



U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management

Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

Certified on December 13, 2022, by the
Grand Staircase-Escalante National
Monument Advisory Committee

William Weppner, Ph.D.

William Weppner
GSENM Advisory Committee Chairman



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

ATTENDEES

MAC: William Weppner (Committee Chair and Developed Outdoor Recreation), Commissioner David Tebbs (Local Elected Official), Commissioner Andy Gant (Local Elected Official), Shea Owens (State Government), Hank Stevens (Tribal Interests), Joel Pederson (Education), Sarah Bauman (Conservation), Drew Parkin (Private Landowner), Stephen Westhoff (Grazing Permittee), Jacqueline Grant (Public at Large), Lanse Chournos (Local Business Owner), Scott Berry (Dispersed Recreation), Vacant (Ecologist), Vacant (Paleontologist), Vacant (Archaeologist).

BLM: Greg Sheehan (BLM Utah State Director), Harry Barber (BLM Paria River District Manager/Designated Federal Official), Adé Nelson (BLM Grand Staircase-Escalante Monument Manager), Carrie Richardson (BLM National Advisory Committee Coordinator), Artemisia Turiya (Paria River District Planning and Environmental Coordinator), David Hercher (BLM Utah Public Affairs Specialist), Amanda Biederman (Virtual Facilitator, Environmental Management and Planning Solutions, Inc.), Alli Yamnitsky (Environmental Management and Planning Solutions, Inc.), Amy Armstrong (Captioner), Julianne Mitchell (Captioner), Liza Schill (Environmental Management and Planning Solutions, Inc.), Luke Hodges (Environmental Management and Planning Solutions, Inc.).

Public/Media: There were about 22 attendees registered; 18 attended, including members of the public, non-governmental organizations, and educational institutions. Attendees included Bob Holliday, Colorado resident; Christa Sadler, Flagstaff, AZ; Hillary Angelo, U.C. Santa Cruz; Joel Brown, U.S. Senator Mike Lee's Office; Kya Marienfeld, Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance; Laura Welp, Western Watersheds; Lisa Clark, Grand Staircase-Escalante Partners; Marc Coles-Ritchie, Grand Canyon Trust; Margaret Smith; Margaret Weppner, Escalante, Utah resident; Marvin Contreras; Grand Staircase-Escalante Partners; Pennie Gray, Bloomington, IL; Rachel Wootton, Utah resident; Richard Webb, Back Country Horsemen of Utah; Sandra Zarzycka, Kanab, Utah resident; Simone Griffin, Blue Ribbon Coalition; Steph Wacha, Grand Canyon Trust; Timothy Kennedy, National Park Service; Chad Hixon, Trails Preservation Alliance; Mark Austin, Escalante, Utah; Jerry Taylor, Garfield County, Utah; John Holland, Grand Staircase Escalante Partners.

GENERAL BUSINESS

9:00 a.m. – Meeting Logistics

>> **Amanda:** General housekeeping items regarding Zoom troubleshooting and the public comment period.

MAC agenda (see Attachment A)

9:10 a.m. – Leadership welcome



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

>> **HARRY:** Welcome everybody. Corning. It's exciting for us to have all of you participating. I want to welcome the MAC. Thank you everybody for attending. Welcome MAC. It's our second meeting together. That's also exciting. It was nice to get the MAC meetings back in progress again, start those up again and we're grateful to have all of you participating. I appreciate your time you dedicate to this because I know all of you have other things you could be doing. But we're grateful you're here working with us and helping us drive where the monument goes. We appreciate that. I also want to extend a welcome to the public with us today.

There will be an opportunity for the public to make some comments, we'll talk more later about how you do that. But thank you for taking time out of your day to be with us here as well. And lastly, I want to thank all our employees that are participating. We're grateful that we're doing this together and we're grateful that all of us have a common interest and that's Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument and what we do with this awesome piece of ground that we call the monument. I have an opportunity often, my mornings and weekends I spend a great deal of time on public lands. This last Saturday I got up early and went on a mountain bike ride out on Buckskin Mountain. I enjoy all the areas of the monument. I'm grateful for a chance to be the Paria River District Manager. I'm Harry Barber if I didn't say that in the beginning. I'm the Paria River District Manager. I hope that you find these meetings interesting. I hope that we can have some meaningful dialogue and in the end, I hope that as we grow closer together, work closer together, that we can make it such that we're providing good guidance, necessary guidance, appropriate guidance. I see that our state director, Greg Sheehan is on. Is there anything you would like to say before we start?

>> **GREG:** First, thank you all and welcome as always. I'm glad we're able to meet. I think we met a few months back, but it was a good deal of time prior to that that there was a meeting. So, I'm glad that we could all be here today. We have on this advisory council or this advisory committee I should say, we still have a couple of vacancies, paleontologists and archaeologists, and we've submitted names on that awhile back, so hopefully we'll hear in the coming months if those have been able to be filled. If we rewind back in time to May, not too far back, there was a revised charter that came out for the Grand Staircase MAC. And basically, it highlights and identifies expectations that are to come from all of you and expectations of what we can help deliver to each of you to contemplate over time. I hope you're familiar with that. If not with that revised charter, I trust that maybe David, you could get copies of that everyone so they can look through that.

But this MAC and advisory committee more than most, really asking you to, I guess, dig in a little bit and help us figure out best ways to manage the monument. I was trying to think of this morning something brilliant I could come say that would be helpful to everyone. And you're also experienced in this area and the geography and history of the Grand Staircase that I don't think there's anything brilliant that I could add. But I would say this, recognition that many people value this area for many different reasons. Tribal interests and their Indigenous history and culture and connections to landscapes have a deep value. Those who use this as a working landscape, it provides a livelihood for



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

many. Those who go to recreate in this area love it for the beauty and all that it has to offer, and I could go on and on. The scientific community, it's such a real treasure and that's one of the nexuses of the creation of this treasure is the scientific component of Grand Staircase-Escalante. I could go on and on. What I would hope for in all of this is a request if you will that there's an understanding that everybody sees this area, this beautiful area of the world a little bit differently and what it has to offer and my hope would be that you keep an understanding mind that there's not a right or a wrong depending on what your perspectives are.

If we all got in a bus today and drove through the monument, maybe we drove over one of my favorite drives in the state from Escalante up to Torrey and over that mountain where you see a vast change in landscapes. If everyone looked out the window and said what do you see out here, you'd get very different opinions from the person sitting next to you or anywhere else on that bus. I don't know that there's a right or a wrong but there's differences out there. And the group that represents this advisory committee have all been brought on there because you have those very different perspectives, and you understand these differences. And our hope is that we come together and have a fruitful dialogue and recognizes everyone in the room and recognizes there isn't necessarily a right or a wrong but differences. And hopefully we can build together something positive. Right now, we're well into our monument management plan and that will be discussed so I'm not going to do that. But I think this is an important time to listen and make sure that voices are heard.

Certainly, after these management plans are done, we'll continue to meet as an advisory committee as we implement the current plans or the future plan that's developed and rolled out. Thank you all for your participation and I do want to recognize, I'm sorry I'm just a moment late as we get started here, I want to recognize Ade Nelson, our new monument manager, you can see her on your screen I think who was selected here I think August timeframe to serve as our monument manager. She's worked in that area for several years. I know she loves and is connected to that landscape. But maybe most importantly I think she's just a wonderful person to listen to all of you and help solve problems. And I hope that you'll always feel comfortable reaching out to Ade and sharing your thoughts or concerns with her and know that she will listen and try to be very responsive. Thank you, Ade, for stepping into this role. We look forward to you serving as our new monument manager. Of course, thank you, Harry, Harry Barber. He made a statement; I use these lands a lot. If you know Harry, you know he's not exaggerating. I think many days per week, Harry is out at 5:00 in the morning doing a hike, a bike ride, somewhere within the monument. And he shares so many beautiful pictures of these areas, sunrises, and different cultural sites and things. We're fortunate to have Harry be a resource for us there and a scientist by training and again we've got lots of discussion about science and science plans and where we go from here and I know that Harry and others will contribute to that. I think with that again we'll welcome you all, thank you and I know we've got a lot of materials to cover today and I'll hand it back over. So, thank you.

>> **HARRY:** Thanks, Greg. We appreciate you as our state director but also as a person that cares about the monument. And all of us are here for that reason because we care about the monument, so



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

thank you. I think our introductions are over and this is an appropriate time to turn it over to our MAC chair Dr. William Weppner.

>> **BILL:** Good morning everyone. Welcome to the second meeting of the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument Advisory Committee. I'm the chairman of the committee. We have a very busy agenda today, some of it is administrative specific to the operation of the committee. That's going to take up most of the meeting. Then in the afternoon we have important sections that are to provide advice to the monument management.

To save time, I'm going to briefly introduce the appointed members and the responsibility or contingency that they represent. And I'll do that alphabetically. We have Sarah Bauman representing conservation. Scott berry representing dispersed recreation. Lance Chournos, a local business owner, Jacqueline Grant, public at large. Shea Owens, state government. Drew Parkin a private landowner. Hank Stevens representing tribal interests. Myself, Bill Weppner. And I want to remind all of the public listening in or watching, there's a public comment period and you'll be reminded frequently to register if you wish to speak during the public comment period that will begin at 2:45.

The committee will then have an opportunity at 3:30 to discuss and consider your comments. To all the committee members we have a busy agenda, that's been said multiple times. So please be mindful of the agenda. I know for myself, we're all learning to communicate as a committee via Zoom, if you see me waving at you, it's a signal to wrap up your comments to give someone else a chance to comment. We really do have some very broad topic areas and some relatively short times to discuss them. So, everybody keeps that in mind. With that we'll move onto the meeting minutes from the July 12, 2022, meeting which was our first official meeting of the current committee. David Hercher and I circulated the draft meeting minutes and attachments to the committee for review and several committee members made comments and asked for additions. So, the draft form was circulated over the last week or so, ten days. I'd ask the committee members is there any discussion or comment on the draft July 12, 2022, meeting minutes. Just raise your hand and unmute yourself and make a comment if necessary. I'm not seeing any hands raised. I'm going to ask again if anybody has a comment. Sarah.

>> **SARAH:** I just wanted to confirm I sent a suggestion to David and I don't know if he integrated it into the draft. I don't know if I saw the final with the addition.

>> **DAVID H.:** I'm having some issues this morning with the computer so sorry about that. Yes, Sarah. And I did respond to you regarding the question that you had for the selection of the chairman. And I did incorporate that into the minutes and replaced what we had, I'm sorry, replaced that file on our MAC web page as well.

>> **SARAH:** Yeah, it was just adding some detail that was in the recording just for future reference if we need it. Thank you.



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

>> **BILL:** Any other comments?

>> **DAVID T.:** I have one. In that discussion did we take a vote to be able to agree to that? I can't remember if we ever actually voted on whether to revisit the chairman position at a future date. Did we come to a consensus on that decision? I don't remember ever actually maybe taking a vote on that to replace the chairman once some other positions were appointed.

>> **BILL:** What I specifically recall is we had a discussion, there was no vote taken, so there was no consensus or actual getting everyone's input on that. Harry Barber did make the comment that this was to be for this point in time a permanent assignment of the chairmanship.

>> **SARAH:** So, when I went back, Bill, and I think, David, I don't know maybe we need to circulate the minutes again. It sounded like there was a lot of discussion back and forth, but it landed with the bylaws would be the place where we would determine the length of the chairmanship and maybe other positions as well. But I think that's where it landed, David. Is that what you -- anyway because it was a lot of back and forth. I believe David, you offered up the solution of maybe we can solve this in the bylaws.

>> **DAVID H.:** So, I did say that. And I know that in the minutes you'll read that I had agreed to that. But then offline the DFO and myself and the monument manager we had a discussion about let's just keep the chairman in place until his appointment in May of 2023 concludes. And then we're going to be voting for a new chairman at that point anyway or if Bill wants to run again. Harry, you have your hand up. Did you want to weigh in on this?

>> **HARRY:** That's how I recall it. I recall the discussion. I recall there was a little debate on whether we should visit the chair again or have a co, go back and forth on that a little bit. Where we ended and I asked David to go back and look in the notes and he couldn't find it, tried to find it in the recording, but I recall saying we were going to maintain the chair that was voted in and that individual will stay until such time we need to make a change into the future. But we were not going to necessarily revisit that in the way that it had been suggested.

>> **DAVID H.:** I did go back to the minutes and annotate that conversation. I could not find the exact area in the recording where Harry had said we're going to vote for a permanent chair right now or an interim chair. I will let you all know that we do have a professional transcription service now for this meeting and probably for the future meetings. So, you can expect transcripts a lot faster than what I could do them. And hopefully a little bit more thorough.

>> **HARRY:** And I felt we left off with, we have a chair, we're going to keep the chair and not the interim. That's how I thought we left it.



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

- >> **SARAH:** It was sort of confusing. Sorry, go ahead. You're on mute, Commissioner.
- >> **DAVID T.:** I raised my hand; I just spoke over somebody. It looks like with the new charter, Bill won't even have a position, is that right?
- >> **BILL:** Say that again, David?
- >> **DAVID T.:** With the new charter that comes in next year, Bill won't be able to reply because of the six-special government SGOs, whatever they call them, officials?
- >> **HARRY:** SGEs?
- >> **DAVID T.:** Yes, SGEs, is that correct?
- >> **DAVID H.:** Bill can apply for an SGE position if he wants to, absolutely. And I'm going to encourage him to do that.
- >> **DAVID T.:** Is that reflected in the meeting minutes that he'll be in place until the charter renewal?
- >> **SARAH:** Sorry, because I went back and listened to it because I was confused about where it landed. And at least in the public meeting and I'm not sure about the conversation afterward, David, but it sounds like what happened in the public meeting was altered through a conversation that you all had separately. But the way that it landed was that in the bylaws would be the place where we would determine how long the chair position would be in place, whether it would be temporary or not, et cetera. So, I would say things are going to be changing next year in the roles that people have. So, I still think in the bylaws is a good place to do it. I don't know if we're in a position to be obviously recommending bylaws right now because we have so many open positions and individuals who have yet to be appointed. So anyway, that's what I remember. Or that's what I heard when I went back to the recording.
- >> **HARRY:** So David, the way I recall it, and I thought it was during this type of discussion. We bantered back and forth whether we should have an interim chair or not. And maybe it's because I didn't express myself as the DFO, but I do recall saying we're going to make a decision. That decision is we're going to keep the chair that is voted in and not go to an interim. And that's still my feeling right now as the DFO so we can keep this moving.
- >> **DAVID H.:** I also agree that, Sarah, that if we make changes to the chairmanship in the future, we outline that in the bylaw. And Bill has a time on the agenda today to start discussing the bylaws.
- >> **HARRY:** I'm fine with that, but I'd like to keep the discussion moving. I think we have a chair and let's maintain that chair and move forward.



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

>> **DAVID H.:** Yes, same here.

>> **BILL:** With that if there's no further discussion, we'll call a vote. And I make a motion to vote to approve the meeting minutes from the July 12, 2022, Monument Advisory Committee meeting. What we'll do on these votes, and I'll call each name alphabetically again, so we have a chance to record your vote and document it. So, Sarah, voting yes approves the minutes, voting no disapproves the minutes. So, Sarah Bauman.

>> **SARAH:** I vote yes, approve with the changes that David made.

>> **SCOTT:** Yes.

>> **LANSE:** Yes.

>> **ANDY:** Yes.

>> **JACQUALINE:** Yes.

>> **SHEA:** Yes.

>> **DREW:** Yes.

>> **JOEL:** Yes.

>> **HANK:** Yes.

>> **DAVID T.:** Yes.

>> **BILL:** Yes.

>> **STEVE:** Yes.

>> **BILL:** Thank you. So, it unanimously passes. I want to remind everyone in the public that we have 12 members right now. So, we'll keep that number in mind as we vote for things. With that, we're going to move to the next agenda item. Which we're right on schedule. So that was already brought up that we'll be discussing bylaws, and we're going to take the next period of time to have a discussion about that.



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

9:30 a.m. - MAC bylaws discussion:

>> **BILL:** As I mentioned earlier, proclamation 10286 which was a presidential proclamation maintains the authorization for this specific monument advisory committee or MAC. The federal advisory committee and for the public we're going to refer to that as FACA was enacted in 1972 to ensure that advice by the various federal committees formed is objective and accessible to the public. So, you'll hear us talk about compliance to FACA as we discuss these bylaws.

The U.S. General Services Administration which is known as GSA is chartered with oversight of the advisory's compliance to FACA. So today you're going to hear topics, and this is some of the administrative work we must work through, you're going to hear topics discussed like chartering which you've already mentioned and committee bylaws which we've already discussed a little bit. So just to give you a very broad definition of both of those entities, a charter is a document from the responsible authority, in this case it's the Bureau of Land Management or the Department of the Interior granting roles and responsibilities to the committee.

We'll address our specific charter in the next agenda item. Bylaws are the rules adopted by a committee chiefly for its members and the managers of how it performs its affairs during these meetings or in fact in the absence of these meetings. It's an operating manual for consistency in how we conduct our business. We do not grant ourselves authority or responsibilities. That comes through the charter. So, for everyone we're currently a committee of 12 individuals, all volunteers appointed for a particular expertise or experience. But also, for our ability to productively reach consensus in the face of disparate opinions. I think that's going to be an important point to consider as we have this discussion. We're not all going to agree on every detail of the bylaws.

Our goal today is to reach consensus on a draft set of committee bylaws to submit to the BLM for review and approval by a BLM solicitor. If compliant, the committee meeting will then be convened in December, and we'll vote to adopt the bylaws. With that introduction, I prepared draft committee bylaws consisting of GSE advice and guiding documents available on the internet. The document was shared with the committee on August 5, 2022, initially and revised on August 24th after specific comments were submitted by committee members. This is meant to be a straw horse document for the committee to consider and to be a point for discussion today. For complete transparency, I did not incorporate all comments submitted because there was not adequate discussion by the committee to justify their inclusion. This is now the time for discussion, and I remind everyone to be specific on the language for consideration and to justify why it's necessary. Please be mindful of the time constraints because we have a lot to cover today. The goal again after this discussion is to have a vote on accepting the draft and moving it forward to the BLM and solicitor. So, I'll open it up to discussion. Sarah.

>> **SARAH:** Thank you, I have a quick question just because I think it will be important for how we proceed. What is the process for updating the bylaws because I know that that's something generally



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

in other situations can be done by the group? My personal opinion is the bylaws should be as flexible as possible. So, if there's a reason to update them, that can easily be raised in a committee meeting and we reach consensus and vote on it. Thank you.

>> **BILL:** Joel.

>> **SARAH:** So, the process for that would it then go through the solicitor again, the way that you described it in terms of being approved? So, any changes would also have to go through that same process? So, we recommend the changes in a future meeting and then they would be approved, and we could approve them at a later meeting.

>> **BILL:** I would assume that would be the process.

>> **SARAH:** Okay, thanks.

>> **BILL:** Joel.

>> **JOEL:** Just a clarification, so I got up and I'm looking at an August 24th version. Is that the latest one that you sent out?

>> **BILL:** That's the latest one that I sent out. David, I believe we were going to try to get that up on screen.

>> **DAVID H.:** Sorry, I got IT here helping me with something. What do we want up on screen right now?

>> **BILL:** The August 24th revised bylaws for the committee.

>> **DAVID H.:** Okay, got it. Amanda, do you have that? I know you do, can you put that up, please?

>> **AMANDA:** Yep, will do.

>> **DAVID H.:** All right, thank you.

>> **BILL:** This might be hard to read. The bylaws as written are about three and a half pages long. And I followed the advice given by the GSA in terms of specific topics and literally used language that was either provided by that advice or I found on other BLM advisory committee websites.

>> **SCOTT:** I have some comments when you get done.

>> **BILL:** I'm hoping that everyone on the committee had a chance to review these. So, the only



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

specific language that I added because of our discussion in the first meeting was around the issue of a quorum. And I look at this committee to be obviously as an advisory committee, we've all made a commitment to participate, and we should be attending these meetings. So, whether there's 12 or 15, we should have as complete a group as possible. There's really no need to define a quorum. If we looked at it as a simple majority right now, that would be seven members out of 12. If we were missing five people, there's an obvious question to be asked of whether we should be holding the meeting at all, because that's important input. So, my goal was to try to make it as efficient and effective and I keep using those two words as possible, to not make it a laborious document. It's supposed to be how we act as a group. But it gives some background justification of who authorized us and how we got here. And obviously if you've read the detail, the DFO has a very significant role to play in this. So, Scott, would you like to make your comments?

>> **SCOTT:** Sure. Thank you. I guess my starting comment is that this is probably an opportune moment to discuss general principles and provisions for the bylaws. But I guess I didn't imagine this was going to be a wordsmithing approach where we were going to look at new language word by word and try and figure out what we should insert in there. As Bill and I'm sure many of you recall, I sent out a detailed set of specific suggested amendments to the bylaws Bill prepared. I continued to work on that until just a minute ago. I emailed all of you a document that's a little easier to describe, a PDF document with all my suggested changes to the language that Bill had proposed. So, I'm happy to go through each of those nine suggested amendments word by word, line by line today if this is the appropriate moment to do that. But I guess I'm suggesting in the interest of efficiency as Bill talked about to back up for a degree and wait until everyone has had a chance to review my suggested changes, and of course the ones that anyone else on the committee would like to offer before we get down to the wordsmithing task with respect to bylaws. That's where I am right now. I sent you all my document that suggests changes in each paragraph of that proposed bylaws.

>> **BILL:** Sarah, you'd like to make a comment?

>> **SARAH:** I guess a little like Scott just wanting to take more time with this and given the fact we have additional members that will be joining and it's how we operate as a group so we're kind of putting things in motion. I know that we had had some back and forth early on when you shared, Bill, your bylaws. I think with the ability to amend in the future I feel a little more comfortable with moving more of skeletal bylaws and then with the assurance that we can make additional changes. But I think that we should consider what Scott put forward and then also making these bylaws responsive to the charter and flexible and inclusive of the new members that are coming in. So those are my comments.

>> **BILL:** Are there any other comments? David?

>> **DAVID T.:** I'm a little concerned about the changes to the amendments. Right now, the language is broad. It covers all aspects, economic, cultural, tribal. I commented on the working document on



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

mine that there's a lot of focus on science and dates, and I know science is a component of the monument, but there are so many other components that I think we need the broad language that covers all components in that purpose. You put some dates in there, but the charter might change. If you have a new administration, there might be a completely new designation or proclamation.

In these you've tied everything to a certain proclamation, but it's going to require future amendments repeatedly if when you put those hard dates in there. And I think that narrows the focus too much because you know these are going to change over time and it's going to be a little bit of a process to go through and amend the bylaws. So that's my opinion. I think I'd like to keep a broad that covers more than just the focus isn't just on science and we can't lose sight of that. But there are economic, cultural communities. There are a lot of things tied to that. That's my \$0.02 for today I guess on this topic.

>> **BILL:** Shea, I see your hand up. This document we're looking at without the changes, the revised August 4th, was that kind of based on previous drafts that the BLM and solicitors have approved to be FACA compliant. Or was that something just drafted on a whim.

>> **BILL:** No, again I followed the GSA guidance they have advice and guidance and that I went through and looked at other BLM documents that have already been accepted and published.

>> **SHEA:** Perfect. I'm comfortable with the existing bylaws from August 24th and I like that, and I appreciate that they seem to kind of be mimicking a template that seems to be consistent with what BLM and the solicitors approved previously. I appreciate that, Bill. Thanks.

>> **BILL:** Thanks, Shea. Raymond, you have your hand up again. I'm sorry, Scott.

>> **SCOTT:** I'm sorry, I should have taken that down. If we get into the paragraph by paragraph, I'll have more to say but I'll take my hand down now.

>> **BILL:** Okay. Sarah.

>> **SARAH:** I guess I had a question as we talk about amending the bylaws. I know we've talked about having subcommittees working in between meetings so we can do some of this analyzing in between meetings and make more decisions and then the other thing is I'm not representing tribal interests, but I know that there are some barriers I think for participating in the committee type work that we should be culturally responsive. And that's something that could be potentially incorporated into the bylaws. So, I see a lot of potential for building the bylaws in response to the whole group and to support the charter more specifically. I'm in the mindset of moving forward but really, I would like if the language could be in the bylaws just referring to the ability to adapt and I think Commissioner Tebbs may be agreeing on the adapting maybe for different reasons. But I think being able to amend those with the committee is important and I wanted to stress that again.



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

>> **BILL:** Okay, thank you. Joel.

>> **JOEL:** So, I just opened what Scott sent and glanced over it. I have two questions or comments. It looks to me what Scott put in for his choice of language is more specific. It kind of copies and pastes things from the charter for example and lays out things in a more lawyerly written and more specific document. But I guess for somebody like me, I guess my first comment is I would appreciate if there's 1 or 2 things that you could share that you think are substantially different in their meaning in your edits rather than just sort of rewording and being more specific. I would appreciate that. And also, second comment, looking through what Scott sent, Commissioner Tebbs just said something about the focus being too much on science. And I guess in looking at Scott's comments, I don't see where his wording or suggested wording changes the emphasis. And rather he's just sort of copying from the chart. So, I guess I'm asking for clarification on how this would change the emphasis to be more on science than it's supposed to be. And then Scott, whether there's one or two things that are substantial that you think you've changed in meaning.

>> **SCOTT:** I'd be happy to do that if Bill would like me to address that.

>> **BILL:** I think David Tebbs is going to respond to Joel's question and we'll get that taken care of quickly. David.

>> **DAVID T.:** I hate the trackpad; I don't have my mouse with me today. So, I'm looking at provide information on science issues and the achievement of management plan objectives as specified in the charter. You know, it's just a play on words for me I guess than looking at the original that is created with a specific purpose of providing information and advice regarding the development of the management plan as appropriate management of the monument including scientific research. It includes scientific research, but it isn't just right up front. As I read through that, I feel like the primary purpose is science, but that puts local citizens, communities' kind of in the backseat. Religious and tribal, that's how I read it. Now we're all open to our interpretations of how we read it. But I think that's fine how it's written, and it does include science, but it isn't the primary focus, science, necessarily. Does that make any sense? And then referencing the charters, the charters can change too. I hate referencing one specific charter if there's a June 1, 2025, charter, now we've got to go amend the bylaws because we've pegged it to the June 1st charter. Does that make sense?

