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Abstract

The recent call for a review of several large National Monuments by President Trump raises questions about the lack of local input in federal land management. Within the land and resource management field, there exists a debate surrounding the effectiveness of community-based collaboration approaches. Using the example of the Organ Mountains-Desert Peaks National Monument and a lens of political ecology, I ask three questions: (1) what has been the impact of the OMDP National Monument on the local community; (2) how informed and involved were local stakeholder groups in the original designation and following review process in Doña Ana County; and (3) how could local public involvement in federal land management be improved upon? To answer these questions, I conducted thirty semi-structured interviews that included ranchers, environmentalists, recreationists, scientists, tribal representatives, and local government officials. These interviews revealed unequal local participation in both the designation and review process, various suggestions for the land management planning process, and locally derived proposals for improved community inclusion. Both the designation and the review of the national monument have clearly created tension in the local community of Las Cruces and driven some away from land conservation goals, indicating the importance of seeking balanced inclusion of local community voices throughout the management process if community based collaboration processes are to be utilized.
Acknowledgements

I want to first thank my thesis committee for their support and guidance throughout this process. Thank you, Dan Doak for pointing me in the right direction at the beginning of this year and providing insight throughout the development of this topic. Thank you, Mark Squillace for challenging my assumptions and pushing me to further explore the intricacies of public participation in land management. Thank you, Dale Miller for your encouragement, teaching me the value of deadlines, and of course well needed humor throughout the year. And, thank you, Jerry Jacka for introducing me both to the field of political ecology and into the methods of interview-based research.

I want to finally give thanks to the Las Cruces/Doña Ana community. From my hosts who treated me like family to each and every interview participant who took hours of their day to share their experiences and thoughts with me, I thank you. I will always consider this community and this experience as an integral jumping off point for my career.

In the following paper, I want you all to know how much I appreciate your contributions and how I hope this paper sheds some light on the situation as means for giving back for the invaluable experience you have provided to me.

Preface

I rang in the New Year at the taquería ¡Andale! in Las Cruces, New Mexico, with a broken tooth (the culprit--the best taco I will likely ever eat), too much coffee from consecutive interviews, and my cell phone which momentarily would prove unreliable as a recording device. During this week, I embraced the warmth of Las Cruces and thus initiated my experience into the world of land management.

I originally engaged in this research to expand my horizons and experience past ecological research. While I have enjoyed the experiences I have had within ecology and will be endlessly fascinated by the miracles of life inherent within, I originally set out on my undergraduate career with the end goal of someday attending law school and specializing natural resource policy. Although daunted by the prospect, I thought I would finally engage in this type of policy-related research.

Perhaps in part inspired by this background in ecology, I have recently found myself fascinated with community: how it functions, how to build it, and the endless benefits of strong community dialogue. That said, this experience gave me insight into how community relates to land management and the role that it should have within it. Going from here, I find myself even more curious about the dynamics of our communities influence how our society functions both within and outside of our natural environment.
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Introduction

Disappearing open space coupled with the dire consequences of climate change on flora and fauna demand increased conservation efforts. Yet, in some cases, mainstream conservation policy fails to afford sufficient regard for the people in its efforts to protect the land. Not only can this harm local communities, it undermines the conservation efforts themselves. Given these criticisms, I saw the need for deep, critical analysis of current land conservation practices. When looking into this field, my question ultimately became: How can we manage public land in a way that respects local interests and original land claims, while also achieving effective conservation goals?

In the Spring of 2017, President Trump signed an executive order to initiate a review of any national monument designated after 1996 that is at least 100,000 acres large, including the Organ Mountain-Desert Peaks National Monument in New Mexico (Exec. Order No. 13792). This review has brought to the surface various criticisms of a lack of public involvement in the designation of the national monuments. For instance, many claim that some of the monuments designated under the Antiquities Act are an unjust use of presidential power and that these “land-grabbing” actions did not adequately take into account local interests.

The purpose of this study is to analyze public perception, knowledge, and participation in the original designation and subsequent review of the Organ Mountains—Desert Peaks National Monument. President Trump’s review has focused much of the debate surrounding the Antiquities Act specifically around the role of public participation in land management, thus the focus of this study. I seek to answer three questions relating to this theme:

1. What has been the impact of the OMDP National Monument on the local community?
2. How informed and involved were local stakeholder groups in the original designation and following review process in Doña Ana County?

3. How could local public involvement in federal land management be improved upon in this case? How can the lessons learned from this case study be applied to the larger debate regarding community-based collaboration in public land management?

These questions were explored using interviews of local community groups.
Background

The Antiquities Act of 1906 permits standing presidents to declare national monuments on federal lands in order to protect objects of historic or scientific interest. It has been used by 16 of the 20 presidents since to set aside federal land for indefinite protection (Kame’enui, 2013).

