

SANTA ROSA AND SAN JACINTO MOUNTAINS NATIONAL MONUMENT
MONUMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF ORAL PROCEEDINGS

LOCATION: DESERT PERMIT ASSISTANCE CENTER
38686 El Cerrito Road
Palm Desert, CA 92211

DATE AND TIME: Monday, March 7, 2011
3:09 p.m. to 5:55 p.m.

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

JOB NO.: 69796DM

A P P E A R A N C E S

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

BOB BROCKMAN, CHAIRPERSON - CITY OF RANCHO MIRAGE

JEFF MORGAN, VICE-CHAIRPERSON - SIERRA CLUB

DEBRA OLINGER - AGUA CALIENTE BAND OF CAHUILLA INDIANS

TOM DAVIS - AGUA CALIENTE BAND OF CAHUILLA INDIANS

STEVE HARRIS - BLM

GRETCHEN GUTIERREZ - FRIENDS OF THE DESERT MOUNTAINS

RON KRUEPER - CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND
RECREATION

LAURIE ROSENTHAL - SAN JACINTO RANGER DISTRICT

RUTH WATLING - PINYON COMMUNITY COUNCIL

MARK WEBER - CITY OF LA QUINTA

JEFF WATTENBARGER - LOCAL DEVELOPER OR BUILDER
ORGANIZATION

CORRIE KATES - CITY OF INDIAN WELLS

JODY NOIRON - FOREST SUPERVISOR, SAN BERNARDINO
NATIONAL FOREST

TOM GILLET - DEPUTY FOREST SUPERVISOR, SAN BERNARDINO
NATIONAL FOREST

AL MUTH - UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, RIVERSIDE

BOB LYMAN - COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE

JOHN KALISH - FIELD MANAGER, PALM SPRINGS SOUTH COAST
FIELD OFFICER, MONUMENT BOARD OF DIRECTORS

JIM FOOTE - MONUMENT MANAGER, DESIGNATED FEDERAL
OFFICIAL

I N D E X

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

<u>AGENDA ITEM</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
Call to Order/Roll Call	4
Approval of Minutes from 9-20-2010	5
MAC Charter and Bylaws Report	6
Election of Chairperson and Vice Chairperson	9
Prioritization of projects/tasks	12
Public Comments	35
Pacific Crest Trail reroute update	39
Installation of Monument Sign on Highway 111	45
BLM/Agua Caliente proposed land exchange	47
Long Valley Plan/Hidden Lake	50
Cabazon Wind Energy proposed project	58
Corridor Management Plan for Highways 74 and 243	87
Monument projects, activities, etc.	95
Open forum for MAC member discussions, Q & A	119
Identification of future agenda items	119
Adjourn	121

1 PALM DESERT, CALIFORNIA

MONDAY, MARCH 7, 2011

2

3

-000-

4

5

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

6

7

8

9

CHAIRPERSON BROCKMAN: Okay. Let's call the meeting to order. And first order of business is to call the role. Jim, you want to help us out?

10

11

12

13

14

MR. FOOTE: I'll do that. It's a little different than the last process, where normally I went down the roster. Why don't we just go around and introduce ourselves, and I will take the role based on that. Start with Ron Krueper.

15

16

17

MR. KRUEPER: Ron Krueper, State Parks.
MS. GUTIERREZ: Gretchen Gutierrez, Friends of the Desert Mountains.

18

19

MR. DAVIS: Tom Davis, Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians alternate.

20

21

MS. OLINGER: I'm Deborah Olinger, Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians.

22

23

CHAIRPERSON BROCKMAN: Bob Brockman, City of Rancho Mirage.

24

25

MR. MORGAN: Jeff Morgan, Sierra Club.

MR. MUTH: Al Muth, University of

1 California Riverside.

2 MR. FOOTE: Jim Foote, Monument Manager
3 and designated federal official.

4 MR. KALISH: John Kalish, Field Manager
5 with BLM.

6 MR. GILLETT: I'm Tom Gillett, Deputy
7 Forest Supervisor, San Bernardino National Forest.

8 MS. NOIRON: I'm Jody Noiron, the
9 still-new Forest Supervisor the San Bernardino
10 National Forest. I came in behind Jean Wade Evans.

11 MR. KATES: Corey Kates, City of Indian
12 Wells.

13 MR. WATTENBARGER: Jeff Wattenbarger,
14 Desert Valley Builders Association.

15 MR. WEBER: Mark Weber, City of
16 La Quinta.

17 MR. FOOTE: Good. Thank you. We now
18 have eight of the appointed positions here, which
19 represents a quorum.

20 CHAIRPERSON BROCKMAN: That in itself is
21 news.

22 MR. MORGAN: We can do business.

23 CHAIRPERSON BROCKMAN: Next order of
24 business is approval of minutes from the last meeting.

25 Jim, I didn't see any minutes, but I wasn't at the

1 last meeting, so maybe there weren't any.

2 MR. FOOTE: I sent out an e-mail message
3 indicating the website that those were available on.

4 CHAIRPERSON BROCKMAN: Okay. So is
5 there a motion to approve the minutes?

6 MR. KATES: I make a motion to approve
7 the minutes.

8 MR. KRUEPER: I'll second.

9 CHAIRPERSON BROCKMAN: All in favor?
10 Okay.

11 (A voice vote was taken.)

12 CHAIRPERSON BROCKMAN: The minutes are
13 approved. All right.

14 Jim, you want to give us a report on the
15 charter and the bylaws situation as well as our
16 appointments and nominations?

17 MR. FOOTE: Yes. Thank you. The
18 Charter and Bylaws were last adopted in December of
19 2010, and so we still have sufficient time before we
20 have to renew. For those of you familiar with the
21 process of recharter, it has to be done every two
22 years. That's a process that goes up through the
23 departments, meaning Department of Interior and the
24 Department of Agriculture, for approval by the
25 Secretary of the Interior and Agriculture. We still

1 have time before we need to resubmit. In fact we
2 probably won't start that process until early next
3 year or about this time next year.

4 In your packet are two handouts. One
5 indicates the Advisory Committee composition as of
6 August, 2010, which has not changed to date, and the
7 attendance record reflecting attendance at the meeting
8 of September 20th of 2010.

9 As you can see, there are a number of
10 positions that will be expiring on December 16th of
11 this year. And in fact you can see most of the
12 membership comes from that grouping, five primaries
13 and four alternates. This month I will be forwarding
14 for approval Federal Registry notice calling for
15 nominations to all those positions, both the
16 December 16th, 2011 and all vacant positions.

17 It typically takes about, as I recall, 240
18 days from time of submission and opening that notice
19 and the call for nominations to approval. So we'd be
20 about in the right timeframe if we submit it this
21 month. So I'm anticipating doing that very shortly.
22 I'll be sure to let everyone know when that Federal
23 Register notice is published, and I certainly
24 encourage everyone to encourage others to apply for
25 the vacant positions and soon-to-be-vacant positions.

1 You could see the number of green blocks here. Those
2 are positions that we have just not had representation
3 from in recent times, so we hope to fill that out as
4 best we can.

5 The attendance record just reflects
6 attendance since February of 2005. As you can see,
7 there were four periods where we didn't have a quorum,
8 but we did in the last two meetings. As of September
9 in 2009, that was the first meetings of which
10 alternate representatives could attend and were
11 appointed. That's why you see those last two rows as
12 looking somewhat different from the rows above.

13 But as I say, we did have a quorum in both
14 the 2009, 2010 meetings. By virtue of the
15 Omnibus Bill in 2009 the quorum requirement was
16 changed from a minimum of eight, which the legislation
17 from 2000 applied to a majority of the appointed
18 members. So that's our quorum requirement now. So
19 right now we have 11 primary positions filled, meaning
20 11 of the interests filled. We'd have to have a
21 minimum of six people. Today we have eight, so we did
22 achieve our quorum.

23 MR. WATTENBARGER: But it's primary
24 and/or alternates that count?

25 MR. FOOTE: Now, if we were to do a

1 majority of the appointed, there are a total of 30
2 positions, being 15 primary, 15 alternates. We're
3 really looking at the majority of the interest
4 positions filled, so we have 15 interests represented,
5 and if we get a majority of the number appointed to
6 those -- right now we have 11 positions covered --
7 then that would be six as the quorum requirement.

8 MR. WATTENBARGER: Okay.

9 CHAIRPERSON BROCKMAN: Any questions for
10 Jim on membership and charter? Anything else? Okay.

11 The next item is the election of chairman
12 and vice chairperson, which was deferred from the
13 September, 2010 meeting. And so I suppose we should
14 seek nominations or have any nominations put forward
15 at this time.

16 MR. MUTH: Would you accept running
17 again, Bob?

18 CHAIRPERSON BROCKMAN: I would. However
19 do note that my term expires December of 2011. I'm
20 not sure whether or not I will continue, so with that
21 caveat, I would accept an additional year.

22 MR. MUTH: May I place your name?

23 CHAIRPERSON BROCKMAN: All right.
24 There's one nomination. Are there any others?

25 MR. WATTENBARGER: Move the nomination

1 be closed.

2 MR. WEBER: Question. Is there any, I
3 guess, point of order before that? So I can jump in
4 there. Is there any reason to think that you would
5 not be renominated?

6 CHAIRPERSON BROCKMAN: To be honest, I
7 don't know if I'm going to seek the additional term.
8 I need to talk it over with some folks, but I don't
9 want to mislead you. I might still be here for
10 another year or two, so that was the only reason I
11 mentioned that. I have nothing for certain that I
12 won't be here.

13 MR. WATTENBARGER: Mr. President, what's
14 the term of office of months, from when to when?

15 CHAIRPERSON BROCKMAN: Well, we
16 generally have been meeting once a year. We revised
17 our schedule this time for another matter on the
18 agenda today. So generally the term has been year to
19 year, but in the past -- and for some reason last
20 September the chairman and vice chairman elections
21 were deferred, so the term is somewhat flexible, if
22 that answers your question.

23 MR. WATTENBARGER: Yeah. So
24 theoretically you'd be in for at least a year?

25 CHAIRPERSON BROCKMAN: In theory, yes.

1 MR. FOOTE: I can add something to that.
2 The charter indicates the elections will occur on an
3 annual basis. If it's the desire of this group to
4 modify that next time the charter comes up, we could
5 submit a request that election of the chair and vice
6 chair occur at a different timeframe, maybe once every
7 two years, once every three years, whatever it's the
8 desire to do.

9 MR. WATTENBARGER: So Mr. Chairman, that
10 being said, I move nominations for chairman or
11 president be closed.

12 CHAIRPERSON BROCKMAN: All right.

13 MR. WEBER: Second.

14 CHAIRPERSON BROCKMAN: Seeing no other
15 nominations, I will politely accept the additional
16 term.

17 Nominations for vice chairperson are now
18 open. I'd like to point out our current vice chair is
19 Jeff Morgan.

20 MR. MORGAN: I'm prepared to stay in the
21 position for another year if this committee so
22 desires.

23 MR. WATTENBARGER: So moved. It's fine
24 with me.

25 MR. KRUEPER: Second.

1 CHAIRPERSON BROCKMAN: If there are no
2 other nominations for vice chair, I'll close that and
3 announce that Jeff will continue for another year as
4 vice-chairman.

5 MR. KRUEPER: Great.

6 MS. GUTIERREZ: Thank you for being
7 willing to serve.

8 MR. FOOTE: I would ask that the group
9 provide a recommendation with respect to the duration
10 of the term. Is it a desire for the charter to be
11 revised such that the term is longer? One year?

12 MR. MORGAN: I think one year is fine.

13 CHAIRPERSON BROCKMAN: I prefer year to
14 year.

15 MR. MORGAN: And seemingly a March
16 meeting has come about that we need to make it in
17 March and not just one or maybe again in September. I
18 don't know. So we'll do it from the March meeting to
19 the March meeting.

20 MR. FOOTE: Currently, again, the
21 charter indicates that the election would occur at the
22 first meeting of the year for the MAC, which would be
23 this meeting. So we'll retain that.

24 CHAIRPERSON BROCKMAN: Okay. The next
25 order of business is the prioritization of projects

1 and tasks for BLM and the Forest Service for FY2012
2 work plans. I'll point out that we had at least two
3 work group meetings on this subject and have produced
4 some material that Jim will go over in a second. But
5 I would want to make it very clear that the
6 recommendations from the work group are only that.

7 The subject of priorities and work projects
8 and tasks is still an open issue for further
9 discussion. And we wanted to make sure that the
10 committee as a whole had the benefit of the work
11 group's recommendations, and that's what's been put
12 before you in written material.

13 So, Jim, you want to take us through what
14 you've given us?

15 MR. FOOTE: Absolutely. Thanks, Bob.
16 As Bob indicated, the work group did meet, and we, in
17 fact, met on three occasions between the September
18 meeting last year of this group and the meeting today.
19 The agencies brought some suggestions with respect to
20 potential work plan commitments for FY2012. The work
21 group worked on those, looked at those, determined
22 what might be some priority actions for those
23 representatives. They, in fact, did prioritize those
24 based on a high, medium and low priority.

25 I did send this out for review to the group

1 via e-mail a week or so ago. Hopefully you've had an
2 opportunity to review that. So the charge of this
3 group at this point is to further prioritize those.
4 In fact you could bring new projects to the table.
5 You could reorganize these. As you see, there's many
6 that are listed as high. What we would like to see
7 this group do -- and I'll explain how we're going do
8 that in a minute -- is to define the highest of the
9 high, if you will. Which of these projects are of the
10 highest priority to this group?

11 Now, you may elevate some that may have
12 been a medium or low priority to a high priority, or
13 vice versa, you may lower a high priority to a medium
14 or low. That's the charge of this group, is to make
15 those kinds of recommendations to both BLM and the
16 Forest Service.

17 We have separated the agency's workloads in
18 the individual rather than treating them as a monument
19 because we deal with work plans on an agency-level
20 basis. We do not get together, if you will, and
21 determine what those work plans will be for each
22 fiscal year. We work on our own separately, and so
23 this is the most useful format for the agencies to
24 digest.

25 Is there any further explanation needed? I

1 don't know if people had an opportunity to, in fact,
2 review these before this meeting. I also did send a
3 document -- it's the one in your handout but also came
4 via e-mail -- with a little more explanation of what
5 these projects are, what the task of this group is at
6 this point in time.

7 And the method we're going to deal with
8 this is, I'm going to distribute some dots, colored
9 dots, to members here, and I'm thinking maybe three
10 dots apiece we can start with. And each individual
11 representative here picks their top three priorities
12 and puts a dot next to that. And on the basis of
13 that, that will become your recommendation as to which
14 are the highest of the high or the highest to the low
15 or vice versa.

16 Any questions on how to proceed or further
17 comments? Bob.

18 CHAIRPERSON BROCKMAN: Maybe this would
19 be a good time to ask whether everyone has had a
20 chance to review the materials and if there are any
21 questions before we get into that process. Al?

22 MR. MUTH: Could you just say a few
23 words about which biological opinion it was that
24 affected the monument?

25 MR. FOOTE: Yes. The biological

1 opinions referred to here are two. They are the
2 biological opinions on the California Desert
3 Conservation Area Plan Amendment for the
4 Coachella Valley. We had two biological opinions for
5 that plan. One related specifically to peninsular
6 bighorn sheep, the other to Coachella fringe-toed
7 lizard, Coachella Valley milk vetch and desert forest.
8 Those are the two biological opinions we're
9 referencing here for BLM.

10 MR. WATTENBARGER: I've got a couple
11 questions.

12 CHAIRPERSON BROCKMAN: Jeff.

13 MR. WATTENBARGER: Please bear in mind
14 I'm new in this group, so I'm going to ask some newbie
15 questions. Thanks again to the working group that put
16 this all together. It really helps prioritize. It
17 sounds to me as if funding is a big issue based upon
18 what I'm reading here. So should that -- oh, hi, Jim.
19 Should that have any effect on where I put my blue
20 dots on the funding that we might get?