>> **BILL:** Okay. Scott, do you want to make some comments?

>> **SCOTT:** Sure. Commissioner, I think those comments make sense to me. I'll just kind of jump into the question that Joel posed. I think my language is generally more specific because I did go back to the charter and in many places in my suggested language, I simply copied and pasted language out of the charter into the bylaws. And the reason of course that I did that is because I think the charter provides our Marching orders for this map. We're supposed to do what we've been asked to do in the



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

charter. And it seems useful to have the bylaws and lay those out that this is the jurisdiction of what this committee was all about. And I think that's important, one thing because we're kind of working in a different system now. The older bylaws that existed prior to any of us being involved here, I think any of us being involved here, were quite different and they were modeled on the general sort of bylaws that applied to example to resource advisory committees that advised the BLM about BLM-managed lands in general. Of course, as we all know there's lots of BLM land in Utah, not all of them are in the monument.

So, what's happened here is under this new regime where we are right now, we're trying to exercise and carry out a different mission. A mission that's specific to the monument and that kind of ties back into the purpose of the monument as described in President Biden's proclamation. I don't know if you were on the earlier versions of this MAC, but at that point the charter really was different and had to form more of a general place for everyone in the community to lodge their views and wishes and ideas about the BLM's performance. And the way I see it now is we're sort of out of that world. We're now in a world where in a nutshell our assignments figure out how to preserve and protect specific resource values in the monument. And I think lots of people in the community, all kinds of interests and groups have evidence and information that would bear on getting good answers to the question of how to best protect resources in the monument. I don't see that the door is closed on anybody. They don't have to publish in nature or science to bring their evidence to us or to the BLM and say this is relevant to one of the scientific questions that the BLM should be investigating.

Given that as the overall sort of picture of what I think the MAC is about, that's why I've gone back to the charter and why I've sort of emphasized that we go back to the proclamations and the charter when we're trying to figure out what we should be doing and what this MAC is all about. So, in a big picture sense, that's what I tried to do and I did go through in a sort of lawyer-like way and try and be more specific about things like voting procedures and meetings and most of that is I think all important. For example, I said something like that all the meetings need to be virtual meetings, or you need to be able to participate virtually. And just little sort of management details like that. But overall, I think the big picture is stick with what our assignment is given by the charter is to focus on figuring out how to find the best answers to protecting the resources that are described in the proclamation. And that was the reason why I kind of went back and revisited all these various paragraphs of Bill's proposal and made them more specific in that direction.

>> **BILL:** Yeah, Scott, I'm going to quickly jump in and give you my own perspective on what you've just said. I don't disagree specifically, but I think there are already existing documents whether it's the presidential proclamation or the BLM guidance document or the charter itself, those are already existing, free-standing documents. The bylaws really don't need to repeat that. The bylaws are really intended to be an operating manual as I said for how we conduct our business. So, we don't have to re-justify everything. That's already, that already exists. And I think we all, I shouldn't say we all, I'll only speak for myself. I think we want something that's flexible. Yes, it can be changed. Yes, there are things that are going to change around us that will necessitate that and there's a process to



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

accomplish that. I worry about some of the language you had in there that was incredibly definitive on how BLM staff are to respond to certain things, like the publication of the meeting minutes. And while we only have one meeting to go on, David Hercher did a Herculean job of a very complicated meeting and got that information to us. But he would have failed according to the language in your document. So, I would rather see something that's flexible, that's as simple as it can be. I don't think three and a half pages is necessarily simple. But fits the necessity. Ultimately it must go up for review. So, with that, Shea, I see your hand was up. I'm going to call on you again.

>> **SHEA:** Yeah, I want to first say I'm not opposed to amending bylaws. I feel like my position is I'd love to have a basic document that we know is going to get through the approval process. If we start to have problems with that, then let's go ahead and amend it. But I'm a little nervous about trying to reinvent the wheel and amending things just for the reasons to amend them. Like it probably doesn't matter some of the changes in there. It's not going to change a whole lot of what our, I guess what I'm trying to say for example the introduction, changes in the introduction or changes in the authority or whatever. It's not going to matter a whole lot. I would love to have a document that we start with, and kind of what Sarah was saying. If we come up with problems in the bylaws, let's address them at that moment. Let's change them. Let's get the bylaws so they're working for us. But to me, I think we've got something in place that we're comfortable is going to get through the approval process, let's start with that and, amend in the future if there are issues.

>> **BILL:** I'm going to next call on Jacqueline Grant.

>> **JACQUALINE:** Thanks, Bill. I'm just going to say that I would really like to see a link to the charter or even wording that says the most recently approved charter and that way the document would not have to be changed every single time a new charter comes into place. But as an educator, I find that my students make much more progress if I give them very specific goals. And in the current form of the bylaws, there's not even reference to the charter. If we have a reference to the charter in place, then we all know to go back there. But we don't need to copy pieces of the charter and insert it into the bylaws. There should at least be a reference to it. Thanks.

>> **BILL:** Thank you. Harry, you had your hand up.

>> **HARRY:** Had my hand up, I took it down. I was simply going to suggest, Chairman, that perhaps others might have some comments. There's been a few in the group that have been pretty vocal. But I notice that there are others within the MAC that have not said much. I didn't know if you wanted to ask again if there were others that might want to provide an opinion and provide some input.

>> **BILL:** Yeah, absolutely. If there's other people that want to make a comment, please just have your hand raised. I don't know if it's a limitation of mine, but I can only see a partial number of the committee members. So, I see two people with their hands raised. Jacqueline Grant and Sarah Bauman again. Is there anyone else? Okay, Sarah, I'll go back to you.



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

>> **SARAH:** Okay, and I would welcome other folks that want to take up -- but I did want to respond to Commissioner Tebbs. I don't think that science is in conflict necessarily with local community residents. And I think maybe that's just a sort of broad point that I want to, I hope we as a group can look for those opportunities where we can really do both. And I think this charter is an opportunity for us to do that. And, what Jacqueline said about putting the charter in the bylaws and Scott wrote something in the chat about that. Initially when I put my hand up, I was going to suggest that we could look at both versions, but I think maybe integrating the most important aspects from what Scott brought forth into Bill, the version you put forth and obviously being able to amend in the future. Thank you.

>> **BILL:** Okay, Jackie, I'm going to ask you to be patient. Hank Stevens has his hand raised. Hank.

>> **HANK:** Thank you. Having a hard time navigating through the process here. One of the things that I'm kind of thinking about is it's not just only our meetings, but also the ability for the public especially from the travel sectors as some of these families are in remote areas and are pretty much limited in their accessibility to get internet and whatnot. So that needs to be considered. The other thing too is that we don't want to make it too complicated. I did try to get into this public comment and the public scoping, and there's so much information there that a person must almost be computer literate on a daily basis to actually navigate themselves through the process of getting themselves into these particular public comments and trying to get their input in there. So, we really don't want to make these bylaws too complicated and even with the built-in processes and their accessibility for these important comments that some of the publics are trying to put towards the national monuments. So that would be my suggestion on keeping the bylaws simple. Thank you.

>> **BILL:** Thank you, Hank. Commissioner Gant. Andy, you need to unmute yourself.

>> **ANDY:** I thought I had it unmuted. Yeah, to the science issue, I agree with Sarah, I think we can do both. I think we've done a fair job of that in the past. But the proclamation would indicate that maybe we haven't. And that focus needs to be significantly shifted. And you can see where people get a little jumpy. That focus is specific as in the new proclamation.

>> **BILL:** Thank you. Jacqueline.

>> **JACQUALINE:** Thanks, chairperson. Are we going to have time to talk about the whole quorum issue, because I can see that going either way? As a person who chairs a committee, we've not been able to hold votes on this other committee that I'm on because of a lack of quorum. But I can also see issues where if we don't have a quorum there can be concerns about voting. And the other thing I would like to talk about if we have time later is putting voting items on the agenda so that we all know they're coming up. Thanks.



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

>> **BILL:** Yeah, those are good comments. I would say and again compliment David Hercher, he made sure all the voting items are clearly identified and have in fact a separate timeframe on the agenda. So basically, we're doing that right now. Hank, I don't know if your hand is up again.

>> **HANK:** I'm sorry, no. I'll remove my hand here. Thank you.

>> **BILL:** Okay, thank you. David Tebbs.

>> **DAVID TEBBS:** I want to clarify; I'm not saying we don't have a scientific component to it. I'm worried like Commissioner Gant said if we put too much focus on the science side of it, we lose focus on the people who live here. That's who I represent is the constituency who lives in the monument, around the monument, and it's tough to eke out a living out in these areas. And if we focus too much on science, all of a sudden, we push out some of the other local, economic, cultural, religious, tribal influences and experiences that our people rely on for strength and connection to the land and community and family and all of those things. So, I agree, it's a great place for scientific research and I'm not going to deny that. But we need to find that balance.

>> **BILL:** Thank you, David. Scott, I'm going to bounce back to you.

>> **SCOTT:** Thank you, Bill. I was going to briefly respond to Jackie's comments about having the organic documents that we should refer to in this committee if we have questions about our work. And in my section two authority, I have listed out the statutory and regulatory authorities that sort of provide the sideboards for our work. So, I was basically trying to address the problem that Jacqueline mentioned by including that. So, we've got the legal authorities there. Of course, in my very first paragraph under purpose, it said our purpose was to carry out our assignment in the charter and identify the new charter June 1, 2022, as the charter for current exercise. I agree frankly with you, Bill, that if we have those references to those authorities in there, I don't necessarily think it's critically important to list out all the specific duties. I put those in there just sort of as a matter of convenience so you wouldn't have to go seek out a different document to know what they were. And I think as Bill has made the point, I think everybody that's on this committee is very interested in what this committee is about and what the monument is about.

My assumption is that by and large, the committee members are going to attend these meetings. And if that assumption is true, then having a majority voting quorum seems like it makes sense to me. I frankly don't think this is going to turn into one of those committees where you've got a committee of 15 and only four of them show up. I think we're all going to be interested and we're all going to be informed and prepared to vote which is why I suggested in my version that we go back to a majority vote approach to the quorum question. And I do want to -- I agree that I thought David's minutes were wonderful. When I wrote this document, it was before I saw David's minutes. And I was afraid they might be too abbreviated. David did a great job on these minutes and having seen the enthusiasm and detail he brought to that job, I'd probably write these a little different now with that background.



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

>> **BILL:** Yeah, again a reason to keep things as simple and flexible as possible. Andy, did you have your hand up again? Okay, any other comments? I guess the one point we haven't discussed here is the quorum issue. And we've gotten several different opinions that I think are all in line saying we're all committed to being participants. I'm sure there's going to be exceptions at some point, but I don't think you're going to lose 4 or 5 people. So, to me, that again makes things simple and more flexible. Is there any other discussion? Shea.

>> **SHEA:** Yeah, I don't mind having a quorum. I agree with what everybody is saying. I would like the quorum to be a little bit bigger than seven. It makes me nervous if we're just barely over half. But I don't mind if we've gotten or something like that, we can go ahead and vote. That doesn't bother me. If the number is higher than seven. I'd like it to be at least ten.

>> **BILL:** Okay, that's a good comment. Joel.

>> **JOEL:** I guess I wanted to advocate for Bill making a few edits to make things more specific. I think there's a little bit of a consensus that it's okay to provide some links. For somebody like me it's nice to have the bylaws be a little bit repetitive so it's all in one place and I don't have to keep track of four different documents. So, I hope that rather than just submitting Bill's version and see if it gets approved or not, maybe there are some tweaks that are a good compromise before you submit that.

>> **BILL:** Okay, thank you. Sarah.

>> **SARAH:** I put it in the chat as well. So, I didn't know if you, Bill, were going to share that more broadly with the group and the public but I think having the specific number majority would be helpful, then there's no confusion when we go for a vote. And then it seems simple to state even though it's already happening but stating those items are on the agenda is probably a good idea. Thanks.

>> **BILL:** David, you want to chime in?

>> **DAVID H.:** Yeah, so I guess the first order of business for me after today is to find out if we do need to cancel a MAC meeting because we don't have a quorum, I need to ask that question, what's the appropriate way to cancel a meeting. Also, the former state RAC representative had always taught me that a quorum would be half plus one. So, for us you would round up to nine. Nine out of the 15 would make a quorum. And I guess we can if the chair and committee want to include that in the bylaws, I think that would be great if we do that. That's all.

>> **BILL:** Thank you. Shea, do you have something to say again?

>> **SHEA:** No, I just forgot to lower my hand, sorry.



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

>> **BILL:** That's okay. Once again, any other comments? If there are no comments then I'm going to make a motion, and the motion which we'll have discussion following the motion I make, the motion I make is that we accept the revised draft from August 24, 2022, that was authored by myself Bill Weppner, with the following revisions: we'll add links to appropriate documents. That would include the presidential proclamation, the charter, and the interim guidance document. And update those links as necessary if there are additional documents that must be referenced. We'll also add language regarding a quorum, and we'll set that number at ten as Shea suggested. And with that, that would be the motion to vote on. And we'll follow this now with discussion of that motion. David.

>> **DAVID T.:** I think general information that references a proclamation or charter, I think that's good. And I don't know how you link over to it if those will change in the future, but I think referencing those I think is good. And I would support those amendments with those two if it's general language and not tied to a specific proclamation, because it may change in the future, and we don't have to go revise everything again.

>> **BILL:** Okay, thank you. Jacqueline.

>> **JACQUALINE:** Yes, we had also mentioned making sure to list voting items as part of the agenda in the bylaws. David is doing a fantastic job, but he may not always be here. So, I like to cover my bases and make sure whoever is here in the future will know what we talked about today. The thing we haven't addressed yet are the earlier discussions related to the term of the chairperson and whether we want to see any specific language in the bylaws related to the chairperson position and term. Thanks.

>> **BILL:** Sarah.

>> **SARAH:** So, I was thinking in response, Jackie, to what you just noted that that would be potentially amended bylaws in the future, but if we wanted to have that discussion now, we could certainly do that in terms of the chairperson term. And then just in terms of like specific language to the proclamation and the charter because this committee is convening for this charter and this proclamation. Obviously, the links are going to go there. And I think our job is to fulfill the responsibilities of this charter and not potential future charters. So, I think we should keep our decision making to what we're here to do which isn't something that might change in the future, I guess. So, thanks.

>> **BILL:** Thank you. Scott.

>> **SCOTT:** Thank you, Bill. I move that or I don't move, I suggest that all the specific amendments that I included in my document be included in revised provisions. They may turn out to be too detailed. But as some of us have commented, too detailed is not really a problem. If you don't need it,



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

you don't need to refer to it. But it's handy to have it all as one document right there in front of you. So, I think that makes sense. And I would add back to what Jacqueline said, one of the things you typically find in bylaws is a description of the offices of the organization and the terms of their service. And right now, we just don't have anything about that. We have some information about the chairman, but we don't have a description of a vice chairman or a secretary or any of the other things you typically find associated with an organization or corporation or something else. So, I really think we should have at least key other offices identified, a vice president to serve if they're not available as chairman and, that makes sense as well.

So, I guess I would like to see a revised version of these minutes that include all the suggestions that I made. I guess I'm more on the side of having too much than too little. But I will say that I tried to find, David referred us to the code of federal regulation section that we must comply with. And for some reason either I'm stupid or I couldn't find the reference, but I couldn't find that CFR section. I don't think there's anything very much in terms of limitations on what goes into our bylaws. It's kind of up to the committee unless you did something way out of hand. And I don't see anything that we've discussed here to be that case. So, I would expect that there won't be a problem with the solicitor, or a lawyer look at their documents. And I don't see anything in the general provisions of FACA that would tend to suggest that we've somehow gone out of bounds with what we're talking about. I guess that's my general remark about what we should do next in this process.

>> **BILL:** Thank you. Shea.

>> **SHEA:** This is totally arbitrary, but I think a one-year term or until resignation might be a good amount of time for the chairperson to serve and maybe we start there.

>> **BILL:** Thank you. Is there anyone else that wants to make a comment? Sarah, do you have your hand up again?

>> **SARAH:** Yeah, I do, I was just going to respond to the one year. Because your position is -- is it May 2023? That won't work for this as we transition to getting the seat reflective of the charter. I think having that term length, I'm inclined to have some of those seats filled and then revisit some of these more detailed discussions because I think we're reflecting how this group is going to operate. But we don't have all the folks in place to make those determinations. So, I guess I just wanted to note that.

>> **BILL:** Any other comments? Shea, your hand is still up. David.

>> **DAVID T.:** Mine's up now. But we have people in place. We have a quorum; we can make those determinations. You hate the see, I don't know, I'd hate to have the responsibility I guess to be the chairperson. But at the same time there needs to be an opportunity for others to also hold that position. So, I don't know maybe a year would be good, two years. And as to members of the committee having



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

term limits, if the term expires, I guess, it's quite a process. Sorry, my phone. It's a process to replace that person to get approval for that. So, I don't know if term limits would be good, I guess to have term limits for an individual, but where do you set that. So, I agree with Shea probably, maybe a year, so you have some churn in that chairperson position. But just good comment.

>> **BILL:** Andy.

>> **ANDY:** I worry that if we save these decisions for another time until there's a larger group, we're not going to get much done. You know how long some of those appointments take. They can really drag on. So where do you stop in that regard before you can make a call, you know.

>> **BILL:** Sarah, you want to make another comment?

>> **SARAH:** I guess I'm back to the chair. I don't think we should put that in right now because we can't even fulfill that. I mean if you're chair and your position ends at that time period, there's no way for you to serve 12 months unless you were to, I guess apply for a different position and then continue at chair under a different role. But I think it sets us up for a problem right off the bat whereas if we just leave it out right now, then we can figure it out once we are there, I guess. Some of these assignments it sounds like are going to be happening sooner rather than later. I don't think we should put something in there that we know that we can't do that at this point given the current situation.

>> **BILL:** Okay, thank you. David Hercher.

>> **DAVID H.:** Sorry, it keeps moving around on me. So just a quick rundown for the MAC, I haven't really put this out there because the appointments have not become official. But we did have a call for nominations in March of this year and we do have two nominations, recommendations approved for appointment. What that means is that they will be going to the secretary for her concurrence. Once that occurs, we will have two more positions filled and earlier this month, we started a second call for nominations focusing on every position, every category that's going to expire in 2023 including the chairmen. And just looking at the new positions outlined in the new charter and trying to front load as many as we can here over the next 30-to-60 days and get those recommendations and nominations sent up through the state office, the governor's office to Washington. I will say that the March call for nominations happened quickly, March to October that was unheard of two years ago or a year ago. It was taking 12 plus months to get those recommendations appointed. So, it seems to me like the administration has really made a concerted effort to fill those positions as quickly as possible which is why again we did two calls in this calendar year. And if we must extend it, I'm sure we'll have a conversation about that. But I don't have the dates in front of me, but I can put that information in the chat so that folks are aware that there is a call happening right now and if you have someone in mind for a certain position, please have them reach out to me.

>> **BILL:** Thank you, David. Now David Tebbs.



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

>> **DAVID T.:** You did sort of answer my question, David. So, you don't have a deadline when those nominations need to be received by?

>> **DAVID H.:** It's 30 days. I don't have the deadline off the top of my head, but I will put it in the chat. There is a deadline.

>> **DAVID T.:** Thank you.

>> **BILL:** Any other comments? Joel?

>> **JOEL:** Trying to find compromise here. I had the same questions about if we all have terms and we leave before a year is up then how you can be the chair for a year. But wouldn't it be possible to have language which I think should be in the bylaws, can we say that the term for the chair is a year or when their term expires on the MAC, whichever comes first. And then it sounds like, Bill, if I understood correctly, there may be opportunities for you to be applying so that you can continue this MAC and complete a year.

>> **BILL:** Yeah, that's certainly a possibility, but I'm not going to discuss that right now. Any other comments? Okay with that, I'm going to amend my motion. So I'm making a motion to have a vote on proving the revised draft August 24, 2022, Grand Staircase-Escalante Monument Advisory Committee bylaws as written by Bill Weppner and adding to them one a reference or links to specific documents connected to this committee such as the presidential proclamation, the guidance documents, the charter. We would also add language identifying a quorum of ten members present at a meeting to allow voting. I would add in this amendment listing the voting items on the agenda, and I'm going to leave the chairperson issue open because that can be addressed later. So, I'm not adding anything in that amended agenda. Or I'm sorry, amended motion. Is there any discussion on that amended motion? Joel.

>> **JOEL:** The quorum should be nine, not ten. Especially following the recommendation that David, was it David Hercher made in the comments.

>> **BILL:** Okay, any other discussion? Scott.

>> **SCOTT:** My suggestion is that we postpone making any decision about moving forward with the bylaws until these two new members are seated and have a chance to participate in this discussion. It seems like we're making pretty good progress now. I don't see the fact that we might wait another couple month will make much difference to this bylaws decision. So, I think that would be my suggestion. Thank you.

>> **BILL:** Okay. David Tebbs.



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

>> **DAVID T.:** In those amendments that you just listed, I would like to be a general term like the language would be to the most recent proclamation or to the most recent charter, so we don't have to go back and change all of that language again if it points to a specific charter or proclamation. It would say the most recent. Because we all know it's going to go back and forth until they get the antiquities act figured out, I think. So that would be my suggestion and I would ask that we move this to a vote so we can move on with the agenda.

>> **BILL:** Okay, a couple more comments. Sarah.

>> **SARAH:** I was just going to comment that I think we should have it be specific to the proclamation and charter because like I said before I don't know if we need to battle over that if the language is inclusive. And then so where did we land with the quorum number?

>> **BILL:** My amendment said ten, the suggestion has been to make that nine.

>> **SARAH:** Yeah, I guess I would be in favor of the ten. But that's it, thanks.

>> **BILL:** Joel, you have another comment?

>> **JOEL:** No, I'm sorry.

>> **BILL:** That's okay. That's all right.

>> **SARAH:** But I can go with nine.

>> **BILL:** David?

>> **DAVID T.:** Based on David Hercher's comments in the chat there's some background there. We cannot hold a meeting if we have less than the specific quorum. When we had eight members in 2021, they just didn't have the plus one at nine, so they couldn't hold meetings. They couldn't fill the other positions so maybe nine is a good number too. I'd be okay with either one.

>> **BILL:** Okay, Ade, would you like to say something?

>> **AMANDA:** Hey, Ade, you're a little quiet, I think. If you could maybe lean into your computer a little bit and anyone who's not speaking, if you could make sure and remain muted so we can cut down on any background noise, that would be great.

>> **ADÉ:** Can you hear me now?



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

>> **AMANDA:** Yes, we can hear you better.

>> **ADÉ:** All right and I just wanted to remind everybody that everything put forward in these recommended bylaws today are subject to solicitor's review. Based on that review and the comments received, that review of that document will come back and come back to the MAC, and you guys will have the opportunity to review and adopt any of the recommendations. There may be input that can be figured out after we receive some solicitor review. There may be a requirement for the quorum based on certain inputs. So just a key reminder there that this is still subject to solicitor review.

>> **BILL:** Thank you, Ade. Any other comments? Okay, I'm going to amend my amended motion once again. And I'll amend it without going through all the detail again so that a quorum would be represented by nine as opposed to the ten that I first suggested. And I guess I'd ask Shea if Shea agrees with that, then we'll go with nine.

>> **SHEA:** I'm comfortable.

>> **BILL:** We lost you there for a minute, Shea.

>> **SHEA:** I'm comfortable with that. Can you hear me okay?

>> **BILL:** Yeah.

>> **SHEA:** I'm fine with nine.

>> **BILL:** Okay, with that and we're pretty much on schedule. Maybe ten minutes ahead of schedule, I'm going to restate the amended motion and we'll put it to a vote. And that moves us forward as Ade just said to getting something in the hands of BLM and the solicitor for review with the expectation that we'll get feedback back by the December meeting. So, my motion is to accept and move forward the August 24th revised draft of the monument advisory committee bylaws authored by Bill Weppner with the following modifications: we're going to add a reference and potentially links to the most recent documents relevant to this advisory committee. We're going to have a quorum for voting that there must be at least nine members present, and there will be a listing in the agenda of all voting items in advance of the meetings. So, I'm putting that motion forward for a vote. Again, I'm going to call your name alphabetically and yes approves that motion, no disapproves that motion. So, Sarah Bauman.

>> **SARAH:** Yes.

>> **SCOTT:** Yes.

>> **LANSE:** Yes.



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

>> **ANDY:** Yes.

>> **JACQUALINE:** Yes.

>> **SHEA:** Yes.

>> **DREW:** Yes.

>> **JOEL:** Yes.

>> **HANK:** Yes.

>> **DAVID T.:** Yes.

>> **BILL:** Yes.

>> **STEVE:** Yes.

>> **BILL:** Okay, the motion passes unanimously. I would only add that in terms of process, I will work with David Hercher and the DFO and Ade and make those additions that we discussed in the amendment and then I'll move that forward through the DFO for the BLM review and the solicitor's review. Is that acceptable by the committee?

>> **BILL:** I'm going to take that as a yes. If you object to it, raise your hand and object to it.

>> **DAVID T.:** Could we get a copy of that because I'd like to see the final language.

>> **BILL:** Excellent suggestion, David. That's what we'll do, we'll put this together with the amendments that I described. We'll make sure that the entire committee gets it. Joel reminded me several weeks ago that we need to always have a deadline for the work we must do. So, you'll be given a timeframe to review it and make any suggestions or comments. But it's going to follow that format that we've agreed on. Okay, Harry?