In 2014, President Obama designated the Organ Mountains—Desert Peaks National Monument National Monument (OMDP) under the authority of the Antiquities Act (Proclamation No. 12508). OMDP comprises 496,330 acres of land and is located in Southern New Mexico surrounding the town of Las Cruces. It is managed by the Bureau of Land Management as a unit of the National Landscape Conservation System. By declaring the OMDP area as a national monument, President Obama withdrew federally owned areas within the boundaries from sale and new leasing and development activities such as hard rock mining and mineral leasing by the federal government. The proclamation for the OMDP National Monument furthermore states the following restrictions: (1) except for cases of emergency or authorization motorized vehicle use is only to be permitted on designated roads; (2) non-motorized mechanized vehicle use (most notably bicycles) is only to be permitted on designated roads and trails; no new roads or trails are to be constructed for motorized or mechanized vehicle use unless in cases of public safety or protection of identified objects; (3) no new right-of-ways are to be authorized unless necessary for the protection of identified objects. (Proclamation No. 12508, 2017).

The proclamation also makes the following clarifications I see as relevant to this research: (1) the BLM may authorize watershed restoration and small-scale flood prevention projects as long as they do not threaten the management of identified objects; (2) the Secretary may renew or authorize upgrades to existing utility line rights-of-way so long as they don’t
exceed current physical scope; (3) the rights of Indian tribe’s or pueblos are not enlarged nor diminished by the proclamation; (4) the Secretary will consult with Indian tribes to ensure the protection of religious and cultural sites and provide cultural or customary access to sites; (5) motorized vehicle use will not be constricted further in wilderness study areas beyond FLPMA requirements; (6) BLM administration of grazing permits and leases will continue consistent with protecting identified objects; (7) the jurisdiction of the State of New Mexico is neither enlarged nor diminished by this proclamation; (8) this proclamation will not be used to affect the Memorandum of Understanding “Cooperative National Security and Counterterrorism Efforts on Federal Lands along the United States' Borders”; (9) existing withdrawals, reservations, or appropriations will not be revoked (Proclamation No. 12508, 2017).

President Obama and his administration justified the designation because of the several important archaeological, historical, ecological, and geological features within the monument. For example, El Camino Real de Tierra Adentro, an early trading route which linked pre-existing Native American paths between Spanish colonial capitals, runs through parts of the monument. Geronimo, the famous Apache leader, is also rumored to have hidden in the caves of the area to evade U.S. soldiers. The area furthermore has various endemic species, such as the Organ Mountains Evening Primrose. Lastly, there is prehistoric evidence of Native peoples in the area as shown by the presence of various artifacts, rock art, and dwellings (Proclamation No. 12508, 2017).

Once a large national monument has been designated, the land management agency will typically prepare a land management plan—something that the BLM calls a Resource Management Plan (RMP). The RMP for a national monument must comply to the provisions laid out in the proclamation. The proclamation mandates that the RMP process “provide for
maximum public involvement in the development of that plan including, but not limited to, consultation with tribal, State, and local governments” (Proclamation No. 12508, 2017). Resource Management Plans must meet the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act through the creation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) or Environmental Assessments which provide for opportunity for public input (National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, 1994). The local BLM field office in Las Cruces is in the beginning states of creating such a plan for the Organ Mountains—Desert Peaks National Monument. While the progress towards a creating a RMP has been stalled due to the review process, the field office outlined a timeline and the steps it plans to take to create a RMP for the monument. The field office will first conduct pre-scoping workshops with the community. They will then develop publish a federal registrar notice of intent for the RMP planning process. After this, public scoping and meetings will take place. Once completed, a draft RMP and EIS will be developed that will be reviewed by the Secretary and the Washington BLM office. A public comment period will then open and comments will be analyzed in order to produce a proposed RMP and a final EIS. Finally, a protect period will be provided until an approved RMP has been procured.

On April 26th, 2017, President Donald Trump mandated an official review of all Presidential designations or expansions under the Antiquities Act made since January 1, 1996, where the designation covers more than 100,000 acres or in cases where there was determined to be inadequate public outreach (Exec. Order No. 13792, 2017). The 60-day comment period for the National Monument review closed on July 10, 2017 and generated over 780,000 comments nationally (Review of Certain National Monuments Established Since 1996; Notice of Opportunity for Public Comment, 2017). Secretary of the Interior Ryan Zinke has since visited these National Monuments to inform himself on the local interests and impacts. The Trump
Administration justifies the review as a way to place the power of land management back into the hands of local and state officials. According to the administration, monument designations that result from a lack of public outreach and proper coordination with State, tribal, and local officials and other relevant stakeholders may create barriers to achieving energy independence, restrict public access to and use of Federal lands, burden State, tribal, and local governments, and otherwise curtail economic growth (Exec. Order No. 13792, 2017).

