



# Bears Ears National Monument

## Monument Advisory Committee Meeting Notes

---

**Wed., Dec. 7, 2022, 8:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.**

### Meeting format: Zoom

### In Attendance:

Monument Advisory Committee Members: Brooks Britt, Denyce White, Kelly Pehrson, Emilee Helton, Chris Kramb, Zeb Dalton, Even Tallman, Angelo Baca, Mark Boshell, and Adam Redd attended the meeting. Davina Smith and Regina Lopez-Whiteskunk were not able attend.

BLM/USFS: Jared Lundell (BLM), Michael Engelhart (USDA FS), Jake Palma (BLM), Emilee Helton (BLM), Jill Stephenson (BLM), Chris Kramb (USDA FS), Nicollee Gaddis-Wyatt (BLM), Orlando Cortez (USDA FS) and Rachel Wootton (BLM)

Other: Lt. Governor Carlton Bowekaty (Bears Ears Commissioner and Lt. Governor of Pueblo of Zuni) and Hillary Hoffman (Bears Ears Commission Staff)

Public/Media: There were about 43 concurrent viewers including members of the public, non-governmental organizations and educational institutions, but more individuals joined and left throughout the day.

There was no quorum during the meeting, so no formal recommendations were provided.

### Agenda:

TIME	TOPIC	PRESENTER
8:00 a.m.	Meeting logistics	<b>Rachel Wootton</b> – BLM Public Affairs Officer
8:15 a.m.	Welcome	<b>Nicollee Gaddis-Wyatt</b> – BLM Canyon Country District Manager <b>Michael Engelhart</b> – USDA Manti-La Sal National Forest Supervisor
8:30 a.m.	Overview of Federal Government/Bears Ears Commission Collaboration	<b>Jared Lundell</b> – BLM Bears Ears National Monument Manager <b>Commission Representative</b>

9 a.m.	MAC Overview Discuss previous meetings and committee work/review agenda	<b>Rachel Wootton</b> – BLM Public Affairs Officer <b>Regina Lopez-Whiteskunk</b> - MAC Chair
9:20 a.m.	Break	
9:30 a.m.	Planning overview: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Scoping Preliminary Findings Presentation</li> <li>- Assessment of Management Situation Overview</li> </ul>	Emilee Helton, Jared Lundell, Michael Engelhart, and Chris Krumb - <b>BLM and USDA FS Staff</b>
9:45 a.m.	Discuss potential alternatives elements that would inform the Resource Management Plan	Emilee Helton, Jared Lundell, Michael Engelhart, and Chris Krumb - <b>BLM and USDA FS Staff</b>
12:00 p.m.	Lunch	
1:30 p.m.	Public comment period	Members of the public (sign up will be provided for those interested in providing oral comments)
2:15 p.m.	Discussion/consideration of public comments	<b>MAC Chair</b>
2:30 p.m.	Break	
2:45 p.m.	Final thoughts/wrap up <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other MAC member discussion topics</li> <li>• Dates and topics for next meeting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Discuss June field trip meeting</li> <li>○ Discuss late summer planning-focused meeting</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<b>Regina Lopez-Whiteskunk</b> - MAC Chair <b>Rachel Wootton</b> - BLM Public Affairs Officer <b>Nicollee Gaddis-Wyatt</b> – BLM Canyon Country District Manager <b>Michael Engelhart</b> – USDA Manti-La Sal National Forest Supervisor
3:00 p.m.	Adjourn	All

**8:00 am – Meeting Logistics**

Rachel Wootton - Quick technical support housekeeping items. Panelists and attendees have different platform views. Let her know if you have audio issues. Can call in if internet audio is not working. Can chime in or use raise hand. Public comment period starts at 12:30.

Regina is not able to join us today because she is traveling in bad weather. Denyce was able to join today but is having some technical issues this morning with her Wi-Fi, so she may go in and out. Would anyone on the MAC like to fill in on the chair capacity today to keep us moving? Without a quorum today, we won't be able to have votes on recommendations. In the past, we have made recommendations to consider in the future. Need 9 members of the MAC to have a quorum. Angelo Baca will step in where Denyce cannot help out.

Quick introductions of MAC member and agency staff that are present. MAC members: Angelo Baca, Denyce White, Eve Tallman, Kelly Pehrson, Brooks Britt, Mark Boshell. Agency: Hillary Hoffman (BEC/BEITC), Michael Engelhart (USFS), Nicolle Gaddis-Wyatt (BLM), Emilee Helton (BLM), Chris Kramb (USFS), Orlando Cortez (USFS), Jared Lundell (BLM), Jill Stephenson (BLM)

### **8:15 am – Leadership Welcome**

Greg Sheehan – Welcomes all those that serve on the MAC. We last met September 13. It's good to see you again and talk a little bit more about the monument and in this case, planning in the monument. We have about 17 attendees right now. Later today there will be opportunity for public comment. I would like to remind you all that a lot that will be discussed today will be the planning effort. Later today, some may want to comment in the comment period about what you have heard or general thoughts. This is important to make sure that this is a listening body. If you have formal comments, make those through our various comment periods. Scoping period has passed, but later in the spring the draft will be out on the street and offer an opportunity for comment. Use those formal methods for comments. I would like to thank those that have been working, the BEC and Hillary Hoffman, our team, Nicolle Gaddis-Wyatt, Jake Palma, Michael Engelhart, and Jared Lundell. There is a lot of work that goes into these plans. We still have a way to go, targeting to get that done by mid-2024, but that will be discussed later on. I want to wish you all a happy holidays. I hope you all stay safe, and your families can spend time together. Back to Rachel.

Michael Engelhart – Thank you to the MAC members for being here and welcome from the Forest Service. A lot of work is right. I speak for myself, and leaders involved, our best days have been these wonderful forums where we can listen to the MAC, the Cooperating Agencies, the consulting parties, visiting Tribal Nations. Getting information that is affecting the planning process. Allowing us to be careful and considerate in moving forward with the management of the BENM. Thank you to the public for being here as well and having your perspective heard. It helps the planning process, and this engagement is needed and

appreciated. I hope we provide a forum and place for you to be more involved and have questions answered. Looking forward to another wonderful day.

Nicollee Gaddis-Wyatt – Thank you to everyone for being here and we look forward to hearing your input.

