

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

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

LOCATION: Crowne Plaza Redondo Beach
300 N. Harbor Drive
Redondo Beach, CA

DATE AND TIME: Saturday, December 3, 2011
8:08 a.m. to 4:26 p.m.

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

JOB NO. : 70355JG

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

MEMBERS PRESENT:

REPRESENTING:

RANDY BANIS, CHAIRMAN	Public-at-Large
APRIL SALL, VICE CHAIR	Public-at-Large
THOMAS P. HALLENBECK	Transportation/ Rights-of-Way
THOMAS ACUNA	Renewable Energy
MEG GROSSGLASS	Public-at-Large
PATRICK LLOYD GUNN	Wildlife
RON JOHNSTON	Public-at-Large
BRAD MITZELFELT	Elected Official
ALEXANDER SCHRIENER, JR.	Renewable Resources
RICHARD RUDNICK	Renewable Resources
DINAH SHUMWAY	Nonrenewable Energy

BLM STAFF PRESENT:

JAMES G. KENNA, BLM California State Director
TERI RAML, District Manager, California Desert
District (CDD)
STEVE RAZO, External Affairs Officer, CDD
DAVID BRIERY, External Affairs Specialist, CDD
ERIN CURTIS, External Affairs, CDD
JENNIFER WOLGEMUTH, Administrative Assistant, CDD
MARGARET GOODRO, El Centro Field Office Manager
ROXIE TROST, Barstow Field Office Manager
Field Manager, Ridgecrest
RUSTY LEE, Field Manager, Needles
BEKKI LASELL, Deputy District Manager, Resources, CDD
EDYTHE SEEHAFFER, WEMO Project Manager
MARK CONLEY, BLM Natural Resources Specialist,
California State Office
GREG HILL, BLM Palm Springs/South Coast Field Office
GREG THOMSEN, Special Project Manager, BLM Palm
Springs/South Coast Field Office

CARL SIELER, BLM Acting Field Manager, Ridgecrest
TOM ZALE, BLM Acting Field Manager, El Centro
RICK HANKS, CCNM Manager
GREG MILLER, CDD Renewables

I-N-D-E-X

ITEM	PAGE
Welcome (Banis) /Pledge (Grossglass)	6
Introductions	6
Review of agenda and procedures for public comment	9
Approval of 9/10/11 meeting transcript	10
Public comment on items not on agenda including requests for DAC to consider items for future agenda	10
Advisory Council member reports	16
Special Guest--BLM State Director James G. Kenna, Comments and follow-up discussion with Council	30
Focus Topic: National Landscape Conservation System (Mark Conley/Greg Hill)	75
Council Questions on NLCS Presentation	100
Report from SRP Subgroup (Tom Acuna/Grabow)	120
Report from ISDRA Subgroup (Dick Holliday)	136
Report from Dumont Dunes Subgroup (Randy Banis)	137
Public Comment on subgroup reports	140
Lunch	146
Recognition of Outgoing DAC member	146
User fee discussion (close out from last meeting) (Holliday)	150
Public comment on user fees	190
Council Business	
WEMO Subgroup proposal (Edythe Seehafer)	203
2012 DAC meeting focus-topic review	229
Afternoon Break	218
Public comment on Council Business	232

Council questions, actions, summary, and recommendations	236
Council questions re field office reports	236
Public comment on FO reports	243
Wrap-up and summary, including discussion of theme and agenda topics for February meeting In Needles (Banis)	246
APPENDIX I: Motions	249
APPENDIX II: Action Items	250
APPENDIX III: Public Comments	251

Redondo Beach, CA

Saturday, December 3, 2011

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

CHAIRMAN BANIS: My name is Randy Banis, and I'm the chairman of the DAC. I call the meeting to order. Thank you for coming, and I would be grateful if DAC member Meg Grossglass would lead all of us in a recital of the pledge of allegiance.

(Pledge of allegiance.)

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Thanks, Meg.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: That was difficult.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: That's all right. I will make it a point to make it harder as the day goes on.

What I would like to do now, please, is have members of the Advisory Committee introduce themselves, please. I'm going to start over on my left, which is unusual, and would you care to introduce yourself, please.

MEMBER GUNN: Lloyd Gunn, representing wildlife.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: Meg Grossglass. I represent public-at-large on the Desert Advisory.

MEMBER SALL: April Sall, public-at-large.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Again, Randy Banis, chairman of the DAC.

MEMBER MITZELFELT: Brad Mitzelfelt, elected official representative.

MEMBER ACUNA: Tom Acuna, renewable energy industry.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Dina Shumway, nonrenewable resources.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: Dick Holliday, recreation.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Let's see if we can pick up a couple more name.

MEMBER RUDNICK: Richard Rudnick, blown in from up north.

MEMBER JOHNSTON: Ron Johnston, member of the DAC, representing public-at-large.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Forgive me. I'm going to do an introduction for Tom Hallenbeck. He had to slip out for a quick errand, so when you see the gentleman, Tom Hallenbeck, transportation rights-of-way representative from Caltrans. And to my immediate left.

DIRECTOR RAML: I'm Teri Raml. I'm the District Manager, the Designated Federal Official for this Advisory Council, and I would like the people who are here to introduce themselves, starting with Becky.

MS. LASALL: Bekki Lasall, director for resources out of the district office in Moreno Valley.

MS. GOODRO: I'm Margaret Goodro, El Centro field manager, Associate District Manager, and Tom Zale will be filling in for the field manager for El Centro.

MS. TROST: Good morning, I'm Roxie Trost field manager from Barstow.

STATE DIRECTOR KENNA: Jim Kenna, state director.

MR. MILLER: Greg Miller, renewables.

MS. WOLGEMUTH: Jennifer Wolgemuth.

MR. ZALE: Tom Zale, associate, filling in as field manager in El Centro.

MR. HILL: Greg Hill, CDD, wilderness and national landscape conservation.

MR. HANKS: Greg Hanks, manager of the California Coastal National Monument. More than 20,000 rocks.

MR. CONLEY: Mark Conley, the California state office. I'm the National Landscape Conservation co-lead in California.

MS. SEEHAFFER: I'm Edythe Seehafer, WEMO Project Manager. I work out of the Barstow field office.

MR. THOMSEN: Greg Thompson, special project manager.

MR. KALISH: I'm John Kalish, field manager for the South Bay/Palm Springs field office.

MR. SIELER: Carl Sieler, acting field manager for Ridgecrest field office.

MR. LEE: Rusty Lee, field manager for Needles.

MS. VASSLER: Teri Vassler (as pronounced). I'm from the South Bay Mineral Society.

MS. CURTIS: Erin Curtis, external affairs, CCD.

MR. BRIERY: David Briery, CDD external affairs.

MR. RAZO: Steve Razo, external affairs director of the CDD.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: I apologize. I have the remnants of Thanksgiving sniffles, but hopefully it won't impede progress.

I would like for members of the DAC to review the agenda one last time. Any additions, changes, corrections? Hearing and seeing none, we will move forward with this agenda.

The transcripts of the meeting were released four to six weeks ago on the DAC Web site. I hope you

have had a chance to pull them down. I appreciated the summary of motions at the end of that particular set of transcripts because we had a very busy meeting of motions, and it was terrific not to have to pull them out from the body of the transcripts. Thanks.

Are there any comments about the transcripts? No comments, no corrections, changes? Hearing and seeing none, the transcripts are approved by consent.

The next item on the agenda is a public comment period for items that are not on today's agenda. I would ask you to save comments that you might have for our agenda items for their appropriate place on the agenda so the DAC can consider your opinions prior to taking any action.

I would like to call Don Houston from the Southern California Gas Company. And Don, you have three minutes. The floor is yours. Thank you for coming.

MR. HOUSTON: Southern California Gas Company is an investor-owned utility and wholly-owned subsidiary of Sempra Energy. It's regulated by the California Public Utilities Commission. It is the largest distributor of natural gas in the United States with a customer base in excess of 20 million customers, most of those in Southern California. But

our service area extends to San Francisco and Fresno counties in the north and the Mexican border in the south.

I'm here to give you a presentation -- I'm not asking the Council do anything -- on an inspection and maintenance program of historic proportions. It's called a Pipeline Safety Enhancement Plan. PSEP is what we call it. Steve, next slide.

Most of you are aware of the San Bruno explosion in September of 2010, and the PSEP is the mandated response to that tragedy that killed eight people and destroyed 38 homes on the San Francisco peninsula, a few miles west of the San Francisco airport. That was a PG&E facility. I want to make that clear it wasn't a Southern California Gas Company facility.

Next slide, please. After that tragedy, the CPUC filed an order institute ruling. That required all natural gas pipeline companies to develop a safety plan, and that safety plan was filed in August of this year with the CPUC. It involves the replacement of 350 miles of pipeline and the hydrostatic strength testing of several hundred more pipelines.

The good news is that at least in 2012, there won't be any impacts in the desert. This is a

statewide program, so not only the Desert District but the other branches of the BLM will be affected. I know Bakersfield and Sacramento have already felt the impacts, most in urbanized areas, but there will be projects in the desert. So I will continue to keep you informed as this plan develops.

If you have any questions, I will be happy to answer them now, but I will be making a subsequent report at the meeting in Needles in February.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Are there any questions for Don?

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: What kind of impacts do you anticipate for the BLM managed lands?

MR. HOUSTON: Well, the replacements involve a lot of ground disturbance.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: Outside replacements, any other impacts due to testing or something like that?

MR. HOUSTON: If the pipes test safely, which most of them will, there could be a discharge of a lot of water. So we will need large areas to set up baker tanks and other facilities to test them.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Thank you. Seeing no other questions, thank you, Don. I appreciate the update on this important issue of public safety.

Next call John Stewart, followed by Ed

Waldheim. John Stewart.

MR. STEWART: Good morning, Council members, John Stewart representing California Association of Four-Wheel Drive clubs. In looking at the agenda I find there are two items not listed on the agenda that should be on the agenda.

One of them deals with the DRECP, the Renewable Energy Conservation Plan. That is something that will have a major impact on the desert and other planning efforts within the desert. I do not see that as an agenda item, and I think it's something that should be reviewed on a regular basis.

Another big item. Fish and Wildlife has recently released the Tortoise Recovery Plan. And it's something that will have an impact on access out in the desert region. It's something that it would be well advised to be well-informed of what is happening within that plan as it moves forward. So thank you.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Thanks, John.

Ed, the floor is yours.

MR. WALDHEIM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Ed Waldheim, Friends of Jawbone, Friends of El Mirage, California Trail Users Coalition, et cetera. Greetings from Daphne Green. I was at the Commission meeting in El Centro. The dates have been set, and I

hope that this fantastic group will set your dates for next year. That way everyone knows the dates for the Commission and the DAC so we don't have conflicts. So the chairman has a copy of that.

And I'm pleased to say that we got them to come to Jawbone for our grand opening on April 28 when we are going to have the grand blow-out opening of the new Visitors Center and new shop. So they will be there, so I'm really excited that they scheduled for Ridgecrest. But the emphasis will be on the Jawbone on Saturday, April 28. And I have let Mr. Pool know about it in Washington, D.C., and I hope we can bring his boss.

And I just talked to Jim -- glad to see this guy here.

Anyway, thank you, John Stewart. The biggest gorilla we have ever seen is the DRECP. It's a little hidden secret there. I didn't pay much attention to it until Dave Beaumont said, "Ed, wake up." And I just didn't believe him. When I finally woke up, thank God we finally got on board. But December 14th is when we, the recreation community, which means everyone here if you are motorized or nonmotorized, will have a break-out session on recreation on the 14th. We need everyone in this room, and thank you

for jumping on it. And we have to get hold of Shari also.

Why do I say that? We were the small little piece that -- they think we are insignificant. They think of us as totally insignificant. That means all of us in this room. Who the hell are these guys? They are insignificant in our picture.

Well, let's shake them up a little bit. I would like to fill up that room with a lot of people. I sent it to everybody. I've cancelled the El Mirage meeting on the 14th to get everybody to go. Why El Mirage? 2,300 acres they want to take from us. They want to take 256,000 acres on our (unintelligible). Give me a break. They want to take 25,000 acres from our open area. Give me a break. This is ridiculous. This is total insanity. So we as an access community have to make our voice known to those guys up there, whoever those guys are, to let them know we are not going to take it. We will camp in their -- I mean, I'm not saying civil disobedience, but we have to show enough is enough. You are taking our desert away. It's for us to recreate, for the public to recreate on, so please make sure you do it, so here is a sheet for the meeting.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: I want to see you camp on

concrete like the 20-year-olds. I may pay for a ticket for that.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Nobody is going to notice until after 14 days.

Thank you, Ed. Thank you all of our public comments this morning. Very nice way to start the day. I appreciate that.

Council member reports are next on the agenda. Do Council members have anything they would like to share?

MEMBER SHUMWAY: I would like to remind everybody here, including our BLM staff, the DAC and commissioners, that the mission of the BLM is to conserve productivity, diversity. And I really don't see where landscapes fit into that conservation in the traditional meaning of conservation-wise use. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Other comments. Reports? Brad.

MEMBER MITZELFELT: Thank you. I do want to echo one of the -- or a couple of the comments made, one being with regard to the DRECP.

I do want to suggest that the Council have a role in providing input to the BLM on the issues, siting issues in particular, on the DRECP. And I see

it as the most important management program going forward on public lands at this time. And I think this needs to happen sooner rather than later. The counties will be bringing forward some proposals to make the DRECP palatable for them and counties are coordinating and communicating on that.

So I would just kind of put that out there that we do have policies that I have talked about here with regard to sustainability of historic uses, mitigation of the same. Also with regard to loss of tax base and over-reliance on acquisition of private lands, which really impacts all -- all of this impacts other economic and other activities. So we have a broad range of concerns there. And I think particularly with regard to the sustainability of mitigation. Very concerned about that. I think this committee can be a very helpful participant in that process.

So many of us here are involved, and I will be too. So I wanted to put that on the record as well as another thing. It's kind of been flying under the radar, but it's very important to San Bernardino County -- and certainly I'm well aware of several other counties -- is the revised recovery plan for the Desert Tortoise released in August by the Fish and

Wildlife Service, and many concerns there. A lot of them are old concerns with the old plan and then there are some new ones, new recommendations that some of them, I think, are going to be very difficult to deal with.

So I wanted to suggest that the DAC be provided with a briefing on the content of the recovery plan, how BLM will approach the implementation teams, and how the BLM will bring recommendations from those teams for changes in land use plans forward to the DAC or just how it will go about revising existing plans.

There will be concerns about the efficacy of measures prescribed in the document. We would just like to request that that be brought to us and we would be updated on the impacts and implementation or -- not impacts, but the implications and implementation that you see -- that the bureau sees with regard to the revised Desert Tortoise Recovery Plan. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Thanks, Brad. Lloyd.

MEMBER GUNN: On October 27, U.S. Interior Secretary Ken Salazar released the Supplemental Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement, PEIS, the most recent efforts of the Obama administration to

guide renewable energy development to appropriate places on public lands.

The Department of Interior received over 80,000 comments, including recommendations and concerns from the conservation communities. California Wilderness Coalition was able to provide information and maps from the Citizens Wilderness Inventory with the hope that they would be able to steer any renewable energy development away from potential wilderness areas in the desert. While addressing our energy needs, we must protect our natural resources and wildlife, including Desert Tortoise and Desert Bighorn Sheep. The supplemental PEIS is the right step in that balanced direction. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: And thank you, Lloyd. Other reports? I'm going to go this way, April, first. Thank you.

MEMBER SALL: I had a question. I was talking to a couple of the field office managers over the last couple months about ranger staff, and I don't know if this question would be best answered by Teri or the state office. But I was curious how the details work.

A current example was Palm Springs field

office I think for the first time in many years has been fully staffed for rangers. During hunting season a lot of those rangers were sent to El Centro for details. I would like to hear an overview of how ranger details in particular are scheduled.

MS. GOODRO: April, for a lot of the different law enforcement details, we have five national priorities for the nation. Those are the Glamis incidents over the holiday weekends, and a large permit called Burning Man. And then we have other hunting patrols and special operations for counter-drug operations.

So each field office and each law enforcement officer is required to supplement those operations. So they are required to go on at least a 14-day detail per year. So as each office is helping out other offices across the nation, they also have their own staffing issues when it comes to having a whole staff, hiring positions, then to fill the position and then for the backgrounds. And then the training at the federal law enforcement training center is six months followed by a three-month training program. If you were to fill them as soon as they come open, there is about a 30 percent lag. And then you add the details on top of that, but the details are actually huge

efficiency for the bureau to provide essential services to the areas that need them.

DIRECTOR RAML: We try our best to coordinate these details, and actually I had a few concerns this year also because try as we might, because it's a big national program, we do end up doing some things like having Arizona rangers come to us when they are needed in Arizona, and California rangers go to Arizona. But it's a big coordination. 250-some rangers bureauwide are scheduled to attend these details. And sometimes we just don't make the right -- sometimes there is some movement around that doesn't seem to make sense, but I understand your concern and I share it.

MEMBER SALL: Just to clarify, the one 14-day detail, that's a national requirement?

MS. GOODRO: Yes, for the law enforcement officers. And the special agents are also helping out. For instance, at Glamis there are 35 detailers that come in for each of the incidents. And that's been reduced from 50 for the previous years, so that's already been reduced by 15.

MEMBER SALL: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Ron Johnston, the floor is yours.

MEMBER JOHNSTON: I will try to minimize my

usage of it. One of the comments made at the start of the round table request for comment was that landscapes are not relative to conservation. And I beg to differ with that in terms of the constituency that I think of, inasmuch as aesthetics are in my opinion and people in the artist industries, are very important elements of the desert and desert landscapes, and they need to be protected.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Lloyd.

MEMBER GUNN: I also had a comment about desert landscapes. About three million people visit California's desert each year, according to Federal Land Management, the BLM. Outdoor recreationists spend about 230 million a year while visiting the region. More protection for this unique landscape translates into stronger world economies.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Thank you.

MEMBER HALLENBECK: There is a project that you might be interested in and it's on a highly accelerated schedule. The American Reinvestment Act was passed a couple years ago, making money available for high speed Internet access for underserved areas. The PRAXIS Corporation has put together a project called Digital 395. It will serve the Eastern Sierras and all the communities there that do have a lack of

Internet service. Branches that I have seen start in Barstow and go all the way to Carson City.

Recently the CPUC approved the CEQA document. I'm not sure of the NEPA status, but this project was originally proposed to go along existing highway rights-of-way. They have changed the alignment to only use the highway right-of-way for approximately a third of the route. The whole route is about 450 miles.

They're raising the level of awareness because the environmental document is a little vague. A lot of it depends upon preconstruction surveys. The alignments haven't been nailed down. Right now it's using a crayon on a large-scale map. One of the issues I pointed out to the proponents are the need for right-of-way permission, not just through existing rights-of-way that the highway department has, because a lot of time that's easement on BLM land. So they need to be coming to the BLM to get a permit from them or permission to be putting a longitudinal utility alongside the highway. So you can anticipate some requests that are going to have a short time frame turnaround because of the nature of the money and the rules that have been placed upon the expenditures and the timeliness of that.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Thank you, Tom. Brad would like to add another comment.

MEMBER MITZELFELT: I wanted to mention, you may start seeing the San Bernardino County Route 66 signs going up on the National Trails Highway between Oro Grande and Highway 95 outside of Needles. And that is a new program to help people navigate that particular route. And it includes the City of Barstow at this point. Signs are starting to go up, and they should all be up by the end of December.

Also, I believe the state office has a person, a coordinator working on a National Scenic Byway proposal for the route. We are cooperating with that. We met with the representative, and we are doing what we can. I wrote a letter in support of it last week. And additionally, I researched the Scenic Highway designations for the route and found out that currently the County only designates from Oro Grande to Barstow as scenic, but not from Barstow to Needles. So I'm pursuing a County Scenic Highway designation for that particular part of the route sometime in the future.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Thank you, Brad. Meg.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: I have a question. Will the BLM have a representative at the Western

Governor's meeting in Yucca Valley about the economic impact of conservation and all that good stuff?

CHAIRMAN BANIS: The DAC will.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: Who will be there?

CHAIRMAN BANIS: I will.

DIRECTOR RAML: We have it being calendared as we speak, so we will put it on our list.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Thank you. With that, I would like a bite at the apple.

At my -- one of my first DAC meetings in mid-2009, I presented to the DAC and others a White Paper that was entitled "A 21st Century Motorized Route Initiative," and in it I described what I thought were three very important tasks or efforts to make for the designation and implementation of route management plans, and it had three legs.

The first leg is route signing, and I have to say that over the past three years the efforts for route signing out in the California Desert District have been of yeoman proportions. The routes, at least your primary and secondary, if not tertiary routes, not only bear signs to help the public get to where they want to go, but also to help identify to people in the public that this route is a resource, that this is something with value and it needs to be respected

and protected and used responsibly.

A second item -- a second leg of the initiative was making available maps to the public so the public could know where to go legally and responsibly in the operation of their motor vehicles in the desert. And I'm happy to say that we have had some initiatives there take place throughout most of the field offices, if not all. The CTUC has partnered with a number of field offices to produce route maps over the coming 24 months.

We also have seen the WEMO Plan routes made into supplemental maps that are available for users to download and use as they navigate the desert. So I'm happy to say that there have been great strides made in that second leg.

The third leg of this initiative was to create an on-line database of the BLM's designated routes so that users could download them to their computer and to their GPS devices so they can print their own custom maps before they go out or just download and put the routes right on your GPS and follow along the trail. As you are driving the trail, you see your progress on the GPS. If one were to come to a fork that happened to have a missing sign and you have a map and you are not sure if that designated

route is the one to right or left, you flip a coin and by the time you've left the setback, you can look at the GPS and know whether you have made the right choice.

So this part about the GPS routes, that third leg, that one I felt was a hard one to approach, I visited the Sacramento BLM state office in November of 2009 and also met with the task force at the OHV Commission about seeing about getting this project started. It was a very frank and sobering discussion. Not only did I learn that my idea was not my idea. It had been someone else's idea a long, long time ago. Mr. Mike Pool had been pushing this idea for many years. And the GIS office knew of this desire and knew of this long-term goal, but there was just too much to do to get there relative to the quality of the route data and relative to areas that just didn't have that data.

So we partnered with the Friends of Jawbone and received -- and applied for and received an OHV education and safety grant to produce a pilot program that would use the agency Professional ESRI ArcView Route Data and make that available to ordinary common users of consumer-level GPS devices. And if you speak with folks in the GIS professional capacity with the

agency, they will tell you that that requires a secret sauce, and we have found the secret sauce.

And I'm happy to announce that next week, the owlsheadgps.com -- that's owlsheadgps.com -- Web site will go into a soft launch to allow folks to see what's there, see the data, use the data and download it to their GPS devices. And the pilot program area is the same coverage area as the Friends of Jawbone map, approximately 1.25 million acres.

So the pilot program consists of essentially two components. One is the data itself. We worked with the WEMO data and we turned that data into something that the public can use on their devices. The second part is creating the vehicle that delivers that data. That's the hardest part. And we created that vehicle. It's in place, so we are hoping as we move forward, if this pilot program is successful, that we can plug additional data into this application and my vision is I would like to see this implemented statewide across all the agencies.

This division has supported AB-742, which requires the OHV commission to have this kind of information available, GPS routes and tracks for the public. So I think this dovetails very well. The reason I'm taking so much time to talk about this is

this has been my obsession for over three years. And I'm tickled that this thing is finally going to launch in the next couple of weeks. And I would invite you all to check it out, please.

Why owlsheadgps? Well, in that same fall season that I went to Sacramento to discuss this issue, a young mother and her six-year-old boy were going to take an overnight camping trip in Death Valley. It's not the time most people go, but the temperatures were well in excess of 110 degrees at that point of time. She drove into the Owl's Head Mountains at Death Valley National Park on the Owl's Head Mountain Road, and she was following her GPS device in her car. They had all these lines and roads -- you've seen them. You know what they are. She was following them, and these lines are taking her across these wild places into what the map says is Death Valley National Monument. That shows you how up-to-date some of that data is.

And there was a road showing going all the way through from Dumont to Trona. Of course, we know that requires you to go across China Lake Weapons Center; those roads have been closed. So she continued following the lines and followed the lines and followed the lines until she gets stuck. Four

days later she was lucky she could be rescued; her son was not. He passed away. And that's why we are doing this.

The reasons for this initiative are, No. 1, to protect the public; No. 2, to protect the resources; and No. 3, to protect the roads themselves so that they don't get closed by people who go off trail, go on undesignated routes, and end up in tragedy. So I appreciate everybody's support that they have given me in the past few years to make this happen. I'm tickled as can be, you can tell. So thank you. Appreciate it very much.

(Applause from the audience.)

The next item on the agenda is very special for us. In my term on the DAC, this will be the first visit of a state director, and we are really pleased to have California's new state director and members of his team here today. May I introduce to you James Kenna from the Sacramento BLM state office. Jim, thank you for coming.

STATE DIRECTOR KENNA: Council members, I'm pleased to be here. Boy, hard to follow a story like that. So let me start there.

What you are doing is really important. And it represents a concept that I wanted to talk about

anyway. I think probably I wanted to do a couple of things here, talk a little bit about who I am and my connections, particularly to the California desert. I worked for a number of years as the field manager in Palm Springs/South Coast, so we are sitting here on what was my turf once upon a time and talking to a Council that I have had contact with for a period of years in a prior life.

So this is something that I have a little bit of background in the California desert. I have a long-term attachment to the California desert. And I am -- intend to maintain a watchful eye on the California desert.

I was pleased last night to have dinner with many of you and have a chance to talk to members of the Council and reacquaint with some of you. Some of you I have met before.

I also want to say that I'm pleased to see the tenor of the discussion, that there are a number of members with different points of view, but they are getting around the table in what strikes me as a very respectful way. That's as it should be. I value the Advisory Council system. These councils were established, and they are part of a long tradition in the BLM. We as an agency, clear back to the 1930s,

have been a little bit different than other land management agencies. And that is that we have always had advisory boards and councils that have been a community representation of the ideas about what should happen on public lands. That, to me, is one of our strongest assets is that connection to communities of people and their viewpoints. So what you do is very, very important.

Under the law you have opportunities and options that are not available inside some of our processes that I think you should exercise. They are important to the BLM, and what you do is important. I appreciate that many of you are taking time out of very, very busy lives because you care about public lands and you want to be part of creating solutions on public lands. So thank you for what you do. And I would like that to sort of be my opener. What you do is important, and I hope you continue to make constructive strides forward.

