ATTENDEES

Jacqueline Ayer, Association of Rural Town Councils (Antelope Valley) and Acton Town Council
Tim Brick, Arroyo Seco Foundation
Dale Benson, CalTrans, District 7
Kelly Carle, Equestrian
Margaret Clark, Rivers & Mountains Conservancy
Ann Croissant, San Gabriel Mountains Regional Conservancy
Ron Ellingson, Mt. Baldy Lodge
Dianne Erskine Hellrigel, Community Hiking Club
Belinda Faustinos, San Gabriel Mountains Forever Coalition
Armond Ghazarian, Los Angeles Department of Public Works
Kelly Gardner, San Gabriel Valley Water Association
Richard Guttenberg, Archeology/Culture
Cliff Hamlow, San Gabriel Valley Legislative Coalition of Chambers
Grace J. Kast, Gateway Water Management Authority
Jackson Lam (for Mark Masaoka), Asian Pacific Policy & Planning Council
Joseph Lyons, San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments
Brian Mejia (for Kathryn Barger), LA County Board of Supervisors – 5th District
Ron Ellingson, Mt. Baldy Lodge
Mike McNutt, Palmdale Water District
Steve Messer, Concerned Off-Road Bicyclists Association
John Monsen, The Sierra Club
Chuck Myers, National Forest Homeowners
Nancy Negrete (for Robert Garcia), The City Project
Judy Nelson, City of Glendora
Michelle Nuttall, Southern California Edison
Daniel Prescott, San Gabriel Valley Conservation Corps
Liz Reilly, San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments
Claire Robinson, Amigos de los Rios
Daniel Rossman, The Wilderness Society
Jack Sahl, Friends of the Angeles Forest
Gary Stickel (for Andrew Salas), Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation
Ben Smith, Community of Wrightwood
W. Lee Smith (for Rick Travis), California Rifle and Pistol Association
John Tobin (for Bill Reeves), Fisheries Resource Volunteer Corps

FOREST SERVICE
Rachel Smith and Adrienne Dunfee, Angeles National Forest

CONVENERS/FACILITATION TEAM
Karen DiBari, Edward Belden and Emily Olsen, National Forest Foundation

WELCOME & INTRODUCTIONS
Joe Lyons opened the meeting. Thirty-four members were present, two Forest Service representatives, and one guest (Theodore Sanler, potential youth representative).
Dianne Erskine-Hellrigel has been outreaching to fill the youth position on behalf of the Steering Committee. Dianne introduced Theodore Sanler, who has applied to fill the seat. Steve Messer has been outreaching to fill the motorized recreation seat after learning that Mike Bishop is unable to participate. Steve has an application from Robert Ettleman, which he shared with Steering Committee members. The Steering Committee will make recommendations regarding the youth and motorized recreation seats during the Committee’s next meeting. SGMCC members will discuss membership recommendations during the October 27th meeting.

NEXT STEP:
- NFF will share applications from Theodore Sanler (to fill the youth seat) and Robert Ettleman (to fill the motorized recreation seat) with the SGMCC Steering Committee for discussion and recommendations during the October Steering Committee meeting.

FOREST SERVICE UPDATES & DISCUSSION

Rachel Smith, new Deputy Forest Supervisor on the Angeles National Forest, introduced herself to the SMGCC. Rachel shared several planning process updates:
- ANF hosted the fourth EA/Monument Management Plan public meeting in Wrightwood; members of the public engaged and provided excellent feedback.
- Matthew Bokach and Rachel Smith will host a public meeting in Spanish soon; this will be the fifth and final public meeting.
- The ANF continues to accept comments via email, website, public meetings, and mail until November 1st.

Adrienne Dunfee, Deputy Monument Manager, updated the SGMCC on the Cattle Canyon project.
- ANF hopes to begin the public scoping process soon. The project will illustrate how the Forest Service and partners can engage the public through on-the-ground work to improve the Monument.

Additional updates:
- ANF hired eight rangers over the summer as part of the field ranger program. Six of the eight rangers were from the local area. The ANF hired several of the rangers for part-time internships during the fall. The rangers made over 13,000 contacts with visitors.
- Over 200 people rode the shuttle to Chantry Flat for National Public Lands Day. Saturday, October 9th was the final weekend for the pilot shuttle.

DRAFT COMMENT LETTER/PLAN MARKUP CONSENSUS PROCESS

Karen DiBari reviewed the process the SGMCC has gone through to develop the Monument Management Plan comment letter and plan markups. The Monument & Transportation Plan Coordinating Committee has been working for several months to collect feedback and input from the SGMCC, address issues early, and develop a comment letter that the SGMCC can approve prior to the November 1st comment deadline. Karen explained that the goal for the October 6th meeting would be to get the comment letter as close to final. Following the meeting
SGMCC members should share the letter with constituencies to identify any final changes.