>> **HARRY:** I wanted to suggest too, and maybe this suggestion is going to my team, particularly David, I don't know how long it will take to take these recommendations, provide them to the solicitor, get information back, but since we have another meeting coming up in December, it would be nice to start working on some answers to some of this. So, I just want David to commit to get solicitors to review this as expeditiously as possible so that we can get responses back to you, Mr. Chairman.



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

>> **BILL:** Thank you, great. And we're ahead of schedule by almost 20 minutes. I'm just going to make a brief comment again, I can't thank David Hercher enough. He has really worked tirelessly in communicating with me and discussing things and finding solutions to some problems and making sure that everything moved forward. So, David, on behalf of the whole committee, thanks a lot for all the effort that you put in. Okay, like I said we're ahead of schedule. I'm open to any suggestions, but I would say let's kind of move the breakup to 10:45 instead of 11:00. We'll take the same, it's a ten-minute break. But if we move it up a little bit, that gives the presenter for the charter presentation a little more breathing room and time. Because I'm sure there's going to be more questions about that. Does that seem acceptable by everyone?

>> **ADÉ:** Bill, I sent a note to David. Depending on whether Carrie's schedule allows for her to join us that ten minutes earlier, if we come back at 11:00, we'll play into whether we can get started right at 11:00 with that next presentation. But David, if you wouldn't mind reaching out to Carrie to see if that's possible and then maybe suggest that we just take advantage of being able to come to a consensus in a shorter time than we had originally thought and take the 15 minutes from 10:45 to 11:00.

>> **BILL:** Sounds good. So, we'll do that. We'll take a break, 15-minute break. And I guess if you want to turn your camera off or mute yourself, I know I'm going to mute myself. But we'll do that. Okay, thank you. We'll rejoin at 11:00. Thank you.

11:00 a.m. – GSENM Charter presentation by Carrie Richardson, BLM National Advisory Committee Coordinator

>> **CARRIE:** I know there have been some questions about the charter, so I was going to go over it line by line. If at any point anybody has any questions, feel free to interrupt. If there are any questions, I'm not able to immediately address, I promise you that answers will be forthcoming. First, I really want to thank you all for your commitment to the MAC. We are very excited about the contributions that we anticipate you all will make as far as standing up a new monument management plan. All right so the charter has 15 standard line items. Those 15-line items are required by FACA.

Any federal advisory committee's charter will have these ideal 15-line items. The first one is the committee designation. That's the official name of the committee. The next is the authority, the authority under which the committee was established. The committee was initially established through the 2000 rod and then was the need for the committee was reiterated in President Biden's most recent proclamation. All Bureau of Land Management advisory committees must be operated within compliance of CFR 1784. This is something unique to the Bureau of Land Management. We are the only agency within the Department of the Interior that in addition to FACA, have our own advisory committee regulations. And those have been in place since 1995.

The objectives and scope, these are please do not feel in the description of duties, I want you all not to



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

feel limited by these. These are duties and responsibilities. But there are plenty of other things if you all have relevant recommendations or advice that you would like to provide, all recommendations are welcome. We're going to go over this real quick. The purpose of the committee is to provide information, advice to the secretary on science issues and the achievement of monument management plans. That came directly from the initial rod. The committee duties and responsibilities, gather and analyze information, conduct studies and field examinations, seek public input or ascertain facts to develop regulations concerning the use and management of the monument. I would like to mention quickly here too, one thing that we do engaged courage if you all are agreeable is on the ground field trips. So, if there's ever any specific areas that it would benefit the MAC to go on the ground and visit sites, we would highly encourage that.

Review programmatic documents including the quarterly division reports and science plans to support recommendations on the achievement of management plan objectives.

Compile data and assess and advise the DFO on the extent to which the plan objectives are being met. So obviously the new plan is not in place. This is something moving forward after the plan is stood up that we would like the MAC to continue to contribute to the implementation of the plan itself.

To make recommendations on monument protocols and applicable planning projects to ensure the overall objectives are being met. That's self-explanatory.

Review appropriate research proposals and make recommendations on project necessity and validity. Make recommendations regarding allocation of research funds through review of research and project proposals as well as needs identified through the evaluation process.

Consult and make recommendations on issues such as protocols for specific projects. For example, vegetation restoration methods or standards for excavation and curation of artifacts and objectives.

And prepare an annual report summarizing the committee's activities and accomplishments of the past year and make recommendations for future needs and activities. This annual report does not have to be something very fancy. It basically is going to summarize the recommendations that were made and where they're at as far as the implementation stage. The official to whom the committee reports, the committee provides information and advice to the secretary through the DFO. As you all know the DFO is Harry Barber the Paria District manager. Support and funding will be provided by the office of the DFO. So, support for any travel, meeting, any kind of funding that's required for the committee is provided by the Bureau of Land Management. The estimated annual operating costs and staff years, now please keep in mind this is an estimate each year, obviously as inflation occurs, these costs are going to go up. The next time the charter is renewed, it will likely be that that figure will increase. And depending on how frequently the MAC meets that indirect and direct expenses for federal staff may increase as well too.



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

Designated Federal Official, the DFO as I just said, Paria District Manager who's a full-time federal employee. The DFO calls all the committee meetings to order, prepares all of the meeting agendas, attends all of the meetings and subcommittee meetings, and adjourns the meeting when he determines the adjournment to be in the best interest of the public, and chair meetings when directed to do by the secretary.

Obviously, you all already have a chair, so the DFO will not need to chair the meetings. The estimated number and frequency of meetings, again this is just an estimate. The committee will generally meet 2 to 4 times per year annually and as such times, other times designated by the DFO.

Now you all are not limited to the number of meetings that you have each year. Some years, especially as you're working on the new management plan is being developed, you probably will meet more frequently. But we would like the committees if nothing else to meet at least two times a year.

The duration, it's continuing. This committee is not going to go away. This MAC is going to be in place for the long term. Now there is a termination line. Every year for committees that are created by presidential proclamations, an executive order must be issued, excuse me, every two years that simply concurs with continuance of the committee. I guarantee that Grand Staircase will be included in every executive order to continue every two years. Membership and designation, the committee shall include 15 members appointed by the secretary. Fifteen members is in the BLM advisory council regulation. We cannot have more than 15 members at one time.

Nine members will serve as representatives of commodity, non-commodity, and local area interests. Now these representatives are people that advocate typically on behalf of the interests that they were appointed, or they applied to and were appointed to represent.

Six members serve as special government employees representing scientific disciplines. The only thing that makes an SGE different from a regular representative, is that before they are appointed, they must fill out financial disclosure forms to make sure that there's no conflict of interest. SGEs do not carry any more weight than regular representative members. Everyone's votes count the same. Unfortunately, those positions just require a little bit more paperwork.

Members will serve without compensation however well away from their homes, engaged in committee business, members will be allowed travel expenses included per diem as the same persons allowed intermittently in government service. That just means that any travel that you all do, you'll be reimbursed for your meals and your hotel and any airplane flights, if you drive, you'll get reimbursed for your mileage. So, nine members will serve as representatives of the following interest areas. Please know that these are not going to change.

Now I understand that there's some people serving in positions that were recognized in the previous charter. All those members that were appointed to represent interest areas that are no longer outlined



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

in the charter are still going to continue to represent that interest and serve out the remainder of their term. No one would be dismissed from the MAC. That will not happen. As we move forward because some of these interest areas and positions are different from the previous charter, we are going to have to transition some of the previous positions into the new interest areas. A lot of that is going to depend, we are currently in a call for nominations. We're accepting new applications. So, some of the new members, the interest areas they represent, or the scientific discipline is going to depend on the applicants that we receive from this call that we're currently in. Now the six, excuse me, the elected official from Garfield and King County, those are going to remain the same. Representative state government is going to remain the same. A representative of Tribal government with ancestral interest in the monument. An educator to represent the educational community. A conservationist to represent the conservation community. An outfitter and guide operating within the monument to represent commercial recreation activities in the monument. And those last three, an educator, a conservationist, and an outfitter were specifically outlined in the presidential proclamation. A livestock grazing permittee operating within the monument to represent grazing interests. And a representative of dispersed recreation.

Six members will be appointed as SGEs. Some of these are specific as far as a member with expertise and paleontology. A representative with expertise in geology to represent the geological community. A member with expertise in botany or wildlife biology. So that position can be filled with one or another, a botanist, or a wildlife biologist to represent the botanical or wildlife biological community. A member with expertise in history or social science. Again, it could be a historian or a social scientist to represent the historical or social science community. And a member with expertise in systems ecology to represent the systems ecology community. All members are appointed to serve three-year terms. That is something that will not change. On occasion, we in the past when a committee is first established, we will stagger terms because the goal is to never have 15 seats become vacant at the same time.

The ethics responsibilities of members. This is important; I know you all received an ethics briefing at your last meeting. Nonfederal members of the committee and subcommittee appointed as representatives are not subject to federal ethics and statutes. However, and these are from the Department of the Interior's ethics office, they are the ones that develop the specific language. However no federal committee or subcommittee members will participate in the committee or subcommittee deliberations or votes relating to a specific party before the department or bureau's offices including a lease, license, permit, contracts or claims that the member represents as a direct interest. If there is a topic that you have a direct financial interest in, you need to recuse yourself from voting on that matter. As provided in 43 CFR 1784.2-2, members of the committee shall be required to disclose their direct or indirect interests in leases, licenses, permits, contracts, or claims that involve lands or resources administered by the BLM or any litigation related thereto. For the purpose of this paragraph, indirect interests include holdings of a spouse or dependent child. This just means that we expect people to be open. If you do have any kind of direct or indirect interest in any of these matters, we just expect for you to make sure that the DFO is aware. Special government employee members,



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

so these are the scientific positions. Members of the committee appointed as special government employees are subject to applicable federal ethics statutes and regulations to include applicable exceptions and exemptions.

Additionally, SGE members are required prior to appointment and annually thereafter to file a confidential financial disclosure report. This is basically, like I said there's no difference, an SGE and a representative vote are the same thing. No vote carries more merit than the other. The only difference is SGEs basically must do more paperwork. And they must file that confidential disclosure report prior to being appointed. SGE members are also required to receive initial ethics training prior to performing any committee duties and receive annual ethics training thereafter.

The Department of the Interior will provide materials to those members serving as special government employees explaining ethical obligations thereafter. If somebody is considered for SGE, somebody from the branch of our solicitor's office will reach out directly to that individual, will share the paperwork, and request that it be filled out and will give a brief individual ethics overview to potential new members. Subcommittees. Subject to the DFO's approval, subcommittees may be formed for the purpose of compiling information or conducting research. However, such subcommittees must act under the direction of the DFO and must report their recommendations to the full committee for consideration. Subcommittees must not provide advice or work products directly to the agency. Subcommittees will meet as necessary to accomplish their assignments, subject to the approval of the DFO and availability of resources.

Subcommittees I find to be very beneficial, because subcommittees are the ones that can spend a lot of time performing research and it saves time for the full committee in the long run because the subcommittee will gather or compile information and then they will do a presentation in your case to the MAC that has already been highly analyzed. It can save a lot of time. The only requirement for the subcommittee, a couple of requirements, the DFO must attend all the meetings. And one member of the parent committee, the MAC needs to be a member of the subcommittee. Other subcommittee members can be anybody that has a specific knowledge for whatever the subject or the basis of the subcommittee is. We do not have an appointment process for subcommittee members. There is not a term length for a subcommittee. Subcommittees typically perform work for a limited period, excuse me for a year or two as a project is ongoing. And once a project is completed, then the subcommittee would simply disband. Record keeping, the records of the committee and formally and informally established subcommittees of the committee, shall be handled in accordance with the general records schedule 6.2 and other approved agency records dispositions.

That just means that for all the minutes, every time we have a meeting, it's announced 30 days in advance in the Federal Register, at least 30 days so public is aware and can participate. The meetings and transcript all must be posted on the MAC's web page, that way anybody that was members of the public and members that weren't able to attend the meeting, can see exactly what topics were discussed. And any resolutions or recommendations that the MAC has come up with. Resolutions and



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

recommendations do not have to be formal. They could be, there's no written requirement as far as how recommendations are submitted to the Bureau of Land Management, if they are accounted for in the meeting minutes themselves, that way the public has access to see how decisions were reached, then we are all good. The record should be available for public inspection and copying subject to the Freedom of Information Act.

So, when they say available for public inspection, the way we make those records available is by posting them on the MAC's web page. Anytime a meeting is held, within 90 days of the meeting, the minutes are supposed to be certified by the chair. If they're not able to do that within 90 days, we still must make sure that minutes are posted on the website, and they're just simply marked with draft until Mr. Weppner can approve them.

Secretary Holland is the one that obviously signed the charter. Every charter we do is good for two years from the date the charter is filed. What that means is oftentimes you'll see that the charter was signed one day, it may not have been filed until a day or two later. When a charter is filed, our regulations require us to formally send letters to members of Congress and a copy of the charter and to also provide a copy to the Library of Congress and that's how a charter officially becomes filed. One of the reasons, the previous charter was still in effect until this was signed. The secretary, even though the charter was not set to expire in the very near future, she decided to update across the board all of the Bureau of Land Management's charters because some of them had language that was added by the previous administration that was meant to redirect recommendations and the secretary wanted that removed. She also wanted to make sure that we had adequate scientific representation on the committee. Now I'm sorry that you all had to basically listen to me read line by line. I know that's not fun listening. But if anybody has any questions for me, I am happy to have a discussion.

>> **BILL:** Carrie?

>> **CARRIE:** Yes, sir?

>> **BILL:** I have plenty of questions but I'm going to ask them one at a time so that you get plenty of input from other people. As I look at scope of activities, I look at we're providing information and advice. Then when I look at the description of duties, there's some strong action verbs in some of those duties. So, we're collecting, we're analyzing, we're doing things. And I just want to make sure that it's clear to the committee and to the public watching us, that I go back to the objectives and scope. It's really to provide information and advice. We're not trying to manage the monument or take responsibilities from the BLM or Grand Staircase staff. We're advising them.

>> **CARRIE:** That is absolutely 100% correct. I don't want you to feel limited by the duties. It's providing recommendations to help the BLM develop the new management plan. Yes, don't feel like yes, there is a requirement like I said for the annual report. We kind of touched on that for a minute. That's not something that has to be formal at all. I don't feel contradicted by the description of duties



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

because there's plenty of other duties that you're likely to perform. We just bottom line is we want those recommendations from you all, the group of experts.

>> **BILL:** Thank you.

>> **CARRIE:** Thank you.

>> **BILL:** I open it up now for anyone else asking questions. Scott.

>> **SCOTT:** Hi, Carrie. Thank you for that presentation. I do have just a couple of quick questions. One question I have is to what extent does the MAC have access to BLM research documentation and studies. It's apparent that the BLM for example has prepared documents, inventories, maps, whatever to help them with the RMP. And I think access to those documents would be helpful to the committee in terms of the functions that you just described, and Bill referenced. Can we have access to those documents? For example, there was a new travel inventory created in the Grand Staircase just a year or two ago that's not been made public. Can we ask to see that and have access to that document? So that's one question. And then just for the sake of getting my questions out of the way, the other one is about individual participation in public participation things that the BLM generally runs. I'm sure many of us often participate in those anyways. For example, I filed extensive scoping comments recently with respect to the RMP. But I guess I'm sort of planning to continue to do that, but I don't want to get crossed wires with my duties and responsibilities under the charter. So, I'd appreciate if you could address those things.

>> **CARRIE:** We absolutely welcome any public comments during the planning period. Your being on the MAC is your additional contribution to the bureau. And the goal when you provide comments, those are your personal comments as to when the MAC makes recommendations, they're more collective where everybody agrees. But we would highly encourage anybody to participate during public comment periods. There's absolutely no conflict of interest, just if it's understood that those are your personal comments on that. But when the MAC makes recommendations, it's a collective. If there are any documents that are public, you should certainly have access to. I would have to guess if there's an inventory that hasn't been released that it must still be in the drafting phase, because I can't see any other reason why that wouldn't be provided to you all. You certainly should be able to request any materials that the BLM has that will help the MAC make decisions or make recommendations.

>> **SCOTT:** Just to clarify, I'm sure many of these things have not yet been released to the public. For example, I believe there are various resource inventories that have been created as part of the RMP process. Assuming they will not be released to the public until some point later in the process perhaps when the draft comes out or something. So those are exactly the kinds of things I'm referring to. An example is maps of routes inside the monument would be helpful for us to understand what the problem is and provide information relevant to that. But again, I'm not sure when that will come out. The most recent information seems to be that a real travel management plan that identifies routes



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

won't even come out until after the RMP is adopted. So again, there's sort of this timing problem, how can we really participate in the duties we've been assigned when we don't have access to at least some of the work in progress.

>> **CARRIE:** Well, I certainly hope that you're being briefed on any of the work that's in progress. I can't promise copies of things in draft to the MAC just because they haven't been released to the public yet and that might be a conflict of interest. But certainly, you should be able to receive an overview on what is contained in the draft documents.

>> **SCOTT:** Okay, thank you.

>> **CARRIE:** You're welcome, thank you.

>> **BILL:** David Tebbs.

>> **DAVID T.:** So, with other people a lot smarter than me with this process in the room. I just have a question, why change the makeup of the charter? It seems like they've overloaded it with government employees now to where maybe the public is getting closed out and the communities. Can anybody answer that for me, I guess. What was the purpose of restructuring the charter with the representative positions?

>> **CARRIE:** I must tell you, Commissioner, I really do not like the term special government employees, because by no means they're not government employees. They're just required to do extra paperwork. They're not receiving a paycheck, they're not on the payroll, they don't have any more influence than a regular representative member. The reason the interest areas were updated is because we wanted to return to the original intent of the committee, and a lot of that was to provide scientific advice. What had happened is that throughout different administrations, the composition now is much closer to what the original MAC composition was. During each administration, especially the previous administration, every time the charter was renewed, they would go back, and some administrations would remove the scientific positions. They wanted a less scientific focus and the secretary's office kind of wanted to bring it back to the original intent of the MAC and that was for there to be a lot of science involved in the decisions.

>> **DAVID T.:** I guess that's my concern that this scientific approach is going to choke out our economic and local communities and religious organizations and culture and heritage. That's what the concern is the scientific approach, science isn't definitive, it changes too.

>> **CARRIE:** Yes.

>> **DAVID T.:** We're just worried that it's tough to make a living and raise a family out adjacent to these monuments and public lands. And we just view that as a step to choke out our local economies



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

and communities because the approach will be purely scientific now. But you've overloaded the MAC to focus on the scientific.

>> **CARRIE:** Oh, please now, it's not me. That's the Secretary of the Interior's signature.

>> **DAVID T.:** I know it's not you.

>> **CARRIE:** Unfortunately, like I said, she did not consult me. As far as just know that that was not at all the intent. There are still nine solid interest areas that are being represented. And six scientific positions. So still, most of the positions, almost 2/3 represent specific commodity, non-commodity, and local area interests.

>> **BILL:** Okay, Sarah.

>> **SARAH:** Hey, Carrie, thanks for that information. I had some questions about the subcommittee makeup that you spoke about. So, you were talking about a MAC member and then the DFO, right? So, you're saying because I think the other thing you said was all of the experts, and I think that's why the science positions are there so that we can have that type of input that may not be that the BLM may not have those positions in house, all of them, and having that outside information would be very valuable. What I heard you say I think is that we can have a subcommittee with individuals who are not MAC members.

>> **CARRIE:** That is correct.

>> **SARAH:** If there is a MAC member present and the DFO. Is that correct?

>> **CARRIE:** Yes, ma'am.

>> **SARAH:** And then we would report back to the MAC.

>> **CARRIE:** That is correct. There's a proposed Lava Wind Energy project that would run through a former Japanese internment camp, so they formed a subcommittee. And that subcommittee has spent a tremendous amount of time on the ground doing site visits for the project. And they have had so far, they've had four meetings and so the next time that the RAC is scheduled to meet, the Idaho, they have a statewide RAC, the subcommittee is going to present kind of an abridged version to all of the conclusions that they've come to the RAC and the RAC is going to use those to make the formal recommendations to the BLM. So, subcommittees I think are a very good resource. And you can be even more specific with what you're looking for as far as members. Now whenever a subcommittee is formed, it's very important that from the junk we determine how long is this subcommittee going to be needed, how many members do we want on the subcommittee because you don't want a subcommittee that has 100 members because then it's not going to be productive. Like I said, there is



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

no formal appointment process for subcommittee members, so you don't get a letter from the secretary or anything. And as soon as that subcommittee accomplishes its goal, then the subcommittee will cease to exist.

>> **SARAH:** So, does the entire MAC need to approve what subcommittees exist?

>> **CARRIE:** Yes, ma'am.

>> **SARAH:** So, if we wanted a botany subcommittee we would basically come to the MAC and say we whoever, MAC members, would like to have a botany subcommittee and then do the MAC members also vote on the individuals within that subcommittee?

>> **CARRIE:** Not necessarily, if they felt so inclined, they could do that. I think that that might not be the best use of the MAC's time just because you all, you're limited in how long a meeting last. But certainly, as far as it would be good for the MAC to develop criteria for what you're looking for specifically for subcommittee members. I would just encourage you not to make it too large where it's difficult to manage and has a difficult time being productive. Now subcommittees are still held to the same record-keeping standards. So, if a subcommittee holds a meeting, we must publish a notice in the Federal Register 30 days in advance to make sure that the public is aware and can participate in those subcommittee meetings. You know the meetings must be open. And formal minutes also must be kept for those subcommittees. That way if anybody ever has any questions about information that they produced to the full committee, that way we have an official record of what the advice and studies were established or accomplished.

>> **SARAH:** And I assume the DFO can request a subcommittee be formed if they need some type of information that they don't have internally?

>> **CARRIE:** Yes, ma'am, that's absolutely correct. Like you said, the MAC can identify, and you're not limited to one subcommittee, you can have more than one subcommittee. That's not an issue. But the MAC can certainly suggest things. Of course, you would want the DFO to buy in that there's a need for it, but frankly I think that the subcommittees save the overall full parent committee a lot of time. Have I answered your question?

>> **SARAH:** Yeah, yeah. I'm excited about the possibility of that and just wondering sort of how we would as a group get that going because there are several potential subcommittees that I think would be helpful in this process. And hopefully, I think they're aligned with the BLM, but yeah just trying to work it out in terms of what would happen next.

>> **BILL:** Sarah, I think we need to probably get some experience with that and talk amongst ourselves. I want to move on so everybody has a chance to ask a question and I have another question to ask which I'll do after I turn the mic over to Harry.



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

>> **HARRY:** Yeah, thank you for just a moment of your time. I want to go back to Scott's question regarding documents or materials that the MAC might need. If there is something that you need, a report from us or another document you think would be helpful as you work with us and help us make decisions and make your own recommendations, whatever those are, I think if they come up through the MAC, come to the monument manager, we can certainly discuss what those are. If there's something because of not having been released to the public, we'll let you know that. Otherwise, I think if it's helpful to your positions within the MAC or if we form subcommittees and they need some information, I think we're here to help you get the information you need. So, I think if you run that through the MAC to the monument manager, we'll certainly help you as much as possible.

>> **CARRIE:** Thank you, Harry.

>> **BILL:** I have a question and it's probably going to be interpreted as controversial and I don't mean it to be. But it's been brought forth to me by community members and I live in Escalante so I'm right in the middle of things so to speak. And it relates to the ethics responsibilities of non-federal members. And the specific question that's been asked by several people here is we have two MAC members that are executives, in fact senior executives of an NGO that has a very close relationship to the Grand Staircase-Escalante national monument. And does there have to be disclosure or something that the general public and the MAC can understand about the depth and breadth of the relationship between that NGO and the monument?

>> **CARRIE:** I certainly think that those members, that absolutely needs to be disclosed. And those people, if there's anything that could even be perceived as a conflict of interest need to recuse themselves from any related conversations. That's the most important thing is that we count on everybody to be honest and to hold themselves to high ethical standards. So, if they are working for an NGO that has other alternative interests in management of the monument, they need to be very clear with that and they need to recuse themselves from related conversations. Do you feel like that's been an issue?

>> **BILL:** We're so early in the process, but and again I'm not trying to be controversial.

>> **CARRIE:** No.

>> **BILL:** It's been raised again by people both in Garfield County and specifically here in Escalante. We just want to make sure transparency is completely understood and that we're doing the right things.

>> **CARRIE:** Yes, yes. Transparency is the key as we expect everybody, you're doing very important work, and we expect everybody to be transparent. Because we would never want anybody in the future to look back and try to discredit things that the MAC have done.



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

>> **BILL:** Shea, I'm going to go to you.

>> **SHEA:** Yeah, so kind of along those lines and sorry I've been in and out, I was transitioning from one site to another. I work for the State of Utah, we've sued the BLM specifically regarding the monument. I'm not a listed attorney, I'm not an attorney of record on that lawsuit, but I am familiar with it. I guess what do I need to be concerned about? And I think there may be, yeah, I guess we also have a lawsuit over roads that go through the monument, right. So, there are these kinds of things. What do I need to be concerned about? What do I need to kind of so I'm not getting anybody in any trouble?

>> **CARRIE:** I tell you what Mr. Owens, because I don't want to get too far into your personal business. Would it be okay if I had somebody from ethics reach out to you as an individual? That way I just, I don't want to expose anything that's private in this forum right now.

>> **SHEA:** That's perfect.

>> **CARRIE:** If you're okay because I want you to feel 100% comfortable when you are making recommendations. And I appreciate your commitment to being honest when it comes to ethical responsibilities.

>> **SHEA:** That's fine. And both of those lawsuits are public, but I would appreciate a phone call.

>> **CARRIE:** Sure. Thank you. And I am not an attorney, I'm certainly not an ethics attorney, but we do have a whole bunch of them that are happy to provide advice. So, I will talk to somebody this afternoon and have somebody reach out to you just so we can be clear on that. Thank you, I appreciate you paying such close attention to that.

>> **BILL:** Okay, I'm going to go to Harry Barber next. Harry.

