

**Official Meeting Record**  
**Approved by the Designated Federal Official and Committee Chairperson**  
**August 1, 2019**

**Bears Ears National Monument Advisory Committee (BENM MAC)**  
Hideout Community Center: 648 South Hideout Way, Monticello, Utah 84535  
June 5 - 6, 2019

**Wednesday, June 5, 2019 1:00 p.m. to 4:30 p.m.**

**In Attendance:**

*Monument Advisory Committee Members:* All members attended (Brooks Britt joined by phone). Names are listed in the introduction round robin.

*BLM/USFS Attendance:* Ed Roberson, BLM Utah State Director; Lance Porter, BLM Canyon Country District Manager and the Designated Federal Official for the committee; Gary Torres, BLM Monticello Field Manager; Ryan Nehl, USFS Manti-La Sal Forest Supervisor; Mike Diem, Manti-La Sal District Ranger; Rebecca Doolittle, Bears Ears National Monument Planning Lead; Lisa Bryant Canyon Country Public Affairs Officer and meeting facilitator, and additional support staff.

*Public/Media Attendance:* Thirty-three members of the public attended the first day and 12 the second day. Nine members of the media attended one or both days. Attachment E is a copy of the sign in sheets.

**1:00 p.m. – Welcome - Agency Leadership**

1. Lance Porter (BLM Canyon Country District Manager and Designated Federal Official for the MAC) welcomed everyone, thanked members of the MAC and the public for coming, provided a brief overview of the purpose of the meeting and introduced the other agency officials.
2. Ryan Nehl (Manti-La Sal Forest Supervisor) joined Lance in welcoming and thanking everyone for their participation.
3. Ed Roberson (BLM Utah State Director) welcomed everyone and provided background regarding: the Presidential Proclamations establishing and modifying the national monuments; the importance of ongoing land use planning efforts for the Bears Ears National Monument, the Grand Staircase Escalante National Monument, and Kanab planning areas. He discussed public engagement, including: the BLM's commitment to seeking input and working with tribes in planning for and managing the Bears Ears National Monument, and the importance of advisory committees such as the Bears Ears MAC, Grand Staircase-Escalante MAC, and Utah RAC in managing public lands.

**1:20 p.m. - Agenda Review and Meeting Room Logistics – Lisa Bryant**

Lisa Bryant, Canyon Country District Public Affairs Specialist and meeting facilitator, reviewed meeting and room logistics, the agenda for the day, and welcomed the media, notifying participants and members of the public they may be photographed or recorded during the meeting.

**1:25 p.m. - Round Robin – Introduction of MAC Members – MAC Members**

- Brooks Britt (paleontologist) – primarily researching Mesozoic vertebrates
- Jamie Bayles (public at large) – works at the University State University, Blanding Campus, and assists people from various backgrounds achieve higher education goals
- Danny Flannery (dispersed recreation)– lifelong Blanding resident, hunter and outdoorsman

- Kelly Pehrson (public at large) – from Monticello, born and raised in San Juan County, former Administrative Assistant to the San Juan County Commission.
- Gordon Larsen (State of Utah) – Governor Herbert’s liaison
- Lee Bennett (archaeologist) – consulting Archaeologist 30-years – management, compliance, interpretation, and working with the public
- Bruce Adams (local elected official) - San Juan County Commissioner
- Alfred Ben (tribal interests) – serves as the Red Mesa, Chapter Vice President, and he conveyed through story that his people’s ancestors were in the area before there were any political boundaries
- Ryan Benally (tribal interests) – introduced himself using a traditional Navajo greeting identifying clan lineage and in English, he’s from Montezuma Creek and has strong ties to the area and the mountain
- Miles Moretti (conservation) - lives in North Salt Lake, he first experienced southeastern Utah working for the Utah Division of Wildlife in the 1980s
- Dustin Randall (developed recreation) – grew up in Monticello, runs a guiding operation
- Adam Redd (local business owners) - from Dugout Ranch and grew up locally, owns the Jackalope Trading Company in Monticello
- Gail Johnson (local grazing interests) - from San Juan County, raises cattle and operates a ranch west of Blanding
- Zeb Dalton (private landowners) - rancher in San Juan County
- Jared Barrett (developed recreation) – owns and operates Wild Rivers

During the round robin, members joked about taking a message back to DC to extend the charter, expiring on September 29, 2019. The meeting facilitator clarified for the public and others in the room who might not be aware, that the charters for advisory councils are renewed on a two year cycle and that the charter is expected to be extended for two more years.