21 MR. FOOTE: Funding is always a
22 question, and we never know what our funding levels
23 are going to be until we get a budget, so I would not
24 constrain it in that regard. Clearly, though, if you
25 see a project that says \$200,000, the likelihood of

1 funding that relative to funding our regular
2 operations costs, the labor, everything else becomes
3 lower, and it depends on how Congress is going to act
4 as they go through the budget process. We've heard a
5 lot about potential cuts in funding, and we just don't
6 know how all this plays out in the end. So at this
7 point I wouldn't constrain it in that regard.

8 I think when we come to looking at these
9 for working on work plans, what's going to happen is
10 we'll work within the framework of our budget, and if
11 there's a high priority issue identified by the
12 Monument Advisory Committee and we don't have
13 sufficient funding, we can look for sources of outside
14 funding to see if that's possible. And there are ways
15 we can go about that, but if ultimately it becomes
16 such that we cannot do the project based on funding,
17 then we can move down to the next one.

18 MR. WATTENBARGER: Okay. But when you
19 do your plan, did you put all your wish list in and
20 then hopefully get money for all or part of them?

21 MR. FOOTE: Anymore it's really a
22 top-down funding issue based on an issue list and
23 agency and departmental priorities, and so we will get
24 a budget passed down from Congress to the department
25 to the agency to the local office. Then we need to

1 allocate that among what our needs are and this will
2 be incorporated into that consideration of where the
3 money goes. We just can't make any promises that, in
4 fact, we would accomplish any of these tasks. We just
5 don't know at this point in time.

6 MR. WATTENBARGER: Thank you.

7 MR. FOOTE: And certainly whether Jody
8 or Tom want to add a discussion to this about budgets
9 and how we work these kinds of recommendations into
10 the work plan, we would welcome that.

11 MS. NOIRON: Well, I think from our
12 perspective, when you start reaching out to 2011, we
13 don't even have a budget yet. We're still on
14 continuing resolution, so it gets even foggier,
15 especially now with everything going on in the world
16 and in this country and the decisions that Congress
17 has facing it, is that I think there's so much back
18 and forth going on right now about the 2012 budget
19 that I agree with Jim. I think that we should just do
20 the best we can without trying to forecast or guess
21 what kind of budgets we may get next year.

22 It's foggier for 2012 than it was for 2009
23 or 2008 or any of the recent years that we've had,
24 just because the way Congress and the administration,
25 the way they're situated all the issues that they're

1 dealing with, the economy, the federal deficit.

2 That's my spin on it.

3 MR. GILLETT: Yeah. I mean there's so
4 many variables. The other thing is, some of these
5 projects are ripe for not necessarily just
6 appropriated funds, but there might be other sources
7 of funding that come available. So if we have some
8 idea of priority and the projects are, as they say,
9 shovel ready, they've gone through the environmental
10 process and they're ready to go, we can try to secure
11 funds from other sources aside from just appropriated
12 funds.

13 And then some of these projects lend
14 themselves to lake partial completion. Some you can't
15 dissect like that. You can't make -- you can't, you
16 know, rip a sign in half and buy half of it. But
17 others you can. You can kind of phase it in.

18 MR. MORGAN: For example on Page 1 the
19 first two projects are actually mandatory. They have
20 to be done anyway, whether they're funded or not, so
21 there's --

22 MR. WATTENBARGER: To eradicate the
23 exotic plants? Is that what you're talking about?

24 MR. MORGAN: Yeah. The first two items
25 come from the biological opinions from Fish and

1 Wildlife Service that were sent as a memo to the
2 Bureau of Land Management as projects that are
3 mandated and have to be completed.

4 CHAIRPERSON BROCKMAN: However, Jeff,
5 not all the projects that were part of the biological
6 opinion received a high priority.

7 MR. MORGAN: No. I didn't say that.

8 CHAIRPERSON BROCKMAN: Maybe he needs to
9 understand that the work group felt that, even though
10 they were mandated, as you said, or as a part of the
11 terms and conditions, we didn't feel it was of the
12 highest priority. For example the one on the second
13 page having to do with inventory of bighorn sheep
14 water sources was not the highest priority. So I
15 think that reinforces Jim's point that we shouldn't
16 constrain ourselves even because it's in the terms and
17 conditions of the biological opinion but rather, what
18 do we feel and see what the agencies want to do with
19 those recommendations?

20 MR. FOOTE: If I can expand on that just
21 a bit, as you see, several of these terms and
22 conditions and the biological opinion do not identify
23 scope of the project. For instance the first one,
24 which indicates eradication of exotic plant species,
25 does not tell us to what extent we need to do that.

1 Is that in acres? Is that five acres? Is it ten
2 acres? That starts to fall under the discretionary
3 determination of the agency. Jeff is right in that
4 terms and conditions and compliance with those is
5 mandatory to prevent a violation of Section 9 of the
6 Endangered Species Act. But again, unless it
7 specifies the scope of that, it's open for
8 interpretation as to what extent we need to comply
9 with that.

10 So if we, for instance, achieve one acre of
11 tamarisk eradication, technically we're in compliance
12 with that term and condition. We'd like to do as much
13 we can, and as Tom indicated, these are often projects
14 we look to outside funding sources for as well. And
15 we have received outside funding for projects such as
16 tamarisk eradication.

17 One recent example is money provided by
18 Southern California Edison to Friends of the Desert
19 Mountains which is available for tamarisk eradication,
20 and we will be allocating that to this project or to
21 some form of tamarisk eradication within the Monument.
22 So those are ways that we can look beyond our
23 appropriated funds to get projects accomplished.

24 MR. WATTENBARGER: One last question is
25 that point. Like do we get money from Bighorn

1 Institute for helping, well, like the first one on our
2 list, for example?

3 MR. FOOTE: No.

4 MR. WATTENBARGER: So they don't
5 contribute anything to this group or to BLM or the
6 Forest Service?

7 MR. FOOTE: They have not contributed
8 dollars. They've certainly contributed the
9 information to help us understand bighorn sheep and
10 better management of them.

11 CHAIRPERSON BROCKMAN: Jim, are we
12 looking only at the BLM portion of this with the three
13 dots, or do the three dots go for --

14 MR. KRUEPER: Forest Service too.

15 MR. FOOTE: That's a good question.

16 MR. MORGAN: I think we need more dots.

17 MR. KRUEPER: I think we ought to do six
18 at least.

19 MS. ROSENTHAL: I think what we decided
20 is that, since they're going to have two different
21 funding sources and two different decisions, they were
22 going to be, like, two separate prioritizings. Right,
23 Jim?

24 MR. FOOTE: Yes. Thanks, Laurie. And
25 just let the record reflect that Laurie Rosenthal,

1 District Ranger for the San Jacinto District of the
2 San Bernardino National Forest, has arrived, as well
3 as Ruth Watling representing the Pinyon Community
4 Council and Bob Lyman representing the County of
5 Riverside.

6 CHAIRPERSON BROCKMAN: So six dots over
7 both agencies, or must it be three and three?

8 MR. FOOTE: Three and three.

9 CHAIRPERSON BROCKMAN: Okay.

10 MR. WATTENBARGER: On our list here,
11 Jim, does it differentiate which agency is affected?

12 CHAIRPERSON BROCKMAN: Yes. If you go
13 to Page 6 on this one, you'll see the Forest Service,
14 six and seven.

15 MR. WATTENBARGER: Forest Service. Got
16 it. Oh, I see. The first several are for the BLM.
17 Okay. I got it.

18 MR. WEBER: Mr. Chairman, as a newbie
19 again also, I've had the same kind of questions that
20 Jeff has brought up, and I don't want to belabor the
21 point when it comes to the budget, because it sounds
22 like a morphous blob. We're not sure what it's going
23 to be. But at the same time that helps me sort of
24 understand, you know, sometimes what can be done.

25 Can some of the oldtimers talk a little bit

1 maybe about -- not you, because you're a newbie like
2 me -- talk a little bit more about some of the
3 priorities, you know, that they think can actually be
4 accomplished with a limited budget scope even if we
5 don't know what that budget is, because obviously
6 budget is going to drive the capabilities somewhat.

7 And while I don't want to get hung up too
8 much on it, I mean generally is actually doing work in
9 the habitat a priority more than accessibility for
10 residents and citizens? You know, sometimes, you
11 know -- I mean I see some kind of different
12 categories. I mean you see parking lot. You see
13 signage. You see accessibility issues, you know,
14 being talked about in some of the priorities. And
15 then you see more habitat-related type of things. And
16 can some of those be accomplished with partnerships of
17 people, you know, volunteers versus hard money?
18 Obviously a parking lot --

19 CHAIRPERSON BROCKMAN: Jim is the best
20 person to answer that, but certainly there are a
21 number of projects here which have been identified as
22 involving several partners in the process. And we
23 kind of had the same questions that you did, Mark,
24 when we were first going over these projects at the
25 work group meeting because a lot of them are still a

1 little bit mysterious to us. But I think we kind of
2 ultimately came down to the idea of, what do we think
3 is most important?

4 MR. FOOTE: I can add a little bit to
5 that. It's always helpful to go back to the
6 Monument's legislation and look at the purpose of the
7 Monument. And really, to answer to your question,
8 Mark, it is twofold. One general category is resource
9 protection, and the other side is providing
10 opportunities for the public to enjoy those resources.
11 So we have a little bit of a dual mission, if you
12 will, and when it comes to making a decision and a
13 work plan, we're going to look at both those missions.
14 That's why it's hard to answer, is one side more
15 important than the other?

16 Again we have that mission. But oftentimes
17 when -- and I know I've heard this a lot from folks,
18 say, who see potential for access limitations and they
19 point to the Monument legislation and they say, "See,
20 you're required to provide the access." But the other
21 piece of that is further in the legislation it will
22 say "consistent with other laws." And so one of those
23 other laws is Endangered Species Act, as an example.
24 So we provide that access to the public consistent
25 with protecting the resource under the Endangered

1 Species Act. So we have to look at those in balance.

2 Our primary objective is whatever is going
3 to be statutory and regulatory to make sure we
4 accomplish that and do the best we can. Clearly
5 there's not enough money to do everything, so we have
6 to make those tough choices about what we're going to
7 do. But we will look at both those issues of resource
8 protection and the enjoyment for the public to those
9 resources.

10 MR. WEBER: Thank you.

11 CHAIRPERSON BROCKMAN: Jim, would this
12 be a time for everyone to start contemplating the list
13 in preparation of using their three BLM dots?

14 MR. FOOTE: I think so. And I would say
15 during the time when we put this up, we'll suspend the
16 recording of the minutes and then reconvene once
17 everybody has placed their dots, if that's acceptable.

18 CHAIRPERSON BROCKMAN: Sounds good to
19 me.

20 MS. ROSENTHAL: Does anybody have any
21 questions about any of the projects?

22 MR. MORGAN: We're doing BLM right now.

23 CHAIRPERSON BROCKMAN: Yeah. Any
24 questions on the BLM side of the project list?

25 MR. WEBER: Are the estimated costs,

1 like, say, for the parking lot at the trailhead, is
2 that -- has somebody actually gotten the estimate on
3 that? Is that a hard number that somebody has gone
4 out and gotten a quote on so you know what the number
5 is?

6 MR. FOOTE: That particular one is a
7 hard number. We do have all the contract
8 specifications for that. We did get three bids, and
9 the estimate is coming in at \$200,000.

10 MR. WEBER: And okay. I mean I don't
11 want to micromanage stuff like that, but is that like
12 a hard surface? Is that a porous surface? I mean
13 what kind of a parking lot are we talking about? Is
14 it gravel just to make sure that cars don't get stuck
15 in the sand, or is this a --

16 MR. FOOTE: It's hard surface asphalt.

17 MR. WEBER: All right.

18 MR. MORGAN: I think it will be used as
19 an expungent of the Visitor Center parking area.
20 Which gets a little crowded at times, but there is
21 adequate parking for the trail right now. It's just
22 across the highway.

23 MR. WEBER: Okay.

24 MR. WATTENBARGER: Can I ask Laurie a
25 couple questions? Hi.

1 MS. ROSENTHAL: Hi.

2 MR. WATTENBARGER: Do you have any
3 control over access to up in the Idyllwild area like
4 for South Ridge trail, that road that goes up there,
5 the one off 74 that goes up to Santa Rosa Mountain?

6 MS. ROSENTHAL: Yes. That's Forest
7 Service land. Yes.

8 MR. WATTENBARGER: As far as maintaining
9 it so I don't ruin my truck when I go up through
10 there?

11 MS. ROSENTHAL: Yes. That's all Forest
12 Service.

13 MR. WATTENBARGER: Okay. That's a high
14 priority for me, then.

15 MR. MORGAN: The road to Santa Rosa
16 Mountain isn't that difficult to maintain, but with
17 the weather they get at Santa Rosa Mountain, they get
18 a lot of rain in the summer up there and a lot more
19 than just a few --

20 MR. WATTENBARGER: There's another
21 question. Do they come through with a blade once in a
22 while?

23 MS. ROSENTHAL: Right. The
24 transportation budget this coming year is going to be
25 lower, so -- getting back to what Jody was saying --

1 so we're going to be actually having a prioritizing
2 session on roads coming up shortly. So we will
3 certainly pass that along.

4 MR. WATTENBARGER: Well, hiking is my
5 passion, so sorry to take time from the group, but
6 thanks for answering.

7 MR. MORGAN: The last time the road to
8 Santa Rosa Mountain was repaired was the tree removal
9 project; is that correct?

10 MS. ROSENTHAL: I believe it's been
11 since then.

12 MR. MORGAN: It doesn't seem like that.

13 MR. FOOTE: Before we suspend taking of
14 the minutes, because we'd certainly like to get all
15 the questions answered on the record, if we can do
16 that first, and then we'll suspend the taking of the
17 minutes until people put on their dots, reconvene.
18 And hopefully we'll refrain from question asking and
19 answering until we reconvene the minutes.

20 CHAIRPERSON BROCKMAN: Laurie, did you
21 have a point?

22 MS. ROSENTHAL: I just had a procedural
23 question about the voting. Maybe you said it, but can
24 you vote on the same project with more than one dot?
25 Has that come up?

1 MR. MORGAN: Put all your dots on one
2 project?

3 MR. FOOTE: We did not cover that, but
4 that seems fair.

5 MR. WATTENBARGER: That's a super high
6 priority.

7 MR. FOOTE: Exactly. Again this is the
8 recommendation of the Monument Advisory Committee, and
9 if it's that critical to this group, then we want that
10 reflected. Al?

11 MR. MUTH: Yeah. Just I noticed on
12 the official tabular charts up there that -- it ends,
13 last heading, for the BLM communication, et cetera.
14 There's a whole category -- terms, conditions,
15 biological opinion. Follow that on the handout I've
16 gotten, and that's not up there.

17 MR. FOOTE: Correct. And let me explain
18 that.

19 MR. MUTH: Please do.

20 MR. FOOTE: The reason that the
21 priorities on the sheet you received are blacked out
22 is, those would be the projects that will be completed
23 prior to FY2012. We will have already done that or
24 the cost or effort is minimal or we don't actually
25 take action until something down the road triggers

1 that action. So no need to prioritize those at this
2 time.

3 CHAIRPERSON BROCKMAN: That would be a
4 wasted dot.

5 MR. FOOTE: Okay. If there are no more
6 questions, we'll suspend the taking of the minutes and
7 reconvene after the dots are on the board.

8 (Pause in proceedings.)

9 MR. FOOTE: Okay. We'll reconvene the
10 minutes. We're back on the record.

11 CHAIRPERSON BROCKMAN: Okay. Let's
12 continue with the tabulation of our votes here. Jim,
13 you want to take us through it?