>> **HARRY:** Yeah, I want to touch on it in the sense that these applications are reviewed, not just here. We get the applications, they're sent out. All these things are taken into consideration as you disclose on the application, your background, what you're a part of, that is taken into consideration. But I want to touch on what was said earlier that if a particular project that we're working on touches on something that you're working on with an outside group, then I think you need to disclose that. I think we're all about transparency. But I wanted to let you know that, and I think you knew this, those applications are reviewed at a number of levels, and we try to look for things that might be controversial. But I'm comfortable knowing that anyone that's on the MAC right now, your application was reviewed and found acceptable to be part of this group.

>> **CARRIE:** And that's why to tail on what Harry is saying, one of the things that specifically is on



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

that application is if you hold any leases, licenses, permits related to the BLM. That way the BLM knows from the very beginning if there's any potential conflict of interest that could arise. And the ethics office will go in and they will look if you have like a permit, they will go and they will pull your permit and look at the permit to make sure that it's not in conflict with any of the duties for the advisory council.

>> **BILL:** Okay, I'm going to go to Joel Pederson next.

>> **JOEL:** Thanks. It strikes me that this committee is composed in ways that present a lot of potential conflicts kind of inherently. If I understand conflicts of interest and maybe I don't, they mostly relate specifically to financial items. So, I've got a specific question. We have a member I think who represents leasing of for livestock, right.

>> **CARRIE:** Yes.

>> **JOEL:** So, if the person on our MAC has got a lease to graze livestock, how is that not a conflict of interest?

>> **CARRIE:** Actually, it's specifically required in our regulations if you're going to represent grazing, you have to have a grazing permit. That is the one that automatically doesn't get a second glance. We want somebody that like I said has an active grazing permit and that way they can provide a good representation for other grazing permit holders. But that is the one represented interest that it's expected that you're going to have that. A lot of times we find that it's not necessarily the individual that holds leases and permits, it's usually their employer. And so typically that's not enough for it not to be too much of a conflict of interest, just depends on what the actual permit is for.

>> **JOEL:** Okay, thanks. So that's sometimes it sounds like an exception. I hope we advocate for a lot of tolerance for each other. It strikes me that the county commissioners also have inherent conflicts of interest related to their elected positions. So anyhow, I hope we all give each other a break.

>> **CARRIE:** Well, the reason you all were selected is because you all were known to be people that can reach consensus in a noncontentious way, and that's what the expectation is, is for everybody to be considerate of everybody's opinions, try to come together as much as possible to make not all recommendations are unanimous but as close to unanimous as possible. Thank you.

>> **BILL:** I've got to go to Hank Stevens next.

>> **HANK:** Thank you, Bill, for that acknowledgment. One of the things that I kind of want to share with the group is that we're talking about a monument that's been established two and a half decades ago. And some of the issues that plagued the tribes was the public laws that were initiated and executive orders that established these monuments and national parks. So, in essence, the tribes have



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

been disconnected from their aboriginal land, talking about the Glen County recreational barrier. Aleutian the tribes, you have -- also the tribes, you must understand might be unfamiliar with the area now, but they are at least connected in a certain way. So, with the MAC group, there's been different charters that have been initiated to suffice the MAC group.

So, with the disconnect we also must remember that the tribes really don't have that trust anymore in the Federal Government, so it's going to take time to bring the tribes up to speed with some of the planning that we're going to have within these national monuments. So, in essence, we need to catch up. And we have the monument management plan that's already existing, we have the RMP that's already existing, we have the AMS that's existing. So, these are things that must trickle down to the tribes so we can get a better understanding and to initiate some sort of plan. For the subcommittee, I think it's something the tribes could use. But at the same time, we must really be flexible in how we address the tribal inputs, because some of the things that we might share with the MAC group could be a little sensitive. So, in essence what we might do is identify certain objects in the area and how they pertain to traditional and cultural ceremonies. And these are things that I believe is something that we could do with the subcommittees. On the other side of it, the staffing from the tribe, we don't have adequate staffing to identify some of these plants if you will or trees or some of the old structures, remnants and things of that nature. There must be room for us to enter this ballpark if you will actually have the MAC group understand it. And that's one of the reasons why I was contemplating maybe some sort of a cross cultural training from the tribes to the MAC group so they can have a better understanding of where we come from and how we utilize the land and whatnot. So, it's something that I'd kind of like to put on the table for the MAC group to get a little bit more flexibility on catching up with and up to speed on everything that's going on with these monuments. And I realize we have a deadline of 2024 to meet some of these obligations. But with your help, I think we meet the Department of the Interior's regulations. Thank you.

>> **SCOTT:** Thank you, I have some of the same questions that Shea raised. An organization that Sarah and I both serve, she is the executive director, me as a board member, engages with the management of the monument on virtually every level of monument management. So, we're constantly in each other's pockets in a way trying to understand how that management is going to work, who's doing what, how it's going to be done, et cetera. So that's just kind of the reality we live in, and I'm sure that was appreciated when we were chosen as members for this committee. There may be other more specific questions. For example, pastors, we used to receive amounts of funding through the BLM, that has not been the case in recent years. But I guess it could be again. I'd like to get your clarification on an NGO applying for funding for some project from the BLM or some agency, does that ring any bells in your mind about conflict of interest. And then as Shea alluded to, we have engaged about the monument in various litigation forums in the past. It's not impossible that we'll do so again in the future. So that's an interesting question to us as well.

>> **CARRIE:** Okay, like I said I really don't want to get too down into what you do personally or what you do for work outside of the MAC. So, I think that it would be best if you don't mind if we



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

had that conversation offline with a member of the solicitor's office that's an ethics specialist. That way they can tell us exactly where that line in the sand is. I would just say if you felt uncomfortable, then the best thing to do is recuse yourself. That's the best advice I can give.

>> **SCOTT:** Thank you.

>> **CARRIE:** Sorry, I know that that's probably not the best answer to your question.

>> **SHEA:** When you say recuse yourself, you're talking about the specific recommendation or issue at hand, not necessarily recusal from the MAC itself.

>> **CARRIE:** No, not recusal from the MAC itself. Just issues you may have a conflict of interest with, that's all. No, not the whole MAC. Please nobody recuse yourself from the MAC.

>> **BILL:** Okay I'm going to go to Sarah and then David Tebbs. Sarah.

>> **SARAH:** Thank you. So, I represent the conservation seat and I know some people disagree with this, but the original group of the monument. But that's why I'm here, right, and that was why I was appointed to this seat. So, I raised my hand before some of the other conversations that took place. But along with Joel, I would say that if you could look at every person on this MAC, we might be recusing ourselves a whole lot. If I must recuse myself from anything about conservation, I'm just saying the organization might be involved with like a project on the ground, like what if we're helping on a restoration project or helping you know, whatever it is, that we have some type of engagement with. And then I would say that, and this was already pointed out, but county commissioners or funding that goes to the commissioners from the Federal Government or whatever it is, related to the monument, how is that different than a conservation project that receives funding. I can see if somebody is like directly receiving funds on a decision, then that's although the grazing permit seems to be okay, but conservation is a different story. So, it's just hard to, when you look at it holistically like that and then you throw in the lawsuits, and I think our organization and I know anyway we're interested in contributing in a meaningful way and I'm interested in bringing forth the perspective of conservation and so I see that as my duty and responsibility. And I don't see that as a conflict.

>> **CARRIE:** I don't see that as a conflict either. You were appointed to represent conservation interests on behalf of all conservationists. I think that the most important thing to remember is that you would want to recuse yourself if there's an issue that you or your family, a family member stands to gain from financially. That's the thing. Certainly, we would expect nothing less than for you to advocate on behalf of conservation. But there's that fine line, is it something that you are going to financially benefit from outside of the MAC, if a recommendation is made.

>> **SARAH:** Right.



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

>> **BILL:** I'll go to David Tebbs next and then Shea.

>> **DAVID T.:** Maybe Sarah gave me a little insight from her comments there. But from Joel's comments, I'm just curious, I'm not upset at anybody. I want to know what the conflict is, I just don't see a conflict, but maybe there's one with a commissioner, other than what Sarah said, there is intergovernmental revenue sometimes that comes in like I'm not sure on the monument what funds would come in. We try to get it for search and rescue and law enforcement. We do have an agreement with law enforcement, but what other conflicts, Joel, were you maybe referring to? I'm not being combative; I just want to understand what others think may be a conflict.

>> **JOEL:** Shea is sort of lifting his hand here. I don't know if he wants to interject.

>> **SHEA:** I'm not the ethical expert here. I think Sarah brings up a good point that we were all appointed to advocate for a certain interest, right. And I don't think the conflict is necessarily between the county's interests or the NGO's interest in the monument. You're supposed to be advocating for conservation and for the county and your constituents and for the State of Utah and the outdoor recreation. That's not the interest that's conflicting. The interest is when let's say there's a proposal for the BLM to fund or start making the payroll payments for the partners. Clearly now okay I've got to recuse myself from that or if they wanted to start, even we've got lawsuits on the road, and I think I could advocate for no, the MAC or the monument should recognize the road as an existing public right-of-way, I think I could advocate for that and it's not necessarily a conflict of interest. Because I'm not gaining anything financially from that, I'm just advocating for the position for which I was not elected but appointed, that's the right word. So, the competing interests aren't between the monument and the entity you represent, the competing interests are individual benefit and the position you represent I think is maybe a better way to look at that. But again, I'm not the expert, that's just kind of the way I understand it.

>> **DAVID T.:** I guess the part I struggle with there's Hank, me, Commissioner Gant. I don't know if Hank is elected or not, Hank. But three of us represent a constituency that we're elected, we're expected to represent 85% of Garfield County elected me or 80%, I don't know, somewhere in there. So that's I guess what I struggle with. And if there's a conflict there, I want to know because I'm not just representing myself, I'm representing the constituency and you're representing the tribal and tribes, Hank, is that right? Is that an elected position or did you just sign up and it's appointed? I don't know. I lump Hank in with us because he may be elected official just like me and Commissioner Gant.

>> **SHEA:** And I think it's more like say we're making decisions that we're going to benefit your business, right, and that you have like a business interest in the decision being made by the MAC. Right now, there's two competing interests, there's your business interest and your MAC appointment interest. And those are the kind of things where I think the conflict arises. But if it's not your appointed interest which is a commissioner, anything you're advocating for the county, even if it's to



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

get more funds for the county, and again I'm not the expert but thinking about this that seems to make more sense because that's the role you're playing. But if you're advocating for the monument to pay the county commissioners, clearly now there's a conflict there, right.

>> **DAVID T.:** Joel, is there anything outside of that you see? You levied the kind of question so I'm just wondering.

>> **JOEL:** I think my comment was trying to clarify that there's probably several of us who have probably a little bit of a gray zone. So, there are strict, direct financial benefits that are conflicts of interest which I'm sure that when we all applied, we probably made sure that that's not an issue. But then whether it's working for an NGO. Commissioner Tebbs, your job and your performance in your job and your being elected does relate to things that we discuss on this to land use and economics. So, I would say for example you more than me have a conflict of interest in terms of your employment and your position in your career. But the reason I brought that up is to say I think there's probably a lot on us and we need to be tolerant of that. I had no specific thing in mind, but you've got a lot at stake on a lot of different levels I understand.

>> **DAVID T.:** And that's a different perspective that I don't look at but just bringing that up.

>> **SHEA:** Just one more comment on that, I agree 100% with Joel, tolerant. But tolerant doesn't mean let things slide either, that's not what you mean by tolerant. Tolerant means we're going to work with each other, but we need to be honest and transparent about those conflicts and recusal is required when necessary. So, I just want to make sure that we didn't interpret Joel's word wrong.

>> **BILL:** Hank, I want you to have a chance to speak.

>> **HANK:** I kind of enjoy your discussion on conflict of interest and a lot of it has to do with money, if you will. Whereas I could actually kind of derail that whole discussion on conflict of interest when let's say if I were to go into the monument knowing there's certain herbal medicine in the area and I'm the only one that has knowledge of it and I can actually take advantage of that herbal medicine and harvest it for myself without consulting anyone. So that's kind of an issue I believe that's on the table if you're kind of talking about the conflict of interest or the harvest of firewood or something that I have knowledge of the area where there's good firewood for a particular ceremony or something like that. So how far do we go on discussing conflict of interest? We all have a mindset to know what our limitations are and where you need to step away from something and things of that nature. So that's kind of my position on that. So, with the commissioners blessing, I'm running for office so maybe next month I'll have my Tribal Council seat. Thank you.

>> **BILL:** I'd like to just, we're at the lunch break time. But I'd like to really congratulate everyone because we really had a very healthy discussion about an issue that if it just laid in the weeds then everybody might get upset at some point. So, we've talked through this, and I think we all just need to



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

agree that we need to be honest and open with one another. And no one should be offended if appropriate questions are asked, and we'll work through it. I don't think you can put this kind of thing in bylaws, I think this is the kind of rapport that must be developed from us working together. So, I think we accomplished a lot this morning. We're going to take a break from 12:00 to 1:00. Enjoy your lunch and we'll see you at 1:00. We really do have a full afternoon. So be prepared. Thank you. Thank you, Bill, for facilitating so well.

>> **BILL:** Okay, see you in a little bit.

>> **ADÉ:** One thing before you go, if you would like to register for public comment, please feel free to say that in the chat, provide your name and we'll get you registered for that. Thank you.

>> **BILL:** Thank you very much.

>> Break for lunch.

1:00 p.m. – Resource Management Plan updates by Artemisia Turiya, District Planning and Environmental Coordinator.

>> **ARTEMISIA:** What I'm going to do is just provide a brief planning update for everybody, specifically we were focusing on what is occurring right now it related to the 60-day scoping comment period that was associated with the and a line that also shared the AMS table, so that 60-day scoping period closed on September 27. What I'm going to present is going to be general and a little bit provisional because we are still in the process of working with those comments and properly summarizing them and seeing everything that is there. I can give you some general updates.

So, again, that's why I won't be showing you charts with numbers and firm conclusions. Here is where we are at generally. There were about 400 unique submissions. We are still reviewing the submissions in determining what is substantive. What I mean isn't an Auto Form letter. There were about 3,000 form letters of various sorts and, again, some of the uniqueness is still being sorted out so about 400 may be 395 or 470 so giving you that information.

Let's see, most of the submissions came through planning so that format does work very well. We got about 36 emails we are still doublechecking and less than ten through regular postal submissions. Is helpful to know whether our venues for support comments are helping or not. We are working with the comments that we got through E-planning, but people are welcome to use whatever format works for them.

There were about 600. Some of these comments relate to various things, like one comment may relate to grazing and recreation. Or one comment may relate to a suggestion of alternatives and might than also have a specific topic that they are interested in like climate change. Some of these numbers will



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

get counted twice in certain ways. But there were about 600 comments that clearly related to the alternatives themselves, the range of alternatives and the alternatives.

There were about 120 comments that clearly related to recreation concerns. That is worth noting that it is a lot. There were about 70 related to travel. There were about 100 related to range lands and range concerns which includes grazing.

There are many other important topics like cultural, wildlife management and so forth. I'm giving you some of the numbers that I'm able to give you right now.

Also, there were parties that made recommendations or nominations for special designations of NECEC's or RNA sets, areas of critical environmental concern and RNA stands to for research natural areas. Both of those are designations that the BLM uses in different circumstances. I would speculate that people use those as ways to nominate special management areas because they were designations that are known and understood, but of course people are afraid of saying things like we believe such and such area should be restricted recreation or something like that so I'm not able to comment on what we have in that more general context of management areas.

We had four recommendations for NECEC's and four recommendations for RNAs that appears clear from word searching and comments and so forth. But understand that this is provisional. We are still evaluating comments. We were starting to create draft scoping reports, or the contractor is, but those are still in revision and reviewed yet by BLM in full and so just to say that the provisional intention is to have a public scoping report by the end of the calendar year. That would be on E planning.

We are continuing with the development of alternatives. At this point, partly importantly, but there are other factors as well, but informed by the comments that have been received. I can say even myself; I have no idea where that is exactly going because we are still looking at the comments. Of course, with input from Cooperators and other groups that we work with and are interested, the MAC, Cooperators (inaudible) and tribes and so forth. So that is in short where we stand. There's a little bit more I'd like to share so just give me one moment to open a document here.

So, part of what happens in the comment analysis phase is that comments are grouped. There is an established structure to start with on how they are grouped, but then we must look at the actual groups that are just materializing themselves from the comment period. There may be some important category of interest that we were not thinking of a head.

Then what happens this is a moment of just general education on comment analysis. Once those topics are designated, I call them buckets, so there might be a resource like air quality, and then there might be a couple buckets underneath it like some sort of specific concern for air quality or for how visibility relates to visual resources.



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

There might be a couple different buckets under the recreation such as the pros and cons of fee areas or permitting. These are totally made up. I'm not saying that these are the buckets. Once we get the buckets, we look at all the comments that fall into that bucket and we create issue statements separate from the full issue statements that call later into analysis, different from the issue statement or management concerns that were elicited under the AMS, we create the substance of that buckets concern is an issue statement. That's what we are partly working on right now. Let me give you just a couple made up examples. They are on the general side. But something like how the BLM inventory will because it's a concern for some people, the historically significant and culturally important resources in the monument how it will forest management practices on the BLM practices within the RMP address the threat of forest wildfires.

In other words, people are like well and I'm making it up again. It's only one perspective on the spectrum, but maybe there is some opposition to certain types of vegetation management that removes of vegetation. But because of fire concern it needs to be thinned or managed.

We will rate those general concerns. I will give you a few other examples. In this phase of comment analysis, we are not answering questions saying I got made up we will have more intensive vegetation removal in areas that the wilderness urban interface that could threaten infrastructure or communities and less management away from infrastructure.

At this point, it is creating these questions so some other kinds of examples that might occur is how the BLM plan would support wildlife corridors. That's the kind of thing that certain stakeholders would be interested in. The issue statements have no biased answers even at this point, but they become part of what gets released to the public and tell you later on so that you can see the categories essentially of issues that have been raised by the public because, again, we were focusing right now maybe I should say stakeholders on what stakeholders were perceiving as interest and issues and how we are going to bring that into have an effect on the plan.

I think that's about where I am at. I can't say anything more specific about timelines. I really can't say much more specific about the content other than to say those are the things we are working on right now and that I have a little piece of information that I can share I'm supposed to and about now but let me see I'm not sure if I'm supposed to entertain any questions or not. Let me check over here. I've written guidance on my other screen, could someone in the BLM chat let me know if I should entertain any questions or just go ahead and now.

>> **BILL:** Let's ask the MAC members if there are any questions. Just raise your hand.

>> **SARAH:** Thanks for the information. I've a quick question on if you could just define and I think you did a little bit about this, but what a unique comment is compared to me guess a form? What is the definition of a unique comment?



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

>> **ARTEMISIA:** That varies at times, and I would have to defer to the contractor on that at this moment. It's usually the pretty obvious that you get. I've dealt with as a lot myself; you got something that is very repetitive with minor alterations. If there is something unique in a form letter, for instance, some NGOs provide form letters and then say that the individual can add their own thoughts and so forth. Those are still pulled out. It's not as if it just ops a form letter. It's that it was a structured format that keeps recurring in the comments, but that's not the definition. But that's what I'm really meaning where someone goes to a website, and they use a lot of predefined language and talking points.

But, again, to just reassure you that if there is something unique there, it is pulled out. It isn't dismissed. But it takes a different level of consideration sometimes to try to figure out what the issue is if some person those are usually very well structured. You get a letter from just some person maybe was never even made a comment and it takes considerably more work to parse out what they are trying to contribute, which we do. Does that help at all?

>> **SARAH:** Yeah, so basically, I'm imagining this that certain organizations assist people in making comments, but if there is a form and then there is some element of that that is independent or unique, another one is submitted then that would be counted as a unique comment.

>> **ARTEMISIA:** It's absolutely acknowledged this is personally who I am and what I bring to my professional work is just to remind people how it works so the reality is that in no sense is it a voting process. You could have 5,000 people who feel this way and to who feel that way. The agency will certainly consider it, but there is nothing like a voting process involves. What we go out for it scoping, there's times it's required like right now in our EIS process we are required with the (inaudible) to have a scoping *teary-eyed. But there are times where a scoping period is optional. In either case the actual intent the phraseology that is usually used is new information. Why are we bothering to reach out? Why is it valuable to use federal money to reach out? It's because we want to know if somebody knows something that we don't, a new idea, the presence of a listed species, and economic concern. When you get a form letter, you are for the most part not getting new information. It's very helpful to know a lot of people are interested and get a perspective and politics over all of course play a role in federal planning, but in the NEPA planning, per se, and the things that drive comment analysis we separate that out because our key me, but duty as is their new information so I'm just saying.

>> **BILL:** Turiya, I don't mean to rush you, but we do need to stay on scale so you can ask a question, but let's keep things as brief as possible so we can stay on the agenda schedule.

>> **ARTEMISIA:** I've gotten a couple of different things. At first, I was told to take your time and then I'm told we need to wrap it up. So that's okay. I will for sure. It's difficult. Go ahead.

>> **SCOTT:** Thank you. First, I want to say is I appreciate you taking the time and I want you to take



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

your time. What you are telling us today at some of the most important information we can get. I know it's Bill's job as chairman to keep things on track, but to see it as more important to really try and get fundamental answers to some of these questions out. Don't worry about the clock. The second thing I am worried about is I understand the process you kind of describe trying to create buckets of issues. I guess I see this more in the point that this is still part of the hard look process of NEPA where you are trying to figure out what to investigate and analyze so that you can conduct a hard look.

In my mind and you may have seen my 30 pages or so of comments that I submitted, basically they are often in the form of questions that here is a subject matter that deserve to be analyzed as taking that hard look. You can redo it in terms of its grammar and try to make it into an issue statement. Basically, I'm wondering how that works for you. Are you interested in discovering approaches or things or questions that ought to be included in analysis as part of the public's RMP process? Is that part of what you do? And then just to shorten the question I'm going to jump to my next one which is in the AMS there's a place where all the alternatives that are going to satisfy all the legal obligations, but what I don't see in there's what are the qualitative criteria that are used to judge whether those legal standards have been met. It seems like they are all going to comply, but it seems like you need some sort of measuring criteria to know whether there is going to be an adequate level of protection.

I'm still kind of lost on what is the criteria that you are contemplating using as you go through this process to identify whether that's how you arrive at that conclusion. I will stop there.

>> **ARTEMISIA:** I'm getting pressure from both ends in terms of I've guidance coming to me over here from BLM people. I was just told next time they will schedule in more time because this is typically what happens when I start to talk that we need more time. I will end with in eight minutes because we have an obligation, but that doesn't mean that it's not in my lane to decide how this happens, but there can be an ongoing discussion on that so to answer your question as concisely as I can.

First, the structuring of parsing comments into categories is precisely part of the initial phase of what you are talking about. We must look at a letter and decipher the key things it is saying. We can go back for the details later and those in fact go into our spreadsheet work as we parse things out, but we must begin to see what the topics are. Even if it only occurs wants, it gets a bucket. It is acknowledged. Then we understand what the issue is. That is in the initial stage. Now, when you talk about a hard look, or we talk about it being sufficient and arbitrary and capricious and all that kind of stuff let's remember we are not anywhere near an analysis. We don't know what we are going to analyze yet because we don't have alternatives yet. So, we take all the information, then we allow changes and development of alternatives using all of that. Then we look at those alternatives, doublecheck to see if they meet the purpose and need and then there is a hard look there. Then we look at the methodology to ensure that any effects that those concerns could be not will be but could be associated with get analyzed. I can tell you honestly, I'm in deep BLM and I am the planner. I do



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

not know what those alternatives will be. I really don't yet. This is a very structured and accountable way to begin to have a list of the new information we just got and then apply it to the alternatives and see how they change. What we will analyze and how to do that sufficiently comes later. I could talk to you for two hours just about that so I appreciate your question, but that's what I can do right now.

>> **SCOTT:** Thank you.

>> **ARTEMISIA:** Thank you for forgiving me for the time. I promised now to my BLM cohorts I will be done by 1:30 so why don't we go ahead Hank, and your hand was up next.

>> **HANK:** My question is some of the data that you're getting from your scoping comments and all of that, is that within the grand circle or can you identify where these comments are coming from, like, other states and maybe even other countries because when we start talking about the public we are talking about the general public and visitors within the monument.

The second question is the proclamation, with the completion with the public scoping comments as of April of last month, you know, I do believe with the proclamation that the MAC group still has an open door to provide comments into what you've already collected.

Then the third question is I like the part that you say about the unknown and new information. I think that's where the tribal perspective comes in, how we perceive the monument, the land, the water, the vegetation and then the environment and all the living creatures and species on the land. That still must be incorporated into your MMP and then also the RMP and then your AMS. I think we still have a lot of catching up to do from the tribal perspective.

My fourth question would be identifying the alternatives, we are working on identifying certain objects in the monument and then incorporating what the issues are and how they are used in ceremonial initiatives with the tribes and then actually identifying other alternatives as to how we can preserve some of these objects. Thank you.

>> **ARTEMISIA:** Again, I apologize. I'm going to be brief not by my own choice. As I think we all know the BLM and government planning processes in general are very structured and meetings have timelines. This is a challenge. I want to acknowledge everything you were saying. Who are the commenters and is that considered; it is kept track of. There are times that that no doubt would be a topic of conversation and have pertinence especially if the information is being checked to see if it is valid, would this person really know. The reality is these are federal lands public lands for all US citizens and all people visiting as well. There is that a legitimate metric that I know of for saying that certain people's input is more important than others although we want them to be there are times that we are comments come from can be very interesting, but it's not a metric, per se. Again, I could say more, and I will in the future and to you if we are allowed more time in another meeting.



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

Additional comments: There are times when comments arrive at a time that there is just no easy or practical way to incorporate them into the process like if we are writing a decision, and now we suddenly get a comment unless it's something that is disclosed, or thinking is blown out of the water. There are certain commitments especially in EISs to deadlines and what those have to be applied for. If it arrives before the deadline, it will go right into this process. Everything that is on this timeline that is interrelated.