### **8:30 am – Overview of Bears Ears Commission**

Jared Lundell – Today we want to start out with a quick overview of the BEC. Proclamation 10285 set up this committee and also the Bears Ears Commission with the 5 Tribes. Hillary is here as a representative from the BEC staff. You can find the cooperative agreement on our website, and it set forward our agreement about our relationship and how we are working together. We are meeting almost weekly at this point, but also have biweekly meetings to specifically go over planning.

Hillary Hoffman – As Jared mentioned, the Obama and Biden proclamations and the cooperative agreement signed, requires the parties to have ongoing and meaningful collaboration on management and planning. We had planned for our co-chairs to be here today, but both were unable to make it due to conflicts in their schedules. I can say on their behalf that the BEC appreciates the agencies efforts on engagement. Engagement happens on multiple levels and happens frequently. BEC tribes have developed their own management plan and it is available the website. The mission of the commission and coalition is to offer and hopefully integrate in collaboration with the agencies as much of that plan is possible in the broader monument management plant. Can speak for the co-chairs their appreciation in invitation to these meeting.

Michael Engelhart – We do get a lot of questions about our relationship with the BEC and how that is operating, so we hope that with Hillary here, you get a bit of insight on how that is working. If there are any questions from the MAC about this relationship, please let us know throughout the day.

Hillary Hoffman – In addition to meetings, the agencies and commission have been engaged in exchanging documents. The Tribe's land management plan isn't the only thing that has been exchanged. The agencies have also shared planning documents with the BEC. There has been exchanges both ways in collaboration.

Question about coalition vs. commission

Hillary Hoffman – The Coalition started as an advocacy group. The Biden proclamation brought up the commission again and asked the coalition to serve as the staff for the commission until the Tribes determine how to and whether to independently staff the commission. They are two separate groups but serve very closely together.

Mark Boshell – Is it safe to say that the commission has given their duties over to the coalition?

Hillary Hoffman – No, the commissioners now are my bosses, they are the leadership of the coalition. They serve as commissioners and coalition leaders, and they direct us and tell us what to do. We facilitate and schedule meetings with the agencies, ensure they can travel to meetings, takes notes at the meetings, and work with tribal governments to ensure they have support they need to send staff.

Adam Redd arrived in person – Grew up in Canyonlands and lives in Monticello and represent the business owners in Monticello.

### **9:00 am – MAC Overview**

Rachel Wootton – Is there anything that Angelo (in the absence of Regina) and Denyce would like to share right now as a committee?

Angelo Baca – Hopeful that Denyce will be able to chime in. In general, most of the concerns, issues, management concepts that we have been wrestling with have been tackled in a document that has been collected as a third-party source that the federal agencies are working with. Our feedback has been collected and hopefully some of these issues will be discussed in length as we move along. The challenge now is getting a quorum with the pandemic and the weather. Challenges getting issues officially documented for the MAC. We have been moving along in this process even with these challenges.

Rachel Wootton – That was a good overview, thank you for that. I will also welcome other MAC members to share your thoughts as well. I was going to go over some of the things you discussed in the last meeting and an overview of our website and MAC administration topics. In our last meeting, we mainly focused on planning and potential issues on the management plan. We welcome recommendations when we have quorums, and we appreciate the input that you all provide for planning and even outside of planning and listening to different perspectives and backgrounds. Thank you for that. If other members would like to chime in about contributions, feel free.

Mark Boshell – Wondering if we could get a bit more information or background about how the BLM and USFS are working with the BEC?

Michael Engelhart – I think what is interesting about our continued work with the BEC, we strive for a free and open sharing of perspectives from both sides. Trying to create an open dialogue. Goal is to have ground level involvement whether it is project level or planning level. That open exchange is the only way that a federal agency can incorporate the traditional knowledge and expertise that is stated in the proclamation. Ground level

involvement is necessary in all levels of management, not just planning, it is also implementation level involvement. From a practical sense we go back and forth about all sorts of things all the time. Shared management relationship in a practical sense. Using the coalition staff to bring things to the attention of the commissioners.

Jared Lundell – Specific example, a few months ago we had members of the commission and staff out to Arch Canyon great house with Tribal youth. Those are some of the day-to-day activities. Along with those weekly and biweekly meetings and regular communication with coalition staff.

Hillary Hoffman – The coalition had asked what sites might be good for stabilization and restoration and coalition and agencies worked together to make that trip happen. Great example of something on the ground. It is also a lot of meetings and coalition staff assisting commissioners

Eve Tallman – Updates on new members?

Rachel Wootton – Still working through nominations that were received in March. Nominations go through a review process with BLM, DOI, and appointments come from the secretary. We are currently working through this process. MAC Meeting website <https://www.blm.gov/get-involved/rac-near-you/utah/benm-mac> shared. On this website, we post meeting notices, agendas, and notes. Also, resources for the committee and the public. Related to Eve's question, there is a list of committee members and look forward to new members, hopefully soon. Would also like to talk about what is next for the advisory committee. This is our last meeting that has been scheduled in the federal register. We would like to speak with you later in the day about recommendations for future meetings. Possibly a late spring field day. Think about what you think might make sense for the committee. Also going to share that Regina and Denyce stepped up to be our interim chair and vice chair until this meeting. We will be looking to you all for future Chair and vice chair positions. Unless anyone has questions for me about these things, we will have a break next, then a more in-depth conversation about planning.

Rachel Wootton – We did have the Lt. Governor from Zuni arrive and we want to welcome him and see if there is anything that he would like to share with the MAC.

Hillary Hoffman – Carleton Bowekaty is the Lt. Governor from the Zuni Tribe and the co-chair of the commission. Would be great to hear from him about the collaboration with the Tribes so far if possible.

Lt. Governor Bowekaty – Appreciate the invitation to be here. I have been in the weeds with alternatives with the agencies. Meeting will help the agencies align traditional cultural knowledge with. As Tribes, we often ask for collaborative management and that involves getting past initial statements and understanding regulation etc. At the same time, we're helping the agencies understand. We often have very strong feelings toward the landscape,

and it is hard for governments to interpret that into something our people can understand. Also making sure the agencies understand how important this is and aligning our values in the regulatory process. Appreciate the work that has gone on behind the scenes. Jake and Michael have been very helpful. Made it to the public scoping meeting in Albuquerque. One of our goals was to have our youth involved on the landscape. Last month we finished a fence removal project in Arch Canyon. People that worked on the project said the landscape felt a little freer. Three years of planning turned out to be a few hours of labor because of how many hands were able to join. Work went so well; we were able to interact with the landscape with our younger generations and share what the landscape meant to each tribal nation. We came to better understanding. Really good to see the younger generation interaction and hopefully one day they will also be involved. Good to see members of the MAC and folks we have visited with recently. Angelo, thanks for coming by Zuni. We will share the firewood project with the council and the commission. Want to make sure we are taking into consideration all of the voices. Those in support, but also those opposing so we can come to a better understanding of what the landscape means to all of us.