**1:35 p.m. – Confirm Courtesy Code – MAC Members**

The committee reviewed the suggested courtesy code and confirmed that everyone in the group agreed to the guidelines.

Lance requested members of the public hold comments and questions until the public open period and emphasized the purpose of the meeting, which was for the agencies to obtain feedback from the MAC regarding the Draft Monument Management Plans and Environmental Impact Statement (MMPs/DEIS).

**1:40 p.m. to 2:40 - Review Presidential Proclamations and MAC Charter – Gary Torres (Attachment B includes the presentation slides)**

In response to questions, agencies clarified/answered:

- What is the role of the MAC vs. the role of a cooperating agency? The authority for cooperating agencies is based in the National Environmental Policy Act and they are involved during the alternative development phase and work under a non-disclosure agreement with respect to deliberative documents and information. The MAC advises and makes consensus-based recommendations during planning and will continue to provide advice and recommendations moving forward.
- Can uranium be transported across the monument? It would be determined through appropriate environmental reviews and in conjunction with state and county laws regarding such transport. With respect to the mine used as an example, there is an approved mine plan in place, which authorizes

transport of minerals on approved roads across the monument.

- What is the status of the Department of Energy mineral withdrawal? The USFS clarified that the Department of Energy mineral withdrawal on South Elk Ridge was removed in 1999.
- What is the importance of MAC feedback compared to other feedback? Agency leadership identified avenues of public engagement and participation throughout the planning process and stated they were all important, none outweigh the other. Agency leaders also added, the administration places a high value on timely decision-making, the tasks and issues before the MAC are complex, and there was an expectation for open dialogue and discussion. Lance provided an example of a different citizen-based working group that thought it would be easy to resolve all the issues, and then, over the course of several working meetings they struggled, and gained a new perspective about how challenging managing public lands can be.

**2:45 – 4:30 p.m. – Overview of Draft MMPs/EIS – Lance Porter (Attachment C includes presentation slides).** During the presentation the facilitator captured items the group wished to explore in more detail in the morning. The list is included at the end of this section.

In response to questions, agencies clarified/answered or the group discussed:

- Adaptive management means that, based on specific criteria, agencies monitor conditions and make management adjustments, as needed.
- The MAC may choose to recommend management options from any alternative in the Draft MMPs/DEIS and make a recommendation that agencies include it in the Proposed Monument Management Plans and Final EIS (PMMPs/FEIS). The agencies advised the MAC that options outside the range of alternatives in the DEIS, could require a supplemental EIS.
- Alternative A reflects existing management as identified in the current BLM and USFS resource and land use plans. As a follow up, agency leadership further clarified that land use plans generally last about 20 years, although they can be updated through plan maintenance, and they don't have an expiration date.
- Agency leadership confirmed there are no active vegetation treatment projects within the monument, although there are projects in other parts of the BLM Monticello Field Office and Manti-La Sal Ranger District.
- MAC members and agency leadership discussed management options related to grazing and how each alternative differed in potential impacts to livestock grazing. Gail also mentioned a permittee concern related to livestock water access on the USFS-administered lands.
- A MAC member asked why the plans included management options for grazing, given the proclamation language stating that nothing in the proclamation would result in changes to grazing. Agencies clarified there are planning regulations requiring the agencies to analyze a range of alternatives related to grazing, particularly in light of the numerous public comments received during scoping. The areas identified as "unavailable for grazing" in Alternative D are not currently grazed.
- Agency leadership clarified that future changes to grazing allocations could be made through a land use plan amendment, if warranted, but it is better to do it at this stage in planning. The agency would make a determination whether a change in allocation is necessary/warranted.
- The MAC discussed management options and Alternatives related to visitor services, including sites identified for public interpretation in the proclamations and sites not identified, group sizes, numbers of groups, visitor caps/limits, current permitting systems, how to address increased visitation impacts in Indian Creek, hardening sites for public visitation, cultural sensitivities with naming and disclosing sites, allowing access while protecting cultural resources, concerns with dispersed