That said, there was nothing ever in the process to keep someone from submitting a comment. They just may not be guaranteed of how it can be integrated in and that often just depends on the specific part of the planning process. I whenever I can try to heed that new information, but in a planning process this big it's not fair to say that your comment is just as good if it comes in outside of a comment period, except for people like the MAC, cooperators, and so forth. There are certainly different meetings where they can contribute. Again, apologies from streaming through. I wrote down your questions. Different perspectives and tribal interests: Here is the thing, new information is generally considered to be in a standard, Western worldview. Because it is within a federal Western legal perspective.

Part of what the commitment is in this planning process is to be involving tribes. In my view, in my view the way I would say this because I don't think we have the adequate language for it in what we are doing on the government side, it is a different perspective altogether. It's not just new information that we can drop in in the way that a normal Western planning process wants to just drop and there's an owl over a mile up the road. That's new information. But if you are asking us to look at something with very different perspectives, but which happens for instance in things that Commissioner Tebbs brought up, cultural views, this is very, very important and it's very difficult.

I would recommend as someone who loves the NEPA, and planning process is that people who are coming from a slightly different or very different perspective, work hard to find ways to communicate that and I could talk about that for an hour. What you were saying is very important, but it's like the round hole square peg thing. Some people don't even realize that. It's not new information and we wanted X. Well, it is new information, but you need to turn your brain inside out in order to appreciate it. I'm trying too just be very honest. That's a little bit out of the circle, but that is my view as a planner. I hope we can leave it at the so that I don't get into much trouble with the people who set these timelines for the meeting. Can we leave it at that, and the committee should then communicate to David if more time is needed for certain kinds of discussions in the future. I appreciate what you said. It's very important and it is what it is. Thank you all very much. Please keep working hard. I appreciate you.

>> **BILL:** Okay. We are going to move on to the next section which is a discussion of the preliminary range of alternatives. We've got about an hour and 15 minutes or so before the public comment period. I want to make sure that everyone has an opportunity to speak. As a brief introduction so the public understands this, the committee's being asked to discuss and make



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

recommendations regarding a range of alternative management approaches for the monument.

These can be found in the Analysis of Management Situation or what is referred to as the AMS documents which can be viewed online. There are two broad categories, a no action category and an all-action category that has four alternatives. I want to assert everyone at the back that you have an opportunity to speak we've got, like I said, about 75 minutes or so. That means about six minutes per person, and we will come back to this topic after the public comment period. I'm going to evoke my chairman prerogative and I'm going to go ahead first.

I tried to be patient and make sure that everybody had an opportunity before. My comments begin first with what is missing from all the alternatives. There is little or no discussion of or attention to the gateway communities that provide access to the monument both in Kane and Garfield Counties. After 26 years of experience in the establishment of literally symbiotic relationship how any alternative may or may not affected the broadest issues of the Garfield and Kane County residence really isn't being considered.

Socio and economic issues, education, public safety culture, lifestyle, religion, traditional, recreation access, all these things need to be considered. There is mention at the end of the alternatives chapter that there will be consideration of local government plans in melding of the two, whether it is local government in the counties or tribal government, but there is no evidence of how that is going to be accomplished.

Secondly, I support OHV as described in Alternative A. That's an area that I am a representative of. I do not believe that the management has good information about the reality of OHV activities on the monument. Many of the comments I read in the AMS lacks supporting evidence. They were generalizations or they are assumptions made by the BLM from non-monument experience. The BLM must recognize that elderly or handicapped visitors use OHV as a safe and reliable means of transportation. The monument is not ADA compliant. They have the same rights to access as the rest of us do. OHV recreation is a social and family activity that allows a group or family to responsibly access the monument without compromising their highway vehicles. We all must admit that access to the monument with a normal vehicle really becomes a challenge.

The monument also must recognize the rights of recreational lists that are using motorcycles, ATVs, or UTVs that are legally registered in states allowing them to be licensed as street legal. They do have the same right to access a designated travel routes. There is often a comment about or suggestion that there is overland OHV travel. That's literally impossible in some areas on the monument and it is not an issue with appropriate signage and mapping. Finally, the BLM is a little short-sighted in considering the elimination of the Little Desert open OHV area. This area has a history of decades of local recreational use before the monument was even created. The clay hills area has a history of being worked for material removal, keeping it as a local OHV opportunity is consistent with senior Department of the Interior commitment to gateway communities to provide



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

local alternative recreation options, and it should continue to be considered. With proper coordination, proper mapping and signing of routes it would be a successful compromise and reduce open OHV use elsewhere in the monument.

My third comment, this is my last one I promise is about livestock grazing. My initial focus is on the stated common approaches to the, quote, all action alternatives. That was a paragraph kind of explaining that these aspects would apply to any of those four alternatives. I am going to quote the BLM statement. "The BLM would provide for scientific discovery where the GSENM would stand as an outside laboratory." I've mentioned in the past that I am a scientist in applied science. I think from the last meeting there was only one project that related to applied science. There's no better example of applied science than research and agriculture. In this case, livestock grazing. Unfortunately, it's a topic that has developed significant bias, primarily from those outside of science.

The management options for range lands and livestock grazing must involve direct connection to the scientific community and their work to minimize or eliminate bias, much broader and deeper than currently exists. A key component of livestock grazing management is unbiased monitoring. It's my belief that the BLM must commit to unbiased, perhaps even independent third-party monitoring to understand outcomes of current management practices before any future adaptive management or the possibility of more restrictive management. Now I hope those comments can stimulate a little more discussion. I'm going to turn it over to the rest of the MAC. I am going to try to call on you randomly so that everybody has a chance to speak. So, Joel we will start with you.

>> **JOEL:** Okay, so Bill I appreciate what you just laid out with your three main comments. The first thing that pops into my head was related to your first one about you called for more inclusion of considerations about the gateway communities and their health into these different alternatives. I guess my question is, could you give an example of that? There are five alternatives given and each one of them of course is management of the property and the monument. Each of them has implications of course for the economics and the people in the gateway communities. I would like to know more concretely what you mean or what would be an example of how those would be included more in the alternatives more explicitly.

>> **BILL:** I will give you one example and obviously I'm sitting here in Escalante. So, Escalante is considered at gateway community. Whether it is defined that way by the Department of Interior or not, it's defined that way by the people that come here. They rely on us for services, whether it's gas or diesel or groceries or even water at the BLM interagency office. They also require if visitors have a public safety emergency on the monument, it takes a resource, our EMS people, our ambulance out of the town and it is then dedicated to the monument leaving the rest of Escalante without EMS service. That's the kind of thing that needs to be taken into consideration. That's why keep bringing up the issue of cooperative agreements. And I don't want this discussion to be just about the points I raise. I want everybody from what you read in chapter 7 as the alternatives, let's discuss what you think about those. Joel, do you have anything else?



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

>> **JOEL:** No, not at this time.

>> **BILL:** Okay, let me move to Stephen Westhoff.

>> **STEPHEN:** Thank you so I agree with the state director this morning that as we each go through the monument; we see different things. I agree with Scott that our goal is to protect the resources of the monument and as a grazing permittee I've always been concerned about rangeland health. Part of the things that I see that bothered me in the monument is the dead and dying grasses in the un-grazed portions of the monument. On my allotment I was supposed to meet range land health standards or be working towards meeting rangeland health standards. Once an area was closed there was no monitoring that I am aware of it doesn't seem to be provided for that the grasses that used to be stimulated by grazing are not anymore and they were dying off. Recent example to me is Coyote Canyon where there is no grazing, so I think my recommendation as the grazing permittee is that we do more monitoring and correct the problem, the resource in the un-grazed portions of the monument. Thank you, Bill.

>> **BILL:** Thank you Stephen. Let's go to Jacqueline Grant.

>> **JACQUALINE:** Thanks. One thing that we should consider in response to your concerns about OHV's is electric bikes and other motorized or electrified ways of accessing the monument. OHV's are not the only way that the elderly or people who have ADA needs can access the monument and E-bikes are one of the largest growing sectors in the transportation industry and is projected to grow even more in the next decade.

Another concern I have there is as a private land adjacent to the monument, we got a lot of OHV users coming up and down the roads of the ranch. The lot owners pay for those roads and the general public doesn't pay for those roads. The damage that we see from OHVs on those roads is intense. I'd like to see some more regulation of OHVs, or it may be just education. I think that will be important.

I totally agree with you about grazing research, but to really perform that well, we are going to have to see more exclosures where cattle cannot go. Deer Springs Ranch has a couple exclosures and the plant life and the pollinator life responded unbelievably to those exclosures, and it did not impact cattle grazing at all on the ranch, but it allowed us to see how the wildlife and plant life responded to not having cattle in those areas. We can easily start setting up stuff like this through cooperative agreements like you mentioned Bill and really start to see the impact of grazing and the positive benefits of including pollinator and plant life protection in grazing allotments where we can do it and where there's agreement to have it.

In Chapter six, a couple of things I noticed that were missing was anything addressing invasive insects and invertebrates. Those can be just as much of a problem as we are seeing on the eastern part



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

of the United States as invasive plants and non-native plants. I think the monument, the BLM would be wise to consider other types of invasive organisms aside from plants relative to 6.14l, so Section 14 of Chapter six, it mentions a lot about science, but I think it would be great and beneficial to have some more mention of education and how our local universities and educational institutions in the southern part of the state are really focused on education and not as much on research, how can we work with them in a greater capacity to really benefit the monument and the communities of southern Utah.

The third point that I would like to make here is just looking at Section 6.2.5 and 16 on tribal use and post-settlement use of the area and land designations. Consider how we can look at the intersection among those three different areas to provide better or more informative land designations. That's all I have.

>> **BILL:** Thank you. Thank you very much. Lance, you are up. Is Lance on? I don't see his name here. Let's go to Drew Parkin, Drew?

>> **DREW:** Thank you, Bill. This has been a good meeting by the way and I want to thank everyone for their participation. I like to focus on one area. I can ramble off on 50 different areas that I'm interested in regarding this topic, which is alternative generation, but I'd like to just stick to one that I think it's really a prime issue.

No one really speaks about it, not in meetings. We speak about it at the coffee shop a lot or to our next-door neighbor, but we don't really cover it in a sophisticated way. That is the local communities, the local community's interactions with the monument. I've been involved with this monument for 14 years now. I had heard before I moved to Escalante about the controversy, and I was stupid enough to think I could do something to help it, so I took a job with the monument. It was not the smartest thing that I could have done. I'm sorry for belaboring this, but this is a really important point to me.

The antagonism that I saw between the community and the monument was palpable. I have been on both sides of it. I've had a BLM uniform on and a walked to the grocery store and then nobody would talk to me. Why is this? After a while I started to understand it. There are some tensions. A lot of them happen before the monument ever happened in the actual declarations with the monument with Bill Clinton. It wasn't done in the right way. It really set the public off on a bad footing for working with the monument.

I think some of the wrong people were hired originally. I'm not saying anybody now by the way. The people I deal with right now I really appreciate. I think there are things that go back that far that make it almost the antagonism that just comes and bashes you in the face. You can't even get something simple and straightforward done because of it.

I think that what we must do is to recognize that there is an issue here. The issues and it doesn't have



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

to do with science necessarily or grazing or off-road vehicles. It's the tension between the issues I think we should take that on as a cause and put a piece in this document where we say to the local communities or something to that effect, okay, and to define an issue of I think I have told you what the issue is, I can be more articulate with it, but what I'm trying to say is what could we do, and when I say we from the local communities are mostly working together for heaven sakes. I've seen so little of that over the years.

Harry, I think you've done a tremendous job and I want to let you know that seems to have really turn things around. That's why I'm saying this. I'd like to bring everything up to that standard. I just think we could do a lot. I will jump right to my second point which is science. I have grappled with science a lot, I appreciate it, I like that we include it. I think there are a lot of things that we can do that are wonderful. I think we should have some social science in this monument plan.

The social science will look at the issue of how we bring disparate interests together to where they can at least be civil and hopefully participatory so that something happens that is good. Basically, I would like to see a win-win for people. I don't want to see this monument bouncing back and forth every five years when the president changes and that's what I can see for the next how many years. I'm nearly done, Bill. I'd like to see those of us that care about this place, that's me, that's you and a lot of other people to start looking at it seriously from both the social standpoint and an economic standpoint. A lot of what I am talking about is making the local community sustainable. I think if we could get together and start looking at some type of scientific project about how we could bring people together, and I relate to our tribal interests. You see issues with the tribe and the monument. I related a lot to the same exact topic. I think I will shut up there. Thank you for listening to me.

>> **BILL:** Thank you Drew. Andy Gant. We need to unmute you. Andy, we still can't hear you.

>> **ANDY:** Sorry, I'm supposed to be an IT guy, which eye did for a living. I can't run my iPad here today. It was slow to respond. I really do appreciate the collaborative feelings that we have had today. I know we couldn't be more diverse. I mean, we are at the opposite ends of a lot of these spectrums. Everybody really has done a great job. I sit in a lot of meetings that there is just no way they were even going to have a conversation with the opposition. Thank you for that.

My comments are simplistic. Coming from a local perspective, we have an unbelievable BLM staff here in our office and we have a lot of experts. They are amazing in their fields. We've got rangeland science, these guys spend tons of time doing their work, doing their environmental stuff and helping people with NEPA. We've been doing it now for 20 years since Bill Clinton built the monument. I don't oppose the monument as a local official, not at all. But I do oppose the fact that we spent years and years doing the resource management plan to have it change every four years, not only to have a change but in this case, it could be said all the prior work that the BLM has done is currently useless and you must start over.



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

We talk about what is that NEPA going to be and what will it produce? We have MEPA ourselves to death here. We need to look at that. I'm not arguing against it in general, but we have multiple projects based on that going 24/7, 365 for decades. I feel almost out of place sitting on this committee telling the experts in the BLM that a been doing this for decades that they should listen to us and that we know more than they do. If they don't agree, someone will litigate. Rather than using policy and science in the fields that we have embraced in the original Clinton declaration which was wonderful, and I wish it would have stayed just he left it. We are going through the processes and if we don't like the result someone will sue the BLM.

I know that's a negative rant. I'm not generally quite that negative, but I wish there was some respect to the process, and I know this is a pipe dream, but I wish the legislature would step up and give us some long-term solutions for the counties, the gateway towns and cities. They are fine with most of it. Let's just put the stupid thing in writing and give these people a future. I wish we were having the discussion and we could agree.

We do agree on the management, but the process is flawed, as is government. It is never perfect, but I guess my questions are kind of hypotheticals, but I wish we could get something done. We just barely got done with the management plan, you know, we had staffed thousands of hours, and I can't imagine the tens of thousands of hours that the BLM put in prior to Trump that was great work and I wish we could reset the clock prior to that administration, and I will stop ranting and raving. I appreciate all of you guys and thank you for listening.

>> **BILL:** Thank you Andy. Okay, Sarah, let's go to you.

>> **SARAH:** I'm just making a note. I am in favor in resetting the clock to 2000 for the management plan, which is alternative D. I also really am trying to step back and hear everyone in this group because I think there are important issues being raised and I hope that we can look at this as an opportunity to see science, and maybe it is how we are defining science. I think people are saying that we think science is important, but that we can do this science and support the local communities and come up with a plan that has appropriate recreation and areas that are not. The main goal is the proclamation, the objects of value. There are discretionary uses that can be approved for certain areas on the monument. Maybe there is a way through here where we can really look at the areas where it makes sense, and there is science to that like where these objects were located, what are the thresholds in terms of visitation, how can we help?

I know we had a group going out one point that included the commissioners, conservation folks, BLM staff, Utah office of tourism where we were looking at working together to address visitor impacts. We were having those conversations, and it felt like it was a healthy dialogue with some common ground there. I'm hoping that in this group that we can see some of that. I just wanted to I guess reiterate the guiding – Drew you mentioned that the alternatives need to meet the purpose and need and it feels like or it is that the purpose and need is to protect the objects of value and so the



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

alternatives that we had to review the no action A and then, B, C, D and E. A, B, and C did it hit the requirements. Whatever we move forward with that they meet the requirements and then look for those opportunities to really find ways of supporting the gateway communities and recreation on the monument that are not in conflict with that. I think of our opportunities to do that, and I hope we can work collaboratively to make that happen. Thank you.

>> **BILL:** Thank you Sarah. Let's move to Hank Stevens now.

>> **HANK:** Thank you chair for acknowledging me. I'd like to express my appreciation to the MAC group and their input to the meeting today. I do enjoy the consultations and all that is going on.

One of the things that I kind of wanted to speak on is grazing allotments. Some of these allotments do have water sources like urgent dam seepage, garden caves, streams and water. That's pretty much what suffices these grazing allotments. From the tribal perspective, we kind of want to look at these water sources in a respectful way and then also the vegetation. I don't take my position lightly because, you know, as you all look at me today, you wouldn't even see the negative part of my skull. I did have a trauma. I fell 20 feet and I do have seven titanium plates in my head. I am not speaking from a book or what not I did experience herbal medicine and its usage and that's what rehabilitated my body to who I am now. It is something that I cherish and that's why I say I don't take my position lightly. With the vegetation or the reduction of certain vegetation I think is something that we should really look at and try to preserve some of the vegetations because some of the tribes use the vegetations for herbal medicine.

The other thing is erosion from the grazing allotments. They are impeding on some of these vegetations and our ancestral sites. Earlier we were talking about the Anasazi ruins, we want to preserve what is left to remember where we came from. I do believe that the tribes have always been a problem from day one. With the new proclamation with the new monument and that's what I reiterated during our first meeting that when the tribes get involved there's going to be a little bit of sensitivity, but I will stand fast with my position to reiterate what the tribes want.

The other topic I wanted to cover was the fuel reductions that are being done by the BLM and the Forest Service. There are the practices that have been common in the area and how we can initiate the tribes input on this is these trees on the mountains and the canyon lands are very important to the tribes and then to have some type of transportation usage for the Western and tribal communities and then some of these, if you are not aware of it, some of the Aspen trees are being used for teepee poles and some of the cedar trees are being used for hogans on the Navajo. So, these are things we need to consider because we are working on within the Bears Ears National Monument and I think we need to find some type of metrics as to identify these objects and how they are used in the tribal communities. I'm not talking just talking about today, but for the next generation that's going to be coming into the world. With that, I would like to share a little story on a puberty ceremony where the Navajos come into the world and when you start having a home state and have a home and homage and a life



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

through marriage and all of that there is always the preparation. I want to look at this life cycle to where we can initiate some type of a program where we can secure some of the cedar trees for hogans and whatnot to have Navajo families get prepped for some of these ceremonies that are very important for the Native American communities. With that tee pee poles and things like of that nature. And also, when I was talking about the water sources and the vegetations that we have wildlife out there to and some of the animals out there actually are used for certain ceremonies and with this puberty ceremony that is very important to us. We don't want to contaminate this particular animal with the uranium fallout from ponds and whatnot so at some of these urgent dams that are holding some of these waters so that deer may have access to them, but we are actually able to harvest a buck hide and this particular buck has to be a buck that died of natural causes, but we don't want the buck to die of contamination of uranium, but hopefully the buck will actually die from being confronted by a cougar or something of that nature or of old age that way we can utilize the buck hide to tie the young girls' hair during her puberty ceremony.

The wood harvesting, we use a certain type of wood for these ceremonies, especially cedar and on the vegetation side we use the yucca plant also to wash the girls' hair, so these are used during the ceremony and then the ryegrass that we use to brush the young girls' hair, so everything's got to be in harmony with the ceremonies. That's a brief illustration or a summary of why we believe that the land is sacred, the water is sacred, and the vegetation. Every form of wildlife on these lands.

It's not so much focused on the two monuments. We are pretty much focused on the overall global planet, the land, the water, the air these elements are very important to us. In essence, when we pray, we pray from the east and then from the south and then the west and then the north. So, we embody all of Mother Earth and the universe, but as time progresses along, when we provide the metrics, we will identify how some of these objects that are being used at the tribal levels. With that, I think you back to you.

>> **BILL:** Thank you Hank we will go to Shea Owens. Shea if you have any comments about the alternatives?

>> **SHEA:** I'm kind of in a bad service area. I like the alternative that would put the existing monument prescriptions over the lands that were put back into the monument I think it was alternative B. That is the alternative that I was most comfortable with.

>> **BILL:** Okay, anything else?

>> **SHEA:** No, not for now. Thanks.

>> **BILL:** Okay, let's move onto Scott Berry.

>> **SCOTT:** Thank you. Basically, I guess I'm taking two bites at the apple because I already



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

submitted 35 pages of comments to the BLM and included a number of new alternatives to be considered. I won't drag this whole committee through that process, but I guess my point of view as I'm kind of taking as my theme here is what Turiya said, that she has no idea what the final alternatives are going to be, and given the degree of uncertainty it doesn't seem to me to make too much sense to focus on how the alternatives as they are presented here given that they may be quite different coming out at the other end of this process.

The question I asked myself is, how would one go about developing good alternatives, strong alternatives? It seemed to me that the starting point was sort of the recognition that we all share here, that the purpose of the monument is to protect the objects, resources, and values in the monument. That's why the monument was created. It's our assignment on this community to advance that goal. That's the number one goal and it would seem like everything we do would sort of fall under that heading of protecting resources and values. That is kind of our assignment. So if I start there, I go, well, what do you need to do that? The question I ask myself is how will we know? How will we know if whatever we suggest is going to provide adequate degrees of protection to the resources and values?

It seems like in a regular world and sensible world you would go to step one come up with some criteria and some rulers and some measuring sticks that would allow us to measure what we are suggesting and to see how it is working, how its ranking in terms of meeting that goal. I have to say after spending tons and tons of time with the AMS I really don't see a lot of criteria presented that tends to evoke a conclusory form saying that's what we are going to do, and here are some ideas. There wasn't really any measuring stick provided.

I kind of realize that's a tough assignment to try to come up with those criteria and it is kind of a scientific job. I am a combination of a lawyer and scientist, I guess. I guess I am thinking though since we still started at the top, I would like to see the BLM proceed by coming up with some sort of criteria that would inform the agency and inform people like us as to whether or not the goals of protecting those resources and values are going to be met. Once we have a defined set of criteria to do that, we would be in a great starting place to try to figure out if any given alternative is good or bad. Right now, the alternatives that are presented are heuristic, of course there is the no action alternative and the three other ones, and all they really say is that we are going to do more of this with less of that or more of this and less of that without any really specify how those will link to the accomplishment of protecting those values. And I think my step would be to step back and develop those criteria.

That's where I come down with it and then I go well what would my alternatives be? Because I think this is a learning process, I think alternatives can be suggested that grow our knowledge that provide better information for us to provide decisions on. That doesn't mean an alternative exactly has to be something that we really want to see happen on the land. An alternative should be something that describes the course of investigation in a place where we must go to collect more information to help



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

us. I think Mr. Westhoff and I agree on grazing for example, that would be a classic one. Why isn't there alternative? We are going to test a variety of models about changes to the grazing regime to see how that would affect resource and values on the monument. On one end of that scale, we can have as many cattle grazing as we have now or as we had in 1995. On the other end of that scale we could have no grazing at all. By exploring each of those alternatives we learn more about the potential effects of grazing on the monument and all of us including the agency would be better informed about what the future may hold.

Another alternative I suggested to BLM again was one of these theoretical ones, there seems to be broad agreement that visitation management is going to be one of the real challenges that the monument's face in the future. I wish I could tell you that I had the answer to that. I don't have the answer to that. There is a field of science out there called recreation science that explores different ways in which to manage human impacts on sensitive areas. They're scientists who spend their whole lives studying that. I really think it would make sense to have an alternative that describes the range of models for managing visitors so that we can explore each of those models from a scientific perspective and try to come up with ways that we might be able to manage visitors effectively in the future.

With that information in front of us, we will be in a better position to make good decisions about how to manage visitation in the future, and how that can be in support for protecting resources and values in the monument. Those are just two ideas. I'm sure everybody on this committee has their own ideas, but basically stepping back a few steps and saying let's come up with alternatives that expand our knowledge and information and maybe less about telling the BLM exactly what to do because when it comes down to the very specifics of things it's hard for any of us to say that we know more than the people that are on the land every day. That is my general thought about the alternatives that we see in front of us right now. I hope the BLM will look at my comments and listen to what I have had to say I go back and really think hard about that idea of coming up with criteria for measuring degrees of protection that can be used to evaluate whatever alternatives they finally come up with. Thank you.

>> **ANDY:** Can I make one more off-the-cuff comment? I support Mr. Berry and some of those comments. I think the key that jumps to mind is the BLM needs the resources to accomplish some of the goals he described and currently that doesn't exist. So, we have got to figure a way for them, let's get science on the monument. If we are going to stick to what we preach how many full-time scientists in any field? How many do we allow them to fund? It has dried up and got used for political defense more than doing that science on the ground. I will shut up. Thanks.

>> **DAVID T.:** I thought you forgot about me. I've been to some cooperating agency meetings. I think Andy and I were the only elected officials in that meeting too. One of the questions that was concerning to me, and I agree with Scott that we should take our time and try to come up with some good strategies of how to try to compile all concerns and try to balance everything, but they are



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

ramrodding this through because they have such a strict deadline. It doesn't leave a lot of time to take a full MAC meeting to come up with a good alternative that we can all get behind.

It's interesting that they have already produced five alternatives before the scoping was even completed. I don't know if that is normal or not. I haven't been in this job long enough, but it seems like they are just really pushing hard to get through this. In one of the cooperating agency meetings, the last one that was in Kanab in-person, and they asked us to take components from all the alternatives and try to come up with an alternative that we could get behind and support.

We also highlighted in that meeting the requirement to coordinate with local and state resource management plans. That is part of the coordination, which is slightly different than cooperating agency where it is government-to-government, tribe-to-government coordination to address those differences in our local resource management plans.

