf of probably over 50 percent of the ice cream vendors that's out in the desert, out in the sand Dunes and Superstition Grill. I also own the RV storage facility, which is out at the Holtville Airstrip.

Our concern -- actually I came to talk about ice cream vending and stuff like that, because I have read this entire plan. I didn't understand it. And I thought I was pretty stupid after reading it because I couldn't understand it. So I didn't want to talk about it. Came to the meeting. Come to find out I'm not the only one. But that's not what my time is here for today. My time is here to speak about ice cream and the vending business.

First of all I think everybody knows Tim.

He's at the general store, at the Glamis Beach Store. He runs the vending operation, which he started about seven years. Done a fantastic job. I mean, terrific job. My hat's off to him. Great CEO, whatever he is. He works for the management of that. It's a fantastic job. But the only thing is, he took a Mac truck through the Imperial Sand Dunes vending area, demolished it, totally destroyed it. It all went to private land, and now we've lost everything.

In the report it talks about the recession and stuff, lower. We're losing business because of that. Nowhere in the report does it say we lost 50 percent of our vending business because of the store. Nor is there any type of response of what we can do to help improve the Glamis vending area for the vendors that are left. But instead what they propose is to increase our rate, to double what we're paying for the vendors that are left that did not leave to go to private property.

There's no plan to improve the vending at all, to upgrade it to the 21st century. But instead they want us to pay for the increase and at the same time -- and they state, which is very important -- I'll probably get down with seconds to go.

They understand that by this Plan they will

lose another 1,260 vending days by increasing the rate. So they want to cut the number of vendors in half again without no proposals to help the vendors that are there. I see my time is up.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: If you're finishing, please finish your thought.

MR. WILLIAMS: We have met with other ice cream companies, brought ourselves together. We have come up with a great proposal that would be fair to everybody. We don't think they need it. We don't think they even earned it because they have not done nothing to save their own program. The program we have provided said that they were in a deficit. Our program would bring it to within 6,000 of what they asked for. The other 6,000, we say you go out and earn it. You go out and provide more vendors. You upgrade your vending area. That is what we want from the BLM. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Thank you. Thank you very much, Dan. Do you have a question, Meg? Go right ahead.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: I just want to say, not to start a back and forth, just to make a general comment. In the American way of life, is that -- I'm not sure it is the BLM's place to compete

with private -- you know, with private, with Tim. I know Tim. I've known him for years. And I don't think it's fair to a private industry to have that, to have it be cheaper or easier or better on public lands.

I think that stuff belongs on private lands and if that someone can, you know, provide a service -- obviously Tim provides a better service than we do, than the BLM does. And apparently you're not happy with what's happening on BLM land. So go to Tim's land. And it's not the BLM's job to compete with private industry. We want private industry to flourish.

MR. WILLIAMS: May I respond to that?

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Briefly I will let you, please.

MR. WILLIAMS: Okay. BLM -- the vending area was there long before Tim was there. Tim only come in just recently. The vending has been going on for years. It's not a question of, hey, Tim was there first and then the vending. The BLM decided to do vending. It's the other way around.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: I see. Okay.

MR. WILLIAMS: The other thing is, we're talking about a rate hike that's good not only for the

ISDRA because it is going to be for the whole county. Superstition, where there is no tip; Gordons Well, where there is no tip. Okay? There's going to be rate increases everywhere, not just by Tim's store. It's not fair at all.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Good reply, and thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It's not this "Tim."

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: The vendor fees and fees they pay are an important of this Business Plan. When you're looking at this and reviewing all of this, don't forget that side of the equation. Thank you.

Terry, would you like to take the microphone on the subgroup reports?

MEMBER MURRAY: Could I have one comment.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Mark, please.

MEMBER MURRAY: Just to kind of wrap-up. We've heard a lot of great discussion regarding vendor fees. And back to Meg's comment, how formal, or what does that document look like that we are going to provide as recommendations? We're not setting the rates.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: No.

MEMBER MURRAY: There is another advisory committee council that does that, and we're going to feed into the that advisory committee a recommendation for them to consider?

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: What we're discussing now, we're hearing the presentations. Any advice that we have to directly offer the BLM, we have the floor and some time to do so. But don't think that our comments and input to Teri are limited to just this meeting.

We're being provided additional information additional testimony and comments next week, so reserve your judgment. We'll have some more comments. And I'm hoping that you can provide as much feedback as possible to Teri and to her staff between now and the next DAC meeting. And I don't know if this will go to an RRAC first or if we'll be having a DAC meeting first.

MEMBER MURRAY: That answers my question.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: However the schedule plays out, whatever insertion points we have, we'll make use of them. Dinah?

MEMBER SHUMWAY: To follow up to Mark, too, we had resolved -- I think it's over a year

ago -- that we could handle some things in background by e-mail. If you needed or Teri needed a response from the DAC, Randy would send out a message and we would all respond based on what information we had. So we can do certain things in background too. We resolved that a long time ago, it seems like, I think.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Thank you for waiting, Terry. The floor is yours.

MS. WEINER: I hope I'll be allowed a few more minutes, too, like the other speakers were. I need them.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Do your best, please.

MS. WEINER: I will.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Thank you.

MS. WEINER: On the subgroup for the Dunes, I may have not looked in all the places I needed to, but this is the first time I've heard about the Business Plan. And Randy explained how many clicks he had to do to get to it, but in your Plan outreach, I think that the conservation community was entirely missed. I should be on your e-mail list because I've been involved with the Desert Protective Council with Dunes public process since 2000, and I received no phone calls. I received no e-mails. I

received nothing hard copy in the mail.

So I'm very interested in this outreach. I think it needs a little more. Maybe you're going to need to circulate the Business Plan a little further. Where I'm coming from is, I think you should charge whatever fees are necessary to manage the Dunes, but my interest is in the fact that it's a beautiful, unique place with some plants and animals that don't live anywhere else in the world, and I believe that the BLM has been entirely missing the boat for decades on reaching out to other populations of people who would love to visit the Dunes to enjoy the natural resources. I have heard so little about natural resources of the Dunes today, it's really shocking to me.

The first time I encountered the Dunes was driving toward Arizona in the early '80s on Highway 78, and I couldn't believe how beautiful it was. I pulled off at the Osborne Overlook to take a walk and go see what was down in the Dunes, and I nearly got killed. And so that's the experience that other visitors have to the Dunes who aren't going to be on vehicles. And I think, you know, the amount of money coming into the Dunes could be radically increased by promoting the Dunes for other types of

recreation, and there's absolutely no promotion.

As a hiker I have to pay \$25 just to take a walk in the Dunes, and I really don't mind that because I know that the Dunes is a law enforcement sink. It's the most hard-to-manage place in the California Desert, from what I can gather, and we -- a proposal I've put in several times for draft management plans was that if this is such -- we heard yesterday in the field at the planning road how many agencies and how many counties and sheriffs have to be called in to manage the recreation. It's like it's unbelievable.

And so my recommendation, which has been largely ignored, is how about a carrying capacity study for the Dunes? How about the El Centro Field Office consider just how many people they could manage for non-off-road vehicles without having to call in so many forces to manage the recreation? That's something that's never been considered.

In various parts of the National Forest there are permits out, so maybe because the areas are being overused for hiking, and they give permits, and they only allow certain number of people into the area on the day because it overstresses the environment and the management resources. So these are considerations

I'm really disappointed that haven't been taken.

We signed on to protest of the final EIS partly because these Dunes are a resource that really needs to be managed for the protection of things that don't live anywhere else. So the Pearson's milk vetch lives in both the wilderness area and the big dunes, but it likes the big dunes better. It seems to like those bowls, and there's fewer numbers up in the wilderness area. And I'm concerned that with some sudden disastrous event, this plant will go out of existence before a lot of people can come out and paint and photograph and hike and camp and enjoy the place.

So on the Dunes TR subgroup I'm very embarrassed to say that I had outreach from Margaret and from Teri Raml to be on the subgroup, and I missed the boat on signing up in time, but I really do think that the subgroup needs to be expanded because there's no diversity of interest on the subgroup and you could get some new ideas by having other interests besides off-road vehicle recreation represented on that.

I go to the Dunes. I go to the Dunes. I don't know where I'm going to park, you know. There's a place to pull off at the Watchable Wildlife site, but other than that I don't have any services or

anything else but. I'm willing to pay for the Dunes because you know, I just -- you need the money, so --

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Thank you, Terry.

Thanks very much for coming in and offering that perspective. It's very nice of you to spend your day with us. Thank you, Terry.

Again could we hear from Jerry Hillier.

Sorry to call you on the spot. I have cards for Jerry on WEMO subgroup and the Dumont Dunes Business Plan. And following Jerry, we have Lloyd Misner. Is he still here? Thank you, Lloyd, and just I'm sorry. And the last comment card that I have is Lloyd. So you get to wrap her up today.

MR. MISNER: Good. So I can be really longwinded.

MR. HILLIER: I was going to offer some comments just for myself on the Imperial Sand Dunes there. I don't have a dog in that fight. After listening to some of the other public comments, I think I'll just pass and not offer those. It would be far easier.

MS. GROSSGLASS: I love you, Jerry.

MR. HILLIER: Actually I can share them in private. No. The bureaucracy associated with the fee raising in my experience -- I serve on the

Dumont Dunes subgroup. And just getting -- you know, any business would flounder if they had to go through this level of bureaucracy to set the price for the goods they're going to sell. And it's extremely frustrating, and there's nothing that any of us can do about it, but it is absolutely stifling. I'll let it pass.