Denyce White – I am Denyce White; I am a MAC member sitting on the developed recreation seat. I am the interim vice chair. Thank you for the MAC members and Angelo for filling in. I think we are good to move ahead to planning updates.

#### **9:45 am – Planning Overview**

Jared Lundell – Want to go over where we are in the planning process, take a look at our timeline, scoping, the AMS, themes for preliminary alternatives. Feel free to MAC members to speak up with questions as needed.

- Timeline slide. NOI issued, public scoping period, draft RMP/EIS, proposed RMP/Final EIS, approved RMP/ROD. Had a number of public scoping meetings, online and in the area in person regionally.
- Preliminary list of resources from scoping. Issues raised about cultural resources. Many comments received about livestock grazing. We received many comments about different recreation topics. We received comments about travel management and listed specific routes, which we will not do as a part of the planning process here. We will instead look at area designations, but not specific routes. Some comments about wildlife and conflicts with human presence as well.

Michael Engelhart – Heard a lot about recreation and grazing particularly and heard a wide spectrum from the public. For motorized use as an example, some wanted to protect objects and values and have less motorized use, and some wanted to have more motorized use. We heard a wide range on many topics. Nothing was a big surprise but heard a wide range of opinions of topics. Also try to keep in mind as we receive these comments, want the MAC to consider that livestock and recreation are not currently objects of the monument. Keep that in mind to help MAC member recognize that as they consider these issues.

Angelo Baca – Question about folks raising questions about livestock grazing within the monument. How might that be related to water and digging more wells? That’s been a concern over and over with many groups. Has it come up? Getting other sources of water for cattle?

Jared Lundell – Yes, there were specific comments about that. That has also come up with the commission. The plan won’t cover specific implementation projects about putting wells in, but it could consider broad management. The range of alternatives might consider no wells, or only having wells in certain places. We have certainly had conversation about this though.

Michael Engelhart – Hard to keep all of the comments straight, but yes, we have heard perspectives from a few different directions about wells and livestock infrastructure. I would describe those comments as fairly detailed and specific from both sides/ multiple perspectives. We have heard that discussion and continue to weigh in developing alternatives. This is an issue being brought up and something we want to place in a range of alternatives so we can more effectively analyze and envision a monument that continues livestock grazing, but how? And are there limitation in the plan on livestock infrastructure including wells. What guidance can we receive related to traditional cultural knowledge and water. Need the BEC and MAC to consider and help guide us in this process as well. We also need a good range to analyze

Mark Boshell – From the state, we talked about water developments. Want to make a point that some people have the perspective that range infrastructure and water development can promote protection of monument objects by keeping cows away from certain areas. There may be ways to use this infrastructure to protect.

Michael Engelhart – Thanks Mark, that is an important perspective. If you look at the LMP provided, the complex issue is being seen through a realistic lens and perhaps a lens of retaining those tools and using infrastructure to enhance, protect monument objects. Important for us to have practical, open minded conversations about livestock infrastructure. Allotments on the landscape have been there for decades and may have opportunities to enhance. Tribal nations are permittee holders and long-standing community members. Really encourage everyone to elevate our discussion around livestock infrastructure and water and go through a concerted analysis of what it means to protect and enhance those monument objects and values. We always see a lot of people that care about complex issues and elevating that discussion will let us have better alternatives. How to elevate voices speaking about implementation level projects to where it needs to be into planning level language and alternative development.

Jared Lundell – Certainly a tool in the toolbox to help spread out cattle. It is not an object and value, but it is an allowed use in our plans.

- Analysis of the management situation slide. Document was published and looks at current management on the landscape and has a preliminary range of alternatives.



Michael Engelhart – In receiving comments from several organizations and individuals, I want to say thank you. We received a lot of thoughtful comments from folks who dove into the AMS and provided a good perspective. Hoping that talking about the AMS and preliminary alternatives will be a springboard for the MAC conversations. Want to hear from the MAC and the public, where have we missed the mark? What may be missing from these alternatives or ideas for new alternatives.

Jared Lundell – Will move through the themes for our preliminary alternatives.

Angelo Baca – I did send additional information to everyone on the MAC about the firewood research that Carleton alluded to. I think it is a good example of traditional knowledge and western science. The idea we are trying to drive toward is that we are trying to improve co management with good information. As the process moves along, we could hopefully integrate some of that into the management, particularly firewood management. Of course, that is only one thing on a complex landscape in BENM. Things that we do have good information on, hopefully we can fold that into conversations in the future. I know we are on a schedule, but reality is that we have as much information out there that we can utilize for the best management as possible for the landscape. Happy to answer any questions about that.

Rachel Wootton – Quick question for you, do you want to share with members of the public as well?

Angelo Baca – Yes, we are ready to share that information publicly and transparently. We have the permission of the researchers.

Rachel Wootton – Members of the public can email Rachel Wootton for a copy.

Jared Lundell – Thank you for sharing that, Angelo, we have been keeping track of that research as well.

- Range of alternatives. Must consider a range of alternatives with some caveats, must be a part of the purpose and need (protect, enhance and restore monument objects and values) and must be technically and economically feasible. Will explore and evaluate any reasonable alternatives and do analysis on those. Preliminary alternatives published in AMS

Michael Engelhart – At this point, we are not to the evaluating stage, so we are developing alternatives that address the purpose and need and must also remember to make sure they are feasible. We need to make sure that we have addressed the entire range as well. Preliminary alternatives from the AMS still have a lot to flesh out and that is what we are working on doing now. Trying to flesh out our ideas and themes and approaches to management. That is where you all can help today. Anyone involved in helping us making the alternatives, our first questions are is it meeting purpose and need and is it feasible.

Jared Lundell – First place we start is where current management is.

- No action alternative. Represents the existing management and current plans. Looking to improve on the previous plans and find out how to best management monument objects and values going into the future.