We sat down with Kane County, PLPCO, which is the public lands with the state of Utah and tried to come up with an alternative that maybe we could get behind and support. We prefer alternative A, but at the same time we feel like we have lost a lot of interaction that we had on the landscape that connects our generations to our ancestors unto those that came before us that really established our communities and where we live. There's a lot of areas on the monument that have ties to our religious beliefs in our communities. I served a mission for the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints on the Yucatán Peninsula, where the Mayan civilizations are at, and there was a colonizer, a priest that ordered all the gatherings of the written histories and had them burnt in Mérida, Yucatán.

There is a quick way to destroy a culture and that is to destroy its written history and its oral history – you lose a lot when that happens and we have seen that through generations in areas that we used to go as families were Easter, or for a ride down the Paria. I keep talking about the old timers that want to get down there and share those histories and experience with their grandkids, but they just can't get down there anymore. They could on an ATV, but that's ... we've kind of worked some language into our alternative to try to connect our youth, tribes, our families to the landscape that we draw power from. That we draw encouragement from, so we've included that in our alternatives also. So anyways if I have the time and I've still got five minutes probably or four minutes.

I would like to go through Garfield County, Kane County, and the State of Utah's preliminary alternative. I will just read through it quick. It's only about a page.

The purpose of this document is to create a high-level, preferred preliminary alternative for the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument to consider this document that focuses mainly on those resources which we perceive to be most critical and does not represent our views on all issues. It also represents a general stance on the resources and significant work and coordination with GSENM and coordinating agencies as required to finalize this alternative.



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

We expect to continue coordination with GSENM to improve and finalize a preferred alternative before public comment. The development of this document was done in coordination with Garfield, Kane and the State of Utah. This preferred alternative reflects goals, objectives, and policies in the state and county resource management plans.

This is our preferred alternative which I thought we were supposed to bring alternatives today to consider and come out with a decision on an alternative.

- **Recreation areas:** more targeted recreation management zones rather than large, landscape areas and coordinate with the counties to identify these zones.
- **Cultural Uses:** tribal, religious and cultural uses including gathering of plants hunting fishing and cultural tribal and religious practices. Discretionary cultural uses by the descendent community including but not limited to the following.
 - So, we like the language descendent community. There are some things that the people in our community are tied to the land in the area and it wouldn't limit these following activities. I really like Hank's description, in both meetings, about the maturity ceremonies. I research that. I watched some of them on YouTube. I'm not sure if I pronounced this right, but it's the Kinaalda Ceremony. I didn't know that's what it was named, but we want to protect those opportunities and other ceremonies because I know they are descendants, and it is great to have them tied to the landscape also. I'm sure they find strength and inspiration and wisdom from that. Also, under tribal ceremonies and traditions, the harvesting of traditional herbs and firewood gathering, and I heard Hank talk about that. I want to make sure I include that because I think that is very important. Christmas tree cutting, that's an issue, Harris Wash Easter event, cultural and religious re-enactments. Juniper-pole cutting, firewood gathering.
- **Cultural Traditions:** This is one I'm passionate about and I feel like we have lost – even in Alternative A – semi-annual descendent community and tribal cultural, historical and heritage excursions to connect generations to the landscape and find strength from the land and our ancestors. An example is a historical pack trip and cultural excursions. Locations that at least I'm familiar with Hackberry, (inaudible) Arch, Nipple-Ranch Bench, Deer (inaudible). Rock Springs Bench, Johnson Hole, the Paria Drainage – for semi-annual ATV rides, and others as identified.
- **OHV Use:** On lands in GSENM, would be designated as OHV-limited except for the Little Desert Open Area, which shall remain open. No areas shall be closed where there are existing linear disturbances until all roads are inventoried and travel management is complete.



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

- **Target Shooting:** All these bullets were included on most of the alternatives. We were okay with leaving that the same as outlined in Alternative A but may be limited during state fire restrictions.
- **Recreational Facilities:** We support the development of visitation principles which allow for the development of recreational facilities once the visitation threshold is met.
- **Livestock Grazing:** The resource management plan should authorize livestock grazing within the planning area and make all lands available for grazing. Specific grazing management should be addressed from grazing management plan and EIS. No changes to grazing should happen until the completion of new grazing-specific EIS.
- **Vegetation Management:** The full spectrum of vegetation management including mechanical, chemical and biological treatments should be made available in this plan – both native and non-native desirable species should be made available for use as far as they are best adapted for the environment. Native and non-desirable species shall be controlled to historic levels.
- **Other Discretionary Uses:** Same as Alternative A. Avoidance areas shall be limited to the smallest extent necessary.
- **Casual Collection:** Casual collection of Paleontological resources, rock, minerals and petrified wood should be allowed culturally for Tribal purposes, if needed.
- **Lands with Wilderness Characteristics:** Same as Alternative A.
- **Transportation and Access:** Primary and secondary routes could be maintained and improved to meet public health and safety needs. Due to media health and safety needs, the following improvements should be analyzed within this RMP and EIS:
 - Hole-In-The-Rock Road surface and drainage improvements.
 - House Rock Valley Road surface and drainage improvements.
 - Cottonwood Canyon surface and drainage improvements.
 - Little Desert OHV shall remain open.
- **Lands and Realty:** State and County policy does not allow for federal acquisition of private lands without state and county approval. Garfield and Kane Counties along with the State of Utah have a no net-loss of private land policy.



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

- **Wild Horses:** The monument contains no designated Herd Management Areas, continue to manage for population of zero.
- **Environmental Justice:** Both Garfield and Kane Counties meet the threshold for a low-income population and an environmental justice community. Any management actions need to be analyzed in depth, so they do not negatively impact the status for our communities.

That's it, I'm done. We put together that alternative. It's not all encompassing, but we put that together to address some of our concerns with our resource management plans.

>> **BILL:** That's very good and I appreciate that. I think we all did. We have about 15 minutes, 13 minutes or so before the scheduled public comment period. I guess I'd like to continue this discussion. Everybody has had an opportunity to hear, we lost Lance, but at least 11 other opinions or perspectives on this and these alternatives. There is a lot. I understand the process and as an independent individual I am just a resident of Garfield County. I am not connected to anything other than being a scientist and an old guy, but the thing that has always struck me in my 26-year history with the monument, it's great to talk about process, but for individuals or the community-at-large to get into that process – it is almost impossible.

I have submitted so many letters and stood up at so many meetings. You always walk away with the feeling that you are just not being heard. Maybe that is right. Maybe that is wrong, but that is the feeling that many Escalante residents have. I think that is probably shared across the rest of both counties. I got focused on very specific issues for the alternatives.

- **Backcountry Airstrips:** I would even include a couple more since this discussion. We have a lot, a lot actually – at least a half-dozen back-country airstrips on the monument. That represents something that's important. It's important for local tourism. We got a lot of pilots coming here and they are always interested in those back-country airstrips. That's a representation that wasn't even covered in any of the alternatives or any of the AMS statements.
- **Degradation of Monument Roads due to over-use:** The comments that Jacqueline made regarding roads being torn up, I can understand that. I live right on Cedar Wash Road in Escalante and my issue isn't with OHV's my issue is with there must be 6,000 Sprinter vans that come through Escalante every day and that is a significant change in the tourism that we experienced over the first 24 years of this monument. We have way more van people and way more fifth wheels. The roads are being really degraded. Hole-In-The-Rock Road, which is always a challenge, but if you are looking at the dispersed recreational camping within the first few hundred yards of the entrance to a Hole-In-The-Rock Road, they have built a warren



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

(inaudible) of roads that I do not think are approved by either the county or the BLM. It's a huge erosion issue and it just keeps expanding. More and more campers, more and more Sprinter vans. If you go down the Hole-In-The-Rock Road, literally the whole way, they park everywhere, drainage cuts, stock watering facilities, they will just park anywhere and everywhere. That is a resource damage that no OHV is creating. That is normal highway vehicles coming in and just finding anyplace to camp.

So, there are a lot of issues that need to be considered. I appreciate everybody's comment about process. Hopefully we can talk through some of this and get through some of this at least on the radar. I especially appreciate David's, and I think Andy had a role in that probably too as a representative of both Kane and Garfield Counties. I appreciate that you put together a specific alternative. Anybody?

>> **SARAH:** Thank you. So, I put something in the chat, and I wanted to say it aloud, just to confirm for us and for the public who the cooperating agencies are and which tribes have elected to be cooperating agencies and what that looks like in terms of further input.

I've heard a lot about local residence, and I think it would be interesting – I know Turiya you mentioned not parceling out who commented on what, but it would be interesting to see what the local communities really are articulating because I know we've heard from folks locally as well about concerns related obviously to visitor impacts.

I think Bill what you said is true that we need to address the impacts as well as impacts from OHV to travel outside of the designated roads, but you are right, there are impacts happening from different user groups. I know residents have a real concern about airstrips in addition to the impact from wildlife and the soundscape. Just really understanding what the local perspective is because I think it is diverse and it isn't just one set of priorities I would say. So, I would be really interested in understanding that more from some of those comments if possible.

Then as far as presenting alternatives because I think we worked with a coalition of NGOs to come up with an issue-based alternative, similar to what you all did for the counties and the State of Utah and there is some common ground there. We are not just polar opposites. I think there is a way through, I really do. Obviously, there is some disagreement in some key areas like where recreation takes place, but I am hopeful that we can work together. Thank you.

>> **BILL:** Thank you, Sarah. David.

>> **DAVID T.:** Bill, your comments and I agree Sarah there are common areas where I think we can work together. But to your comments, Bill, that is the problem, that's one of the challenges with having such a large landscape to manage. The BLM, and I think the management of the BLM would agree, they need to put more resources into managing it because none of us like to see that. I wish we



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

could go back to before it was even a monument and not even have the designation because we used to go down as a family and we wouldn't see anybody all day, but now it's like what you have described because it is on the map now. It was protected before under BLM, but that is not the reality that we live in. Where did Bill go? I was looking right at him. But that is the challenge we have to deal with and the reality we have to deal with now.

>> **ANDY:** And the problem has doubled since COVID.

>> **BILL:** That is exactly the comment I was going to make Andy.

>> **ANDY:** The Sprinter vans, I call them COVID vans. They were looking for a way out to get the heck out and they found us.

>> **BILL:** The AMS wanted to eliminate data from 2020 and 2021, using COVID as a reason to exclude it, but I think that is the new norm. I don't like that expression, but that's exactly what's happened. The whole type of recreation that we are going to see has changed in '20 and '21. We shouldn't ignore that; we should be looking at it very carefully.

>> **DAVID T.:** Could David, Adé, or Harry break down the component of the cooperating agency for Sarah? I thought that was a good question, about how it breaks down.

>>**ADÉ:** Sure, and I put this in the chat, but then I realized that the chat responses are only available to the hosts and the panelists – so in response to the cooperating agencies for this RMP planning process: Garfield County, Kane County, the Kane County Water Conservancy District, National Park Service, Utah's Public Lands and Policy Coordinating Office. I think I got that acronym right for PLPCO, Washington County Water Conservancy District, U.S. Forest Service, Dixie National Forest, and then the Hopi Tribe, the Navajo Nation, and the Kaibab Band of Paiute Trib.

So as far as respect to the definition of a cooperating agency, Federal, State, Tribal or local agency having special expertise with respect to the environmental issue or jurisdiction by law, that qualify for cooperating agencies status. A cooperating agency has the responsibility to assist the lead agency which in this case is the BLM by participating in the NEPA planning process at the earliest extent possible.

In this effort we did engage with cooperating agencies by sending out those invitations early on in the process. I can't remember if it was right before we published the *Federal Register Notice* or if we got things in motion recognizing that the *Federal Register Notice* was set to publish for the Notice of Intent, but anyways we sent those out to the cooperating agencies.

In response we did receive a response from those entities that I just called out requesting to be cooperating agencies in this planning process; therefore, we moved forward with putting together and



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

drafting MOUs which were then individually sent out to all these agencies and then there were some that came back with revisions. Those were then sent up to the solicitor's office, fielded, verified, confirmed and then we finalized those MOUs.

So, as far as the input that is received throughout the planning process – they have multiple opportunities to work directly with BLM and provide input as we develop, for example, the preliminary range of alternatives, as we go through with analysis. There is a BLM desktop guide to cooperating agency relationships that was published in 2012. That does go in to give a little bit more detailed types of involvement throughout the steps of the process. I could probably find that we could make it available if there's more interest there, but that's just a general overview.

>> **BILL:** We are right getting close to the time, but I want Joel to have an opportunity to chime in here. So, Joel?

>> **JOEL:** Yes, thank you. I guess at the end here, after having listened to everybody express their concerns and what is important to them, I'm interested in looking for, I'm worried about the way forward. For example, Scott advocated for taking a step back and doing a bunch of study first and then rethinking alternatives. I think that we need the alternatives in order to have something to discuss, but I will admit that as I read through the five alternatives, they were difficult to be ... they are not very concrete. So, for me, before I can decide or make a recommendation, I would really need to know whether Alternative B versus Alternative D versus the Alternative that Commissioner Tebbs provided. What would it mean on the ground, in terms of acreage this way or acreage that way or miles of roads this way or trails that way – and so without that ... so, I found the alternatives to be too vague. But I also understand that we need them, and I would advocate that we need alternatives that set goals and then once we have goals, in terms of what are we going to do? And what is the goal? Then we do science later to figure out how to meet the goal.

I want to see if we can find a way forward where we have alternatives and that they have details in them so that we can set goals and not kind of reboot the process from nothing. I appreciate the alternative Commissioner Tebbs read to us because as I was listening, I think it did include some more specific goals or benchmarks in it and I imagine that that will get shared with us.

>> **DAVID T.:** I'm okay sharing it, but do I just reply to the group with an attachment, or can I drop it in the chat? It's a PDF.

>> **ARTEMISIA:** Is now a moment where I could just chime in for a moment?

>> **BILL:** That's fine.

>> **ARTEMISIA:** I just got a signal from management here to just chime in for a moment. So what Joel was saying, these are very good insights. Of course, alternatives need goals, objectives, what we



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

called in the past management actions, now the BLM is calling it management direction.

So just to remind, some of you have been in both cooperator meetings, MAC meetings, and public meetings. The message that we've been hoping to convey, and I will just reiterate it which should answer your question a bit is that because of the required very expedited timeline and although we are doing very good work by simply focusing on this here at the BLM, it's not that we are actually doing less work.

But because of the sequence that needed to happen that are mandated like getting that NOI published for a 60-day public comment period and that there are certain elements that are required to be in that AMS that had to come out by the middle of that to be available for 30 days which is also a requirement. It was so early in the phase of planning that to meet the requirement of discussing alternatives what we have been saying is, we are not actually looking at these as developed as alternatives as you would see and some planning processes. We were putting forward essentially preliminary management strategies; they are alternative strategies. They are very broad approaches and by the time that we can share and have developed these, we will have the usual tables that you find in an RMP of goals, objectives, management actions, just one moment. Those are the specific things that will guide the analysis. So, let's not think that there is a pretext that these are at the level of development that you would find in a planning process that have a lot more time, that would put out the first round of alternatives in a much more developed face. I hope that helps and everything you said Joel is exactly right. We will get there before we entered the analysis phase and, again, I apologize Bill, but I was asked to just comment in on this. Thank you.

>> **BILL:** I hope you appreciate that we have the public comment period that has a specific time, and we are already almost five minutes late. With that David, if you would I guess be the moderator for the public comment period?

2:50 p.m. – Public Comment Period.

>> **AMANDA:** We are going to share our screen here shortly and I will run over some brief instructions. Just like last time, for now I will put everyone on mute so that we can reduce our background noise. So, if we could, I don't think we need to I can explain the instructions here. Like our last MAC meeting we are now in the public portion of today's meeting. We do have a list of those attendees who pre-registered to comment when they registered for today's meeting. We will go through those participants first. We have a 3 -minute timer up on the screen. If you could try to keep your comment limited to that three minutes to make sure that everyone who wants to speak has an opportunity to do so today, we would really appreciate that.

When you see your name displayed on the screen you can go ahead and access the raised hand feature to let us know that you are ready to provide your comments. That raised hand feature is located at the bottom of your resume screen. It will show up as a little raise hand icon. If you were calling through



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

the phone today, I see we have one phone call, press star nine on your phone keypad to access that same raise hand feature when we call your name.

Once we call your name and see a raised hand, we will go ahead and unmute you. We will ask you to spell your first name aloud for the record and we will give you notice that we will start your 3-minute timer and, again, you will see the timer going up on the screen. Once you have reached the end of that three minutes if you could wrap up your comments so we could move on to the next commenter we would appreciate that? We have seven pre-registered commenters so, again; we will first work our way through the commenters who signed up. If we have time remaining, we will then move onto anyone else who would like to offer a comment today. So, at this time we will go ahead and go to our first commenter who is Margaret Smith and I see that Margaret has raised her hand. Margaret, I will go ahead and ask you to unmute, can you hear us?

>> **MARGARET:** Yes, I can hear you.

>> **AMANDA:** If you could spell your first and last name aloud for the record?

>> **MARGARET:** M- A- R- G- A- R- E- T S- M- I- T- H. First, I want to thank everybody for making this public session available to the public. That means a lot to have Zoom commentary available to us. When I registered for this event, I thought I was going to be making a comment but I do not have one at this point.

>> **AMANDA:** All right, thank you Margaret. I will put you back on mute and lower your hand and we will move on to our next pre-registered commenter who is Christa Sadler. Christa, I see your hand raised so I will go ahead and ask you to unmute. Hello Christa, can you hear us? If you could spell your first and last name aloud for the record at that we will start your time.

>> **CHRISTA:** C-H-R-I-S-T-A S-A-D-L-E-R. Thank you for allowing for this, I'm going to read my statement and hope that it lasts only three minutes. I wanted to address some of the MAC members concerns that science is somehow taking over and I want to de-emphasize that sentiment.

First, fewer than half of the MAC positions are science-based. Science is not a “belief that is automatically contrary.” Science is a methodology that uses observations about natural and physical processes and hypotheses and testing to help us understand how the world works.

Using science to help us understand how to manage this monument can and should be non-political, non-partisan, and ideally help us understand the best practices for the protection and preservation of the monument’s objects of value and landscapes. The exclosures are an example for grazing on the land and potentially how to make grazing healthier for portions of the monument. Science is not the opposite of the stories, anecdotes, and experiences of the people who live on and work the land. Rather it can be a means of supporting these understandings; helping to find more effective ways of



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

managing the land.

Deemphasizing science runs the risk of managing based on partisan politics and the loudest voices and opinion with the result that the land may become more precarious. I wanted to say that of the management strategies presented, I most support strategy D which seems to provide the best protection for the land and its communities while still largely allowing for the discretionary use is that it made this monument the first of its kind within our public land system. Having said this, I also support the idea of developing criteria for determining the effectiveness of an alternative. In Grand Canyon they use adaptive management with an adaptive management workgroup to determine the effects of Glen Canyon Dam on the downstream resources. Whatever alternative is developed, it should have a major component of adaptive management, perhaps with the MAC acting as an adaptive management workgroup or a subcommittee doing that as well. Thank you so much for having this meeting and for allowing me to comment.

>> **AMANDA:** Great, thank you, Christa. I will go ahead and put you on mute and lower your hand and we will move on to our next pre-registered commenter who is Richard Webb. Richard, I see your hand raised, so I will go ahead and ask you to unmute. If you will spell your first and last name aloud then we will start your timer.

>> **RICHARD:** R- I- C- H- A- R- D W- E- B- B. I represent the horse guys, and a lot of folks in the backcountry horsemen that are interested in preserving the land as much as we can. I understand the various interests and as horse people we find ourselves being crowded off the lands through all types of different recreational activities. We are seeking an experience, where we can go to a place where the land is as much as possible not overrun. That is our principal concern here. We see it up here, I'm in the northern part of the state where certain recreational areas have turned into mini lagoons if you will with the amount of activity on them and the overcrowding. I think that this overcrowding issue is one that is going to be very difficult to manage. I think someone is going to have to bite the bullet and put limits on the amount or number of people that can visit sites.

I've given this a lot of thought and we've dealt with it in a lot of areas. We believe that this is the only solution that we can think of. The other thing is that we are looking to maintain like you do wilderness areas where they are pristine places, there aren't very many and I think it is three percent of our public lands are wilderness areas, to be able to visit areas that reflect the pristine nature of the land that goes way back on the time schedule and being able to access it, it needs to be managed. It just can't be ah, "I pay my taxes and a way we go." We all pay our taxes, but we also understand that certain things will work, and certain things do not work. There are sacrifices or limitations that must be placed.

I think that that pretty much covers what I had to say. I appreciate this meeting. I've been here since you started, and I found it very informative, and I thank you.



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

>> **AMANDA:** Great, thank you Richard. I will go ahead and put you on mute and we will move on to our next preregistered commenter who is Mark Austin. Mark, I don't see you on our participants list. I do see we have one phone caller. So, Mark if you are calling in, you can access the raised hand feature to let us know you want to offer the comment by pressing star nine on your keypad. We will now go to Jerry Taylor, who is our next commenter. I don't see Jerry on our list of participants on Zoom, so if you are our phone call or either Mark or Jerry you can access that raised hand feature by pressing start nine on your phone keypad.

All right. I don't see any raised hands so at this time we can go ahead and stop screen sharing and we will turn it back over to Bill for the next item on the agenda.

3:15 p.m. – Advisory Committee review, discussion and consideration of public comments

>> **BILL:** I am a little worried that some of those phone callers may not have gotten through due to a technical glitch, but if that happens, I apologize and I am sure we will welcome any written comments if you want to submit them. The next agenda topic is for us to vote on a preliminary range of alternative recommendation to BLM from the Monument Advisory Committee. So, to begin this I would ask, is there anyone that would like to make a motion? So, I have got two hands up, to me they popped up simultaneously and I'm going to go to Commissioner Tebbs first.

>> **DAVID T.:** So, I have a question first, so we are supposed to vote on a range of alternatives or a specific alternative that we support? They have given us a range, what is the voting item? A range or preferred alternatives A, B, C, D, or E?

>> **BILL:** Or something else.

>> **DAVID T.:** Like I threw up an alternative, but it is not complete yet. We will be presenting that on Thursday, but those are some of the items that we are looking at as we look at our resource management plan.

>> **BILL:** I think that's because that is the language used in the AMS, so they have a range A through E, whether we pick one or two, I think that's up for us to determine.

>> **DAVID T.:** We could say I propose that we support range is A and B, is that with the question is?

>> **BILL:** And I think we should open this up since you raised that question, I think we should open this up to a little discussion.

>> **ANDY:** Can Harry or Adé weigh in on this? You know we have the concurrent project going with our cooperating agencies. Can they weigh in on the parallel tracks that we are working on?



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

>> **ADÉ:** Yes, so what we were hoping to receive from the MAC at the end of this meeting was for the discussions to occur for the public comment so they have a common understanding as to the ideas and thoughts that were being passed around the MAC as a group and then for the public to also comment and provide input in which the MAC could consider when putting together a formulated thought – whether it be an entire proposed alternative of points or maybe identifying a preferred alternative on behalf of the MAC, like we really like B, but we feel like it's missing this point, this point and this point. So, I don't know if you want to take that opportunity to discuss some of the input received during public comments and how that could help frame some of the discussion that you can then have and hopefully come to a consensus as to what put forward as a recommendation to the BLM.

>> **BILL:** That's probably a good suggestion to continue discussion before we make any motions so, again, I'm going to open it up. Let's discuss so we are all on the same page of any step we take to move forward.

>> **ANDY:** So, is this going to be an ongoing process or just a one-time recommendation today that these are our concerns, and we are done? Or what would be involved as the cooperating groups develop?

>>**ADÉ:** This is the MAC's opportunity to provide input to be considered when the BLM finalizes the range of alternatives development. As far as those who are cooperating agencies, there will be other opportunities including, as Commissioner Tebbs stated, the upcoming meeting on Thursday.

>> **ANDY:** Thanks.

>> **SARAH:** I guess we are just jumping in. I don't know if you were calling on people Bill or not, but I was just going to, say, going off what Joel commented on and Turiya's response, it feels premature to try to advance the alternatives. I absolutely would prioritize alternative D if we are looking at protecting the objects of value, I'm just wondering if there's a possibility for more response for the committee towards this. It feels premature.

>> **BILL:** Thank you Sarah. Shea?

>> **SHEA:** So, one of the public commenter's talked about and I really liked the idea, but I think the laws and policies as they are written generally allow for the BLM to restrict in order to protect you know you talk about recreation uses. If the recreation use is harming something, the BLM has that ability, and the monument will as well, to restrict or mitigate that activity to protect the resource and so I think when we talk about having that flexibility, what we ought to consider is having the full spectrum of tools in this plan and that the whole monument might be open to recreation opportunities were just going to right-off-the-bat that you can't in this area because we might down the road say it makes sense for the resource to move recreation out of area A but if in the planning process and not



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

allowed recreation in area B that we don't have the option or the monument doesn't have the option to move it up. I like the idea of flexibility, the scary thing about flexibility is that you start to put very little restrictions or very little controls in the plan and really start leaving the controls open to the interpretation of the staff at that time. Its better and it's a double-edged sword, you have the creativity and flexibility to be able to do a lot more things, but you also have the creativity and flexibility that also may turn out bad. The flexibility idea, I really like the idea of having a more open plan because you can always take away, but if the plan is not open enough, you can't open it back up more, once a decision has been signed, at least not without first amending that plan.

>> **BILL:** Thank you Shea. Hank?

>> **HANK:** Thank you. I do believe that the alternatives still need to include the tribal perspectives. And, like, Sarah said I think we still need to identify objects and values and how the tribes perceive some of these objects and their understanding of it and all that. There is a big question about science too, whereas from the tribal perspective with the planet enlightenment, how the soil, water, the vegetation, how everything interacts as a whole unit, as an object. So, that is something I think that we need to leave room for.