- camping near livestock and wildlife water sources, and impacts of recreational target shooting.
- The importance for Native American access to collect herbs and medicine, simplifying the permitting process, and/or making permits more accessible to residents in the southern part of the county, although it was noted that, due to poor internet availability in that area, online permitting may not be the best option.
- The BLM clarified bicycles are considered mechanized vehicles, but not off-highway vehicles (OHVs), which are motorized vehicles.
- Agency leadership clarified no roads are being opened or closed as part of the monument planning process and specific road decisions will be made during implementation level travel planning.

Items identified by the MAC for possible consideration the following day:

- Visitation and recreation topics, including: how to address increased visitation; balancing recreation access, other multiple uses (ie grazing), and protection of the monument resources; which sites will be highlighted and hardened for visitation and how they will be managed; a permit system for climbers in the Indian Creek area; group sizes, the number of groups and/or visitor caps; visitor education, infrastructure, services and/or targeted outreach; and recreation management zones; and front country vs. backcountry experiences.
- Clarifying target shooting language
- Dispersed camping near water sources, potential conflicts between recreation and livestock/wildlife
- Native American concerns including identifying site(s) for tribal ceremonies, ways to ease permitting requirements for plants/etc.
- Rights-of-Way (ROWS): clarifying language noting differences in language for Shash Jáa and Indian Creek units, and better rationale for avoidance/open/exclusion areas
- Cultural landscapes
- Wildlife
- Clarification of wood gathering rules and regulations, request to simplify or make permitting more accessible, particularly to residents in the southern part of the county
- The Charter and a discussion of annual operating costs and the MAC's role. Agency leadership clarified the costs of the meeting are primarily administrative related to meeting space, travel, agency support. In order to focus on the Draft MMPs/DEIS, this was deferred to a future administrative discussion.
- The role of law enforcement in resource protection and the potential use of security cameras.

**4:30-5:15 p.m. Public comments to the BENM MAC**

*Members of the public who requested time to speak were each allotted three minutes to speak in the order they signed in. Although their main points were captured, there may be some errors and incomplete sentences in the written transcriptions. The BLM provided the committee with copies of emails submitted prior to the meeting (Attachment D)*

1. Anna Tom: *She introduced herself using a traditional Navajo greeting identifying clan lineage. (She was also speaking for her mother Betty Jones) – We have family history here and live in McCracken Mesa, my mother also lived in Butler Canyon, when she was a child she raised and grazed sheep. At the time, in 1934 (before the GLO and BLM) my dad had the grazing there. My family wants to let Native people to graze. There was a permit for a Native American to graze and they want to use this permit. (She held up a copy of a tourism guide with a photo of a hiker at a cliff dwelling) How are you going to keep these Anasazi ruins? How long will it take to wash off the sandstone, how many people will it take*

to wash away all of the sandstone? As Native Americans, this is against our religion, it's important to keep distance, keep some people away, cover with screen or fencing, and protect these areas.

2. Genevieve Mitchell: Originally from Arizona, my maternal grandfather is from Aneth. I want to emphasize that our grandparents wanted us to carry on the traditions, it is up to the grandchildren to reconnect, to protect the grazing permits for Ute people and collect herbs/medicines for ceremonies. Our ceremonies have to be done in a certain timeframe, they can't wait for the BLM to open doors for us to get a permit. So request consideration of how our ceremonies can be done in a timely way.