Michael Engelhart – We also want to add that we are working on Forest plan revision, but since it is not final, we still rely on our older plan. We have learned a lot from Tribal Nations and other agencies in our Forest Plan Revision process. Some of our discussions around Forest Plan revision have helped us as an agency develop a reasonable range of alternatives, but that is why you are not seeing anything here about our new plan. It is just not the current management even though it is being carefully considered and incorporated into alternative development in the monument.

Jared Lundell – Any questions about these previous plans or on this topic?

- Management common to all alternatives. Much of what this will include is collaboration with the BEC. Other things will be interpretation, incorporation of Traditional Indigenous Knowledge, etc. Will also see goals and objectives about how we want to manage different resources. They will stem from existing law, policy, regulation, as well as the proclamation.
- Alternative B. Specific alternative themes for the preliminary alternatives. Prescriptive for recreational uses. Direct or heavy-handed management for recreation. May include more infrastructure in certain areas. Specifically guiding for more facilities and might have more recreation management zones and areas that guide our recreational users and guide management of those areas. Might do something proactive for grazing which could be more infrastructure to move livestock out of riparian areas. Could include livestock management that would help protect cultural resources through infrastructure. Something might be putting buck and rail on an alcove to protect monument objects and values. Might also consider areas unavailable to grazing. Vegetation under this alternative might include use of all available tools like mastication of trees, hand thinning, etc. Would help us proactively manage toward protecting monument objects and values.

Michael Engelhart – Just as a reminder as we go through these. There are elements of B that can look like heavy handed management, direct management, all the tools. Want to make sure that we remind ourselves that based on management common to all, often when we look at analyzing vegetation with all tools available, but also must incorporate traditional cultural knowledge, etc. from the previous slide. Contextualize all of these alternatives in that light. Recreation is not an object, but it is a heavy use on the monument. Recreation is a growing activity in the west. We need to contextualize it as not an object.

Jared Lundell – Thoughts and discussion around proactive, heavy-handed approach to protect monument objects and values? If it is helpful, you can think of project level, and we can work to elevate it to the project level.

Angelo Baca – Could you expand on facilities that might be developed under alternative B?

Jared Lundell – There is an idea of focal areas, and we might emphasize that under this alternative. On our landscapes, dispersed recreation is generally allowed. You can hike anywhere without limits unless we specifically restrict. We do have permits in some areas. Those would be things we would contemplate. Under this alternative we might focus on focal areas. Mule Canyon village has been restored and has interpretation. Something we would not necessarily want to continue today without input from BEC. Makes people spend time at a place that can handle more people rather than places further in the backcountry. Those places we would improve facilities and might think about if there are other places that should be included. Would want to work with Tribal Nations and the BEC. The Butler Wash developed site is an example. Folks go to an overlook and that may be a good place to add some facilities. Might mark a trailhead for a less developed site under this alternative. Would guide visitors to certain places, but perhaps keep visitation lower at other places.

Michael Engelhart – Has heard some positive aspects of this approach, but some people have pointed out that then you are attracting people to some places. There is a tradeoff here in any built environment.

Angelo Baca – I would agree with that, especially in areas that may not need hardening or would be preferred to not have it. I also understand that some places would benefit from that. That is a definite consideration. Helpful and useful for everyone to get expanded views on facilities developed in these areas.

Jared Lundell – Any further discussion around this alternative and what it may look like? Alternative C. Emphasis on protection on intact landscapes while allowing uses in zones. Zones are a concept we are toying with. An example of existing is that we have the Trail of the Ancients RMZ (may consider changing the name) and has management related to it being in the front country and seeing a lot of users. For vegetation, may consider using all tools in certain zones or only hand thinning in certain zones.

Michael Engelhart – The concept of taking a zonal approach is another good lens to look through to see what we can do. We have a wide variety of allowable uses. Zonal approaches serve as a way to take one approach in some areas and have different approaches in other areas. I think this alternative has already been a useful tool to look at a moderation of approaches. This alternative is spurring conversations that need to happen and have been useful. Conceptualization of the zones is still in development. Regardless of what the zones look like, the space to have the conversation is being created by this alternative.

Eve Tallman – Question about alternative C, it sounds like the zones are in draft form. Can we learn more about those draft areas? At what point will MAC member learn about those draft areas?

Michael Engelhart – One of the things that might drive zones is our known or perceived knowledge of how people are utilizing and accessing landscapes. It can be looked at using recreation opportunity spectrum or backcountry front country. What is easily accessible, hike able, etc. and what is not so accessible. Also looking at the condition of the landscape and resiliency. We have also talked about traditional cultural use and how that could affect a zonal approach. A lot has to do with current or foreseeable use of the landscape and draw some boundaries that way. Also looking at effects we know. What do we know about trail use when it is close to a community vs. far away. The best I can say is the approach is an amalgam of that information and trying to come up with a mapped approach. Still conceptual at this point. Opportunity to get that conceptualized will probably take at least a month, maybe more. We have a working group trying to work on this.

Jared Lundell – Still working through this, for the BLM we might use recreation areas. This may be altered through the alternatives as well. Probably broad categories like Cedar Mesa, Indian Creek, etc.

Brooks Britt – Talking about largely recreation, but science will be affected by this. This allows some mechanical things that makes it rough for paleontologists to access. Might make some allowances for research.

Jared Lundell – If any MAC members have discussion about particular things like that or where zones should be, that would be great. Those are good points of discussion, so thanks for bringing it up.

Michael Engelhart – Today, the MAC can help us think about the zonal approach, but also Brooks, you bring up that there are considerations that may not be the primary driver, but could spur other conversations to help modify. Hard to envision a zonal approach that will speak to all resources, so how to we handle that?

Jared Lundell – We typically try to build some flexibility into these alternatives too where administrative use or permitted use might be possible for things like this. Other thoughts or discussion about zones?

Denyce White – Wanted to make a comment, she thinks the alternative C is interesting and taking into consideration of looking at condition and how places are being impacted and how to address and accommodate to its uses. Also, to me the foresight likes the idea of having these drive zones. Also seems like a way to keep consideration of other perspectives in these zones. While presenting these, considering indigenous perspective and uses.

Mark Boshell – Apologize I had to jump off for a few minutes if I'm redundant. There is so much wilderness in BENM and ACEC etc., I'm a bit hesitant to adopt more zoning within the plan because so much is already zoned for specific recreation use activities. Hesitant to have more primitive/backcountry zones.