Let me talk about a series of subjects, and I will try to be brief, which for an Irishman is very hard. But I want to make sure there is opportunity in the time available to have some question and answer time. I will start with -- there are a couple of things that came up in the comments that I would like

to speak to so they are off my script.

The law enforcement details piece. I think there is room for us to look at that, and I know Teri and I have talked about that. I think that's an important thing to constantly take a look at. The other side of that question, though, that I want to make sure folks understand is California is a tremendous beneficiary of the national detail system. Without access -- because more flows into California by far than flows out of California and our ability to cope with some of what we face -- and I was here in the early days before we had access to a national detail system, and we really struggled on the dunes with some of the public -- basic public safety kinds of issues.

A vastly different situation now. And a large piece of that in my view is due to our access to national details. So in my view, it's a highly valuable piece. We want to hold onto it, value it, but like anything, there is always room for improvement here and there. So I think that's probably the first thing.

But it launches me into a little bit of discussion about recreation and access and public safety. Let me start by saying that that's an

important piece of what we do. We have a very, very, complex and diverse mission in the BLM. Probably -- and this may be a parochial statement, but I think the most difficult land use management mission that there is, because of its breath and diversity and variety of issues, but also in my view probably the single most important management mission for the United States.

And that's a pretty bold statement, but I think it's true. And it's because of that breadth and depth we get the toughest sustainability problems and the most important heritage hand-off and some of the most important community support issues that there are in public land management. And it's precisely because our mission is not just park things or just wildlife things, but those things plus much, much more.

So I am a great believer in the BLM mission. I think it's critically important, and I think this group, because of its nature as a FACA-chartered group, and that connection to community is a very, very important piece of it. So enough of that. I want to make sure I cover the things I have been asked to cover.

I wanted to talk a little bit about delivery on the promise of the National Landscape Conservation System. This is, I think, the most important

conservation move to happen in the United States since 1891. And let me explain to you why. For many, many years in the early history of our country, all the way up through 1891, we made the decision, starting in 1803, that we would hold lands in common as citizens. But it was sort of a holding company. It was a pass-through, and that's how most private lands and state lands were created. There was a statehood process and land patenting process, and a lot of lands just basically passed through that system.

In 1891 we said we would retain some lands for common purposes in perpetuity. And that's what created the public lands. That's before Forest Service, Park Service, Fish and Wildlife Service. And all of the early reserve systems in the United States were under the General Land Office, the predecessor to the BLM. So this system that we are talking about now returns to those routes and adds to the park concept and the refuge concept and the national forest concept. It reinvigorates that concept of a community-based system of conservation lands.

That's a really important piece. It takes us back to the 1890s, but this is the country where that can happen. We have a conservation history as citizens and a history of how to do it. But this goes

back to, we don't just have to draw lines around things and put a single agency in charge. We can have a community-based system. That concept is doable anywhere in the world. It doesn't cost the 20-plus dollars an acre that a national park costs, which is not doable in many parts of the world simply because of its cost.

So it's really important that we get it right. And probably the single-most important place to do this right is in the California Desert District. It is the original conservation area established under the Federal Land Policy and Management Act.

So what I see before us are three things. First, we have to raise the level of attention to the deliverables, to the conservation values of the areas that we have in the California Desert District. I mean in every national monument, conservation area, we have specific things that we are trying to accomplish on specific lands. So we have to put those above all else and make sure that we are delivering them.

The second thing I wanted to talk a little bit about is the community piece of this. And you already guessed how important I think that is. And I heard some great comments earlier on on how to do this because it really is a partnership. It isn't just

about what BLM will do inherently. It can't be. It has to be about multiple parties working together to do the delivery.

And it has to be about the dialogue about how to do that. So think about some of the comments we heard earlier: Maps, GPS systems, GIS systems. What is that interface to the visitor? That's important. How does that work in relation to a trail system? And I mean everything. We have the opportunity to have a world-class trail system accessible and knowable, and it's everything from the Route 66 signs we heard about that have a community flavor where you are meeting the landscape and meeting the neighbors at the same time. That integrates what is going on in the community. So it's everything from the interstate style of road to multiple use roads or four-wheel drive roads to trails and clear down to the foot trail into very remote kinds of landscapes. That should be a system. And that's doable. That's someplace we can get there.

But we can't get there alone in BLM because for one thing, we don't have all the parts. So if we can create that flavor and the flavor of the community comes through in each of these areas, what a wonderful thing. I think that has tremendous potential.

The other thing we often talk about is hand-

off to another generation. So how do you do it? For me, it's good getting young people out on those conservation lands. And I have already in my short tenure thus far tried to start some of that. I want to get a couple of pilots, and one of them down here in Southern California, started on how do we work that network of things that are going on that are the interface between youth and the community, particularly under-served youth and public lands.

How many kids are out there that live within a two- to five-mile radius, and we are dealing with -- this is competition -- playing with your thumbs. It's in our interest, as people who are interested in public lands, to bridge that gap. So that's something that I think we will pay some attention to.

I also wanted to touch just briefly on the safety piece related to permitted events. I don't want to go into it in depth because I understand you are going to talk about it later, but the safety piece of this is important. Johnson Valley should tell us that, if nothing else. And we need to make sure that we learn and find opportunities for improvement. So I want to thank the work -- I understand there is a subgroup that's been working on this. Thank folks for paying attention to that and doing specific work to

help us work on that issue.

Appreciate the comments on renewable energy, including the comments during the comment period. So let me talk a little bit about the renewables in general, and specifically about the DRECP. First question, why are we doing this? And there are a lot of arguments about why, and frankly, it's one of those things that you can grab ahold of from a number of different angles.

First, there are some obvious things about, are the carbon-based sources of energy having an effect on climate? And what connection does that have to the warming that we have been seeing in the climate record. We can't know that with certainty, but we know that there is opportunity for us to do something about the relative mix of energy sources that we have. We probably are not going to manage or control climate. We know that, too. But maybe we can mitigate.

Set aside, then, for a moment, whether you believe in the climate change or not and whether we can have any effect on it. Let's talk about it from some other aspects.

What is going on in the world? In energy technology? Where are the biggest changes coming?

And I would submit to you that we are in a change segment of time that is very much like what we saw with the industrial revolution and the advent of coal. And then if you go to large field development for oil and gas in Texas, coupled with the model T, you can see energy and the transportation system evolve in each these. If you look, you can see something move up into co-dominance. Right after World War II you saw that with nuclear. And we now have in this country 104 nuclear plants that are part of our system.

So if you look at the big pieces of our system right now, we have a lot of it that is aging infrastructure. You can look at our coal power plants, the age of those, the air quality problems that they have and what the possibilities are to do something about that and how much does it cost. We have got to do some changes in our infrastructure no matter what. So where are they and where should we invest within our country?

You can look at it in terms of our infrastructure for transmission. We spent, in the post-World War era, we built a lot of large-scale transmission, and we built it with a lot of excess capacity. And there was discussion and controversy

about why you are building these lines with way more capacity than anybody will ever use. Well, now we have hit that. They are full.

So what do you do now? So we are in a very, very, critical point in terms of our energy generation and transmission system just in terms of the health of the infrastructure and the long-term reliability against demands. So we have to make changes from that point of view alone.

You can also look at economics, and this is not lost on many countries in the developed world. There is a very healthy and very aggressive competition going on with China, Germany, with a number of the European countries and the United States. The United States is in the game, and we have a lesson we can learn, I think, with what happened with wind. Wind is probably the most mature of the renewable technologies. It's been around the longest. But if you look at large wind turbines, the technology was invented in the United States. But if you go to buy a large wind turbine today, most of the parts are made in Germany or somewhere in Europe. Why?

The reason, I think, is pretty obvious. What you saw was those governments set a policy that moved their policies ahead of the price point. And 80

percent, generally, of the jobs that are underneath an emerging industry are in the supply chain. So it is in our interest from a long-term jobs perspective to compete in the renewable energy industry that is emerging. But it's not without risk and it's not without difficulty.

There are a number of complex issues and problems, but it is pretty clear that the early parts of this are going to have a lot of impact on particularly how the supply chain forms. And if we in the United States want those jobs, then I think we've got to get in there and compete.

We had a discussion at dinner last night, and I'm going to offer this as something you may disagree with, but I think it's a very reasonable projection. Look at the changes in photovoltaic cost and technology in just the last two years. Precipitous drop, and you have seen a huge evolution in the solar industry as a result and a huge migration because of unit cost to photovoltaics. And if you look at those, the cost curves are projected to cross across traditional sources in the next five years.

A lot of that has to do with how you work the numbers, but let me suggest one way to think about it. Once you build a renewable source, your operations

cost is low. If you look at rate cases from utilities cases against carbon-based sources generation, you have an annual cost to buy the gas, buy the coal, whatever the generation source is. In renewables, that operational cost goes way down for the life of the project. So there are some economic arguments on the rate payer side, too. And most of what you do in utilities has a seven- to ten-year lead time. So getting started early is going to affect rates in that period, seven to ten years from today.

So that's sort of an overview of renewable energy 101 and my view of why we are doing this and why there is such a priority. This goes beyond the political and policy pieces where we have a state that said it's important. And we have a national government that has said it's important for us to get on top of our infrastructure to rework our energy generation and transmission system.

Let me talk about the DRECP in particular. We have in the early part of this process been pretty much driven by a project-by-project basis, and it's application driven. That's not the way to create the most logical system from an energy generation and transmission standpoint or from a natural and cultural resources standpoint. It has unforeseen impacts

because it's hard to look at the whole. So that's what the DRECP is about is let's stand back from this thing and let's do it as quickly as possible so we can get out of this application project-by-project world and let's look at the system logic.

The system logic from a generation and transmission standpoint and a system logic from a natural resources, cultural resources, land use, people perspective. Let's put all things into that pot, and let's figure out the logic of where the best places are to do that. And there are a lot of huge policy decisions in the middle of that. There are policy decisions about, is it better off close to load with short transmission? Or a long way or moving across time zones so you can balance some of the intermittency issues in our portfolio, so there are energy kinds of questions like that.

There are also huge issues in terms of sustainability for wildlife population, access for recreation and all kinds of things. All things need to be in. At this point the biology side of that process is pretty well underway. They are getting a lot of the data put together and putting alternative conservation strategies together.

The tribal conservation piece of it we are

getting going, but we have a lot of work to do there. We are starting -- the stakeholder groups have been working. I was happy to hear that the recreation groups are getting their input into what we are going to do. And this has become a very, very complex thing. Things, even when I was here a decade ago in Palm Springs, were not as complex as they are today. And the demands on the desert and the desert landscape are bigger.

So what we do here is really, really important. I support that comment made earlier about how important this planning effort is. It is critically important for all of those reasons. All of the outcomes are important. The recreation outcomes, the natural resources outcome, the landscape and scenic outcomes, all of those things are important and just as important as the energy infrastructure kinds of questions.

So let me finish with one other item I wanted to touch on and then open myself to questions. And that is the tribal relationships. This is an emphasis item I am going to have, and everyone else is too, at least the BLM. I think there is work to be done there. If you kind of look at where we've been, I don't think it's as successful a relationship as it

could and should be. Just -- I'm sort of a pragmatist kind of guy, and I think we've got some work to do there. But I think it's really doable, and I've put some personal effort into that relative to the DRECP.

I want the tribes in the process. I want them to have opportunities to participate just like everybody else and put their ideas into the mix in terms of the range of alternatives. So we are trying to make that happen. I think it's a simple thing for us to do in the sense that it's simple on one level and hard on another -- that it really boils down to, I think, three things. One is clear communication protocols so that we have, with each tribe, a clear understanding of what issues are supposed to be leader to leader kinds of discussions and what issues are in kind of the staff work kind of things. And maybe there are some triggers in there that kick it up into a leadership issue. And it's different from tribe to tribe. We have to figure that out.

The second piece is to have a personal relationship at the leader level, a phone call, like we hope we have with counties and state agencies. And we need that with tribes, too, where the tribal leader can call up a field manager and say I have a concern, let's talk. And vice versa.

And then the third piece is that we can't always approach tribes just with somebody else's project. There have to be some things where we have an overlapping interest that we can work on together, and we should. Those concepts are something that we are going to work on here during my tenure in California.

Hopefully you got a good sense of the incredible importance I attach to the conservation lands initiatives and the community interface with that. I think there are a number of important things going on, and we are going to have to do all of this in a very respectful way of all of the things that were already there. There are a number of uses and people living in and among the public lands out on the desert that have to be a part of this, engaged in a respectful way, in this dialogue.

So let me end it there and sort of open myself up to questions about something I said or just about anything you want to talk about.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Thank you, Jim. Thanks very much for that.

STATE DIRECTOR KENNA: You bet.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Council members, take advantage of this. Do you have questions or comments?

Meg.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: I actually do have one question, and I don't know if you can answer it. Feinstein has S-138 out there. And in the Mojave Trails National Monument there is a proposal currently, OHV use is allowed. So if that comes to fruition and passes as is, will that monument be part of the National Conservation Landscape System, because I thought that traditionally when we actually went to legislation, that anything with OHV use wasn't going to go in the NLCS, so how will that work? I personally think that OHV use is conserving, because you have OHVs on trails; you are not on the land. Doesn't mean you hadn't destroyed it. That's still a type of conservation.

STATE DIRECTOR KENNA: Well, I think -- two thoughts. One is I have taken to using a shorthand and just using Conservation Land, so don't worry about the acronym. That's one easy shorthand way.

Second point, one of the things about the National Landscape Conservation or Conservation Lands is that it really has much more flexibility than most systems. And the root of the answer to your question is in the creation of the unit. If you go to a wilderness area, what are the values that are

identified? Solitude, naturalness, recreation. So those are the deliverables.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: So is the deliverables in the actual language of what is the mission of that Monument?

STATE DIRECTOR KENNA: Right. That is my point. So if it's a conservation area, the conservation construct for that area and for that community interface is the defining piece. And so it's not -- there are places where it's frankly a very rule-based system. The consistency across all wilderness areas is pretty strong. But if you go, for example, national conservation areas across the country, there is some variability in those that generally reflect how the designation was created. And they usually have at their root a local discussion about what is important and how to deliver that.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: Can I ask one more question?

STATE DIRECTOR KENNA: Sure.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: You are the boss, so -- also in the Feinstein Act, as I'm calling it, it creates the five -- congressional protection to the five OHV areas. When we were drafting that bill, that's another area where they said those areas will

be set aside on their own. They are not part of the National Conservation Landscape. I was under the impression that that was not written in stone. And I think that we kind of, legislatively and with our land management context, we can rework how we think of those lands. Because within those areas, if it passes, you can't put a solar plant or you can't do large-scale utility development and those kind of things. So it's still conserving those lands. So will there be any type of putting them into this Landscape Conservation System?

STATE DIRECTOR KENNA: Part of your question I can't answer because I'm not the one to answer it. The part that sort of is handicapping what is going to happen in the political process around a bill that's before Congress is beyond my scope. So what the outcome will be I think depends on a lot of factors that are way beyond my control, and appropriately so. That's the purpose of that process.

I think what I am trying to do is explain the context. And the context I think says that for those kinds of questions, the root goes to the underlying dialogue and process that's going on around that legislation and what the decision is when you get a bill passed and signed into law. Then it's charged to

us. And when it gets to us, we pay attention to those deliverables.

What are they? And whatever they are when they are passed in a specific piece of legislation, they raise the level up above everything else that is sort of generally around them. We have to ensure that we are delivering durables for the next generation in those kind of areas.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: So it's what the purpose of that unit is conservation, and conservation is written into all of those?

STATE DIRECTOR KENNA: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Tom Acuna.

MEMBER ACUNA: Mr. Kenna, I thought your thoughts on the tribal government were particularly very interesting to the renewable industry. The tribal governments, getting their consultation, getting their support has been a difficult challenge, and you mentioned a greater outreach. So what I am looking for, maybe you could give us a glimpse as to how and when and what might be some of the tools that you would direct the BLM staff to employ to help maybe provide a change from the current approach.

STATE DIRECTOR KENNA: Well, there are a couple of -- I gave you kind of my three guiding

principles in terms of the communication protocols, the relationship piece, and let's not always come to them with somebody else's thing. But I think there are some, I guess, best management practices.

One is that, for us, the government-to-government relationship is a lot bigger than a Section 106 process. And most tribes just chafe at the idea that they are confined to that narrow playing field. So I think you kind of go to them and have discussions usually way -- even on a project level question, way ahead of engaging the Section 106 process.

Just what do you think about this project? And nothing about the process requirements of Section 106, but government-to-government consultation should precede the technical 106 process. So there should be a piece where it's more of an open playing field and not as confined to questions of eligibility for National Historic and Preservation Act lists and things like that. That, I think, is probably really an important concept.

The second piece is embedded in the piece about relationships. That if the first time the relationship is being established is about when we want something, that's a harder relationship to establish than one that just sort of looks at the

general, what are our common interests kinds of things and has a dialogue.

And then later you have already laid some groundwork to have some more specific and sometimes more difficult conversations because you know each other a little bit, and that's not rocket science. We have done that with other governments for many, many years.

MEMBER ACUNA: So would you direct BLM field managers to contact some of the local tribes within their territories?

STATE DIRECTOR KENNA: I already have.

MEMBER ACUNA: Great.

STATE DIRECTOR KENNA: I think as a matter of fact -- and I don't know whether this level of detail connection will have to continue -- but in terms of my correspondence with the tribes, I have made sure that faxes of those before I left the office yesterday are going to the district and all the field managers so they can see what I committed for them to do in writing.

MEMBER ACUNA: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Brad Mitzelfelt.

MEMBER MITZELFELT: Appreciate your comments and you being here.

With regard to the proposed National Monument Mojave Trails, since Meg brought it up, it just occurred to me that the Secretary has endorsed the legislation on the record and officially endorsed the legislation the senator has put forward. I have to think that it will be the policy of the department to work on that and support that and do some internal planning.

We have some concerns, speaking as a county, relative, again -- there are concerns relative to public safety and services in these areas, infrastructure and so forth, that I think could be planned in advance rather than in response to a proclamation or a bill. In fact -- and I have to think that the bill's not going away. Our county doesn't have a position on it, but we have a member for it. But we don't have a position. Me, I just had significant concerns.

But again, seeing that the Secretary has endorsed it, I just wanted to say that some of the things that some of the stakeholders have managed to convince the senator that are important and should be in there, if they don't end up in the House version of the bill or if they don't end up in the final bill that's signed, I think that scenarios need to be

looked at, talked about. And also, if the bill doesn't pass and eventually if the president decides to designate -- I don't know if that's legal, but I think it's something some people have talked about as a future possibility, and that's speculation -- but I just think that, you know, if your higher headquarters asks you for input, that we talked about at district and state level about some of the issues -- and I'm going to speak for San Bernardino County -- if it's thought through and worked out in advance, we would certainly appreciate that. And I don't know if you have any further thoughts on that. But because, like I said, the department has to put the shine on, I thought I should say that publicly.

STATE DIRECTOR KENNA: I'm good with that. The department has a position, and it will surprise you that I support the department's position. But probably the more important thing is, I may or may not get contacted in the way you suggested. We'll let that be what it is.

What I do value, and this is outside of whatever is going to happen inside that legislative process, is on Route 66, we should be working on that community front end now. There isn't a need, and that's why we are committed and we have a position

working on it. And we, I think, want to see this community front end concept really catch fire all over the state. That we have a relationship that implies partner delivery from the beginning in regards to recreation. I think there are opportunities here independent of legislation. The President's initiative on America's Great Outdoors has a big emphasis around partner delivery.

That fits BLM to a "T." We didn't end up with -- and it may be that it's because of the success already and what is happening in many areas -- we don't have any featured projects, the BLM, in America's Great Outdoors in the national roll-out. But the concept is something we can do. And I'm willing to push and promote, trying to get that community front end where meet-the-neighbors, meet-the-lands kind of concept is embedded in how we are doing business.

So if you want to generate a discussion at the local level among the area interests to address the interests you are talking about, I'm willing to hear it and pass it through to those who want to talk to me. But I have to be careful not to cross that lobbying line because that's not a role for me. But if the goal of the conversation is let's go get some

things done together, I'm there.

MEMBER MITZELFELT: Just a quick follow-up with regard to what I think some of the initial intent of the legislation was, that there are things that I'm doing and that the county is doing that will support those goals, regardless of whether the monument advances. And that I think the BLM also is and will be doing. So why not coordinate and strategize on how to best do that? I think we agree on that. So I appreciate that very much. Thanks.

STATE DIRECTOR KENNA: Let me add a comment based on your comments earlier. I hope we do that on the energy questions too. I think the counties are really, really important in the long-term piece there.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: If I might engage for a moment. I would like to engage briefly on the topic of DRECP. I think that there is a difficult question for many of us in mind as to how we can get involved in DRECP, given that the lead for this project, despite the planning area being predominantly Desert District, the lead is being taken by the state office, it feels to us. And the Desert Advisory Council's mission and charter is to advise the Designated Federal Officer.

And we wish to provide advice on renewable

energy development in the desert. We are not sure as to how much of this is most effectively focused toward the DFO or how much of our opinions and efforts should be focused toward other areas in the BLM and such. And I wanted to introduce that quandary that we have and see if you had some advice for us on how we can, as a Council, step up our involvement with DRECP.

STATE DIRECTOR KENNA: I do. I think there are a number of places to do that. But let me start by giving you a little bit on the infrastructure for the project so you understand why it's designed the way it is.

There is a renewable energy policy group -- we often think of our planning process as a stand-alone, and in this case they won't be. The state, out of the governor's office, chairs the REPG. And meetings are monthly. And it looks across everything from ongoing project stuff that's in the pipeline to the DRECP. It includes both those tracks.

So -- and it has around it a lot of infrastructure, too, including stakeholder groups and other things. So I think we appropriately -- and this happened before I got here -- attached and said, rather than do this as a county or a state plan, a BLM plan, whoever else is going to get into the mix, we

should, and because of the nature of the thing, do it together. And it should fit together and then everybody can interface with a single integrated process because the power line infrastructure, the generation infrastructure and the relationship to the overall system, the relationship to the landscape issues, all those are going to cross. And the wildlife issues frankly, all those are going to cross ownerships.

So it's going to be for us a plan amendment to plans in both the Desert District and in the Central California District. But it will also be under state law a Natural Communities Conservation Plan and it will also be under the Endangered Species Act for Fish and Wildlife Services, a Habitat Conservation Plan which allows permitting. So we are trying to do all of those things inside one construct.

And we have done it before in the Southern California area, mostly in very populace areas. There is one in the Coachella Valley and one in Western Riverside County. So that concept of pulling it all into a single process is not new.

What is new is the scale. And really the scale of the question is what drove the scale of the plan. The scale of what should your energy generation

and transmission footprint look like in Southern California with major, major parts of the load nationally on the coast in Southern California is a big question with big-scale issues. So that's why it's structured the way it is. I support the structure.

The second part of your question, how does this group and the district manager interface with that? I think there are a number of options. And we talked about some of them at dinner last night. One would be, because of the diversity and the knowledge base inside this group, looking specifically at the range of alternatives and are all the issues represented in the range of alternatives so you get the analysis you want out of the document? And I heard a little bit of that this morning that there is concern that certain issues weren't going to get adequate attention. You want to make sure everyone understands their importance. This is the time, and that will evolve between now and early spring. We are at the front end of that discussion. We don't have a range of alternatives yet.

In response to Ed's question about who are those guys, well, I'm one of them. And Teri has ready access to me. So talking to Teri gives you direct

access on any issue to talk to me, whether I'm here or not. So I think there is tremendous opportunity. I told you before, the diversity of this group makes it important for us to listen to you. And the charter of this group, given the geography that it covers, also makes it important for us to listen to this group.

So I encourage you to engage in the process and think about where you are in the process. And I talked about this with Teri. So that it isn't just sort of a general engagement, but trying to be constructive relative to the process piece that we are in. And the process piece we are in right now is what should the range of alternatives be and what are all the issues and how do we map that? What does it look like on a map?

So I really think that's important. And there are a number of questions out there. I'm very encouraged to hear the counties are talking among themselves. I think the county piece is very, very important because that's important of what that footprint statewide is going to look like. And if we can't come together on what that is, we risk having some of the Rube Goldberg kind of problems that are pointed in different directions, trying to do the same thing.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: I think the DAC will agree with me in that we struggled greatly in trying to involve ourselves in the renewable energy development issue. And I think that -- I don't know that we feel we have been successful, and I think to some extent that's why a quarter of the DAC members that you see here at one point in time have finagled their way on the stakeholder committee itself. A quarter of the DAC are members. And it's out of that frustration that we had to go somewhere to at least try to have an effect. So that's where that point comes out.

Another question relative to DRECP is the -- Ed brought up the immediate question that's on the surface of the DRECP relative to recreation, which is the renewable energy study areas, the RESAs, as to how those would affect recreation. And you heard passionately about that, and I won't restate that. You got that message.

But for many in recreation the actual 800-pound gorilla in the room is the reserve areas and what activities will continue to be allowed in these reserve areas and what kinds of restrictions might end up being put into place with regard to public access and recreational activities in these reserve design areas. If a reserve strategy includes capping the

number of miles of roads per X number of acres due to conservation, or if restrictions on the use of certain kinds of hunting tools or bullets or things or the seasons or whatever, these will have impacts on the recreation. And it's the reserve areas that have a good number of recreationists very concerned.

And because, when you mention OHV to a general ordinary member of the public, they see a Greensticker vehicle going in circles around the track or up and down hill or something like that. And those aren't the areas being considered for reserve. The only effective reserve lands are going to be those that have conservation value to them. And those are the places where people go to hunt, to look at stars, to paint landscapes, to take photographs, to collect rocks, to bring their horses and ride.

So our concern for recreation, at least, is what impacts the reserve might have. So we have two gorillas we are looking at: Where we are going to build them and where we are going to reserve. And I appreciate you letting me make that point. I have a third point, but if you would like to reply.

STATE DIRECTOR KENNA: I think that's appropriate. And this is the time to talk about -- if you have ideas about the breadth of different

strategies and what should be considered in that regard, that's great. Get them into the mix. I see nothing wrong with that. And what you do will be part of the record of this process as much as what is going on inside the stakeholder groups.

So I think it's fully appropriate for you to have those kinds of discussions. And there is a tension there. I mean, we have to -- if I take -- for example, the tortoise piece came up quite a bit this morning. Well, what is an effective tortoise conservation strategy? What needs to go into that to make it work so it conserves tortoises? How does it work, then, for all other things?

Well, that's the purpose of having a public process around those kinds of questions. And we are early enough in this process that if there are things that we should get analyzed -- and this is what I was trying to get at earlier about the scope of what gets covered -- let's get them in. Let's make sure that we at least take a stab at answering questions like that, and we usually do that by the range of alternatives that are presented.