3. Sylvia Zhonnie: Congratulations to MAC and you will be the voice of all people in San Juan County. I feel comfortable with Alternative D to allow access so that people can have benefits to it, such as wood gathering and other values that benefit Native Americans. Please consider a recommendation to designate a ceremonial ground and consider a horseback riding trail. Consider a way to acknowledge the warriors, what their story is behind the Bears Ears, it's important for the young people, to give them stories about the warriors.

4. Marjorie Haun: I think this is a fascinating process, and believe in it, it's important. It's troubling - the treatment you have received in the media. You have been vilified and much of the reporting is negative. There is an overwhelming native group that is boycotting process, the Tribal Coalition should be participating in the process. To them it is a foregone conclusion that this is going to fail, everyone needs to look at this objectively. I believe that we have the best people who applied and will give this [planning process] the fair treatment it deserves.

5. Leland Grass: *(Introduced himself using a traditional Navajo greeting identifying clan lineage)*. I'm from Arizona, I came here tracking the stories about Bears Ears and the controversies and I have a group of medicine men and elders, to talk about issues among our people and focus on healing and bears ears and talking about the Anasazi. Very sensitive issues, talking about this - it affects the youth, like today, everyone is gathering but there is no healing. It affects a lot of people we should step back a little more and focus on healing, not be in controversy, it should be more about healing, not about rock climbing and not about shooting. I would like to talk more and it should be about healing.

6. Josh Ewing: I live in Bluff, run a non-profit organization, Friends of Cedar Mesa, we advocate for natural and cultural resources in the region. We run an education center about Bears Ears, monitoring initiatives, helping visitors, conducting research, and involved in advocacy of the area. Encourage you to consider what message the plan sends: The preferred alternative is the least protective and in some areas it is less protective than 2008 [Monticello Resource Management] plan. What is important to you? ...the least protective plan for smallest area? Or something better? When the political pendulum swings back in the next election it will hit the locals the hardest. Instead of the least protective alternative, I respectfully urge you to select the alternative and options offering the most protection of resources.

7. Libby Fayad: General Council for the National Parks Conservation Association, which has joined others in the litigation regarding the modification of the BENM. Emphasized the importance and beauty

of the area and the need to protect it. I hope that you will not do anything as a committee to damage any part of this area, and I believe the area will be made whole again, when litigation prevails. Please include the parks as part of your considerations.

8. Harrison Johnson: I live north of Montezuma Creek – McCracken Mesa. Congratulations to all committee members on this board. With respect to the issue of Bears Ears, Shash Jaa, IC, this area should belong to the locals, we are the fixers, and can fix it right. I am happy with Trump and Zinke for downsizing the monument. My Aneth Chapter is against the Diné Bikéyah believing they deceived us saying that we can move back to raise our sheep. That will not happen. Feels deceived. The committee should make a recommendation that Shash Jáa and Indian Creek make a monument for my ancestors. Bears Ears Butte was called enemy lookout point. For grazing, I would like a fair resolution and get our cows up there.

8. Jonah Yellowman: I am a Spiritual advisor for Diné Bikéyah, spoke of boundary lands and the Creator created it all for a purpose, told the story of the two rivers (one male, one female) that come together here and the Bears Ears are at the center of this sacred place including Comb Ridge, San Juan River, Colorado River, and Bears Ears. Ancestors used to hunt, use the area for prayers and ceremonies, this knowledge is now being set aside. Please have respect for our people, all tribes that came together asking for this.

9. Cynthia Wilson: I am from Monument Valley. Utah Diné Bikéyah want to come back to practice traditional hunting and ceremonies. How does this management plan incorporate the 75 elder interviews and views of 5 tribes recorded for history, especially when we don't have representation from these tribes? Obama recognized critical insights come from ancestral people, where are those voices on this committee? Each of those voices is important. The unity of the 5 Tribes asking for protection of the Monument incorporate indigenous knowledge and land practices to the team. This plan only includes Western views and needs to incorporate more indigenous management views.