14 MR. FOOTE: Well, I think it's kind of
15 self-explanatory. I'll just go through the counting.
16 If you want to on your own records for yourselves put
17 down the numbers we go down. We have eight for the
18 first project, which was the exotic plant species
19 eradication. The one for the field inspections for
20 Windy Point/Snow Creek to determine OHV compliance.
21 We had six for the PCT issues at Snow Creek, one for
22 the pursuit of alignment with municipal codes relative
23 to the MHSCP, four for replacing the Monument highway
24 sign on 111, one for inventory of lands for wildland
25 status, five on the visitor services, completing

1 construction of the Randall Henderson trailhead
2 parking lot; zero for the inventory of natural and
3 artificial bighorn sheep water sources, four for the
4 construction of the amphitheater at the Monument
5 Visitor Center, zero for the implementation of the
6 existing prohibition of dogs and the issue of locating
7 free-ranging dog packs, two for wildlife habitat
8 inventories and monitoring, zero for conducting
9 cultural resource inventory, zero for enhancing
10 web-based outreach. And those were the Bureau of Land
11 Management projects.

12 For the Forest Service projects we have one
13 for the Fuller Ridge hazard tree removal, seven for
14 the Palm Canyon tamarisk eradication, six for the
15 closure of the illegal routes in the Santa Rosa
16 Wilderness, two for replacing or enhancing
17 interpretive materials at Cahuilla Tewanet, five
18 replacing Forest Service signs to reflect Monument
19 location at the identified site, two for monitoring
20 competition for water between bighorn sheep and cattle
21 in Palm Canyon and two for pollinator management.

22 I can see right off the bat that there's a
23 strong emphasize between agencies on eradicating
24 exotic species. Seems to be a common theme. Okay.
25 With that concluded, we will move these

1 recommendations on to our respective agencies. And
2 I'd ask, are there any further questions or
3 clarifications that folks would like?

4 MR. WATTENBARGER: One question. So the
5 ones that we dotted, you'll put those on the list and
6 recommend to the agencies?

7 MR. FOOTE: Yes. I will then compile
8 this and send this back out to the Monument Advisory
9 Committee so that all those members that are not here
10 today also will receive this information, and then we
11 will utilize this in considering our work plans for
12 FY2012.

13 MR. WATTENBARGER: Very well done. I
14 like it that you're so organized here today. Thank
15 you.

16 CHAIRPERSON BROCKMAN: Jim, when will
17 all of this actually be decided?

18 MR. FOOTE: I'll defer to John and Jody
19 and Tom on this.

20 MR. GILLETT: Our next-year program of
21 work development process and budgeting process,
22 sometime early summerish is when this will be. And
23 that's why this is so timely. To get this more up
24 front -- this information up front in terms of where
25 the committee sees our priorities is very helpful

1 earlier. It's better earlier than later. So that's
2 when we start our -- it would be our current year
3 planning for the coming fiscal year.

4 And you guys are probably about the same
5 timeframe?

6 MR. KALISH: Yeah, pretty much. Later
7 on this year we'll start putting in for our project
8 money, and typically our Monument lands usually float
9 fairly high to the top when it comes to overall budget
10 priorities as far as projects. And that will all tie
11 in to money that will actually be allocated next year.
12 So depending on when the federal budget will be
13 finalized next year, what limitations we have to live
14 under and how much discretionary money and how much
15 money that's tied in to these types of programs that
16 is going to be allocated out from Washington, and
17 we'll be able to utilize this priority list and start
18 to affect or put money into some of these projects.

19 We certainly try for, through all creative
20 means, to leverage the funds either through grants or
21 collaboration with other entities and volunteer
22 projects and all the standard ways that are used to
23 try and stretch limited dollars.

24 But this is very exciting and very
25 interesting that exotic species, of course, rose to

1 the top and definitely something that's high on --
2 been high on our minds, especially the tamarisk and
3 the Sahara mustard and other invasive species that
4 we've been dealing with in the last few or more years.
5 So we'll certainly feed this into the process and look
6 forward to the outcome.

7 CHAIRPERSON BROCKMAN: And Jim, I think
8 we would like to maintain some follow-up so that we're
9 as a committee aware of how these recommendations have
10 fared in the ultimate process of the budget. So keep
11 us apprised.

12 MR. FOOTE: Will do.

13 CHAIRPERSON BROCKMAN: It's 4:00, and on
14 the agenda we have the time reserved for public
15 comments. However I don't see anybody from the public
16 in attendance. But Gretchen wanted to say something.

17 MS. GUTIERREZ: That was a loaded
18 sidebar, wasn't it, Bob? So thank you. I'm not able
19 to stay clear until the end, when you actually are
20 going to hear an update about the Monument's projects
21 and activities. But first of all, I'd like to say
22 thank you to those of you that came and participated
23 and/or worked hard on this past Saturday, when we held
24 the Annual Wildflower Festival at the Monument. We
25 had approximately 2,000 people there for the day's

1 activities.

2 We ran over 800 people out on hikes, so
3 they utilized the Randall Henderson, the Ed Hasteley and
4 the Art Smith trails. It was a great weather day. We
5 were thankful it happened on Saturday and not
6 yesterday, with the with winds starting to pick up and
7 occur here in the valley, and we're still tabulating
8 all of our various segments of information about that
9 event.

10 We'll have a report to Jim, and then he can
11 distribute it accordingly as he so chooses within the
12 next week as to overall numbers of the day. But we
13 took a lot of surveys. We ran about 500 surveys out,
14 and overwhelmingly it was a very positive event. So
15 the community outreach and support of the Monument is
16 there. People are very thankful to be able to come up
17 to the Monument. A lot of them, it was first timers
18 to come up to the Monument for the day. So we were
19 very appreciative of having good weather and a great
20 event.

21 And the other thing we have going on at the
22 Monument -- and we're very excited about this from
23 Friends' side -- is that in partnership with the BLM
24 and U.S. Forest Service, we have undertaken the
25 building relocation move that was discussed last

1 September at this group. It is actively underway at
2 this time.

3 On February 16th we moved in four modular
4 trailers up to the Visitor Center, and in a little
5 over two short weeks we are stuccoed. Today we are
6 trenching for the utilities, and we are expecting to
7 be moving into those units within about three to four
8 weeks at this particular point in time.

9 We've got some pictures available in both
10 Jim's category of pictures and in mine, because we've
11 been taking pictures every few days on this process.
12 But if you happened to come up on Saturday and
13 wandered around the site up there, everyone couldn't
14 believe they were modular trailers. They thought they
15 were buildings that we had constructed in about three
16 weeks' timeframe because three weeks ago they weren't
17 there. So we're very pleased about that project and
18 our partnership with that.

19 It will be our new home for Friends, for
20 myself and all of our Friends staff as well as
21 accommodating space for BLM and Forest Service to have
22 office space there at that facility as well. So we're
23 expanding the facilities there on-site. So we're
24 happy about that. Thank you. That's it.

25 CHAIRPERSON BROCKMAN: Any questions for

1 Gretchen before she has to leave?

2 MS. GUTIERREZ: Otherwise I'm going back
3 to a jobsite to continue building stuff.

4 MR. FOOTE: The primary function of
5 those new buildings is also to provide space for
6 volunteers for training work space. Right now we are
7 growing a volunteer program and little space for them
8 to work or congregate, and this fulfills that
9 function.

10 MS. GUTIERREZ: Just an aside, I
11 actually was approached through one of our partners
12 that gives us grants, and through our grants, we can
13 help with some of your projects. They asked Saturday
14 can they be the first to book in our conference room.
15 And I said, "Sure." And they're the first ones, and
16 they'll be in there the first week of April. So we've
17 got to have everything up and ready for them by that
18 point in time. So yes, it will be available for that
19 purpose as well. So thank you.

20 CHAIRPERSON BROCKMAN: All right.
21 Great.

22 MS. GUTIERREZ: Thank you.

23 MR. FOOTE: Thanks, Gretchen.

24 CHAIRPERSON BROCKMAN: Well, that takes
25 us to our various updates. Jim, you want to introduce

1 our speakers for these updates?

2 MR. FOOTE: Yes, absolutely. The next
3 two items, the update on the Pacific Crest Trail near
4 Snow Creek Village and the installation of a Monument
5 sign on Highway 111. That will be covered by
6 Steve Harris, who come on board last July as Outdoor
7 Recreation Planner. We do have a couple of handouts
8 in your packet, one page relating to each of those.
9 Some of these pictures you've seen before. The PCT
10 handout is two-sided, so you'll see a couple of
11 pictures there, and the Highway 111 is one-sided.

12 And I'll let Steve take it away.

13 MR. HARRIS: Thank you, Jim. Thank you
14 all for having me here today. I am a little new to
15 the area, and I've met some of you already. And my
16 name again is Steve Harris. I'm the Outdoor
17 Recreation Planner for the Santa Rosa/San Jacinto
18 Mountains National Monument. It's very exciting to be
19 involved in a service-first agreement with the Forest
20 Service and partnering with those folks in all of
21 this.

22 And the issues with the Pacific Crest Trail
23 resolve around a short area or section of the trail at
24 the Snow Creek Village. And the best way to start is
25 to look at the photographs. And you can see some of

1 the signage that's out there indicating no trespassing
2 on the Desert Water Agency and a gate blocking the
3 road. And that's actually the trail. So there's some
4 confusion there, and we're trying to alleviate that by
5 doing some things.

6 We met with a lot of the key players one
7 day out at the village to get their concerns addressed
8 or at least, you know, documented. And there were a
9 lot of -- the whole range of issues were discussed
10 from move it as far away as you can to just, you know,
11 fix some things right here. And that was -- one clear
12 indication that we got out of it was to maybe phase in
13 with just updating the signage to start with rather
14 than rerouting the trail.

15 What we would like to do -- and we've
16 already got some cooperation from the Desert Water
17 Agency. They're going to remove the two signs you see
18 on the gate. They've already agreed to do that and
19 also --

20 MS. NOIRON: They're gone. We were
21 there today.

22 MR. HARRIS: Are the new ones up yet?

23 MS. NOIRON: No, but the old ones are
24 gone.

25 MR. HARRIS: Great. Well, they've also

1 agreed to replace those with a little more trail-user
2 friendly sign indicating it's okay for hikers to go
3 through. I'm glad you were up there. Great. And
4 they supposedly were also supposed to remove the old
5 wooden signs. I don't guess you saw those up there.

6 MR. FOOTE: They're gone.

7 MR. HARRIS: They're gone. So they've
8 helped us already in that regard. And also the County
9 of Riverside Transportation Department is very easy to
10 work with. They have said they would be able to
11 provide us with an encroachment permit, very easy to
12 acquire, and if we want to put any signs up along
13 Snow Creek Road for parking, that's okay with them.
14 And we are likely to be able to do that as well as
15 some other signing we can update along the trail to
16 get people to stay on that section of the trail and to
17 know where they're able to go through the village and
18 stay out of the village, where some of the village
19 residents are concerned about trespass there as well.

20 So the first phase will be to update the
21 signing and then just try and monitor that for a while
22 and see how that works out. And further down the
23 road, if something else is needed, then we will
24 proceed with requirements there with maybe an
25 environmental assessment. But for now we'll just fix

1 the signs, and that seems to be a good solution
2 short-term, and it can be done quickly.

3 Yes, sir?

4 MR. WEBER: Question. How long were
5 those old, ugly signs there?

6 MR. HARRIS: That one looks like another
7 breath of wind probably would have blown it to a pile
8 of wood. Yeah, it was pretty old, dilapidated
9 signage. And fortunately we have the Pacific Crest
10 Trail Association working with us also to give us some
11 advice and assistance of putting up some new signs,
12 stickers.

13 We'll be able also -- in addition to the
14 signs, we talked about possibly put some new posts in
15 or new guide signs with an arrow just to simply allow
16 people to see they can go a certain direction. But
17 yeah, the old signs have been removed, and we're going
18 to update everything with a new sign to kind of give
19 people a fresh start there.

20 MR. MORGAN: We've been complaining
21 about those signs for 25 years. It's only taken 25
22 years to remove illegal signage.

23 MR. HARRIS: I'm 55 years old, and it's
24 taken me that long to get here, so finally we're
25 getting a little something done.

1 MS. ROSENTHAL: Hooray for Steve.

2 MR. HARRIS: So this is a good start,
3 you know. It's great that something is happening, and
4 I thank everyone that was involved in the process.
5 And it's still ongoing, actually.

6 MR. WEBER: What timeframe to get the
7 updated signs in?

8 MR. HARRIS: Desert Water Agency has
9 indicated it will be very soon. We'll do those signs
10 very soon on the gate, and we'll have to develop a
11 couple of signs for the parking and get those probably
12 within a month or two, reasonably within a month or
13 two.

14 MR. WEBER: So Desert Water Agency is
15 paying for it. They're coordinating the verbiage with
16 you to make sure it's completely appropriate. Are we
17 talking two months?

18 MR. HARRIS: Yeah. They're to remove
19 the "No Trespassing" wording, and they still want to
20 leave some of the blue wording you see at the bottom
21 about the -- or maybe revising that to, you know, "No
22 unauthorized vehicles access," but they do want to be
23 able to put on there that PCT trail users, you know,
24 are allowed to go through. So we will see that, and
25 they have shown that to us, pretty clean ones,

1 already.

2 MR. WEBER: So 60 days, 90, days, 120
3 days, 30 days?

4 MR. HARRIS: Or sooner for the DWC sign.
5 Sounds like they're ready to move quickly.

6 MR. FOOTE: Any other questions on PCT
7 reroute? Thank you.

8 MR. MORGAN: Just a comment. If what
9 you're proposing doesn't work, you might need to think
10 about rerouting a little bit there.

11 MR. HARRIS: Absolutely. Absolutely.
12 We have met with a lot of other people on this, and
13 the Forest Service, Beth Boyce, she's the head of the
14 PCT section of that trail for the Forest Service. And
15 they're still looking at reopening the optimal
16 location process where that whole area between -- you
17 know, in the valley there.

18 It's a process apparently that, you know,
19 was done and looked at for, like, ten years, and there
20 was really no resolution to it. A lot of alternatives
21 were looked at, and they want to reopen that and see
22 if there's another way to get some closure on that
23 part of it. But if nothing else, we can still look at
24 a simplified reroute at Snow Creek if necessary.

25 CHAIRPERSON BROCKMAN: This seems to

1 demonstrate the effectiveness of our vote on this
2 particular matter.

3 MR. FOOTE: Already.

4 CHAIRPERSON BROCKMAN: It's amazing how
5 powerful.

6 MR. MORGAN: It's already done.

7 CHAIRPERSON BROCKMAN: Want to go to the
8 next one?

9 MR. FOOTE: Uh-huh.

10 CHAIRPERSON BROCKMAN: Go ahead.

11 MR. HARRIS: Is that me again?

12 CHAIRPERSON BROCKMAN: You're on.

13 MR. HARRIS: And some other pictures in
14 your packet were for a sign that had been in place on
15 Highway 111. It was a sign that indicated -- well, it
16 was a guide sign for the National Monument, a large
17 sign. And shortly after it was placed there, someone
18 had an accident and killed it, broke it off, and then
19 somebody else came by and stole it. I think that
20 information was passed out in the last advisory
21 council meeting.

22 So what we have is a replacement sign, an
23 identical type of sign that's being stored up at
24 Idyllwild at the Forest Service. The only thing we're
25 lacking are posts to put it in and, you know, the

1 labor to put it up. Caltrans has tentatively offered
2 us a couple of posts, but we still haven't acquired
3 those. So the process is still, you know, taking
4 place.

5 Yes, sir.

6 MR. WEBER: The sign that I see shows a
7 marker with a white cross there. That is not related
8 to the sign necessarily, is it?

9 MR. HARRIS: We checked into that, and
10 it was not related. In fact that cross was recently
11 placed there, and as best we can tell, it was a recent
12 accident not related to the sign.