I mean, we were in a stage of the process; not only do we not have a preferred alternative; we don't have a range of alternatives yet. We are very

early. But that says we have to go pretty quickly or we are going to stay in this application-driven, project-by-project, hard-to-connect-up-what-is-going-on-in-the-system-level kind of world, and that's not good for society at large or for most people inside the process.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: I'm going to pass on my last question, looking at the agenda, give another member a last crack at the apple and a chance for you to close the comment if you had would like. April.

MEMBER SALL: I had a couple of questions for you regarding -- given where this discussion is going, my first question, I will start with a little more specific. In your comments regarding where we are at in the process and that we don't have alternatives yet but needing to move very quickly for that, one of the concerns I have heard among a lot of the stakeholders is that we are moving forward to shape these alternatives when we don't have some of the basic data layers and data needed to do that. And it would be very costly to have to, both in terms of resources and time and resources on the ground, insert that at a later date and move forward in a planning process planning without such knowledge. That's pretty basic on the ground. So I will share that as a quick

comment for you.

But my larger comment that turns into a question is, given the concerns and this balancing act for DRECP and all of the things we need to consider and try and protect in terms of the resources and the conservation values, recreation, historic uses, et cetera, and also looking at some of the assumptions made in the PEIS -- for example, that 75 percent of the development will occur on public lands -- when there is this component that there is a lot of private lands that's also appropriate for this development, how do you see the timing of DRECP and trying to balance all these complex values versus utilizing private lands that already have that type of impact of development into this process and not making so many rush decisions that we sacrifice a lot of uses in the desert and conservation lands that we can never fix and get back?

STATE DIRECTOR KENNA: We always face the tension between data availability and release of a plan and need to get to a decision. So your point about underlying information is a valid one. It's one we always have to consider.

My thinking on that right now is it's not right. That's really a readiness question that will

probably be out there in the spring, because a lot of work is still ongoing and will be ongoing over the next period of months.

The second point is the relationship between the PEIS and the final footprint that comes out of the DRECP. In the PEIS specifically, they reference step-down processes and not just here in California but in all the six western states. And the intent is that -- and we had this discussion last night as well -- you can't do the detail level of analysis in the PEIS that you need to do to get to that footprint question. You have to make, by the nature of the scale, some assumptions like about mix between ownerships.

But those are expected to be adjusted in the step-down process. And should be, based on the logic of the analysis. What is the logic of the system from generation of transmission system? What is the logic of what is going on from a natural and cultural resource and land use perspective? That logic requires a set of dialogues that you can't really do effectively inside a national programmatic EIS.

That's why we need this step-down and why it's so important. So I think we should be careful about direct translation of any assumptions, analysis assumptions from the PEIS in terms of interpreting

what the decision should be in the DRECP. Point one.

Point two is the logic that should drive that is based on what we just discussed: The issues that are out here. The knowledge that is out here. The data that can be developed and the conversations we can have at this scale.

MEMBER SALL: Thank you, I appreciate that. My second question was related to NLCS. And I guess one of the things that I have struggled with in terms of thinking about the National Landscape Conservation System and explaining it to people is that although it does, by definition, represent a larger system of lands, there are also separate sort of floating island units of management.

And so my question is, In thinking about NLCS and climate change and some of the other aspects scientifically in terms of conservation in perpetuity and landscape conservation, has BLM considered any sort of -- maybe a designation, but something to address connectivity for conservation and ecological process, conservations, and also, of course movement of plants and animals?

STATE DIRECTOR KENNA: Well, that's probably another plug in some respect for the DRECP. But the answer is yes and no. The yes part of it is, yes,

they are interested in that and working to address it. But there are a variety of processes that manifest through the DRECP being one. Any other land use planning piece is another. Some of the project level things we are doing have connectivity. Some of the relationships we have with a variety of NGOs and governments have connectivity as part of the discussion. So there is not a neat, tidy answer on connectivity, but I do think there is a lot, based on what I know about current goings-on, there is a lot going on.

The second part of that is the relationship with that to the National Conservation Lands. One of the beauties of the system is the flavoring that happens where you were meet the neighbors and meet the lands in each of these individual units. So I would hate -- the thing we are going to have to balance as we work this community interface question and issue is, how do you preserve that richness in the system and at the same time, create enough system so that we raise to the level of meeting expectations of the public of a national system. That's a difficult question, and I'm not sure we are matured enough yet in just ten years to really answer that question.

If you think about sort of the prior model

that came out of the 1891 decision to hold lands in common for conservation, we have been working on that for over 100 years. We are ten years into this question of coming back to that community-based root and trying to recreate another model of conservation that has that as its center. And so some of the hows, we are still in a learning phase. I'm interested in ideas on that because I think it's a really important question.

MEMBER SALL: Thank you for your thoughts.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Meg.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: I'm so sorry. I just wanted to make a comment to follow up on what Brad said, that the Secretary seems to have kind of blessed the Mojave Trails National Monument. When we were at that meeting with David Hayes, the deputy, whatever his title is, at that meeting he wanted to know what wilderness was out there and that was deserving of protection. And we kind of turned that around and talked about how the community built this monument in the proposal.

And I'm very happy that it seems that the administration has given it its blessing. And if the President or administration just decides to go ahead and designate it and not through a piece of

legislation, I hope they would ask the land managers their opinion on what would be in it.

And I would think from a management perspective, that if they chose to take out the OHV use, that, coupled with the loss of Johnson Valley, it would be chaotic to the Southern California recreation community, no matter how you recreate, whether you were a rockhound, or an OHVer, or drive anywhere out on those trails. I hope that those local community deals made on the Monument are respected. And if it's done administratively, that those stay there. I know you can't really say that.

STATE DIRECTOR KENNA: No, fair point. I hear you.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: It was a community-driven bill, and we all worked very hard on it. And I'd hate to see that torn apart.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: If I may turn the floor back over to the director, if you have closing comments for us.

STATE DIRECTOR KENNA: I guess the first and foremost has to be the comment I opened with, and that is I really place a lot of importance on the advisory council process in the system because of that community interface. It's a place for us to put an

ear to the ground. And I know that it takes significant personal commitments on each of your parts to be part of that, and that sometimes it's probably even uncomfortable because of the disagreements across the diversity of points of view and trying to hammer out, well, what do we have in common out of that mix can be a difficult process.

But I want to encourage you, because it's so important, to persist. It's important to find ways to -- where you are in frustration about how do we get a voice in the mix -- to find a way that does that because these advisory councils are unique by law. They are set up and chartered in a different way to provide that community connection and dialogue across a diversity of perspectives. And it's different than just some public comment period because it's a dialogue. So what you do is really, really important.

I hope you got a sense of my values and the direction that I'm interested in as the director for California BLM. I am very much -- I believe that we get in BLM the toughest sustainability questions that exist in public land management. I think they are tougher than are questions about refuge or even hydro power kinds of questions because they have so many overlapping interests all at the table that need to be

considered.

But I also think -- and you heard this in my opening -- I really attach a lot of importance to what is going on with the Conservation Land System. It's a really, really -- it's hard to see critical moments in history when you are in them. But I think we are in one with conservation lands. Can we go back to that root concept of a conservation system of national importance with a community front end? That's a big, big question and a very important one in my view.

So the last thing that I would encourage you to sort of remember: I hope you remember about the sustainability issues and questions, the heritage piece of what we hand off to another generation. But there are a lot of things that we do that support the community level interface with public lands. The recreation amenities that public lands present. There are the energy questions which we have been engaged in from the beginning as the General Land Office when wood was the primary source of energy in the United States. We have a long history of working on those issues. But there are also very, very public safety questions and issues that we also have to engage and keep in the forefront of what we are doing with communities.

You heard my philosophy about partner delivery. As an agency, one of the things we are best built to do, over all other federal land management agencies, is to partner. We were important to the United States in a number of ways. For every \$1 that is spent on public lands, there are \$4 to \$5 that go to the treasuries. So we are important to the taxpayer, just generally.

But the fact that we address those sustainability issues and questions that were so important to the heritage for the next generation and that were so important to the communities that are the neighbors I think is at the forefront of all of that. So thank you for hearing what I had to say. I enjoyed the question and answer, and I appreciate the opportunity, Mr. Chairman and Council.

(Applause from the audience.)

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Thank you very much. I hope the other advisory councils are visited, too, so they, too, can benefit from your counsel.

We are going to break to get a little rest. This isn't going to be a long break.

(Brief recess was taken from 10 a.m. to 10:14 a.m.)

CHAIRMAN BANIS: I would like to call the meeting back to order. It's 10:14. The next item on

the agenda is our focus on the National Landscape Conservation System.

Let me just briefly explain to DAC members, I know this is a little bit of a shake-up. But that's because I felt you all were so comfortable with where we were going. Traditionally we would close our topic that we opened, our can of worms last time, and then start our new topic in the afternoon. We had to rework our schedule, and I'm afraid we tipped those backwards.

So we will be hearing about the National Landscape Conservation System this morning. And after lunch, we will get back with the user fee concept and then we will close that can of worms and move on.

This next presentation is going to be a slide show. Members of the audience, forgive us if you don't see any DAC members up here watching. We are among you so we can watch the slides too. So I would like to introduce to everybody Mark Conley, BLM national resources specialist, to make a presentation.

MR. CONLEY: Good morning. First, I would like to thank you for the opportunity to talk about the National Landscape Conservation System and also thank you for yesterday's field tour. Teri, your staff, Steve Razo, Greg Thomsen, really did a

wonderful job of exposing you to one of most unique national monuments, the California Coastal National Monument, the 20,000 rocks and islands off the coast. And you got to see and hear first-hand some of the partnerships we have here going on here in Southern California and Rick Hanks, our manager, has done a wonderful job of building those gateway partnerships.

Before I get started, there are a few documents I just wanted to bring your attention that's in your packet, the Desert Advisory Council members. I have a copy of the NLCS strategy, an overview document that provides management framework of the NLCS over the next 15 years, so that's in your packet, as well as the Secretary's report to Congress on the BLM lands deserving special protection. And there are a number that he recommends in California that we can briefly touch on.

And then a summary of our California National Conservation Lands and the types of designations we have. And then specifically the California Desert District designations. And just for your information, the California Desert District manages the largest part of the National Conservation Lands in the bureau. We have 174 units in California, and here in the Desert District there are 72 wilderness areas that are

managed in our five districts here in Southern California.

I also wanted to briefly talk about how the management of the National Conservation Lands differ from other public lands. Just briefly touch on that. There was a lot of discussion on the proposed legislation. I will just briefly touch on that because that could have major implications here in Southern California and the Desert District on some of the areas that could become part of the NCLS.

And then lastly, I would certainly like to solicit the help and advice of the Desert Advisory Council as we continue to move forward with this new system of public lands that Director Kenna talked about and the many challenges, but also an exciting time for the bureau. And also I did hear discussion about the DRECP, and there are potential implications with that planning effort as far as other conservation lands that could be added to the NCLS system here in the California Desert District.

This slide here is the Kingston Range Wilderness. It's one of the largest wilderness areas in the CCD managed by both Barstow and Needles field offices, and just a spectacular area. Important habitat for desert species and one of our crown jewels

in Southern California.

Jim really touched upon the key concepts of our newest system. Former Secretary of Interior Bruce Babbitt was instrumental through a secretarial order in creating this landscape level protection. And he wanted to bring together under one system the special areas that are managed by BLM. And it initially started in March of 2000, and just in 11 years there has been a real tremendous amount of effort that's been done and work that's been accomplished.

One of the main focuses for the National Conservation Lands is conservation -- its primary focus is for the management and part of the multiple use management of BLM, but conservation is obviously a very important part of managing these areas.

And then lastly, it brings to BLM a system of public lands that we can manage, a new system. Prior to 2000, many of the BLM's crown jewels were being transferred to other federal land management agencies for management. And since 2000 there has been a renewed effort to have these areas managed by BLM using that landscape model in building community partnerships, working closely with stakeholders.

Just to kind of further summarize over the last 11 years, one of the major issues that happened

in 2009, the Omnibus Public Lands Management Act codified into law the NCLS for the BLM. Then in addition, Secretary Salazar in November of last year issued a Secretarial Order that clarified BLM's responsibility in managing these areas. And last year there has been a push by President Obama in America's Great Outdoors. A lot of the National Conservation areas are very important recreation areas, and that is a focus of America's Great Outdoors. And also, protection of these areas through collaborative land acquisition.

And I just wanted one statistic over the last decade to bring out that over 250,000 acres have been acquired in the CDD area, working with many of our land trusts and partners. It's an incredible accomplishment. I was just told about our last acquisition. We have acquired over 100,000 acres of inholdings through donations and also with land and water conservation funds, but also partnering with our land trusts. The Mojave Desert Land Trust, the National Audubon Society, the Legacy Foundation are just a few of the organizations we work with and have done tremendous work in protecting some of these real special areas.

Briefly, nationally, BLM manages about 245

million acres in 12 western states primarily. And out of that amount of public lands, about 27 million acres are now part of NCLS. Here in California, we have 174 units. And this is a hard map to read, but there is one on the back table. I have some maps that were produced by -- in partnership with the National Geographic Society in 2000 that shows our National Conservation Lands. And there are a few of these copies on the back table that have a much more detailed map that show these areas and locations.

In just 11 years the system has grown. And I wanted to briefly touch upon the different types of designations included within the National Conservation Lands. National Monuments is one of the categories. Here in California, we have three National Monuments that we manage. Nationally there are 16 and over almost 5 million acres.

National Conservation Areas are another unit of the NLCS, and we have gone from 10 to 21 units in just 11 years. Wilderness Areas, from 138 to 221. And what is interesting about this statistic is 87 are in California. About 40 percent of the total wilderness designated up to this date is here in California.

One statistic that has gone down are

Wilderness Study Areas that have been set aside for plans or under review for possible designation by Congress. We had 618 units in 2000, down to now 545. And that's partly because some of those Wilderness Study Areas were designated wilderness. We have Wild and Scenic Rivers, a number of those units. We have gone from 35 to 67. And in California, we have eight Wild and Scenic Rivers. And here in the California Desert, the Amargosa River and Cottonwood Creek were designated in the Omnibus Public Lands Management Act in 2009. And then lastly, National Scenic and Historic Trails part of the system, and the Bureau manages 16, either directly or segments, of National Scenic and Historic Trails with other agencies.

As I mentioned, we have three National Monuments here in California. The Santa Rosa/San Jacinto Mountains National Monument that provides a backdrop to the desert cities in the Coachella Valley is one of our National Monuments, a spectacular area.

And Greg Hill, our wilderness lead, will talk a little more specifically about the Santa Rosa/San Jacinto Mountains. And in the lower left corner is the Carrizo Plains National Monument, where we work with Fish and Game and other partners in managing of a very special area by our Bakersfield field office.

And yesterday you had the opportunity to observe many of the rocks and islands on the California Coastal National Monument. And the last slide in the lower right is Vermillion Cliffs in Arizona. And I understand the California condor was reintroduced here a number of years ago, a real beautiful area.

National Conservation Areas are again a part of the National Landscape Conservation System and also similar designations. And I want to bring out our smallest NCLS unit, the Piedras Blancas Light Station managed by our Bakersfield field office on the coast near Cambria, 19 acres, and we have a light station there. The buildings have been taken off because of structural problems, but we are in the process of refurbishing of this and a lot of work being done there as well as protection of the coast for sea birds and marine mammals.

Wilderness is a very big issue especially in the CDD. And 72 out of the 87 wilderness areas managed here in California are here down in Southern California, and a lot of very important areas are protected. Two of those areas in the lower Cash Creek Wilderness in Lake County and the Inyo Mountains Wilderness managed by Bishop field office is a Forest

Service/BLM co-managed wilderness area.

Wilderness Study Areas, that's one category where here in California the numbers have gone down. We now manage 69 designated Wilderness Study Areas. A couple of examples up in the northeast higher in the state. The Wall Canyon in the Surprise field office, and down in the lower left, the Bodie Hills in the eastern Sierras, a real special area, important and lots of interest on protection of that area in the Bishop field office.

Wild and Scenic Rivers, one of your corridors, the Amargosa River designated in 2009. We are currently writing a management plan. Roxie's team in the Barstow field office has the lead for that. And then Cottonwood Creek, our Ridgecrest field office working with the National Forest Service on that new designation. And the lower left hand corner is the North Fork of the American River and the Auburn recreation area just north of Sacramento, another very special area.

National Scenic and Historic Trails, very important in the bureau is very involved in the management of these areas. Here in Southern California we manage, along with the National Park Service, parts of the Old Spanish National Historic

Trail, that upper left-hand corner slide, just north of the little community of Baker. And I believe that's Kingston Peak Wilderness in the background of that slide. The lower right-hand corner is the Pacific Crest National Scenic Trail and the White Water Canyon Area. And the bureau is responsible for the management of almost 200 miles of that trail in Southern California. And the Iditarod Trail up in Alaska, which is one of the longest trails. I believe it's one of the longest trails, over 2,000, and the BLM takes the lead on the management of that trail as well.

Director Kenna discussed a lot of the management focus, so I'm not going to go into a lot of detail, but it's landscape scale protection. We are looking at not just BLM land, but what makes the most sense, working with community groups, other agencies, in partnerships in developing protection for these areas. And it's really a new model of resource protection and one that we are still evolving and working forward. And potentially I see the DAC providing feedback to us as we move forward.

And our goal is to keep these areas undeveloped and remote and keeping most of the recreational visitor services outside of these areas

unless it's essential for public health or safety or other uses. We also allow compatible uses, grazing, travel management, and that issue is addressed in these National Conservation Lands, usually through our management planning process. But obviously, it's extremely important to have access into some of these areas in developing those travel management planning parts. And as we go forward with the designations, it's also very important.

And again, community partnerships and really sharing management responsibilities in managing these areas. Again, a focus that we really put a lot of emphasis on. And it allows us to leverage and manage these areas in a much more cost-effective manner in working with stakeholders and community groups.

Then lastly, the scientific research and outdoor laboratories. Many of these conservation lands provide great opportunities working with universities and other scientists on a number of studies ongoing.

So the focus is on resource values, recreational, cultural and Native American values, paleontological values, wildlife, water and air quality. And I mentioned scientific laboratory and scenic values. That has been an issue especially with

some of our historic trail corridors and the renewable energy projects and addressing those scenic values as we move forward. And that's an issue we are going to be pushing and working on over the next few years.

Again, the National Conservation Lands are very important recreationally. Over 30 percent of all the BLM land recreational use occurs in many of these areas. And lots of different types of uses occur, from motorized to mechanized to hiking, backpacking, camping, hunting and fishing, and very important for communities that are adjacent and near these areas.

These areas are also important for cultural and Native American issues, and we work in partnership with many tribes throughout California. And I just wanted to mention the Santa Rosa and San Jacinto National Monument in the upper left-hand corner, the Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians are partners with the BLM because it's their ancestral home and of very important significance to the tribe. And we work in partnership and work to protect those areas and interpret, working collaboratively with tribes.

Some of our areas -- and I will just mention two -- the Grand Staircase Escalante National Monument in Utah is an extremely important area for studying dinosaurs and some of the early findings that have

been found dealing with the fossils and even new species of dinosaurs have been discovered. And lots of ongoing work happening in many different sites around in the west.

These areas are also important for wildlife, critical habitat for a number of species and just -- the Peninsular Bighorn Sheep, critical habitat within the Santa Rosa and San Jacinto National Monument. Desert Tortoise is very important in a lot of our wilderness areas. Southern California provides critical habitat for the tortoise and even the California Condor in the upper right-hand corner. The Condor uses habitat in Carizzo Plains National Monument, managed by BLM. In our California Coastal National Monument, the rocks and highlands serve as important habitat for sea birds and mammals.

Water quality and protection of water is again another key component of the NLCS. The slide on the upper left-hand side is the Headwaters Forest Reserve managed by the Arcata field office. It's important habitat for spotted owls and marbled murrelets. Lots of restoration work has been done in that area.

And the other area I will mention is the San Pedro National Conservation area south of Tucson,

extremely important area for birds, other mammals and a lot of the species in this riparian area in the Sonoran Desert. And the last slide is actually the Trinity River, I believe, up in Northern California, BLM managed with the Forest Service certain segments of that river.

We talked about the scenic values and the importance of these National Conservation Lands to protect the scenic values and provide places for research by scientists and geological processes. The Carrizo Plains National Monument, many studies ongoing. The upper right-hand slide is the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument, lots of work being done in geological processes and climate change and other studies as well.

Just to kind of change gears briefly, in 2010 was the 10th anniversary of the NLCS. In California we had a number of events. We had 16 events around with our partners highlighting some of these special areas. The summit, the Tenth Anniversary highlight was the National Conservation Summit that was last November in Las Vegas where we brought together stakeholders, friends groups, other partners. And from that, we helped articulate the strategy for the next 15 years for the National Landscape Conservation

System. And Secretary Salazar at this summit issued his Secretarial Order providing direction on the management and lots of discussion on how we can further the program.

One key concept we heard over and over and I've heard it today was the name, National Landscape Conservation System. It's very clumsy, cumbersome, and we want to possibly come up with another name. National Conservation Lands is used by our Conservation Lands Foundation, our nonprofit partner that works with the bureau, promoting and working to increase public awareness of the system.

In your packet there is the outcome from the summit which was the 15-year strategy that highlights our framework and management over the next 15 years as well as a number of action items. And obviously, from this, Director Kenna wants California to develop a California strategy that would tier off the 15-year strategy on how we will further our system here, the 174 units managed by BLM California. And we are going to undertake that effort shortly working to strategize our priorities over the next 15 years here in California.

The strategy has some very good background information, and I don't want to go into a lot of

detail because we are running behind schedule and there is some information in your packets where you can further read and some of the goals that have been articulated by our partners. But a couple of points that I would like to just leave with managing these areas on a landscape scale basis, working collaboratively with partners, and the focus is preserve, protect and restore these areas where we can.

Briefly, there was some discussion earlier when Director Kenna was here. I will briefly touch on the proposed legislation in the sense that these bills could add units to the National Landscape Conservation System in California: The HR-41, introduced by Representative Issa; the Beauty Mountain and Agua Tibia Wilderness Act, the lands in San Diego County would become part of the Beauty Mountain Wilderness Area, and that bill has the support of Representative Issa and Senator Boxer.

There is a lot of discussion about the California Desert Protection Act of 2011, S-138, and that again would designate a number of areas, wilderness monuments here in California, potentially adding to our National Conservation Lands here in Southern California.

And a couple of other bills I wanted to bring to your attention. A unique bill introduced by John Campbell in Orange County is a lighthouse reservation on some of the rocks in Orange County. This bill would eliminate that reservation and add those rocks to the California Coastal National Monument, so our 20,000 rocks will go up in number.

And lastly, Representative Kevin McCarthy has a bill introduced, the Wilderness and Roadless Area Release Act of 2011, which would release wilderness study areas managed by the BLM that were not suitable when the initial plan would be released as potential wilderness areas, and that bill was introduced.

Just briefly, the Beauty Mountain Wilderness Bill, the dark yellow in San Diego, those are the lands in San Diego County that are not wilderness. The northern part of Beauty Mountain, that's River Skies, San Diego County Mines, Representative Mary Bono Mack introduced the Beauty Mountain Lands Omnibus Act and now Representative Issa also sees the value, and Senator Boxer, in adding and closing and managing this area as one unit. It also provides camping and hunting access. That dark green line would provide access into the wilderness for hunters, and that was important to Representative Issa.

Just briefly, the California Desert Protection Act, two new national monuments, the Mojave Trails National Monument, and in the Palm Springs area, the Sand-to-Snow National Monument. Five new proposed wilderness areas up near Fort Irwin, as well as a special management area down in Imperial County, Draper Wash Special Management Area. Lands would be transferred from BLM to the National Park Service for Death Valley National Park, Joshua Tree National Park, and Mojave National Preserve, which would enlarge some of those boundaries.

And then three Wild and Scenic Rivers designations, Whitewater, Amargosa and Surprise Creek Canyon. And as other more land transfers, five national OHV areas, coordination with tribes on cultural sites on the Colorado River and many other parts of this bill. It's very detailed and many parts to it.

Also included in your packet, Secretary Salazar's report on BLM lands deserving protection. And here in California, the Secretary recommends that many of the lands that were outlined in Senator Feinstein's bill should be protected. Two proposed National Monuments, the wilderness areas, and the three Wild and Scenic River designation. And then

there was the Beauty Mountain Area that was proposed as well as English Ridge up in Mendocino County. Those were the areas that should be protected and the department is behind it.

Mojave Trails National Monument, Historic Route 66 corridor, just under 1 million acres, and the Sand-to-Snow Proposed National Monument, the Whitewater area. The Pacific Crest National Scenic Trail traverses through that area, as well.

And a lot of discussion about the Desert Renewable Energy Conservation Plan. The only point I wanted to bring up is potentially the lands that become conservation lands or designated conservation through this planning effort may become part of the National Conservation Lands managed by BLM. And that's because in the Omnibus Public Lands Management Act of 2009, it says in the law that the BLM will designate conservation lands in the CDCA for inclusion in the National Conservation System. So potentially we could be looking at some of these conservation lands being added to the National Conservation Lands as part of our system.

I will turn it over to Greg Hill, and he will specifically talk about some of the issues here in the California Desert District.

MR. HILL: We have seen a lot of the pretty slides, but I'm going to discuss a little bit about each of the units of the National Landscape Conservation System we have in the CDD and some of the things we are doing right now to help people enjoy them and implement the management plans for them.

Of course, we have the Santa Rosa and San Jacinto National Monument, and also this is a handout in your packets so you can have that as a reference for later on in this. And there is a map of just the NLCS units in the Desert District that we also handed out to all the members.

The Santa Rosa and San Jacinto National Monument is jointly managed by the BLM and the U.S. Forest Service, although the lead for management is the BLM. And we have a monument manager working out of the Palm Springs/South Coast field office. The Monument is primarily managed by the BLM and Forest Service, but we also have state lands, tribal lands and private lands that are within the Monument that are managed by our partners. So there are a lot of partnerships going on with the National Monument.

Over the last year there was a lot of emphasis on the Monument's Tenth Anniversary and was featured prominently in art exhibits and photo

exhibits and special edition of *Palm Springs Life*. It has been an emphasis, as have all the NLCS units, on the President's and Secretary of Interior's Youth Initiative to get youth outdoors and more connected with the natural landscape. So there has been a big emphasis on those kinds of program, as well as other interpretive publications, personal services, and all kinds of special events that go on in the National Monuments.