10. Kelly Mike Green: I am a lifelong resident of San Juan County and I support Alternative D and believe the reduction in size and the less attention the area receives is better for protecting resources. It's important to have continued access to the area for ceremonies, herb, wood, and pinyon nut gathering, continued use of existing roads, mountain bikes should have the same use as other use. Will BLM and USFS add more wilderness after this plan is signed? Who is responsible when road washouts occur and who will repair them and will access be maintained? Will a fee be established, and could some of that money be used for search and rescue and help law enforcement?

11. Tim Peterson: Representing the Grand Canyon Trust: Thanked the committee members for their time and volunteerism, expressed concern with wasting people's time, having this meeting and planning while the repeal of the monument and Trump Proclamation is under litigation. Recommends holding off on planning until litigation is done and focusing resources on addressing increased visitation. The original proclamation requires the 5 tribes be involved, and they need input for not only just Shash Jáa and Indian Creek Units, but the entire 1,350,000 acres. Everyone has a story and perspective, engaging

one-on-one, person-to-person offers opportunities to find common ground and, as others have called for, for healing. I hope the path forward includes everyone.

12. Rachel Nelson: Representing Friends of Indian Creek, Salt Lake Climbers and Access Fund, climbing advocacy groups, promoting access through responsible recreation. Climbers are the largest recreation user group in Indian Creek. Please protect climbing access and camping. Proclamation 9558 includes climbing as an important recreation opportunity. Climbing groups and climbers continue to work with the BLM and provide comments for management planning and implementation level plans for climbing opportunities, we've participated in surveys of users, please look at comments submitted. Please support the highest number of acres managed as VRM I. Support Alt C as it offers protections and allows access for climbing on hoodoos in Shash Jáa, and we can utilize best practices to camouflage hardware. She was disappointed to not be appointed to serve on the MAC and wants to be of assistance.

*Following the public comment, the meeting was ended for the day by agency leadership thanking everyone for attending.*

**Thursday June 6, 2019 8:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.**

**8:00 a.m. - Brief overview of yesterday's activities and agenda for today - Facilitator, Lance Porter**

Lance thanked everyone for their input, good discussion and identified topics of discussion. Agency leadership expressed that they were looking forward to the recommendations and advised the MAC to prioritize issues and focus on high level recommendations to accomplish the work ahead and use the analysis in the Draft MMPs/EIS to help with recommendations.

**8:15 a.m. - Select a Chairperson – MAC Members**

Lisa defined the duties of the chairman for the MAC:

- Lead the meetings with support from BLM facilitator;
- Assisting in identifying discussion topics and provide input for meeting agendas; and
- Reviewing and approving official record of meeting notes prior to public posting.

Three members were nominated and seconded: Bruce Adams, Gordon Larsen, Ryan Benally.

Bruce Adams was elected by an anonymous vote. Bruce accepted and immediately motioned for nomination of a vice-chair and nominated Ryan Benally, who was approved by a unanimous vote of the committee.

**8:30 a.m. - Bears Ears National Monument Draft Monument Management Plans and Draft EIS – MAC discussion and feedback – MAC Members**

General discussion, including:

