



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

**Bears Ears National Monument Advisory Committee  
Meeting Notes  
March 27, 2024**

This meeting was held in-person at the Hideout Community Center at 648 South Hideout Way, Monticello, UT 84535, with a virtual participation option on Zoom.

<b>TIME</b>	<b>TOPIC</b>	<b>PRESENTER</b>
9:00 a.m.	Meeting logistics	<b>Rachel Wootton</b> – Bureau of Land Management Canyon Country District Public Affairs Officer
9:05 a.m.	Welcome and Introductions  Management Updates	<b>Jacob Palma</b> – BLM Monticello Field Manager <b>Nicollee Gaddis-Wyatt</b> – BLM Canyon Country District Manager <b>Michael Engelhart</b> – USDA Forest Service District Ranger
9:45 a.m.	Resource Management Plan Overview	<b>BLM and USDA Forest Service Planning Team</b>
10:15 a.m.	Break	
10:30 a.m.	Discussion of management alternatives included in the draft Bears Ears National Monument Resource Management Plan	<b>BLM and USDA Forest Service Planning Team</b>
12:00 p.m.	Lunch	
1:15 p.m.	Public Comment Period	<b>Members of the public</b>
2:00 p.m.	Discuss public comments received.	<b>MAC Members</b>
2:15 p.m.	Discuss the open public comment period on the draft Resource Management Plan, the preferred alternative, and public comments	<b>BLM and USDA Forest Service Planning Team</b>

3:45 p.m.	Action Items/Input on next meeting time, date, and agenda	<b>Rachel Wootton</b> – BLM Canyon Country District Public Affairs Officer
4:00 p.m.	Adjourn	All

**Attendees:**

- **BLM:** Rachel Wootton, Emilee Helton, Jared Lundell, Nicolle Gaddis-Wyatt, Jill Stephenson, Jake Palma, Shirley Cloud-Lane, Tina Marian
- **USDA FS:** Barbara Van Alstine, Michael Engelhart
- **Monument Advisory Committee (MAC):** Mark Boshell, Jamie Harvey, Davina Smith, , Regina Lopez-Whiteskunk, Louis Williams, Denyce White, , Eve Tallman, Shawn Ivins, Angelo Baca
- **Public:** Approximately 30 members of the public attended virtually or in-person.
- **BEITC/BEC:** Liberty Kinsel
- **SWCA:** Emma Clinton

**Meeting Notes:**

- Meeting Logistics
  - Rachel Wootton ran through the meeting logistics for hybrid meeting formats.
- Welcome and Introductions
  - Meeting attendees introduced themselves.
  - Jake Palma noted that the Bears Ears National Monument Draft Resource Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement (RMP/EIS) was released in late March and is currently in a 90-day public comment period. The next MAC meeting will be in August. The purpose of today’s meeting is to dive into the draft plan together and get initial feedback from the MAC before the Proposed RMP and Final EIS is developed, when the agencies will utilize the current range of alternatives to develop the final range of alternatives, including the final proposed alternative, while adhering to Proclamation 10285.
  - Nicolle Gaddis-Wyatt noted that the agencies are excited to go through the plan with the MAC. Any of the current alternatives could be the final proposed alternative, or it could be a mixture of elements of all the alternatives. The agencies welcome MAC feedback and as much input as possible.
  - Michael Engelhart added that the agencies are very interested in hearing the MAC’s opinion on the DEIS. The agencies have said their piece in coordination with Cooperating Agencies (CAs) and the Bears Ears Commission (BEC) through developing the alternatives range and now the agencies are looking forward to listening to the opinions of the MAC. There is still lots of time for influence that the public and MAC have on the plan and the agencies are interested in getting it right. Meeting with the MAC and the public are interested in hearing what everyone has to say.

- Jake noted that Jamie Harvey from San Juan County Commission was recently appointed to the MAC by Secretary Deb Haaland.
- Angelo Baca thanked everyone for joining today and noted that this meeting is a necessary step in getting the plan right. The meeting is procedural and takes time and effort to get through and he wants to acknowledge all the work that has been done so far to get to this point. Hopefully this discussion will relate to the application of all that work.
- Shawn Ivins hopes for some discussion and tangible results. Shawn is wondering about the five vacant MAC spots and asked about applications for those positions. Rachel advised that there was an open call earlier this year and some applications came in. Applicants were nationwide. Another call will likely be needed for the four terms that expired in January and Lee Bennett's resignation. Unfortunately, the processing of applications and appointments takes some time (a year and a half, on average).
- Draft RMP/EIS Overview
  - ePlanning
    - There is an interactive map on ePlanning that is available for the public. The agencies shared a screenshot of the map. Different layers can be toggled on or off to view different resources. Jill Stephenson added that the map goes through resource management from Alternative A to Alternative E in the list of layers. All layers are labeled by resource and by alternative. The agencies screen-shared the map. Jill noted that there is a glitch where the planning area draft needs to be unclicked and re-clicked to appear correctly (likely a GIS projection issue). All the data that appears in the Draft RMP/EIS appendix as a map will be here in this web map. Mark Boshell thanked the agencies for this useful tool.
  - Timeline
    - Jill shared the timeline of the project. The agencies are in the Draft RMP/EIS stage of the project, which began in mid-March 2024. After the public comment period ends on June 11, 2024, the agencies will begin work on the Proposed RMP/Final EIS. An important aspect of the final draft is to incorporate public comments. That will take the better part of the summer, with a Proposed RMP/Final EIS in October 2024, followed by the Governor's Consistency Review and public protest period, with publication in January 2025. Eve Tallman asked if the MAC could weigh in on and review public comments during the August MAC meeting. Jared Lundell advised that public comments can be discussed at that meeting.
- Draft RMP and Next Steps
  - Jared advised that the agencies set up this meeting to discuss the Draft RMP/EIS and the group will discuss some resources in detail. Questions from the MAC can also be discussed during the meeting.
- Alternatives
  - The agencies showed and reviewed the current range of alternatives in Slide 10 of their presentation. Jared explained that "discretionary actions" are actions that the agencies can weigh in on and for which the agencies will design management. Jared noted that all action alternatives have a focus on Traditional Indigenous Knowledge (TIK), with

Alternative E having a specific focus on TIK. Alternative E is the preferred alternative in the draft plan. The agencies are not committed to picking that alternative in the final plan; the proposed alternative just needs to align with protecting Monument objects. A new alternative that mixes elements of all alternatives can also be developed. Jared stressed that this is a range of alternatives, and the agencies will take in feedback from all parties to design a final range of alternatives and construct the Proposed RMP/FEIS. Angelo noted that the people online could view the interactive map online as a helpful visual. Jared added that there will be more discussion of the public comment period at the end of the day today.