I had some questions on the WEMO. And they're more questions than comments. First off I've received recently several e-mails on the integration of the BLM route designation process and the so-called CAPA process. For some reason it escaped me. When they did route designation, they separated. And the Barstow resource area did their route designation, and the Ridgecrest area -- and mostly in Kern County -- was largely deferred until some future days, and then they never quite got it done. And then as a result of the litigation and the magistrate and all the other activities, they have now been integrated.

And I've had some e-mail expressions of frustration relative to the CAPA process, and I just wonder if you could offer a comment or two on that and how it's going to be integrated or whether it's an issue. And I don't know. There's a little bit in San Bernardino County, and I didn't know whether I

needed to get involved or not.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: I'm going to make a comment, answer your question a little bit then defer to Randy, who knows a little more about this than me. However I will say that one of the other advantages of --

MR. HILLIER: Be quick. My time is running out.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: -- of being the chairman of the ad hoc group is that you get to be somewhat of a dictator. Since I didn't understand about CAPA -- and it was brought up very vocally at our very first meeting and took up quite a few minutes of time -- nevertheless, I don't care about CAPA. We are going forward with TMA-7, which is where CAPA is. It's in the northern part of TMA-7. But the CAPA process is going on. And I have no idea how they're going to resolve both, but we are writing our report probably long before CAPA gets done, so we'll be writing our report and making recommendations regardless of what happens at CAPA. Then probably it will be up to the BLM parcels to resolve those.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Don't worry. I'll give you another nickel, Jerry. We have new members. I would like to explain the CAPA a little bit just for

a second.

The West Mojave Plan, the WEMO Plan, that was first signed in 2006 designated routes across the West Mojave Desert, except for the areas immediately adjacent to the city of Ridgecrest in the El Paso Mountains, so there were two --

MR. HILLIER: It did not extend up into the Indio County.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Correct. There were two subregions at that time. Now we're not talking subregions; we're talking TMA's, travel management areas. But at that time two of the subregions, Ridgecrest and El Paso, did not have route designation done because of the intense interest of the Ridgecrest community and their desire to participate in the collaborative process.

The BLM agreed, and in the WEMO West Mojave Plan there is a section that says that after the record of decision is signed, there will be a planning process, a collaborative community planning process for route designation for those specific areas of the West Mojave. It provided an approximately four- to five-year timeline to get those route designations done.

In the meantime conservation community

succeeded in having the courts remand this West Mojave Plan back to the BLM for a redo. However the CAPA process had never got off the ground, so now we're back at this kind of convergence, where we have West Mojave planning and CAPA planning going on.

Now, at one of our earlier DAC meetings in the spring, we were not sure if the BLM would actually be conducting a CAPA process -- right? -- so an early DAC meeting, when the DAC formed the -- when we went to the El Paso Mountains.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Okay. That day. I get it.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: That was an opportunity for the public to reach out to the BLM. And the local Ridgecrest community, I believe, was successful in convincing or getting the buy-in of the BLM that they would indeed convene a CAPA planning process.

MEMBER MUTH: You're using the acronym without a definition. Tell me what it means.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: I didn't, did I? "CAPA" stands for "Collaborative Access Planning Area." CAPA is not a thing. It's a place, a planning area. And we are going to plan motorized access collaboratively in that area. Now --

MR. HILLIER: I'm sorry. I punched this button.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: This is good. Especially our new members need to know this. This is very important. So now we have a CAPA process for a small section of WEMO and the rest of WEMO planning going on. How does all of this fold in together? Does WEMO have to be part of the TMA's, or is WEMO actually something entirely separate because it has its own life per the 2006 Record of Decision?

There are opinions that the court did not say the CAPA was not -- they didn't say anything about the CAPA. So it took a little bit of touchy feely get-together. The BLM worked with the Ridgecrest people and have convened an El Paso CAPA planning process. They've had four public meetings on the El Paso CAPA planning process, meetings that filled rooms bigger than this.

And how this is going to fold in together, is a big question. Jerry is asking, how is the subgroup dealing with it? Dinah replies that --

MEMBER SHUMWAY: We're not.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: -- the CAPA lands -- the CAPA area is in TMA-7. The subgroup will review all of TMA-7, make recommendations for TMA-7. Those

areas in TMA-7 that fall in the CAPA, those recommendations will go to them. All the recommendations for the rest of TMA-7 will go to the people who are making those decisions. So that is how we kind of view this. So we are looking at TMA-7 as TMA-7. And it's really the BLM that needs to delineate whether this is going to go to a CAPA or this will go to a different process.

MR. HILLIER: And I guess --

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: So there. I think that put it in the whole. But before you keep going, just real quick I want to make sure the subgroup members are on board so they understand what you're about to say.

MEMBER HOUSTON: That was a great bit of background, Randy, but it's missing one thing. The court made certain findings before it came to this decision to send BLM back to the drawing board on the routes. My understanding is, one of the primary findings is that when the alternative route designations were proposed in the Western Mojave Plan, there wasn't a significant diversity between those proposed alternatives and that is the reason for the remand; is that correct?

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: I would say that's a

fair statement. A little bigger, but that's a good nutshell.

MEMBER HOUSTON: So my question to Dinah and her group is, is her report going to address the court's findings and the court's concerns?

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Yes, we are going to be addressing them in a general way. But we have taken the tack that has been pointed out to us many times, the court really didn't have any problems with any of the criteria defenses for closing any roads or designating them as limited. What the court had a big heartburn over was any criteria or defense for leaving roads open. That was their big heartburn.

So our push, for the most part, not exclusively, has been for defending certain roads that need to be kept open based on the information that we get from the public. We still have -- we have several members who are pushing for certain roads that are open to be closed or proposing alternate routes. In fact we've had a lot of alternate routes going on. This section would be better to be closed, this section closed would be better to be opened, and in return we should close this route because it encourages proliferation, for example.

So we've had a give-and-take, but we've

been mostly concentrating on getting information from the public in what their preferences are and in encouraging them to define specific reasons for why roads should be open. Classic example, roads to this certain important paleontological area should at least be designated limited rather than closed. So that's kind of the tack we've been taking.

MR. HILLIER: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Thank you. Jerry, back with you, please.

MR. HILLIER: And thank you. And just -- the reason I asked the question is, it didn't seem like the court was even aware of this, and now the magistrate has said, you know, you'll do the whole thing. So I needed to know -- and thank you very much for clarifying that -- does the court know that is what's going on yet, because that leads really to my second thing, this give-and-take that has happened over the last 60 days or so in which the plaintiffs have raised questions in terms of whether the BLM is doing the right kinds of things. And there's disagreements, and there's been an ongoing discussion.

And I might say for the record the county who was involved and came in as intervenors on behalf of the Bureau have not participated in the route

designation process. They were advised by the Council that really they didn't have a dog in this fight since none of these roads probably would qualify under our area, 2477, and therefore we didn't really have any role to play other perhaps to represent constituent interest, and we didn't figure that was a big enough deal.

But this give-and-take with the judge and magistrate and possibility of coming out and making field reviews, what's going to happen there, or do you know, or can you say for the record, or can you speculate on what's going to happen?

MEMBER SHUMWAY: I'm going to do it like I did last time. I'm going to make a comment here, and then I'm going to defer to Teri, who recently was tasked with -- what's the word? -- bringing up to speed the new judge that's overseeing the case, or the interim judge overseeing the case. So you're right. We haven't had any lead agency input in our effort.

But remember, the subgroup -- and this is how I look at it. Correct me if I'm wrong, but the subgroup reports to the DAC, so we're a citizens' group, and even though we have gone at great lengths from the insistence of our members to comply as much as we can with the NEPA regulations in that we have

encouraged as much as we can information and input from the public -- like I say, I'm a dictator, but our report is being prepared specifically for the DAC.

These people here are going to approve our report, and when it's approved with any revisions, it will be transmitted to Teri, the Desert District Director, and it will be her decision then to incorporate our recommendations. So that's how I look at this process.

MR. HILLIER: Good. Okay. Thank you.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Wait. Now Teri is going to tell you about access to the judge, because that was --

MR. HILLIER: Is it Judge Illston? Was she replaced or just the magistrate?

DIRECTOR RAML: Magistrate.

Judge Illston has turned over to the magistrate and continued to monitor the progress. The magistrate at this point is mostly interested in the implementation of the court remedies. The planning process part of it, you know -- that part is far enough out that we have not been providing any updates other than including a record in our quarterly reports of all the meetings that have been held.

So the magistrate is the very interested in

our implementation of the court remedies, and also he is taking very seriously the role he feels he's going to play. And he does want to get out on the ground. So we did have a conference with the judge, and he did an excellent job of kind of getting to know the parameters of the court remedy, and he also at that time has requested a visit. So that's what we're kind of planning.

And so how he looked at it is, he kind of wanted to get the extent of the disagreement between plaintiffs and the BLM of our we're proceeding on the remedies. Then he wanted to get more familiar with the landscape that he feels fairly certain he will be ruling on in the future, and that's kind of where we're at.

MR. HILLIER: Okay. Thank you very much there. It's going to be an interesting aspiration of 25 years of baggage. And that's how long, frankly -- in all honesty that's how long -- I think about 1987 was when this process started. So it's outlived several.

And the last question I got does not include access, and I'm going to deal with the specific field office manager to answer that for me. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Jerry, thanks for bringing the topic of the El Paso CAPA up.

MR. HILLIER: I didn't mean to press a hot button.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: I'd like to make another comment too. Teri, correct me if I'm wrong. While this WEMO subgroup is going to with our process, the BLM is conducting their own process as well. They're going forward with this with their maps and their designations and their route criteria, mitigations, the whole thing in preparing their various alternatives.