- Throughout the meeting, members reiterated frustration at the lack of time allotted for this task and thorough discussion of issues. They spent time discussing how best to accomplish the meeting goals by the end of the meeting.
- House on Fire needs attention/infrastructure to support the high number of visitors
- The growing number of climbers in Indian Creek
- Higher visitation in general
- Acceleration of the cultural resource management plan
- Need to protect and preserve sites named in the proclamations and draft plans
- Impacts occurring now due to high visitation
- Planning level vs implementation level decisions
- Consider security cameras at sensitive sites
- Discussion of Traditional Cultural Properties and lack of Cultural Landscape discussion in the Draft MMPs/DEIS, context of Cultural Landscapes may encompass more than just the lands within the monument, which are a component of the larger landscape
- Importance of interpretive materials including Native American and pioneer history
- Conflicts between allowing access/visitation and protecting cultural resources
- Visitor education/interpretation
- Tribal concerns with hardening sites prolonging life versus natural degradation; importance of the area to origin stories, ancestral use of the region, areas important in different ways to different groups, and keeping sharing traditional knowledge
- Establishing a ceremonial ground near the Bears Ears Buttes including recognition of tribal warriors and leaders - such as K'aayelli (Navajo leader from 1800's), a place to teach youth, set up teepees and pray for elders and veterans, place for teaching
- How much to disclose about ceremonies/ceremonial grounds – disclosure vs privacy, how this affects agencies ability to manage uses and conflicts
- Responsible recreation, visiting sites respectfully, value of guides teaching visitors to not enter structures, cliff dwellings, etiquette for visiting sensitive cultural sites
- Kigalia Ranger Guard Station as possible location for ceremonial sites
- Simplifying and/or speeding up permit processes for ceremonial gatherings, there are specific times these occur, make permitting for hunting, wood gathering easier, closer to residents in southern San Juan County so they don't have to drive to Monticello, which presents a hardship for many, consider tools like Letter of Understanding for ceremonial activities, establishing certain stipulations and thresholds under which permits/permission isn't required
- Form a subcommittee to further explore some of these issues; agency clarification that while GSA FACA regulations do not require public notice of subcommittee meetings, in an effort to be more transparent, the BLM regulations require advance announcements of subcommittee meetings and that they are open to the public. The review and approval of Federal Register Notices generally takes 90 days before publication. Useful tool for future meetings, but doesn't meet the timeline for this task.



- Target shooting – clarification of how it differs from hunting, challenges/opportunities, and need to clarify language in the plan to be more specific to address concerns, but allow for it as much as possible
- Fire and vegetation management, discussion of management tools, such as chaining
- Purpose of recreation management zones in several alternatives to help provide and manage various visitation experiences i.e. front country vs backcountry
- Permitting, visitor caps, group sizes, numbers of groups
- The BLM clarified that in the alternative table (chapter 2), when Alternative A said “No Similar Action”, that meant there was no decision or management guidance in the 2008 Monticello Resource Management Plan specific to that particular topic or issue addressed in alternatives B, C, and D.
- ROWs inconsistent language in the alternative table, how it relates to travel planning and RS2477 (plan doesn’t address RS2477)
- Conflicts between recreation and livestock grazing – water sources, camping, language in the plan favoring recreation when conflicts are identified
- Group wanted to discuss wildlife and paleontology as well as many other items in the draft plan, but ran out of time and were very frustrated by the lack of time allowed. Discussed extending the meeting, but several members had to travel, and generally it’s better to stay within the times published in the Federal Register. Agencies acknowledged the challenging time limitations and offered to factor in more time for future meetings given members’ engagement and desire for thorough discussions. Affirmed the good work the group completed in the short time and expressed appreciation for their engagement and obvious preparation for this meeting.

In summary, eleven motions were made and seconded and had sufficient support to carry forward as recommendations to the agency. Several motions were made and seconded but lacked majority support to carry forward as a formal recommendation. Recommendations are listed below:

**Motions considered and carried forward as formal recommendations to the agencies:**

**Recommendation 1:** The Proposed Monument Management Plans and Final Environmental Impact Statement (PMMPs/FEIS) should have a greater emphasis and more discussion regarding cultural landscapes (all cultures, including Native American and pioneer heritage) and accelerate completion of the Cultural Resource Management Plan (target 1 year to complete).

**Recommendation 2:** Identify ceremonial grounds for Native American use, include interpretation and signage for warriors and history of Bears Ears and include the historic interpretation. Involve tribal preservation officers and others with tribal expertise in developing interpretive materials. Thoroughly recognize the trade-offs of publicizing and identifying ceremonial locations and being respectful of tribal wishes for privacy in ceremonial practices.