And some of the monument staff and programs have been recognized nationally for their innovation in reaching the public, and in some cases on some sticky issues like dogs in the Monument, and that's been a big issue. There are also new interpretive sites and buildings at the Cahuilla Tewanet Overlook, with our partners, Friends of the Desert Mountains, expansion of visitors centers and offices at the Palm Desert Visitors Center.

We have the California Coastal National Monument. That was the focus of our fieldtrip. We learned about the partnerships and what we have here in the Desert District and in the South Coast Resource Area, our portion of the California Coastal National Monument.

We have two units of the National Wild and

Scenic River system in the district. We have the Amargosa River, and that's 26.3 miles on public lands. And a comprehensive river management plan is being developed as well as an overall management plan for the Amargosa River area of Critical Environmental Concern. That's being done by our Barstow office. And we have a four-mile segment of Cottonwood Creek Wild and Scenic River and that's way up in the corner of the CDCA up in Inyo County.

We have the units of the National Scenic and Historic Trails, three units. We have the Pacific Crest Trail, which is very famous. It starts on the Mexican border and goes all the way up to Canada. We have approximately 130 miles in the Desert District. And one of the things that's going on with the Pacific Crest Trail are improvements and possible reroutes due to mitigation from the Sunrise Powerlink Project, which is down near the border. So we have some opportunities to look at perhaps modifying the route or perhaps even moving the current terminus which is right on the border up against the border fence that border patrol has built over the years, moving it to a more scenic location.

The Juan Bautista de Anza National Historic Trail was important in the California and Bay Area

history. That was the route that the Governor of Alta California, Juan Bautista de Anza, led the settlers and others up from Sonora up to found what's now San Francisco. And portions of that cross through the CDD. And one of the things that's been really fun down in the El Centro field office is staff there won a national award for an innovative audio tour of the of the Yuha Desert, which features a big part of the Anza trail down there.

We have the Old Spanish National Historic Trail that crosses through -- almost the entire Desert District has some portion of it going through it. But on public lands, that's primarily crossing the Ridgecrest and Barstow field offices. That trail was designated because that was an important trading route during the Spanish and Mexican periods between New Mexico and California. So the trail starts in Santa Fe, New Mexico, Colorado, Utah, comes down through the Great Basin and eventually the terminus was the small pueblo of Los Angeles. And the Barstow office is working on developing an interpretive brochure. So that's some of the things that are going on with the National Trails.

Wilderness is what most people are familiar with as one of the biggest components of the NLCS and

about a third of the public lands in the CDD are in wilderness or wilderness study area status. And as Mark mentioned, nationally almost half of all the wilderness that BLM manages nationally is in the CDD. And we have 69 wilderness areas that are part of the National Wilderness Preservation System. I included a map in the handout because there are so many of these units. It's an older map, but it has each of the units listed by number so you can kind of see where they are located throughout the district. And we have -- that's the units that are in the California Desert Conservation Area.

Then we also have three wilderness areas in the South Coast Resource Area. So we have wilderness going from the border, our Otay Mountain Wilderness Area about 15 miles east of San Diego, right on the Mexican border all the way up to the Sylvania and Piper Mountains Wilderness up north of Death Valley National Park.

We also have Wilderness Study Areas in the California Desert District. There are several of them in the California Desert Conservation Area, about 170,000 acres, and two WSA's in the South Coast Resource Area, and those two are Hauser Mountain, again down by the border, and Beauty Mountain, which

was discussed a little bit. We have a Beauty Mountain Wilderness in Riverside County and the Beauty Mountain Wilderness Study Area in San Diego County.

The last thing I will mention is Wilderness Restoration Projects we are doing, and this also ties into Secretary's Youth Initiative. So we have Youth Corp teams working for each of the field offices in the CDD, and they are doing restoration projects primarily in wilderness. They just finished up a project, and they are going to be coming back to it in the Kingston Range.

Other areas they are going to work at is Bighorn Mountain Wilderness, Orocopia, Big Maria and Riverside Mountains Wilderness. For the Palm Springs South Coast field office, Bigelow Cholla Garden and Chemehuevi Mountains in Needles. And then there is multiple projects going on in Ridgecrest. They have actually got a separate team from the Student Conservation Association doing multiple projects in that area. So there is a lot of going on in the National Landscape Conservation System in the CDD.

And that concludes our presentation, so we will be up here to answer questions if you have any. And again, I mention the handouts that we passed out to the members. And there are more handouts in the

back, including the 10th Anniversary Edition of the NLCS, specifically for California. So this is a California-specific publication for all the NLCS units we have here in California.

MEMBER ACUNA: The chairman stepped out for a moment, and I have been asked to continue with the meeting. So programs -- all the DAC members can join the table again so we can ask Greg the questions. Greg, great presentation. So do we have any questions here from the DAC?

MEMBER RUDNICK: One is probably just a personal preference, but I like the name Landscape. It sounds like you are trying to phase that out in the total name or trying to shorten it. It gives a feeling of something new and fresh rather than just conservation.

MR. CONLEY: Thanks for that comment. One of the reasons is the difficulty of saying the National Landscape Conservation System. It's kind of long and complex, and we have heard from a number of our partners saying what can we do to make that a little shorter and easier? And landscape sometimes is a confusion I have heard from the general public in thinking of landscaping around the office or regular landscape projects. So that's one of the comments we

have heard, but we are still working on it that. One of the challenges in the Omnibus Public Lands Management Act that codified the system into law did refer to it as the National Landscape Conservation System.

MEMBER RUDNICK: Second question: Who do you look to for partners? Who qualifies as a partner for part of the system?

MR. CONLEY: It really depends on the unit and the location and the interest. But obviously, like for some of our National Monuments, we look to the gateway communities adjacent to the National Monuments.

For some of our wilderness areas in remote locations, we work with a lot of different partners because they are coming from long distances, from the Los Angeles area. And so we partner with just a lot of environmental organizations, other interested parties, and depending on the interest in the project. We also do a lot of work, as Greg mentioned, with our Youth Corp Teams and we partner with volunteers to work with some of these teams, and we bring them in from many different locations.

MEMBER RUDNICK: If a group had an interest in being a partner, who would they contact?

MR. CONLEY: Depending on the location or where the unit is located, go specifically to the field office where we manage that area.

MEMBER RUDNICK: Thank you.

MEMBER ACUNA: Randy, I return it back to you.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Other questions, please?

MEMBER GUNN: Mark, I wanted to suggest a name. Just came to me. Maybe National Treasured Landscape.

MR. CONLEY: Thank you. Again, we are getting all ideas, and Treasured Landscapes is definitely worth considering.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Are there other questions? Dinah.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: You talked about inventory items. What kind of inventory items do you collect?

MR. CONLEY: As part of the planning efforts, we do a lot of baseline inventory. For example, travel management, we go out and inventory all the routes within a specific unit. And from that we can make better decisions on designating the route network.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: You also collect biological data?

MR. CONLEY: Correct.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: And geological data?

MR. CONLEY: Correct.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Ore potential?

MR. CONLEY: That, as well.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: So you do collect mineral potential data?

MR. CONLEY: Correct. And also valid and existing rights within these areas are recognized, so if there are mining claims that are valid at the time of designations, we certainly recognize those claims.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: But your activity specifically excluded mining?

MR. CONLEY: I wouldn't say we exclude it. We certainly would look at that in the planning process.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Well, according to all your information that I read, mining is not considered a compatible use.

MR. CONLEY: If it's about an existing right, we would do that. If it's in the planning process for management of these new units, we would not look at new areas to potentially --

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Well, almost all the unit designations -- there were six of them and I'm not

going to remember all of them -- but they were Wilderness, Wilderness Study Areas, Monuments, National Scenic Areas, all of these areas specifically exclude mining.

MR. HILL: You might mention that many of the units of the NLCS are made up from congressionally designated units, such as wilderness and national trails. So if the legislation specified that those areas were withdrawn from the mining laws, then that comes from the legislation rather than a bureau action in managing those.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: But this is a bureau program; correct? So my reading of this whole program, everything I've read and seen is this is a huge expansion of acquisition of lands that will specifically exclude mining activities. Well, to me, this should be a National Landscape Protection program, not conservation program because that's what it is. While grazing and some renewable -- it won't allow renewable energy, will it? Will this program allow renewable energy?

MR. HILL: There's general guidelines for the NLCS units, but again, each one of the units was generally designated through a congressional legislation that specified in the legislation how the

unit would be managed. And so those are parts of the NLCS that have their own specific management guidelines that were in the law that actually resulted in that unit. Most of these designations didn't come through BLM planning processes. I don't think there are any of the units that are anything other than congressionally designated area.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: But this is a program you are expecting to expand?

MR. CONLEY: The units will be expanded based on legislation that is introduced and then passed into law. And that usually guides the management of those areas, what is actually specifically stated in the act.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: So this is an additional level of management over all the other managed areas, the wilderness and monuments and everything else?

MR. CONLEY: Usually tied to legislation or presidential proclamation.

DIRECTOR RAML: The idea of the expansion of the program isn't necessarily tied to expansion of additional lands that we would manage under this program. And I don't know if that's what -- I'm not sure that's kind of what the range of questioning is. It's more the idea that our focus on these units that

are part of that system is going to expand, and we are going to take a look at developing a strategy for California. We are going to pay attention and highlight those lands. And as both Greg and Mark have said, there is expansion of the lands in terms of additional acres managed under the system, comes through usually other actions. But when we talk about expanding the program, it's expanding focus on it and use and outdoors and stuff, but not necessarily saying we are headed out to add additional lands at this point. And your interest -- we know your interest, so keep your eye on the DRECP and some other places.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: For this program, I'm wondering why you need a nonrenewable person even to advise. There is nothing to advise on. You could collect geological data and the only mineral data you are collecting are on existing claims. No additional claims will be allowed to be established. That's already in these properties; correct?

DIRECTOR RAML: Part of, I think, in certain areas, certainly if you are talking about recognition of the value of these landscapes and historic values, particularly trails and stuff, one of the reasons we might need a person is to keep the legacy uses of the land. But in terms of advising us about expansion of

nonrenewable energy development on these lands for the future, probably not as --

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Or an area that shows some future mineral potential at the very least.

DIRECTOR RAML: That would be a good discussion.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: I would advise that the land preservation program needs to have some element that allows for the identification of potential mineral areas.

DIRECTOR RAML: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Very good exchange. Thank you, Dinah.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: To follow up on what Dinah's question was, it seems like this program is, just to me, anyway -- is just another level on top of existing legislation, like you say. There is legislation that has designated certain areas. Whatever the legislation drives what can be done in those areas, whether it's mining, whether it's -- whatever it is. The legislation is what drives that. So what really -- I'm struggling to understand why the government needs to have another program on top of all the other -- these legislations. It sounds like all you are doing is taking existing legislation or

existing designations, if you will, whether it's a Wild and Scenic Rivers or Wilderness Area or Wilderness Study Area, you are just putting another cap on top of those, and I don't really understand what the benefit is other than making some jobs in the government.

MR. HILL: Just on the history of it, I know this grew after President Clinton designated the first National Monument and following up with 15 more National Monuments. It was thought that there needed to be something to kind of unify those areas and emphasize them within the bureau's budget process and also for external affairs to kind of showcase them to the public.

And then the other congressionally designated areas were added to that, like the National Conservation Areas, the Wilderness Areas and such. And then finally, it was formalized and written into -- in the law formally through the Omnibus Public Lands Bill in 2009, whereas previously it had been kind of a bureau initiative but it hadn't been formally recognized by Congress. So I think the intent is to show sort of a unifying concept around these special designations just to help to promote them and to help the public understand this is an

important thing that BLM does because it was kind of a new thing to have National Monuments after 1996. We didn't have them before. This was a whole new thing for BLM to be involved in as National Monuments. And primarily I think that's where a lot of this grew out of.

MR. CONLEY: One quick comment is prior to 2000, many of these specially designated areas would be transferred to other agencies to manage when they were identified as treasured landscapes or areas that needed special protection. The NLCS allowed BLM a way to manage these special areas and also consider other multiple uses that are compatible with the reasons for the designation as stated in the law.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: I understand it. It just seems like that's a job of the field offices, to promote their particular area. Again, I just -- I'm going to say it again: This just seems like another level on top of the field offices and everything else to manage their own area. If there is a special area to promote that particular area, that should be the job of the field office. We don't need this whole big thing on top of it. That's just my own personal opinion. Thank you. Thank you for your presentation.

MEMBER RUDNICK: I agree with Dick. What is

the purpose of another layer? But in looking at the things that are -- the types that are added in there, the Wilderness Study Areas, which could go into wilderness or not go into wilderness, one thing it might get locked into a situation.

We also have Kevin McCarthy with his bill to release some of these. What happens there? Are they already locked in? I guess it would be an act of Congress that they be released. So some of those things leaves a lot of unknowns to me.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Other Council members, questions? Comments?

MEMBER HALLENBECK: Are study areas in the NLCS?

MR. HILL: There are.

MEMBER HALLENBECK: If they are released, do they fall out?

MR. CONLEY: I assume they would.

MEMBER HALLENBECK: There needs to be a mechanism in there to ensure that.

MR. CONLEY: If we released them from the study areas, they would fall out to be managed as regular -- as our other public lands.

MEMBER HALLENBECK: Would that take another action by BLM to release them?

MR. CONLEY: No, not for Wilderness Study Areas. Congress has to actually release those. In the Omnibus Public Lands Management Act, there were three study areas in the Eastern Sierras that were released as Wilderness Study Area, and they are now managed through our Resource Management Planning process.

MEMBER MITZELFELT: Just a statement. When we were asked by the Department for new areas to propose for wilderness, I think that that analysis -- I mean, we responded and said we don't have any. But we also, there are also wilderness study areas that we don't think should continue to be study areas. This would be a lot more palatable if we released them.

A third of the lands are either in Wilderness or Wilderness Study Areas. That's a heck of a lot. So from a county perspective for access and other uses, I think there are study areas that won't become wilderness. So therefore, they shouldn't be treated as wilderness in our opinion. Just a statement.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: To follow up on my other question, can you tell me how much of the BLM's budget is going to this, above what was normally scheduled to promote these areas? How much of this NLCS costing the public?

MR. CONLEY: A couple quick thoughts on that. First, we have been managing wilderness in the California desert for many years, so those dollars have stayed pretty constant over the past five to ten years with a slight decrease. Where we have changed and added focus is our National Monuments, the National Conservation Areas and the other special designations. And these areas are receiving additional management attention through our budgeting process. And as a subactivity 1711 that provides funding to manage these areas, initially we programmed some of these other dollars from our wildlife and archaeology and brought them under one. But now we have a subactivity account for these National Conservation Areas and other special designations.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: Those costs are above what would normally be done for the archeological or biological work in those areas?

MR. CONLEY: Speaking for those National Monuments and NLCS areas, there is some added emphasis on management. We have placed additional staffing in these areas because of the need for more intensive management on these areas. So we have done these through a number of means. But some of the costs have gone up.

MR. HILL: I would say at the district and field office level, there is no new positions, just for NLCS. The positions go to the unit. So when the Santa Rosa and San Jacinto National Monument was established, then yes, we did add staff to manage that National Monument. So by definition, that's part of the NLCS. Others of us, like myself and Mark, with NLCS responsibilities, that's just an extra added hat to the things we are already doing.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: My concern is every time we turn around and we want to do something, we don't have enough money or enough staff with the BLM to do it. And then we see this program come along, and we are using staff and federal funds -- to do this. And again, it just seems like a duplication of effort.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Is that okay if we wrap up with the final comment? Any other hands? Dinah, I will have you as the last comment.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: I apologize for putting you guys on the hot seat, but I'm still going to be the DAC curmudgeon. It's my role.

For one-third of all the public lands in our desert to be Wilderness or Wilderness Study Areas is, I think, nuts. One of the things that public lands and private lands have done is build wealth if they

can provide jobs or tax revenue. For example, if you can farm something on lands, public lands, you are going to build wealth and provide jobs and provide tax revenue. If you can develop a mining claim on public lands, then you can provide revenue and provide jobs and build wealth for communities. And I don't mean government jobs. I mean jobs that build wealth for this country.

I'm making a comment, and I'm asking a question. A good example is in Feinstein's new bill it includes in the park the old Viceroy Gold Process. Everybody knows it's at the extreme east end of San Bernardino County. In those waste dumps, in those leach pads, are about 20 percent of all of the gold that was recovered, that was mined from Viceroy. No mining operation ever gets all of the gold or all of everything. They just can't. It's impossible.

Traditionally, about 20 percent of all of the gold that is mined is placed on the leach pad and about 20 percent is left. In this price market and knowing -- not knowing maybe what our mineral needs will be in the future, I think also it's nuts to even include -- to even consider making something unmineable that has 20 percent of all the gold that was mined out of that process sitting there in the

leach pad at 1200 dollars an ounce today.

Stuff like this that happens is absolutely nuts. And I think to designate lands, landscape lands that will specifically exclude activities like mining which provides wealth for our communities and our companies on a tax base developed, including the establishment of mining claims, which provide the BLM with \$145 per claim every year even if nothing happens on that land, it's generating revenue.

So my question to you in that environment is how can you specify or say that the -- these lands have special meaning to the American people and is an engine for economic growth? I think it does just the opposite. It stifles economic growth, and it doesn't provide jobs. So explain how it provides jobs, please.

(Applause from the audience.)

MR. HILL: I don't think we brought any handouts or any statistics, but we could provide them or help find you links to many of the organizations that provide recreational opportunities on wilderness and national monuments and such. I'm sure that is something we can help you find or provide a link to for the Council.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Thank you. A per-acre

number would be nice.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Teri.

DIRECTOR RAML: I want to make a quick closing comment about the value of this discussion. We get pretty exuberant at times when we gather together and we come up with a strategic plan and particularly because we are feeling so positive about this effort. This kind of discussion is a grounding discussion for us. Certainly for Mark and Greg, who are in the business of communicating what the program is about, it's good to hear that everybody is not on this band wagon. And that the communication about this program -- and one of the things I'm hearing is maybe we need to be careful to not call it a program. It's seen as something on top of something. Just hearing the conversation makes the difference to us, and it's going to certainly -- I know Mark is going to take it back because when I am communicating about this, we are going to miss the mark if we were not tuned up on these issues. So thank you for this discussion, and we get a lot out of this interchange.

MR. CONLEY: I would like to thank the Desert Advisory Council. Obviously, some comments here we probably didn't want to hear. But it helps us as we move forward with this program. It's new; it's only

11 years old. It's a lot of coordination with a lot of members of the public, and this is very important to us. And I really do appreciate the time you gave us this morning to talk about the National Conservation Lands and look forward to working with you as we move forward.

And the Desert District in California is one of these real important areas where it brings a lot of debate and discussion about what should be protected, what needs are out there. So again, this is very helpful to us, and thanks for allowing us the time to speak today.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Really, thank you both very much. We are indebted to you for the presentation and the work that you did. So thank you kindly.

MR. CONLEY: Thank you.

(Applause from the audience.)

CHAIRMAN BANIS: If there is no objection from the Council, I would like to do just a modest rearrange of a schedule. And that is to accommodate the attendance of one of our subgroup chairmen who was expecting to make a morning presentation. I would like to make sure it stays that way and have the SRP subgroup report next. It's just a slight rearrangement. No objection? If not, I would like to

turn the microphone over to Tom in just one moment.

But first before I do, if I may, I imagine this will all be part of the report, but just to keep things formal through the DAC, I would like to first thank Meg for the heavy lifting on the initiating the SRP subgroup. I have to liken this somewhat to a roller coaster in that I think Meg's role in getting that roller coaster up to the very top of the pinnacle. And I would also like to thank Tom for agreeing to step in on the interim basis to help be the DAC's representative while he rides that roller coaster down through the rest of the way. And if there are no objections from the Council members, if it's all right, I would like to make an interim appointment of Tom as the representative to the subgroup as a formal appointment. I would like a motion on this.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: I make a motion that we appoint Tom Acuna to take Meg's place as the chairman of the subgroup -- representative of the DAC on the subgroup.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: Meg seconds it.

MEMBER ACUNA: I think you should note something very important here. This is probably the last meeting for me, and you need a recognized DAC

member to help the subgroup. So I think what we should be doing is maybe perhaps looking for someone else on the group. And since we are going there, maybe, let's see, Ron Johnston. I would like to see him be potentially that person.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: But you are still willing to carry the torch through the next few stages?

MEMBER ACUNA: As long as Steve Razo says I can do it, I'm willing to continue.

MR. RAZO: We will keep your feet wet.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Very good way to put it.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: So if Tom's term is up December 31, can he continue in that capacity after December 31? Is that what you are telling us?

MR. RAZO: Not in that capacity, but he could certainly continue.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: If your term is up on the 31st, can you still be the official DAC representative on the subgroup?

CHAIRMAN BANIS: No.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: So when we will vote on this, it will only last 27 days. Maybe we do need to have an actual new volunteer -- I mean victim -- for this subgroup so it works. Are you going to be reappointed?

MEMBER ACUNA: No, no. But if I were going to make a motion, the motion would run something like this: Tom Acuna would be the representing DAC member through December 31. After that time, Ronald Johnston would be representing DAC member.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Dinah, would that be a friendly an amendment?

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Does Ron agree with that?

MEMBER JOHNSTON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: We have an amended motion. So the motion is that Tom would continue serving as the representative of the DAC to the SRP subgroup through the remainder of his term, immediately followed by DAC Council Member Ron Johnston.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: Second.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: All those in favor? Thank you. All opposed?

Motion passes, and thank you very much. I will turn this agenda item over to Tom, and it's all yours.

MEMBER ACUNA: I'm going to give a brief overview, and then I'm going to introduce the chairman of this subgroup.

What is the subgroup we are talking about? The Special Recreation Permit Subgroup. And their

charge is to evaluate what events -- what they need to provide to the BLM when they seek permission for some sort of event. It could be equestrian or off-road. So I am going to introduce Chairman Jerry Grabow. And one of the important things is he has worked very hard with the group to work with stakeholders to understand what it is that they need when they run the events and how they might manage a special recreational event. So he will give us the who, the what, the when, and where.

He has a few slides he is going to share with us, and we should be able to be brought up to speed. There is a termination on where they are going with this subgroup. It probably -- I probably shouldn't go any further because Jerry is going to bring us up to speed right now.

MR. GRABOW: Like Tom said, I'm Jerry Grabow, chairman of AMA District 37. I'm appointed the chairperson of the subgroup. Our task was to create a template of an operating plan for the SRP process. And we were given a template that the SRP task force had created or had acquired or however they ended up with it. The product that we got from the BLM task force wasn't a bad product; in fact, they made District 37 use that product to create our own

operating plan that all 34 of our clubs put on events with. And our goal was to create an event that they all looked the same. So whether it was the Invaders Motorcycle Club or Desert MC, all of the events would look very similar. And the members of our groups would understand where they are supposed to be, where the safe zones are, and so on and so forth.

So today we have given the operating plan that we worked on, and we are going to give that to the DAC to give to the BLM's task force and look for their input on it. By no means is it a done product. It's something that we have worked on and we have gotten this far with. And we would like to get some input back on it.

One of the things that I feel that's important is that we end up being good partners to the BLM as far as providing public safety. And as event organizers, we want to eliminate our liability on public lands as far as -- if we have another accident, in my opinion, we will all be done racing or doing activities on public lands, whether it be competitive or noncompetitive.

One of the other things that -- we have four items that we would like to recommend for future tasks. So touching on the idea of limiting our

liability as event organizers and making the events look somewhat similar, one of the off-road advocacy groups put together a meeting in Las Vegas at the SEMA show, and there was a number of the top promoters of off-road events, competitive events that were called to that meeting. And we kind of floated this idea by them of -- I have used a code book; we have also come up with guideline books, best management practises, whatever you want to refer to it as, but in the group's opinion, that a lot of these safety features and knowing where to stand and learning the idea that you can't stand next to the course or you need to have certain safety precautions in the pits, if all of the events -- and I'm only speaking of competitive events -- look similar, the general public at some point will learn these different traits and learn that you can't stand next to the race course. You can't -- you need to do certain things safety-wise in the pit areas. You can't have children in the pits. And so on and so forth.

And that's one of the things for AMA District 37, and we are going to start. Our next season starts in January, and that's one of the things that we are going to do is starting in January, we are going to follow those rules and manage riders' meetings, which

we have done all year; before, we had done riders' instructions, and now with the BLM's encouragement we have done riders' meetings.

We learned that some of the riders don't take that seriously. So starting in January, we are going to start enforcing these rules pretty heavily handed, in the event that eventually they will learn what is appropriate and what is not appropriate.

So moving on for the future tasks that we would like -- the subgroup would like to have would be looking at cost recovery. The other item would be an incident resolution process. That would be if there was an incident where spectators were in an area that they weren't supposed to be, that there is a log that's created in managing different aspects of the event and keeping an accurate accounting of that.

Availability of permits as well. And then also noncompetitive SRP's. We would like to look at that too. So anyway, that's the conclusion of my report.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Thanks, Jerry, and thank you Tom. Any comments or question on the general direction that we have done so far? Any advice that DAC members have for the subcommittee moving forward?

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: As I understand it, the

subgroups are formed and they are given direction by the DAC. So is this essentially this subgroup asking if they can go down the road with these four things? As I understand it, we have to give them direction and then they work from our direction, just like the Imperial Sand Dunes and Dumont Dunes because those four items were very wide in breadth. If we just say nothing, are we giving them the okay to just go ahead and audit all of the cost recovery books? We really need to sit down and talk about what specific direction we are going to give this SRP subgroup because this could entail a lot of BLM time and money. So I would like a little bit more specifics and then for us to talk about what the general direction of this subgroup is going to be, because this is a lot of time and effort that's going to be required of limited resources of the BLM.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Let me say first the intent on the agenda from an operational standpoint of the DAC and my perspective is that this is a checkpoint that we have here now. And if the DAC is comfortable with the report and moving it forward, and yet, by hearing nothing from us, would ask the subgroup to continue to work with the BLM's advisors and the task force in reaching an appropriate discussion on those

items.

And I think that the second question is more of an opinion of mine based on what I have seen. I think the subgroup members and the BLM's advisors will find that happy medium of moving forward to make sure it's not too disruptive. But at least from an official standpoint, this is a checkpoint and if the DAC has opinions and further wants to take action, great. Otherwise, this is just a great checkpoint. We can give them a green flag to keep them moving forward. So that's how I see this moving forward. Tom and then Dick.

MEMBER ACUNA: I will start with two points. The first point is I think what the SRP group is doing is they are being creative. They are developing ideas for us. And I think the person, whether it's me or Ron in the future, our goal is to help the SRP group develop ideas that has a chance of winning the approval of the BLM staff. And that still remains. So it's a collaborative effort.