Executive Order 13792 requires a review by the Secretary of the Interior Ryan Zinke to consider whether the original proclamations included “the smallest area compatible with the proper care and management of the objects to be protected”, as mandated by the Antiquities Act of 1906. The order also asks Secretary Zinke to examine the effects each designation may have on the available uses of these lands, the concerns of state, tribal, and local governments affected by a designation, and the availability of Federal resources to properly manage designated areas (“President Trump Reverses”, 2017). Secretary Zinke has since presented his recommendations regarding the reviewed national monuments to President Trump, largely advocating for an expansion of multiple-use ability within the monuments (Zinke, 2018).

A preliminary analysis of this controversy for the Organ Mountains—Desert Peaks National Monument shows various viewpoints regarding the original designation of the monument and its subsequent review. There is controversy particularly surrounding the economic impact of the monument designation, restricted access potentially imposed by the designation, and a perceived lack of public participation in both the designation and review.

Prior research suggests overwhelming public support for the national monument based on the significant historical, ecological, and archaeological significance of the area. Using the public comments generated from the comment process of the review on regulations.gov, Wang et al.
(2017) analyzed a sample of 748,707 public comments. Ultimately, the report found that for the OMDP National Monument, 92.6% of commenters opposed the executive order for the monument review. A second study, by Third Eye Strategies, involved interviews with 400 active registered voters in Doña Ana County, and found that 63% oppose a reduction to the monument (Clermont, 2017). The Las Cruces City Council signed a resolution on the 19th of June, 2017, supporting the original Organ Mountains Desert Peaks National Monument designation (“Local Elected”, 2017).

One major imperative for monument supporters is the protection of petroglyphs and other valuable tribal cultural resources for the First Nations that have ancestral claims to the lands—Ysleta del Sur Pueblo, Fort Sill Apache Tribe, and the adjacent Mescalero Apache tribe. The Ysleta del Sur Pueblo cites past and current use of these lands by native peoples as justification for the large monument (“All Pueblo Council”, 2014). The Fort Sill Apache Tribe are successors to the Chiricahua and Warm Spring Tribes who historically resided in the region (Hauzous, 2014). The adjacent Mescalero Apache Tribe has also voiced opposition to monument reduction, claiming the monument was part of the tribe’s ancestral homelands (Soular, 2017). Soular also reports some support for co-management of the monument with local tribes (2017).

Supporters of the original monument at its current designation status and size believe the economic impacts of the designation to be significant. A review by Headwaters Economics predicts increased tourism revenues from the national monument designation, claiming that travel and tourism in Doña Ana County account for 19% of private wage and salary, 9,571 jobs, and 6$ billion annually from recreation (“Organ Mountains”, 2017). Research from BBC Research and Consulting predicts that the designation would generate 7$ million dollars, rising the post-monument total economic impact of the area to over 17$ million U.S. dollars in revenue.
generated from grazing, operations, retail, activities, gasoline, groceries, restaurants, and lodging.

In addition, this report predicts that OMDP operations and visitor expenditures will generate an additional 1.1 million annually in state and local tax revenue—almost doubling the current tax revenue (“Economic Impact”, 2013, p. 2-4). Essentially, they predict that a monument designation will improve visitor experience and attract more non-local visitors that would bring in outside money to the economy, basing visitation estimates on patterns of other monument designations (“Economic Impact”, 2013, p. 17).¹

Others primarily cite economic losses, significant access issues, and a lack of public outreach as justifications for the review and possible downsizing of the national monument. U.S. Representative Steve Pearce of New Mexico is a strong proponent for a downsizing of the OMDP National Monument, arguing that both economic and land conservation goals would be best served this way. Representative Pearce introduced a bill to establish the Organ Mountains--Desert Peaks as a National Monument legislatively, at a much smaller size of 60,000 acres² (Pearce, 2017).

With these main trends in mind, I looked to the local community of Las Cruces for more information.
Review of the Literature

Through a lens of political ecology, I first look at the literature on community collaboration in conservation practices. Within this analysis, I focus on literature pertaining to developed, post-industrial countries, largely due to the dramatic contextual differences relating to land and resource management regimes. It is also important to note that in this paper, I start from the premise that conservation is the ultimate goal. That said, I look to find ways in which collaboration and public participation in management may improve or hinder effective conservation efforts.

A lens of Political ecology

Political ecology is a field that explores the interconnections of society and the environment and how the economic and political aspects of our society interact with the environments we are a part of. P. Robbins describes political ecology as, “a field of critical research predicated on the assumption that any tug on the strands of the global web of human-environment linkages reverberates throughout the system as a whole” (Robbins, 2012, p.13). A similar definition of political ecology is reflected in, “the processes by which people turn undifferentiated surroundings, space, into a landscape of identifiable and meaningful places, and the ways that these meanings reflect, reproduce and affect social relations and cultural values.” (Carrier and West, 2009, p. 162). The field of political ecology and those within it advocate for “fundamental changes in the management of nature and the rights of people, directly or indirectly working with state and non-governmental organizations to challenge current conditions” (Robbins, 2012, p.13).