**Recommendation 3:** As a future agenda item: MAC &/or subcommittee would like to discuss and provide input on the list of public use sites identified in the DEIS (from the Presidential Proclamations) as well as how they will be managed and allocation strategies. They may wish to consider additional sites for hardening and visitation and provide guidance regarding managing front and back country sites differently. The MAC requested sufficient time and opportunities to provide input of these issues prior to implementation. *(note: this was not a unanimous recommendation, 3 dissenting, concern seemed to be with sites listed in the DEIS, and wanting to address it now rather than later).*

**Recommendation 4:** With respect to fire management options, the MAC recommends carrying forward Alternative D, and adding language broadening the discretion for use of chaining. The PMMPs/FEIS should include language from Alternative C and D to allow more flexibility in chaining as a management tool where it is appropriate and consistent with the protection of monument resources *(similar to language in Alt C minus the word “only”)*.

**Recommendation 5:** Under Lands and Realty - Clarify language in Alt D (lines 1 & 2) so that the words “granted” and “issued” are consistent.

**Recommendation 6:** Under Lands and Realty – MAC expressed a preference for Alternative A due to concerns with limiting flexibility in authorizing ROWs. (Lines 1 and 2) *(note: this was consensus by voice vote, but not “enthusiastic”)*

**Recommendation 7:** Lands with Wilderness Characteristics – MAC recommends carrying forward Alternative D, which is the same as Alternative A *(strong consensus)*.

**Recommendation 8:** Livestock Grazing- MAC prefers for Alternative D for the Indian Creek Unit and Alternative A for the Shash Jáa Unit. Recommend modifying language in DEIS to read “Maintain, improve, and authorize new range improvements to allow for effective range management” and eliminate the first bullet under 2.4.5.2. “Recreational high use areas”.

**Recommendation 9:** Target shooting: MAC recommends clarifying, refining the language regarding where shooting is allowed, so that it does not overly restrict recreational target shooting.

**Recommendation 10:** Change language regarding climbing anchors to allow for the use of top anchors with the condition they are camouflaged, and chains and webbing are removed.

**Recommendation 11:** In general the MAC favors Alternatives A or D and recommends for topics not addressed by the MAC during this meeting, due to lack of time, that management options from Alternatives B or C are not carried forward *(majority in favor, consensus not reached, 3 dissenting)*.

***Additional discussion:***

The MAC expressed significant frustration regarding the lack of time to provide recommendations on all the alternatives and to more fully discuss visitor services, group size limits, wildlife, and paleontology. The preference of the group was to provide for existing uses and maximum flexibility in management and access within the monument, which is perceived to be best represented in Alternatives A or D. Members expressed concerns with greater limitations identified in Alternatives B and C. Due to the

general nature of this recommendation and members' concerns about not fully knowing the potential ramifications of this recommendation, there was not a full consensus, but a majority were in favor.

**Motions considered, not carried forward as recommendations:**

- Expand dispersed camping near isolated springs and water sources from 200' to 1000' (ref 2.4.7.2 bullet 2) – 5 in favor, 7 against, 3 abstained, primary concern was this restriction could close out entire canyons to dispersed camping as some are very narrow.
- As a way to speed up the process recommend members vote on each alternative for each resource topic and then agency can just record the votes, rather than try to reach consensus. Voice vote, majority not in favor
- Recommend Alternative A for all recreation decisions. A majority was not in favor, with the primary concern that they lacked time to thoroughly consider the ramifications of these complex issues.

*Agencies thanked everyone for coming and Lance Porter adjourned the meeting.*

**Handouts/Materials:**

- [Attachment A - Agenda](#)
- Attachment B – Presentation: Overview of Proclamations and Charter
- Attachment C – Presentation: Overview of the Monument Management Planning Process
- Attachment D – Comments emailed to the MAC prior to the meeting
- Attachment E - Meeting sign in sheets
- Excerpt of the Alternative Table in [Chapter 2 of the DEIS](#)
- [Monument Advisory Committee Charter](#)
- [Bears Ears National Monument ePlanning webpage](#)
- [Monument Advisory Committee Federal Register Notice](#)
- [Advisory Committee Meeting Press Release](#)