Jerry has a number of issues that he is working on with the group. I think it's our -- what we will try to do at the DAC level, my level or Ron's level, is try to advise them and bring it in the direction that has the highest chance of meeting the

requirements of the bureau.

Once that's done, once we have come up with a document, then it's going to go to Roxie and her team, and they are going to evaluate it from many different angles. And once they have evaluated it, then I think if it's acceptable for all of us, then it can be adopted. That's my view, and so I would just like to see the picture come back up real quick here, the slide -- the last slide that Jerry spoke about.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: I believe we have a printout in our packet, and this is a really good packet at this meeting, and I think you might find that in the packet too.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: Tom, it seems like you were discussing the operations template, and I was discussing the four things they wanted to move forward.

MEMBER ACUNA: I think that's part of it.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: I'm sorry. I misspoke.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: I didn't see it in the packet.

MEMBER ACUNA: It's not being distributed at this point.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: There was to be a printout of the slides.

MEMBER ACUNA: Are you talking about what Jerry is putting out?

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: So we don't have a copy of the slides or what the group provided to the BLM task force?

CHAIRMAN BANIS: There is some more refinement that Jerry and the team has put together, and it will be circulated before next meeting. And it will be sent to the bureau's office in Barstow. And we just feel that it really needs to be looked at by the BLM staff. We need some refinement. We just didn't want to roll it out today. So does that help?

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: So when the group is done with their revision, they will build this task force, and then the task force will give it to us?

MEMBER ACUNA: Yes, it's still coming and not to worry.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: But it might go back to the subgroup from the task force.

MR. GRABOW: We are looking for the BLM's input going back to what I had said before. The subgroup wants to be a good partner to the BLM. They provided a document to us that we felt was really pretty good. So the amount of effort and time that went into it, we probably had 15 meetings over the

course of the six months that we have been together, and we feel that the product itself is really good, but we would like to get their input.

MEMBER ACUNA: I think that's a wise thing to do. I'm just going to turn your attention to these four points in here. The four bullets on the slide. The cost recovery. Here is an example where we could use some help from these folks. I believe it's everything over 50 hours of BLM work, that triggers the total fee being paid by the applicant. And there is some concern, for example, at some events are like 60 or 70 hours of BLM staff time to evaluate the application for a special recreation permit. Others are easier to do. Some are 30 hours or maybe even 49.5 hours. And so what the group -- this is one of the issues that they are struggling with is how do you bring consistency if you can in terms of cost? Jerry, what would you add to that?

MR. GRABOW: I mean, as far as looking at the cost recovery, I'm only going to speak for AMA District 37. We can put on one event in one field office and go with the exact same event and go to another field office, and we go into cost recovery. And again, when I spoke at that meeting at the SEMA show, none of the event -- I shouldn't say none. The

majority of the event organizers, the off-road public communities aren't looking to put on events for free. They want to pay their fair share. If these events cost the BLM money, they want to pay their fair share.

But there needs to be consistency in between the field offices. And basically, that's what it boils down to. Not that we are trying to -- that the off-road community is not looking to not pay cost recovery because at any particular event, whether it be the King of the Hammer's event, which is a week-long event and if they paid \$5 per rider and the BLM staff time that it takes to manage that event, of course, they need to be able to pay that. But they also need to know what it's going to be and it has to be fair. If they can provide monitoring on their own and that's acceptable, I mean, then that needs to be able to happen as well.

But like for my organization at AMA District 37, we have to be able to know what an event is going to cost before we put it on, because all of our fees are dictated by a rule book. It's not a sliding scale. And we have done -- I should say AMA District 37 has put forth the effort to try to make the events look consistent so the BLM can feel comfortable managing these events or monitoring and providing

public safety.

And on the other side, we need to be able to have that same consistency, I guess is the best word that I can come up with, so we know what we are going to get as well. And I think it's not that we want to audit the BLM's books. I mean, I wouldn't know what I was looking at if they provided it to us. We are just looking for some consistency. So that's really what it boils down to.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Jerry, are there any other comments that you would like to get some advice from?

MR. GRABOW: Not that I -- not yet that I can think of.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: I would like to make a point: The protocol that we have for the subgroups is subgroups come back with their data back to the DAC and the DAC makes that recommendation to the BLM. So -- and I know this is just like you say, a stopping point along the way as an update, just like any of us give our updates for subgroups and give us an idea where you are at. So I would expect the -- obviously you work with the BLM so that you have a good product to come back with, but the product comes back to the DAC for formal presentation to the BLM.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Thank you. Agreed. Meg?

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: So I am uncomfortable with just giving them these four things without a plan. So when they say they want to address cost recovery, what are they going to ask of the BLM and then what data they are going to ask of the BLM when it comes to cost recovery? And how are they going to use that data to ensure consistency? So there is definite lack of a definite plan. What is the plan and which one of these things are you going to do first? And then if it's cost recovery, so the first thing is you get together and you ask what of the BLM? So you obviously are asking something of the BLM and how will you use that data to get consistency between the offices, if that is the end goal?

So this more seems like a blank check than a work plan. I would like to see a detailed work plan that says we want to look at these four things. Well, that's nice, but how would that actually happen?

CHAIRMAN BANIS: That's a very good point. I look at it as if we are in agreement with the end points. And our question is with the process. That I believe is what we rely upon our DAC representative to help carry forward the wishes of the DAC. These comments you are saying about a plan of action for achieving them I think is reasonable and a reasonable

one for our DAC representative to work with the subgroup to see that we have plans for that.

So I am a little less concerned with us setting the process here today and allowing our DAC representatives to work with the subgroup and the BLM to come up with a good process. My concern is mostly with that end destination, that the destination points that we want to be as opposed to the route we are taking.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: They should come back and tell us how they come to this process? Or are we going to allow them to have free reign and do whatever they want? I would like to have them come back with a process for the four things.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: I would like to see the DAC's representative to take your advice very much to heart and to work with that group to ensure that their process involves a plan. I don't know that the DAC wants to see the plan. Maybe I'm wrong. If the DAC wants to see the plan, I'm happy to take that comment. If the DAC's more interested in the destination and the results, I'm happy with that as well.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: My understanding, most of the subgroups are recreation, so I can't really speak to the issue. However, one of the reasons we have

subgroups is so that the DAC doesn't get into a micromanaging situation with these things. We agreed to provide expertise from our subgroups and with the DAC representative on the subgroup.

So my suggestion would be to trust the subgroup representative to be guiding the group and then get back to us with the results. We should leave it up to the group to decide how they should proceed. If we agree with the bullet points, that these are important things, then let's let the subgroup go forward and give us the results of the cost recovery process and what they would recommend. Let's not micromanage. Let's let people do the job we asked them to do.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: The issue is on the table, and I would be happy to -- if you have a motion, let's see if there is a second.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: Let's let Ron go.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Any other comments or questions on this or direction? Ron Johnston, please.

MEMBER JOHNSTON: Being as though I'm going to be involved in this, and I think Tom and I had some brief discussions yesterday about it, I agree with what Dinah is saying. I think the DAC has its hands full enough with numerous other things. And the

purpose of the subgroups is to keep the DAC from dwelling on the micromanagement issues and to be presented with the big picture by the subgroup, who has fleshed it out.

And I think this group seems to have shown they have sufficient expertise and knowledge of the area to be able to bring it to that point. And if people like Tom and I from the DAC can add guidance and overview and possibly temper some of the directions it's going so it winds up being a presentable, understandable, acceptable solution for the DAC to pass or not pass, I think that's really an acceptable motion that I would go for.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Well, I don't know that we need necessarily a motion, but if we have a motion to hit the table, I'm happy to entertain it. No? I think our advice as "no" has been made. If there are no objections then, we can move on.

What I would like to do if it's okay with you, Dick, given that we are getting close to lunch time -- we have about five or six minutes before lunch -- may I save the ISDRA report for right after lunch?

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: I don't need much time.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Do you think this is good?

Then the floor is yours.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: Just to give you an update on the ISDRA, we had a meeting on November 3. We had a really good meeting, I believe. We got updates from the BLM management on visitation at the dunes from the Halloween event. We got updates on the fee program status, the number of permits sold and where we were so far this year to date. We got update status on the medical and legal law enforcement status, so it was very worthwhile.

We got some updates on the partnership process. We have some partnerships with groups down there that are doing rider training, and we got an update on how many children had been trained at the dunes. We also -- we reviewed my fee presentation that I'm going to make later this afternoon. I reviewed that with the DAC subgroup, and they made some suggestions which were incorporated within that.

We finalized with a brainstorming session on issues for the ISDRA's future, kind of a brainstorming session that put together quite a few different ideas of things that could be used to improve the recreation area. Some of them are probably possible and some of them probably aren't possible, but it was a session to put everything out on the table. We had a good

session.

We will schedule another meeting in February. We don't have a date set for that yet, but we will get a date set and try to do something before the next DAC meeting. If anybody has any questions other than that, that's the essence of our meeting.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Questions? Comments?

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: Thank you, Dick.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Terrific. Well then, we do have another few minutes. I would be happy to move into the report from Dumont Dunes subgroup.

The Dumont Dunes subgroup has met once since the last DAC meeting. On October 4 we met, and we have been briefed on new visitor services center, so to speak, up there. I don't want to be say it's an actual visitors center facility, but there is a trailer that has been converted and nicely appropriated and placed in an area that's welcoming to the public and a place for the public to be able to ask some questions, get information while they are there on site as opposed to an earlier arrangement that was more of a law enforcement agency encampment that was less approachable or deemed less approachable by some of the visitors. So this is going to be more warm and welcoming, and it's already in place and

being well used, I'm sure.

Another item we had continuing updates on is a fencing project. And I keep reporting on the project of installing the fences, but it's a long project. It's several miles of fence and this is focused fencing. This isn't perimeter fencing or wrapping around or long, Nine Mile Straight Line fence or anything like that. This is targeted fencing at specific points where we are experiencing noncompliance with users who seem to want to explore the wilderness areas and off route areas on their vehicles. So the fencing will help with that, particularly in the Salt Creek ACEC area and the TNT railroad.

The big issue along TNT is that the fencing will be outside the railroad so that that route remains an open and viable pathway for motorized use. And we worked with the BLM to reach that accommodation. And I'm a regular visitor to the Salt Creek ACEC rest stop adjacent to Dumont Dunes. And I visited there again on the way to the Amargosa Wild and Scenic River scoping session. And I took about half an hour walk around that area. And it was my very first visit there that I have not seen any active OHV trespass tracks. I visited that site in excess of

a dozen times in the past half dozen years. And this is the first time it's been as clean as it is. So I think some of that is working.

I think that's about all we had immediately on our plate, other than we still wish to assist the agency in a realignment of the fee schedule to simplify the fees and perhaps even implement the possibility of a second pass that goes with your annual pass. Because Dumont Dunes, the visitors -- the families tend to come out sometimes in separate vehicles. They don't all go out at once. Some of the family gets out there a day or so in advance to set up the camp and get things going. And the rest of the family arrives in a second vehicle. And at this time the way the rules are, you would need a pass for each one of those vehicles coming in. So the option for a second vehicle pass to help keep the families together and friends to enjoy their camp sites I think would be a plus.

So thank you. I guess that's all I have to report on the Dumont Dunes subgroup. Comment? Questions? Given that, we were back on schedule. Are we? I have three public comments. Shall we take the three comments and break for lunch? I'm going to call them in this order. Kim Campbell, Ed Waldheim, and

John Stewart.

MS. CAMPBELL ERB: Okay. Kim Campbell Erb, now. I'm going to comment on a couple of things. One of them is the National Landscape Conservation System discussion. I agree with Dinah completely. Minerals are one of the things that must be considered as a valuable resource. Minerals are both resource and a source of recreation. And as a rock hound, and I do represent rock hounds, the fact that they were located on current conservation land or proposed conservation lands doesn't make them any less valuable either as a mineral resource or as a recreational resource.

And I don't believe that mineral collection is inconsistent with conservation. And route closures deny access to the elderly and the handicapped, and many rock hounds are elderly and handicapped. And closing routes or denying mineral collection is a significant problem for rock hounds.

Regarding the SRP subgroup, I really wanted to go to all the meetings, but I don't think there has been a public meeting since September. And I am disappointed that I haven't been able to participate. There aren't meetings that allow public participation, and I do want to be able to participate in that process.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Congratulations, Jay.

MS. CAMPBELL ERB: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Ed Waldheim. Comments on the subgroups reports?

MR. WALDHEIM: I want to put in a little push for the Piedras Blancas. If you have never gone and seen that lighthouse, please go and see it. It's an incredible program that he has over there. It's a conservation program. I also appreciated Mark letting us go on some of the land conservation area trails, and we need to make sure we keep our accesses open.

I'm looking at the Amargosa River. That's very important for us out at Dumont. The last thing on the permits, I would highly encourage that the agency, especially the three field offices that issue permits or four of them, that the field managers get together with the subgroup and make sure that they come with a fee standard process. Right now I can go to different field office with a different story and different way they treat me. It's all over the place. Now we have one place is a bad office to work with and the other one is a good one. And then it changes around. What was good is now bad. So there is no reason for that kind of disparity. A fee is a fee is a fee. So let's make sure it's consistent so the

folks like Jerry Grabow, whatever he puts on, that he can expect the same thing. And that includes a cost recovery portion. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Thank you, Ed. John Stewart, followed by Jim Bramham.

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

This issue about the fees has been hanging around for a long time. After the last DAC meeting what I can see is the promises that were put on some time schedules from the last DAC meeting do not appear to be met. And like Ms. Campbell indicated, there has not been a public meeting of that SRP subgroup, and yet I hear that there was a special focus group of non-subgroup members held in SEMA. And now we have something for competitive.

But what about the noncompetitive? Somewhere along the lines here this process seems to be off track and running behind schedule and needs to have something to move it along and actually bring it up so it's now addressing the real core issues to what is going to happen with the fee process. Coming up with a standard process, coming up with something that's workable, coming up with something that addresses the special needs of the competitive side and also

addresses the needs of the noncompetitive, nonspectator events.

Right now you are putting on -- just essentially lumping noncompetitive, nonspectator events in with the same requirements with competitive events, which is wrong. It's a bad way to treat the casual recreation users out there, putting an undue load on them.

I would like to take a quick moment to express -- to make comments on the National Conservation Land System and find there are some discrepancies on the information provided and what was said. It looks like you are still going to be identifying lands not in the system to bring into the system, which are using your partners to identify adjoining lands which -- how are you putting that in with the legislation if partners are actually identifying the adjoining lands to bring into the system? There seems to be a disconnect in there.

Multiple use or conservation? Your conservation strategy is emphasis on conservation. Compatible uses -- well, grazing. You left out recreation. Major component of recreation is the motorized recreation. You have developed a strategic plan, with partners. Have motorized recreation been

invited to the table to discuss it? From all I can find and see is, no, they have not been. That has been land acquisition partners that is taking more land out of recreation opportunity. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Thank you, John, for your comment. Hi, Jim. Welcome to the mike.

MR. BRANHAM: Jim Branham, California Association of Four-Wheel Drive clubs, as well.

First I want to go to the NLCS portion of this. I got a call from Carl Roundtree in Washington, D.C. Based on some pushback, they felt on the national level from some nationally circulated publications and some blog issues about this and how unfriendly and how uncooperative this system had been to motorized groups and motorized access.

And so he asked that I would try to figure out a way to try to integrate some more comments or ways to reach out to the OHV public. And I actually told him that one of the things I would be doing is coming to this meeting to go on the tour yesterday, which I greatly appreciated, recognizing that a majority of it was motorized. So along the coast to gain access, which is basically one of the concerns that the motorized community that recreates on or adjacent or within or adjacent within these NLCS

areas.

So I started reading and looking at the blogs on the Internet that Carl pointed out to me. And truly, I think where the rub comes is that folks in that arena have identified that as many of these areas were discussed, the values that were created, that created them into the system that caused them to be put into the system not only devalued, but in many.

Ways dismissed the very things that were important to the motorized community, whether it's high use areas or very dispersed recreation.

So not only that, but as they became part of the system, it feels as though to these folks in the blogs that there is basically a cancer that grows from that, that suddenly that feeling or desire for land use goes to areas that were not in the system or for the next area that we looked at, those values again become the dominant value rather than the ones currently used in those areas. So as Teri alluded, how the conversation moves forward on this I think is very important to the partnership.

And to John's point, there is a very fine line between the bureau constantly telling motorized recreation that they can't lobby for us or on our behalf, yet set up a system by which they try to find

partners that will indeed lobby for them for a greater system. So concerned about that. So can I have three minutes on the subgroups?

CHAIRMAN BANIS: We have another comment period coming up. I think everyone really wants to grab a quick bite. We will get up in the afternoon again. Any other comments or questions before lunch? Hearing, seeing none, there is a one hour, 15 minute allocation for lunch and back here prior to 1:30.

(Lunch recess taken from 12:10 p.m. to 1:26 p.m.)

DIRECTOR RAML: DAC members and gathered folks, we are going to call the afternoon session to order.

It's going to be my great pleasure, before Jim Kenna leaves us, I would like him to participate in a little bit of recognition to our outgoing DAC members. And I had a lot of remarks I need to prepare, but I don't think I have to say quite as much because of the way Jim led and closed the remarks, and he was very articulate in terms of the importance of it.

But I do want to read a little bit of the letter we read to each of you and so you know. So I'm going to read your letter first.

(Reading) So accept my sincere appreciation

for your dedicated service to the CDD from 2006 to 2011. The Bureau of Land Management always has and will continue to take great pride in the very close partnership and most importantly, the friendship we enjoy with the DAC. Your willingness to attend meetings on weekends, take time away from work and your family has enabled us to discuss and work through some very critical issues. Your valuable insights have and will continue to carry great influence in how we manage our public lands throughout Southern California for years to come.

Renewable energy, military base extension, recreation, border issues are just a few of the many items that have our staff extremely busy and in the national spotlight, which in turn has made you extremely busy and has brought increased attention to the DAC and your work. We have seen the DAC evolve over the past few years into a very vital and dynamic group that enjoys increased respect from both the staff and the public alike. During your term as chairman, you did an amazing job of keeping our meetings orderly and running smoothly and efficiently, and I think your leadership and several conversations you and I had have helped lead us to the point we are now at with the DAC.

I hope we will see you again. I enjoy that little exchange, but I hope you know you are always welcome, the friends of BLM. Start with Tom. And for those of you that weren't chairman, Jennifer, we have a wonderful gift for you and we will hand this out and have a quick photo opportunity.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: She has plastic gloves on!

(Applause from the audience.)

MEMBER ACUNA: Teri, can I just say thank you. It's been my sincere -- I'm very sincere when I say this, it's really been honor to be part of the DAC. We all have families. When is the last time you saw your cousin? Two years ago? For me, I have gotten to see all of you on a quarterly basis. I see you more than my family. People in the audience, BLM staff, and it's hard after six years not to create some strong feelings for you all. This has been a special part of my life. I have enjoyed working with the BLM. You are wonderful people, and I think any professional in the land use business should get the opportunity to work as closely with a great organization like the BLM and DAC. And thank you for putting up with me. Many times I would choke, but thank you for being patient with me. I greatly

enjoyed this and I encourage the DAC to continue enjoying this group and what it does. So my gratitude to you all. Thank you.

(Applause from the audience.)

DIRECTOR RAML: These are recognitions for you as you end your term. These are not, so don't jump to any conclusions with what is happening with the rest of you. So Dick Holliday, here is yours.

(Applause from the audience.)

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: Dick is up for reappointment.

DIRECTOR RAML: Yes. Supervisor Brad Mitzelfelt.

(Applause from the audience.)

DIRECTOR RAML: Then this is Lloyd Gunn. Thank you, Lloyd.

(Applause from the audience.)

DIRECTOR RAML: So Jennifer has the boxes and I think each of you get the glove too.

MS. WOLGEMUTH: We didn't clap for Tom Hallenbeck. We need to clap for him too.

(Applause from the audience.)

DIRECTOR RAML: Actually, I have to say our fingerprints are all over these awards, from the bottom of our hearts but not literally, so what we are

going to do real quick, we will do a quick photo op and start the meeting.

STATE DIRECTOR KENNA: I'm not going to spend a lot of time making speeches here. I really do think public service at the present time, perhaps it's an under-rated thing. But it's a really noble thing, and for people that as citizens step in to a public service role has to be commended. So thank you.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Thank you. Ladies and gentlemen, DAC members, we will move on to the first item of business this afternoon, the user fee discussion. This is a closeout of discussions that began at the last meeting, and we have for you a Power Point -- some slides to view. I'm going to turn the agenda over to Dick Holliday to make the presentation.

At the last meeting we opened up discussions on user fees. Dick Holliday worked ahead of that meeting and put together a long list of possible recommendations and topics for discussion. At the last meeting we heard those, we talked a little bit about it, and since then we have had the opportunity to discuss it even more among ourselves and with Dick. Dick made a few calls, and Dick has somewhat refined the presentation, and I'm turning the floor over to Dick now.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: We went through and talked to the DAC subgroups, different users. So this first line here is just to give everybody a little update on the program.

BLM fees are authorized by the Federal Lands Enhancement Act, and there are certain fees that the BLM is allowed to collect. Amenities: Expanded amenity fees and special recreation permits. They were prohibited from charging entrance fees and there were certain requirements that the law and the BLM generated for exercising that. We went through this -- this was one of the topics that was set up for this year, and we went through and asked for public comment. And we received comment from individuals. We received comments from recreational organizations, and we received comments from the DAC subgroups.

What I did is I looked through all these comments, and there were a lot of specific issues. But I looked through the common comments, if you will, and most of the people wanted to see more public participation in the generation of the fees, changing of the existing fees, design and investment of the fee income. And also looked at increasing accountability for the fee revenues so the public is available to know where their fees went.

There were two other issues that came up quite extensively was a second vehicle permit and a single day permit. The second -- the second vehicle permit is addressing some of the issues where people buy yearly permits and they may come into the recreation area early and the family may come later with other vehicles. They have to buy another yearly permit. And some areas around the country do have a second vehicle permit where it's maybe a family, as Ron said at lunch, kind of a family entrance fee and you may have the second vehicle would be tied to the first vehicle. So that's one of the issues that came up.

So the district manager asked us to have three specific things that she asked for. One thing was what is working and what needs improvement for BLM users and fee programs in the California desert. So what is working?

Well, currently fee compliance is high. At the ISDRA, we are in the 90 percent criteria. They go through and do spot checks and find out how many people really have permits and purchased them, and we are in a high compliance.

General public satisfaction with recreation fees. Some people don't like them, but the general

feeling is they need to participate in the funding of their recreation areas, and there is general public acceptance of the user fees.

General public satisfaction with the recreation areas. BLM does some satisfaction studies, and there have been additional studies done by some third-party people, and the general satisfaction with the BLM's areas is satisfactory.

Most people are happy with the user fees as long as the fees are used in their area. And that's what the Federal Lands and Recreation Enhancement Act specifies that the fees are used in the area where they are collected.

What needs improvement? There are things we can do to improve the program. One is to make sure that the public is totally involved in the fee design and the fee investment. And those terminologies, design and investment were a part of the Recreation Act. We want to reduce the cost of fee collection.

Fee collection, at least at ISDRA, 30 percent of the fees are used to collect fees. They collect \$3 million and they spend a million dollars to collect them, which is not a good ratio.

Improved public announcement when fee change is required. We need to have a better system of

getting the public involved and notified that these are going to be happening.

Better public notice of how and where the fee dollars are spent. There is a great misunderstanding of how much it costs to operate these recreation areas. People will say, Jeez, how much can it cost to dump the bathrooms and take out the trash and take a little sand off the road? They don't understand the cost associated with operating the recreation area. We need to get that information out to the public so they are more satisfied with the fees they are paying, knowing where their fees are going.

We need better accountability for expenditures, where the fees are going, how much is coming from fees and how much is coming from appropriation. We get grant dollars, if they are partnership money being utilized in the recreation area. We would like better accountability for where those fees are coming from and where they are going.

One of the other questions was -- she asked was what feedback does the DAC have on the current fee schedules and any proposed changes. The current fee schedules, the general public I have talked to and the comments are that the current services provided are adequate for the current fee schedules. What we are

getting for what we are paying is adequate or more than adequate.

Additional fee schedules for daily use is needed at some locations. Right now the only two fees in most of these areas are a weekly fee and a yearly fee. So if you come for the weekend, you come for one day, you are paying the weekly fee if you don't buy a yearly permit.

Additional fee for a second vehicle is desired at some locations, and those two locations are primarily Dumont and the ISDRA. And again, we explained that a lot of times a family can't all come at the same time and the second vehicle may be used to bring them to the recreation area. And this permit -- they are really buying -- they are not buying a camping permit. They are buying a recreation permit for motorized recreation on public land. And just because they come in another vehicle, it's really not appropriate to charge them again, although the way the BLM collects the fees is they collect it from every vehicle that comes to the area. So if there were a second vehicle permit, that would help many families.

And there is an excessive amount spent on fee collection. The last time I asked for some of the information, it hasn't been provided from the BLM on

how much fee costs are spent at the other locations. We don't really have that kind of information. It hasn't been provided to us, but I know from my personal experience and the data I get from the Imperial Sand Dunes, 30 percent is spent on fee collection.

Feedback on -- this was another question. Feedback on the DAC about current fee schedules. Well, I only know of two proposed fee schedules. One is Dumont Dunes, and that change is reasonable. What it's done is public comment period. There is a planned fee for Sawtooth Campground that they were explained last time we visited Sawtooth campground at the last meeting. And it looked like that was a reasonable approach. I don't know of any other -- no other fee recommendations have been given to us that I know of.

So what suggestions can the BLM communicate to administer fees more effectively? I have generated five recommendations for the DAC to provide to the BLM. These will be recommendations from the DAC, and we can discuss them and decide whether you want to vote for them or not. You have a copy in your packet in printed form.

The first one is kind of a three-part series

and this is -- we were talking at lunch today. Most of this data has been provided to us. At the ISDRA, this data was provided to us at our last meeting. And so the reason I put these in here is I would like us to have a record of what the DAC would like to see provided so that in the future, if we have different managers, different people managing the area that there is a record of what we asked for and it's in the record.

So we would like to see a yearly public reporting for the recreation areas, the type, the number of permits sold, the fee received, the percentage of each type of permit sold. If we have a family permit, a weekly or yearly permit. What is the percentage? Let's see how it's working.