13 MS. WATLING: Good question.

14 MR. WEBER: Obviously, if it was the
15 breakaway, is important to consider. And maybe that
16 is still maybe in that location if it's so close to
17 the shoulder.

18 MR. KATES: Caltrans' right-of-way is
19 going to want to make a breakaway.

20 MR. WEBER: They're not going to have a
21 solid posts anymore.

22 MR. HARRIS: We already have an easement
23 with Caltrans at that location for that sign, and the
24 requirement is for breakaway post. They have to be
25 made a certain way so they have that breakaway feature

1 to fulfill a Caltrans requirement. Yeah, the cross
2 was, unfortunately, in the same location but a
3 different incident.

4 CHAIRPERSON BROCKMAN: Any further
5 questions for Steve?

6 MR. HARRIS: Thank you.

7 CHAIRPERSON BROCKMAN: Jim, you're on.

8 MR. FOOTE: This is an update of the
9 proposed land exchange between BLM and the
10 Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians. If you
11 recall, at the September 20 meeting, I distributed an
12 environmental assessment that we had released to the
13 public for public comment and review. Based on that
14 release we did extend the comment period on two
15 occasions. The comment period was for in excess of 90
16 days.

17 As a result we received comments from 141
18 individuals from eight organizations and three
19 governmental entities. And based on a review of those
20 comments, we determined that it's appropriate for us
21 to prepare an environmental impact statement.

22 So our next step is to public a Notice of
23 Intent to begin the EIS process, or environmental
24 impact statement process, at which point we identify
25 the issues with the public be addressed in the

1 environmental impact statement. We prepare a draft,
2 we release that draft for public review and comment
3 and then develop a final EIS and decision.

4 Then the 141 comments from the individuals,
5 the eight organizations, three governmental entities
6 will be responded to in the draft EIS, and then the
7 public has an opportunity then to see how we've
8 responded to those comments and then make additional
9 comments, if they feel it necessary, in the draft EIS.
10 And so that's kind of it in a nutshell.

11 Timeframes. We were hoping to have a
12 public scoping meeting before the seasonal population
13 leaves in mid April. However the process for getting
14 the Notice of Intent published was longer than
15 anticipated. There are several weeks of review
16 required at the Washington office, and so we're
17 looking to do that later in the year, the whole public
18 scoping comments.

19 However in the meantime, because we did
20 receive so many comments, we have a good idea of what
21 the issues are going to be. We'll still be working on
22 the document so that, when we do in fact release the
23 Notice of Intent, we hopefully have somewhat of a head
24 start, we'll have responded to comments and should be
25 able to move that process through quickly once we go

1 to public scoping.

2 MR. WATTENBARGER: Question. In EIS
3 did I understand that you respond to each one of the
4 140 comments?

5 MR. FOOTE: At this point I think our
6 strategy will rather be that, when we receive comments
7 on the EIS, we will respond to the public concern
8 statements in the draft EIS. In other words we'll
9 look through all the public comments, identify every
10 comment individually and group those and then respond
11 to those.

12 So for instance people have issues with
13 access to the Carson Trail, as an example. We'll
14 address that issue in the response to comments and
15 similarly deal with all the comments that way.

16 MR. WATTENBARGER: Thank you.

17 MR. MORGAN: I have a question, Jim. I
18 had asked you this before, and you said you'd get back
19 to me. I would like to review the public comments
20 that you received, and do you think you can make
21 arrangements for me to do that?

22 MR. FOOTE: Yes, we can. It's a
23 sizeable pile of paper.

24 MR. MORGAN: I know. I'm not asking you
25 to copy it for me. Just make it available.

1 MR. FOOTE: Yeah, you can come in and
2 look at those.

3 MR. MORGAN: Okay. Thank you.

4 MR. FOOTE: Any other questions on that
5 process? Again we'll keep you apprised of when that
6 Notice of Intent is published, and we'll establish
7 public scoping meetings again at a minimum of one,
8 probably two in Palm Springs. One of the concern
9 areas of this, because this is largely located within
10 the City of Palm Springs jurisdiction, the City had
11 concerns. So we want to ensure that at least a
12 meeting is going to be held in Palm Springs. But
13 again I'll let you all know when that happens so
14 you'll be apprised when the meetings are.

15 CHAIRPERSON BROCKMAN: All right. Ron,
16 you have a report for us on the Long Valley Plan?

17 MR. KRUEPER: Yes. Thank you.
18 Ron Krueper, State Parks. An update at
19 Mt. San Jacinto State Park. A couple of items. Long
20 Valley Management Plan, which is the
21 top-of-the-mountain station for the Palm Springs Tram,
22 comes up. We've always envisioned from our general
23 plan that we did earlier in 2002 that there would be a
24 more specific management plan completed for that
25 Long Valley area, which, of course, has a lot of

1 impacts from the visitation from the tram.

2 We did start this project up a year and a
3 half ago, and then due to funding constraints, we had
4 to stop it. But now we're back on track to go through
5 a plan to actually have an EIR. We're going to have
6 an NOP coming out shortly, and we're going -- we did
7 have some stakeholder meetings earlier last year in
8 Palm Springs here and up in Idyllwild to get public
9 input and have taken some of those thoughts and ideas
10 at those meetings and now have come up with some plans
11 that we will daylight at the next public meeting.

12 I was hoping to have that date for you
13 today, but I don't have that. But it's soon, and
14 we'll have another meeting soon here in Palm Springs
15 and another one in Idyllwild here this late spring
16 sometime.

17 This is to see about how to protect the
18 meadow a little bit better up there and to site
19 certain of the areas there as you gravitate away from
20 the Mountain Station into the wilderness area so that
21 it is a way of getting people to kind of get away from
22 the mechanical conveyance into the wilderness area.

23 Also in that area, then, we have the
24 Hidden Lake Preserve, and that's south of
25 Hidden Valley. It's an area that also has endangered

1 species of blue curls, and we're looking at ways of
2 making sure we protect the resources but also provide
3 access, because a lot of people like the Hidden Lake
4 area, also to see a Public Resources Code change,
5 where all hikers in the area have to stay on
6 designated, maintained trails so that we protect the
7 resources there.

8 But also at the other end of Hidden Lake,
9 of course, is this beautiful view of Palm Springs. So
10 a lot of people want to traipse and walk right through
11 that area. So we recognize that, and as a way to help
12 with access and help the public to at least enjoy that
13 area, there is going to be a trail designed out of the
14 water -- up on the side of the watershed with
15 interpretive signs and "Stay on trail," "Keep out"
16 signs, but at least get to the overlook, where a lot
17 of people like to go as a destination point to oversee
18 and then come back to our main trail. So it would be
19 kind of like a spur trail there.

20 The other update is that we continue to
21 work with slight realignment improvement of the
22 Pacific Crest Trail along Fuller Ridge within the
23 State Park. This last summer we had ten spike camps
24 by the California Conservation Corps, and so they were
25 up there all summer redesigning and straightening out

1 the trail, not so much up and down, improving it for
2 equestrians. There were many portions of that that
3 were very hard for equestrians to move through. And
4 we'll be continuing that again this summer in Phase 2,
5 another large operation of use of the CCC crews, and
6 it's worked out really well.

7 And the last thing, too, is that another
8 meadow in San Jacinto is Round Valley, and this last
9 fall we were successful in repairing a head-cut repair
10 at the end of Round Valley, and it will be constantly
11 monitored now and into the future to see how the
12 slowing down of the dewatering of the meadow will
13 hopefully keep, you know, the encroachment of
14 lodgepole pines and also keeping recreational use more
15 to one side of the meadow so that we don't have
16 impacts to the meadow.

17 So that was a very successful project with
18 another CCC crew and cutting and kind of relocating.
19 It was up to 800 cubic yards of fill material back
20 into the end of the meadow to prepare the head cut and
21 to slow the dewatering of the meadow.

22 So any questions on any of those four
23 topics?

24 MR. WATTENBARGER: I'm sorry.
25 Personally I wanted to ask a couple questions. So

1 which end of Round Valley -- did you block the water
2 from leaving?

3 MR. KRUEPER: Yes, the south end.

4 MR. WATTENBARGER: And that lake, is
5 that accessed by the tram?

6 MR. KRUEPER: It can be. Not directly,
7 but it's about a mile-and-a-half hike.

8 MR. WATTENBARGER: I've never been
9 there.

10 MR. KRUEPER: That's why it's called
11 Hidden Lake.

12 MR. WATTENBARGER: Sounds like a
13 fascinating place to visit.

14 MR. KRUEPER: Yes.

15 MR. WATTENBARGER: Thank you.

16 MR. FOOTE: Just one question, Ron. The
17 trail access to bypass Hidden Lake, is that going to
18 be natural surface or any fencing, or will there be a
19 hard surface?

20 MR. KRUEPER: Just a regular trailhead,
21 no equestrians out there from the Little Creek trail.
22 We're going to -- we have a trail designed to -- so we
23 don't have obtrusive fencing, we're going to be
24 creative with some natural rock use that maybe uses
25 some CCC's to help create some natural looking

1 barriers to keep people -- and we're hoping that
2 through our creative interpretive signage and whatnot,
3 that people take ownership and hopefully understand
4 the reason they have to keep up on the slope and keep
5 off of the periphery of the lake for the blue curls.

6 MR. FOOTE: For those who have never
7 been there, it's just a fabulous area going from
8 Hidden Lake out to the overview, one of the best views
9 into the San Jacinto Mountains, just gorgeous.

10 MR. WATTENBARGER: Is there some sort of
11 maps that are given out to hikers to see where the
12 trails are?

13 MR. KRUEPER: Right at our ranger
14 station at Long Valley at the bottom of -- where you
15 have to walk down heart-attack hill from the
16 Palm Springs Tram down to the valley floor.

17 MR. WATTENBARGER: By the way, could you
18 put escalator or something there?

19 MS. WATLING: There is a tram.

20 MR. KRUEPER: At least that gets you up
21 8,000 feet.

22 MR. WATTENBARGER: When you hike up
23 there and you're coming back and you have to go -- I
24 don't know how many hundred feet that is from the
25 valley to the tram station, that's hard.

1 MR. KRUEPER: Yeah.

2 MR. MORGAN: The tram people had a
3 proposal last time this came up to put what they call
4 a people mover, a walkway, like, to the tram station.

5 MR. HARRIS: They put an elevator at
6 Carlsbad Caverns.

7 MR. WATTENBARGER: That's an expensive
8 process.

9 MR. KRUEPER: Yeah, very much so. And
10 for the degree of cost versus the usefulness and also
11 potential breaking down. Also, as I said, it's
12 wilderness area, so as we try and move away from the
13 tram, it's kind of like desensitizing, gravitating
14 slowly towards a wilderness area and stuff.

15 MR. WATTENBARGER: Do you limit any of
16 the people in the wilderness area?

17 MR. KRUEPER: Yeah, camping, overnight
18 spots. We have a Public Resources Code of 400 people
19 camping, but it doesn't limit day use. But that's
20 something that perhaps we're going to be looking at
21 because there's just more and more people visiting the
22 tram and also even on the Idyllwild side.

23 MR. WATTENBARGER: I wondered about
24 Round Valley, because you have a limited number of
25 spaces for overnight.

1 MR. KRUEPER: Yes.

2 CHAIRPERSON BROCKMAN: What level of
3 visitation do you get in the peak season of the tram?

4 MR. KRUEPER: The tram every year
5 creates -- it's about 440,000 people, and that
6 comes -- they come up on the tram. It doesn't mean
7 all of them go into the wilderness area, but we figure
8 about 20 percent, 25 percent of those people do go
9 down some extent into the wilderness area.

10 CHAIRPERSON BROCKMAN: That's an annual
11 figure?

12 MR. KRUEPER: Yes. It keeps get growing
13 every year. The Palm Springs Tram is doing well with
14 ridership.

15 MR. WATTENBARGER: I can see how
16 Round Valley would suffer with all those people up
17 there.

18 MR. KRUEPER: Yes. That's why we're
19 trying to look at this plan to maintain resources so
20 it's not loved to death.

21 MR. MORGAN: If you have public
22 meetings, don't hold them at 7:00 on a Friday night,
23 because that keeps many, many people away.

24 MR. FOOTE: I was there, Jeff.

25 MR. MORGAN: Well, that's you. You're

1 more dedicated than many others.

2 MR. KRUEPER: Anybody else?

3 CHAIRPERSON BROCKMAN: Next one. Okay.
4 John, you have a report for us on Cabazon Wind Energy.

5 MR. KALISH: I sure do. Our office has
6 been very actively involved for the last two years or
7 so in renewable energy. I'm sure if you read the
8 newspaper the Desert Sun or Press Enterprise, that
9 you're pretty up to speed on all the various projects
10 that we've been working on. The vast majority are in
11 eastern Riverside County further out into the desert
12 and involve a variety of solar proposed facilities.

13 Overall we've got about 140,000 acres under
14 application for renewable energy projects. So it
15 gives you a little idea of scope and overall workload.
16 Within Coachella Valley itself, we really are not
17 under that level of workload as far as renewable
18 energy projects, with one exception, and that's the
19 Cabazon Wind Energy Project that has actually been
20 around for quite a while.

21 And what I'll do is just go into a very
22 brief description of the project, and then we can talk
23 a little bit about the history and how the MAC has
24 gotten involved in this project and then see where you
25 want to go from there.

1 So if you look into your packet, you'll see
2 kind of a map here that shows -- it has two large kind
3 of black outlined, not complete rectangles, but down
4 south of I-10 where 111 splits off over into
5 Snow Creek and in an area called Fingle's Finger.

6 Cabazon Wind Energy, which is owned by Bill
7 and Brad Adams, who are wind-energy operators here in
8 the valley and have been so for quite a long time on
9 BLM lands, they do have an existing lease up on
10 Whitewater Hill and other areas on the valley floor,
11 but they very recently submitted a right-of-way
12 application in our office for their Cabazon Ridge
13 Project, which under the County process has been
14 designated as WECS 118 Wind Farm Project. I mentioned
15 it's near Snow Creek and Fingle's Finger.

16 The proposal itself is for 52 either Vestas
17 wind turbines or 42 of the 3.6-megawatt Siemens wind
18 turbines, which would be the largest wind turbines
19 anywhere within San Gorgonio Pass or Coachella Valley.
20 And presently the largest wind turbines are on
21 Edom Hill at the British Petroleum Project, and those
22 are two-and-a-half-megawatt machines. So these are
23 very sizeable machines, up to 438-feet tall.

24 The wind turbines themselves are on private
25 lands, but if you go to the next page, you can see the

1 BLM lands are the ones that are shaded over the aerial
2 photo. Private lands are not. And each one of those
3 little kind of yellowish marks is an individual wind
4 turbine, and the black lines are roads. So in looking
5 at that -- and actually there's a larger map up here
6 that shows the private lands right here with the wind
7 turbines. And this is all reflected on the little
8 diagram that you have. This piece of land right here
9 (pointing) is BLM, as well as this small piece of
10 land.

11 So the wind turbines would be placed on
12 private lands essentially in-holdings within the
13 National Monument, but the access roads and other
14 ancillary facilities would be placed using
15 right-of-way grants on BLM lands, against that
16 right-of-way applications for those facilities on BLM.

17 So again the private lands are all within
18 the Monument, but the actual issues as far as BLM is
19 concerned are those road utility and underground
20 infrastructures, the communication lines that would be
21 all part of the project.

22 And there's a couple of other aspects of
23 the application involving safety setbacks in which the
24 applicant is proposing to extend their essentially
25 encumbrance onto adjacent BLM lands dealing with

1 required setbacks to allow for public safety in the
2 vicinity of these wind turbines. And these setbacks
3 can be anywhere from the height of the actual wind
4 turbines, say, 400 feet, up to three times the height,
5 three times 400 feet, or 1200 feet. So those safety
6 setbacks are all part of the overall proposal.