Jared Lundell – The concept here too is to manage more toward specific areas. One example is Cedar Mesa and it has many uses that exist already. One area we might want to focus on is focused recreation facilities and guide visitors to places that can handle visitation like the Trail of the Ancient RMZ. Not only very protective measures but could also identify more proactive management or more allowed use areas in certain areas. Back to Denyce too, it's important to keep in mind that we want Traditional knowledge and uses throughout and thinking about how they are used across the landscape and how they might be use or not be used. Also don't want to limit traditional uses.

Michael Engelhart – Glad you brought that up about existing management Mark. Some of that will not change like congressionally designated wilderness and inventoried roadless areas. Looking for alignment with these other areas with the zones. Just wanted to let you know that is something that we are considering as agencies. Appreciate the comment.

Jared Lundell -

- Alternative D. More of a hands-off approach. Allowing for natural processes. Really limit facilities for recreation. Would still education public, but might not mark a trailhead, a more hands off approach. Minimize facilities. For vegetation might prioritize natural techniques. Might limit facilities for livestock grazing too.

Michael Engelhart – This is the more passive, light-handed management approach. Folks see this in a number of different lights. Curious as to what the MAC thinks, but to spur conversation, let's take vegetation for an example. Some folks would say natural techniques would not do enough and we might be risking objects and values. Remember management common to all, but recognize we want to leave room for monument objects and values protection.

Eve Tallman – This idea about limiting the intensity and density of recreation. That seems regressive in terms of managing the current conditions. It seems that that is a lot of palatable to work with alternative C and create zones that might have heavier use than others. Vegetation is not keeping up with the intensity of the recreation uses and cultural visitation. Vegetation just can't recover from even one set of tires going across an existing landscape for dispersed camping etc. Alt D seems like the horse is out of the barn on that one so to speak.

Denyce White – This seems like a passive approach to recreation and vegetation but also seems like something that would be in a subcategory of B. Looking at current conditions, do we limit the people coming to site? Do you put more facilities up? Not that this is bad, but this is an option that sparks more dialogue. I like what I'm reading, and I think it creates dialogue.

Jared Lundell – Heard a lot from comments, that taking this hands-off approach is in the reasonable range of alternatives. I think for a lot of people this is sort of concerning considering the amount of recreation we see on the landscape. It may not work in certain

area. All are worthwhile discussion points. Another example is the wells, under this alternative, you might not allow as many wells or any.

Michael Engelhart – Really appreciate both comments. Horse out of the barn is important. We know that you don't have to build anything, and people come anyways. On this light hand approach, we couldn't ignore that people are coming. Would it need more permits? Limitation in numbers or group sizes? I think it's important to talk about this in that context because that could have an effect on the user groups. I don't see it as positive or negative, but different approaches.

Eve Tallman – Limiting intensity and density of recreation within zones seems like the better way to focus attention in other areas. In other BLM areas where permitting is the norm, it is so intensive and not user friendly that it is almost possible that alternative D isn't viable in terms of economic and technical feasibility because of limiting recreators with a permit system monument wide seems onerous. Alternative C seems like it might handle that better. I think managing group sizes and permits would be very difficult.

Angelo Baca – My question is more about how the federal agencies see themselves in terms of capacity for executing alternative C or D very well? You would have to adjust your approaches, workloads and bandwidth. We could say one or both would be better, but what does it really look like practically? Can you pull it off?

Michael Engelhart – More specifics to discuss with each. I don't think any of these alternatives are technically infeasible at this time. We make a promise through the ROD but want to make sure we have the ability. Forest Service has added 2 law enforcement and may add a special agent next year. Also hired permanent recreation staff, 3 BENM rangers, and can hire more seasonal staff. They are the eyes and ears on the ground. We have also expanded archaeological staff. Also growing partnerships with Tribal Nations, Ancestral Lands Corps, etc.

Angelo Baca – That is helpful, like you said it is a promise to the people, but historically promises are hard to pull off, so want to make sure we're within our means.

Jared Lundell – BLM over the last few years has hired quite a few more recreation staff and I think these partnerships are also very helpful thing. From the BLM we have 2 law enforcement for the Monticello field office and 2 in Moab and a supervisory law enforcement officer. Moab helps out a lot as well. It is definitely a large area though. You bring up a valuable point though and that is something that we will think about moving forward and may limit us in some ways as far as how much we can do. Maybe further permitting is something we could consider. This is something where we could mix alternatives too. These are good questions and things we will keep in mind moving forward. Want to make sure they are feasible, but also want to think outside the box. Thinking about if things are practicable. We will definitely keep it in mind.

Michael Engelhart – One thing to highlight that in response to partnerships is also funding and making sure we aren't getting too big too fast related to funding. Don't want to over promise and under deliver.

Jared Lundell – One final slide and about 45 min until lunch. This is an open slide to dive into other topics that you might want to discuss.

Eve Tallman – Likes the suggestion of taking a break now and then coming back. A little tricky not knowing the details of the scoping comments. Without any specifics may not have much more to add to the conversation in an hour.

Jared Lundell – Final scoping report is still a few weeks out from release. Those are the public's input on things, but part of what we want to do here is take time to get the MAC's input. Take a break here and do lunch and come back at 12:45.

Denyce White – That works for me. Other comments or questions from the MAC members.

Angelo Baca – Thinks that would work. Could discuss fuels after looking at his materials too. Give folks time to gather their thoughts.

Rachel Wootton – Heard from Davina that she is sick and will not be joining us. Zeb did join us. When we come back at 12:45 we will continue this conversation. 1:15 we will begin the technical test for members of the public.

Michael Engelhart – Has a suggestion with the committee's permission. We would love to hear the voices of the MAC. With your permission we would like to allow space for a quick round robin of the committee members about their thoughts.

Denyce White – She is open to that idea.

Adam Redd – Lot of information to take in. Doesn't have the paperwork in front of him, but his view is to continue taking care of the monument, similar to how the BLM has been taking care of all the BLM land. Would like to see not a lot of restrictions, we all have our uses. Management of those uses as we go forward. Maybe hardening some of the archaeological sites more so they can stay protected. That is my view.