Gross revenue, projects completed with the user fees. What projects were completed using the fees so the public knows where their money is really going. And projects that are being scheduled for future years. These are actually -- each one of these things is actually coming out of the law practically. The projects completed and the user fees and the projects are all in the law. Those are things that were specified in the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act.

The second part of the first recommendation would be to generate a yearly reporting format for the recreation areas, and that would be what the fee revenue was used for at the recreation areas. And again, we are looking at some broad categories so we get an idea of where these fees have gone. How much was spent on law enforcement. How much was spent on administrative and overhead and fee management, maintenance, visitor services. And we actually have on line at ISDRA, we have these things broken down. And at the bottom of the Web page, it explains what is in each one of these categories so the public can see what is there.

So we have that already done at Imperial Sand Dunes, and I have been told it's not very time-consuming to provide this level of information, just a few hours. And the BLM gets, as part of that administrative and overhead, they can get up to 15 percent of the fees in order to manage the fee program. So there is ample -- I don't know about the personnel, but there is ample money available.

The third part of this first recommendation would be to also show a yearly budget and show what went into forming that budget. Some of that money came from fees, appropriated funds, and OHMVR program,

Greensticker fund, and some of that money came from partnerships. Again, giving transparency to know what it costs to operate the recreation area. And we can put that into a budget thing showing where that money is coming from, how much it takes to manage that recreation area.

Second recommendation: We want to again put this down as a DAC directive, if you will, to use the DAC subgroups and friends groups for this general public communication of issues. Operational information, plan changes that would affect the recreation areas. For instance, plan changes if there is a fencing project or going to be construction in the area, something to get that out to the public. And these are conduits to the public. This isn't the only conduit to the public, but it's one of the conduits. Any increased public participation on fee issues -- again, when there is new fees, changes proposed and investments and yearly accounting statements should be communicated through the DAC subgroups.

This one here, Advisory 3, this one here was associated with the approval for fees. And currently there is a group called R-RAC, the recreational -- R-RAC is Recreational Resource Advisory Council. And

that's actually a Forest Service entity in Northern California. It's in Sacramento, I believe. And they are the ones that are set up to approve fees in the CDD. This particular organization hasn't had a meeting since June of 2010. I talked to one of the members, the recreation members last week, and he said they are thinking about having a meeting in the first quarter of next year. But the issue becomes, if we need a fee increase in the CDD for whatever reason, to manage our lands here, it's very difficult. It has to be approved by some entity. And that entity is the R-RAC, and it currently is not very functional. It may be functional or may not.

So one of the suggestions here would be for the DAC to recommend those fees or review those fees. There has been some reluctance to do that from different DAC members, but there needs to be some organizational structure that reviews those from a public standpoint. One issue, kind of interesting, is that a DAC is really a RAC and RACs are in all states and these R-RACs have overriding level in all states. And in Colorado recently, the BLM took over the review of the fees from the R-RAC just so that they would have more control over their individual areas.

So this is kind of -- this may be a moot

point if the R-RAC is reconstituted and available on a timely basis to approve fees. Then it may not be necessary for the DAC to do it. But it seems logical for the area the size of the desert that some more local control is available for the review, public review of these fees. So this is kind of an optional thing when we get looking at whether we want to do these or not, we can have some discussion on this one.

The fourth recommendation would be to request CDD investigate implementation of a second vehicle permit. And I would like them to utilize the Dumont and ISDRA subgroups in this process and bring a report to the DAC for review by the second DAC meeting of 2012. I would like to have this available for the 2012 and 2013 season, if the BLM can do that. The people on the Dumont Dunes subgroup have some good ideas of how to get this going, and it doesn't seem like it would be overly complex to do that. They could have a tear-off on the bottom of a permit and have a family two-vehicle permit or a family permit or something of that nature. But this would be something that would be very helpful to a certain group of the recreational people. It's not everybody, but some.

My last recommendation is to reduce the cost of fee collection before asking for any additional fee

increases. If we were using 30 percent of the fees to collect a fee, we need to figure out a better way to do it. If you were giving to a charity and found out that 30 percent of their money or more was being spent to collect those fees, you wouldn't be so happy to give your money to that charity. And not that we are a charity, but it doesn't seem to be a reasonable amount to spend.

There will be different values for different areas because different areas are easier or harder to manage. ISDRA is much more difficult to manage because it's a larger area and has more entrances than Dumont Dunes or El Mirage that have single entries. So those are my responses from people that we received from our last meeting. And I will let Randy go through, and we can talk about these recommendations.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Thank you, Dick. Thanks for that presentation. I would encourage our DAC members to peruse the packet and pull this piece if you haven't already. And we may end up bringing out our pens and pencils on this, as well, at some point. So to get the discussion started, Dick, do I understand you would like to move recommendation number one? That's in three parts.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Any second?

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: Now I have to see so I need to find my copy --

MEMBER MITZELFELT: Second.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: We have a second by Brad, and it's a packet that starts with a cover letter. And it has some subsequent pages, perhaps.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: Found it. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Recommendation one. Okay. And I appreciate Dick having put all this together before the holiday and distributed it all to everybody so we have had plenty of time. And I also thank the folks who submitted some comments to Dick, as well. I believe you received some from Tom and from Alex. Tom Hallenbeck. Any comments, questions?

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: These three parts are on page --

CHAIRMAN BANIS: That's considered Recommendation 1.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Can I make a comment?

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Yes.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: This first recommendation I think I wholly support. I wouldn't exclude anything. But it seems to be more of a housekeeping thing. This is the kind of data that the BLM should already have,

so I think it's just a matter of getting it together that can be sent out to the DAC members in a reasonable way, like a PDF. I don't have any heartburn over this.

MEMBER JOHNSTON: This may not be a reasonable suggestion, Dick, but it might make it easier and more readable by the vast majority of people who see it if instead of having columns and columns on an Excel spreadsheet to represent these areas or things, if they were broken down with colored pie chart that you are looking for as a percentage of the whole. Might just make it more readable by all the people who are going to be exposed to it.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: That's actually how it's set up on the Web page. The ISDRA Web page has some pie charts like this on it, and I'm not concerned greatly with the format as long as the data is available. We have had different formats for this data. I would think that one of the things that is more concerning to me is consistency. If we have a chart like this that shows the percentages, which is fine. My primarily goal here is to get these kind of in the record and have consistency across the different areas. So, yeah, that's fine. The format that the BLM would like to provide that data in is not

an issue.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Tom Hallenbeck.

MEMBER HALLENBECK: First, would you consider modifying your motion to break it into three pieces. Tackle each one at a time because I'm going to have trouble with the whole package. The motion I'm suggesting would be modified to be dealing with the first section of recommendation, 1-A and 1-B and 1-C. That's okay with the maker of the motion?

CHAIRMAN BANIS: In order for us to receive public comment on this prior to our vote, I'm going to move -- I'm going to take motions and seconds and discussion on each of these piece by piece, then we will hear from the public and then we will take our votes after that, having heard the public comment. So what we have here now is we have are engaged in discussions on recommendation No. 1 and we have agreed we will be taking three separate votes. Is there additional discussion?

MEMBER HALLENBECK: Yes. It seems like bullets are a little bit repetitive. Can you tell me the difference between "total received" and "gross revenue"? The second and fourth bullets appear to be essentially the same information. Gross revenue is usually our totals.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: Yeah, you are correct.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Which one would you like to strike?

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: Strike the gross.

MEMBER HALLENBECK: This information has been provided. This idea is just to give them a standardized format so it's presented the same way and you don't care -- it has to include at least these, but the specifics of that -- because this is a good community for the BLM to tell a good story to that they are completing projects. I think it's a good opportunity for them to tell a story. And they need to have a flexibility to tell it each year in a way that makes sense to them and still provides the same essential information, and that's my only comments to 1-A. Do we want to talk about all three or just 1-A, B and C?

MEMBER MITZELFELT: On all of these, some of the information can be broken down, again, simply on charts that I would think that if it was distributed with the permits when people buy them, that's going to help get the word broken out. But that's going to get to the people who are paying it and I think generate -- when they see what they are paying for, it generates support and more business. So I don't know

if that was discussed, but that's kind of a thought I have.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: That's one of the reasons we now put this on the Web site, something like this. And, yeah, if BLM wanted to hand that out or have that be part of the package, that's fine with me. I don't want to dictate that that's done by the contractor or by the BLM or whoever does that, but it just makes sense to get as much information as you can to the users.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Very good. Tom, still have the floor. No. 2 on B, anything? Or C?

MEMBER HALLENBECK: 1-B, I would be reluctant at this point -- I'm not understanding the need for the information in this kind of format. I don't want to tie the hand of the BLM in the way they distribute the money unless there are legal requirements, in which case they are going to follow the law if it's a legal requirement. Why is it necessary to have them report back on these expenditures in part 1-B and 1-C, too, I guess. What are you getting at in terms of asking for this information to be broken down further into these areas?

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: It just shows where the

visitors' money goes, whether to maintenance, overhead, law enforcement. When you pay your fee, you would like to know where that money is going. And the only thing I'm asking BLM to give us is just a breakdown on these basic classes here. And from what I understand with their accounting system, it is not overly troubling for them to do this. In fact, this data I understand took a couple hours to generate and generate this slide. So from the standpoint of time and effort, it's not that great and it gives -- if I go out to the dunes if someone says where does my money go, I can show them this breakdown here.

MEMBER HALLENBECK: Isn't there a category for projects? If 1-A says there are projects completed, should projects --

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: Projects are in those visitor services, maybe a road. The visitor services proves that they were out there maintaining the roads or they do a new project or camping pad in or they put in a new rest room, those are included in that visitor services. And I don't want them to break those down so finely in this format, but they can come through and give us a breakdown of what they have completed this year with those fees if there was a project, per se, other than just normal visitor service.

MEMBER HALLENBECK: Okay. Thank you. And the third one is getting away from the discussion on the fees and talking more overall on revenue streams. Is it connected to this topic?

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: This goes back to how much it takes to manage the recreation area in total. The cost to manage the recreation area comes from many sources. It comes from essentially these five sources. It comes -- well, they have expenditures, they have fee expenditures, they have appropriated funds, OHMVR and (unintelligible). I guess the first one should be appropriated dollars rather than expenditures. I assume that one should have been appropriated expenditures or dollars rather than fees. And the next one would be fee expenditures -- I do have appropriated funds there.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: So shall we strike that first one? Striking the first one on 1-C. Continue.

MEMBER HALLENBECK: I will give the floor.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Any other speakers on this motion? Hearing and seeing none, I would like to table the vote until we hear from public comment. Shall we move to No. 2? We have a motion from Dick. Do I have a second to put this on the table?

MEMBER JOHNSTON: Second.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Second from Ron Johnston.
Are there any comments or questions?

MEMBER HALLENBECK: Well, I was at a meeting here some meetings ago when we were schooled as to the use of subgroups and RACs and technical committees. And I'm not sure that the subgroups were the appropriate one for these issues. For the first issue, the general public communication, subgroups should be formed for specific purpose and charge them with it, and when they are done, they go away. I am looking for clarification from BLM staff on that. And the second issue, that seems like a good specific topic for a subgroup to tackle. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: I think the DAC considers the Dumont Dunes and the ISDRA as a subgroup, as a standing committee. And it has not been assigned a termination. This SRP subgroup did have a task with the conclusion at the end. If it's not the will of the DAC to have these be standing committees is another issue, but the floor is open for discussion.

MEMBER HALLENBECK: Would it be inappropriate to name it Friends of Dumont Dunes or Friends of Imperial Sand Dunes?

CHAIRMAN BANIS: If I were to give a quick devil's advocate answer back, it would be a FACA

requirement that a Friends' group is not in an advisory capacity, whereas a subgroup is an advisory to the DAC and can advise the bureau. I'm just going to speak for Dick that this subgroup and Friends' group in the sense that if it's a subgroup, the subgroup would have a crack at it. If there is no subgroup and it was a Friends' group there instead, they would have a crack at it.

MEMBER HALLENBECK: The point is we are not asking the subgroup to give us a recommendation. We were asking the subgroup to do the communication. So I'm not comfortable with that. The second issue, I can't really read too much into it. If they are going to provide the DAC so we can provide the BLM advice on increased public participation, that would be appropriate, but not to directly do it on their own as a line function.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Do we have some opinions on the Council?

MEMBER JOHNSTON: I would agree with that.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: I guess I'm confused. It seems like this is already what the subgroups do. Am I confused? Don't we give all this -- isn't that the function of the subgroups already? It's true, correct, all these things do happen through the

subgroups already; correct? The point in the motion is that you just want to get it on the record that that happens because this doesn't seem like anything that we don't already do. We already do all this.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: From a point of order answer, I would refer Council members to the mission statements that it approved for the Dumont Dunes and ISDRA subgroups in -- boy, a long time ago. But we have those documents. They are available on the DAC Web page. If folks would like to take a peek, I'm more than happy to pass around my tablet to take a look at it. They are one page for each.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: It's already what happens, so I don't have any problem with any of it. If Dick wants to get it on the record, I'm perfectly okay on it.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: May I make a comment?

CHAIRMAN BANIS: It's yours.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Is that a yes?

I agree with Meg. I'm not really -- since I'm not in a subgroup and I'm not in that world, I don't really know. But I'm assuming that the subgroup in all their meetings and attendees do essentially provide public communication on what is happening and they get feedback, too, which you feed to the DAC. So

they are already doing it.

But what I am thinking is perhaps maybe what Dick means -- and I think following up with something that Brad said, too -- was maybe there is some specifics that can be used by the BLM to follow up with maybe what Brad said. This would be a great press release at the beginning of the season saying increased fees mean more projects for Dumont Dunes. Just like a little one-page thing that could be fed in so that subgroups could help generate information that the BLM could use to publicize the use of the Dumont Dunes and fees collected and the projects. And that would emphasize a sort of the self-sustaining kind of situation which is kind of what people want these days.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Before I turn to the floor to Tom, would the DAC like to hear the five bullet points of the mission of one of our subgroups?

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: This is the bullet points.

No. 1, advice regarding long-range planning and resource management priorities, which may include the review of broad categories of allocations or expenditures of funds.

No. 2, discussions and recommendations

concerning potential infrastructure projects and significant operational changes.

No. 3, review of season's activity and identification of key issues, concerns, and potential approaches to address them.

No. 4, discussion and advice about current and planned law enforcement activity, medical responses, maintenance activities, status and results of any environmental monitoring activities, and noncommercial special recreation permit fees. And last, communication of accurate and useful information between BLM and its interested constituencies and the public about the area and its management.

Hearing that, Mr. Hallenbeck --

MEMBER HALLENBECK: Well, whatever the BLM wants. And I'm all confused trying to get it straight here between what about what the subgroup does and how that fits in. If the BLM desires general publication, which they should, they are doing a good thing. I'm not quibbling about that, but does it have to be under the auspices of the DAC? Why can't they do it directly under the auspices of the BLM and why go through us?

CHAIRMAN BANIS: I'm sorry. Just one moment.
A point of information: I appreciate this modest

confusion over the structures and so forth. And that's what is leading us to recommend that we designate one of our meetings next year to deal with subgroup issues directly where I think we would relearn our subgroups and reassess our subgroup issues and take that bull on by the horns.

Unfortunately, we are going to discuss this work plan as the next item of the agenda. But I think that dovetails into a further discussion by the DAC on the bigger issue relative to its subgroup. So we may have another opportunity to kick at this again.

Further discussion? We do have a motion that's made and seconded. Is there more discussion?

MEMBER JOHNSTON: Just to clarify -- and I think I know where Tom is going on this -- and that's what I see too. It's a matter of the word "general public communication," I think are those words. I think as to who the body is who officially is making the statement regarding the gathering of all the input and the decision as to how the BLM is going to administer the areas that the subgroup is responsible for should -- I think what he is saying and what I am agreeing with, should come from the BLM, not from a subgroup making press releases on their own and being a vigilante force out there that's making

recommendations to the public as a broad communication.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Let me suggest our topic today is user fees. In this particular recommendation No. 2, the second major bullet seems to be very direct to the user fees. The first bullet seems to encompass not just user fees, but even greater issues. The fact we hope to have, with the consent of the DAC, a meeting on subgroups in April, perhaps this first item about the general public communication is something that might be better discussed in a more broader context of subgroup discussions.

So I would just simply offer for the DAC's consideration a possible amendment to strike from consideration at this time that first major bullet and leave the second major bullet under recommendation 2.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Do we need to say something? I recommend, then, we present that exactly as Randy stated just now: Leave off the first bullet and use for DAC recommendation two the second bullet on this recommendation and go forward.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Is that okay to the maker and seconder? I see nods from both. If there is no further discussion, we will receive public comments shortly. We will move to recommendation number 3.

Dick, I assume you are making a motion on 3.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: I want to hear his motion because I have a say on this one.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: That's No. 3?

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: This means we would have the say in it, not the R-RAC; correct? Is that -- I feel strongly, yes, that that should be the case. So, yes, I second.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: We have a motion and a second from Meg, discussion. Tom, followed by Meg.

MEMBER HALLENBECK: I feel strongly that this is way outside our role. We were not an oversight body.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: The R-RAC is essentially a body, just like us, managed by the Forest Service, and they are people not in touch on what happens on the lands down here. So I don't even understand why that process wouldn't run through a group of people that are appointed like we are to an area that they are not in touch with what happens here. So I like the way they did it in Colorado, and I think we should do it here. We should be in charge of our own fees and make sure that happens in an equitable manner. And this is where people need to give testimony on the issues that come up. In Glamis fees might change and

in Dumont Dunes also. And why should the people have to go to talk to an R-RAC up in Sacramento or in Central California that don't even understand our issues or areas. Local control over local fees.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: What I am hearing may be an issue of philosophical or an issue over local decision versus a nonlocal decision. I also hear an issue that is -- this group is not active; what do we do in the event it is not active? I see two things here.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: I don't care if they are active or not. They shouldn't have say over what happens in an area we are familiar with and they are not.

MEMBER HALLENBECK: It's the Desert Advisory Council. We can provide advice, but once you step into the oversight role, it's a whole different ball game. You have different responsibilities here. You have a different level of care to take. I'm not prepared to take that on, and I don't think that's appropriate for this group. We are here to provide the BLM manager advice.

MEMBER MITZELFELT: It may come down to wording. If we called it receive public input and communicate public input rather than using the word "oversight," then I think we would accomplish what we

are looking for.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: I mean, the R-RAC is an Advisory Council just like we are. "Oversight" happens to be the term that Dick used. They are the same type of Council that we are to give BLM advice. To give the federal agencies advice.

MR. RAZO: I do need to add this. The charters are being rewritten right now for the RACs across the country. There is going to be language regarding this in the charter, so we don't know what it's going to say. But there is talk that it will state that if there is an R-RAC in the state, whether it's functional or not, it's got to go through the R-RAC. And it's going to be the R-RAC's decision to decide whether it does get put down at the local DAC level. That's still coming. So despite what Colorado did and other states did, there is charter rewriting going on right now because they are due for their next round. And that subject matter as I understand it is going to be part of the charter language.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: I have Tom and then Dinah. That's Tom Acuna.

MEMBER ACUNA: Steve, I think you got where we were going. It's important to get BLM's opinion and the latest information from your perspective. You

announce they are rewriting things and that it might facilitate what we are talking about here to have an idea when that might occur. Do you have an idea when that might occur?

MR. RAZO: We are hoping by the end of the year, but we are not sure.

MEMBER ACUNA: It seems like we could defer this item until the next meeting, and hopefully there will be some conclusion on this.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: I'm seeing a nod from the maker of the motion, a desire to withdraw the motion?

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: Yeah. I think if there is a concern about the charter and the charters are going to be amended, then let's just wait. This issue -- my point in having this issue is to try to be prepared for fee changes that may be coming down the pike and make it easier to get those done.

MEMBER MITZELFELT: But if we do that, then we are not telling the Designated Federal Official what our preference is. And our preference is to receive it locally. And so we are just assuming that they were not going to seek your input on the charters, I think, if we withdraw it.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Thank you. Now that we are back on, Dinah and then Meg.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: I have a question for Teri or Steve. And Meg, you might be able to answer this.

My understanding is there is an R-RAC in California. And the R-RAC, only on this issue, just the fee issue, has to approve or has to make a recommendation to Teri about how to proceed with fee increases. I mean, it has to be approved by them. But aren't they an Advisory Council, as well?

DIRECTOR RAML: Yes.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: So my specific question is, If they are an Advisory Council and they can't really tell Teri, just advise, then why can't we advise Teri at our level? And if the R-RAC doesn't like it, then fine, the R-RAC doesn't like it. But we have already made our advice. I mean, we are an Advisory Council.

DIRECTOR RAML: The role of the R-RAC in fee increases, or according to FLREA, is more than advisory. It's approval or disapproval. And the other thing is that I was in Arizona when the Arizona BLM RAC took on the R-RAC responsibilities for Arizona. And if you were to pass this -- we have a couple things in play. One is the revision of the charter, and the other is if you pass this motion, when you make that recommendation to me, I would bring someone from Arizona over to talk to you about it

because you need to make that decision informed, because the amount of work that it takes to be the deliberative body on whether we increase or decrease fees, certainly, there are some R-RAC members that have very keen interest in that and maybe there are some that don't, but you need to be prepared about the time commitment obligation before you come to closure on that.

Because I would not want you to make that decision with just the idea that those decisions are being made in Sacramento by people who don't know their business. It may be totally appropriate, but I would like you to have that information before you took that vote.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: I think we should consider that advice.

MEMBER HALLENBECK: Has the language been changed? Are we still talking oversight or advisory now, because there is a big distinction there.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: The maker and seconder of the motion, let me ask this: Instead of the public oversight, instead, the public input? Receive and communicate public input. Is that okay for a motion, at least moving this still forward? Do you find -- Meg is the seconder.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: I'm trying to formulate a question. Was the intent of your motion to be that this DAC replaces the approval process of the R-RAC?

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: Yes.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: Because if you input public input, that does not -- to me that doesn't say that -- that does not say that we are asking the BLM to replace us with the R-RAC. It just says we are asking that we take input when this happen. Approvals have to go through the R-RAC; correct?

MEMBER SHUMWAY: No. The last bullet specifically says to operate in lieu of the R-RAC. It's not available for fee recommendations.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: If not available for fee recommendations.

DIRECTOR RAML: Timely.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: Dick, I will leave it up to you.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: What was the question?

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Changing the text of the word from "oversight" to "receive and communicate public input" does exactly what Meg says. Take it from a mere advisory to an actual oversight role, and that's a big crux of this discussion.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: But does that only happen

if the R-RAC is not available for timely recommendation?

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: The term "oversight" comes from the Federal Register requirement that the BLM put out how they were going to manage the FLREA program. There is terminology in there that will be public oversight, and that word is public "oversight." And it's not public "input." It's public oversight. That's what the law says. And there has to be some public oversight someplace when they ask for a fee increase. So that oversight body is to be an R-RAC. If an R-RAC is not available, it can be the RAC or an R-RAC. And if you read the law, they can just about decide how they want to do it. I don't know about the charter for their particular organization, if that's legal. But the way the law is written, it can be an R-RAC or RAC. If there is no R-RAC, it can be a RAC.

And the problem is we don't have an R-RAC working in the state of California. So if it's working, then it should be the one to do that. But as Meg says -- California is so huge. A lot of these states are small or have small areas or one RAC for the whole state. We've got people in Sacramento and if you call up there and look at the R-RAC on the Web site and look at the people on that, they don't have

any knowledge of our area.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Tom, followed by Meg.

MEMBER HALLENBECK: I can't say I have knowledge and I'm here. Your motion says we are going to be the public oversight for the fee program. That's way too broad. If you want to talk about fee increases when those occur, we can be an asset to the BLM and the manager and provide her advice from that on what we have heard, but if we want to see -- oversee the whole program, that's extraordinarily broad.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: I guess I want us to be -- however you guys want to put it, we should have the approval power that the R-RAC currently has because they have no idea who we are, what we do or anything. And I strongly agree with what Brad said. If we let this motion go and wait for them to rewrite our charter, they are not going to rewrite our charter the way we think it should be written. So Brad has a great point that was a very smart thing for him to say. The R-RAC hasn't been around for three years. I don't know if that's going to be a big huge job, guys. Sorry.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: One of the issues associated with the R-RAC, if there is an increase for

a fee in Southern California, anybody that wants to make a comment on that other than written has to travel. Typically their meetings are in Sacramento or Northern California, and they are primarily interested in Forest Service-type things. There are very few issues that come up on the R-RAC schedule for BLM that I have seen. So you have to travel to Sacramento to make a comment.

And then to answer your question, the fee oversight of the fee program includes looking at new fees and looking at some of these other things we looked at, how the money is being spent. If you read the law, the authors of the law wrote the law so that the public had input, not only on -- fee design and fee investment are the two terms they use. And I think their original intent of the law was to allow public access and public oversight, and they utilized the R-RAC/RAC situations to do that oversight, and that's what is specified in the law.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Meg, before I turn to you, may I just -- the DAC is very quick to point out when its advice is not taken by the BLM. We have been just given some advice from our DFO, and I think we should again consider that advice.

I have never been to an R-RAC meeting; Dick

probably has. I don't know what the packets -- what is involved, what anything -- I don't know what is involved. And Teri's advice has me a little concerned. And we have an opportunity -- we are proposing that in the work plan to have a February meeting in Needles. Needles is as close as we are going to get to Arizona.

We might have the ability to bring in a guest speaker from Arizona to let us know exactly what responsibilities we would be undertaking, how it works, and what we would be doing. And at that point in time if we felt this was right down our alley, we can join this again. So my recommendation would be to take Teri's advice, and we might want to pull this for discussion.

DIRECTOR RAML: I will add quickly -- and I'm not sure how Colorado works, but the BLM RAC in Arizona ended up with an R-RAC subcommittee because of the amount of effort it took to review all the fee increases. So they subcommitteeed that work, and they brought that work to the full R-RAC because of the amount of time it took. That's why I'm interested to have you hear how they are functioning now. And I have been gone for a couple of years, so things may have changed.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: Just keep in mind that I think here in the CDD we already have a pretty tight reign on oversight on the fees, as is exemplified by Dick's first two motions. So I'm not sure -- I mean, we track -- we already track all of these fee numbers. All the information is tracked. So if the whole thing is that we don't want to have oversight, we do quite a bit of oversight. One of the reasons we have these subgroups is for fee oversight. We essentially already do it. Right, Dick?

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: To a degree.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: I don't have a problem with waiting until February.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: I will just stop this discussion at this point in time and withdraw that motion. And we will ask the BLM to have somebody from the Arizona R-RAC or RAC at the next meeting to explain the details of what it takes to manage the oversight of the fee and we can get a better handle on that. And we will move from there. I will quit this discussion and move on.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Thank you, Council members. Thank you very much for this discussion. I turn your attention to recommendation No. 4. We will assume Mr. Holliday is the maker of the motion. Looking for

a second.