- Jared noted that not all resources will be reviewed today and asked if there were any specific resources that the MAC is eager to talk about that the agencies may not cover, such as Cultural Resources. The agencies will review recreation, lands with wilderness characteristics (LWCs), grazing, and visual resources in their presentation.
- Recreation
  - On Slide 11, the agencies reviewed recreation management. Jared explained that Alternative B focuses on providing infrastructure and education for visitors about Monument objects. Alternative C is focused on indirect education and permitting. Alternative D is focused on limiting recreation uses and discretionary actions. Alternative E takes a more TIK-informed approach to recreation management. Alternatives B through D focus on Recreation Management Areas and Management Zones, but Alternative E uses a new method similar to GSENM – a zoned approach with zones covering the whole monument.
  - Jared noted that recreational shooting (“target shooting”) does not mean hunting, but rather shooting at targets. The agencies are working with Utah Dept. of Wildlife Resources (UDWR), CAs, and the BEC to define this shooting activity as required by the Dingell Act. Generally, there is an increasing level of closures from Alternative B, which closes Indian Creek Recreation Management Zone (RMZ) to target shooting, to Alternative E, which closes the entire Monument to target shooting. The intent here is to limit target shooting that results in a high degree of litter on the Monument. This range of alternatives would allow for flexibility to allow hunting activity on the Monument. Jake noted that sighting rifles during hunting will also be allowed. Nicollee added that this is mainly aimed at limiting shooting at junk targets like televisions and other items which leads to littered areas on the Monument.
  - The agencies reviewed the maps of the alternatives. Jared noted that under Alternative A, nearly the entire monument is covered in Recreation Management Areas (RMAs). The BLM is shifting away from covering the entire monument in recreation areas. Under Alternatives B and C, there are fewer RMAs/RMZs, with more focused RMAs/RMZs for areas that have high volume of recreation and need these areas to manage that activity, such as White Canyon, Beef Basin, and Cedar Mesa. These areas are where infrastructure and educational materials will be focused, such as along Highway 95. There are also Extensive RMAs (ERMAs)

focused on more dispersed recreation, and the Comb Ridge RMZ, which is focused on day use.

- Eve asked if the MAC could be briefed on the State stepping back from the Trust Lands Administration (TLA) parcel land swap. Jared agreed and explained that there are a lot of state parcels throughout BLM lands across Utah. In the Bears Ears National Monument (BENM) proclamation, it is stated that the BLM will work to exchange TLA parcels for BLM lands in other areas of the State. This effort is currently on pause. Jake added that this is happening more at the State and Federal level, rather than at the local level. The local level is more focused on developing the management plans. Nicolle noted that access will be provided to TLA lands, as the agencies will need to work with TLA to provide access to these parcels.
- Under Alternative D, there is less focus on providing intensive recreation management throughout BENM, and more emphasis on managing areas where there are issues with recreation occurring. The management focuses more on limiting recreation activities in problem areas.
- Alternative E, the preferred alternative, zones the entire monument for recreation activity (Slide 15). The Front Country Zone follows main roads, and the Passage Zone is along secondary travel routes to allow a little more recreation management flexibility. In the Outback Zone, there is some minimal development like trails, and in the Remote Zone, recreation would be mainly self-directed and managed via permitting.
  - Eve inquired if, over time, there would be an opportunity to propose changes to this zone map. Jared noted that small changes could be incorporated, but changes that are too substantial would require re-doing analysis. However, the alternatives management could be combined to create new maps. Eve noted that when she thinks about wilderness characteristics, the majority of Indian Creek does not seem like Remote. Having the Front Country zone along the road makes sense but expanding that strip of Front Country to accommodate visitation would be beneficial. For example, the obelisk in the middle of the desert was flocked to by visitors and the area around the obelisk was trampled due to a lack of parking, camping, and restroom facilities. More opportunities for developed facilities could be useful in Indian Creek to reduce encroachment on the Remote Zone. Jared agreed and noted that the intent is to focus that infrastructure in Front Country Zones, and this map is focused on including those infrastructure areas with a slight buffer. Jake suggested they look at the interactive map to review Indian Creek. Jared noted that the main Front Country buffer is wide enough to cover these sites. The climbing routes are largely in the Outback Zone, with flexibility to allow climbing in the Remote Zones but not to provide bathrooms in those areas. The Outback does allow infrastructure like trailhead development and minor facilities.

- Mark inquired about the Passage Zone. This map doesn't seem to show many. Mark commented that BENM might need more Passage Zones and asked how large they are, how wide they are, and what they allow. Jared noted that the Passage Zone buffer is not a consistent width across BENM. Jared noted that minor changes could be made to these if needed, but the intent is to cover minor facilities and education infrastructure. These areas would allow flexibility to provide facilities to accommodate day use increases. Mark inquired if this would accommodate dispersed camping. Jared advised that dispersed camping would be allowed in any zone and is allowed in existing sites across BENM. Mark noted that due to the extent of roads on the monument, more Passage Zones may be needed. Jared thanked Mark and encouraged the MAC to provide feedback in comments that may help develop another alternative to address such concerns. Jake and Jared added that roads are still allowed in non-Passage Zones, such as County B roads.
- Alternative E Management Actions (Slide 16)
  - Jared explained that Alternative E aims to protect Monument objects by encouraging visitors to stay on trails and by designating more trails through implementation planning. Basically, this means that people can hike off trail, but people would be encouraged to stay on trails to limit impacts to BENM objects. The agencies would focus more on this in areas where impacts to BENM objects from recreation are evident. Eve asked if there would be extra levels of implementation level planning and inquired about a Recreation Area Management Plan (RAMP). Jared confirmed that more planning would be completed. Eve asked if the RAMP would dictate what is allowed at the implementation level. Jared confirmed and explained that the agencies would do RAMPs for all Zones, which would focus on how the agencies would manage specifically in each of these zones.
  - For dispersed camping, the agencies would work to designate dispersed camping areas, but such camping would be allowed in existing disturbed areas in all zones.
  - Eve asked about the prohibition of geocaching. Jared advised that this is mainly due to off trail hiking and instances of geocaching in cultural sites.
  - Jared explained that currently, climbing and route setting can be done in a dispersed manner without any agency approval. This would change under all action alternatives. Climbing would acquire agency approval before installing new hardware. There are provisions across all alternatives allowing replacement of existing gear on existing routes without such approval, however. Angelo asked if climbing community input was utilized in making this decision. Jared noted that the climbing community and other user groups have expressed interest and need to begin to regulate climbing activity in Indian Creek. Indian Creek receives over 50% of BENM visitation, and much of that visitation is for climbing. The intent is