So this process is kind of a parallel process. We're going on with our process, which involves the public. The BLM is going on with what they already know in preparing their documents and their maps for the court. And hopefully we'll have our recommendations done so they can incorporate them into their process. So this isn't just the WEMO subgroup. We're just going to be advising and making recommendations, which is what our role should be.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Thank you. We have continuing comment. Before I bring up the next speaker, I'd like to close comment card requests for subgroup reports. I'm still going to take those cards

I have. We'll have those. So for this part of subgroup reports, I'm not taking more comment cards, but comment cards are still being accepted for the comments on field office reports. Okay. So I'll still take cards on that.

And Lloyd, I got you all excited that you were going to be last, but I neglected and lost track of Glenn, and Glenn wanted to say something. So Lloyd, you can let Glenn go first.

Glenn, the microphone is yours for a three-minute personal comment. We heard from you earlier as a subgroup member. Love to hear any comments you have as an individual, and the floor is yours for three minutes, Glenn.

MR. MONTGOMERY: Okay. Thank you. What I want to talk about in my three minutes is, this morning I talked about how the BLM needs to put more budgetary data into the Business Plan so that the Dune users can know where the fees are going, where the money is coming in. I mentioned that the DSG group had a meeting in January of 2010 and we were given budgetary data. I went ahead and went back over to my office, and I printed it out. It's 22 pages, so it's very in depth, goes through every item the for FLREA, what they have to do to meet the requirements of that

and then also projections of appropriations, fees and everything in there.

So the point of this is, the BLM has something in place, or did at the time. Is it still available? I have the file. If they don't have it, I can give it to them. They forecasted out -- it was midseason, 2010, and they forecasted out through -- end of the season, 2014 that they ended up forecasting. And again it was midseason, 2010, so we don't know how 2010 ended, 2011 ended, and we don't know how we're at right now, which is the 2012 season.

But when they go out to forecast, they're looking at a net deficit of 443K. And with that the projections that they did for fees was \$130, and that would have started in the 20 -- let me double-check again -- I think it was this year, the 2012 season, yeah. It would have started in this year's season for an increase to \$130 for a season pass, and then it would have continued through at the same rate to 2013 to arrive at the deficit they're at right now.

But we don't need 22 pages to show to the Dune users but something simplistic, just like the front page has a graph on it that will give some information to the Dune users so that they can make a good decision on it. What I'd like to do is, I have

three copies I could leave with you.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Could I have one to Steve, one to me and one to Teri, please.

MR. MONTGOMERY: Sure.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: I appreciate that. Much obliged. Thank you.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: Thank you, Glenn, much.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Thanks, Glenn, for going back to the office to get that. All right, Lloyd, I promised you.

MR. MISNER: Good afternoon, members of the DAC. My name is Lloyd Misner. I represent the Orange County ATA Association. We're a non-profit social riding club. We've been in existence since 1983. We've spent about 80 percent of our off-roading activity in the ISDRA. That's about a trip a month. And after being here today, most of the rest of what I had written here almost needs to be tossed because I've learned a lot. But I also would like, if I could request -- I had written out a much longer comment on the Business Plan, if I could go ahead and submit that, and, if you'd like, I'll send you an e-mail so you can distribute that.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Thank you. Please.

MR. MISNER: And this also puts me in a rather difficult position, commenting on the Business Plan, because a lot of the people who work on that Plan are also people that I know personally, respect and like professionally as well as personally. So it's just a little difficult to say negative things about something that you know these people put a lot of heart and soul and work into.

One of the comments that is was made earlier about the safety at the Dunes that Margaret had made earlier, the safety out there has really changed a lot in the last ten years. The improvement in the law enforcement has run off a lot of the bad element, and it's a much safer place to recreate. And I agree with that, and I think that's a good thing to have gotten to.

The second-vehicle pass was a good chunk of my comments, and you folks have already dealt with that, so I kind of sort of have to let that go. I think that Kim pointed out a very good solution to that, and I would reinforce that with making the second-vehicle pass a requirement of the fee, the pass provider on the website.

I don't feel the second-vehicle pass needs to be something that people purchase over the counter.

Most people who want and need to use that second-vehicle pass will be willing to go the extra step to buy it online. I don't see a major inconvenience in that.

Some of the other concerns I have with the Business Plan have to do with the data involved, and that is in my comments. But to summarize for the fiscal year 2011, while they state there's 1.1 million visitors and a compliance rate of 90 percent, they're also stating that for fiscal year 2011, there was 61,000 approximately permits sold. And simple math can't make that up to 1.1 million visitors.

I have a major -- as a user and as a representative for a user group, it's not that a fee increase may or may not be warranted. It hasn't been presented with enough data to justify it, and the data that has been presented, we have serious concerns over its accuracy. The best I can come up with, any way I calculate it, is about half a million visitors a season, which means 1.1 million is almost overstating it by double. So what we're asking is to have the DAC recommend to the BLM to go back and work on fixing some of these data errors to the plan so that the plan that is produced will be more accurate.

Sorry. I'm out of time. I did want to touch

briefly on the vendor issue. I know Dan had a very passionate -- he's much more invested than I am. The history he was trying to point out -- and this is in the Business Plan -- the BLM would like to make that a profit center. At one time it was in fact a profit center because most of the vendors, or all of the vendors that are now on private land, actually, were on public land and were paying the BLM to be there. But the program itself was managed to the point where it was more economically viable for the vendors to go onto private land, thereby actually losing the profit center.

So I would recommend the BLM reconsider how that plan is actually run. As for the plan in its current form, the \$7,000 per space that they're talking about raising will not affect anybody near the private property area but will in fact affect the four vendors at Gecko Road who have no other place to go. They can either pay the fees or not be there to provide services to the users. So again we would ask that the BLM reconsider how they are running that.

The last question I have -- and I wanted to ask that about because I had my hand up -- was, this group obviously doesn't vote to approve or disapprove the Business Plan, but does this group vote to

recommend support or not support for the Business Plan? So as a group you won't make a decision of support or either way?

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: No. Your understanding is correct. We will not be making a specific thumbs up or thumbs down on the plan. But, Teri, you have a comment.

DIRECTOR RAML: Well, what I would like to do -- and before we close on the Business Plan, I'd like to make some comments. So I'm going to leave it to Randy on how he wants to get us through this part.

MR. MISNER: The other part is, where should we be directing our public comments and time? Should we be spending time at the DAC subgroup level and giving comments there, or should we be spending it here?

DIRECTOR RAML: And that's what I will try address when my time comes.

MR. MISNER: Thank you. I know it's a lot of work for what amounts to volunteers, and it's appreciated.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: Thank you, Lloyd.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Lloyd, that was nice of you. Thank you very much. I appreciate your sticking around and waiting all day long for this. It

was very appreciated.

We have one final comment on subgroup reports. This is on the SRP subgroup from John, three minutes, please. And then we'll move to Council questions regarding field office reports. John, three minutes, SRP subgroup. Thank you.

MR. STEWART: Good afternoon, council. I just want to make a brief comment on the SRP report. I appreciate the fact that the SRP Operating Plan is ready for use. As it was reported out, I would like to point out that it was designed for competition events. That leaves still a gaping hole. What about non-competition events? Yes, you can just put "not applicable," but that's still 15 pages of extra work that people are going to be required to step through, and there's still no definitive process of which will be non-applicable by individual speculative action by the different field offices?

So I would still like to see an SRP Operating Plan that covers non-competitive events. These are events that do not have spectators but they're purely non-competitive, you know, for clubs. And we need something that will completely address that and make it simple, quick and easy as possible just to alleviate the extra paperwork required. Thank

you.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: I have one comment.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Just a minute. Very good. Thank you, John. Just a quick clarification. I think Ron will agree. This Operating Plan Template for competitive events is not a requirement to be filled out. It is a tool. It is a tool to be given to event organizers to help them organize for their permit application. So this is not an actual permit application. This is a tool devised by our subgroup to help competitive events prepare for and give thought to everything they're going to need to do in order to get a permit.

That doesn't take away from anything that you said about a similar document for non-competitive events. I agree. But this is a tool to help organizers in organizing their events. Am I correct on that?

MR. STEWART: It is a tool and a guide, and it is guidelines that the BLM will use to determine whether or not this event is being put on safely for motorized vehicles. And it is only for motorized vehicles. And it very clearly has a section to check if this is a non-competitive event that does shortcut the required number of items you have to fill

in on the form.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: I see.

MEMBER JOHNSTON: So it is rather a catchall form for motorized events.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: I see. Meg?

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: That was my comment.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: That was the one.

Okay. Thanks. Very good. Thank you very much.

We'll move now to council questions regarding field reports. Oh, excuse me just a minute. Just a minute.

DIRECTOR RAML: Okay. Did you close on the motion?

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Thank you for the reminder, Teri. We left open a motion. No, we did not take the motion. Do we have a motion to accept the work of our SRP subgroup, Meg?

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: I move we accept the SRP Motorized Event Operating Plan. I just want to make it clear that it is for competitive or non-competitive motorized events, and I want to move that we accept their work.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Meg has moved. Do I have a second?

MEMBER MURRAY: I'll second.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Very good. Thank

you. Mark seconds. Any further comments, questions?

The motion is to accept -- oh, pardon me.

MEMBER HOUSTON: Randy, because of the lack of time to prepare, I'm going to abstain.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Thank you. Quite all right. Thank you.

MEMBER ERB: One small comment.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Please do, Kim.

MEMBER ERB: On Page 17 it refers to stalking. I think you meant staking. And this is just sort of humorous. Don't think you authorized stalking.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Ron, can you note that, and let's connect on that. We missed it.

DIRECTOR RAML: Oh, that spell check.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: It proves you guys aren't perfect.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Sorry.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Can you amend the proposal with the suggested changes.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Acceptable to the maker, acceptable to the seconder, the motion is to accept with change the subgroup's SRP Operating Plan Template. No further comments? Those in favor, say, "Aye." Opposed? Abstention of one.