A political ecological framework is similarly used as a means to explore public participation—or lack thereof—in environmental management. Political ecology’s application to
land management is well illustrated in a diagram created by Reed. This diagram describes the factors that affect the way in which governance and institutional capacity are in the management of UNESCO sites in Canada (Figure 1).

![Diagram illustrating the application of political ecology to land management regimes. “A conceptual framework for interrogating environmental-management regimes” (Reed, 2007, p. 323)]
Community-based collaboration: What is it?

Community based collaboration (CBC) is a term utilized by many in the field of political ecology and natural resource management referring to a spectrum of management options that employ varying amounts of community involvement and power in the management process. The Community-Based Collaboratives Research Consortium 1999 defines community-based collaboration as the involvement of local community volunteers with diverse interests to collaborate in resource management of a resource that impacts the physical, environmental, or economic health of the same community. The decision-making process may even require participation by local stakeholders (Firehock, 2011, p. 2). Another author describes CBC as “designed to forge a compromise between nature protection, property rights, and local livelihoods” (Schwartz, 2012, p. 2324). CBC grew into popularity in the United States land management context in part due to settlement patterns resulting in checkerboard patterns of public and private land, a resurgence of the property rights movement, the difficulty inherent in managing resources across diverse ecological and social environments, long held traditions of American democratic governance, and finally community interest in seeking solutions that recognize community values (Firehock, 2011, p. 4).

Many types of public participation already are included in land management: notice and comment, formal and informal hearings, town hall meetings, open houses, workshops and consensus-based processes, and personal meetings (Squillace, 2013). In this analysis I consider community-based collaboration to typically indicate a higher level of involvement, one that may fall in the category of consensus-based processes and workshops. Finally, it’s equally important to establish a working definition of community for this analysis. The definition Berkes provides
works especially well, describing communities as “multidimensional, cross-scale, social-political units or networks changing through time” (Berkes, 2004, p. 623).

**Community-based collaboration in the land and natural resource management field**

While the field of political ecology generally seems to support community-based collaboration, there is significant controversy regarding this concept within environmental management. While some see collaboration as a way to engage local communities and knowledge (Berkes, 2004; Finewood and Porter, 2010; Díez et al., 2015; Apostolopoulou and Pantis, 2010), others criticize collaboration as potentially compromising environmental protection in favor of private interests (Schwartz, 2012; Squillace, 2013).

**Benefits of community collaboration in land and resource management:**

Authors promote community-based collaboration as an alternative to the incongruence between the environment and management practices attributed to centralized, top down control (Berkes, 2004; Finewood and Porter, 2010; Diez et al., 2015, Robbins, 2006). From this viewpoint, the reliance on expert-based management focused primarily on scientific studies carries the risk of excluding discourses of ‘value, equity, and social justice’ from management principles and issues (Berkes, 2004, p. 624). To some level of disagreement, Finewood and Porter point to a broader ‘structural incongruence’ that inherently exists between markets and the environment, claiming, “decision-makers are unable to reconcile market imperatives (i.e. commodification) with the spatial ‘rhythms and cycles’ of land. (Finewood and Porter, 2010, p. 133).

Many authors instead argue that community-based collaboration benefits land and resource management by building on community place-based knowledge and experiences and providing for more flexibility (Berkes, 2004; Díez et al., 2015; Finewood and Porter, 2010). This
first requires an expansion beyond traditional science-based approaches, such as the inclusion of traditional ecological knowledge of native communities (Berkes, 2004, p. 627). Through including local voices, some authors claim that community-based collaboration builds trust and compromise, thus fostering long-term community support for conservation practices (Berkes, 2004; Díez et al., 2015; Apostolopoulou et al., 2010).

*Limitations of community collaboration in land and resource management.*

Arguments regarding the limitations and disadvantages of community-based collaboration in land management regimes suggest how private interests potentially have more power than the public interests in public land management contexts (Schwartz, 2012; Squillace, 2013; Finewood and Porter, 2010). One perspective suggests that the application of political ecology to the context of land and resource management of developed nations is problematic since political ecology largely originated from literature surrounding the management contexts of developing nations (Schwartz, 2012). Preservationism has recently been called into question for being hegemonic, primarily in some developing countries where the preservation of natural areas is favored over the interests and even well-being of local communities (see Mbaria and Ogada, 2016). However, Schwartz argues that collaboration has replaced preservationism in being hegemonic, claiming that that “power dynamics in the field of growth management and conservation have shifted: the collaborative, market-based, win–win approach has displaced top-down preservationism as the hegemonic paradigm” (Schwartz, 2012, p. 2339).

That said, authors point to how economic and private interests may be unduly favored in collaborative processes—a form of neoliberalization of nature (Schwartz, 2012; Squillace, 2013; Finewood and Porter, 2010; Reed, 2007). Rather than seeking to balance conservation goals with the interests of livelihoods and property rights, authors argue that community-based
collaboration leads to development centric management (Schwartz, 2012; Finewood and Porter, 2010). For instance, Finewood and Porter (2010, p. 138) warn that because our society largely utilizes markets and money to value environmental resources, development friendly perspectives may prove more powerful in collaborative processes, forcing dissenters to reframe concerns through discourses other than environmental/ecosystem health.