MEMBER HALLENBECK: I will second.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Second by Mr. Hallenbeck.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: I would like to comment.

I'm going to follow practically -- I'm sorry. I withdraw.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: No. 4, any further -- no discussions on No. 4. Thank you. We will move to No. 5, please, I will assume Mr. Holliday is the maker of the motion, second by --

MEMBER SHUMWAY: I would like to comment, and I will second. My comment is I agree wholeheartedly with what Dick said about reducing the cost of collecting the fees. All over the financial magazines, financial pages, annually around tax time you see articles on how to determine the reliability of a charitable contribution, and you can go on the Web site. So if you support the Chihuahua Adoption Agency or something like that, you want to find out that at least 80 to 90 percent of your donation is going to go to adopting Chihuahuas and not administration. So you need to be careful with that.

And in this age of high tech access, it seems really impossible to me and it costs 30 percent of all the fees collected to collect the fees. It doesn't

seem reasonable to me. We should try to reduce those costs.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Tom Hallenbeck.

MEMBER HALLENBECK: If you raise the fees, the percentage will go on. I certainly don't have any problem with this except for the bullet, and I'm not here to tell them what to do. I would like to advise them to work to reduce the fee collection, but I don't need them to show me the plan. So I would like to take the bullet out.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: In fact, I didn't have the bullet on there when I started this, and Randy gave me the suggestion that I put that bullet on there.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: One of the members of the audience took me to task a little while ago for not having enough specific deliverables in my motion, and sometimes that advice doesn't carry through to every place in life. So we struck the bullet. Any further discussion? Thank you ladies and gentlemen. Council members, we are going to hear from the public and receive some advice. I'm going to call in the order I have them. John Stewart.

MR. STEWART: Good afternoon, John Stewart California association of Four-Wheel Drive clubs.

It's been an interesting discussion and I

have heard a lot of falsehoods, misinterpretations, misrepresentations of what congressional intent was.

Now, as one individual who was part of the congressional discussions leading up to Federal Land Recreation Enhancement Act and heavily involved in the rule-making which established the R-RACs, the overall intent was a fee program that would replace the various fee demo programs that were left over from the Clinton administration. The FLREA, when passed, provided a consistent framework for all land management agencies that collected a fee of any type in management of lands.

This included National Park Service, Corps of Engineers, BLM, Forest Service and Fish and Wildlife.

Now, within that construct, a lot of what Dick has been putting forward and some of your original recommendations are part of the law. The law requires that the agency collecting a fee administer it properly, basically with a business plan that tracks the expenses and shows that the expenses are being appropriately applied back to the agency or the land area where they are being collected. And they have to be accounted for. They cannot be collected in one area and then moved over to support another area. They have to be reapplied to support the amenities

within that area.

Now, when it comes around to this R-RAC, there are not -- or there is not one R-RAC per state. There are nine R-RACs throughout the entire United States. Those nine R-RACs roughly approximate the distribution of the Forest Service regions. That was done under the rule-making and under the structure there in order to reduce the number of people and the number of organizations that had any kind of an advisory capacity. The members of the R-RAC were strictly set up to administer under approval and oversight of the fees. So any agency, any local agency would apply, put together a business plan, or plan of operations of how they were going to collect and administer the fees, and show that they have solicited public input and the ability to collect and reapply the fees back in that area. And they were to go up to the R-RAC for the final approval.

It's within that construct is the existing R-RAC for California. Yes, it has been essentially defunct because I believe there were at least two members of that Council actually passed away, and there was a major delay under the Obama administration in getting reappointments through. I know other things happened in other states, and yes, some other

states have subverted it temporarily. But they are only subverting it to the point where they can make a recommendation to go up to a higher level for approval.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: I'm sorry. I have to bring up -- I have to bring up now, Jim Branham. Do you have a comment?

MR. BRAMHAM: As to the first one where you talked about totals, numbers and gross, I believe you were referring to totals as in totals of each style of permit rather than totals and gross being the same thing.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: Probably.

MR. BRAMHAM: So the total would be the number of day passes, the number of seasonal passes, and etc., and gross would be the dollars that were received by each of those and the total dollars.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: It's there. It's there. Type and number of each permit sold is bullet point No. 1.

MR. BRAMHAM: So the second one --

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Total fee revenue received.

MR. BRAMHAM: Total fee revenue received.

And the next one was --

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Gross revenue.

MR. BRAMHAM: The total revenue received would be every dollar that came into the system?

CHAIRMAN BANIS: No, total fee revenue received.

MR. BRAMHAM: That would be the total amount of money that every person gave to the bureau. The next one is the amount of money to the bureau that is received from grants, so there are two different numbers. One is a gross, and one is a net.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: We will discuss that. Don't use up his time.

MR. BRAMHAM: And the distinction of the three pots of money, the ability for the advisory group to be able to know how much money is there from grants from the OHV division and the dollars from Congress as well, and to be able to know what priorities those were sent for so we can make good recommendations to the bureau on where the fee money should go to fill in the slots that aren't otherwise filled by other grants or appropriated dollars. So it's important that we know all three pots of money and where they are allocated and how all those are broken down.

On point 2, communications, extremely important. We have gone through a history and

continue to have a history of blogs and bulletin boards that give misinformation. The Web site has always been considered the place to get real information, and I would hate to see in any way for that to be taken out of that system. And we have never volunteered information. We have never gone out to recruit off of that. We try to produce accurate information, and that's what all that is trying to do.

All the advice goes through the DAC. So there was a concern that we were making recommendations. We make recommendations through the chair to the DAC, which then in turn makes those recommendations. Partners are already putting out a pie chart. We were talking about end of the year and how the user who is buying the permit gets the information our partners put out. The UNG product -- I'm sorry, I don't have it here, but it's a great publication. And that's how that, plus the information that the bureau puts out, is how the public gets its information. FLREA requires input, and I will just leave it at that.

The R-RAC situation I would absolutely want you to put that back in. I think that motion has a place. Originally, there was supposed to be an inner jurisdictional overview, which is the R-RAC, by virtue

of the Forest Service and BLM getting together. But in our case there is a cut up as we go that there would be a proposal where the public could have input; there would be a subgroup that the public could then have input; then it would come to this body for more input. I would hope for approval. But the next recommendation would be to go to the R-RAC. We have had two years of not being able to do anything on fees. We have had recommendations on Dumont Dunes that we tried to move, and we still can't move them.

ISDRA would like to look at fees as well. And at this point there is no physical way for us to move forward to make a recommendation to the bureau for the public or for you or anyone to make a final recommendation to them. And I think there has got to be -- and I don't know that February is going to be the time that gets done. I recognize that that was offered.

But anyway, and the reduced cost. There has been four major players in collecting fees at the sand dunes at Imperial. One got so cheap in what they bid they wouldn't even show up to do the job. So there comes a point when it's impossible to collect fees for the price they were charging. There was another that was charging 55 percent, and they couldn't do what

they were supposed to do. And they gave it up and walked away and took a ton of that fee money and equipment that we never got back. So there is a point at which you can pay too much.

Thirty percent may look high, but it was also done to make sure that we did what we have been so successful at Dumont doing, to make it possible for people to buy off-site. And we have exponentially increased people buying off-site. And the bureau has already said when they go through their next go-around on fees, that they are not going to go over the 30 percent fee.

But the history is that we have gone too far one way and the other, we have had performance problems. Right now we have a really good person, and yes, we are probably paying her too much at this point, but what we are getting in the value is just tremendous. So that and the fact that we have gotten people to buy off-site will continue to benefit the district, so it was a good investment.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Thank you very much for those comments. Everybody heard that. Thank you. Ed, do you have to share some words, please?

MR. WALDHEIM: Ed Waldheim, Friends of Jawbone. The preparation that Dick did, thank you for

spending the time doing that. I would like you to add on whatever you come up with the total number of visitors that we have. The visitors is very important especially when we start working with Commission grant monies, how many visitors did you have? And also add the acreage of how many acres we are talking about. In Glamis we are talking about 65,000 and Dumont Dunes 11,000 or something like that. The expenditures should be really broken down in what is personnel, what is equipment, and also in the budget -- it's funny how everybody keeps forgetting about the Waldheim budget.

I had a budget for every single agency in the state of California. I can tell you exactly how much it costs to run an OHV program in the state of California. It took me two years with staff of every agency to put it together. We spent 43 million dollars statewide on OHV programs. Give a couple thousand because it's been a long time since I put it together. And in that budget you can see exactly how much I get from appropriated money and sticker money so we can manage the property.

In the fees we need to stop the spikes. If we have a capital improvement we have to make sure we list it as such. When you have an even budget for

services and maintenance, that's wonderful, but all of a sudden you are going to build a building, so we need to make sure we do that.

As far as the R-RAC is concerned, I would highly suggest that the subgroup and DAC continue to pretend you are going to be an R-RAC. But start doing your public hearings and process on what you want to do so when the R-RAC does reconstitute and come back, you are done. We lost Dumont Dunes because we didn't have public process and the wording, and we didn't completely do what we had to do and we had to pull out of there. So let's get ready and prepare it. Prepare and have all the documents and everything in order so when R-RAC comes around, you are ready and we can move forward. And I think that's the only way we can do it so you have your document ready to go when they open up. Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Thanks, Ed.

Back on discussion. Dick, you have the floor. Do you have any modifications to your motions resulting from discussion?

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: To 1-A there where we struck the gross revenues, really instead of taking that out, if we would change the wording. Gross revenue from the sale of permits available to the BLM.

We have a total fee received. That's the amount of money that we have received from the vendor and how much was available for the BLM to spend. The difference is what it costs them to collect those fees. That just makes that a little bit more visible.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: So to restate bullet point No. 4, gross revenues from the sale of permits made available to the BLM.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: Right.

MEMBER HALLENBECK: Dick, may I suggest even simpler? Put the gross revenue back in it and change the second bullet to the net fee, because that's what you are talking about is gross and net.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: If we circle gross revenue because it was struck out and then we put it back in. Leave gross revenue. Go back to bullet point No. 2 and change total fee to net fee revenue received. And even maybe switch the places.

MEMBER MITZELFELT: Gross above net.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Yes, gross above net. Any more discussion on 1-A? Hearing and seeing none, all in favor of 1-A, raise your hand. Opposed? Motion passes. No. 1-B. Further discussion on 1-B? Hearing and seeing none, all in favor.

MEMBER HALLENBECK: Well, there is the net we

were looking for; right? Anyways, that's all.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: But the net is going to be broken up.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: In favor, aye. Opposed? No noes. The ayes have it. Motion passes.

Recommendation 1-C. Is there discussion, further discussion? Okay. I will call for the vote. Those in favor say aye. Opposed say nay. The ayes have it. Motion passes.

MEMBER RUDNICK: That's with expenditures out?

CHAIRMAN BANIS: With that first bullet point is crossed out in 1-C. That's correct.

Recommendation number 2. We crossed out the first major bullet point. We are only discussing the second major bullet point. Discussion?

MEMBER HALLENBECK: I believe you tabled this until the February meeting.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: No, not this one.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: The first bullet point, yes, we are striking it from today, but we will revisit and have a greater discussion on subgroups. With that clarified. Those in favor, say aye. Nays? Motion passes.

Thank you. Recommendation No. 3. As I

understand it, we do not have a change of any of this language, and we are asking that this is what we will defer for a discussion in February at Needles and hopefully receive some advice from our R-RAC folks. I have Meg and Dinah.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: I want to be sure procedurally that I understand. So we are essentially tabling this so it must come up for a vote at the February meeting? I would like it tabled.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: We have a motion to table until the February meeting. Second?

MEMBER JOHNSTON: Second.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Those in favor say aye. Opposed nay.

MEMBER HALLENBECK: Nay.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: By hand, please those in favor raise your hand. Seven in favor. Opposed? Two opposed. Motion passes.

Recommendation No. 4. Is there further discussion? Call for a vote. Those in favor say aye. Opposed say nay. Ayes have it.

Recommendation No. 5. The bullet point was struck, but we still have the bold concept at the top. Discussion? Call for a vote. Those in favor say aye. Opposed, nay? Ayes have it. Motion passes.

Mr. Mitzelfelt, you have the floor.

MEMBER MITZELFELT: This is just minor wording, so I don't think we have to revisit 2. But all of the recommendations are worded as verbs except for one, and that is number 2. And I think we can fix it by changing "increased" to "increase" in both the bold and the bullet. All the other recommendations are verbs and this one is --

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: I got to say I failed English four years in a row.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: I'm going to rule that as a point of order. Accepted. Thank you. Very good. Thank you all.

Let's move on to another item on our agenda, and this one is Council business, the WEMO subgroup proposal. WEMO subgroup proposal. Edythe Seehafer is from the Barstow field office and Edie is going to discuss with us the WEMO group designation project and a role that the DAC can play to assist in that. Edie, thank you for coming.

MS. SEEHAFER: DAC members, audience, thank you for this opportunity to brief the DAC on the West Mojave Route Designation project. This project was formally initiated with the Notice of Intent September 13 of this year, and it's a review of the route

designations decisions for the West Mojave Plan approved in March of 2006. The route network covers over 3 million acres primarily in Barstow and Ridgecrest with a little bit in Needles and Palm Springs. The decisions that will come out of this project must be made by March 31, 2014, and I will keep coming back to that because that's an important point.

Are you flipping this up there on this? The purpose of this presentation is to give you a briefing that provides a background of issues driving the Mojave Route Designation Project, an overview of the project components, the planning process, and its current status and the overall schedule. And also to ask for your interest and ability to provide additional input through a subgroup. BLM recognizes the ongoing public interest in route designations on public lands in the desert. It seems like one of the most enduring and interesting issues that we deal with. And the DAC has the unique opportunity to become more involved in the project, using its subgroup mechanism.

Recognize the deadline that I mentioned. The West Mojave Project Overview will include backgrounds to provide context for the project, including its

relationship both to the CDCA Plan and the West Mojave Plan Amendment, the Partial West Mojave Remand by the Court, and the five issues this project must address. The overview also refers to new guidance that provides a framework for the route designation review we are doing and includes identification of travel management areas. These were not part of the original Mojave route designation.

We have one specific planning component at the CDCA Plan level, and a lot of the activity level decisions we will be making. Key components of the West Mojave Route Review process that are currently underway includes setting up public scoping for the travel management planning efforts, refining of the route designation process we will use, and data compilation and development of the route designation document strategy. These are all key components of the court decision.

The overall schedule I'm going to share with you includes both the travel management plan scoping schedule, some interim milestones we set up for the project, and the deadline for final decisions. I want to keep coming back to you thinking about the possibility of a DAC subgroup, discussing your role and how you would like to be involved, considering

both makeup and commitment of resources that you can give.

Project background: Basically, there is one element of the CDCA Plan we will be revisiting directly. There is specific language in the motor vehicle access development of the CDCA plan, specifically the existing routes language in the West Mojave Plan that was inconsistent with our CDCA Plan guidance. There is a few more inconsistencies between the West Mojave Plan Amendment and the CDCA Plan that created some confusing language. And to the extent we can revisit those to make them clearer, we will do so.

But the main focus of the project is the review of the actual route network that was approved and adopted in the West Mojave Planning Area. This includes range of alternatives, analysis, specific route designations on all public lands in the planning area. And the decision itself from the route designation process will be documented and implemented throughout the travel management plans.

I thought I should mention in addition to what is being addressed, I would like to share what is not being addressed in this review of routes. The Partial Court Remand is the framework for the review of the West Mojave Route Network revision. The Remand

does not include a wholesale revision of the CDCA Plan. It will affect existing routes and other specific language issues in the CDCA Motor-Vehicle Equal Access Supplement so far as they result from the review of routes we do and specific measures of the CDCA Plan that may be revised as a result of this route review.

I don't know what we will address at this point. There is stopping, parking, camping identification. Some other plan level decisions, and we may add some additional documentation as a result of this planning effort to supplement that shows how travel management areas and travel management plans will be implementation tools for the CDCA plan and the West Mojave Planning document.

This effort will not change many components of the CDCA plan or the West Mojave Plan, including many motor vehicle access elements. These are elements that are unrelated to or unaffected by the specific route designations, the route network, and this includes area designations. That is designation of open or closed areas for motor vehicle use, unless they are specifically updated maps that come out of the 2009 Omnibus Bill for Wilderness that will more accurately reflect what the current status is. Other

than that, no changes are proposed at this time to any area designations even though that was referred to in some of the remand language.

Most aspects of the West Mojave Plan were upheld or adopted by the courts. And that means that other West Mojave decisions that were adopted or remanded provide some parameter on a revisiting of this route network. In addition, some were left in place but not adopted, and may or may not change as a result of this review of routes.

The five route designations that must be addressed can be found in the Court Summary Judgment and Remedy Documents. These are posted at the CDD Web site. It's a link entitled WEMO amendment activity. You may want to take a look at those. I suspect most of you already have.

Currently there is an inconsistency of the West Mojave Route Designations with the governing CDCA Plan that limits routes to those existing in 1980. This has been an ongoing issue. This is the one CDCA Plan issue we must address to comply with the Court remand.

The second required consideration is adequate application of the route designation criteria. Those are the route designation regulations at 43 CFR

8342.1. Application of these criteria may involve route changes and better documentations of the decisions we have already made in the West Mojave Plan.

The third is an explanation of the range of alternatives and an expansion of that range. Specifically we were told to come up with a wider range of alternatives with respect to the miles of routes proposed to be designated. The additional alternatives must include at least one alternative with a smaller route network than that approved in the West Mojave Plan. Basically, all the alternatives in that plan had looked at 5,098 miles, and the courts found that at fault.

Another consideration is that alternatives to the network must still comply with the other parts of the plan that have been adopted and the goals and decisions in that plan that are kept in place. Therefore, BLM is not revisiting these. We have to make sure that whatever we come up with is still consistent with those.

The fourth requirement is further discussion of the no-action alternative. The main consideration is that the current discussion was found to be inadequate to fully lay out the existing situation of

what is currently out there. And that it also did not provide an adequate base line to accurately reflect the impacts from the various alternatives.

Finally, the project must supplement or provide new documentation of certain resource analyses that resulted from the route designations and/or mitigation adopted. These are outlined specifically in the summary judgment I think starting at about page 48. And they include such issues as air quality and cultural resources. Mitigation can include measures already adopted or will be proposed through this effort. That could include adoption of the network alternative mitigation measures, too.

I needed to briefly talk on this, although this is a lot of information because the policy and planning framework for the route designations has been augmented since the West Mojave analysis. The main issues are a lot of the travel management and transportation management guidance. These require the travel management planning mechanism and identification of travel management areas, and they occur at the activity level.

The route review includes routes outside the focus areas that were in the original West Mojave Plan. I don't know if you can remember back to 2006,

but there was, I think, 11 or 13 focus areas. And outside of those areas, less work was done on the ground and the existing public land routes were designated as open.

What we will be doing in the supplement is identifying those areas, delineating them on maps, and basically making the designations and conducting the analysis of those areas so we have a complete network.

This isn't a very big map, but this is the West Mojave area from the northern part of the California conservation area to almost the Cajon Pass. The southern extent is basically the San Gabriel National Forest, the San Bernardino National Forest and the Joshua Tree National Park, so it's a big area.

And so we looked at the signing strategy and these basic little areas in here are the result of the signing strategy we used to actually get route numbers on the routes out in the field. And there were 33 areas that were identified, a couple with just scattered parcels that were not identified. But basically we have to deal with this entire 3 million acres of public lands. And so what we have come up with is the strategy that will help us get through the travel management planning process and do so in a way that based on the signing strategy follows our

rationale for how we split these up.

We came up with eight preliminary travel management areas. If you have your summary, you will see in the next slide where we have the table of the scoping schedule, our preliminary travel management areas. These were come up with as a result of looking at both geographical and topographical and route designation connectivity issues. So for instance, the first meeting covers -- I don't know if I have a way to do this for another one where I can highlight. Do you know if there is a way to highlight the circular pointer?

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: Push the little button.

MS. SEEHAFFER: Now, if I can hold it steady. Basically this middle triangle in here is the first item that includes the Afton, Broadwell and all the other areas east of the Barstow city limits, going all the way out to the end of the West Mojave planning area. The second area we identified is this northern area up here, which is basically all the areas north of Ridgecrest, surrounding China Lake to the northeast and west. The third area we identified was down in the southern part down here, which is basically downhill from the San Bernardino and Joshua Tree and south of 47 and the other side of 62. The fourth area

we identified was this far western portion of Ridgecrest, which is basically Jawbone south. And the fifth area we identified was the Desert Wildlife Management Areas, mainly critical habitat, which are north of I-15 and I-58 and south of Fort Irwin.

The sixth area we identified includes El Mirage and Edward's Bowl, that area all the way west of I-15 to the Barstow field office boundary. The seventh area we identified was the area -- let me make sure I've got it -- in Ridgecrest, El Paso, this area in here.

The eighth area, which is the last area, is all this area west of the Twentynine Palms base all the way over to 15 between 247 and I-40. That area, there is a lot of questions about it, but it has both the OHV areas from the central part of the Barstow field office, Johnson Valley and Stoddard Valley. So these were the preliminary travel areas. We are looking for your input on these.

Basically, that's what we have proposed and next is to have scoping meetings. And I did put dates on here. They didn't get in here. What we proposed in the order I showed these, of scoping meetings, three in January, five in February. The second one, which is not listed on here, is January 18, proposed.

The third one is January 26th. And then we have five in February, the 7th, 9th, 14th, 16th, and 21st. And what that means is any input we get from you in terms of how you would like a subgroup formed, we need that input as early next year as possible because when we finish up with scoping, which we anticipate being in mid-April, we would like that subgroup to be in place before or by the time that occurs so we can get timely input and get you involved from the ground level up.

One of the other things we are working on right now is the route designation tool. There were problems with the tree that was used in the West Mojave Plan. What we are looking at now is addressing some of the issues that were brought up, having consistent and supportable decisions and network cohesiveness, and then showing how the decisions made are based on the regulatory criteria and all of the criteria.

Some of the mitigation measures that we may consider is route closure or reroutes, closure of other routes with more impact, the reduction in total miles of routes in an area to preserve critical values. Also, monitoring, education, signing strategies and other mechanisms as we identify them or as you provide them to us as recommendations. I think

I figured you really didn't want to hear too much about GIS at this point.

The schedule overview we are looking at: Basically, we are talking about wrapping up the scoping for travel management plans April 15. That seems like a fitting day. And after we have the specific travel management plan meetings to talk about those areas up close, what we would like to have is a couple of meetings, one or two meetings, to show the entire cohesive network alternatives based on the specific in-depth reviews of particular areas. We are talking about getting the draft travel plans completed depending upon the complexity of issues and where we they are located up to June 28. Having the supplemental EIS by June 28, 2013. We don't have much give on that because we have to allow for these follow-up processes, so we have to have everything out by then. And then having our final decisions by January 31. And that's with the March 31 deadline, so we are giving ourselves a little bit of leeway there, but not very much. Not much at all.

So I guess what I wanted to talk about next was the DAC subgroup possibilities. It would be a great tool to bring your knowledge and additional information to bear on this effort. And I know there

is a lot of information already out there. And the time commitments in particular are something you need to consider in terms of whether you want to proceed and if so, the scope of the subgroup you want to take on.

I would like you to consider the goals, composition and the time frame to assist in keeping this project on track and in producing a better outcome. The goals could include a feedback on travel management plans, the actual content of those plans, feedback on specific travel management areas. Focus then put on specific routes and network preferences in areas with information and rationale. Viable minimization measures you can recommend. Providing input consistent with remand direction. And recommending effective monitoring, compliance, education, and enforcement strategies that enhance BLM resource capabilities.

Considerations for composition of a subgroup could include geographic-based membership that would help ensure more local knowledge of various areas, as well as including members with good understanding of issues as well as on-the-ground information and knowledge that would support the goal of viable recommendations.

So what level of commitment can the DAC provide? I anticipate this could be an intense workload for two years, depending upon the scope of the group subgroup. There is no flexibility in the March 31, 2014 deadline.

So in summary, the project must include a regulatory-based process and documentation consistency. The scope is the entire West Mojave Planning Area, including both the signing subgroups and the nonsigning subgroups. And it covers the majority of the two field offices. It will be subject to judicial review. And so what will DAC's role in the subgroup be? I encourage you to get involved, and I hope you will and think about what you can do. And so I guess I'm open to questions.

MEMBER HALLENBECK: What was that second bullet on the last slide?

MS. SEEHAFFER: I don't know.

MEMBER HALLENBECK: Three subgroups?

MS. SEEHAFFER: Subregions.

MEMBER HALLENBECK: You weren't coming here asking for 33 subgroups?

MS. SEEHAFFER: I probably said that but that's not what I mean.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Edie, thank you for that

presentation. However, just in the interest of making sure everything gets taken down right and all, I'm going to just call for a very brief five-minute recess to let Judy take a rest room break, but this is very brief. Then we will discuss everything and take public comment.

(Brief recess was taken from 3:38 p.m. to 3:48 p.m.)

I would like to call the meeting back to order following the recess. We just heard a presentation from Edie suggesting ways that the DAC can assist the BLM in its WEMO route designation effort. The time line is what I would like to discuss right now. Well, let me first say just quickly, are we interested --

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Yep.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: -- to continue discussing this? Is it something we want to consider? Is this something we would say about creating a subgroup?

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: I think you are out of your mind to create another subgroup. Really, you guys really want to? If the general public is interested in participating, why can't they participate through the NEPA process? And don't we already have subgroups and issues? They are a lot of work for you guys.

DIRECTOR RAML: We are asking, of course.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: God bless you.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Let me paraphrase our friend Jimmy in Lord of the Rings. (Inaudible) chance of failure? What are we waiting for? Other comments?

MEMBER SHUMWAY: I'm assuming since Edie gave such a wonderful presentation -- and it's nice to see you again, Edie -- is that Teri is asking for the DAC's role. So that's my assumption.

My question is this would be a subgroup like the SRP where we would send out applications and hopefully get knowledgeable people. And you asked specifically from the high desert area that are knowledgeable and willing to work on this issue. And I'm also assuming further that a lot of these people would maybe be the same people who are on the original subgroup?

MS. SEEHAFFER: I don't know about that. People come and go off that original subgroup.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Some of them are dead.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: It was a Super Group.