Eve Tallman – My hesitation to talk more is that I was hoping to be able to see that first round of comments that were from the MAC members before the scoping period. I don't think the comments were ever shared with the group, but maybe I missed that. I also printed Angelo's article about harvesting firewood, but I need time to read it more. Just the comments that you've received so far about the scoping. From here, from today, what will be this group's involvement after the consultants put together the initial scoping spreadsheet? I certainly have perspectives and opinions, but I feel like I'm speaking out of turn because I don't know what is on the table.

Michael Engelhart – Just in recognition of the committee and the planning process. Scheduling the meetings so far in advance can be difficult to fit them into meaningful parts of the planning process, so I want to acknowledge that at this stage it is hard to engage on specifics of the scoping report. At the end of the meeting, we are going to talk about our meetings going out into the new year and where we might want to have some critical conversations at an opportune time. It is hard to find that point in time for being hyper effective on the planning process itself.

Eve Tallman – It seemed like the MAC member had submitted a lot of comments in writing. If I could see those it would help inform my ability to make comments on these alternatives. We submitted comments to the contractor but haven't heard back. I would like to see the comments that were submitted. It feels like we didn't circle back on that. I don't feel like there is enough group knowledge for us to provide feedback on some of this in my view. In the last meeting, I asked questions about airspace and noise pollution, and would like to see if that's something the MAC could address.

Jared – A bit complicated as land managers because we can't adjust airspace issues for full fly overs. We can really only make changes if folks are landing in the monument. We have talked about drones some in the past and it will be addressed in the plan. It is somewhat complicated, but they have less range, so typically will need to take off or land on public land. Regarding the forms submitted to the contractor that were a part of developing the AMS. Emilee, do you know?

Emilee Helton: I pulled up the MAC website and they are included in the June notes that were published there. I will post the link in the chat in just a moment. (June meeting notes on this website: <https://www.blm.gov/get-involved/rac-near-you/utah/benm-mac>)

Angelo Baca – I think this morning's conversation was helpful. I will say however, that Eve brings up a good point, because, as we know the transitions of the Mac members mean that we don't necessarily have institutional memory that's sufficiently transferred over about some of these previous issues that have been discussed. And I feel that there is probably a little bit more opportunity for that to happen, if facilitated, right instead of this feeling of putting the cart before the horse. It's a little bit difficult to know what we're working with if one. We're kind of siloed and don't always know the concerns of other Mac members that may want to express some of their opinions here. Can we provide formal recommendations without a quorum.

Rachel Wootton – That is true, we cannot have formal recommendations, but it is still important for us to get input from the MAC.

Jared Lundell – May want to discuss some of the past meeting input at a future meeting. A reminder that previous notes are on the website. Field trip videos may also be helpful for MAC members.



Rachel Wootton – I will commit to emailing meeting notes out to people so that you know when they are finalized and out there. Something I can do to make sure you all have the information that you want.

Brooks Britt – Would like to start with the drone topic. Drones are crucial to geologic studies. Always hope to fly those, fine with needing an FAA license. Would like to be able to go out and find new sites. Archaeology is the focus of this monument, but there are known and unknown paleontology sites too. It is important for us to be able to use tools and access sites sometimes with ATVs, etc. Sometimes we need mechanical assistance to do our work. Any questions for me. It's access, ability to do the research. Has used high explosives in national parks, jack hammers, all the way down to the hand tools.

Michael Engelhart – Paleontology is listed in the proclamation, and it is an object listed in the proclamation. Also, a call to expand education. Points also apply to other academics and other allowable uses. Thank you for that much needed perspective. Good to hear what the realities of paleontology research could include.

Mark Boshell – Nothing to add. Looking forward to looking at alternatives. Would be good to see those at some point.

Angelo Baca – From the last two MAC meetings, it was sort of unclear what the process for public comment. Could we do a quick review of what is going to happen next?

Rachel Wootton – If there is time, we can also talk about the wood cutting research.

## **12:00 Lunch**

## **1:30 pm – Public Comment**

Laura W. – This is an exciting group to watch with the co-management issue. I've been enjoying the talk and noticed that a lot of people are talking about the uses. Paleo was interesting. I would like to expand a bit on the underlying natural resources that underlie these things. One thing is vegetation treatments and livestock grazing. And how the interim memo saying you need to protect and manage based on the proclamation while we are waiting for the management plan. Another thing I'm concerned about is the point about the SITLA land exchanges. Are those lands being protected now? I'm concerned about some of the wells being drilled and activities between now and when the monument plan comes into effect. Also, an expression of wondering how management now on the ground has changed. In terms of vegetation treatment and livestock grazing vs. a traditional field office.

Tim P. – I want to speak a bit about alternatives and preliminary alternatives in the AMS. I think as we all know, NEPA provides that all of these must have a no action, A. That's a

requirement of NEPA, but that alternative will not comply with the proclamation so they cannot choose it. B and C also fail to comply. Protection of the monument objects and values are the top priority. Target shooting and recreation development, vegetation management are uses that do not enhance or protect the objects and values. Important to keep in mind that everything needs to comply with proclamation. Heard negative value judgements about alternative D from agency. That it is concerning and may not work. D will probably be the most popular alternative with the public. Would encourage agency to create a reasonable D. Still a lot of concern about range improvements and wells for livestock. BLM and SITLA have proposed a lot. AMS says possible to develop additional alternatives. Would encourage agency to make the coalition plan into an alternative.

Kenneth P. – I have a concern about the SITLA lands that will be exchanged for BLM lands outside the monument. We have property in Dry Valley and from the preliminary map, there is a proposed exchange of 7 sections not far from our property. Afraid that if they put a mine in or whatever they do, it may affect our water and the value of our property. Want to know if the committee is going to address how and when all of this exchange is going to take place.

Patrick M. – I am the Vice President of CO off road trail defenders. Wanted to discuss some issues that surprisingly weren't really raised today. We have very significant concerns with alternative D especially. Pleasant surprise to see that you all have concerns as well. One aspect of that alternative was more of the wilderness emphasis. It would automatically convert LWC to areas managed for those characteristics. All of those lands would be closed to motorized use. That would wreak havoc on the road network throughout the monument. There were roads and ways, and roads were mapped as outside of wilderness characteristic areas, but ways are inside of lands with wilderness characteristics. D would result in automatically mandating closure of hundreds of roads throughout the monument. Critical connectivity to other public lands. Chicken Corners jeep trail is one of the most popular roads in Moab and the last few miles of that is in the monument. In the past the MAC has generally expressed support for keeping the roads as they are. Would close hundreds of miles of road would destroy recreational experience in the monument.