(Voice vote taken.)

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Thank you. Motion passed. And I'd like to turn the microphone before we go to the next item to Teri, who would like to address and wrap up some comments on the ISDRA Fee Proposal Business Plan. Thank you.

DIRECTOR RAML: And I hope to do it with a little bit of clarity, I hope. So one of the things -- and this is going to be a little rambling because I want to cover three different topics in this. First of all, Randy and I were talking at the beginning of the meeting that one of the things that we need to make as part of the meeting is to discuss roles and responsibilities in what people are doing here and what their responsibility is. I think we neglect that because, when we look around the room, there are so many familiar faces I think we kind of just cut to the chase. But I think that's something we're going to add to the agenda to kind of bring some clarity to this.

One of the things I wanted to talk about -- and this is in terms of the DAC's role with the Business Plan and the subgroups' roles with the Business Plan. It has not been clear. And I think part of it is there is a sort of circular way we work

together. The DAC's role is to provide advice to the DFO or to me or to the secretary on topics that I ask for advice on, and then when so moved and so petitioned and when you feel so, to provide me advice on things I may not be asking for. And so that's kind of part of it.

I think the subgroup has a mission statement, but part of that mission statement is kind of similar. The subgroup has a responsibility to provide advice to the DAC on things the DAC asks for advice on. You know, in other words this subgroup is an arm of the DAC, and so you can task the subgroup to do things for you. And that is kind of their charter through their chair to provide information to you. It also is the opportunity of the people who participate on the subgroup to request you to do something.

And I think in something this kind of complex and contentious, those roles and responsibilities kind of get a little blurred. You know, in this particular case, you've got also another advisory council's potential involvement in this, which is an RRAC, which has also been chartered to have a responsibility and a role with these fee proposals. So I understand the confusion and the lack of clarity on who's doing what when.

I think also because of this process, you know, there is a requirement for a public involvement process associated with fees, but it's not a NEPA process, you know. It is an opportunity for public comment and for public involvement, and so I think that's the other thing, is that at times we tend to get a little bit hung up on days and that sort of stuff. But in this case we've provided an opportunity for a public comment.

Now, where should that public comment be addressed? Well that's kind of a little bit of the confusion. The public-comment process that we opened up was to be addressed to the BLM. At the same time the subgroup is interested in having public comment addressed to them, and they are also interested in having public comment addressed to you. And so add the roles and responsibilities of the subgroup what they're trying to accomplish, what your tasking to accomplish, what you're asked to accomplish, then where does all this public comment go?

And frankly there's not that much clarity. We are working under -- well, as most know, we are very anxious to move forward on this Business Plan. We have some very real decisions to make in terms of contracts and some other things, and we need a lot of

lead time to be prepared for the next season. So yes, we are moving quickly, and that causes a lot of consternation.

Okay. Let me kind of switch gears a little bit. Let me say this also. I do read the e-mail that comes to me copied, you know. And I'd like to say that I always appreciate receiving it, sometimes not so much, but I do see it all. And so if I'm on the copy line, I do get it, and I do read it. I do not respond to a lot of it because it's not addressed to me. It's just kind of making sure I'm in the loop. So, you know, I am seeing a lot of the dissatisfaction, the dysfunction terminology, the pleas for a lot of stuff. So I kind of know there is a whole undercurrent of -- I don't want to diminish it, but I'll just call it crankiness about how things are working.

And I also recognize that -- you know, Jim came up earlier, and I wrote this down at the time. He's looking for sideboards for future discussion. I think that is probably in order, you know, because I think it is frustrating to everybody to not believe -- to not have any faith in the process and not to know how they're interacting in the process, not understanding what the sideboards are and where

there's opportunities to be effective and where there's opportunities to just kind of spin your wheels. So I think that's a good comment, Jim. I think we should be trying to develop sideboards for discussion.

I think the other thing Nicole brought up -- she brought up the topic of collaboration. And I think right now, particularly in the context of these fees, that is a loaded term. I think if you were to look from the perspective of certainly the field office and the field manager -- and I think they believe they have been collaborating, and so and I think that there is a real, you know, honestly felt "No, you have not."

So I think that's another thing that we need to determine is, what does collaboration mean? What does it really mean? And on what extreme? If it's the idea that we have a meeting, you come, you make your comments, they get recorded, and we believe that's collaboration, that's not true. But if collaboration means you come and you give us a document at the end of the day and everything you said is in that document, that's also not collaboration. So I think we've got some work ahead of us because I think the sideboards aren't clear and what it means to

collaborate is also not clear.

And I think lastly, because I think one of the reasons I'm going to really strive for some clarity is, as I kind of said with the DAC and the subgroup, there are things you're asked to do and there's things I'm asking you to do that you may or may not take on. There's things that the subgroup is asked to do that they may or may not take on. And that is a collaboration, truly. So I think there's the mission of all of us, and then there's the role, responsibilities and opportunities. And I think, you know, we'll work very hard here in the very short term to provide some clarity to that.

So lastly I want to clarify what I would like to do. And I think we've tried to be pretty clear, and I know it's frustrating what our next steps are, BLM's next step. We have just closed a comment period, and a lot of people -- and even today people are providing comments. And of course until we really look at them, we don't know where they're directed. But it's all one big set of input that they're all received. And then from that we determine what's next. And to me it's a little premature to decide what's next without a real thorough analysis of the comments.

Also for me, particularly without a NEPA -- NEPA is sort of a requirement as a platform -- what we'll be looking for in comments is not necessarily number but the representation across the spectrum of interests, the depth and analysis. I mean, so when American Sand Association hires someone, you know, actually tasks someone to give a very thorough comment analysis, to me that indicates there's probably been plenty of time for comment. But I'm not going to close the door on any of it.

So what we're going to do -- our next step is, analyze the comments and determine our next steps forward. Now, what I would like the DAC to do -- and I will produce you some clarity what I would like to you do as you get a chance -- is, those comments that have come clearly to you, if you could take a look at them and kind of analyze them and see if there's something that comes into those comments on what you -- if you have a recommendation based on those comments, what I'd like you to do is feed those through Randy.

I think there's two levels of, sort of things, we need to look at. And I think we've covered a lot today. One is what I'm most interested in from the DAC members through Randy is process comments, you

know, because what you heard today is the fee business, the recreation business is complex. And the idea that we with -- you know, and I'm not diminishing anybody throwing out a good idea or "How come?" Or, "Have you thought of this?" Or, "This seems like a good idea." That is very rich comments, and it means that there's not clear -- we're not clear. We're not communicating clearly everything we've considered.

But the content part of this is pretty complex, and there's -- thank goodness people get degrees in outdoor recreation management, and that's why it's a science and a profession for us to get into the nitty-gritty analysis. I'm not so interested in that from you. But I am interested in process, and obviously that has been a process caused a lot of heartburn and a lot of confusion. So if you see something in our process that we need to be improving upon or if you think there's something from here on how we need to improve, that will be helpful.

What we will do, though, is, we will provide you that kind of clarity of what I think the roles and responsibilities are under FLREA. I want you to take a look at the documents you're receiving. Then BLM will provide you something that kind of says, this is the comments we've received. We'll do a mini

content analysis for you and lay out our timelines. And that will be helpful for you to comment back.

And we'll try to be really clear on the timelines we're trying to meet, and then you can kind of run it by staff and say, I know this is contentious. My advice wasn't enough. It should have had be more, because what is that's RRAC will be looking at. They will be looking at the quality of our public participation process. And we think we're running it pretty well, but there may be some flaws in it. So hopefully that kind of sums it up.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: DAC members, any immediate questions back Teri on that? Did that help clarify?

MEMBER MURRAY: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: I think so too. Just one minute, please. Thank you, Dan. One quick question, please, just quick.

MR. WILLIAMS: I know in the meeting, but can we still make comments to you in the next few days, or is this it?

DIRECTOR RAML: BLM culture in terms of comments is so funny. You know, the problem is, we always receive comments. You know, we really do. I mean, we never tell anybody, "Don't write us anymore.

Quit talking to us. We're done with that." So there is always an opportunity to provide comments. And what we try to make clear is, the best opportunity for your comment to be included in our deliberations is as early as possible.

So in this particular case, you know, we set a deadline. It's November 30th, so that comment period is closed. However take in mind what I said. If you've got things you want to share, of course we will receive your letter, and because this is not a NEPA process and this isn't going to be that sort of thing where it doesn't have that kind of legal aspect to us, send us your letter, and we will consider it.

MR. WILLIAMS: Can we have some type of meeting, negotiate a settlement on fees and stuff for vending or whatever?

DIRECTOR RAML: I've gone as far as I'm going to go. Did you hear that? I talked really fast.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Thank you. I'd like to turn the floor back to the council members regarding questions regarding the field office reports. Field office reports were sent to you and provided in your packets. So I'm just going to look around at Mark, Al, Dinah, Meg. Good. Then we'll

start with that. Mark?

MEMBER MUTH: Mr. Chairman, do you want us as individuals -- there are five reports here -- to go through on our own, or do you want to start with one report and then take our comments? How would you like to do this?

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: You know, that's probably a good idea. Yeah. Let's do that so we don't have to comment three, four or five times.

We did miss our afternoon break. Before we jump into this, I do need to give a break here. Please, cats, don't run away. I'm not going to herd you. We'd like to have a seven-minute break, please. We'll be back at 3:30. Thank you. That will put us back on time.

(A brief recess was taken.)

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Ladies and gentlemen, I reconvene the meeting at 3:35 p.m. Please, we'll move to council questions regarding field office reports.

But first, Diane, did you get all your letters? Very good. Thank you. Al, the floor is yours, and you have questions regarding the State Director's Report.