7 I mentioned I'd give a little history.
8 Back in -- seems like 2005 or so? -- this proposal
9 originally surfaced. There are issues on the County
10 level dealing with this project proposal in that it is
11 inconsistent with the County General Plan. Really the
12 different parts of the plan that it is inconsistent
13 with are a requirement under the General Plan that no
14 wind turbines be built south of Highway 111. And the
15 second inconsistency is that no wind turbines are to
16 be built within the Santa Rosa and San Jacinto
17 Mountains National Monument. And the third
18 inconsistency is development -- this would be require
19 development on slopes greater than 25 percent.

20 So what the project proponent has done over
21 a couple of years is worked with the County and has
22 gotten the County to agree to go ahead and proceed
23 with this project on the County level and initiate an
24 environmental impact report that would analyze both
25 the project itself as well as the changes to the

1 General Plan within that document.

2 If you look back in your packet here, you
3 can see a couple of photos here. This is a series of
4 four photos looking west on I-10, and on the left side
5 of the upper photo as well as the next two photos
6 down, the ridges that are portrayed are the ridges
7 where these very large wind turbines would be
8 constructed. The last photo shows the Pacific Crest
9 Trail, whose alignment would go very close to the line
10 of wind turbines on the very eastern side of the
11 project.

12 The Monument Advisory Committee has in the
13 past looked at this whole issue. Back at that time
14 the County stance was that they were not going to
15 accept and analyze this application because of the
16 issues with the County General Plan. You can see
17 written in or highlighted in yellow that there
18 actually was a resolution to essentially advise BLM
19 not to proceed in analyzing an application that is
20 inconsistent with the General Plan. On the last page
21 the motion was approved.

22 A couple of things have changed since then,
23 one of which is the County's decision to go ahead and
24 move forward with this project, and in fact, it is
25 right now in their queue within their planning staff

1 to go ahead and initiate an environmental impact
2 report on the Cabazon Wind Project.

3 So really from a BLM standpoint there's
4 really two decisions that need to be made. One
5 decision is whether or not BLM as an agency goes in
6 with the County in preparation of a combined NEPA and
7 CEQA document, essentially an EIS/EIR on the project,
8 analyzing the project jointly and ultimately coming
9 out with decisions on the County side whether or not
10 to approve the project as well as the General Plan
11 amendments. And on the BLM side it's whether or not
12 we would grant the rights-of-ways for the access roads
13 and the other ancillary facilities across BLM lands
14 that are within the National Monument.

15 In just a quick staff review of the
16 project, a couple of the issues that we've come up
17 with -- and I'll just kind of run down through these
18 issues, one of which is whether or not our issuance of
19 a right-of-way grant across BLM Monument lands is
20 consistent with the Monument designation.

21 Clearly there would be impacts to the
22 overall view shed in and around that area; additional
23 impacts to designated wildlife corridors within that
24 location; whether it's compatible with the Snow Creek
25 and Windy Point Conservation Areas as designated under

1 the MSHCP; the impact to overall sand transport that
2 would affect the dune complexes within
3 Coachella Valley; clearly, impacts to use on the
4 Pacific Crest Trail; and lastly we fully anticipate
5 that the project would be controversial, given input
6 that we've received in the past.

7 On the flip side from an overall
8 wind-energy standpoint, the location of this proposed
9 project right within San Gorgonio Pass on those ridges
10 is a prime spot, and from an esthetical and an
11 engineering standpoint, from purely a wind energy
12 standpoint, it would be a quality site to build on.
13 So those are kind of the pros and the cons.

14 So I guess the question is whether or not
15 you feel that we should have some discussion on BLM's
16 approach to this project, whether we go in with the
17 County and jointly analyze the project as an EIS/EIR
18 or whether we can as an option allow the County
19 process and the General Plan Amendment to run its
20 course, allow the County to make a decision on the
21 project and then we tier off of EIR and analyze our
22 portion of the project rights-of-ways then issue our
23 own decision after the County process is finished.
24 Any questions on that?

25 CHAIRPERSON BROCKMAN: Yes. Mark?

1 MR. WEBER: Can you just go over the
2 numbers again. It was up to 480-foot high? There was
3 two options on the different types of turbines. One
4 was -- what was the count on them? I'm trying to
5 understand the magnitude.

6 MR. KALISH: It was a smaller wind
7 turbine at 52 total turbines.

8 MR. WEBER: What's the -- four, four --

9 MR. KALISH: Forty-two of the
10 3.6-megawatt Siemens machines, which are 438-feet
11 tall.

12 MR. WEBER: The 52 were 2.5 megawatts?

13 MR. KALISH: They're in that vicinity.
14 I think it depends on availability of wind turbines.
15 There's kind of a worldwide shortage of wind turbines
16 and whether they can be acquired in a timely manner.
17 And then just the engineering aspects of siting these
18 wind turbines, especially given the grades of the
19 roads going up to the individual paths and the
20 steepness of the slopes.

21 MR. WEBER: And then follow-up to the
22 other question is, you said there was three
23 inconsistencies; right?

24 MR. KALISH: Right.

25 MR. WEBER: No turbines south of 111, no

1 turbines south of Interstate 10?

2 MR. KALISH: Of 111. This location is
3 right where 111 peels off.

4 MR. WEBER: And then slopes of greater
5 than 25 percent?

6 MR. KALISH: Twenty-five, and then
7 within the National Monument.

8 MR. WEBER: And these are pretty close
9 to the peak?

10 MR. MORGAN: These go up to -- 4400
11 feet, I think, is the higher one. If you look where
12 just if you're coming east on the 10 just before you
13 turn on Highway 111 to go to Palm Springs, there's a
14 narrow piece of land that comes down. To the west of
15 that there's some existing older turbines. Some of
16 these would start right there and go up to about
17 4,000-some feet.

18 MR. MUTH: It's right here (pointing).

19 MR. WEBER: Is that part way up, that
20 top picture?

21 MR. MUTH: It's about up to the highest
22 point there.

23 MR. WATTENBARGER: So the highest part
24 of this picture would have turbines on it?

25 MR. MORGAN: Yes.

1 MR. WATTENBARGER: Wow.

2 MR. MORGAN: It also involves at least a
3 million cubic yards of grading.

4 MR. MUTH: Are you ready for comments?

5 MR. KALISH: Certainly.

6 MS. WATLING: Can you do it without
7 swearing?

8 MR. MUTH: No, I can't. You'll notice I
9 seconded Buford Crites' motion back then.

10 MR. KALISH: You certainly did.

11 MR. MUTH: I see no reason to change my
12 views on this thing. I see virtually no public
13 benefit, given the costs that you outlined of doing
14 this project. So I would say to the BLM not only "no"
15 but "hell no," do not issue the right-of-way to this,
16 period.

17 MR. KALISH: The question would be,
18 would we analyze in a joint process with the County
19 under a NEPA/CEQA process the entire project?

20 CHAIRPERSON BROCKMAN: I think that may
21 be your question, but that wasn't Al's answer.

22 MR. MUTH: No. That's a strategic thing
23 I think you need to decide. But I don't know how the
24 rest of you feel about tiering off of one thing.
25 Jeff?

1 MR. MORGAN: I have a comment on that.
2 If you join the County in a joint EIR/EIS process, I'm
3 pretty darn sure, given the current makeup of the
4 County, they will try and approve this in some form or
5 another, and that way you might be tied to their
6 decision. And there again, if you let them go ahead,
7 then you tier off later, you again might be under
8 pressure to conform to that decision.

9 So I suggest that you maybe talk to the
10 County a bit more and say, "This is basically
11 inconsistent with the idea of the National Monument."
12 It certainly will not perform in great favor with --
13 the persons living in Snow Creek and certainly Pacific
14 Crest Trail are not going to see any benefits by
15 having wind turbines about 300 feet from the trail,
16 500 feet or whatever it is. I haven't seen the
17 latest.

18 MR. FOOTE: It may be helpful to ensure
19 that we're not at this point reacting to what may be a
20 decision of the BLM. We're at this point considering
21 how to engage in a process.

22 MR. MORGAN: Okay.

23 MR. FOOTE: And looking at these issues,
24 one key consideration is, what would result in the
25 most robust environmental analysis? And would that be

1 a separate EIR and then beyond tiering off an EIS, or
2 would that be a joint EIR/EIS? And one of the primary
3 concerns I have -- and I'm certainly not a CEQA
4 expert, but I have a concern about the quality of the
5 visual impact analysis under CEQA as compared to what
6 the BLM analysis would be under NEPA. I know the NEPA
7 process very well, and it is a very strong visual
8 resource analysis. I don't have the same confidence
9 in the analysis under CEQA.

10 So that's why you look at where we'd be in
11 the end here, and is -- our strength and our
12 obligation, I think, to the public is to present the
13 highest quality environmental analysis through a joint
14 process, which I believe would likely be the case, or
15 do we tier an EIR that may or may not be?

16 CHAIRPERSON BROCKMAN: Corey?

17 MR. KATES: I think we should be totally
18 involved in this process, because letting the County
19 run with an EIR, they're going to adopt overriding
20 considerations and not going to get the full impact of
21 visual aesthetics. Just like the valley issue with it
22 being controlled by the County, we need to be totally
23 involved in the EIR and the CEQA/NEPA documents
24 because there will be a totally negative impact on
25 both the Mountain Conservancy land and the impact of

1 the economics of the valley. There's a visual impact.

2 MR. MORGAN: Besides visual impacts
3 there's -- something the windmill operators will not
4 take into consideration is the impacts on birds in
5 that area, as golden eagles. Most of them have been
6 killed by the windmills. But the wind industry in the
7 Whitewater Pass area has never done a comprehensive
8 study regarding avian mortality. They did a fake
9 study about ten years ago on this big black box that
10 says, "Do not use this study to make any decisions
11 regarding avian mortality from windmills in this
12 area." They went there three times for a few hours
13 each time and said, you know -- you can read the
14 study. It's 57 pages of nothing.

15 MR. FOOTE: That would certainly be an
16 adequacy issue on the NEPA/CEQA document that could be
17 raised during its preparation. If the public feels
18 that has not adequately been covered, then it would
19 comment, and there would be response to that during
20 the process.

21 MR. MORGAN: If you talk to proponents
22 of this project regarding avian mortality, they'll
23 say, "We ain't seen a dead bird yet," and that's a
24 quote.

25 MR. MUTH: Just from the biological

1 perspective of this, we're not talking a few -- a few
2 stray birds. This is a major West Coast flyway for
3 migratory birds. It's hundreds of thousands of birds
4 that go through there every year. Not all go through
5 in the daytime. Many of them go through at night. So
6 this is a significant place in terms of migratory bird
7 pathways.

8 Also Friends of the Desert Mountains,
9 Coachella Valley Conservation Commission, we've spent
10 millions acquiring habitat in this corridor that goes
11 across between the two conservation areas. So this is
12 not just -- okay. It is an important entryway to the
13 valley. But biologically, doggonit, this is exactly
14 the spot Baja California meets the Sierras. That's
15 how this stuff gets there. And so it is
16 extraordinarily important.

17 And like Corey said, we really need to be
18 involved in this both from the sociological aspect of
19 what it could do to the economics but also the biology
20 of it.

21 MR. FOOTE: If I hear you correctly, Al,
22 then it sounds like you're in support of a joint
23 process to ensure that both the federal and the County
24 processes are integrated, and the issues you raise
25 with the avian pathway is certainly one that should be

1 addressed in the joint environmental document. And
2 ultimately the decision, of course, comes out of that
3 process.

4 CHAIRPERSON BROCKMAN: Putting aside all
5 environmental analysis just for a second, does BLM
6 have the unilateral authority to say no?

7 MR. FOOTE: It does not before going
8 through the process. That would be predecisional if
9 we were to deny a project.

10 CHAIRPERSON BROCKMAN: Following a
11 process, BLM, in spite of what the County or anyone
12 else does, can say no in terms of the access on BLM
13 land?

14 MR. FOOTE: It's a discretionary
15 project.

16 MR. KALISH: If it was inconsistent with
17 the County Plan and the County made a decision that
18 they were not going to amend it or not going to allow
19 this process to move forward, then we would not
20 analyze the project just because it's inconsistent
21 with the planning on adjacent lands. But if you look
22 at the legislation and the designation of the Monument
23 and the language that was used, as well as the
24 Monument Plan, there is nothing specifically in either
25 that says that a project like this can be denied on

1 its face.

2 CHAIRPERSON BROCKMAN: But I thought I
3 heard you say earlier it was inconsistent with the
4 Monument Plan.

5 MR. KALISH: No. With the County
6 General Plan.

7 MR. MORGAN: The County process would
8 change the General Plan to make it consistent. That's
9 what they --

10 CHAIRPERSON BROCKMAN: Did you have
11 another question, Mark?

12 MR. WEBER: Comments, I guess, and
13 questions. Jim is getting at the heart of it. I
14 think, Al, you're saying that you know, the passion
15 and the emotion that I kind of, you know, obviously
16 sense coming from you -- and I kind of share that with
17 you -- aside, we need to be involved, like Corey is
18 indicating, to make sure that this doesn't go down a
19 path that we don't -- if we're not at the table, then
20 it's hard to impact the decision making that's
21 occurring at the table. And so I think everyone would
22 agree with that.

23 So -- but coming to the table, we don't
24 want to look like we're partnering with somebody in a
25 path that may be inconsistent with the General Plan of

1 the National Monument. I mean that's where I'm coming
2 from. I mean personally, from what I'm hearing on
3 this, obviously the energy side of it is a great
4 thing, but that does not override what I would
5 characterize as visual blight, and that's not
6 something that we want to create in a National
7 Monument is visual blight.

8 So I mean to me it sounds like we need to
9 be at the table to be part of what is happening. And
10 that's the only way that we're going to be able to
11 truly impact it.

12 MR. MUTH: I guess the issue is, are you
13 at the table with the County or after the County?

14 MR. WEBER: I would say you're at the
15 table while the discussion is occurring, and I think
16 it's obviously -- I don't know if it's already been
17 done, if John has already sent the letter indicating
18 that this is totally inconsistent with their
19 General Plan and possibly could be inconsistent with
20 the -- I don't know if it's not really the plan or
21 with the intent behind the National Monument. And so
22 you're kind of sending them a good, hard signal.

23 I mean obviously they know this is going to
24 be challenged. This is going to be a huge deal, and
25 this is not going to be something that is just going

1 to go through. This is going to take all kinds of
2 P.R., and I don't know how they're ever going to
3 accomplish this. But I think it's appropriate to give
4 them some kind of written whatever is appropriate on
5 the written side. And to me, if it's appropriate, to
6 come from the chair here or at some other point of
7 saying this could be inconsistent with the intent
8 behind the National Monument, that's giving them the
9 political side of it that this may not fly.

10 MR. FOOTE: Well, as we mentioned for
11 the land exchange would be a similar process on the
12 EIS/NEPA side that we would be issuing a Notice of
13 Intent to prepare an EIS, and then we'd have a public
14 scoping session to identify those issues to be
15 addressed. And we've heard several issues here to
16 ensure that those are at the fore of any environmental
17 analysis.

18 One other issue that John mentioned about
19 the -- and Al did, too -- about the Conservation Area,
20 the linkages of wildlife corridors, and certainly
21 here's a map -- and you're welcome to look at this
22 later -- of which this is the Snow Point/Windy Point
23 Conservation Area under the MSHCP. Clearly the
24 project lies within that conservation area as well as
25 what we see. Here is a map identifying the corridors

1 or linkages in the eco-processes here, so these are
2 also big issues that would need to be resolved.

3 The proponent has reached an agreement with
4 the proponent CVAG has, with it's a settlement looking
5 at take issue, how to resolve take issue under the
6 County under the MSHCP and how the take of temporary
7 disturbances when rehabilitated would be returned to
8 the County. So that has been addressed by the Cabazon
9 Wind Energy folks with CVAG. There is an agreement
10 that's existing, and that was one of the obstacles
11 that the proponent needed to overcome to reach its
12 point.