Eirene H. – I'm just going to ask for updates and clarification there was an online commentary on House on Fire proposals for roadway or some kind of infrastructure. I just wonder what came of that and also during the summer there was a public meeting addressing permit holders' requests for water wells. What has been the outcome of that? I came into the meeting late, so I didn't preview all of the alternatives. I'm speaking from that viewpoint. Then, I'm a citizen science surveyor looking at pinyon jay habitat in and around Bears Ears and I'm sure US managers are aware that their pinyon jays are in trouble. I just want to throw that out.

Meredith B. – I am with the Utah Dine Bikeyah as an office manager and every summer we do a gathering of traditional knowledge sharing. I would like to include subject matter of replanting. Would be great to have replanting in one of the proposals brought up today. Another matter I wanted to bring up is we have issues brought up to us by local ranchers

and residents. If that would be brought into the MAC's proposals. It is hard to get a hold of anyone on an emergency basis at this time. We would be in a vulnerable position to get help when we are far from towns. I wanted to know if those issues would be brought into the proposals we heard today. During individual moments of ceremony, how are those areas going to be protected when we are utilizing specific areas and specific plants to have prayers. Will they be included also in the proposal?

Kate M. – I am a researcher who has been researching with Native communities, in particular the Dine community who uses things in BENM. I work at the University of Utah on human ecology. I want to speak to the research I've been working on. I have been researching firewood. There is a document you may have seen that is a policy portfolio and research summary that represents many years of work and collaboration. This research documents how people's need for firewood is integral to cultural identity and economic solvency. Firewood is a central source of energy that people rely on above other forms. Found that firewood is a central issue for folks. Will continue to gather and have to continue. Resource will face significant changes with climate change in the coming decades. Have created projections over the coming decades. Suggest that there will be less wood in 40-80 years. Concerned for what that will mean for monument and surrounding communities.

Ashley B. – 6<sup>th</sup> year living in SE Utah. Recognizing family for Pearl Harbor Remembrance Day. Family insisted that I was born to help support our world for the health and wellness of future generations. In the foundation of the monument management, there needs to be a solid information and resource for racial discrimination prevention. In college I was a fellow and participated in social justice work. Less than 3% of BLM public lands have been surveyed for cultural resources and that said, if no one knows what this place is, how would anyone know what steps to take to prevent. I am a community journalist and I feel like it is not safe to write about BENM. Camping there and people were digging up things and I confronted them, and they said it didn't matter. Initiated my thoughts on what effective racial discrimination prevention would look like.

JoJo M. – Management partnerships for this monument from the proclamation, BEC, and MAC that they can do management in collaboration setting a large precedent. Archaeological and cultural resource management has been looking to include ecological resources. I think we should look at the boundaries of cultural versus ecological resource management with the respect of traditional ecological knowledge in future management of Bears Ears. I believe this could embolden culture, resource, policy, and mechanisms of enforcement to combine various cultural ecological protection. Could expand cultural resource policy already in place. I have learned from my work with the Navajo Nation in Glen Canyon Dam project. Would be something to consider with multiple tribes to bring in diverse knowledge of ecosystems.

Jessica W. – Current artist in residence for UDB in SLC. I am Hopi and Tewa. Raised a concern for people not realizing that they are on sacred spaces. The nature of exploring, people don't realize they're stomping around on kivas or sacred spaces. Ashley's example

was a good one. I like the idea of learning where our sacred sites are in the area. Not sure what the solution would be. At least mark it so you could reference something outside of yourself. Indigenous existence is recognizing your life. In Cedar City, Black face is shoved under the rug. Need to mark sacred sites around BENM. In the Snow Bowl incident with Hopi, they were ok with water issues and artificial snow, but they weren't happy with waste-water snow. Using unclean water on a sacred area.

Louis W. – BENM is very special. I have been guiding here since 2012. I'm an owner of Ancient Wayves. We're out here year-round on the ground and see what is needed out here. Think about how to manage this place properly. How do we take care without removing activities. Ongoing debate and conversation every time we're out there. Perspectives from all over the world with our guiding. We want our grandkids and kids to be our here and learn from this place. I simplify and go back to my native culture. We treat this area like it's a person. Keep in mind that this place has feelings. Keep it basic. Looked up monument – something set up to keep alive the memory of a person or event. Very important for everybody, everyone that leaves in the region, US, all over the world. Keep it simple, keep in mind it is here to protect this place. Some things may require a change.

Jesse W. – Wondering about the co-management with the five Tribes. The involvement with other tribes that are further away, how much information and involvement are tribes going to be involved? Tribes that are further away. The other thing, since the monument is a huge area and we have different agencies working in it, is there going to be a program or liaison that will involve the Tribes to show them the importance of BENM? Would like to see the commitment of the co-signing come to a realization that this is important, and it has culture and history and our traditional stories here at the monument.

Discussion/consideration of comments:

Denyce White – Thank you so much to the public for your comments. Quite a few things have come up and it is interesting because we did spend most of the morning on the alternatives and thank you for the reminder to be logical from the mind and speak from the heart as well. A lot of us care and want to protect BENM or we wouldn't be here.

Eve Tallman – Question is that some of the public commenters brought up issues that I'm not sure that they're in the scope of what the MAC will consider. One is the SITLA land swap will take about 10 years or so. How will the SITLA lands be managed during that period? Also, a comment was brought up about creating wells in areas that it might not be allowed in the monument. Is it business as usual? I brought up chaining and brush hogging last time, and I didn't think it was still really a thing, but it seemed more possible. What is the status quo? Are there management methodologies on hold until a new plan?

Jared Lundell – They are working on the SITLA land exchange, but I haven't heard what might be exchanged outside of BENM. Can't speak specifically. As far as timeline, no specific timeline, just called out that we will do this with the proclamation. Approvals go up

to secretary. Not something we are hugely involved with at the field office level. As far as the SITLA land that is currently in BENM, we don't manage the SITLA parcels, but we manage the land around it. Questions about the wells, we may have talked about some in the past. There are current proposals for wells in BENM in BLM lands and on some SITLA parcels. In general, part of the analysis is working to protect objects and values. The plan is still in progress, and it will set further guidelines, but we work to protect objects and values until then. Status of those projects is that we are still working on them. Have been through public comment. Still working through process.