MEMBER MUTH: With regard to the State

Director's Report, it's something of an oversight, or I'm not sure quite how to characterize it. But the State Director is indicating an additional six months to look at alternatives for the DRCP, Desert Renewable Energy Conservation Plan Report. What's not pointed out here or in any of the field reports -- it may not have been appropriate there -- was that the independent science advisors submitted a report. I think it was in October. And it was probably the most scathing report I've ever seen regarding the government group-produced document, and that's not really indicated here. The report was of such a harsh nature that it strikes me that a six-month time extension even just to look at alternatives probably will not be enough.

And my question would be, in light of that peer-reviewed report, is six months a reasonable time to consider alternatives and a redrafting of that report?

DIRECTOR RAML: Let's see. What we'll do with that Steve, we'll note that, and we'll send that. And I also read the -- I think it was August, and I read the science advice report too, and I don't think -- I have not seen any response to that report from, you know, the REAT or the policy group or

anything. So what we'll do is raise that to the State Director and try to get back on you if they're preparing to respond to it or if it's going to stand on its own. We'll try to respond to that. I will make a note.

MEMBER MUTH: One other comment on the peer-reviewed science. It really takes some digging around on the DRECP site to find. It's about three or four layers down, and more prominent is the 2010 peer-reviewed report. You have to dig deeper than that to find the 2012 report, so it is there if you look for it.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Continue. Who's next?

MEMBER MUTH: El Centro.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Very good.

MEMBER MUTH: This one is pretty quick, Margaret. In looking through your report and also the proposed Business Plan and going back to one of the gentlemen's comments about not making the visitor numbers work out, I pulled out 1.14, 1.2, 1.5 million visitors per year. And half a million visitors' discrepancy or within that range, I know it's difficult, but can you figure out why you get so many different numbers coming up? Is it just

communication?

MS. GOODRO: I can, because there's lots of different ways to look at visitor stats, and so those numbers are based off of traffic counters for vehicles driving over. And so those are visits. That's not visitor use days. So for example, if you were to take 57,000 passes and generally an average of 3.5 people, because it's a family, per pass, so times that by the 57,000. And then folks usually come for about five to six visits for a year.

Like for example we have one group. Say they come about once a month, and so average that five to six visits, so times that, and then when they come for a visit, generally a lot of folks come for the weekend, so they show up Friday night, they leave Sunday or Monday on a holiday weekend. So they stay anywhere between three to five days. So if you were actually to look at visitor use days, it would be well over three million. And so it depends on what aspect you're looking at.

So we know the number of passes sold, and that number with the 1.1, that's from a vehicle traffic counter saying that's how many vehicles drove over that, and it's not including calculating how many people were in that vehicle and how many days, then,

that vehicle parked and went and played.

And then also, when you look at visitation, we also have passes sold, but then we have lots of visitors who don't buy passes and who come to recreate and visit and summertime visitation. And so there's different ways of looking at land management. As Teri talked about, I'm one of those geeky recreation majors. So in land management visitation is an interesting science, and there's lots of ways to look at it.

But most people do and what's general in Department of Interior is to use the traffic counters. And so that number with the 1.1 million, that's talking about visits when that vehicle drives over the road. And so that's not including how many people are in the vehicle and how many days they stay. Did that answer that?

MEMBER MUTH: Yes, it did.

MS. GOODRO: Okay.

MEMBER MUTH: Was I the only one that didn't know that? Does that help out with questions about the number of visits or visitors?

MR. MISNER: Mark and I will have an off-line discussion, but if you look at the Business Plan and the way it's written, that 1.13 million leads

everyone to believe that's how many visitors there are in the Dunes for that season. So you have to be able to make the numbers out somehow, and I can't do that. So what I'm really saying is, the Business Plan needs to be rewritten in a manner that actually provides data that shows me that 90-percent compliance is actually true.

MS. GOODRO: So with the 90-percent compliance that he's talking about, that number is from our staff and permit staff going out and actually physically checking that vehicle. That's what the compliance is based on. So they see a vehicle. They see that that 90, 91 percent has that pass, and so that's where that compliance number comes from.

And what I'd like people to think about -- and I ask for some help. We want input to make this the best document and make the most sense, and so that's where I'd like to look at. We're providing services. So for example last year we had 407 medicals. This last weekend, for Thanksgiving we had over 92 medicals and over 40 arrests. So when we're talking about staffing, we're staffing for the incidents that are happening. Those medicals and that law enforcement, we're paying to get those garbages emptied when they're full. We're paying to pump the

toilets when they're full and keeping those roads and things open when the storms come and wash them out. So a lot of what we do is based on the need we see, and that's not based on a traffic-count number. That's based on how many calls we're getting in the field.

MEMBER MUTH: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: I'm sorry. We don't want to get back on that train again. I've got more trains to go around the tracks, but don't go far. Questions for Margaret on her report?

I have a question, and I'm sorry. I'm really serious about this. How do you capture a bighorn sheep? I have no idea. How do you? Are they trapped? Water sources or --

MS. GOODRO: What they have is, there are water sources they use, and they are tranquilized.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: So they are rather ornery and don't take to being captured well.

MS. GOODRO: Some are friendlier than others. I, myself, am a ram. It depends.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: Are you going to buy him a drink?

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: The next victim, Al.

MEMBER MUTH: I did turn off the mic.

Palm Springs. John, I just wanted to follow up on this. There was some discussion about the kit fox distemper at our last meeting, and do you have any more developments on how has that spread? Does it seem to have disappeared?

MR. KALISH: The kit fox distemper study is ongoing. Right now I have not seen any summary of their findings, but I know the crews have been out in the field and the study continues. But I certainly can find out and send you an e-mail.

MEMBER MUTH: Okay. I'd just like an update so we can follow that to see if it spread to any other mesopredators and that sort of thing.

MR. KALISH: I'll do that.

MEMBER MUTH: Okay. The former solar millennium project twice sold now, dust control and weed abatement, is that being monitored on a frequent basis?

MR. KALISH: You're talking about the Blythe project?

MEMBER MUTH: It was Palen, I think. Solar Millennium. Then it sold again to a trust.

MEMBER SALL: Well, yeah. The Solar Millennium is owned by or was owned by Solar Trust of America, which went into bankruptcy.

The Palen project was never finalized as far as an authorization. We did complete the final environmental impact statement. However at that time Solar Millennium was having some real thoughts of considering a project redesign and backing up and resubmitting a plan of development and looking at other potential technologies. That project as analyzed was a solar trough project.

While all of that was going on, they ultimately -- or their parent company went into bankruptcy, for which both the Palen project, the project that was never authorized, and the Blythe project, which was authorized in November of 2010, those projects have been sold. The Palen project was sold to BrightSource, of which we have had one meeting with the company. They have not presented us with a plan of development or an amended right-of-way application for the Palen project, so they're still in the process of looking at a project design that would fit both their needs and fit various site considerations of the Palen project site.

The Blythe project is in a similar state. That project was purchased by Nexterra, the company that owns Ford Dry Lake Genesis project and also is the proponent for the McCoy project just north of the

Blythe project. Nexterra is going through the same process as BrightSource at the other site. They're looking at modifying the overall project design. They're looking at potable-take technology versus solar trough, potentially amending the footprint of the project and also are looking at ways that they can incorporate or integrate the Blythe project in with the McCoy project, which it abuts. So they're in the process of going through the all of that work. We have yet to see a plan of development or an amended application such that we could start moving ahead on analyzing that project.

As I said before, there was no disturbance out of the Palen site, so any dust issues out there would just be natural levels of PM10. At the Blythe site there's about 600 acres that had been disturbed. We are working with Nexterra and previously with Solar Trust to ensure that they control the weeds out on the site and control the PM10 issues out there with dust suppressants and methods to do that.

MEMBER MUTH: Okay. I was interested in the Palen site, but it was the Blythe site in particular that was the dust control I was thinking about. I just asked it wrong.

MR. KALISH: Yeah. The Blythe site,

about 600 acres, it was disturbed. They did build a tortoise fence, which they are in the process of removing that fence. It's a barrier that doesn't fit into what their proposed project ultimately is going to be. I mean, it fit with the previously approved project that Solar Millennium had, but that fence is being removed. Weeds are being controlled, and dust-suppressant methodology is being implemented.

MEMBER MUTH: Okay. Then one -- I can't help but harass you about this, John. On Page 4 of the report -- and I think the off-road community might pay attention to this -- "BLM action, install signage and provide information to the public regarding riding opportunities in the Palm Springs Field Office." Now, you didn't really mean that, did you?

MR. KALISH: That's within?

MEMBER MUTH: So it says, "in the Palm Springs Field Office." You meant to say "area," didn't you? You've got a big office.

MR. KALISH: Well, we've moved to a new office, and we have quite a sizeable wareyard out in the back, so I guess it's feasible. But, well, thank you for that.

MEMBER MUTH: You'll make sure you'll get even.

MR. KALISH: Yeah, and get even.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Questions for John?
Dinah.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: I have a follow-up to the Blythe, of course. So these guys, the Solar Trust, had to put up bonds, or they assumed the bonds for Solar Millennium. Is it the bond money that's being used to keep the dust down and remove the fence, or is the new owner assuming those costs?

MR. KALISH: Well, the reclamation bonds, they just stand as they are, and they're not being utilized to do any of that work out on the site. As it went through the bankruptcy process and purchase, you know, all of that activity was done by the project proponent utilizing their own funds.

At some point the bond -- that's really part of the bankruptcy. But that bond will be returned, and a bond will be established for Nexterra.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Put up their new bond?