13 Now, again in dealing with the County, the
14 County is being able to move forward in some manner
15 with this project. Again I think fundamental issues
16 are the inconsistencies with the General Management
17 Plan, resolving that simultaneous with analyzing the
18 effects of the project. And again our decision for
19 BLM is whether to engage.

20 One other issue. There is a Forest Service
21 piece to this on the requests for waivers -- of the
22 waiver setback or, I should say, that more eloquently,
23 the request to waive the setback requirement, not only
24 is along PCT on the flat lands adjacent to BLM lands,
25 but there is one of the uppermost towers that would

1 require that same waiver relative to Forest Service
2 lands. So that request has also been submitted or
3 will be submitted at some point.

4 CHAIRPERSON BROCKMAN: Corey?

5 MR. KATES: I had a question with Jim on
6 the land take.

7 CHAIRPERSON BROCKMAN: Jim.

8 MR. KATES: Jim, I had a question on the
9 land take. How far along is that in the process?

10 MR. FOOTE: The which?

11 MR. KATES: The land take, the
12 negotiating and sale of the land. What exactly are
13 they doing?

14 MR. FOOTE: You mean on the private
15 lands?

16 MR. KATES: Yeah.

17 MR. FOOTE: The land is leased from a
18 private landowner, so it's not a parcel that's been
19 sold. It's under lease by the private landowner to
20 the public.

21 MS. NOIRON: Is it the same owner for
22 both parcels?

23 MR. MORGAN: Yes, Christensen.

24 MR. FOOTE: Yes.

25 MR. KATES: How far is the application

1 process with the County?

2 MR. FOOTE: Do you know, John?

3 MR. KALISH: Well, our next step is to
4 meet with the County. It's in their planning queue.
5 They -- I think, in fact, I had a copy of it. They
6 did go out with a Notice of Preparation quite a ways
7 back but just have not acted on it. So from a
8 standpoint of initiating the EIS/EIR as a joint
9 process, all that's standing in the way is an
10 agreement between BLM and the County to initiate that
11 process and then us launching our Notice of Intent and
12 meeting all of our EIS requirements.

13 MR. KATES: I don't know how the County
14 took an application if it's inconsistent with the
15 General Plan. That's an issue.

16 MR. KALISH: I think there is
17 litigation.

18 MR. KATES: They should have done a
19 moratorium. That's what they should have done to
20 identify the issues with the plan. They shouldn't
21 have taken it in. That's a big hole. It definitely
22 needs to be a joint process. I think the County is
23 looking the other way.

24 MR. MORGAN: The County is looking to
25 approve this project.

1 MR. GILLETT: If the County Plan is
2 amended to make this project consistent, are there
3 other private lands where renewable energy development
4 could occur in that same general area? Just a
5 question.

6 MR. KALISH: I'd say potentially yes.

7 MR. FOOTE: Always.

8 MR. KALISH: The parcels may be small.

9 MR. KATES: The EIR itself will look at
10 alternative sites, and they would be owned by the
11 proponent or leaseholders. They could be anywhere
12 else. But there's wind generation. It costs more for
13 land acquisition and entitlements.

14 MR. MORGAN: But this proposal is so
15 inconsistent with all of the land uses within that
16 area no matter who owns the land. You know, the
17 County will approve anything right now. But I don't
18 think the BLM or the Forest Service or the Monument in
19 general would find any redeeming features with this
20 project.

21 CHAIRPERSON BROCKMAN: It seems to be
22 the sense of all of us here.

23 MR. WATTENBARGER: Do we need a motion
24 to recommend something to John?

25 CHAIRPERSON BROCKMAN: I was wondering

1 that. This isn't an action item on the agenda, but
2 would it be of benefit, John, to have a motion of the
3 MAC to continue with the environmental review process
4 with the County?

5 MR. KALISH: Given the previous motion
6 to stay out of the process, I think that would be
7 helpful, just the statement that you know, you believe
8 that the BLM ought to pursue joint NEPA/CEQA process
9 to analyze this project.

10 MR. WEBER: Just a question before we
11 get to that, too, is, is it appropriate for some type
12 of a letter coming from this body addressing the
13 question mark of why something that's inconsistent
14 with the County's General Plan would be considered
15 prior to that issue being addressed, number one?

16 And then, number two, whether this whole
17 project is consistent with the goals or the objectives
18 of the National Monument.

19 MR. FOOTE: I think it's up to this
20 group to determine whether it feels such a letter
21 would be appropriate.

22 MR. WEBER: Because I think there's
23 going to be a lot of passion, and obviously there's a
24 lot of passion Buford had expressed previously. And
25 you know, I was just kind of trying to run some

1 numbers. And 130 megawatts or 150 megawatts of power
2 along this peak range area, you know, to me that's --
3 you know, you look at that versus the cost, and could
4 you get that 130 or 150 megawatts elsewhere, which
5 would make sense. And it doesn't compute to me you
6 would even go there.

7 And knowing the environmental impact,
8 knowing the political and P.R. challenge this is going
9 to face and knowing the limited resources that
10 government has, why are folks spending a whole lot of
11 time in this gyration if ultimately it has a very low
12 probability of being successful?

13 And it seems to me like it would be really
14 nice if we could lay something out saying, hey, look,
15 you know, come on, folks. Wake up. I mean this is
16 not consistent with the General Plan that the County
17 has, and it's not consistent with the -- I keep
18 struggling for the words, whatever those words are.
19 Maybe you have those words, of where the -- consistent
20 with the objectives of the National Monument.

21 MR. FOOTE: And I think, going back to
22 the mission of this group, which is to provide
23 recommendations to the agencies with respect to
24 implementation of the Monument Management Plan, then
25 you'd have to look at this relative to that to

1 determine whether this is appropriate for you as a
2 group to send a letter.

3 This is not a project specifically
4 identified in the Monument Management Plan, and that
5 might raise a little bit of a gray area. Certainly
6 every individual is welcome to act on their own, and
7 it may be appropriate for individuals to submit
8 letters to the County asking that very question about
9 consistency with the Management Plan.

10 And the County has taken a course of
11 action, decided which way to go. Our duty here is to
12 determine how to engage in that process, whether to or
13 not. And so I'd say be wary of as a group perhaps
14 stepping outside the mission of the group to make
15 recommendations on the Management Plan to an issue
16 like that certainly how we manage the public lands
17 within the Monument being those two sections is
18 exactly what we're looking at here, and that is, how
19 do we engage in that process, the County Management
20 Plan inconsistencies? The County is going to make its
21 determination how to go forward with that.

22 And this may be an opportunity for Bob,
23 whether he wants to elaborate. He just stepped back
24 into the room, but as the County of Riverside
25 representative -- and I'm sorry, Bob. You missed all

1 the discussion.

2 MR. LYMAN: Sorry.

3 MR. FOOTE: Whether you might have an
4 answer to the question. The question was really going
5 to the Cabazon Wind Energy Project. And the question
6 is really, why is the County addressing a proposed
7 project that's inconsistent with the County's General
8 Management Plan, and is that a problem?

9 MR. LYMAN: Those recommendations will
10 be taken back to the planning commission as part of
11 the staff report. It doesn't mean that there's any
12 implied approval to that. We can't tell somebody they
13 can't submit. Now, as it grinds through the process,
14 they may not like the answers. They may not like the
15 requirements. And that's largely dealing with the
16 proponent for WECS 118, what's happened.

17 MR. FOOTE: So from a County
18 perspective, looking at whether it's individuals or
19 this body as a group commenting to the County about
20 the inconsistencies with the plan, how would they best
21 transmit that to the County, those kinds of concerns?

22 MR. LYMAN: They can be addressed to me,
23 and then I will forward it to the planner, and they
24 will be part of the staff report that goes forward.

25 CHAIRPERSON BROCKMAN: Bob, was there a

1 concomitant application to amend the County's
2 General Plan to make this consistent?

3 MR. LYMAN: I have not seen a GPA on
4 that project.

5 CHAIRPERSON BROCKMAN: Okay.

6 MR. WEBER: Do you anticipate them doing
7 one, or have they indicated they're going to? For it
8 to go forward, they would have to; right?

9 MR. LYMAN: For approval. And again
10 it's finding -- if legislative bodies can find that it
11 is consistent, they can go to overriding facts and
12 findings.

13 CHAIRPERSON BROCKMAN: I personally feel
14 that this committee should kind of stay away from the
15 question of consistency with the County's planning
16 document. I think your question of whether or not BLM
17 ought to engage in the environmental review process
18 as -- as I would say it as a prelude to saying no is
19 the way to go rather than deal with the County's
20 consistency or inconsistency question, because that
21 can be rectified either through an interpretation or
22 by a subsequent application, and then where are we?
23 We're back where we started, which really the
24 environmental issues related to the BLM land.

25 MR. KATES: It needs to be between the

1 BLM and the document, not this body as a whole.

2 That's not the mission or goal as a body.

3 MR. MORGAN: It's not just on
4 environmental issue on BLM land. There's
5 environmental issues on the actual lands that the
6 proponent has leased or whatever and the adjacent
7 lands, given where it is and what it is, and it's more
8 than just visual, so much more.

9 MR. WEBER: Because we're talking about
10 the migratory, you're talking about the habitat, the
11 trails. There's connectivity.

12 MR. MORGAN: It is where the Peninsular
13 Range joins the Transverse Range. It's right at that
14 point. There's a large omnibus. There's two of them
15 under the freeway, which are fairly heavily used.
16 This is a big problem with the location of the County
17 jail, because that would really have a major impact on
18 it too. So there's a lot of stuff happening on the
19 wrong place or having been proposed in the wrong place
20 at this time.

21 MR. FOOTE: So if we could bring this
22 back to where we were, and that would be, is there a
23 recommendation from this group to engage with the
24 County in a joint EIR/EIS?

25 MR. MUTH: Bob, could you put your

1 comments in an eloquent motion.

2 CHAIRPERSON BROCKMAN: I was going to
3 just take Jim's language and suggest and move, then,
4 that the MAC recommend to BLM to participate in the
5 joint environmental review process with the County
6 with the intent to evaluate this project with regard
7 to the Monument Plan as well as the purposes and
8 objectives of the National Monument in the process,
9 something like that.

10 MR. WATTENBARGER: Second.

11 MR. WEBER: That's a motion.

12 CHAIRPERSON BROCKMAN: Any further
13 discussion on the motion? That was somewhat short and
14 disjointed but --

15 MR. WATTENBARGER: Very eloquent.

16 MR. MUTH: You have a second.

17 CHAIRPERSON BROCKMAN: We have a second?

18 MR. WEBER: Second.

19 CHAIRPERSON BROCKMAN: Any further
20 discussion? All those in favor signify by saying
21 "Aye." Any opposition?

22 (Voice vote taken.)

23 MR. MUTH: Bob should ask him if he
24 abstained.

25 CHAIRPERSON BROCKMAN: And we have an

1 abstention still?

2 MR. LYMAN: I think in this instance,
3 yes, I will.

4 CHAIRPERSON BROCKMAN: All right. That
5 was an interesting presentation, John.

6 MR. KALISH: Thank you.

7 MR. MORGAN: A quick comment on that --

8 MR. FOOTE: Well, we're right on
9 schedule, Bob.

10 MR. MORGAN: If you get a wind turbine,
11 it is supposed to produce. Say you've got a bunch of
12 turbines supposed to produce a hundred megawatts or
13 whatever that is, if they're on 24 hours a day seven
14 days a week with never any downtime for breakdowns,
15 the actual production rates never go above 18 percent.
16 Often in this area they're down to three or five
17 percent. These are actual production, and I have a
18 whole bunch of them from various wind projects in the
19 area if anyone wants to look at them.

20 CHAIRPERSON BROCKMAN: All right. We
21 are right back on schedule. Laurie, can we have your
22 report and update.

23 MS. ROSENTHAL: I do. And you know, the
24 Palms to Pines Corridor Management planning effort,
25 well, actually we started talking about this eight

1 years ago, even longer than this last project, but
2 it's been about three years ago that the grant was
3 actually awarded. And this is the first step. And
4 we've talked about at various different times, so I
5 don't want to bore you with the whole history. But
6 this is the first step towards becoming a National
7 Scenic Byway.

8 So a grant was secured. And so finally
9 after many months and years of the money being
10 stalled, of changing hands, the process has finally
11 begun for the Corridor Management planning. This
12 consists of a series of five workshops over a 12-month
13 period. And this is for all of Highway 74 and 243.

14 The three locations that the meetings are
15 held in are Pinyon, Garner Valley and Idyllwild. And
16 the meetings and the actual plan is completely
17 community driven, which is really wonderful, and it's
18 facilitated by Dr. Emilyn Sheffield. She's a
19 professor at Chico State University and one of the
20 leaders in the field of demographic predictions. So
21 very interesting person to facilitate these workshops.

22 The purpose of the workshops -- the main
23 purpose is to complete the Corridor Management Plan.
24 So each meeting focuses on a different aspect of this
25 planning effort. And the main thing about the plan is

1 to enhance the visitor experience and the vitality of
2 the communities that are along the byway.

3 And also planning, because according to
4 Dr. Sheffield, we are going to be increasing by 70
5 percent the population in Riverside County from 2005
6 to 2025. That's pretty sobering. And they're coming
7 whether we plan or not. So, as she says, you might as
8 well plan for it.

9 Now, Jim and Steve and myself have already
10 attended eight community meetings, I think it is, the
11 two that were kind of preliminary and then the last
12 series. So each of these five workshops we do the
13 same exact workshop in the three different communities
14 that I talked about.

15 The first meeting was in November, and that
16 laid the foundation. The second meeting was in
17 February, and the focus was on interpretive themes and
18 intrinsic values. And people got pretty excited with
19 that, because people were there because they love the
20 area, and we have a lot of people that have a
21 tremendous history at their fingertips.

22 And then the next meeting is -- set of
23 meetings is April 5th through 7th. And that is
24 actually going to be maybe be even more interesting
25 than the last two because it's on the transportation

1 and safety aspects. And I guess kind of my take is
2 visitors' driving versus high-speed commuters, you
3 know.

4 And one of the ingredients that is very
5 important but not always available, according to the
6 team, has been to get an interface with Caltrans. And
7 we have that person, Bill Mosby, and that has helped
8 tremendously. They've had members of Caltrans at the
9 last meeting, and they will certainly be at the next
10 series of meetings as well. And so let's see.
11 April 5th is going to be Idyllwild. April 6th is
12 going to be at Camp Ronald McDonald. That's Garner
13 Valley. And April 7th is going to be at the
14 Elks Lodge in Pinyon.

15 And I'm going to let you know what some of
16 my observations are, just a few of them, what I've
17 seen as kind of a repeated theme. And that is I think
18 that the communities of Pinyon and Garner Valley are
19 going to want the plan to help them to recede from the
20 public, you know, just drive on through. Don't stop
21 here, while Idyllwild, I think, is going to want
22 people to stop and make it a destination. So that's
23 kind of what we're seeing right now. It's only been
24 the second official meeting, so things could change.

25 The other thing, as I said, is just the

1 historical knowledge and tremendous enthusiasm.
2 People really want to share what they know. And the
3 other important theme, which is going to be probably
4 the highest, I think, even in the community of
5 Idyllwild, is going to be the safety issue. Those of
6 you that live or drive along the byway know about the
7 fatalities.

8 And when I got here, there was actually a
9 Highway 74 safety committee that would meet. And Ruth
10 is shaking her head. She was involved in that as
11 well, because people would drive up and down from
12 Pinyon, and they were seeing fatality accidents, and
13 they felt like they had to do something. So that's
14 going to be a real high focus. Whether, you know, to
15 go to the next step, which is to nominate this byway
16 for becoming a National Scenic Byway, it has to be
17 community driven. It doesn't matter what the Forest
18 Service or BLM or any of the other agencies think. It
19 has to be community driven.