Jacob Palma – Mark Boshell may have more to add about SITLA lands.

Mark Boshell – Exchange will happen as fast as it will happen. Lots of factors involved that is outside of our control, a congressional thing. These lands have been SITLA lands for over 100 years and most haven't had development. Doesn't expect dramatic development. Mining is not very profitable there. Wells will improve the grazing operations out there to disperse livestock and reduce impacts.

Angelo Baca – Few points for the comments. Grateful for contributions. Highest number of contributors we have had. Indigenous perspectives and discussion about alternatives has been helpful. We're looking at different ways to interpret these alternatives, but with two key things that appear to be not as clear yet, which is 1. Other comments we haven't seen, 2. How to integrate the coalitions management plan in this. Seems that it's not crystal clear yet that the discussion is wholly coherent about how indigenous perspectives with prioritized protection of objects and values are being centered. Also thinking about finer details about how to execute well. Voices here are considering similar perspectives. For us to have deeper discussions, we're not completely prepared to move on policy recommendation, nor at quorum. Think these conversations are important for educational piece. From everything that seems like specific questions to observation, help to get discussion rolling. Hillary is a fantastic addition to the MAC meeting. Huge presence for what we want to have happen in this convo.

Michael Engelhart – We also agree Hillary and Carleton's involvement is an additive value. Management actions common to all and things from the BEITC's appendix. We have been trying to pull it in, but we know there is more work to do.

Hillary Hoffman – It has been great to be here and have learned a lot. Briefly want to speak to a point Angelo made. Just to add that it is happening and it's a slow process. To make sure the right people on the Tribal side are in the room and the right people on the agency side. It has been a learning experience for all of us and bodes well for the future of collaborative management.

Jared Lundell – Always a bit abstract and not concrete and hard to deal with in that sense. Anything we can do to help provide more info. This part of the planning phase just is very

abstract. Later phases you will have more meat to chew on. It is a harder time and more about basic knowledge of working on the landscape and how it is being used.

Angelo Baca – As an option because I think we will end pretty close to time, there is availability for Kate to expand on firewood research. Option for vice chair Denyce.

## 2:45 pm – Final thoughts/wrap up

Rachel Wootton – Good opportunity to get out and build connections. We're recommending a field visit in late Spring. If you could share some thoughts about it and possibly a late summer meeting for a planning meeting.

Michael Engelhart – Open for full discussion. One of the values of managing with the MAC and the BEC. An opportunity to be on the landscape together, potential for June for more open access on USFS lands that are high. Also realizing it still needs to be a public meeting. Discussion of issues and opportunities on the landscape. First consideration for the MAC.

Jared Lundell – Keep it open, they have to be public meetings. A field visit could be helpful. Discuss things in person and on site. A few places we were thinking of on the forest and on BLM thinking of Butler wash developed site or something like that. Maybe House on Fire trailhead. Some ideas, but open to thoughts.

Denyce White – There is connectivity in Valley of the Gods.

Jared Lundell – That would also be a great option and easy to get around for a lot of folks.

Denyce White – Cell service is better than what it was before the pandemic.

Angelo Baca – Would be interested in having a site visit in the field. For it.

Rachel Wootton – Great, we can plan on having a field trip as the meeting and we can work on logistics. Any feedback on topics/ sites etc.?

Eve Tallman – Would like the staff to provide us with a short list of places of concern you would like us to see even if we go on our own. Shay Canyon could be an easy place to get to before June. Share with us a short list of places for us to go peek at.

Rachel Wootton – Does the late June timeframe generally work for everyone?

Michael Engelhart – To Eve's point, as we develop a list of sites, they may have separate topics.

Jared Lundell – Makes sense to start drafting a list of sites.

Denyce White – Would this be an opportunity to have Native indigenous guides give their perspectives?

Jared Lundell – Haven't had a field trip with the MAC yet but could look into it if the MAC would be interested, but the idea would be to get perspective from the MAC.

Rachel Wootton – We've had partners involved in meetings before. I don't know about inviting someone where compensation might be something we would have to think about. Will have to look into how we would approach that. If we have partners that have information that we would share?

Jake Palma – Could also invite park rangers that are out on the landscape every day.

Jared Lundell – Could also bring in a researcher like Kate. Could talk to the commission to see if they would provide an indigenous perspective too.

Rachel Wootton – Will send out information about proposed dates and information about the meeting. Look forward to hearing from folks their feedback. I'll be in touch relatively soon because we need 3-4 months to put meetings in the federal register. Another thing I wanted to bring up is virtual vs. in person meetings. For future meetings, do you feel like virtual is working? Would you rather do more in person? For our summer planning meeting, is virtual working or would in person be best?

Mark Boshell – Voices support for in person meetings.

Eve Tallman – I guess at the beginning of the meeting we went over a timeline. How does the timeline of the scoping process affect when you would need to talk about those elements?

Jared Lundell – Scoping would be done by then for sure, we were thinking as far as further updates for planning would be the next major milestone is the late summer timeframe. That might be the time that we can talk about actual concrete alternatives. Could contemplate an in person or virtual meeting.

Eve Tallman – Appreciates Mark's comments. My own perspective is that we're all coming from so far afield that travel is a big deal and covid and it's a huge thing in Moab. In Flagstaff it seemed like a big thing on Navajo Nation. Can only hope that by June it's not a problem. Do have concerns about getting all 50 people in one room. It seems so much easier to have public participation in the audience with the virtual participation option.

Denyce White – Clarification with timeline. If hosting the end of June vs. late summer. Would that be ready when we go out in June?

Jared Lundell – Field focus would be the meeting in June, but the draft wouldn't be out yet. That would be released in August and that is when we were thinking of having the next virtual or in person planning meeting.

Jared Lundell – Thanks for taking the time and to the public for giving comments. Thanks for your participation throughout the day.

Michael Engelhart – Truly wanted to thank our public that attended the meeting today. Thank you to the MAC members and your perspectives.

Denyce White – Thank you to the public and the MAC members and agency members. Also, Hillary and Lt. Gov. Bowekaty. A lot of think about and contemplate and looking forward to meeting you all in person and possibly in the field.

**3 pm – Adjourn for the day**

**Notes finalized:** Meeting notes were finalized on Mon. Feb. 23, 2023, following an opportunity for Bears Ears Monument Advisory Committee review. No notes or edits were received.