MR. KALISH: That's correct, upon that time which we would authorize the project, or could.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Thank you, John.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Further questions?
John, just to comment, I'm grateful that -- I would be grateful to see the Santa Rosa, San Jacinto Mountain

planning processes continue to keep the issue of dog-friendly trails in the forefront and that that does get resolved at some time in the future. My canine constituency would be upset if I didn't bring that up to date.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: That would be your wife.

MR. KALISH: That process is starting to gear up again. We've been waiting for the Fish and Wildlife Service to issue a biological opinion that would allow that Trails Plan to move forward. It is a complicated planning process due to the various different jurisdictions involved, private lands, tribal, BLM, of course, State lands. So it's pretty much of a handful to pull together. It's taken a lot longer than I think anyone ever anticipated, but the dog issue is certainly in the forefront of that trails planning process, and I'll pass along your recommendations.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Please. Thank you. I appreciate that. Further comments for John? Thanks, John. Councilman, continue your interrogation.

MEMBER MUTH: Ridgecrest. In your report under renewable energy, you mention Type 2 and

Type 3 applications. And I have no idea what those are. Can you enlighten me.

MR. SYMONS: I can speak to it a little bit, not as well as people more intimately involved in renewable energy. But the Type 2 are wind development in which they're putting out the towers, that type of issue, and the Type 3 are actually the ones that are going forward with the project development. So your Type 3 are going to be bigger projects, when they're actually going forward with the actual project. Type 2 they're just putting on a test to see if its feasible, if they want to go ahead and pursue the project in that particular area.

MEMBER MUTH: Type 3 could be wind or solar?

MR. SYMONS: Yeah, I would assume so. I don't have any solar, so --

MEMBER MUTH: Just wind.

MR. SYMONS: I don't have any solar on the resource area, our field office.

MEMBER MUTH: On Page 6 top of the page, BLM action, last bullet, I have no idea what this means: "Support for research activities by University of Nevada Reno and collaboration with the Navy and BLM, Carson City," period. "Developing predictive

model involving location, material, environment, significant."

MR. SYMONS: This was one from the -- my archaeologist wrote that one up. As you see in some of these things, when I first came in, I said, "What kinds of projects do you have?" And I got them. But apparently the Navy contracts a number of different projects, in which one of them is a cultural survey, and it's a modeling thing.

And to be perfectly honest, when they were explaining it to me, it has to do with -- it's predicting if you go out and do a certain random sampling, how you can predict where certain activities will happen or where we will find them, so that right now when you go out and you search an area and you find it, and then you have it. This is a modeling so you can kind of predict what you might find out there based on -- similar to sampling or averaging or of that type, developing a model for that.

I don't know the exact science behind it, but the purpose is to be able to predict what you might find out there, what areas would be high concentration as opposed to low concentration.

MEMBER MUTH: That translates to a predictive model for locating cultural resources?

MR. SYMONS: Basically, yeah.

MEMBER MUTH: You could have just said that. Wild Horse and Burro Program. The numbers in the report cost you \$3600 per day, \$1.31 million per year to feed 900 animals. You're adding on pasture expansion and new sheds. What's the total cost of that program on a yearly basis? I know you have mandates under the Wild Horse and Burro Act and all that, but what is that actually costing the field office?

MR. SYMONS: At the Ridgecrest Field Office?

MEMBER MUTH: Yes.

MR. SYMONS: At the Ridgecrest Field Office I believe that our budget is right around 1.5 million for it, but I would have to get back with you on the exact numbers. I don't have those right now. And the feed is a huge portion of that.

MEMBER MUTH: And relative to your other resource management programs, how does that stack up? Is that about average, or is that an excessive amount? Is that your most expensive, or how would you --

MR. SYMONS: It's one of our large ones, but that program, the way it actually works is, we get -- the money comes down from the State office

based on the number of heads that we have in our facility. And so they give us so many what we call feed days, and we program that out. It's one of the interesting programs because it's kind of self-contained. A lot of the programs we utilize multiple specialists in other areas to do it, whereas the Wild Horse and Burro Program for the most part deals with just the staff and the corrals to what they have. Occasionally we might do an EA, such an expansion of the corrals, but most of all the money is spent there, and it is one of our larger budget items.

MEMBER MUTH: Okay. Black toad monitoring, Page 8. What happens to that monitoring data? Where does that data go? Is it available to the public? And why are you doing it in October? They hibernate, and most amphibians are surveyed in the spring for calling surveys.

MR. SYMONS: I'd have to get back to you. I haven't had time to research all of these projects in the time I've been there, and I don't know black toad. But I can get an e-mail to you and find out why. I can ask the question.

MEMBER MUTH: I guess the general question of what happens to the species-monitoring data at all the field offices? Where does it go? I

mean, can we look on a website somewhere or find it without digging down, down, down? I mean, what happens to all that? It's a lot of money and effort.

MR. SYMONS: I'll have to report back to the DAC at least for the field office. And I don't know whether you want it to come back to the District or just from the Ridgecrest Field Office, whichever way you'd like to do that. I can try to find out where all that is housed.

MEMBER MUTH: Okay. Maybe it needs to come back from the District, Teri.

DIRECTOR RAML: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: DAC members? Oh, continue.

MEMBER MUTH: One more. One more.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Keep going.

MEMBER MUTH: Okay. Desert Tortoise Protective Council, Desert Tortoise Research Natural Area. I think that's in Ridgecrest; right?

MR. SYMONS: Yeah, the preserve.

MEMBER MUTH: A good deal of consternation over the fact that the DTRNA was contained on the maps as being a study site for more energy development. And given all the resources that BLM has poured into that and all the cooperative

efforts over the years, it really seems inappropriate that that would even make its way on to DRECP map. So I just call that to your attention. I know it's going to fall off of there. Right? Right?

MR. SYMONS: I'm not the final decisionmaker, but, yes, I'm aware that that was over there. And I've had talks with a number of people on it, and it has been noted that it's a concern, and I've talked, actually, with the Desert Preserve Staff on it as far as the issue goes.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Council members, questions?

MEMBER ERB: I have a couple of questions for the Barstow Field Office.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: For Ridgecrest?

MEMBER ERB: Okay. No.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Very good. Thank you, Carl. See you Thursday. Next field office. Are we down to Barstow yet?

MEMBER MUTH: We're down to Barstow, and I actually have no questions for Barstow.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: I have Needles.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: I have Barstow.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Let's roll to needles.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: I have a question.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: We kind of want to save Barstow for last because Dinah has a few questions.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Needles.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Hi, Rusty. Come on in.

MR. LEE: I wasn't clear on whether I was being called. I don't have to come up if Al didn't call me.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: One is the Excelsior Road is finally open.

MR. LEE: Yes, it is.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Yes, because I'm running a field trip out there. The other thing is to the Kingston, but the other thing is the iron project, the US Iron guys. It looks like they finally paid you.

MR. LEE: Yes, they did. They're in good standing with the federal government at this time.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: They are. Now, are they still in the picture on that project, or are they out of the picture totally? Are they still going forward?

MR. LEE: They're mining up there, as far as I know.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: So they are mining.

MR. LEE: Unfortunately the mine is on private land, so we basically have haulage. Our engagement with them is haulage.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: You mean hauling out on the road?

MR. LEE: Yes. I'm a mighty guy.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Council members, other questions? I read that Stateline Solar will be having some public meetings at some point coming soon. It was described that they would be at Primm. You know what I'm going to say, don't you?

MR. LEE: Could I update you on that.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Please, jump right in.

MR. LEE: I was going to go request permission to update you. The meeting will be held January 9 at the Primm Golf Course, two sessions, one from two in the afternoon until five and another one from six until nine. We didn't have the dates finalized on this one final. And, yes, the draft EIS did go out on the street Friday last week.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Any chance of having

a meeting in a population center, just as an idea, just to get some people out? Thank you.

MR. LEE: I had that discussion with the RIFO staff, and they were as enthusiastic as I was for holding it in a populated area.

DIRECTOR RAML: Let's revisit it.

MR. LEE: That was my position.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Thank you. I appreciate it. Very good. Katrina, thank you for waiting. Dinah, would you like to start, please.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Let's let Kim go first so we can finish up with my comment.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Kim?

MEMBER ERB: Okay. And this may seem like a strange question, but I truly am curious. For the Amargosa Vole Demographic and Disease Study, I see it's collaborative study between the BLM agency and UC Davis. Why UC Davis and not a more local university?

MS. SYMONS: I'm going to have to get back with you on that. I don't know the logic track with the agreements that were made.

MEMBER ERB: Okay. My next question is for the K Road Calico Solar. Is there any news on that project, what the status is on that?

MS. SYMONS: I will get back with you, Kim, on that.

MEMBER ERB: Okay. And one final question. It came to mind because of an earlier discussion in the Ridgecrest area, but the wind tower near Sleeping Beauty, is that a test?

MS. SYMONS: I'm looking at anybody that might know.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: It has to be a test. There's no project.

MS. SYMONS: Near Sleeping Beauty?

MEMBER ERB: Yes.

MS. SYMONS: I will check on that one.

MEMBER ERB: And the Cadys, southern Cadys just north of -- west of Ludlow, east of -- Jay, help me. What's the name of that road, the offramp? Hector Road. East of Hector, north of Ludlow, north of 40.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: I just want to say that the Marine expansion was not on this report, and I e-mailed you and asked you, and you nicely said that it would be on the next report. It's something that's very important to the OHV community, and I know that the Marines have put off their decision on their FEIS, but I would hope that once we get closer to when we're

going to get a ROD, that we would ask the someone from the whatever you guys call it to give us a presentation on whatever their final is going to be. Thank you, Katrina. I appreciate it.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Mark, please.