Authors finally caution against the assumption that local voices are more legitimate than that of the broader public, given that collaborators promote their own private interests and already have increased participatory ability compared to the larger public through established processes (Schwartz, 2012; Squillace, 2013). Given these limitations, this perspective cautions against placing too much decisional power in collaborative processes in public land management, emphasizing the primarily educational outcomes this process should achieve (Squillace, 2013).

While taking into consideration the limitations to collaboration itself, it may be more useful to ask: how can we make collaboration and public participation in land management more effective, benefiting both communities and management practices? The existence of a constructive dialogue and a high level of transparency between different stakeholders and researchers has been found to be an important factor in creating effective CBC efforts in the Natura 2000 model of the European Union (Díez et al., 2015, p. 134-135). Multiple authors in the field also mention the importance of ensuring equity in collaborative land management processes as a means to empower the most excluded and vulnerable segments of a community (Díez et al., 2015; Robbins, 2006; Apostolopoulou and Pantis, 2010; Reed, 2007; Squillace, 2013). If policymakers fail to recognize the disparities in power that “classed, gendered, and raced processes” create, CBC risks creating “exclusivist ideologies of property and nature”
(Robbins, 2006, p. 198). Squillace expands on this notion of inclusion, noting that public interest should consider the potential interests of future generations and non-human communities (2013, p. 21-3)

From this analysis, it would seem that there is importance not only in finding an effective level of public participation and engagement, but also in exploring effective implementation of CBC depending on the land management context.

**The Collaborative Process and Organ Mountains—Desert Peaks National Monument**

In many ways, the call for a national monument review process is evidence of a shift towards community-based collaboration in U.S. public land and resource management discourses. In analyzing the impact of the OMDP National Monument on the local community, I am essentially exploring the relationship between the local community and the monument land. I see this as an important first step in assessing the political ecological implications of public participation in national monument land management. Exploring the level of involvement and engagement of local stakeholder and community groups in both the designation and review processes of the OMDP National Monument may help uncover the current state of public involvement and community collaboration in federal land management processes. The level of inclusion of local voices into monument land management decisions may lend insight into the extent and value of current community collaboration on public land management in the U.S.

Finally, by asking community leaders how local public involvement in federal land management could be improved upon, I look to see if a sort of community-based collaboration in this context could prove useful in forming consensus and communication surrounding public land management. Within this, I determine if the aforementioned limitations of CBC exist within the context of the Las Cruces community and the OMDP National Monument.
Figure 2. Map of the Organ Mountains—Desert Peaks National Monument boundaries showing public, state, and private land divisions courtesy of Jerry Schickedanz of New Mexico State University
Methods

The Trump Administration’s stated reason for the national monument review process was to better account for local interests, claiming that the designation process failed to adequately consider these interests. Thus, a large part of this study serves to assess if the designation process did indeed exclude community interests and whether the review process of Secretary of the Interior Ryan Zinke has adequately engaged the public. Within this, I ask how well Secretary Zinke’s recommendations reflect the positions of the communities in Doña Ana County and Las Cruces.

Participants

I spoke with 30 people from Las Cruces and Doña Ana County, New Mexico during the course of the research. From news reports and government documents, I identified a series of community groups—ranchers, environmentalists, recreationists, scientists, tribal communities, and local government/Bureau of Land Management—from which initial participants were drawn. The inclusion criteria include any community members aged 18 – 100. Because of the short time frame of the study, I used a limited snowball-sampling approach to identify further individuals to interview who are informed about the designation and review of the Organ Mountains—Desert Peaks National Monument.

Duration of the Study

Interviews were conducted between December of 2017 through February of 2018. Over half of interviews were conducted in person between December 27th 2017--January 6th 2018.

Questions

I chose to use a semi-structured approach; often times these questions served as jumping off points for the conversation and are only a guideline for how my interviews were structured.

1. In the designation how involved were you and your community?
2. Tell me about your involvement with your community or occupation.

3. How have you seen the National Monument designation impact your community? What do you perceive are the advantages or disadvantages?

4. How would a potential downsizing of the National Monument impact your community?

5. How informed do you see your community regarding the initial designation and following review process and are you aware of any misconceptions?

6. Did you have the chance to talk with Secretary of the Interior Zinke when he visited Las Cruces?

7. Did you feel that your voice and interests were heard during the review process? That is to say, how well did you feel you and your community were able to participate in this process?