to allow for that important use while balancing that use with other desires and concerns, particularly from Tribal Nations, about limiting impacts to Monument objects and particularly to cultural resources. Existing routes that impact cultural resources have previously been closed, and many route pioneers did not even realize that they were climbing over cultural resources. Eve noted that across the country there are some extremely successful bolt review committees, which often have climbers on the committee alongside agency staff and conservationists. Indian Creek visitors may not typically be local, but she recommends that a route approval process committee include climbers who use the area. Another question is, what happens in the interim? Jared noted that under any action alternatives this management will change and once the new RMP is in place, new routes requiring new hardware would not be allowed without agency approval. The Indian Creek RAMP could consider having members of the climbing community on these approval committees. Rachel said [inaudible].

- Mark asked about the encouragement for staying on trails under Alternative E. He used to work at NPS and understands the need to encourage users to stay on trails, but asked if this language is intended to encourage people to stay on trails where there are trails, or if this discourages people from hiking at all in areas where there are no trails. Nicolle explained that this management is to encourage non-local visitors to stay on trails and keep them near the infrastructure and visitor education areas, while locals and experienced public lands users who understand how to interact with the landscape can hike across the landscape in a non-harmful way. Jake noted that a lot of visitors look at a map of the top ten visitation sites and then only go visit those sites. There will not be signs saying, “Don’t hike anywhere.” Mark agreed with funneling visitation to sites that can sustain that visitation and thanked the agencies for this explanation. Jared noted that the agencies will continue to work with the MAC and other parties to implement this general guidance in actual management. Rachel added that people who call in or review the BLM website or visitors center materials would tend to go to high visitation areas anyway. Michael added that this would be a tool to prepare for higher levels of visitation on the landscape without restrictive or enforcement management. The agencies would use public outreach materials to direct most visitors to high visitation areas. Angelo added that the education for visitors on how to not leave impacts is very important. The example of the Sunshine Wall and ignorant interaction with the landscape is important and using these incidents as case studies to educate is the way to go.
- Mark agreed with the conversation on funneling increased visitation to specific areas but hopes that these large Remote and Outback Zone designations will not restrict the ability to sign trails and educate visitors

- in these areas as well, because it needs to be easy to direct and inform visitors who do choose to interact with these areas of BENM. Jared noted that signs necessary to protect BENM objects could be allowed, like in Cedar Mesa canyons. Education can also always be provided at trailheads. One of the bigger concepts is to focus education where many people go, so that when people go to Outback or Remote Zones, they know how to interact with BENM objects. Michael added that this strategy will be used to develop an ethic around how to interact with the landscape.
- Lands with Wilderness Characteristics and Inventories Roadless Areas (IRAs)
    - The BLM reviewed LWC designations (Slide 19). Alternatives B and C add more acreage than Alternative A, including areas around but not including off-highway vehicle (OHV) routes near White Canyon. Alternative D will manage all lands inventoried as LWCs for wilderness characteristics, as will Alternative E.
    - Jared explained that these areas are the primary deciding factors in where roads are closed. Wilderness Study Areas (WSAs) and IRAs are closed, as well as wilderness areas, to OHVs. Under Alternative B, all LWCs will be OHV limited and LWCs will be closed under Alternative C. [Inaudible]. Alternative D will close all areas managed for LWCs to OHVs. Under Alternative E, all areas managed for LWCs will be OHV limited. The BLM shared LWC maps of LWCs under all alternatives.
  - Travel Management Area Designations
    - Jared explained that OHV open areas allow cross-country OHV travel. There will be none of these open areas in BENM. OHV limited areas provide limited travel on existing routes, and there are also OHV closed areas, which would be closed to all OHV travel. An OHV is defined as any motorized vehicle. During implementation level Travel Management Planning, the agencies will specify specific routes as Closed or Limited. Jared explained that slightly fewer acres are closed to OHV under Alternative B than Alternative C due to LWCs managed as OHV limited, rather than closed, under Alternative B, and a similar comparison exists between Alternatives D and E. Additionally, under Alternatives D and E, Arch Canyon RMZ will be OHV closed (not just closed seasonally in Mexican spotted owl habitat).
    - The agencies showed maps of where OHV routes are located related to closed or limited areas. Jared explained there is very little change to designation of existing routes, as there are no existing routes in closed areas under Alternative C, although Alternative C closes more areas than Alternative B. Michael added that regardless of area designation, there is very little impact on existing routes on the landscape. Under Alternative D, LWCs are OHV closed and there would be a handful of routes (~100 to 200 miles in total, compared to the thousands of miles of routes on BENM) in closed areas. Under Alternative E, those routes would be in limited areas and would therefore be left open.
    - Mark inquired if LWC designation would impact implementation level planning. He inquired if under Alternative D, roads would not be designated in limited areas but could be designated under Alternative E. Jared confirmed. Jared added that



these travel management decisions only impact general users of public lands, but administrative permits could be used if necessary for grazing permittees or for other uses (fuels treatment, other administrative actions) for authorized OHV use in areas closed to the public. Michael noted that the USDA FS uses Recommended Wilderness through the forest plan revision process, and some areas in the plan are being proposed as Recommended Wilderness in BENM on National Forest System (NFS) lands (6 total areas). These would be managed as OHV closed areas, but these recommended areas do not include any existing routes. This wilderness designation has to be done using the USDA FS planning process, rather than the Monument RMP development process.