I do want to reflect on the question that Richard Webb had. A lot of times we look at them as being an animal, it's just a horse but to a certain extent we must look beyond that and that's where your matrix comes into play, where this horse is confined into a corral or the only exercise that this horse is getting during the day or during that week or the month or year is a walk. This horse has a spirit also and it is a spiritual being. It breathes, it eats, like us humans do. Where do we come in to actually provide that nourishment and the mental stability for this horse, so if we do recognize some of these ancestral trails to where we can actually utilize and reuse some of the trails and reacquaint the public and the people that are interested in the horseback riding or taking them to a nice scenic area, it could do an enormous things for this particular horse if it was actually being provided something like a trail ride in the mountains or something of this nature. I think it something that we all need to be open-minded about and try to look at every piece of the puzzle within this monument. Thank you.

>> **BILL:** Thank you, Hank. Scott?

>> **SCOTT:** My thinking is that I feel like we are like the jury for an art show, and we must pick the best painting in the show, but none of the pictures have been chosen for the show yet. So, it seems like a radical case of getting the cart before the horse to try to get to the specific of who we think that winner should be or what this final form of the alternatives would be until we have more information. My suggestion would be that we continue this discussion with the idea that in the next six months that this committee can actually come up with something like a preferred alternative to recommend to the BLM, but not make an effort now to apply sideboards or shut down the process at this time because as many members have pointed out there are too many unknowns out there and we don't have a great set of standards to go by with respect to making good choices. That would be my suggestion.



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

>> **BILL:** Thank you, Scott. Jacqueline?

>> **JACQUALINE:** Thank you. I agree that it would be preliminary to choose one specific alternative today. We've heard some comments from the public, but, for example, we heard from Hank, we heard from Commissioner Tebbs, we haven't been able to incorporate what they have had to say. I don't know that we have the full range of alternatives in front of us to pick the best one at this time. Thanks.

>> **BILL:** Thank you Jacqueline. Joel?

>> **JOEL:** I'm worried that Artemisia is going to make my point for me. I think that reading the agenda, I don't think our task right now is to zoom in on what the correct and best alternative is, but instead we are supposed to provide edits to this list of alternatives, so we are coming up with recommendations like we need more information on this, and we need a presentation on that. I think with the land managers are looking for is for us to help edit these ranges of alternatives, not to choose one right now.

>> **BILL:** Thank you Joel. Commissioner Tebbs?

>> **DAVID T.:** So, I agree, I would like to come up with a comprehensive alternative. It does seem premature, but I ask about the schedule to get this done by early 2024 I think, spring, it didn't even allow for National Parks to go through their processes. They are having to speed up. So, if we took six months to do that, and Artemisia or others could talk about that schedule we are on, they are really ramming it through, but my comment is that we are bound to overlook something, and we are not going to come up with the best solutions because we are on such a hard timeline. So that is what concerned me is this hard timeline that we are on as a group. Six months, they are going to be passed this and into the next three or a couple of phases into the process.

>> **BILL:** I want to make sure now Turiya before we go to you that we get all the comments from the MAC members. Sarah, I see your hand up again.

>> **SARAH:** Yes, I guess I'd like to hear what Turiya has to say because I'm listening to what Joel said and I am imagining us suggesting edits to these alternatives and what that would look like and trying to do that in a 20-minute period, but Turiya – I'm curious what the direction from BLM is on this agenda item.

>> **BILL:** Turiya, just hold on a minute. I want to make sure Scott do you have another comment to make?

>> **SCOTT:** No, I took my hand down. I don't have anything else.



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

>> **BILL:** I'm sorry. Okay, Turiya?

>> **ARTEMISIA:** Okay, so just to make sure I am on point, but I've been asked to interject a bit here is could you repeat how you phrased the question to the committee that people are answering? Remember that the agenda is made by the DFO.

>> **BILL:** The topic reads vote for preliminary range of alternative recommendation to BLM from the MAC.

>> **ARTEMISIA:** Right, okay. So, thank you very much. I appreciate that. So, this is a preliminary range of alternatives. It does not mean that these are even the ones that will ultimately get analyzed. We will have to see if everyone that we end up with which may be different than that, is that it meets the purpose and need, etc.

So, the process is unfolding as it is, and your thoughts, I think at an earlier time in the meeting at one point, Bill, I might be wrong you asked for a rationale to the committee – always to understand why something is, is very helpful, it gives us insight to know how something may or may not pertain.

We may not know why it is important and you might, so this is where we are in our process, and you have the obligation and the privilege that you are helping us. So, even though it would be great to know more, this is where we are, and your thoughts on this range of alternatives, and what's included in them is very useful whether it's that you feel one is better for this reason, or you think we need less because these two are similar. Any insights will be helpful.

I wanted to comment also on what Shea said about specificity. That is exactly right and that's why we would have goals, objectives, management actions. If a plan is too broad then every time you try to do something there isn't enough guidance there to know if we could proceed and do NEPA on that, and so a plan that is too broad really doesn't say anything at all. So, it is very important that plans have the appropriate and on point management directions, but we just are not there yet. I hope that that is helpful, it was intended to be thank you.

>> **BILL:** Thank you Turiya. Shea, you have a comment?

>> **SHEA:** I wonder if what might be the most appropriate thing is for us to recommend that yes, we think this range of alternative is sufficient, maybe proceed with more analysis or if we ought to instead recommend, we like the range of alternatives that would also like to see these things considered within your range of alternatives. Some of which, Commissioner Tebbs talked about and some of those other things, that could potentially be our recommendation that yes, we like to see this stuff added to the range of alternatives or no we think the range of alternative is sufficient. That's our recommendation. Would that be appropriate for what the BLM is looking for? Because I



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

am with everybody else, I could not select an alternative without seeing the prescriptive language or the goals and objectives that are in that alternative. I think Scott said it great, it's the cart in front of the horse in this situation.

>> **BILL:** Harry, hang on for a second. I want to get Joel's comments. Joel?

>> **JOEL:** Thanks again. So, just listening to Turiya I wanted to respond. So, my opinion based on what she tasked us with is that of the five alternatives A through E. I personally read Alternative E, and I find it unrealistic because I believe that as MAC we are going to come to a compromise and if it was me at making a decision on my own which it is not, I would ask the BLM to take alternatives B and D and provide some sort of "what if analysis" for us or a presentation on what would this mean on the ground, what would it mean in terms of tables of information? It would be a contrast of this versus this. Maybe that's a step forward, that's my opinion.

>> **BILL:** Good comment. Harry?

>> **HARRY:** I think Joel's comment is spot on as well as Shea's. That's how I saw things happening. Maybe the word vote was a little bit misleading, but I see in this meeting you guys essentially saying is this an appropriate range of alternatives? Is there one we need to get rid of? Is there something we can add? That is what I was hoping we would walk away with, your gut feeling on that range, and then if there was something that we needed to do as Shea and Joel explained, we go from there.

>> **BILL:** Sarah, you have a comment?

>> **SARAH:** Yes, I wanted to say that I think that what Joel just said is a good route to go. I support alternative D and I think that is the alternative that is compliant with the proclamation and the criteria but being able for the committee to see that in comparison to B, could be helpful in a way to have meaningful conversation.

>> **DAVID T.:** To add to your comment Sarah, we don't have a final alternative. Alternative B could be compliant once it is finished.

>> **SARAH:** Maybe it's work shopping because it's not going to be final. So maybe it's just for work shopping purposes that we see it on the ground as what it would maybe look like as it becomes more developed, but you are right, there were all these aspects that are missing so is it even possible to do that. I'm hearing that maybe it would be.

>> **SHEA:** Yes, so as I understand it the process and there's probably lots of people who know better than me on this call, but they start with this purpose and need, which is Chapter 1 and then they go onto this alternative development and at some point, as they are doing the alternative development, the BLM and the planning team I'm assuming, will start to come out with the prescriptive type. For



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

example, recreation use one alternative may propose (inaudible) SRMAs while another may propose these five management zones for recreation.

And that will start to hash itself out as the process moves forward in the planning effort.

After those get more prescriptive or better described each alternative then it goes on to the analysis in which they tried to project the impacts. I think that what Joel is asking for is can we see the analysis of what the impacts are and what it will look like on the ground. My guess is the planning team is not there yet. But I would support that 100 percent Joel, if that's what you're asking? I would like to see that on the ground, but I don't think they can get there until they first get more accurate descriptions of what the actual prescriptions, restrictions and authorizations in each of the alternatives would be.

>> **JOEL:** Yes, I'm not asking for that end-product like you are describing. Just if there are some comparisons to how do the two contrast generally and how much land is set aside for this use versus that use in B and D – not what the impacts down the line will be.

>> **SHEA:** And Turiya are you guys not that far along in your planning process, for example, plans available for grazing, have you hashed out which alternative there would be this many acres available, versus this alternative? Have you got that far in the process?

>> **ARTEMISIA:** So, I guess it hasn't been discussed, but grazing is not a good example because there is past work on the EISs that were essentially stopped under the Trump Administration as we moved into that RMP process. There is existing work there. That when there is more information, but in terms of in general, what is your question exactly?

>> **SHEA:** So, for recreation do you have all the SRMAs that we want to designate in Alternative A versus all the SRMAs that we want to designate in Alternative B versus Alternative C? Have you gone that?

>> **ARTEMISIA:** We've gone that far in terms of coming up with preliminary ideas that we are still internally reviewing, but we started try and go in those directions. So, say you said, well, alternative C looks good, and I am just making this up, except it would need to be clear that X, Y, and Z is the type of areas are not open for SRPs. So, you might even speculate that certain alternatives look good, but since you can't see the details yet, you would recommend or see a need for X, Y, Z details, not a million of them, but some broad strokes.

>> **SHEA:** But you guys can't provide us with Alternative B has 12 SRMAs in these locations and each one is these many acres versus Alternative D, can you?

>> **ARTEMISIA:** No, I had conversation yesterday with the appropriate person at the state office and the thing is both our office and the state office and the contractors are in an active process of trying to come up with some things that are consistent, so there isn't something to show you at this point that would make any sense at all.



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

>> **SHEA:** Okay.

>> **BILL:** I guess I'm not committed to B and D. I liked what Commissioner Tebbs, and Commissioner Gant did. They took the best of all those alternatives and took a lot of input from people to flush that out, to flush his recommendation out. Personally, I don't want to get so locked on only two of those alternatives because I just don't think we have enough information. We all keep saying that. So, what I am hearing is we are not ready to make a vote and maybe that wasn't expected of us from what Harry said but some dialogue about what we are seeking to make proper recommendations.

>> **ARTEMISIA:** So, like Sarah said D looks good at least to her because she can see it meets the purpose and need. Joel said he felt that D did not look appropriate because he felt it was really an impractical approach so you might be able to cull together some pros and cons and maybe you can think of other things. Those were very specific rationale to consider for us.

>> **SARAH:** I think Joel was commenting on E not D; right Joel?

>> **JOEL:** I meant to say Alternative E.

>> **ARTEMISIA:** I meant to say E, that what I was attempting to say E.

>> **JOEL:** Not to jump in here, but here's another good example of a question I have. As a geoscientist, I was surprised and maybe alarmed to learn that there is a quite large proportion of swaths of the monument that are open to fossil collecting freely by the public. I would be interested in knowing at what point in this list of five different alternatives does it turn off the open fossil collecting by anybody? Would that be Alternative C versus B or what?

>> **ARTEMISIA:** Let me remind you also of a few things, be creative and open minded here. You might say as a geologist for all alternatives, would everyone be on board with we can't have ... okay, thank you. I'm just trying to give...

>> **BILL:** So, what you could have is a compilation of 12 opinions, and that's okay. That's directive to what you want.

>> **SCOTT:** Would it help to have a set of criteria to measure these things? I mean it seems to me that we are just stabbing in the dark. Wouldn't it be fair to have 10 criteria that we measured against each element of these alternatives, and we could say, oh, here is alternative A, bullet points C gets a D score on the criteria that we establish to measure this? It seems like without a set of measurement criteria, then it just becomes everybody's personal preferences. Some people like A and some people like this. We don't have the structure to make a good rational decision without criteria.



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

>> **BILL:** Scott I'm going to come back to the comment that Turiya made earlier. If we provide the rationale for the statement, we make that seems from what she said to be helpful for where they want to get. So, it's not just making the statement, it's also explaining why the rationale you got, and used to get there.

>> **SCOTT:** I agree with that Bill, I think that makes sense short of trying to come up with a set of criteria that might be too big a job. At least if we all adopted the view that you just expressed to get a stated preference, but then you've got to attach it to this accomplishes this goal, protection of resources or something.

>> **SHEA:** So, to answer your question Joel about casual collection of fossils, the way I understand it is that was available in the lands removed from the monument back in the Trump Administration. Now that they are back in the monument, Alternative A, which is probably not legal to select, that would probably leave it open for casual collection. I think as soon as you got to alternative B, C, D, or E they would no longer be available the way for casual collection, the way that I understand the plan. I like Scott's idea of having some criteria against which we could evaluate these plans too.

>> **ANDY:** I think we are missing some of the intent of today. I'm sure there's probably some in the group that have been through these RMPs before and in cooperating agencies meetings, which we were conducting regularly now as well. What I think the staff are looking for is, is this range reasonable? Is there anything significant missing from any of these that they have not put in the package that we need to bring up? It's not so much approving them because this is going to get hashed out in those RMP meetings and in hundreds of hours of arguing the little individual points of each one. I think they want from us more the bigger picture, how many of these are acceptable, is it B through D or B through C? Did we miss something significant that puts a fatal flaw in any of these rather than details. Does that make sense?

>> **BILL:** It does. Let me get a couple more comments in here, David?

>> **DAVID T.:** I just had a question. So, I'm hearing the only one that complies is this alternative, why would the BLM even put an alternative forward if it didn't comply in one way or another, I guess? Does that make sense? In my opinion, in my limited research, all of them should apply and then fit within the proclamation. Why would you put forth an alternative that didn't comply?

>> **ARTEMISIA:** I'm going to just interject here and I kind of been asked to. To reiterate what Harry said, yes, we are not looking for a vote. We are looking for recommendations. I can include things specific to certain alternatives (inaudible). What was just spoken before is correct that we come out with a range, and we haven't yet fully vetted if it meets the purpose and need and so forth because it isn't developed enough, but we want to know, is there anything you think we have really missed in this range, say we had no conservation heavy alternative, we would have missed that? Say



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

we had no discretionary need emphasis; we would have missed something. Any flaws. Give us feedback on what we have so far in a general way, that is what I'm looking at my notes from the people I work with, that is what we are looking for.

The answer to your question, David, is all alternatives must be legally viable which includes that they need to meet the purpose and need or what are we doing except the no action. In an EIS you must have a no action as a baseline comparison knowing that it may not conform, but if you can see right away that E or C or something really doesn't conform, we would like to hear that because that is a good reason to remove it. It would never make it to analysis anyway. But have all viewpoints and perspective and values that are forefront in this value process to some degree been captured here? Thank you.

>> **SHEA:** Yes, so I guess in that spirit I'm hoping to get this right, I would like to recommend that we add to one of these alternatives the traditional tribal community and religious uses of the land as being authorized in one of the specific bullet points.

>> **SCOTT:** I guess this is an idea as well, this is all hypothetical, but alternative C says the goal is to create a world-class recreation area and while we all can see that recreation is always going to be an important factor for the monument, recreation was not even a purpose for the creation of the monument.

That is clear in the organic documents. Again, I don't know where I'd finally come down on that, but I'd say if we are looking for specific stuff that we don't need, we don't need an alternative that gives a principal description and an activity that wasn't even part of the purpose of the monument in the first place. So, if I could just offer that again as kind of the idea of the trouble we get into when we take this broad approach with more specific criteria, guidelines, and a sideboard for what was used because of clearly conceived that there are other people in the community that have a different view than I do about the role that recreation plays in the monument.

>> **BILL:** I'm going to jump in and say I am certainly one of those people. Not just because of my own background, but we've got a 26-year history that we cannot ignore. There are communities across two counties that have developed businesses and lifestyles and dependency on that recreation. We cannot ignore that history.

>> **SCOTT:** Right. I agree with that. We can't ignore. I would never say or suggest that recreation be eliminated from the monument. I'm just saying that in the order of criteria and in the purposes, it's not a good idea to start off with an alternative that is focused on something that was not a purpose of the monument, now I agree that what we are doing and what they RMP needs to do is address the human impacts of visitation. In the alternatives I gave the BLM, I suggested because they need to sit down and seriously study all the various models of the recreation management – so we have a better idea of what are the alternatives for managing the human impacts of the monument. I simply don't know enough right now to really make an educated choice about that.



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

>> **BILL:** I am not trying to be argumentative with you Scott. I agree with some of what you were saying, but that's why I like David and Andy's alternative, so to speak. They came up with very specific examples of things. That's what I don't like about B through E. It seems so constrained where you are looking for something that is probably a hybrid of all of that. I go back Turiya's comments, if we can provide what is important or what have we missed and we provide a rationale for it rather than trying to say one of the specific alternatives in its entirety is the right one to go with and we are going to massage it, why not provide that basic here is what we like, here is what we think you have missed, and let them digest it.

>> **SCOTT:** I think we agree on that, and after hearing this conversation that is my plan. To provide that kind of specific advice connected with the meeting one of the goals for purposes and say here is what Scott berry thinks you should do. I think that makes a lot of sense because I've said it for years, but it doesn't seem to catch on.

If we had a specific enough list of the recreation and otherwise, so we all knew exactly what we were talking about, I bet we would find agreement. I've always said if I could sit down with all the ranchers in the valley and they said, hey, these are the roads we need to access our cows, I'm guessing that that would probably be fine to me and we would fine with many people in the conservation world, but instead were trying to talk about it in the abstract without really having that very specialized knowledge that you need to make decisions in a specific way.

>> **BILL:** Let me go to Stephen Westhoff so you can make a comment. Stephen?

>> **STEPHEN:** I just wanted to, say, where the monument has such a large border with Glen Canyon National Recreation Area, which is designed for recreation and most people at least in Escalante access Glen Canyon through the monument. It seems like it would be a problem if the monument Didn't recognize recreational uses along that approximate 100 miles of border.

>> **BILL:** Good point and, again, I think that's another example of here is something that got missed and Turiya I hope that is the kind of information and rationale that would be helpful.

>> **ARTEMISIA:** Yes, And I am just repeating myself, but information and rationale is what we are looking for. Not voting and not preferences. You are here as experts. Bring in your expert information and rationale. Not voting or preferences.

>> **ANDY:** On the recreation piece, it's a bit of a mixed message. In the proclamation, it states that while we recognize it's a world-class recreation opportunity then they say it's not the primary purpose. That is right. It is the only mechanism, to fund this entire operation. The money comes from the two counties that must run this thing. So short of what the BLM has for limited resources as far as their overall management strategy, if Congress was going to give us some money to manage the thing so the



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

BLM could get out there and watch these trailheads and look for the damage and police the ATVs that are going crazy that would be wonderful, but they haven't given us anything. Not only do we not get any money to basically manage, but they also prevent us from collecting any tax that would help management. In Kane County we are over 90 percent. We must raise all the money to run the thing. You guys have heard this all time and again, I'm sure. We will offer search and rescue, health and welfare, tow trucks. It is seven days a week for us, so it is kind of, like, deer tags, managing the deer herd. Somewhere that has got to fit in because we are not going to have any revenue. If there isn't any recreation, especially in Kane County, TRT and recreation are 85 percent of our budget, there will be nobody left to keep the idiots from overrunning our monument. There needs to be some component of that to fund the operation of the monument.

>> **BILL:** Thank you Andy. Commissioner Tebbs?

>> **DAVID T.:** So, you must find a balance. In Garfield County alone, I talked to the sheriff around lunch time we've had 32 helicopter hoist rescues in the monument and the surrounding area so on federal lands and in our county, not including about 50 other canyon ropes rescues, ambulance, recovery, vehicles. That is expensive when you have a helicopter in the air that is the State of Utah paying for that luckily, but the volunteers, most of these programs are run with volunteers. There is a huge cost with people coming to the area, but you've got to have both components unless the federal government will pony up and offer more resources and finances and emergency services and everything along those lines, otherwise it is tough how it is right now to even make it work.

>> **BILL:** Sarah?

>> **SARAH:** I have a few comments. I don't think anybody has proposed zero recreation and I do think that the counties realize economic benefit from the monument.

As far as services go on that side, I would imagine there is more opportunity there to potentially help cover some of the cost of the services related to agreements with the federal government. When I wrote in the chat that I support alternative D and the justification for that, I think we could each either write it in the chat or I don't know how people want to communicate that, but if we are looking for a range of ideas from the committee as experts in different fields or bringing forth knowledge that could be helpful to BLM, that is not saying that alternative D the way it is right now is where it will land.

I think each one of us can say whatever it is we want to say, but the alternative is that we don't have the ones that are before us to weigh in on so that's what we have and that is what the BLM is using to move forward. Obviously, the public scoping period, all the information that they received during the last period is being considered as well, but we as the MAC can give the specific recommendations based on our seats here. It seems, like, that's what the BLM is looking for and then they will take that into consideration along with all the other information that they are receiving.



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

The cooperating agencies have other opportunities to work through some of these issues that you were raising that are specific to the cooperating agencies. That's it. Thanks.

>> **BILL:** Sarah, I can understand your comments. I am probably too narrowly focused because the people's comments that I want to hear from are the people that live and breathe in Kane County and Garfield County. To me those are the most important comments because it's the lives and livelihoods whether it's a business or a first responder, that's the input that I want to get and I don't think we are getting enough of it, and I think that has to be reached out and gotten somehow.

>> **SARAH:** I actually agree with you there that we haven't gotten enough of that, and I don't know where those people are because there is the public comment period right now.

>> **BILL:** I will say this and it's probably not going to be an easy comment to digest but a 26-year history, it is what Drew talked about – a 26-year history that hasn't been the smoothest of relationships, a lot of people got burned out, so they don't go to the scoping meetings. They don't feel they are being heard. They feel they are being talked to. There are issues that are important to me that some people just, you know I am a first responder, and I'm a first responder for an entity that reports to a city. It's not the county sheriff, it's the City of Escalante. There are no cooperative agreements. Those are the types of things that need to be heard and need to be flushed out.

>> **SARAH:** I think the local perspectives are very important and probably not exactly aligned with the interim compared to folks around the country because I think there is different, that all voices are important, but absolutely the local perspective needs to be heard and considered. I'm very disappointed we didn't have more folks speaking up today. I think that does indicate an issue because we were supposed to be considering public comment and we had three voices, I think. Speak up.

>> **SHEA:** I know Jerry wanted to comment. I was at the same location with him without service and I bailed to come get on this and he couldn't get out of that meeting. So, two things that I would like to maybe add to this list of things we would like to also see considered in alternatives or whatever recommendation we are going to make, these are just state policies that I feel like are not represented in any of the alternatives yet.

The first one has to do with roads and access. I think the state would like to see an alternative considered where no areas with linear disturbances would be closed areas until after a travel management process has been completed and which you inventory the roads and go through the process of inventorying and evaluating them. Once that has happened, at that point if those roads are in areas that we feel like need to be closed, everybody kind of like what Scott has said, we all agree that that road is important then it's fine to start closing stuff. But closing areas with linear disturbances prior to doing inventory and evaluation statement, we are very much against that, and I don't feel that is represented in these alternatives.



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

The other state policy that I don't see represented in any of these alternatives is they have got very much a no-net loss of grazing AUMs or grazing HM's and they've got a very kind of explicit purpose or point of maximizing grazing and the sustainability of grazing and I know that one is going to be tricky with the language in the monument proclamation, but I think there are areas where we can both maximize, stabilize and make sustainable grazing without harming objects and values. I would like to see that state policy reflected somewhere in one of these alternatives as far as maximizing and stabilizing the grazing industry within the monument.

>> **BILL:** Personally, I think there is science that could be applied to those objectives.

>> **SHEA:** And I agree 100 percent. And I think that sometimes we fight before we listen, and we fight before we understand each other and that's why there is this perspective that grazing only damages and that the two cannot be compatible. I think there's a lot of science that supports they can be. I think there's areas where they can't be. For the most part, I think the two can co-exist, and I think that is the state's position as well.

>> **ANDY:** A unilateral closure or elimination is obviously the biggest political hot potato in my opinion and probably in the entire monument that must be dealt with.

>> **JACQUALINE:** So, in thinking about how this discussion might be helpful to the BLM, if we look at the current alternatives are there any that are completely unacceptable to the entire committee, and we have a rationale for why any of those might be unacceptable? So that's one way that we can help them by eliminating if we think there is something that needs to be eliminated from the alternatives.

The second thing, like Shea said, are there any concerns that we have heard today that we really think need to be included and are not included. We could narrow down the focus of our conversation to either eliminate an alternative and present a rationale for that, and then add what we think needs to be included that is not there, I think that might help the BLM quite a bit in moving forward to present the final range of alternatives that they are going to need to have when they get to the resource management plan.

>> **BILL:** Turiya before I get to you, I would like to see us agree on a work product that comes out of this. I don't think we can get something done today, but with 12 people, the opportunity to do just what Jacqueline said, put that type of information down and then compile it and pass that through to the BLM.

>> **ARTEMISIA:** You will have to work out with David and managers as to what is acceptable in terms of how to get that done. However, what I would say is that there are certain things that probably the committee knows it will not agree on and it's not beneficial to do much with those because we need a committee recommendation. We need something that does not contain disagreement within it. So, it can't be a set of different viewpoints and that is very challenging. I just want to point that out. It needs to be a committee recommendation is my understanding.



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

>> **BILL:** But with that said, number one you will never necessarily get complete consensus, if you put it to a vote, whatever the majority is going to carry the day. I can see a work product that we can't accomplish today where each person inputs that information and then collectively we work through that to make the best consensus possible if that even sounds reasonable, but I want time to be able to think through this. I mean, to be honest with you I'm still stuck on Commissioner Tebbs and Commissioner Gant's example because I think that really showed thoughtfulness. It might be missing some rationale, but it combined things and got to an endpoint.

>> **SHEA:** So, can I jump in, sorry, I don't want to be cutting anybody off that has their hand up? I've been wrong a lot so maybe I am wrong now, but I think when we talk about a range of alternatives, what's important is that we propose a broad enough range of alternatives that at some point the decision maker can take what's been analyzed in that alternative or range of alternatives and create a preferred alternative.