8. How do you think that various stakeholders should be better involved in federal land management?

**Data Analysis**

In this study, I recorded the majority of the interviews except in cases of technological malfunction and transcribed portions that were relevant to this research. Using this data, I synthesized the results in order to construct a picture of public perceptions of the OMDP National Monument and of local community involvement in both its designation and subsequent review. Within this, I analyze the comments made by community members separating interests by perceived community or stakeholder group.
Results and Analysis

While in Las Cruces, I learned a great deal about the context in which the conflict regarding the OMDP National Monument is set in. The designation of the OMDP National Monument happened after a long string of legislative attempts to get areas within the monument designated as wilderness—efforts that started roughly 20 years prior to the presidential proclamation by President Obama in 2014, which replaced these legislative attempts. These bills never made it through congress. Conversations generally suggested that this process was largely organized by the New Mexico Wilderness Alliance (NM Wild), and later supported by the Friends of the Organ Mountains Desert Peaks National Monument (FOMDP). Table 1 compiles the interviews of this research, naming the occupation and organization of each participant except in cases where anonymity was requested.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder group</th>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scientists</td>
<td>Angel Peña</td>
<td>Archeologist/Cultural Resource Specialist</td>
<td>NM Wilderness Alliance</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>Botanist</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fernando Clemente</td>
<td>Wildlife Biologist</td>
<td>Friends of the Organ Mountains-Desert Peaks</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gregory Penn</td>
<td>Biologist</td>
<td>NMSU</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Margaret Berrier</td>
<td>Artist/Archeologist</td>
<td>BLM</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joel Hoffman</td>
<td>Biologist</td>
<td>Friends of the Organ Mountains-Desert Peaks</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranchers</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>Rancher</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frank Dubois</td>
<td>Rancher</td>
<td>Former DOI</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jerry Schickedanz</td>
<td>Rancher</td>
<td>NMSU</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wes Eaton</td>
<td>Rancher</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Organization/Role</td>
<td>Contact Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rancher</td>
<td>Local Farm Bureau</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmentalists</td>
<td>Meg Freyermuth</td>
<td>Artist/Volunteer</td>
<td>BLM, Friends of the Organ Mountains National Monument</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jeff Steinborn</td>
<td>Activist</td>
<td>NM Wild</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gabriel Vasquez</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>Friends of the Organ Mountains-Desert Peaks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nathan Small</td>
<td>Advocate</td>
<td>NM Wild</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bernie Digman</td>
<td>Business owner</td>
<td>Milagro Coffee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carrie Hamblen</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Green Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreationists and Sportsmen</td>
<td>David Crider</td>
<td>Business owner</td>
<td>Southwest Expeditions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>Motorist Business Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dan Carter</td>
<td>Biologist/Recreation and Trail Advocate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Cornell</td>
<td>Activist/Community organizer</td>
<td>Doña Ana County Associated Sportsmen/NM Wild</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTACT</td>
<td>David Soules</td>
<td>Sportsman and Board Member</td>
<td>NM Wilderness Alliance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mel Taylor</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Four-Wheel Drive Club</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David Beyer</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Four-Wheel Drive Club</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David Smith</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Four-Wheel Drive Club</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Communities</td>
<td>Rafael Gomez</td>
<td>Tribal Official</td>
<td>Ysleta del Sur Pueblo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTACT</td>
<td>Alex Mares</td>
<td>Tribal Liaison</td>
<td>NM Wild</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Cruces City Officials</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>Flood water manager</td>
<td>EBID</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joel Delk</td>
<td>Floodwater management</td>
<td>Soil and Conservation District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 1. Table of research participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other BLM</th>
<th>Chuck Glyph</th>
<th>Volunteer</th>
<th>BLM</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tom Phillips</td>
<td>Former Supervisor for Recreation/Cultural/Wilderness Programs</td>
<td>BLM</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Environmentalists

During my research, it became clear that the environmentalist community supports the national monument designation and lists various benefits to the community, ecosystem, and land that the monument brings. It is important to note that this group is quite fluid as I discovered that scientists, some recreationists, those in the business community, tribal representatives, and even one rancher I talked to would describe themselves as environmentalists. That said, in this community group, I include those whose primary occupation or advocacy focuses around the environment. I primarily reference representatives from the New Mexico Wilderness Alliance (NM Wild) or Friends of the Organ Mountains Desert Peaks (FOMDP) as well as quotes that speak directly to environmental concerns.

Perceptions of the Monument

The prominent argument brought up through my conversations with environmentalists was that through a designation, the risk of disposal is eliminated that would otherwise threaten the ecosystem, cultural resources, and the landscape itself of the area. Among the environmentalists I talked with, there was an emphasis on the protection of the ecology of these lands. Professor Joel Hoffman of New Mexico State University claimed that despite decreased visitorship, the western areas of the monument are just as important due to the historic and prehistoric objects such as the Butterfields stagecoach line and the WWII bombing targets. Nathan Small of NM Wild summarized the impact of the monument, stating, “what won’t...
happen is that those lands won’t be sold off, they won’t be fully industrialized. That’s the baseline in a national monument protection” (Interview 20). Jeff Steinborn, the Southern New Mexico Director of NM Wild, echoed this concern, stating that lands up for disposal were “potentially on a long term trajectory towards development or disposal”, and that “there is no guarantee that the community will have these public lands in the future” (Interview 4). There was acknowledgement of the improbability of oil or gas extraction in this area due to no known sources; however, one respondent feared that the review process is an attempt to open this area up so that when technology develops “they can drill even further in our monument and they want to have that land open” (Interview 3).