20 And we'll see. We'll see how things go in
21 that respect. I know Idyllwild is kind of looking
22 like they might want to do it. Some of the other
23 communities are rather hesitant. Even if they decide
24 not to do it now, maybe wait for a future date or
25 maybe never, that plan can still be used. For

1 example, it can be used to help get grant money by
2 Caltrans for safety issues, those kinds of things.

3 Just having this Corridor Management Plan,
4 I think, is going to really, really help the
5 communities in a lot of ways. And just planning for
6 the future rather than -- as I said, the people are
7 going to come regardless.

8 So Jim, Steve, have you been at any of the
9 meetings? Ruth?

10 MS. WATLING: Yeah.

11 MS. ROSENTHAL: Yeah. And anything
12 you'd like to add, any observations?

13 MS. WATLING: No, but just to confirm
14 that Pinyon and Garner Valley feel pretty much the
15 same way in not engaging in a lot of seeing but go
16 through, see it, have it interpreted but keep moving.

17 MR. WATTENBARGER: Can I ask Ruth, are
18 they encouraging the designation to become a scenic
19 byway?

20 MS. WATLING: I think there's a positive
21 feel for that. But just how it's applied is the
22 issue.

23 MR. WATTENBARGER: Then I'll ask my
24 couple of questions. Does the byway designation --
25 does that start in, I guess, at 111 at the beginning

1 of 74 and go all the way to wherever it ends?

2 MS. ROSENTHAL: It goes all the way
3 through to the end of 74, where Hemet is, and all the
4 way through all of Highway 243 as well.

5 MR. WATTENBARGER: And is the grant
6 money -- is that just to do these workshops, or is
7 that to go all the way to the designation?

8 MS. ROSENTHAL: That goes all the way to
9 complete the Corridor Management Plan, and that's
10 going to be done by the team. The actual writing will
11 be done by the team.

12 MR. WATTENBARGER: How much did you get?

13 MS. ROSENTHAL: Two hundred -- do you
14 remember, Jim?

15 MR. FOOTE: Two hundred-plus thousand.

16 MS. ROSENTHAL: About 200,000, yeah.

17 MS. WATLING: I might add that there's
18 no assurance that having all this together will gain
19 us any funds to do anything. That's a whole separate
20 kit.

21 MR. WATTENBARGER: Like Laurie says, it
22 maybe is a springboard to getting more money once the
23 plan is in place.

24 MS. WATLING: Possibly.

25 MS. ROSENTHAL: If you do become a

1 National Scenic Byway, and she does -- Dr. Sheffield,
2 does feel pretty confident there's a pretty good
3 chance than it would. It has all the intrinsic values
4 for what she's seen previously for a pretty good shot
5 at becoming a National Scenic Byway. If they decide
6 to go that way, then there is a pot of grant money to
7 do improvements and enhancements, which other types of
8 designations do not have it. Like right now it's
9 already a designated State Byway, but that doesn't
10 necessarily come with any funding. This actually
11 from -- federal highways does come with funding that
12 they can apply for if they decide.

13 MS. WATLING: Do you know the amount of
14 funding?

15 MR. WATTENBARGER: One last question
16 here. Do the individual communities have to send a
17 letter to somebody to ask that this be done?

18 MS. ROSENTHAL: Yes. There is a whole
19 process to apply to become a National Scenic Byway.
20 And Dr. Sheffield is going to tell them how to do that
21 if they so desire.

22 MR. WATTENBARGER: Okay. Thank you.

23 MS. WATLING: I just wondered how much
24 money is available at this point.

25 MS. ROSENTHAL: I know in the pot for

1 National Scenic Byways -- I'm not sure, but it's
2 significant because you can do some pretty major
3 things with it.

4 MS. WATLING: Okay.

5 MS. ROSENTHAL: Yeah. Any more
6 questions?

7 CHAIRPERSON BROCKMAN: Okay. Thank you,
8 Laurie. Report update on Monument projects. Jim?

9 MR. FOOTE: I'll just launch into this
10 first, and then this is an opportunity for our other
11 agency representatives to give an update. Just two
12 quick things to finish out your package. We have been
13 in a partnership with Palm Springs Life in developing
14 Monument-based articles. Starting last September
15 there have been six successive months of articles in
16 Palm Springs Life with a focus on the National
17 Monument. March, I understand, doesn't have one.
18 However it should resume again in April.

19 Tom Brewster has been the photographer of
20 that project, and there is an art show of his
21 photographs at the Michael Lord gallery in
22 Palm Springs beginning April 1st to April 30th. The
23 reception is April 1st from 6 to 8 p.m. Certainly
24 encourage you all to attend. Wonderful photography,
25 and it's all of the National Monument.

1 And the second piece or last piece in your
2 pocket -- packet -- pocket, one of those -- is a piece
3 developed by the Sonoran Institute about the
4 National Monument and some of the partnerships and
5 what can be found there. I'd just encourage you to
6 read this. And that's it. And we'll, I think, just
7 start with Laurie's update from an agency perspective.

8 MS. ROSENTHAL: Maybe John can go first,
9 since mine is so much longer.

10 MR. FOOTE: Anything else to add, John?

11 MR. KALISH: Sure. A couple of things
12 that a few of our staff wanted me to convey here at
13 the meeting. In talking with our foreign fuels staff,
14 which do a lot of our habitat restoration -- and we
15 had invasive program work -- they wanted everyone to
16 know that in the past year 272 acres worth of tamarisk
17 or salt cedar were removed from the Sheep Canyon area
18 within the Monument. Approximately 20 of the April
19 trees were removed around the Art Smith trailhead, so
20 if you've been in that area, it will look
21 substantially different. And actually those trees
22 were burned as biomass fuel and sent down to Colmac
23 plant to generate electricity, a little twist on that.

24 They are right now getting fairly heavily
25 involved in doing some mapping of a new invasive

1 grass, a Mediterranean steppe grass, stipa capensis,
2 which is found in the Angel Canyon southward along the
3 Peninsular Range. And they as a staff are working in
4 coordination with the Low Desert Weed Management Area
5 staff and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service on
6 discussing options dealing with this new invasive
7 specie, as well as they've removed Sahara mustard and
8 other invasive grasses on approximately ten acres of
9 Snow Creek, just a couple of the habitat restoration
10 projects within the Monument.

11 And then real quick, just a rundown from
12 our law enforcement program. We do have a ranger,
13 Wes Miller, who is dedicated to the National Monument,
14 and he does work within the Monument a minimum of
15 three days a week patrolling trails or trailheads. He
16 spends a fair amount of time over on Windy Point
17 dealing with the OHV issues, and he just sent a few of
18 his stats.

19 He's issued, like, ten citations for dogs
20 on non-dog trails; OHV violations, 18; drugs,
21 narcotics, four citations issued; weapons, one;
22 closure violations, ten; vandalism, three; theft from
23 a vehicle, or the proverbial car looters, caught two
24 and is prosecuting them; and then hunting non-game
25 species, he's written six of those citations. Just a

1 range of the types of law enforcement things that he
2 does encounter on his daily patrols within the
3 National Monument.

4 MR. WATTENBARGER: Do those citations
5 generate a fine?

6 MR. KALISH: They do, and our rangers,
7 due to an agreement with the County Sheriff's office,
8 have the option of either going, utilizing the State
9 violation notice and taking the case into the District
10 Attorney's office or writing it through the Federal
11 Magistrate. So depending on the type of case it is
12 and the support that the District Attorney's Office
13 gives -- that does provide the rangers in handling of
14 these cases -- they make a decision as to what
15 direction they want to take those cases. But they do
16 resolve, if they are found guilty, then result in --
17 most of the time or very often in a fine or some other
18 type of settlement or unsupervised probation, all of
19 those standard types of prosecutions or convictions
20 that are utilized within the courts.

21 And then the last thing is I would just
22 like to compliment all those who were involved in the
23 wildflower event this past weekend. It was just
24 incredible weather and a very well-organized event.
25 Went off very well, excellent music and displays and

1 programs and hikes and just a lot of happy people
2 there. So congratulations on a job well done.

3 MS. ROSENTHAL: Yeah. I echo that as
4 well. Every year just gets better and better, and
5 it's just a happy place.

6 I'm happy to report that Judith Colgero has
7 been selected as a Monument Visitor Center Visitor
8 Information Assistant. She's going to be a Forest
9 Service employee, and she starts March 13th. Some of
10 you might know her because she works right now for the
11 Friends of the Desert Mountains behind the counter
12 there. And so it should be a pretty smooth
13 transition. So we're very excited about that.

14 Some of you are very passionate about the
15 Santa Rosa Mountain area, and so I'm pleased to report
16 that with the economic stimulus funding, we did get
17 some funding for the Monument for that area. The
18 Pinyon Flat Campground and Ribbonwood Campground now
19 has new picnic tables and fire grills. We also have
20 new picnic tables in the 16 yellow-post sites up on
21 Santa Rosa Mountain area. Still to be done, grills
22 and carbonite markers this summer are going to be
23 installed.

24 We're going to be asking for strong
25 volunteers. The second part of this is the Santa Rosa

1 Springs, you know, which has that -- the springs and
2 that dilapidated restroom. We're going to be taking
3 down six or seven hazard trees there. The fire crew
4 is going to do that. Then we're going -- if you have
5 ever gotten water there, you see that hillside there
6 really is in need of a retaining wall because it's
7 ready to crumble, or already has.

8 And so we have 70,000 pounds of blocks that
9 are going to be installed in there, hence looking for
10 the strong volunteers. Each one of those blocks is
11 85 pounds. We'll also be replacing the piping at the
12 springs and barrier posts in the parking area. So
13 it's going to get a facelift. You know, we don't need
14 people that have tremendous amount of knowledge. We
15 just don't want people to hurt their backs.

16 So we're looking for strong people. Like I
17 know Buford -- or I just had a conversation with him,
18 and he's going to look for some Eagle Scouts. But
19 this is going to be fun. We're talking about a couple
20 of weekends in June for campouts, and so this is going
21 to just be a fantastic place to come to when we're
22 done. I mean it is already. It has the beauty. Now
23 it will have the infrastructure.

24 The last thing -- there have been questions
25 about the status of our Santa Rosa Fuel Reduction

1 Project. Some of you who have attended our field trip
2 previously have been involved. But here to give us
3 the status report we have Hal Carey, who is our
4 District Forester. Dan Felix is our District Fire
5 Management Officer, and Chris Fogle is our district
6 Battalion Chief, and so I'll just turn it over to
7 them.

8 MR. FOGLE: Chris Fogle from the District
9 Fuels Battalion. And really we're here to answer
10 whatever questions or concerns you have. Rather than
11 go over the entire project again, which I think most
12 of you have already seen or heard, and putting maps up
13 over the walls, if you have any specific questions or
14 concerns, I'll be happy to address those and explain
15 any questions you have.

16 MR. CAREY: I'm Hal Carey, the District
17 Forester. I'm responsible for the vegetation aspect
18 and writing the vetch prescriptions for the project.
19 And of course we have intimate knowledge of the land
20 and a good understanding of how the project is
21 involved, where it is now and where it's going.

22 Just to give you a real brief time spot of
23 where we are now, we're expecting the specialist
24 reports and the analysis to be completed by the middle
25 of April and continuing with the NEPA timeline, from

1 there hoping seeking a decision by the first quarter
2 of fiscal year '12.

3 MR. MORGAN: Are there going to be any
4 more public -- any other opportunities for public
5 input into this decision?

6 MR. CAREY: We've gone out to scoping
7 formally and received public comments. We had robust
8 response from a variety of different groups, and we're
9 going through the comment analysis stage as part of
10 our specialist reports and analysis. At this point I
11 don't believe that there will be another round of
12 public scoping for additional comment.

13 MS. ROSENTHAL: If there's some new
14 information that you have, feel free to contact us,
15 Jeff.

16 MR. MORGAN: Okay. That's fine. I'm
17 curious to see what new stuff you guys come up with.

18 MS. WATLING: I have a question. Is
19 this the slope of Santa Rosa that you're speaking of?

20 MR. FOGLE: Most of the project is on
21 the north slope of Santa Rosa Mountain proper from the
22 main ridge all the way down to just short of the
23 highway.

24 MR. CAREY: As you know, the main intent
25 of the project is essentially threefold. There's an

1 essential communication structure at the top of the
2 mountain which we're required to maintain and protect.
3 There's also the surrounding communities and then, of
4 course, all the forest recreation users that recreate
5 at the top of the mountain and use the corridor to
6 access that recreation site and then the intrinsic
7 values of the forest and the chaparral ecosystems
8 themselves.

9 MS. ROSENTHAL: A lot of people are new
10 here, so they may not be aware of the project. But we
11 did have quite a bit of turnover on the advisory
12 committee.

13 MR. CAREY: Okay.

14 MS. ROSENTHAL: So it might be helpful
15 to give them a little bit of background.

16 MR. CAREY: Basically the idea is to
17 manipulate the vegetation to achieve the objective of
18 protecting life, property and infrastructure. This is
19 the current proposed action. This is Highway 74
20 running right through here. This is the road that
21 goes up to Santa Rosa, Santa Rosa Road. These are the
22 communities have of Ribbonwood and Spring Crest.

23 MR. FOGLE: Pinyon and then the houses
24 along the Indian reservation, Santa Rosa Indian
25 Reservation, there's several structures around here.

1 The contour site is up on top and the County repeater
2 site right up here.

3 MR. CAREY: So we have a lot of
4 important uses to protect, and one of our main
5 concerns is the communication infrastructure, so we've
6 proposed some manipulation of the vegetation around
7 those structures. Basically the solid-looking
8 polygons here represent either some sort of ground or
9 mechanical treatment, whether that's -- that could be
10 hand cut and pile. That could be removal of hazard
11 trees and yarding that material out. The crosshatch
12 this way represents some level of broadcast burning.
13 The green would be within the wilderness area. The
14 red would be outside of the wilderness area.

15 And when you see that -- well, I'll let you
16 explain the intent of how you approach the burn. But
17 the intent is not to remove all the vegetation. I'll
18 let you explain why.

19 MR. FOGLE: Again the prescriptions we
20 come up with for the fuels modification as far as the
21 burning goes is to reduce the overall coverage area by
22 30 to 70 percent. The target really is to reduce the
23 standing vegetation in the chaparral fields by
24 50 percent and do that in the mosaic pattern. So most
25 folks, when they picture prescribed burning, they're

1 thinking of the old timber-style block burning, where
2 you go in and blacken the whole thing. That's not
3 what we're talking about. We're talking about trying
4 to mimic the natural ignitions of the area, which is
5 lightning. And we have quite a bit of lightning-fire
6 history on Santa Rosa.

7 This is a prime area. Because of the
8 desert influence to the north, east and south of it
9 and then the high mountain influence to the west of
10 it, we get a lot of lightning-caused fires up on
11 Santa Rosa. Because of our Fire Management Plan for
12 this forest, which dictates that all of the land on
13 the San Bernardino National Forest is WUI, Wildland
14 Urban Interface, that we have full-suppression fire
15 tactics on this forest, which means -- some of you may
16 have heard of, you know, wild-use fires or fires for
17 resource benefit. That's not an option for us on this
18 forest.

19 The reason for that is because, based on
20 our historical fire behavior, any fire that starts in
21 any location on the forest, even if it starts in the
22 wilderness, in one burning period could reach a
23 community. So we can't risk letting lightning fires
24 just sit up there and skunk around like you see in
25 Yellowstone, Yosemite and some of the other

1 National Park areas.

2 So with that in mind, we have suppressed
3 hundreds of fires in the Santa Rosa Mountain area over
4 the last 30, 40 years. The last significant fire
5 history we have on this mountain was from 1940 and
6 1944.

7 MR. CAREY: I've got that map here, if
8 you want to show it.

9 MR. FOGLE: So the average age -- all
10 the red stars are at least one lightning strike. And
11 when I say at least one is -- our current program for
12 mapping and holding these, it takes it to the center
13 of the section. So if there's multiple ones in same
14 section on the map, it will put it all to one star and
15 then it will have multiple dates around it.