More specifically, the SGMCC is following this timeline:

1. **October 6th** – SGMCC special meeting to reach approval on the letter – strive for preliminary consensus agreement.

2. **Between October 6 and Oct 22** – SGMCC vet the letter and draft plan comments with their constituencies.

3. **October 19th** – Issues on the Cover Letter or Plan Markups due to NFF or the M&TP Coordinating Committee; committee will roll up new issues in order to send a final draft out prior to the October 27th SGMCC meeting.

4. **October 24th** – M&TP Committee distributes final letter/marked up plan to SGMCC.

5. **October 27th** – SGMCC meeting (100% vote) – reach consensus and finalize letter.

**DISCUSS AND CONSIDER APPROVING THE DRAFT COMMENT LETTER**

Michelle Nuttall reviewed the changes the Monument & Transportation Plan Coordinating Committee (M&TPC Committee) worked on between the September 22 and October 6th meeting. Michelle and other members explained that the revised letter is a product of long discussions and lot of compromise over the past several months.

Michelle encouraged SGMCC members to go into more detail in individual comment letters if they would like to provide additional comments. Individual letters are welcome so long as the letters do not conflict with suggestions and comments offered by the SGMCC.

Karen explained several rules for the discussion:
- Not dealing with grammar, typos, and small edits such as commas
- Will address big issues
- Don’t let the perfect be the enemy of the good

After thanking Michelle and the committee for all they did to produce the drafts and letters, members discussed specific feedback on the letter and plan markups. When tough issues came up around language, Karen asked members to work in small committees to develop language that would be agreeable to everyone.

Additional discussion items:
- SGMCC members expressed their support to have the SGMCC continue to provide a resource to the Forest Service after the plan is complete.
- The Forest Service expressed support for having the SGMCC continue after the plan is complete and assist in the implementation stage of the effort.
• SGMCC members deliberated the topic of objectives and time-specific priorities for the ANF. One member noted that the SGMCC has identified 22 different objectives that include a timeline starting in 2017; without the resources to implement the objectives, the ANF would be setting up the plan for future failure and public dissatisfaction. Committee members discussed the thinking behind the group’s objectives, and their belief that objectives are an important component of the plan and will help the agency plan successfully in the future. The letter states that the SGMCC would be comfortable with objectives OR goals.

• Members discussed whom to copy at the end of the letter. After deliberation, members decided to copy the entire Southern California congressional delegation. Members also discussed how to list the name of SGMCC members at the end of the letter. The SGMCC asked the Steering Committee to develop a recommendation that the full group could discuss during the October 27 meeting.

See Attachment A to review the draft letter with revisions.

NEXT STEPS:
• The Steering Committee will develop a recommendation for signing the letter (how to list members and alternates). The Steering Committee will also review and clean up the membership list based on who has participated in the process to develop comments.
• Rachel Smith will provide information to the Collaborative about the objections process and how a group letter will affect the participation of SGMCC members in the process.
• Draft Letter and Monument revised language from those asked to provide specific language is due to NFF by COB on October 7th. NFF will send out the updated draft by COB on October 11th.

Karen asked members to vote on the comment letter, in draft form, recognizing that several committees formed to develop specific language suggestions in response to concerns that were raised during the review.

Consensus: All members could live with or support the draft comment letter in draft form.

DISCUSS THE DRAFT MONUMENT PLAN Markup

SGMCC members reviewed the plan markups document in the same way that they had reviewed the draft comment letter. As the SGMCC made revisions, committees were formed to provide specific language that would be agreeable to all members.

Karen asked members to vote on the plan markups, in draft form, recognizing that several committees formed to develop specific language suggestions in response to concerns that were raised during the review.

See Attachment B to review the draft Monument Plan with revisions.

Consensus: All members could live with or support the plan markups in draft form.
COMMITTEE UPDATES & PROPOSALS - COMMUNICATIONS & ENGAGEMENT COMMITTEE

Mike McNutt is now the chair of the committee. In addition to taking over in the leadership role, Mike will take the position previously held by Jack Sahl on the SGMCC Steering Committee.

Mike McNutt updated the SGMCC on changes within the committee. Mike outlined several needs that the committee will work to address:

- SGMCC Logo
- Communication materials
- Process for press releases and other media materials
- Point people and communication guidelines
- (Potentially) social media platforms like Facebook and Twitter

Mike explained that there are many process steps to figure out before the Communications and Engagement Committee can start communicating about the SGMCC. For example, who can communicate, how will communication materials be approved, how much media coverage and attention do we want, etc.? The committee would first like to develop broad goals to help determine next steps.