In addition to this, many environmentalists saw the monument as a means to more effectively regulate the land, thus preventing degradation of the objects identified in the proclamation. This concern for regulation was specifically directed at overgrazing prevention. J. Steinborn hoped that with the monument designation, there will be more staff available to understand both the environmental and archaeological resources, promoting better management of these objects (Interview 4).

Another benefit cited by environmentalists focuses around the economic benefit that the OMDP National Monument designation has brought to Las Cruces businesses—primarily due to increased attraction of tourists, retirees, and businesses. All of the environmentalists with whom I spoke agreed that the monument designation is drawing more visitors to Las Cruces. The predominant visitorship is to Dripping Springs and the Sierra Vista Trail according to multiple respondents. M. Freyermuth volunteers at the Dripping Springs Visitor Center and claimed that the number of visitors has at least tripled in the last two years and that it is not uncommon to see at least one thousand people over the weekend (Interview 1). J. Steinborn cited that there has
been a 150% increase in visitation by his own estimation (Interview 20). Furthermore, there seems to be increased national interest in the monument. M. Freyermuth claimed that at the Dripping Springs Visitor Center, “at least half of the cars have out of state plates” (Interview 1). Carrie Hamblen, director of the Las Cruces Green Chamber of Commerce, brought up a Lonely Planet Article written about Las Cruces, something she claimed illustrates how Las Cruces is now on the map because of the monument (Interview 3).

Respondents from the environmental community maintained that with this tourism come direct benefits surrounding business and economy. During our conversation, C. Hamblen brought up the aforementioned BBC report claiming significant financial impacts of the monument due primarily to increased non-local visitorship (Interview 3). According to respondents, this outside interest is important because it brings outside money to Las Cruces, growing the economy. Not only are people visiting, but they are allegedly moving to Las Cruces as well. J. Hoffman told me that the monument “makes Las Cruces a lot more attractive place for businesses to come, or people to retire to” (Interview 11).

Everyone from this community explained how the designation of OMDP National Monument supports product branding and allows promotions around the monument. The branded products brought up include Organ Mountains Outfitters and Amaro Winery which have a series of wines. C. Hamblen among others emphasized that there is a positive impact for businesses when they decide to cross-brand the monument with their business (Interview 3).

Another prominent argument made by those in the environmental community was that the monument designation allows for a better quality of life for those living in Las Cruces. J. Hoffman suggested how the majority of the community “has fallen more deeply in love with the natural spaces that we’ve got around here, both East and West of town” and how the monument
promises a high quality of life for the people who live here. Bernie Digman, who represents Vet Voice⁹, held that his advocacy for open public lands comes from his belief that these lands are valuable for the mental and physical health of veterans returning home from combat (Interview 9).

I perceived that environmentalists see the monument designation as a means of bringing the Las Cruces community together and strengthening community bonds. This was a point that was particularly emphasized by C. Hamblen of the Green Chamber of Commerce. An example of this that stuck out to me was the creation of a Girl Scouts patch¹⁰ that gave troops the opportunity to go out and learn about and support the monument land. Another example brought up a few times was the Monument to Mainstreet event that takes place in Las Cruces in September (Interview 3). C. Hamblen foresees a future in incorporating the rich cultural heritage and diversity of Las Cruces with the monument through present and future events such as a past Mariachi concert (Interview 3). Gabriel Vasquez, former board member of Friends of the Organ Mountains–Desert Peaks National Monument, similarly credited that monument in strengthening the identity of the Las Cruces community. G. Vasquez felt that one of the reasons that New Mexico loses its best and brightest to other states is that they don’t feel a strong connection to their home. Finally, M. Small noted that post-designation, “internally I’ve seen a great deal of pride, celebration, and expanded connection.”

Regarding the claims made by ranchers, environmentalists were generally convinced there was no negative impact imposed by the national monument designation. Environmentalists point out that nothing has changed in terms of land use since the designation, which is due to the fact that the Resource Management Plan is only in the beginning stages of creation. The most representative quote comes from J. Hoffman: “Nothing about this monument has stopped
ranchers from doing their ranching.” Secondly, both G. Vasquez and B. Digman mentioned how ranchers are leasing land for a comparatively cheap price, far below market value and thus had little room for complaint. Five of the people I talked to from the environmental community even believed that the ranchers were being dishonest in their claims. M. Freyermuth argued that, “it is hard to have a conversation with these people who refuse to understand or are willingly lying” (Interview 1). M. Steinborn claims that, “you have hyperboles designed to instill fear…frankly for selfish motivations so that someone can retain sole possession” (Interview 4).