MS. SEEHAFFER: Yeah, the Super Group. That was a group that came and went in size and composition. What I would need from you is specific designated members for the DAC subgroup. What I am

concerned about is we have a lot of friends groups out there. Some of them cover very specific areas. None of them are FACA groups that we can tap into. You are our FACA group, and this being under remand, I think we want to do this if we use a subgroup other than just the NEPA process. I think we want to do this by the book.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: So the last time around, to follow up, the last time around with the original West Mojave Plan, was the DAC involved at all? Does anybody here remember?

CHAIRMAN BANIS: I do. It was more just information and presentations. It wasn't deep involvement. They already had that Super Group process in place. Non-FACA Super Group, by the way.

MS. SEEHAFFER: Yes, I know.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: I have another question but maybe somebody else may want to comment on that line of question.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: My only point would be to also consider our time line and how we generally do this. And what would be a good strategy? And one we have employed in the past is, one, we design a mission statement for the group. We have done that for the other subgroups, that one-page bullet point, how many

seats, what kind of representation categories we are looking for.

And then after we put out the mission statement, there is a solicitation for applications. Usually it's about 30 days. And then from there, the applications are forwarded to the DAC chairman, and then the chairman of the DAC nominates the members of the subgroup and asks for approval from the DAC. And then that group is constituted and ready to go to work.

I bring that up so that we can look at the schedule and see how we want to do this in a way that yields a subgroup in a timely manner to be involved. And I'm sorry to be jumping ahead, but if we do refer briefly to our draft work plan, we do tentatively have a meeting scheduled for -- proposed for February. If the group is desired to be operating as early as March --

MS. SEEHAFER: April at the latest.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: -- April at the latest --

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Is there an interview required for these appointments? Just an application?

CHAIRMAN BANIS: We have gone through applications in the past. My trouble here is that I would like to see the DAC discuss a draft mission

statement like we have done for the other subgroups, because in my opinion that's really what can set this group on the right track or hopelessly lost in the woods. And we keep referring back to those mission statements when we come to cruxes in relationships, strategy and missions. We keep going back to that. So I think that's really the most important thing. And maybe even more important than the selections of the committee, because the mission is what is really going to guide this group.

So that's why I really would like to have the DAC in on this as much as possible. And if our next meeting is February and we are just going to approve a mission statement and start calling for applications in February, we won't be able to seat the group until the end of March at the earliest, and end of March at the earliest is Edie's latest. I'm up for comments. Any suggestions?

MEMBER SHUMWAY: In your estimation -- and Meg, you have done subgroups before -- is it possible to design a mission statement in two weeks, publicize it, get out an application, get applicants to respond, and then have a selection process in place by, say, the end of February?

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: Do you want an honest

answer? It would start with an H and end with an L, hell, no.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Are there any regulatory time frames?

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: Just as quickly as the BLM staff could do it.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: I think the BLM staff is motivated.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Good choice of words.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: If this is something that the BLM wants, and Teri is specifically asking for our help, I would assume they would be motivated to move quickly on that. If the DAC is tasked with designing a mission statement and the BLM signs an application form --

CHAIRMAN BANIS: We have existing forms.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: -- so it seems to me like something like this could be done if not by the end of February, certainly by the end of March and end of April is when you need to get started? That's the end of the scoping?

MS. SEEHAFFER: Scoping period we are talking about closing out April 15, and so we want to jump into analysis. The group is brought into the analysis process to present to you and so we begin -- we are

already beginning data compilation.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: I'm also assuming, to go further, that if a group was in place by the end of March, if we had a subgroup in place, then they may have an opportunity to attend one or two subgroup meetings in April. Aren't there a couple scheduled? I mean, sorry -- I'm sorry, scoping meetings.

MS. SEEHAFFER: What I am proposing is a follow-up meeting or two in March that would basically pull everything together we have gotten from these more location-specific scoping meetings. So certainly people who have an interest and come to the NEPA meetings, the scoping meetings in January and February, and I assume they will, whether or not they are on the subgroup or not. If they have an abiding interest, then pulling that information together and reviewing that information and starting on the process of evaluating and making adjustments where we have additional information from the subgroup, looking at any process adjustments that you want to recommend. If you want to recommend some revisions to the actual travel management plans, these are activity plans like OHV plans, I want that information and advice sooner rather than later.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Roxie, I take it you might

have an idea for us?

MS. TROST: Roxie Trost. I was hoping, like Edie, that we could get a subgroup sooner rather than later. And I agree, Randy, that the mission is key and highly important. One thought that we had is that we do have an idea of the makeup, and I don't believe it would take very long for us to pull that together. We feel that seven to nine seems to be the ultimate number. We have real specific slots where we feel that we can get some help.

And then after -- if we could get this part completed by our February meeting, I think our first meeting with our subgroup could be discussing our mission and finalizing our mission statement as a team. So that's a suggestion.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: May I follow up with Roxie? So Roxie and Edie then, by saying you have specific ideas, do you have specific people that you think might be willing to do that, or does it still have to go out to applicants?

MS. TROST: We would hope it would go out to applicants.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Do you have specific people you have in mind?

MS. TROST: We would send it out fairly

widespread.

MS. SEEHAFFER: I have already had people walk up to me and say they are interested in this.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: We need a DAC member that will be the conduit for the information to make the recommendations to the DAC to forward to the BLM. So to start the process off, it looks like Randy, you need to get started.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: That's a good point. You know, if we appoint a DAC member today that would be part of this, that DAC member could work with me and the BLM to start getting that mission statement draft out. We could send out the application. We have the application already available. It's standard and maybe by the February meeting we could be approving the whole kit and caboodle. We could be approving the mission statement and the slate of nominees. Who wants to help me?

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Unless anybody else has a burning desire to do this, I think I might have to volunteer.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: I'm going to be going to those meetings with you.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: They were in my territory.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: We have been doing this for

far, far too long to give up now.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: I would volunteer to lead the subgroup as the DAC member. But not necessarily as the chairman.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: The chairman is elected. Are there any objections to our asking for Dinah to help? Terrific. Thank you, Dinah.

Dinah will be the representative and Dinah and I will work with the Barstow field office to draft a mission statement. I do want to get a vote from the DAC, a vote to establish, but as a result of that vote we can then send out the aps and get going on it. So therefore, now that we have talked this one around twice, do I have a motion from a DAC member to establish a subgroup. We have a volunteer. Do we have a motion?

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: You are going to make this motion.

MEMBER HALLENBECK: I will move to put a DAC subgroup to look at this issue of the remanded work for the Western Mojave Designation Plan.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Well said. Do I have a second?

MEMBER RUDNICK: Second.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Second by Rudnick. Any

further discussion?

MEMBER MITZELFELT: I'm curious as to whether this affects San Bernardino County pretty significantly, and San Bernardino County was an intervenor in the case. Does that give us any problems designating someone from the county to participate? And would it have to be a subcommittee group member or could we send someone to represent the county and not have to be --

DIRECTOR RAML: We will look into that. I will look for a recommendation, but it might not necessarily be the same person every time.

MEMBER MITZELFELT: So anyway, I would look for a recommendation on that. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: I'm trying a way to note that, and I think I would like to know if there are other recommendations for interests that you think need to be there.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Minerals, of course.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: Roxie seems like she might already have a list in her head.

MS. TROST: Edie and I have had a lot of discussion about this topic, and I think that some of them will be resource oriented, but some of them will also be geography related. So I think we are looking

at a combination of people with the geographic knowledge as well as the resource knowledge.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Any other suggestions from the DAC members? Okay. Hearing and seeing none, we will want to -- I would like to take a vote on the adoption of the DAC, but we have one other piece of business to discuss and then we can take a public comment and vote as per agenda.

So before we take that vote, let's move into the work plan briefly. Thank you, Edie and Roxie. We will get the big vote in a minute and dance and all that.

So this is the work plan that's proposed. Let me just say this work plan is a balancing act that combines, first of all, we considered the issues that are going to have key insertion or decision points. We don't want to discuss issues too early. We don't want to discuss them after decisions have already been made. So we are looking timeliness of issues. The second thing we looked at is where have we been -- where have the DAC meetings been over the course of the past two years? And where do we need to go in order to continue rotating our meetings across the Desert District. And when you look at the list of meetings at the bottom, it's obvious that we are due

for a stop at El Centro, Ridgecrest and Needles.

And the other thing to balance is you have got your issues, you have your locations. How do we tie the issue to the right location? We wish to discuss a renewable energy issue. It might be a good idea to do that in a place where there are projects taking place, and that was it. That is what we had to work with, and we threw all of those things up in the air and this is how it came down and landed.

There is a lengthy break between April and September, but know that a couple of us are putting some creative energy into finding a way to maybe fill that with some kind of an activity. Maybe not an actual DAC meeting, but maybe a mixer with another Resource Advisory Council or something like that.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: Bureau barbecue.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: I wholly support this work plan. I think this is a good work plan, and I'm excited about this and do we have any comments? Or do I have a motion and second to bring this to the table.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: Again, I would like to see on these meetings another line item, and that is another column. And that is a designated DAC person to follow up on each one of these issues.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: That's all right.

MEMBER HALLENBECK: I will move that we adopt the proposed 2012 work plan as presented.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Do I have a second?

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: Second.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: It's been moved and seconded. It's on the table. Do I have further discussion?

Dick had a suggestion to add an assignment category. Any other discussions on his?

What I would like to do at this point, we haven't voted, I know, but let's put some dates on here. We are voting on the dates. Put everything in there so we know this is final and a done deal. I have asked everybody to bring their calendars. And do we have a suggestion for February? Just know that I have no life, so I will meet when you folks want to meet. So let's go with the busiest folks first. What weekends, if any, are available in February?

(Discussion was held off the record.)

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Back on the record, and I will announce that the Council has tentatively set the dates for 2012 meetings as February 10 and 11, in Needles with the topic of DRECP.

April 20 and 21st with a topic of subgroups in Ridgecrest.

November -- September still to be determined, tentatively in Pomona at the state -- L.A. fair. And last, November 30 and 31st in El Centro discussing issues of tribal and cultural concerns.

Public comment? Anyone want to comment on the subgroup or on our schedule? Jim, Ed? You have something too, John. And Kim. I got you.

MR. BRAMHAM: Supportive of the subgroup concept and hoping to get them forward as fast as possible. Through the scoping meeting process you are going to be able to give the opportunity to identify or have people identify their desire beyond that subgroup, so I would propose that you would have that information available at those scoping meetings to be able to solicit folks and have that all rolled up by the time we get to February so you can take one whole shot at it.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Thank you, Jim. That's a really good idea.

MR. WALDHEIM: Ed Waldheim. Again, I get upset when we go through great lengths to make sure we coordinate meetings, and I pushed the Commission very hard to come up with meetings because, just as you want the public to participate, so does the Commission. We make a big mistake when we don't go to

the Commission. You get millions of dollars from those folks, and you act like they are nothing.

From the state director, I told him today and the Forest Service is the first -- they don't even bother showing up at the Commission meetings. So I tread very lightly with this because I feel that both of you are very, very important to the public, the Commission, and the BLM DAC meetings. And I have a very hard time when you deliberately just go over it. So I want you to think about that when you do the next meetings. I will go to Commission before I come to DAC because that's where the money is. And if I don't go there, I won't be able to help you with grants so you can pay for some of this. So give me a break.

I fully support what you are doing for the West Mojave. I appreciate you doing that, but I would like to make it very clear, I need to get a map. The map has to be usable for the public. Right now it is not. I have spent 580 dollars to print the maps. I was fully prepared to put them together. I retired my West Mojave Plan maps only to find out that they do not match. There is not the same scale; they are useless. And for you to start working on trying to come up with a route designation process with a little map here and a little map here and a little map here,

there is no connectivity. There is no way you can figure out a good system for the West Mojave Plan so you are dead on arrival. You have to get the map ASAP so we have a big map up there and the public can process it. That's a key for me to get the job done. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: We did avoid four out of five meetings of the Commission. If I had gotten 80 percent in college, I may have gotten a degree. John.

MR. STEWART: John Stewart, California Association of Four-Wheel clubs. I'm supporting of the comment of the subgroup concept. I am a little hazy about some of the details. The brief provided some high level overviews and expectations. I think if you start looking for people and get information as soon as possible about specific skills that you are going to be looking for, that will help.

I know that quite a few of us could probably round up some people that would be willing, but we need to know how many people and what kinds of skills are going to be necessary so we can try and fill the slots with some qualified people.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Thank you. Dynamite. Hi, Kim.

MS. CAMPBELL: Kim Campbell, rockhound

activist. I think it's great, the idea of a subgroup for this. I do think that the public or -- the subgroup should be involved prior to the travel management planning schedule so that they can provide mapping information for you. I think mapping -- there needs to be a system of mapping to use so that people who have information to contribute have a way of contributing it. And I don't think that that exists currently.

Some of us have been collecting data regarding rockhounding and other recreational interests and already have some information to contribute. So I think it's a great idea, but you do need to appoint people who can mobilize the public to provide information. And I guess that's the end of my comments, except that I would love to be on the subgroup myself. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Very good. Thank you. Council members, we are back to take a vote on our WEMO subgroup proposal. Are there any last thoughts after having heard comments? Hearing, seeing none, I will call for a vote. Those in favor, please say aye; opposed, nay; motion passes.

Thank you, we will bring up the proposed work plan. Any further comment based on the public

comment? All those in favor, please say aye.

Opposed, nay, passes. Thank you.

We are going to move to Council questions and actions, summons and recommendations. We did that already. We already did that. We have been doing that, so now we are moving to Council questions regarding the field office reports. They were terrific. This month, there are a lot of them. Anybody have any comments they would like to bring up? I have a couple if I can find them. Ron, you are on.

MEMBER JOHNSTON: I wanted to compliment El Centro on incorporating almost all of the things we were talking about in terms of the application and expenditure of fees and what they provide. I thought that was a great example for everyone.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Thank you, Ron.

If I may take a stab, I do have a question for Barstow field office. I am wondering about the status of the acquisitions -- the donated properties in the Avawatz Mountains, specifically the Salt Creek -- the Salt Basin area, gypsum mine area, but could you also touch on Sheep Creek? I don't know if those are both in the same boat.

MS. TROST: Roxie Trost, Barstow BLM. I can talk about Sheep Creek. That has been acquired and

recorded, and it now is in the possession of BLM. There were two cabins on the site. One was a safety hazard and has since been removed, but the other is still on-site.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: All right. The other properties, though, you can't talk in specifics. When lands are donated to the agency, is there some process that happens to decide what use classification it goes on or anything that's going to be assigned to that property?

MS. TROST: Typically the -- the Sheep Creek property was actually surrounded by wilderness, so the designation for that property will become wilderness. The Cherry Stem remains. So typically, when a piece of property is donated to BLM, it then obtains the surrounding land status, whether it's multiple use or wilderness, wherever it happens to be.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: For Catalis (as pronounced)? Okay. I understand. For El Centro, just a suggestion. With the list of the renewable energy projects, in addition to the output -- projected output, it would be helpful to have the acreage of the footprint. And that's all I have. Thank you, appreciate that. Any other comments?

MEMBER SHUMWAY: A little curmudgeonly kind

of thing. Carl, I know you are on -- is it called detail? Is Carl still here? Hi, Carl. I really loved -- about a year ago we asked all the field offices to use the same format for reports, and it would be nice if you would get on board.

CARL SIELER: That's not one of my strong points.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Just a suggestion.

MEMBER HALLENBECK: General comment: I would like to see activities, if there are any, on the Great America Outdoors. That's a great program. I endorse it and encourage it.

And one question for John Kalish. The canal lining project. We are out here spending money to mitigate -- to help meet project environmental requirements. Which project are you mitigating for? Is it one of yours or the lining project? And who owns those canals, and how did you get involved?

MR. KALISH: Well, it involves the lining of the Coachella Canal. The canal itself is owned by the Coachella Valley Water District.

MEMBER HALLENBECK: Are they lining it?

MR. KALISH: The canal has been lined and the actual mitigation was for impacts of the lining of the canal.

MEMBER HALLENBECK: Why aren't they doing it?

MR. KALISH: We are being paid to do the mitigation.

MEMBER HALLENBECK: Thank you. That's it.

MR. KALISH: In fact, to the tune of two million dollars. And all of that mitigation is being focused in on Dos Palmas.

MEMBER HALLENBECK: Once they line it, it doesn't leak anymore.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: I have a little bit of a question, then. If they are paying you to do it, John, how come they didn't pay a contractor to do it?

MR. KALISH: BLM is a cheap date.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Since when is the BLM competing with private enterprise for projects?

MR. KALISH: Well, what the company did was -- actually San Diego County Water Authority as well as the Coachella Valley Water District were responsible for mitigating for the lining of the Coachella Canal. There were -- through a long, fairly lengthy process, the decision was made among all of the parties to focus the mitigation for the canal lining in on our Dos Palmas Preserve. It's adjacent to the canal. It's an area that we have very intensively managed. We manage Dos Palmas Preserve

for a couple of endangered species, the Yuma Clapper Rail and Desert pupfish, to name two. It made a lot of sense to focus in for the mitigation project at Dos Palmas because of our intensive level of management in that area. We do have a resident on-site and it's a protected area.

I know both the San Diego County Water Authority and the Coachella Valley Water District ran the math as far as whether it would have been better for them to go out to another area or better for them to contract all of the mitigation out at Dos Palmas. In lieu of the plan that we had come up with, which was very consistent with the management plan that we were operating out there at the Dos Palmas Preserve, ultimately their decision was to go ahead and go with our proposal, our mitigation plan.

The money over a 10-year period has been -- is being transferred to us under a 10-year plan to do all of the restoration and mitigation that was required by the project, one of which was 352 and a half acres of desert riparian restoration that was required under the canal lining project. So we have nearly completed that amount of acreage of restoration there at Dos Palmas.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: I don't want to interrupt

you, but I'm going to. So ultimately this was a project between three different agencies and decided to keep it at an agency level. It didn't go out to bid, I guess is my question.

MR. KALISH: Well, we do have a crew out there of our BLM folks that do some of the restoration, and we have contracted out for a fair amount of the other restoration on-site. So, you know, a good portion of it actually has been contracted, but it has been contracted through the BLM. And we have also used inmate labor also as a way to complete the mitigation as part of the project.

MEMBER SHUMWAY: Thank you, John.

MR. KALISH: Another one of the mitigations is construction of about 110-acre marsh, it's a created marsh, for both Yuma clapper rails and black rails. And it is a very successful project. A few years ago we did take the DAC when we hosted the DAC at Palm Springs, we did take a DAC on a tour of Dos Palmas, but that was probably four or five years ago.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: You created this 100-acre marsh out there adjacent to the canal, I assume. Was that marsh there before they built the canal or was it just a result of seepage over the years?

MR. KALISH: Once they lined the canal, then

it halted all water seepage. And so all up and down the canal through Coachella Valley and on down into Imperial County, huge areas of desert riparian and natural riparian habitat dried up. And to mitigate for that -- and that included marsh lands that existed up and down the canal that were in a sense artificial marsh lands.

MEMBER HOLLIDAY: They are artificial because they were generated by the canal. They weren't there before the original canal was put in, were they?

MR. KALISH: No, they weren't, although within the Dos Palmas area, it's called Dos Palmas because there were natural springs there historically, you know, went back before recorded history. So there has always been water at Dos Palmas although Dos Palmas itself, once the canal was lined, did dry up in some areas. And we have been augmenting the water flow into the local water table from the Coachella canal within that area to keep the mitigation projects going. But that 100-acre marsh was just to replace the marsh areas in other locations up and down the canal that dried up once the canal was no longer a dirt-lined canal and lined with cement.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Thank you, John. Thank you. Any other questions, field manager reports? Field

manager report, public questions? Anyone have questions of the field manager reports? John? Ed, you have questions?

MR. WALDHEIM: Yes, sir.

MR. STEWART: John Stewart, California Association of Four-Wheel Drive clubs. I did have two questions. One is more of a comment than a question.

With respect to the El Centro field office, along the Colorado River, the Paso Picacho State Park is expected to be closing as of December 31. That's in the Indian Pass area, and it's a very popular area, especially for winter recreation. And I'm kind of curious as to how the BLM is going to handle any changes in traffic or if there will be gates placed in the area or exactly what is going to happen to traffic patterns in that area that may disrupt recreational access.

Also, in stepping up into the Palm Springs field office, for a number of years we've been talking about a plan or something of an advisory subgroup meeting or working on Drop 39. And John, has that been totally shelved for the time being? Are those problem areas no longer there? It's something that I would like to keep on the record if the problems still exist.

MR. KALISH: You are talking about the proposal by the county to open up an OHV area?

MR. STEWART: Yes.

MR. KALISH: That proposal is still active. We have been coordinating with the county.

MEMBER GROSSGLASS: I'm on the Riverside OHV Commission. As far as I know, we are still moving forward on that, and I thought we were getting close to acquiring the funds to acquire -- to purchase a whole 640-acre parcel right next to the 640-acre parcel you guys own. We won't have another meeting until the middle of December. If you want to, come to that meeting, anyone who would like to come to that meeting.

MR. STEWART: I did not see any mention of it, and I just wanted you to know I would like to see that it is listed on the actions or the projects to follow. Thank you.

MR. KALISH: That is the Drop 31 project, kind of a joint BLM/Riverside County project.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Thank you, John Stewart.

MR. WALDHEIM: Thank you for the BLM managers who put out the reports. And I want to thank Needles for including the CTCU maps, one we are working on. The Palm Springs office will also be working on a map,

the Barstow office will be working on their map as soon as we will be getting through an El Mirage grant. Ridgecrest, we are working on map No. 9 for the Friends of Jawbone, which will include the new designation areas in there. So I want to say thank you to the agencies for putting that in.

I would like to make one extra comment on the Ridgecrest office, that we give a lot of kudos to the youth who are working on restoration crews. But we failed to mention that Friends of Jawbone has almost \$1.5 million in restoration work, and we employed almost eight full-time people from the California City, people working on the payroll through the OHV grants to do the restoration in the Ridgecrest office. So we do an incredible amount of work in that.

Someone from the OHV staff is coming down on the 13th to tour the entire area that we have been working on, which is Jawbone, El Cerritos, El Pasos, the Rands, and a little bit over into the other side of East 395, so we are busy.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Thank you, Ed. Friends of Jawbone, job creators.

MR. BRAMHAM: I really appreciate El Centro. Margaret and I have been working steadily to try to make improvements at the subgroup level, and Dick

Holliday has been part of that. And we are back on track. Great meeting, the last meeting. Steve Razo attended that, and we appreciate that. So we are happy there.

And if you are coming to El Centro and you are going to look into tribal, aborigine and cultural interests, we invite you to Glamis.

CHAIRMAN BANIS: Last comments? Very good. Thank you all very much.

The wrap-up and summary. Yesterday was amazing. We had a wonderful time. I think we all kept an open mind about the agenda topic and about the location. And I think those of us who were able to experience the fieldtrip yesterday were greatly rewarded for our open-mindedness and this is another -- just another in a series of responsibilities that the BLM has that we continue to learn about and hopefully we can help advise in this area as well.

I will see, if there are no further questions or comments before Teri adjourns the meeting, we would just like to, if I may say, on behalf of the DAC to send our best wishes and the hopes for recovery to a long-time friend of the desert, Eldon Hughes. For those of you who have been involved in desert issues

for many years, you have been in the same room and on the same podium with Eldon, and I'm sure you share great respect for the man. And I think all of us are passing on our best wishes to him in these difficult times for him and his family. So with Eldon in mind, I would like to pass the gavel to Teri for final words.

DIRECTOR RAML: I want to thank everybody for coming. I think it was a wonderful meeting. I was quite happy to have the state director here. I think he just reinforces the importance of this group.

A quick word about Eldon. Eldon was the first caller I received when I was appointed to the California Desert District, the first external. He called me up and I had a lovely conversation with him and he welcomed me. I have not had the pleasure of meeting him, but he was the first outside voice I heard welcoming me to the Desert District. So with that, meeting adjourned.

(The proceedings were adjourned at 4:46 p.m.)

R-E-P-O-R-T-E-R-'-S C-E-R-T-I-F-I-C-A-T-E

I, JUDITH W. GILLESPIE, a Certified Shorthand Reporter, No. 3710, for the State of California, do hereby certify that the foregoing pages comprise a full, true and correct transcription of the proceedings had and the testimony taken at the hearing in the hereinbefore-entitled matter of Saturday, December 2, 2011.

Dated this 24th day of December, 2011, at Riverside, California.

JUDITH W. GILLESPIE, CSR, RPR, CLR

M-O-T-I-O-N-S

- A. Maker: Banis
Second: By Consent
Motion: To approve the last meeting transcript.
Result: Motion carried

- B. Maker: Banis
Second: By Consent
Motion: To approve the agenda.
Result: Motion carried

- C. Mover: Shumway
Second: Grossglass
Motion: To elect Tom Acuna to be the DAC representative on the SRP Subgroup until 12/31/11, to be replaced by Ronald Johnston
Result: Motion carried

- D. Mover: Holliday
Second: (1) Mitzelfelt; (2) Johnston; (3) Hold; (4) Hallenbeck; (5) Shumway
Motion: To accept recommendations from the User Fee Subgroup with the changes discussed on pages 150-203.

- E. Mover: Hallenbeck
Second: Rudnick
Motion: Establish a DAC Subgroup to look at issues for remanded work for Western Mojave Route Designation Project
Result: Motion carried

- F. Mover: Hallenbeck
Second: Grossglass
Motion: To adopt proposed 2012 Work Plan as presented on pages 229-235
Result: Motion carried

A-C-T-I-O-N I-T-E-M-S

Stewart: 1. Have a discussion on the DRECP on each agenda
2. Have news on the Tortoise Recovery Plan from Fish and Wildlife

Mitzelfelt: Desert Tortoise Recovery Plan briefing by BLM on impacts of implementation

User Fee Recommendations:

1. Instituting family fee so second vehicles/family aren't charged extra
2. Allowing for a single-day permit
3. Make sure public involved in fee design and investment
4. Reduce cost of fee collection
5. Improved public announcements when fee change is required
6. Better public notice of how and where fees are spent
7. Better accountability for expenditures
8. Additional fee schedule for daily use
9. Fee for Sawtooth Campground

Bramham: Subgroup information available at scoping Meetings before February for WEMO plan

Waldheim: Coordinate schedules with OHV Commission

Stewart: Notification of skills need for WEMO subgroup

Campbell: People need a way to contribute to WEMO subgroup. She would volunteer to be on subgroup

Sall: Wants to know how ranger details are scheduled

Hallenbeck: BLM needs to grant right-of-way permission for high-speed internet (PRAXIS) access for underserved areas

Grossglass: Western Governor's Meeting in Yucca Valley needs to have DAC representation

Kenna: DAC should be active in DRECP discussions