- Louis Williams asked, what is the criterium for an area to be characterized as an LWC? Jared explained that the BLM has a process to assess different lands for wilderness characteristics. Areas where there are existing routes or extensive existing disturbance are typically eliminated, and then staff specialists review areas that are inventoried for wilderness characteristics. These areas tend to be more remote without existing disturbance. Louis explained that he was asking because to him, the whole BENM is LWC. Jared noted that this is typically done using specific regulations for what wilderness technically is, which excludes areas that appear to be wilderness but are technically not wilderness according to regulatory definitions.
- Visual Resource Management
  - The BLM and USDA FS use similar categories for visual resource management. The BLM uses Visual Resource Management (VRM) Classes, while USDA FS uses Scenic Integrity Objectives (SIO). Jared explained that VRM Class I is unaltered, Class II is barely disturbed, Class III is flexible, and Class IV allows facilities. SIO Very High allows no visual Change, and SIO High allows some changes that fit within the general characteristics of the landscape. The BLM shared the maps of the VRM management under different alternatives (Slides 28-30). VRM Class I for BLM and SIO Very High for USDA FS tends to be IRAs, WSAs, and wilderness areas. For VRM II, the agencies want to allow some infrastructure (e.g., a bathroom, a trailhead). VRM III allows for more development. Alternatives B and C have no areas of VRM IV and are primarily VRM I and II and SIO Very High and SIO High. Alternative B allows slightly more flexibility around highways. Under Alternative D, there is some flexibility for VRM III at existing developed sites, such as existing communications sites for the Navajo Nation. USDA FS would be mainly SIO High except Dark Canyon. Alternative E would be VRM I except along highways and Passage Zones. USDA FS would be mainly SIO Very High except along routes.
  - Eve asked if the viewshed classification is based on looking towards the VRM Area or is within the VRM area looking anywhere. Eve doesn't understand how you can have no interpretive signage, or a bathroom, or a parking area, in a VRM I area viewshed. She asked what this means. Jared explained that in VRM II areas, the infrastructure would need to be similar to the landscape. For VRM I, existing infrastructure could remain or could be replaced. Eve advised that this

seems untenable if the goal is to protect the landscape and educate users, as it would eliminate new interpretive resources. The existing landscape allows users to see very far across the landscape and it sounds extremely limiting to serve the goals of protecting Monument objects if there are no signs instructing visitors or explaining the viewshed. Jared thanked Eve and noted that these VRM I classes are restrictive, but this management comes from Tribal Nations; they place high priority on protecting visual integrity. The agencies are trying to strike a balance that maintains visual integrity while protecting BENM objects. Michael noted that this feedback aligns with CA feedback received to date. From the USDA FS perspective, the best management is somewhere between the categories of SIO High and Very High. Michael added that vegetation management and fuels treatments could also be limited by such restrictive management.

- Mark echoed Eve's concerns under Alternatives D and E and worries that these VRM categories would not allow the flexibility needed to do the proper management to protect BENM Objects. This was seen in GSENM in wilderness designations adjacent to recreation areas, which prevented BLM from creating infrastructure needed to allow parking and restroom facilities in these recreation areas with higher demands. Jake reiterated that this feedback reflects the need for the range of alternatives provided, so that these options can be weighed to determine how best to protect the objects of the monument. The agencies will take in these comments to determine if there is a better way to protect visual resources and allow necessary development at the same time. These are the types of comments that the agencies appreciate. Angelo noted that it may be worthwhile to review this topic in August to understand the perspective of the Tribal Nations in making these recommendations. Jared encouraged the group to review the BEC's Land Management Plan as well.
- Livestock Grazing
  - Jared showed a slide outlining the alternatives for grazing. Under Alternatives B and C, there is more acreage unavailable to grazing than under Alternative A. Most of these acres are not currently grazed and are difficult for livestock to access. Under Alternative D, there were some cultural resource concerns near areas like Butler Wash that led the agencies to make certain areas unavailable, and there are some other areas that would be made unavailable based on ecological frameworks and the results of current ecosystem studies. Under Alternative E, the same areas would be unavailable as under Alternatives B and C. Range improvements are possible under all alternatives except for Alternative D, but any existing range improvements can be maintained. The agencies shared the maps of grazing management (Slides 32-34). Jared noted that canyons constitute the main closed areas under Alternatives B, C, and E. Michael noted that the majority of areas unavailable on Forest Service lands under Alternative A are also unavailable under all action alternatives, with the addition of South Milk Ranch Point due to past impacts and high density of cultural sites under Alternative D. Alternative D also closes areas not meeting standards for ecological systems based on Assessment, Inventory, and Monitoring (AIM) data and remote sensing data, and

due to significant impacts to cultural resource sites from grazing. Shawn asked about the closure in John's Canyon. Jared explained that this canyon is partially unavailable already under Alternative A, and under Alternative D, some additional nearby area is made unavailable. Shawn noted that this is concerning and reduces animal unit months (AUMs) available to grazers. Michael noted that there would be no reduction in AUMs under any alternatives on Forest Service lands. Jared noted that Alternative D does reduce some AUMs, but the other alternatives would not. Jill advised that under Alternatives B, C, and E there would be about 62,000 AUMs, and under Alternative D there would be about 56,000 AUMs. Shawn noted that this reduces a grazer's ability to adjust to unforeseen situations that impact grazing in other areas that permittee may graze, and even though this reduction in AUMs isn't much, it reduces the ability to adjust to poor weather conditions or other similar setbacks. This would be worrisome to grazers in this area who make big adjustments all the time due to the nature of grazing in this area. Shawn feels a lot better about Alternative E, and Alternative D would be the main concern from a grazing perspective. It's good to not lose AUMs, but even the changes under the other action alternatives may require a loss of flexibility. Shawn runs cattle in Butler Wash and that pasture was equivalent to other pastures on the winter range. Normally, the BLM permit is for 8 months which is split in three different pastures, but the last several years, the Butler Wash pasture was cut to several weeks of use to take care of that area, not because of BLM mandate, but because there are other areas that are less impacted that the grazer can use. The point is, taking those options away under Alternative D, even with a small loss in AUMs, could prevent grazers from making necessary adjustments. Shawn also noted that other concerns include the water development restrictions, as existing water developments could be removed unless they protect BENM objects. Shawn explained that 99% of water developments are developed to protect resources. He asked if this management is talking about removing water developments on sites that are intended to keep cows away from stream sources or move the cattle around the landscape to prevent congregations. Jared noted that these water developments aimed at protecting streams and other resources would remain. Jared noted that BLM would review those developments and do an analysis of whether they are meeting the requirements to protect BENM objects. Only in cases where they are not protecting resources or are irrelevant or obsolete would they be removed, and NEPA would be done in all these instances. Shawn agreed that there are many such obsolete improvements on the landscape. Shawn asked why this language is not under Alternative D. Alternative E only discusses this removal. Jared explained that this is because the BEC noted that there is a need to remove these obsolete "improvements." Jared noted that Alternative E could be picked for area closures, but Alternative D could be picked for range improvement management. Jared noted to keep in mind for feedback which alternative's management is preferable for different management objectives. Michael added that all these analyzed elements can be used to create an amalgamation of management activities in the proposed alternative.