There's probably room for consensus, even though and I'm going to go out on a limb here and say that Sarah probably doesn't like the idea of an alternative that maximizes livestock grazing. She may still be willing to agree that it's okay to have that within the range of analysis, just not maybe in our preferred analysis. There may be opportunity for consensus in this range, kind of like what Jacqueline was saying. Are there things here that we need to add to the range of alternatives and are there things in the existing range of alternatives that we need to get rid of because they are just crazy or whatever.

I think there may be room for consensus in that, and I think the things listed in Commissioner Tebbs' and Commissioner Gant's proposal could be things that could be part of a formal recommendation that for these reasons we would like the BLM to consider an alternative that includes these developments.

>> **SCOTT:** Shea are you thinking – I'm curious sometimes putting the far ends of the poles on the table to find compromise. I guess I'm just wondering if we add an alternative that said, the preference here is maximized grazing, do you think it's okay to have on the other end an alternative that says grazing shall be eliminated on the monument. Is that the polarized approach that you think would bring some agreement to the recommendation?

>> **SHEA:** Yes, I think if they are within the legal side boards and spectrums, yes. I don't think it would be appropriate to have an alternative in their saying grazing shall be placed in priority to any other use, but to say that we need to be actively promoting and actively growing grazing and the livestock industry when it is not in conflict, I think that is a reality. For sure that should be in there. It's a reality to eliminate grazing entirely, it should be in there if that is legally feasible. I would agree with you on that but setting side boards for sure. Really quick I feel like I called you Scott, but your screen says Raymond. What do you prefer.

>> **SCOTT:** I go by Scott. I still think of my father as Raymond. So even though my official name is Raymond, Scott is what I go by.



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

>> **SHEA:** I'm the same way. I'm Jeffrey Shea but my dad is Jeffrey, so I always go by Shea.

>> **SCOTT:** We are in agreement.

>> **BILL:** I'm still out a little bit of loss of what product we are going to deliver to the BLM. Sarah, do you have another comment?

>> **SARAH:** I was going to respond to what Shea said. I agree with that I think putting forth maybe there is three and I propose B and D question as a potential and it doesn't exclude other ideas or alternatives coming forward. I think it just narrows the pool for BLM, and I guess I would also go back to the fact that we were starting with alternatives, why would they put the alternatives if they didn't meet and why are we even considering it.

It's confusing right off the bat because you have to respond to the proclamation and NLCS but here are the alternatives that do not necessarily do that. So, we can maybe take aspects from one or another and looked toward building an alternative. The foundation I would start with would be D because it brings us back to the 2000 focus which really is why the monument was established and restored. Obviously, from the conservation side I would absolutely like to have discussions about other uses on the land if they are in support of protecting those objects of value. I think there's room without with recreation, grazing and other things.

>> **SHEA:** So, my vision of what we are proposing or what we would submit for the work product Bill, may be different than ... In my mind I am picturing a formal recommendation that says something like we are in support of the existing range of alternatives except for A and B. In addition, we think we ought to add these seven or these four or five things to the range of alternatives and that is our recommendation. That is kind of what I am envisioning in my mind.

>> **SARAH:** I think we are envisioning the same thing, but I wouldn't other things on right now because I don't think we can do that right now. Jackie put something in the chat related to keeping the full range. I am more inclined to narrow it down since that's what we are supposed to be doing, I think but anyway.

>> **SHEA:** I think it's sometimes important to have a bigger ... I've heard people tell me this and Turiya can probably articulate this better than me, but sometimes it's nice to evaluate something even though it's legal, but it may not be very practical because you can use that justification to dismiss it if that makes sense. I think Turiya could speak to that, but the broader for preliminary analysis purposes might sometimes be better.

>> **ARTEMISIA:** That is correct. Legally everything that is considered at an early stage is considered an alternative considered. It is at a later stage that some of them are dismissed, and they do not get detailed analysis because it's very clear for a few rationales that they are actually not going to go



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

anywhere, that they will be problems will be look more closely. We are at that initial stage where we are looking at alternatives that may be dismissed before analysis. It's possible. What Sarah is trying to do is narrow it down and not continue to look at things that don't need to be looked at, but it's up to the committee if there to determine if there are any such alternatives that right off the bat are not going to pass the test, so to speak.

>> **ANDY:** I'd like to see a motion that basically says somewhere in the middle of this range of classifications we generally all agree something would work and we need to pass out onto the committee. Unless there is some glaring failure here, right? Am I wrong? Is that what Turiya is saying?

>> **SHEA:** I think the glaring failure is that there are some people in this group that feel like there are certain things missing from the range of alternatives and I think the information, like the historical uses for tribes and local communities for example.

>> **ANDY:** I agree. That must be added. Yes, that is not in there.

>> **SHEA:** And then I think that not closing areas where roads may exist until we have inventoried and evaluated those roads, I don't see that in there anywhere, and the grazing thing. And if people have other things that they feel are missing from those range of alternatives, then that should be added to.

>> **BILL:** So potentially it's a work product. If we ask Shea and Sarah to create that document. We are not going to have it today but create that document from all the input and discussion that we have had today and use that to circulate to the entire committee to make sure we were capturing that range. That seems to be something we could get consensus around. It would provide more specificity and it would provide rationale. Is that a reasonable work product?

>> **SARAH:** I am up for it.

>> **ANDY:** Sounds like it's up to Sarah. I mean the only quote defect we found is we need more language on the tribes' concerns. Other than that, there is somewhere in there between A or D that would work.

>> **BILL:** Shea are you up for that?

>> **SHEA:** Yes, the one thing I haven't heard is there anything that people have seen in this range that has been presented to us that we just want to kick out. I personally don't see anything that we just want to kick out but does anybody else? Maybe that's a conversation Sarah and I need to have. I can think of several things that people have said that need to be analyzed. I know Joel mentioned just getting rid of alternative E altogether, but is their stuff that we want to kick out that we are all in consensus with?

>> **BILL:** I guess to me the absolute closure or banning anything that is absolute that is so broad and



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

complete that it will never be considered.

>> **SCOTT:** I agree that, one of the problems of the monument was the federal fiat that was enforced from above and created so much bad feelings, but maybe it's a way to solve some of those things is to say it's not going to be a broad closure, but anybody who is running cows in Garfield and Kane County will have access to a quick, efficient system to use the roads they need to use as a way to address the local concerns and the back country roads or leaving the back country roads open two the American public. Is there some place process wise in the middle where we could address that type of problem?

Recording ended. The rest of this meeting's notes are derived solely from notes taken. I cannot attribute dialogue to a particular committee member. (Revised as of 12/2/2022 due to misplaced recording of afternoon session part 2).

>> **ANDY:** There must be. We are not looking for exclusivity. Openness or close. Is that mutual? We want those vans out of the place.

>> **SHEA:** I think you cannot authorize use on a road that is not part of this effort. That is part of the implementation, travel management effort. Currently there is currently a list of roads that are authorized to be used, and rules that are not authorized to be used right now. Right, you said, You're clear that whole monument is closed to motor vehicle traffic, except roads that are designated as open.

The whole monument is closed to motor vehicle traffic except roads that are designated as open.

There is that a list of closed roads or open roads.

I didn't say that right. That is much better side, but there is one small area that is open for a highway travel, everything else is limited to designated routes. When we go through that travel management process, that's where some of the designated routes may be from open two close. At that point once you've gone through that travel management process if there are areas where there are closed roads, I think people can get behind that.

The problem the community is going to have is if you say this area is closed, but people in the area know of roads in that area, even though they may not be authorized at the current moment they see that is closing down roads.

>> **SCOTT:** I agree with you I think that is one of the problems we have run into the last 25 years. It we need to be as specific as we can and make allowances for real needs of people in the communities without trying to solve the mobile part at the end of the day in terms of needs of actual locals to take care of their economic business, that's probably a set of roads that could be identified and we could work with. Well, not. Why not give it again? You know broad areas of the monument open to whatever traffic anybody wants to take out.



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

>> **SHEA:** No, and I agree. I've been on some of those visits and very rarely with the range of interesting parties and stakeholders do we show up to a road and disagree about the reasons of the use and whether that road ought to be used or not. I would site 95 percent of the time everybody agrees.

>> **ANDY:** I think you are right. I agree. I still think we can kick something out today. I know they really want to get this moving. But on a map, it is a lot harder.

I still think we should kick something out today. I know they want to get this moving. If we have to go back to committee, we are only talking about a couple of issues that if Sarah and Shea will allow us let's just do those recommendations and pass it so that everybody can get to work.

There is consensus they are to be hard we just can't do it in this way we got to get it in front of the larger group and pass it with these recommendations and send it along to Adé and let them get back to us.

>> **SCOTT:** What is Sarah and Shea's timeline? I don't get fair to, say, to them they've got a workup a document for the potential discussion.

>> **SARAH:** I think we can do it in a week. We can get it in writing and then everybody is looking at the same thing and we are all responding to the same document in writing. I don't know. I think it is doable.

>> **ADÉ:** The bearer of bad news, but all deliberation needs to be done in this public meeting setting so any recommendations that is a formal recommendation coming from this committee to BLM needs to have a consensus.

>> **SARAH:** What was that last part? Consensus on what and what must be a majority vote? And it can't be done outside of the public meeting is what you were saying I could make a motion that that we vote on alternative B, because my constituency that's about the only one they're going to support me on. Can we hear from Joel quick? I know we can say B and D, and then we can go from there just like Joel said before. Yup.

>> **JOEL:** Hold on. Bill, you need to step in and moderate this a little bit more because we were hearing the same people talking; and secondly, a proposal to me just as a suggestion for argument I would suggest that we eliminate both E and A because I think we need to reduce the workload and get a little bit focused as we go forward. Bill, I would appeal to you I think as I read the skeleton of alternative C, I believe, that a future C could accommodate your desires about OHV use.

>> **BILL:** I agree. To me I would say B, C, D. So, if you knock out both ends you have got the middle. I still would like to see something about the flexibility of other things being added because I think those are important points that have been brought up. So, we can have a motion that does that with, I don't



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

know if we need to identify the specific additional points, if we can do that today, but I am willing to listen to a motion.

>> **BILL:** Can I make a motion? I move that we recommend to the monument management staff that if they will add to their alternatives something that considers not designating any closed areas (inaudible) prior to going to that evaluation that they will add to their alternatives something that considers maximizing grazing in areas where appropriate, and something that adds historic or considers historic and community uses of tribes, communities, and religions that these alternatives would be a sufficient range.

>> **SARAH:** I would need a definition of what that all it looks like I got us as far as getting behind the official recommendation. I'm not opposed to what you were saying. But there isn't a clear understanding for me what that looks like on the ground.

>> **SCOTT:** This is an old lawyer speaking, but this is something that needs to be written down and carefully looked at. I'm going to be opposed to voting for anything based on a sort of general floating oral discussions here. If Shea would like to add those things, I would like to add that they will include something about being open to the idea of excluding grazing in all areas where it damages resource monuments and values and to including recreation (mumbling). You guys can see where this is going.

>> (Overlapping Speakers Resulting in Lapse In Audio Feed.)

>> **SCOTT:** I just have to say I don't think it can be done and what makes legal or bureaucratic sense right now. We are going to have to find a way to work out something in writing that we can I'll look at and critique.

>> **BILL:** Shea, your comments.

>> **SHEA:** I understand 100 percent what Scott is saying. I was under the impression that those recommendations already existed in capital alternative E, but I don't have that in front of me.

>> **SARAH:** I just want to say is there a proposition to going the direction of eliminating the two ends of the spectrum?

>> (Overlapping Speakers Resulting in Lapse In Audio Feed.)

>> **SCOTT:** We can't eliminate the first one. Alternative A has got to be there by law.

>> But I was wondering about that.

>> **JACQUALINE:** We cannot really eliminate that. We cannot eliminate A because that has to be there



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

by federal regulation.

>> **SARAH:** I would propose a motion that we support A and B. No, way. B and D.

>> (Overlapping Speakers Resulting in Lapse In Audio Feed.)

>> **SARAH:** Let's bring it to a vote A and B.

>> **BILL:** We are going in the circle again that they are trying to get us out of. I mean, we can make separate motions here and vote them, but you are going to have to live with what the vote is.

>> **SARAH:** What about B, C, D?

>> **BILL:** That's where I was.

>> **SARAH:** A because it has to be there, we are kind of in agreement.

>> (Overlapping Speakers Resulting in Lapse In Audio Feed.)

>> **SARAH:** We could say that A needs to be there by law, but we don't recommend.

>> **SHEA:** So, it's my understanding they are not asking for a recommendation on an alternative as much as they are asking for clarity as to whether these alternatives are sufficient or lacking. Am I wrong in that thought?

>> **BILL:** Are you asking that of Turiya.

>> **SHEA:** I'm asking the committee, but if Turiya wants to time and I'm not opposed to hearing her opinion. I like hearing her opinion.

>> **ARTEMISIA:** I think it is useful to recommend this much is you feel comfortable so if you want to start with, A, C, and D or whichever ones you want to pick you are correct A is going to have to be there, but if you all agree that A is probably not going to be the thing and you have a reason, you should say so. You should ask yourself why we are in a planning process if A would really work.

>> **SCOTT:** That's a good question.

>> **ARTEMISIA:** I highly recommend that you all be sure, some indicated a moment ago that they didn't have the alternatives right in front of them and I have read some things that maybe not everybody is 100 percent clear. Certainly, look at those before you put your vote in. Pull it up on your screen.



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

>> **BILL:** Any additional comments, I know there are hands up and I don't know whether you left them up. Shea? Scott?

>> **SCOTT:** That was human error. You guys have heard me on this.

>> **BILL:** Sarah, do you want to say something?

>> **SARAH:** Yes. So, I guess as far as getting consensus I thought originally when Turiya was making comments that are soliciting feedback from the group that we could provide a diverse perspective on each, but it sounds like we can do that, but what they are really looking for is consensus directive from this group which we might not get today. I put my opinion in the chat that I support alternative D because it supports the purpose and need and is capable of (mumbling) and you all saw that; right? And A, B, C don't do that, and E is restrictive as we have been talking about. I think it is hard to recommend what is right in front of us as you directed us back there because for me representing the conservation I have to take the take the position I think we all need to do this because legally we need to meet the requirements of the proclamation as well as the criteria and order to do that the way that does exist right now legally, they don't do that.

Whatever we put forward well need to do that, right? I think what we had talked about doing before it was kind of coming up with a recommendation that addresses that issue, but I don't as it stands now, if we are going to put forth holistically 100 percent, I don't think we can do that with A, B, C. I am sticking with D personally.

I would like to ask Adé a question and a point of clarification. In one of your earlier statements did you say we didn't necessarily have to move forward with a vote.

>> **ADÉ:** You need to come to a consensus through a majority vote on what the additional recommendation from the MAC is. And I apologize because I've got hearing issues and your vocal kind of comes across a little so we would have to have a vote.

You need to have a vote there needs to be a consensus.

>> **SCOTT:** Not necessarily today.

>> **ADÉ:** If we have talked about timelines and schedules, we've talked about how we have included cooperating agencies and their input as we move through this planning process but recognizing those deadlines and timelines for the MAC to put forward for the BLM to consider and having applied, we need to have that now because we are going to continue to move forward in the planning process with this recommendation. By December we are going to be further through the planning process.

>> **SHEA:** That is so unfair of the BLM to ask us to recommend an alternative when the only



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

alternatives which we can see the actual language is A because it exists. I would not recommend an alternative today because we don't know what they are. We don't have any idea what they are. There is no language yet.

>> I guess recommendation is a little strong. It's more support that there is a preliminary range of alternatives that have been provided in a summarized nature that will then led us into developing an official range.

>> **ADÉ:** We are looking for key things that we have missed the things that we have talked about so if you say overall the MAC supports the BLM range of alternatives recognizing that we need to have a range that will then become narrow down as we continue through this planning process.

>> **SHEA:** I can get behind that whether we think this range is sufficient.

>> **BILL:** Harry, do you want to make a comment.

>> **HARRY:** Yes, let me suggest that it is 4:30 on the agenda that is what we said we would be ending this meeting, but we can go beyond that, not to keep us here all night what I was going to suggest is that we try to wrap this up by 5:00. If you guys can take what Ade just said looking at the preliminary ideas to see if we can come to some consensus in the next 30 census and by 5:00 we have something from you that would be helpful.

Okay personally I can't go beyond five because I have another meeting this evening that I must attend so I would appreciate it if we could get it done.

I would like to do that rather than walk away and not have something solid from the MAC.

>> **SCOTT:** You know I sort of object to this, Harry, in a way I you know he his lawyer, a lot of people I've been in a place where you're trying to close a deal, and someone says it's my way or the highway. You've got to do it right now, and we're never going to come back and get a chance to do this. My reaction in those conditions has always been to say heads to the doorway.

And so, I really think when I took from it, what did they had the same minute ago as well? If we delay this, maybe it'll come into the process late. Maybe it won't Come in in the ideal time. Maybe it won't be perfect for the purposes of the BLM. But frankly, it might be perfect for the integrity of this committee to make sure that whatever we've done has had a chance to really be fully considered and vetted by the people who are volunteering their time and attention here so frankly. I'm with Shae. I think I'd say that way things stand right now. I would not be prepared to support the motion, to adopt a preference of any kind.

>> **HARRY:** By the people who are volunteering their time and attention here so frankly. I'm with Shae.



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

I think I'd say that way things stand right now. I would not be prepared to support the motion, to adopt a preference of any kind.

>> **BILL:** Okay, let me get you. You have a comment.

>> **SHEA:** I would say what I would be comfortable with today, and maybe Scott is on the same page as me. Maybe he's not, but I would be comfortable, recommending that the existing range of alternatives right. We believe it to be a good range of alternatives with recognizing that these, and then let's see if we can put a list together, six or seven, or whatever that number is. These things should also be included in this range. These are some things that are not included in the range that we'd like to see added to the range and you know, and that that point we're comfortable with the range of alternatives that I'm comfortable with what I'm. What I'm not comfortable with is saying that the committee recommends alternative be, or the committee supports alternative be, or something like that.

>> **SCOTT:** Just put in that placeholder and say, you come, you got it up. You've got enough ground covered here to cover everything, and there'll be your committee if it's so interesting to find a time later.

>> **HARRY:** And Bill, might I suggest, as we're talking right now that that somebody is writing this down so that we have something solid and can be read back. And people agree with it.

>> **SARAH:** So, we're basically saying, we're landing with a through E, and we will work on other things later. Is that what I'm hearing?

>> **BILL:** Hold on just a minute. I hope that David Hercher can write these things down because I can't write and try to coordinate everybody at the same time and participate. So, David, I hope you can capture these things what I'm hearing again, is, it's? And we must have a legally, but it's an A. Through D range with a list of modifications potentially. Is that what I'm hearing?

>> **SHEA:** I heard A through E as in elephant.

>> **SARAH:** Yeah, I think what we went back to here is the full range. Um! So, I think that that seems to be uh where we landed, and then we will kind of, and I think that's what we were going to do when she and I were going to work on something, but we decided to try to have an action today. Um, because they said we need to vote, and maybe the vote is we are going to go, you know, stick with the full range, and then make other recommendations in the future.

>> **SHEA:** So, Scott, I'm comfortable with what you said. I think that's good. I don't know that it's much help to the BLM Um! Is there any addendum that everybody here is in agreement with?

>> **SCOTT:** yeah, I that just starts down that same road you and I could, if we were having a beer. You and I could agree on what to put in the agenda about roads and closures and stuff, but we're not going to



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

be able to figure it out on the next fifteen minutes on this call.

>> **SHEA:** So, I agree, and so maybe we recommend that and I'm thinking out loud, so please don't ridicule me here. But maybe what we recommend is that the existing range of alternatives is a good start but it's lacking in I don't know how to say that the right way. There are things that I am wrong with, that I feel like there are things that we have. The we in the committee believe ought to be analyzed in this range of alternative. They're not there, are they? But it feels that way.

>> **SCOTT:** My specific set of interests. And if I was drafting an addendum I'd probably put in a couple or three of those as well. So, it's right. Once I can. I think we I get the sense I could say, here is, here's a potential motion on hypothetical motion.

The motion is that we communicate a statement to the BLM. That we find the range of alternatives described in the AMS is an acceptable starting place for analysis, this recommendation being subject to future amendment by the committee. Just leave it at that. If we're going to do anything today. Frankly, I mean, I'm okay with not doing anything. But it's going to do something, I think. But we could. All sounds like we might all be able to live with that sort of very broad statement, and not and I can see It's not going to be terribly useful to the BLM. But again. I'm still sort of like same where this is the blame for that. In a way it doesn't lie with anybody, because the schedule is determined by others. But I don't think you know.

It's not fair to ask all of us to come up with that kind of detailed suggestion in this particular setting. I mean we could have another meeting. We could have as many meetings as we want. Let's have a meeting day after tomorrow or next.

>> **BILL:** You need to write that down. The simple motion you just made.

>> **DAVID H.:** I have the existing range of alternatives described in the AMS as an acceptable starting point for the BLM.

>> **SARAH:** Whatever we come up with officially, you know. Maybe on the road it must legally sort of address. That issue of this is legal, as it relates to the proclamation. And I think we're considering options right now that don't meet that very basic threshold, so it will have to be. You know.

>> **SCOTT:** Well, that's where the amendments come in the BLM. Granted they're not taking a big step with what we're suggesting right now. But we're not going to quit working on this. We've got another meeting set in two months. Well, at least it's made some progress. I think we could all come back in December with the much more specific and concise level of the addendum we'd like to see added, and we can make our first adjustment or amendment to the recommendation of that time. I think that makes a lot of sense.



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

>> **BILL:** I'm going to ask Scott to make the motion and we'll take a vote on that motion. So, the discussion is over on the range of possibilities. And, Scott, I'm going to go to you to make a specific motion that we can advance.

>> **SCOTT:** I'm going to try and go slow here so that Dave, you can get it, and I don't look like an idiot as I try and make it up right here.

The motion I propose my motion that this committee communicate to the BLM the statement that is approved of the range of alternatives described in the analysis of the management situation in Chapter seven of the AMS subject to subject to future amendment by this committee.

>> **DAVID H.:** Motion – I propose this committee communicate to the BLM a statement that approves the range of alternatives outlined in Chapter 7 of the AMS, subject to future amendment by this committee.

>> **SHEA:** So, can I make. Can I make one suggestion?

>> **HARRY:** I wonder we've talked about. Maybe that communication needs to describe that some being helpful or not, I think, Scott. I'm sorry. Shae, go ahead.

>> **SHEA:** I don't want to overstep here. But can we, somehow, in that communication that it's a good starting point. I like that language, but we plan to add things that need to be analysis. Analyze, and it's probably fine how it is. I'm probably overthinking it. Let's just go for it.

>> **BILL:** Okay, the motion's been made. Little bit of discussion any more discussion, or I'll call for a vote.

>> **JOEL:** Yeah. Sorry. I guess I want to ask. I worry that this isn't very helpful or constructive. Could somebody remind me why we can't also recommend that E be dropped, and that the BLM focus on fleshing out B C and D.

>> **BILL:** That's where I'm at. I mean, I would like to see E eliminated.

>> **JOEL:** But I think there are reasons why people want to keep E and we have to keep a for legal E. But I like to hear what the reason is.

>> **SHEA:** So, can I? Can I maybe suggest why we can be, and I know I probably hate E at least as much as most people. I think that when it's a defense against just one of one of the requirements, and I think if we eliminate alternatives that are that are maybe technically legal, that that we then run a risk of : of not complying, or the monument runs a list of not complained with their mandate to have a full range of alternatives. So, I think it's important to have something like that sets that sideboard. If this is kind of



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

the full range. But I may be overstepping that. That that's my understanding of the law, and why? I think it might be valuable to keep the ...

>> Overlapping speakers.

>> **SARAH:** because but then it's the only legal ones are D and E. I mean, if you're going to look at confined with uh ...

>> **SHEA:** and it's probably not the right time to have that conversation. But I think a lot of the existing prescriptions on the monument protect the monument. Objects like they like. They're legally required to be protected. But again, that's you know. It's probably a conversation for another time.

>> **SCOTT:** You know we've got a motion in front of the committee. I, David's read it out accurately, I think. I guess with those guys you should either close the discussion or call for a vote, even if it gets turned down. So, we've got a record of how that phone is gone, and then we can consider another motion That's Shae or anybody else wants to.

>> **BILL:** Okay, we'll do that. We'll close the discussion, and I'm going to call for a vote, again. It's going to be done alphabetically. So, Sarah Bauman.

>> **SARAH:** Yes

>> **SCOTT:** Yes

>> **BILL:** Yes

>>**LANSE:** Absent (did not vote)

>> **ANDY:** YES

>> **JACQUALINE:** Yes

>> **SHEA:** Yes

>> **DREW:** Yes

>> **JOEL:** Yeah

>> **HANK:** I will vote opposite of opposing. No.

>> **DAVID T.:** No



Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Advisory Committee Zoom Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 18, 2022, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

>> **STEPHEN:** No

>> **BILL:** Okay. We have one missing. So, it's seven votes, yes, and four votes, no. So, the motion passes.

>> **HARRY:** I appreciate all of you for what we're able to get done today. I want you to know that we don't like moving at this rate as well. Uh, I feel like under our previous planning effort. We moved fast under the current planning effort. We're moving fast, and so, I apologize for that. I can't do anything about it. But thank you, all of you, for what you're able to do today.

I have a high degree of respect for all of you, particularly for hanging with us and trying to get this done; but I feel, and I hear your pain.

Tomorrow I'm in. I'm involved in the rack meeting, and the Greg had sent me a chat or state director and said, maybe tomorrow you can let people know how the meeting went, and I think I do want to portray that this speed which we're moving is making things a little complicated. So, thank you.

>> **BILL:** I'd like to thank everybody. I think we had a very productive meeting. I think we're building a relationship which hopefully can lead to consensus. Motion to adjourn.

-END-