MEMBER MURRAY: Katrina, in the report -- and this has to do with various wind projects -- there's a golden eagle movement study that's about, and it's tied to the aviary protection. Could we at the next meeting -- this is more a request. Can we get an update? Maybe we can get Dr. LaPre to give us an update where they're going with this study and what they hope to have completed.

I know it says in here you're monitoring the movements of the birds that are in the Barstow area, but I think this has a far-reaching effect other than what you have just in the Barstow area. And maybe we could ask Larry to kind of give us an update on that. Thank you.

I guess I should probably address that question to the DAC members. Would you guys like an update on the golden eagle movement studies that are out there?

MEMBER MUTH: Statewide.

MEMBER MURRAY: Statewide, something,

because I think it is more encompassing than just the Barstow area. I know they're studying it because of the wind projects. There's wind projects in Tehachapi.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: San Diego.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Our next meeting is regarding renewable energy discussions. That would be a good sidebar.

MEMBER MURRAY: Thank you. That was the only comment I had, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Perfect. Any other comments, questions? Dinah?

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Okay. This is not really putting Katrina on the spot, but it's kind of updating everybody too. I think this was about -- it wasn't at this meeting. Might have been the meeting before. So maybe a year and a quarter ago -- because I am a slacker at NEPA, I know not how it works. I am easily confused. It's where I am in the process. So we had taken a trip out to Sawtooth Canyon, which is a really nice, brand-new campground that -- I think, Mark, you were there -- on this Sawtooth. It's a place close to my house, so we go hiking there quite a bit. No trails. And my community is a little older community, and it would be nice to have a trail for

some of these people we take on these elder trips, I guess you might say.

So I had proposed to Randy and Teri that we ask the Barstow BLM District to consider designing a trail under the NEPA process which would be short-term, easy to design, had already had an environmental impact report done for the campground. And when we talked with Roxy, Roxy said, well, we're already going to be doing a trail in Afton Canyon anyway. Then we decided to use Afton Canyon, and I got a name of a person working on it. But then the subgroup came up, and so that fell by the wayside.

After reading your report, Katrina, about the Amargosa trail development for which they just got a \$250,000 grant, so here is a trail we know will go forward. I'm wondering if we could use that trail to go through the NEPA process. Will this happen in the next year, within the next year?

MS. SYMONS: In our discussions earlier I said I would get with staff in order to find out the status on both of those projects that you mentioned and then for whatever is really ripe to meet the outcome of working together on the NEPA piece, a commitment to do just that.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: So either one of those

would be appropriate?

MS. SYMONS: Correct. So it's a matter of, like I say, getting with staff, finding out the status of that and really finding out which one of those is most right to meet the intent that you're than wanting of working through NEPA.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Right. So the idea for the old members who forget easily and for new members who didn't hear me talk, I forget easily. So the idea is that we would learn how to NEPA process -- I'm totally selfish because I want to know how it works, how the NEPA process actually works in a real project, because a lot of these projects take years to go through. I'm in the mining profession. Seven to ten years before you permit a mine on private property. So these are long-term projects, and I think going through the process with a little project like a trail would be a suitable way for us to learn how NEPA works. Okay?

I'm done, unless anybody else has a question. I guess I need to know from the DAC members if we want to go forward doing this.

MEMBER MURRAY: I think it's a great idea because NEPA touches everything that we get. I think it's a great idea. I think NEPA is something we

need to have education about.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Do we need a proposal? I mean, it's kind of already on the table that we were going to do this.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: I don't think so. We're all in consent on this. We're open to it. We would love to see you continue pursuing this with Katrina and staff. And once it's really ripe, I think it will be a good time for us to all jump on board.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: I'm going forward with the WEMO project, and sometime before our next meeting, Katrina, we can get together and decide how we're going to proceed and present that to the DAC at our next meeting. Thank you. I'm done.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Thank you, Katrina. Welcome to the first DAC meeting.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: This was nothing.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: I'm closing comment cards for public comments on field office reports, and I'd like to call Edie Harmon first, please. Hi, Edie. It's 4:14. We did lose our time, so I'd be grateful if you'd do the best you could.

MS. HARMON: I'll do the best I can, but -- Edie Harmon, and I spent several hours on the phone last night with Ocotillo residents. So some of

what I have to say is going to come from those conversations. And a couple of weeks ago I went through a NEPA training course with US EPA. And one of the things that came out of that -- and I asked EPA specifically, I'm concerned on the variances and compliance with mitigation measures and compliance with construction on the Ocotillo wind, and residents have commented that Dudek doesn't even post on the internet until after they've seen what the residents have already observed, photographed, documented and everything. So there's a significant gap between BLM assumption of compliance and residents' documentation of what's there.

And when I asked the EPA staff person that did the training -- I said, I'm really concerned because I hear about all these variances that Pattern is applying for, and in the view of the public it means that the final EIS was woefully inadequate because if it had been adequately done and there had been time to resolve these issues, there wouldn't need to be all these continual variances. And the responses from EPA was, yes, that's a correct assumption about the adequacy of the EIS.

And I have to say one of the problems is, the public has lost confidence in BLM. We were told

early on that, if you didn't have a personal input to Ken Salazar, no matter what you had to say, it wasn't going to make a difference. So a lot of us ended up feeling we're reviewing NEPA documents -- and I've done it for decades -- knowing you have to go through the protest but realizing all our efforts are merely to lay the groundwork for litigation, because we've basically been informed that what we have to say isn't going to be likely to make a difference.

BLM has been in too much of a hurry to approve these projects, and I don't think the president and his administration have much of an appreciation for the resource values of the desert that are being threatened by industrial skill, renewable energy, whether it's wind or solar. And I am overwhelmed by how much greater the impacts are in the California desert than when wind projects have been constructed on mountaintops in New Hampshire, Vermont and Maine.

The impacts in the mountains and the forests and private land in the east are far less than here, but here we have less rainfall, so the long-term consequences, negative consequences, are going to be far greater because we don't have rain.

There's a real serious question now as to

this limited-use area. What are approved routes of travel? Where are they? I heard that over the Thanksgiving holiday it was looking like an off-road vehicle open area because the damage to the limited uses area west of Ocotillo is so extensive because of all the grading for the wind turbine project, and the amount of dust is getting even worse.

So I mean there's a real problem if you've got an area that's been protected for decades and suddenly it's fair game. Could I add a couple more things?

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: We're addressing field office reports.

MS. HARMON: I'm commenting on the field office report.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: I need a specific issue on the field office report.

MS. HARMON: Ocotillo Express.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Continue. Just try to wrap, please.

MS. HARMON: One of the things I'm really concerned is that there's not going to be much left of public lands in Imperial County and other places after all the renewable energy projects. And in the past I remember that the DAC had a

representative of Native American tribes and issues, and I think given the concerns that Native Americans have for the impacts of these renewable energy projects on lands that have been so traditionally important to them, that it would be really important to have a tribal representative on the DAC, even if it means at this point adding one more position.

I remember in the past there were tribal representatives, and I really thought that Preston Arrow-weed was representing the Native American community and other people that had been tribal leaders were representing tribal interests, and some of their interests are very different. We need to learn from them, and I've come to know and respect a lot of tribal members from different tribes. And I would encourage the DAC to find it in your hearts to have one more place for a Native American. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Thank you for that specific comment. I appreciate that. I would just say I urge you to also make that comment all the way to Washington because our membership is determined by charter from the Department of the Interior, and it is revised every two years.

MR. HILLIER: It's by law.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Yep. Thank you, Edie. Terry, you're the last comment today, please. And this would be on field office reports.

MS. WEINER: Yes. A Business Plan for the Sand Dunes. I just want to --

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: I can't go back there.

MS. WEINER: It's in the field office report.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: If it's very specific on that item that she did, but I'm not going to go back around the train again for --

MS. WEINER: No, no, no. I just want to stand corrected on the outreach, that is was done. And I said I didn't get this. And the other thing, apparently I'm on David Briery's press release list. Apparently in October he did send me two e-mails about the Business Plan being available, and I was out of town a lot, and I missed it. And I just want to stand corrected that you did do your work.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: That was kind of you. Thank you, Terry. I'm sorry for giving you a hard time. Thank you. I deserve that laugh. Thank you.

Well, the last thing we're going to do is

discuss our calendar year program of work.

Approximately two months ago perhaps or 45 days ago, maybe. It wasn't even that long ago. We met at the district office. I was there, Dinah. I think April was there by phone. You were right there, too, Kim. Kim came down, and we had a good conversation about the 2013 year and what our calendar is going to be.

You have in your packet this printout that is going to show the range of months that we're suggesting for our 2013 meetings, and it is also suggesting the themes and tentative locations and topics. The next meeting we're suggesting would be during the month of February, and it would be regarding renewable energy, specifically DRECP and its relationship or its efforts with engaging the counties.

The June meeting -- and by the way, let me go back and just say this is all a kind of a balancing act. Every issue has a certain timeline that it moves along. We want to make sure that we consider issues when there's an appropriate insertion point for us. And the place that we have our meeting is also helpful to us with regard to the field trip and the expertise of the local staff to help us. So all of this is kind of, as I said, a balancing act for these issues and

trying to find the right timing and place.

June we're suggesting to be an appropriate timing to dig deeper into the West Mojave planning, and that would be in Ridgecrest. That could also include a topic of the El Paso CAPA. We are suggesting a September meeting on a terrific topic that, boy, we went around three or four times on it with brainstorming ideas here, working landscapes. It would be an opportunity to hear from mineral development, from grazing interests and from so many of the other ways in which our federal land works for America and works for our economy.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Generates income.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: It generates income.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: And restoration.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Also in restoration.

Very good. Finally approximately December we'd like to discuss the issue of volunteers and partnerships again and solidify our partnerships and relationships with not only the interests but, I think, bringing in the subgroups as well to talk about planning for issues for the subgroups to work on moving forward. So opening the floor to Dinah.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Mr. Chairman, that partnership one what was the one that was mentioned

today, where people adopt certain sites.