- Mark appreciates Shawn's comments and is curious to hear from Shawn and the agencies about how this will unfold. Should Alternative D or E be selected, how livestock would be managed in these areas? These areas are often already inaccessible to livestock, but ignoring the AUM situation, how would the agencies keep livestock out of these areas and whose burden is it to fence areas? Jared noted that some areas would be challenging to keep cattle out of, but the agencies have looked at some of these areas and tried to keep grazing closures to what could be reasonably limited. Some side canyons in Butler Wash are already unavailable. Shawn noted that it shouldn't be entirely the burden of the permittees to close these areas, as in some of these difficult areas where cows are accustomed to going, it would be difficult to keep the cows out of those areas. Permittees have worked with BLM to put up temporary fences or other barriers in certain situations. Tina Marian noted that similar to the management for Alternative A, these alternatives are designed so that natural barriers could be used to close off areas. This could involve upkeep of existing fences. Shawn noted that this might be harder for Alternatives B, C, and E, because there are some really small areas that might be harder to exclude than entirely fencing off some bigger spots. Jared appreciates this specific feedback and if comments are provided, it is important to hit on these topics where elements of the different alternatives could be mixed together. Jared noted that it is likely, and history has shown, that the agencies often come up with another alternative to use in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS. Michael noted that the last thing the agencies want to do is put grazers in an impossible position. This was part of the calculus in developing the alternative. The agencies reviewed geographic barriers and know there is some further refinement to do if an area is made unavailable to determine how to make areas unavailable successfully. For example, there are rarely cows in Hammond Canyon but there are some areas where cows do end up. The agencies want to create a polygon that prevents a permittee from being in a position of noncompliance if a cow gets into such an area. The agencies want the permittee to help the agencies achieve the goal of compliance. A path forward will need to be determined for implementation once an alternative is chosen. Michael noted that to control cattle on the landscape, geofencing or virtual fencing could be used.
- Eve asked, if a permit lapses or is retired, what happens specifically? Jared explained that voluntary relinquishment of permits is allowed, and that would include allotments that are within or partially within the Monument. If a permittee relinquishes a permit, that area would then be closed to grazing. If the permittee wanted to transfer the permit to another permittee, that could be done as well. Eve noted that she senses that the general public may think that this management doesn't go far enough with limiting grazing on BENM and if this is juxtaposed with areas where humans are not allowed to go on the monument, (i.e., grazing is allowed on most of the monument but people are encouraged to stay on trails), this may be difficult for PR. Jared noted that the trail management is just encouragement at the end of the day. In many cases, most people will still be able

- to and feel empowered to walk off the trails, but to stay on the trail if possible and if they're going somewhere to where a trail exists.
- Shawn noted that he hasn't seen anything in the plan about noxious and invasive weeds from cars or hikers from outside the Monument, and then the county has to spray for those. Jared noted that these are covered under the Vegetation section and there is a range of alternatives for how to deal with these weeds. Shawn noted that he'd like to see an aggressive approach to address these weeds. Nicollee noted that as visitation increases, more ways to address weeds will need to be developed, although the agencies currently have a contract with the County to deal with these weeds but could maybe take on more of this work in the future. Michael noted that the USDA FS staff carry around geo technology to document and plot any instances they see of noxious weeds.
- Rights-of-Way (ROWs) and Special Uses
    - Jared explained that these ROWs are how the agencies permit special uses like transmission lines, fiber optics, roadways, or research permits on federal lands. Jared explained that there are exclusion areas where ROWs are not allowed with no exceptions, avoidance areas where ROWs are avoided but allowed if necessary, and open areas where ROWs are assessed through NEPA but typically allowed if acceptable. The agencies shared the maps of ROW areas under the alternatives. ROW exclusion areas can include wilderness, WSAs, or areas prone to erosion. Alternative B does have some ROW open areas to facilitate infrastructure for nearby communities in the future. Alternative C replaces open ROW areas with ROW avoidance areas. Alternative D has more ROW exclusion, and ROW avoidance areas are in areas where it may be necessary to allow infrastructure. Alternative E is mostly ROW exclusion except for highway corridors, which are ROW avoidance. Angelo asked about Alternative D vs Alternative E. Jared shared the acreage difference on Slide 35. Jared explained that anyone can apply for a ROW, but important considerations for ROWs on BENM would be that the BENM is near communication sites, so having all ROW exclusions would not allow new communications sites to serve nearby communities. Nicollee added that most ROWs are for electricity, fiber-optic, and communications, and in avoidance areas, the ROWs are limited to infrastructure that is absolutely necessary to route through BENM. For instance, there would not be an art installation ROW permitted in a ROW avoidance area. Cell towers fall under ROWs and permits for studies for infrastructure in ROWs may also fall under ROWs. Eve asks if this conflicts with the VRM Classes. Jared explained that the VRM classes allow existing infrastructure, but no new, apparently different infrastructure would be allowed. For instance, if Alternative D was picked, the VRM management may limit what would be allowed in ROW avoidance areas. Jake noted that Bluff to Mexican Hat is trying to install fiber-optic. The group wants to string fiber-optic lines on poles but that does not match the ROW management and drilling was not an option due to solid rock alongside the road. This may create complicated cost issues.

- Eve noted that the lack of cell service is one of the great things about the BENM area. She wonders if Alternative E addresses that concept. Jared noted that this is not noted in the ROW management but may be noted in other areas of the document. Nicolle noted that when reviewing the document, it is important to look at other resources besides what a person is passionate about to determine how to comment on a preferred alternative. Eve inquired if there is a narrative about cell service in the document, which may be conflicting between public safety and remote recreation. Jared recommended looking at the Lands and Realty and Socioeconomics and Social Justice sections, as well as maybe LWC and VRM, although the intangible conflict between remoteness and safety may not be covered explicitly. Jake noted that there is some discussion of public safety throughout the document.
  - Virtual fencing could be done under Range Improvements rather than ROWs, which could impinge on flexibility for managing grazing around cultural resources. Virtual fencing requires a mast for the antenna, which does require service. Angelo noted that he'd like to know more about virtual fencing and if it's possible with satellite connectivity. Shawn advised that the current technology does require some cell service. Michael noted that there are some systems that do not require cell connectivity, but they may be more costly. Michael noted that virtual fencing systems have been very effective, but the technology is new and comes with risk. The technology for virtual fencing is advancing quickly.
- Public Comment Period
  - The agencies provided this time to comment to pre-registered users who expressed an interest in commenting on the Draft RMP/EIS.
    - Janet Slowman-Chee, Executive Director of the Utah Diné Bikéyah (UDB) organization: Janet expressed thanks to the agencies for their work. Janet expressed the importance of spirituality. The Indigenous groups value the spirituality, the attachment to the landscape, even the plants used for healing and the places Indigenous People go to make connections for spiritual wellness. Janet reviewed the documents and looked for how spirituality fits into the plan. UDB has a very strong focus on spiritual wellness, not only for the people, but for the plants and soils, and noted that that's how Indigenous people place values on their surroundings. Janet's core message was, let spiritual values be the foundation [of the plan]. Janet understands that the federal government is leading this [planning effort] and is using its guidelines as a foundation. Janet notes that at UDB, they believe that spirituality has to be the foundation. Janet appreciates the fact that the agencies are strongly considering the Indigenous people. Janet is unsure how many Indigenous communities are in the room, but it would be good for them to be at the table consistently.
    - Millie – UDB: Millie grew up in the area and has been a part of the BENM movement for a long time, albeit not as involved as everyone in the room. Millie also worked for UDB and was hired last year and is grateful to have a paying job where one can be part of things like this. Millie knows how contentious these things can be and how demanding this work can be for the agencies [inaudible].