16 So 1944 fire came through here, and then
17 1940 fire came all of this brown-beige color down
18 there. So about half of the project area was burned
19 between 1940 and 1944. Since then we have had only
20 one fire over ten acres that has entered into the
21 project area. So half of the fuels in this area are
22 65 years old. The other half are greater than that.

23 MR. CAREY: And with the infestation of
24 the beetle in around 2003, 2004 there was an extreme
25 amount of mortality in the conifer stand at the top of

1 the mountain. We were concerned that if a fire was to
2 start on this north slope and proceed up into that
3 conifer stand, we would have pretty much a
4 stand-replacing fire.

5 So one of the main goals of this project is
6 to reduce surface fuels by mechanical but primarily by
7 the use of fire in a controlled way to limit future
8 potential mortality if a wildfire was to start. Then
9 of course we also have the goals of community and
10 human life protection.

11 MR. FOGLE: And to give you an idea,
12 everything -- it's easier to see on this first map.
13 Pretty much everything in the green up here is the
14 timbered area of mixed conifer. And regular fuel
15 loading for the desired condition of a healthy forest
16 in that area is about five to six tons per acre.
17 Currently there's 22.7 tons per acre, and that is a
18 direct result of us eliminating fire in the area due
19 to the WUI concerns around the forest. So that played
20 into -- part of our decision making is, how do we
21 reduce the amount of fuel loading and thereby lower
22 the fire intensity if one does occur, lightning-strike
23 or even human-caused fire that runs through this area?
24 How do we manage the land and protect the timber stand
25 up there from a stand-replacing event and get it back

1 into a healthy condition so we don't end up with the
2 great mortality that we had with the beetle
3 infestation?

4 Along with that in the chaparral fields,
5 the average fuel load going in chaparral is about 14
6 tons per acre at an average height of six foot. Most
7 all of this in the red hash area around the chaparral
8 continues on around -- is 15- to 20-foot tall and
9 about 28 tons per acre, about double. So the fuel
10 load is is two to three -- three to four times as
11 heavy as it should be in the timbered areas and double
12 what it should be in the chaparral, based on historic
13 levels.

14 So the idea is to go in under prescription,
15 when we can better control what the fire is doing, and
16 put fire back into the ground in a mosaic, not in a
17 straight, flat, squared-off burn, drop fire here and
18 there and let it burn out, get the consumption that we
19 want that were desired and then leave islands of
20 untouched vegetation all through the hillside.

21 MR. CAREY: And in successive years,
22 obviously.

23 MR. FOGLE: Correct. So the burn units,
24 there's actual six different burn units.

25 MR. CAREY: Question over here.

1 MS. WATLING: Are you going to use a
2 masticator at all?

3 MR. CAREY: That is one of the tools we
4 are analyzing the use of. In order to establish
5 certain holding lines, in order to burn off of them
6 safely, when you have 20-foot brush coming right up to
7 the road, you have to push that back a little bit in
8 order to get your on-the-ground firefighters a little
9 bit of an opportunity to start the fire and back it
10 off slowly.

11 MS. WATLING: Okay. And have you talked
12 with the Santa Rosa Tribe, with their elders?

13 MR. CAREY: We have. In fact there's a
14 couple of small units here. You can see one 1A, 1B
15 and 3A. These are actually on reservation land. And
16 originally this project was much larger than it is as
17 you see it now. When Chris and I became involved, we
18 determined that we can meet the purpose and need of
19 the project with less impact to the land, so we scaled
20 it back by about 20 percent.

21 MR. FOGLE: Yeah, about 2500 acres.

22 MR. CAREY: Pulled it out of the
23 reservation only onto these essential areas around a
24 lot of the wilderness extremities. So we're trying to
25 pull it back to what we actually absolutely have to

1 have to meet the purpose and need. And part of that
2 is still on the reservation, and of course we're in
3 contact with them and our CAL FIRE partners for some
4 of the needs that we have to deal with the private
5 in-holdings that are essential to base our operations
6 off of.

7 MS. WATLING: Do you have a plant list
8 put together?

9 MR. CAREY: We do. And that's all --
10 it's in the silviculture report and the botany report,
11 and of course the wildlife also touches on it.

12 MS. WATLING: Is that available on the
13 web?

14 MR. CAREY: That's a good question. I
15 think it is. It's publicly available information. If
16 you don't see it on our National Forest website, I'll
17 give you my card you can contact me and we can get
18 that information to you.

19 MS. WATLING: I appreciate it. Thank
20 you.

21 MR. MORGAN: Do you have these maps
22 posted on the website?

23 MR. CAREY: Yeah. I believe that this
24 map in particular is -- and I know that this is the
25 same map, along with that fire history that we sent

1 out in the original scoping package.

2 MR. MORGAN: So it's not changed?

3 MR. CAREY: It hasn't changed.

4 MR. MORGAN: Okay.

5 MR. CAREY: So that gives you an idea of
6 where we are now and what we're seeking as far as
7 current timeline and what we expect it to take.

8 Yes, sir.

9 MR. MUTH: Sort of related to this, even
10 after you have your burns and the fire gets out of
11 hand up there and you have people on the mountain,
12 there's only one way out of there. And over the years
13 I've harped that there's got to be an evacuation site
14 somewhere from there sometime. Is there any way to
15 put an evacuation site for people on the mountain?

16 MR. CAREY: We did get that comment, and
17 Chris had some real good answers for that.

18 MR. FOGLE: Let me address that. One of
19 the things that played into the overall project was
20 our concern about protecting the forest visitors that
21 come and use this area. It is -- well, I'm sure
22 you're all very familiar with it. It's a very long,
23 bumpy, slow road to get up to the top, one way in, one
24 way out. So the hashmarks along the road was with
25 that in mind -- was to create a buffer along the road

1 that would give an evacuation corridor for the folks
2 that were up in the mountain visiting if there was a
3 fire that started while they were there to better
4 protect them to get off the mountain and out of the
5 way of the fire.

6 Now, there has been a helispot that we have
7 used for many years up by the Toro Peak Campground.
8 That helispot is just big enough for a helispot. The
9 dangers with identifying a place as a --

10 MR. CAREY: Shelter in place.

11 MR. FOGLE: -- shelter in place or
12 evacuation area is people think, okay, what the agency
13 is telling me is that it's safe to go there. I will
14 be safe. If I can just get there, I will sit here and
15 be safe and the fire will go around me and won't hurt
16 me.

17 In order to do that, we would have to
18 actually make it a safety zone, and there are
19 guidelines to what is considered a safety zone for the
20 Forest Service and Fire. And basically just to give
21 you a real brief idea of what kind of area you're
22 looking at, for one three-person, three people and
23 one-engine crew, a safety zone would take up
24 208 square feet, 208-foot radius.

25 MR. CAREY: About an acre.

1 MR. FOGLE: So it's about an acre.
2 That's about a football field for three people and one
3 engine. So if all the campsites -- Laurie let you
4 know there was a 16 campsites. We have a 10-percent
5 maximum capacity at each campsite -- that's 160 people
6 plus vehicles. So you're looking at an area cleared,
7 no trees, no brush all the way down to mineral soil
8 about 628-foot radius. And that is considering no
9 slope, no wind. So it would actually have to be
10 bigger. That's a huge scar to put on the land up
11 there in the middle of a wilderness area at the safest
12 place that we have, which is the helispot. It's the
13 most accessible place we have that's not ground based.

14 That area is also on an average of about a
15 55-percent slope. So the helispot sits in a saddle,
16 and that's why we're able to use it as a helispot,
17 because it sits in the saddle. So again you're
18 looking at a very large scar to put on the ground
19 because of the additional slope.

20 And 55 percent is a very steep slope. So
21 you're looking at putting something on the ground
22 there that is about six football fields wide down
23 clear to mineral soil. That's not something we desire
24 to do, and that's not something that we see as a
25 practical alternative.

1 It was brought up in both scopings, the
2 original plan and this plan, and we addressed that in
3 the same manner. We do not feel that that's a
4 practical alternative to do up here because it gives
5 people the false impression that it's safe. As long
6 as I can just make it here, I'll be safe from the
7 fire. And with these slopes with these conditions,
8 with this kind of fire behavior, we don't want anybody
9 on the mountain. We want them off the mountain, which
10 is the emphasis in creating the corridor along the
11 road.

12 And the proposal is to do 300-foot
13 mastication, or a clearing of the chaparral in some
14 way, on both sides of the road, removing snags within
15 that 300 feet either side of the road to create that
16 safe corridor for the forest visitors to get in and
17 out.

18 MR. MUTH: I see the corridors along the
19 road, but I wasn't asking about a shelter.

20 MR. CAREY: So you were talking
21 extraction?

22 MR. MUTH: I was talking extraction.
23 And I think your current chopper site is right up on
24 the communication tower peak.

25 MR. FOGLE: It's just above there. It's

1 above the Toro Peak Campground and maybe a hundred
2 yards above the campground, if you're continuing up
3 towards the repeater site.

4 MS. WATLING: There's a gate there,
5 isn't there?

6 MR. FOGLE: There's a gate before you go
7 up into the repeater site but not before you get to
8 the helispot.

9 MR. CAREY: Some of the concerns about
10 having the extraction capabilities is availability of
11 resources. When there's this fire, there may be other
12 fires, and there may or may not be helicopters
13 available. Typically you're going to have a lot of
14 smoke associated with a lot of these fires, which
15 could restrict visibility, time of day, intensity of
16 the fire, and then also jurisdictional responsibility
17 is not really within the Forest Service hands for
18 extraction. It's with the County Sheriff's. And I
19 don't know if you want to comment any more on that.

20 MR. MUTH: So pretty much the attitude
21 is, if you can't drive down the road, you may be a
22 goner, toast?

23 MS. WATLING: That's a risk.

24 MR. FOGLE: Yes, it is a risk. You
25 know, similar to hiking up anywhere in the mountain,

1 you're not going to be able get out of there quickly.
2 And I'm sorry I misunderstood your question. One of
3 the big concerns with evacuations again is, if we
4 have -- if we have a fire significant enough where we
5 need to get you off that mountain, the probability
6 that there's going to be helicopters available for
7 that is going to be pretty low.

8 They're going to be focused on getting
9 water drops, getting supplies, troop shuttles to get
10 them where they need to go. And then we regularly
11 ground helicopters or any aircraft because of wind
12 speeds, because of visibility if the smoke column lays
13 over and all the fire history on this mountain, no
14 matter where it comes from, that smoke column lays
15 over the peak, basically over the helispot. We have
16 used the spot mainly for lightning fires and quick
17 access to keep them small. We're not talking about
18 large fires. So that column quickly shades out and
19 socks in that area that we would typically use as the
20 helispot.

21 MS. WATLING: There's kind of a big
22 meadow out there right before you get into the tall
23 trees. Could you use that for a helispot?

24 MR. FOGLE: I don't know, to be honest
25 with you. I would have to look at it.

1 MS. WATLING: It's pretty flat, for one
2 thing.

3 MR. FOGLE: I know that the one place
4 they feel most comfortable landing is the spot above
5 Toro Peak Campground. That's why we've identified
6 that and used that several times.

7 MS. WATLING: But that would be unlikely
8 to be used in a fire just because of the conditions
9 you described.

10 MR. FOGLE: Right. If it was a
11 significant-sized fire, where we were evacuating this
12 area, Santa Rosa Mountain, yes.

13 MS. WATLING: You might look at that
14 spot to see if there's any use. It's clearly been
15 cleared off once, and it's relatively flat.

16 MR. FOGLE: Okay. We can look into
17 that.

18 CHAIRPERSON BROCKMAN: Anything else,
19 Laurie?

20 MR. FOOTE: Any updates? Tom?

21 MR. GILLETT: Just appreciate all of the
22 effort of the work group in putting together these
23 work plan priorities, and thank you to Jim and Laurie
24 for facilitating that process. I think that's good
25 information.

1 MS. NOIRON: Just the only thing for me
2 is just a snippet so you guys know who I am and where
3 I'm from. This is the first time meeting a lot of
4 you. I'm career Forest Service. I'm in my 28th year
5 with the agency. I've worked a number of different
6 places across the country. I've been in California on
7 National Forest since 1995, so -- what's that? -- 15,
8 16 years. Before I became the Forest Supervisor here
9 on the San Bernardino, for the last ten years I've
10 been the Forest Supervisor on the Angeles National
11 Forest right next door.

12 So with that said, I do have a lot of
13 experience as a line officer and all, but I was
14 telling some folks at lunch today that the differences
15 are striking between the Angeles and the
16 San Bernardino. I might as well have moved to a
17 National Forest in Vermont or New Hampshire, quite
18 frankly, for the differences. So I am really glad to
19 be here. It's just a gorgeous forest, and I'm really
20 looking forward to getting to know you folks and
21 working with you and all. So I appreciate being here.

22 Definitely obvious to me how much time and
23 energy and how committed you folks are to helping us
24 manage your National Forest and National Monument.
25 That's really special. So I appreciate the personal

1 time that you folks put into this.

2 CHAIRPERSON BROCKMAN: Okay. In order
3 to try to get us out by 6:00, are there any other
4 general items from the committee that somebody might
5 want to bring up at this point?

6 I have a question for you, Jim. We had
7 pretty much settled on a once-a-year meeting except
8 for purposes of bringing together either a work group
9 or the MAC for any eventualities that may occur in the
10 interim. Do you see anything coming up in the rest of
11 this calendar year that might warrant an additional
12 meeting for the MAC?

13 MR. FOOTE: I believe we were looking at
14 two meetings a year, the next meeting to be in
15 September.

16 CHAIRPERSON BROCKMAN: Okay. That's the
17 meeting I missed, so I wasn't sure if we concluded
18 that. So September would be our next regularly
19 scheduled meeting?

20 MR. FOOTE: Correct.

21 CHAIRPERSON BROCKMAN: Do we have a date
22 for that as yet?

23 MR. FOOTE: I don't. I think normally
24 we've done it the third Monday to avoid the Labor Day
25 holiday.

1 CHAIRPERSON BROCKMAN: Okay.

2 MR. FOOTE: And so we'll try to schedule
3 that again for the third Monday. And before we do
4 close out, I want to thank Diane Mann, our reporter,
5 for recording this. She has tremendous patience with
6 us in listening to some of these cross conversations,
7 and I don't know how she records all of this of this,
8 but she manages. Thank you, Diane.

9 MS. ROSENTHAL: So that would be
10 September 19th.

11 MR. FOOTE: Okay. September 19th would
12 be the next MAC meeting. Thank you, Laurie.

13 MS. ROSENTHAL: Is it possible to have
14 it here?

15 MR. MORGAN: I don't know. You have to
16 ask the County.

17 MR. LYMAN: At this point, yes.

18 CHAIRPERSON BROCKMAN: If the County is
19 still in business in September, okay.

20 MR. LYMAN: It looks like our budget is
21 going to go through.

22 MR. FOOTE: And if there is a need to
23 convene another meeting or more of the work group as
24 we start to go through the process, we'll alert folks
25 to that and schedule that.

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

MR. MORGAN: By e-mail?

MR. FOOTE: Uh-huh.

CHAIRPERSON BROCKMAN: All right. If there is no other business and there's no other objections, meeting is adjourned.

(The meeting was concluded at 5:55 p.m.)

-000-

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

R E P O R T E R ' S C E R T I F I C A T E

I, DIANE CARVER MANN, a certified shorthand reporter, do hereby certify that the foregoing pages comprise a full, true and correct transcription of the proceedings had and the testimony taken at the hearing in the hereinbefore-entitled matter of the meeting of the Santa Rosa and San Jacinto Mountains National Monument Advisory Committee.

Dated this 31st day of March 2011, at Chino, California.

DIANE CARVER MANN, CSR NO. 6008