MEMBER ERB: Site stewardship.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Site stewardship.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Yes.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: And does that include the cabin-adoption program that I think I heard four or five years ago?

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: It really might be a good time for a refresh on that.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: If it still exists.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: The cabins by and large do exist. Vandalism has taken their toll on some, and other forces have taken their toll on some others. But it's still a program that is alive, and I think it would be nice for new members to see that part of it. It's again an extension of our cultural discussion today.

DIRECTOR RAML: I wanted to add something about the volunteer partnerships one. I also want to propose to the DAC, and of course I want to get a white paper in front of you. One of the things that it would be great if you were to consider doing for me is actually consider giving a DAC volunteer award or partnership award. And there are a lot of different award formats and stuff, but I think

that that could be something that could be really kind of a wonderful tradition. And, you know, we could if you're interested. And of course I'll try to put some sideboards and framework for you put actually get together and review some proposals about some really great things that are going on in the desert and maybe kind of recognize some folks.

And to me that would be another way of maybe getting folks to come to the meeting, receive some recognition, get a little pat on the back for all the good work they do, continue to encourage people to put up with us and volunteer.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Thank you. All this is coming back. Thank you, guys.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Please.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: May I ask Teri a question? So if you're planning to do this, I'm assuming you're planning to award this at our December meeting, or are we going to talk about it at our December meeting?

MS. RAML: We would do the award at our December meeting, so I've got to get my folks in gear.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: So before that we need to approve the application and the publicity?

DIRECTOR RAML: Right. And this is one of those opportunities for us to collaborate and you can decline. I'll present ideas, and you can decline. I'll present ideas, and you can kind of say, "Teri, we respectfully don't think we have the time to tackle this," and that would be fine. I'd like the opportunity to frame it for you and see what you think about doing it.

MEMBER MURRAY: Sure.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: So the floor is open. Al?

MEMBER MUTH: Mr. Chairman, I was just wondering if we can come up with a date at least for the February meeting.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Absolutely. We'll take that next, if we could.

MEMBER MUTH: Okay. And locations for those meetings.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Yes. Do we want to fill in the blanks on three and four?

DIRECTOR RAML: I don't think I've got that. Yeah.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Should we fill in the blanks on three and four or keep that open?

DIRECTOR RAML: I'd like to keep it

open.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Teri would prefer to keep the location open for three and four at this time, unless you have a strong -- or a candidate you would like to offer and Teri could consider.

MEMBER MUTH: One in Barstow?

MEMBER MURRAY: Yes. The first one is Barstow. The second one would be Ridgecrest.

DIRECTOR RAML: Right.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: We do need to set dates, and I have April dates, and I have specific requests.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Good. As far as this work schedule goes, I'm not looking for a vote or anything. This is where we're going. Looks okay? Any other comments or suggestions? It's always open. The closer we get to each meeting, though, it gets full. Done.

MEMBER HOUSTON: I just looked at it briefly, and the only comment I have is, you have noxious weeds under public safety. It seems like they would be proper appropriated under ecological function than safety. I've never been attacked by a weed, but I guess it could happen.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Ecologic function?

MEMBER HOUSTON: Correct.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: I wanted to just get that. Good. This was kind of a brainstorming little page of things thrown into categories, but good call.

DIRECTOR RAML: I'll go back and look at that because this topic list -- and it would be good to just address it real quick. So this topic list is coming off of the State Director's Strategic Plan. So I'll double-check that. Like Randy said, the idea is -- and you'll see it on the bottom of the State Director's Report. It's kind of -- the priority items are the following, and we pulled that right off of his Strategic Plan. So I'll go back and double-check. And this is my work, which sadly we may have made a mistake, or maybe someone has made a mistake.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Could be fire management.

DIRECTOR RAML: We'll look into it and see. It could be fire.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It could be hay fever.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Next thing I'd like to consider is dates for February, please.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: How about the 8th and 9th or 1st and 2nd. We really need to, for the

Business Plan in order for us to be able to close that, consent the RRAC and give Neil time to get a new contract out. If this is where we're going, then we do need to have it earlier rather than later unfortunately. I know April is not available on the 23rd, and I'd rather not go on the 16th, if anybody cares.

MEMBER MURRAY: I'm good on the 8th and 9th.

MEMBER MUTH: I agree.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: That was easy. Holy cow. That's never going to happen again. The 8th and 9th. The next DAC meeting will be held February 9th, the field trip on Friday, February 8th. Location will be in Barstow. The theme will be renewable energy. Topics will be DRECP and working with the counties on renewable energy development.

DIRECTOR RAML: So our intent when we did the work plan was to see if we could bring either county planners or elected officials to that particular meeting. So Katrina, we'll work with you on it. If we can get the participation of elected officials, that may lend itself to not Saturday. So we'll keep you apprised of how that works.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Right.

DIRECTOR RAML: So the normal pattern of Friday field trip and Saturday meeting, it was really important while we were planning it to see that the DAC would have the opportunity hear from how the counties feel about the area of the DRECP, so we may forego field trip or reschedule or work with that, just so you know that's part of the intent.

MEMBER MURRAY: What you're saying is, if we wanted to have a field trip, we could do that on Thursday and meeting on Friday?

DIRECTOR RAML: Yeah, maybe.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Or more, the field trip may involve visiting with elected leaders and county leadership.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: We still need to have the meeting on Saturday.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: But we will have the formal meeting on Saturday, correct. But rather than a field trip, maybe a field trip to city hall or something, county administration.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Please, Dinah.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: I know we're getting close to time. I would like to propose if we can try to set some other dates because last year we set our

dates for the entire year, and that worked out really well for me because my calendar gets filled up really fast. And I really would propose that we try to set the dates. It doesn't mean they couldn't be changed sometime in the future. If we've all got our calendars here, let's just go through and do this.

For example I propose our December meeting be held the same time it is now, the first weekend in December, because that has worked out so far two years in a row.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: And it really does before the craziness.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: It's after Thanksgiving and it's before Christmas crazy.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Oh, I'm busy then. No. That's fine.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: That's the 6th and 7th of December, 2013.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Okay. Very good. That would be the 6th and 7th of December.

DIRECTOR RAML: We'll work with them in advance this time. Tim raises a good point. We'll get that into our calendar.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: That was December 6th field trip, December 7th meeting. Do you

want to keep rolling?

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: Keep rolling.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Can we go through June, then?

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: We're holding the locations open for three and four at this time.

Anyone want to offer a June meeting date?

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: Hold on. Let me get there.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: I would like to make a proposal and make it early in June because, since the February meeting is going to be early, that's going to impact the WEMO report presentation to the DAC, which we will get to the DAC before the meeting so that we can discuss it and accept it at the DAC meeting, unless we do that in background somehow.

MEMBER JOHNSTON: The first weekend in June is 7 and 8.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: I'd be good with that. June 7 and 8. Good. Okay. Looks like we have agreement for June, and the meeting would be June 8th, the field trip, June 7th.

MEMBER MURRAY: June 7 and 8.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: And that would be on WEMO in Ridgecrest. September?

MEMBER MUTH: Let's keep it early. I don't have my calendar. Early on, the first week or so.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: I don't see a paper calendar.

MEMBER JOHNSTON: Six and seven is the first weekend, yeah.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: Labor Day would be that first weekend, is it not?

MR. HILLIER: Labor Day will be the 2nd of September.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: So then 6th and 7th is good. If that's all right, 6th and 7th would work.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: I see a pattern here.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: The pattern is, we're not very busy the first weekend of every month?

MEMBER SHUMWAY: First weekend of every month.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: That would be September 6, field trip; September, 7 meeting, location to be determined.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: It's so much easier to do it this way. When we schedule it, it gets on everybody's schedule.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: I've also reached

out to Jess Riley, and I've got her blackout dates. We're good. So I think we've covered our missing members the best we could. Very good.

In that case, I hope no one will mind, but it's been a long and wonderful meeting. We've had more participation from public and people that we've had a in a long time. I don't think there's a need to recap and revisit every item on the agenda, but I do want to thank you all for coming. Thank you all for making this a long day. And knowing that some of you have a long drive ahead --

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: Can we just say a thank you, Larry Blaine, retired from the Barstow office.

CHAIRPERSON BANIS: We acknowledge in the minutes the DAC's warm wishes and thanks for all of his years of help to the DAC and the subgroups, and we wish him the very best.

Thank you. Any last items of business from the council? Hearing and seeing none, there's no objections. We're adjourned at 4:36.

(The proceedings were concluded at 4:36 p.m.)

-000-

R E P O R T E R ' S C E R T I F I C A T E

I, DIANE CARVER MANN, a certified shorthand reporter, do hereby certify that the foregoing pages comprise a full, true and correct transcription of the proceedings had and the testimony taken at the meeting of the Desert Advisory Council for the Bureau of Land Management.

Dated this 13th day of January, 2013, at Chino, California.

DIANE CARVER MANN, CSR NO. 6008

M-O-T-I-O-N-S

- A. Maker: Muth
 Secunder: Sall
 Motion: To approve the transcript of the
 April, 2012 meeting.
 Result: Motion carried
- B. Maker: Sall
 Secunder: Grossglass
 Motion: To send a card to Judy Gillespie
 and to put together and send a care package.
 Result: Motion carried
- C. Maker: Grossglass
 Secunder: Murray
 Motion: To ask BLM to study offering a one-day
 pass for users of ISDRA.
 Result: Motion carried
- D. Maker: Grossglass
 Secunder: Murray
 Motion: To accept SRP Subgroup's Operating
 Plan Template.
 Result: Motion carried