Like Janet said, the documentation of what's happening, people can underestimate what it takes to do this kind of work and to track community involvement and to have people in these spaces who have history in these spaces and respecting that is very hard. Millie likes to center relationships and our relationships to food and building those relationships [inaudible] and Millie wants to focus on bringing all of us together. Millie believes that it's not easy to create these different lifestyles and cultures that benefit everyone and keeping centered those relationships and those histories is really important. Millie appreciates that approach, and asked the group to consider, how do we manifest what we're talking about? Millie expressed her thanks again.

- Tim Peterson – Grand Canyon Trust: Tim offered thanks to the BLM and USFS, and MAC members and explains that it takes a lot of commitment to be here and to do jobs well. BENM is a progression of a new idea of the management of public lands in the United States. The development of the DEIS with the Tribes is something to be celebrated. Tim requests, that as people review the DEIS, that TIK is seen to be a management tool and to keep in top of mind that management actions must provide the most protection for monument objects and values, which are significant to many different native nations and how all the pieces interact together. Additionally, Tim urges that TLA land needs to be swapped out of the monument and explains that the rash on the map is very visible. Urges folks at the state to take a step back and look at what is actually in the plan and to revisit the land exchange for the benefit of the monument and school trusts.
- Shawn Ketchum – Project Manager for 100 Years of Silence in White Mesa: Shawn K. explains 100 Years of Silence is a project meant to communicate the healing of the trauma and the coming together and working together of indigenous peoples to establish a point for the community to feel welcome and heard wherever they go and to be recognized as indigenous peoples. Shawn K. talks about how Posey's trail is next to a cultural site in the monument and that the trail holds significance to many people. Shawn's family has gathered there for generations for celebrations, to reconnect with nature, and to heal. Management of the trail would help preserve the trail for future generations and signage would be a helpful way to communicate the history of the trail. Working days could help community members watch over the land and share the personal stories of 100 Years of Silence as it relates to the Posey Trail. Shawn K. urges USFS to protect the Posey Trail together and preserve the history of the trail.
- Katherine Voldowsky – Lawyer for Navajo Nation but notes her comments are made as an individual who enjoys BENM (online comment). Katherine used to work for NPS at Bandelier and Haleakalā National Monuments. Katherine explains that those monuments' purpose is to protect Indigenous perspectives and cultural insights but little insight was used to develop the management of the monument. Katherine explains that Alternative E, which incorporated Indigenous Knowledge, does a good job of capturing the insight and is vital because these areas do not make sense without the inclusion of Traditional Indigenous Knowledge (TIK).

- Jared notes there are no more public comments but will ask again at 5 minutes till 2:00 PM.
- Jake asks if the MAC wants to address any of the comments.
- Angelo provided a summation from the discussion prior to the lunch hour regarding grazing, VRM, signage, cell tower usage, change in grazing areas, and change in technologies. Angelo explained that there is still an ability for us to manage the monument better, but it might mean picking and choosing different management from the range of alternatives. The MAC wants to discuss certain areas that require more nuanced discussions to pull off the management. Angelo thanked Eve and Shawn for bringing up the hard questions. There may be minor differences between the alternatives but Alternative E, with the Tribal input, is important because it includes the input of Indigenous ranchers and grazers who are trying to find a way to come up with management that makes sense from all sides. Progress is being made and the recommendations are helping getting closer to that. Angelo noted that these conversations seem much more progressive than those conversations over the last two years.
- Jake mentioned that Eve had a question about Traditional Cultural Properties (TCPs). Michael explains that TCP is an acronym in the plan but was missed in the acronym list. Traditional Cultural Properties is defined in cultural resource law. It is a place of cultural importance and practice and is an important part of the landscape and how stories are told.
- Eve asked about OFM. Jared explained that OFM is Outcome Focused Management and is a survey of visitors on the landscape. It is an ongoing study in BENM.
- Eve expressed concern about Janet's comments about the UDB and asked if they didn't have a place at the table in the development of the plan since they don't see that spirituality component wasn't in the plan. Jared explained the role of the BEC and how they work closely with cultural and religious leaders. UDB is a consulting party for the plan. There will be a consulting party meeting for those groups to provide input. Michael explained that Alternative E was developed most closely with Tribal Nations; however, all alternatives include Tribal input and components of the Bears Ears Inter-Tribal Coalition (BEITC)'s Land Management Plan. Alternative E does the greatest job at including the Tribal viewpoint, but it is important to note that all alternatives include that to a degree.
- Jake explained that the Purpose and Need section of the DEIS talks about identifying spiritual uses and meaning of the landscape. A management plan is very high level and doesn't get into the specifics of the minute details but more of a framework. Those specifics will be developed in collaboration with the BEC and will be considered in the future.
- Angelo noted that the Ute Mtn Ute submitted a plan for the Posey Trail many years ago and it may be time to dust that off and revisit. Jared expressed that this would be a good project to look at with the Commission and Ute Mtn Ute.
- Louis provided that it will take a team to get this done and this team has just started working together. BENM is the first of its kind. Louis appreciates people coming together. The monument is a touchy subject in the area. There are probably some instrumental people that we haven't heard from that would have input. First, the group