Members noted that the Steering Committee may be able to approve logos, letterhead, and less substantive information needs.

NEXT STEP:

- Communications & Engagement Committee will develop a proposal with a broad goals and suggested process recommendations to bring back to the Collaborative for approval during a future meeting.

SHARE AND DISCUSS UPCOMING PROCESS STEPS AND DECISION POINTS

In response to questions about the decision-making rule that the SGMCC will use to reach consensus on the comments during the October 27th meeting, Karen shared the group’s decision-making policy and the 90% fallback rule. Because the SGMCC successfully reached consensus on the draft comment letter and plan markups, the fallback rule wouldn’t be an option during the October 27th meeting (because it doesn’t go into effect until the meeting after there has been a failed attempt at consensus). Though members confirmed the commitment to reaching consensus, they wanted the fallback rule to be available to the SGMCC to use during the October 27th meeting.

SGMCC members developed the following decision-making proposal for the October 27th meeting:

_The intent of the Community Collaborative is to reach consensus. If the Community Collaborative cannot reach consensus after at least two votes on the comment letter and draft monument plan at the October 27, 2016 meeting, as a one-time exception to the standing policy the letter will be approved if at least 90% of_
those Community Collaborative members present in the room agree.

i. When a vote is taken, names of members who did not approve will be recorded in the meeting record. If/when a proposal is made to the Forest Service or shared publically, language will be included to say, “The Community Collaborative reached super majority approval on this issue.”

ii. Dissenting member(s) and their represented organizations shall have the opportunity to provide public comment, on the dissenting item, outside of the Community Collaborative’s process.

Consensus: The SGMCC members voted in favor of the temporary decision-making policy, which will only apply during the October 27th meeting.

NEXT STEP:

• NFF will send a notification about this vote out to the SGMCC via email right away. NFF will send language out to give SGMCC members who left early or were not able to attend the meeting time to raise concerns. NFF should let members know that they are allowed to object to the new process if they were not present during the meeting.

MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS & MEETING FEEDBACK

The next meeting will be Thursday, October 27 from 9 a.m. to 1 p.m. NFF will send out venue information as soon as staff confirm a location. As a reminder, the regularly scheduled November meeting is cancelled (due to the Thanksgiving holiday) and the December meeting will be Thursday, December 8. The Steering Committee has discussed the December 8th meeting being some kind of social event. NFF is making efforts to hold future meetings in more central locations.

SGMCC members provided the following feedback at the end of the meeting:

• Good work
• Excellent
• Good cooperation
• It was a monumental success!
• Congratulations
• This process went so much more smoothly than first time. We’ve learned a lot.
• Relieved
• Thank you for collaboration!
• Impressed with everyone
• I need a break.
• Appreciative
• Impressive
• Thoughtful discussion
• Thank you
RECAP OF ACTION ITEMS

- NFF will share applications from Theodore Sanler (to fill the youth seat) and Robert Ettleman (to fill the motorized recreation seat) with the SGMCC Steering Committee for discussion and recommendations during the October Steering Committee meeting.
- The Steering Committee will develop a recommendation for signing the comment letter (how to list members and alternates). The Steering Committee will also review and clean up the membership list based on who has participated in the process to develop comments.
- Rachel Smith will provide information to the Collaborative about the objections process and how a group letter will affect the participation of SGMCC members in the process.
- Draft Letter and Monument revised language from those asked to provide specific language is due to NFF by COB on October 7th. NFF will send out the updated draft by COB on October 11th.
- Communications & Engagement Committee will develop a proposal with a broad goals and suggested process recommendations to bring back to the Collaborative for approval during a future meeting.
- NFF will send a notification about this vote out to the SGMCC via email right away. NFF will send language out to give SGMCC members who left early or were not able to attend the meeting time to raise concerns. NFF should let members know that they are allowed to object to the new process if they were not present during the meeting.

RECORD OF DECISIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Consensus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All members could live with or support the draft comment letter in draft form</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All members could live with or support the plan markups in draft form</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The SGMCC members voted in favor of the temporary decision-making policy, which will only apply during the October 27th meeting:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The intent of the Community Collaborative is to reach consensus. If the Community Collaborative cannot reach consensus after at least two votes on the comment letter and draft monument plan at the October 27, 2016 meeting, as a one-time exception to the standing policy the letter will be approved if at least 90% of those Community Collaborative members present in the room agree.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. When a vote is taken, names of members who did not approve will be recorded in the meeting record. If/when a proposal is made to the Forest Service or shared publically, language will be included to say, “The Community Collaborative reached super majority approval on this issue.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Dissenting member(s) and their represented organizations shall have the opportunity to provide public comment, on the dissenting item, outside of the Community Collaborative’s process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>