- needs to come together as a team. Louis comes from the Navajo Nation and is not familiar with who is on UDB. Louis explained his career as a guide and his connection to the landscape. Louis sees areas in the plan that can be interpreted different ways (e.g., areas that are proposed as closed to grazing may be bighorn sheep habitat). The team component of this plan is very important and needs to include team members and teamwork from people's homes. Louis emphasized that the group is all on the same team and needs to come together to work together. There needs to be balance within the management and maps. Some alternatives are off-balanced. BENM is setting an example and can learn from other monuments and voices not being heard, but BENM is different with the MAC and the potential needs to keep going.
- Jared asked for any more public comments.
    - Rachel read one comment provided in Q&A portal. Dana supports option E and includes a story about visiting the monument in the fall and her experience.
  - Davina noted that the public hearings are an opportunity to be transparent about the plan. This is the time to engage and learn more about the plan [inaudible]. The Commissioners will be in attendance at the meetings for a full form of transparency. Jared advised that Commissioners will be present at public meetings and can help answer questions about Alternative E and how the plan came together.
  - Eve noted references in the document to recreational water pumping and asked, how critical is the water shortage in Dark Canyon? Eve explained that some occurrence of water pumping seems to refer to cattle, but if the plan is talking about people not being able to drink from a water source while backpacking, it should be clarified, and that pumping is not the proper word for filtering water. Water purification as a concept needs to be clarified. Jared clarified that the section is about not using water during periods of drought. Eve stated that the agencies would need to provide information to the public that the people must bring their water. Jared agreed.
  - Eve noted that the concept of resource rest isn't defined. Grazers rest the landscape. In Eve's personal experience, the seasonal resource rest doesn't require legislation and it naturally occurs during the winter and summer from weather conditions naturally keeping people away. After Covid, BENM was really overgrown from lack of use. Eve expressed that to legislate that rest seems like it's not needed (speaking specifically about Valley of the Gods, Canyon overlooks, and Indian Creek). Eve had a few comments about not allowing filming and asked if there is a movement to educate people about visiting the monument, as some sort of commercial outreach seems necessary to provide education. Additionally, Eve mentioned that permitting all day use in the monument seems unenforceable and non-fundable. There wouldn't be enough money to pay for that type of oversight. Eve asked, how would people get permits? Eve noted she feels strongly permits would be difficult to enforce. Jared mentioned there has been a lot of discussion about what these permits would look like. One potential permit would be for any use in the monument, which would be similar to what GSENM does for camping. It wouldn't necessarily be a fee permit, but a permit that would provide agencies with information about where people are going to help focus management. This would be figured out at implementation level. Eve asked if there is the overarching concern regarding educating

- visitors. Jared mentioned that with permits, visitors are required to follow what stipulations are provided under that permit.
- Angelo explained that as a filmmaker, it's a good idea to not have excessive drone usage in the monument for wildlife concerns and that the word commercial has different meanings. It can be large scale, massive productions that don't protect the land or someone with a Go-Pro, which have different levels of impacts on the environment. Angelo noted the questions being asked are good questions, but the nuance must be understood of what goes into it. Angelo noted that resource rest is a great practice and has been happening forever. The area is in a drought and there is uncertainty with how management will impact the resources and it shouldn't be dismissed outright but kept an option to be able to think ahead.
  - Shawn asked, if water is there, can hikers not use the water? Jared clarified that visitors would not be allowed to pump water and would need to carry it in if there was a severe drought to protect water for wildlife. Under Alternative C, this may mean permits would not be issued. For commercial filming, Under Alternative E, there would be no commercial filming in the monument. The agencies could still work to develop educational videos, there just wouldn't be opportunities for corporations to film commercially to potentially generate revenue. Rachel noted that filming for news media is also covered under different processes.
  - Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACECs)
    - Jared introduced ACECs and explained that ACECs are intended to provide additional management in certain areas. There are five ACECs in the current management plan. Two public nominations for ACEC were received during the public scoping period: John's Canyon Paleontology ACEC by Society of Vertebrate and Aquifer Protection ACEC by the EPA. Many ACECs are not being brought forward in the range of alternatives because management is already covered under different management as a result of this being a national monument and the protections it provides. Those ACECs are covered under Alternative E as an option to provide that level of management. Some ACECs which had very specific management, like Valley of the Gods ACEC and Indian Creek ACEC, were kept throughout the alternatives. Jared explains Alternative E and the ACECs proposed under that alternative include John's Canyon Paleontological ACEC and Aquifer Protection ACEC. The Aquifer Protection ACEC would protect drinking water zones for White Mesa, Blanding, Bluff and Natural Bridges. Jared explained Alternative D and the ACECs proposed under that alternative. The management would limit discretionary uses in these ACECs.
    - Shawn asked, what are the main differences in management between the ACECs and the monument? Jared explained there are specific management criteria for each of the ACEC in the plan.
    - Louis asked if the agencies include in the plan that they would recruit Indigenous rangers. Jared explained that the plan does address that and there are current programs set up to help provide additional assistance and as a way to provide additional education and perspective on the landscape. This could be through internships or through other programs developed with partners. Michael described some examples of youth conservation corps that the agencies work with and the USDA FS rangers that are out on

- the landscape. Louis asked if the agencies have worked with Navajo Nation Parks and Rangers. Michael answered not yet but the agency is interested in pursuing it.
- Angelo asked the MAC members online if they have any comments. Mark expressed appreciation for the MAC members willingness to have productive conversations today.
  - Denyce discussed the maps for the proposed ACECs and how the different alternatives can find a balance. Denyce mentioned that protecting water is critical, especially to the Indigenous communities. Denyce asked what caused the reduction of acreage in the Paleontological ACEC between the alternatives. Jared described how the BLM wanted to honor the nomination, which appeared to be based off township and range. The BLM then worked with the BLM paleontologist to tighten up the boundary to reflect where the paleo resources specifically occur.
  - Denyce asked what the discussions look like for Alternative D Aquifer Protection ACEC and the subsequent discussions with the grazing permittees. Jared explained that there are additional management actions in the alternatives that would limit the drilling of new water wells. Relevant and important values were identified in the proposed ACECs, and there are many actions that are already in the plan that address those values.
  - Eve asked about the Indian Creek ACEC and what it protects. Jake clarified that it is an existing ACEC that protects scenic values.
- Public Comments Received
    - Jared explained that the public comment period is ongoing and will be slightly longer than 90 days. The public can submit comments through mail or online or in person at public meetings (addressed on Slide 47). Eve asked if the meetings are recorded and shared. Jared advised that there will be two virtual meetings which will be recorded and available on BLM Utah's YouTube channel. These meetings will involve a presentation overview of the RMP and a Q&A period for the rest of the meeting. There will be five in-person meetings (Slide 48) where participants can provide written or dictated comments to court reporters. The BLM expects a lot of comments and will produce a public comment report that can be reviewed with the MAC, along with a substantive comments overview. Jill advised that as part of the final EIS, the agencies will only provide responses to substantive comments (defined on Slide 49). The agencies will provide a summary of how comments were used to influence the plan, along with agency responses to substantive comments. Jared advised that rather than commenting "I like dispersed camping," saying, "I have been dispersed camping in XX area that you are closing in the new RMP. You should not do that/that is unnecessary for XYZ reasons." Comments are also not used as votes for alternatives.
    - Jake advised that this slide deck will be provided to all MAC members after this meeting.
    - Angelo suggested another MAC field trip on the Monument, as this meeting format had some substantive results. Jared advised that it may only be possible to visit the NFS portion of BENM due to the heat in August. Rachel advised that since the next MAC meeting was advertised as a hybrid option, a new Federal Register public notice would need to be released for a field trip. Eve agreed with Angelo and noted that a field trip may be useful for the new MAC members. Even a self-guided tour could be useful to provide materials for interpretation when visiting the Monument. Jared advised that there are

- some YouTube videos produced by BLM for the MAC a few years back. Rachel can email out those links to the MAC.
- Rachel inquired about the next meeting being hybrid vs. all virtual. Jamie suggested meeting in-person. Rachel inquired about a separate field day for the MAC. Denyce likes the idea of a separate field day. The MAC meeting on 8/8 is a Thursday, so a field day could be held on 8/7 or 8/9. The meetings could be separated out as well and a field day could be held in the fall of 2024. Angelo suggested peak visitation could be a good time to see the Monument and suggested sticking with summer. Jake advised that the Federal Register notices do take quite a bit of time, but the agencies will do their best to make this happen. The BLM will start working on getting approval for the field visit.
  - The December MAC meeting on 12/9 can be planned to be virtual due to weather conditions considerations.
  - Rachel mentioned the MAC wanting discussion of public comments at the August meeting and asked for any other requests for the August meeting. Denyce asked what places the MAC should visit to not repeat sites from the last field visit. Jared advised that last time they visited the buttes, Butler Wash, and Kigalia and Arch Canyon overlook. The agencies can come up with some suggestions for sites to visit and the MAC can send along any suggestions. Michael suggested visiting places where the public had a lot of comments. The group may want to stay on the NFS lands due to the heat. Denyce suggested an area near Natural Bridges. Jared advised that it could be useful to visit concerns with dispersed camping. BLM advised that they do have some ongoing recreational trail projects that the group could visit. Denyce suggested the areas near White Mesa. Rachel reminded the group that the MAC meetings and field days are open to the public.
  - Open Public Comment Period / Preferred Alternative
    - Bruce Adams, San Juan County Commissioner: Bruce noted that he is preaching to the choir and was the initial chair of this committee [MAC] a long time ago. Bruce appreciates all the service and the time that the agencies give to this important issue. From the county standpoint, some issues are really important. The first item is to allow wood gathering by Indigenous People in the monument because they've been doing it forever and it would be horrible if the monument management plan did not allow them to gather wood. Also, the county is a little unsure, and Bruce is not blaming the agencies, about what is expected of the county, especially when it comes to search and rescue, law enforcement, road maintenance, and bathrooms and all of those infrastructure needs that exist on BENM. Those needs should be the responsibility of the federal government. The county is willing to participate to provide a lot of those services, but they are getting more and more demands that are hard to meet. For instance, the legislature just passed a law for a resource officer in every school in the state of Utah and the county doesn't have a single extra resource officer in their sheriff's department and the state is telling the county to provide one but not offering to pay for it. Likewise, the federal government has not offered to pay to manage the Monument. Moving forward, it would be important to have some kind of contract with the county where services could be maintained or the county could offer services like picking up trash receptacles, but there has not been any communication with the DOI or the federal government on any level. Bruce wants to

place no blame on local people and appreciates the local staff, but those are issues that will have to be addressed at some point. The county is willing to be a participant in those things but cannot do it on backs of the taxpayers of San Juan County. The county only has 8% private property and that is all that can be taxed, so that puts a burden on the homeowners in the county. Bruce hopes that those kinds of things will be addressed somewhere along the line. The county agrees with protection of the Monument area. There were 11 protections afforded to this area before BENM was designated and it is well protected with various laws about antiquities, visual resource protections, wilderness areas, and wilderness study areas. These are layered protections on the Monument area. The county is glad that the agencies are willing to come to Monticello and meet. Bruce expressed his appreciation.

- **Open Discussion**

- Rachel asked for other topics to discuss. Angelo noted that having the field day before the MAC meeting in August makes sense to have hands on engagement, experiencing the landscape and understanding what we're talking about at the meeting. Angelo noted that 8/7 may be more effective as a meeting date. Rachel asked for any concerns. The group concurred. Eve suggested visiting Valley of the Gods. Eve asked if any of Valley of the Gods is Front Country and asked if any bathrooms could be built. It is getting obviously more impacted from dispersed camping and some discussion of how to alleviate human impacts could be beneficial. Rachel noted that if the August date doesn't work the BLM heard the need for a field day and one will be arranged.
- Jill advised there will be public comments accepted at in-person meetings, but the virtual meetings will focus on Q&A. Rachel shared the ePlanning page and showed where the participate button and web map are. The virtual public meetings do not have public comment periods, but comments can be submitted at the in-person meetings. Nicolle noted that you used to be able to comment on the maps on ePlanning, but inserting a picture of the map if relevant to your comment could be useful if applicable.
- Angelo thanked the group and expressed looking forward to the progress that will be made this year. Eve inquired if it is encouraged that the MAC members communicate when not in meetings. Rachel advised that the advisory committee would not want to have substantive communication outside of the larger group, but the group can coordinate meeting times and logistics outside of the meeting space. Angelo noted that there will be a long time between March and August MAC meetings, it might be good to have communication during that time. Rachel can make sure that the DACA rules are clear about what kind of communication can be had. Rachel noted that if MAC members plan to travel, please reach out to her so the reimbursements can be figured out in a timely manner.

- **Action Items**

- There are some YouTube videos produced by BLM for the MAC a few years back. Rachel can email out those links to the MAC.
- The BLM will start working on getting approval for the 8/7 field visit. The agencies can come up with some suggestions for sites to visit and the MAC can send along any suggestions.

- Rachel can make sure that the DACA rules are clear about what kind of communication can be had among MAC members outside of MAC meetings.
- MAC members planning to travel for August meetings will reach out to Rachel so the reimbursements can be figured out in a timely manner.

Meeting notes were emailed to Federal Agency Leaders and the Advisory Committee Chair. No edits were made, and the notes were finalized 6/28/24.