Environmentalists also generally held that ranchers were uncompromising in their demands. This was a point that J. Hoffman brought up, who felt that ranchers only would accept the monument lands being turned into Rangeland Management Units or downsized.

Similarly, environmentalists dismissed the idea that the monument designation would impact border patrols. Most informative on this issue was Jeff Steinborn who formed the Border Security task force while an aid for Senator Jeff Bingaman. In this role, J. Steinborn brought together the ranching community with border patrol to make sure that they had enough staffing and communication to provide for effective border enforcement. J. Steinborn explained that “the National Monument designation does not have any specific language that prevents border enforcement”. Additionally, J. Hoffman contended that “[Border Agents] can patrol along existing roads and along the border as much as they want” and that the Senators spent years talking with border patrol and ensuring that they had adequate access to the monument (Interview 11). For instance, according to J. Hoffman, there were plans to install electronic devices on the monument that would alert border security of potential trespassers.

Lastly, in response to the claims that there were things listed in the proclamation that were on private or state lands, David Soules, who has done a fair bit of mapping for the
designation of the monument, made clarifications in a later email surrounding three elements of
the proclamation which he believes may be the subjects of this controversy: Providence Cone,
the Butterfield Trail, and Kilbourne Hole.¹³ D. Soules explained that while Providence Cone is on
State Trust Lands, there is evidence of Native Peoples in the surrounding area on Federal land
within the monument. He also predicted that a likely land exchange between the BLM and the
State Land Office will add Providence Cone to the monument. Secondly, regarding the
Butterfield Trail, D. Soules cited that one Stage Stop is on private land, and a second stage stop
is on State Trust land within the monument. However, the stage stop on the State Trust Land is
also an inholding, subject to a possible future land exchange to eventually include it inside the
monument. Finally, although part of Kilbourne Hole is on private land, D. Soules claimed that
there is a significant enough portion of it on public land to validate its inclusion in the
proclamation. In conclusion, D. Soules stated that, “private landowners certainly have cultural
features on their land, but it appears to me that the language in the monument declaration was
prepared very carefully.”

Involvement of the Environmentalists

The original designation was led principally by the environmentalists, specifically with
NM Wild at the head. Furthermore, of those with whom I spoke, all felt included and that both
the environmentalist community and the larger Las Cruces/Doña Ana County community were
informed and engaged in that process. Statements regarding involvement from all of those
somehow affiliated with NM Wild or FOMDP are included in this section.

As noted, NM Wild led the effort for the designation of OMDP National Monument. D.
Soules explains that NM Wild led the campaign for a national monument and continues to
support ongoing efforts to designate appropriate areas in S. New Mexico as wilderness
However, it would also seem that Carrie Hamblen and the Green Chamber for Commerce had an important role in developing support for the monument designation (Interview 3; 9).

Environmentalists emphasized how deeply involved they felt their community was in both the legislative designation attempts and in the presidential proclamation designation process. Interviewees highlighted how there was roughly a 10 year effort to designate this land as either wilderness or a monument (Interview 1;3;6;11;20). C. Hamblen emphasized this, saying, “Obama didn’t designate OMDP just after 3 months of us telling him that this was going on...that was a ten year process” (Interview 3). M. Freyermuth claimed that work in the community truly initially began around 20 years ago (Interview 1). N. Small argued that the field hearings, hundreds of public meetings, and the multiple pieces of legislation that were part of this process made the OMDP designation one of the “most vetted conservation efforts” (Interview 20). D. Soules detailed how one of the bills came out of congressional committee with unanimous approval and bipartisan support but didn’t get a vote due what he feels was the then focus on healthcare—potentially explaining the failure of the legislative attempts for designate the monument (Interview 22).

Turning to the presidential designation, the overwhelming opinion was that all parts of the larger Doña Ana community were intentionally involved and engaged by the environmental community who largely organized the effort. J. Hoffman told me that, “the whole process was very much driven by community outreach and soliciting community response” (Interview 11).14 Similarly, N. Small stated:

“*We’ve done by and large a darn good job with voice and buy-in from a lot of different perspectives, including quite conservative perspectives, quite a-political perspectives.*
Those voices have been and continue to be at the table...It was a strong affirmation of a locally driven effort around federal public land” (Interview 20).

J. Steinborn testified, “We would never want to do anything that would obviously hurt any group of people in this community by conserving land” and that NM Wild worked, “real hard to mitigate any real issues” (Interview 4). Specifically referring to the ranching community, J. Hoffman said, “we were listening and actively trying to engage that community for years, we just seemed not to be able to get anywhere” (Interview 11).

Within the presidential designation process, meetings with Secretary of the Interior Sally Jewell were described to be engaging and well attended. From these interviews, I figured there were at least 500 people and up to 800 people in attendance at a public meeting with Secretary Jewell (Interview 2;3;11). The environmentalists claimed that Secretary Jewell was unbiased and listened to the community (Interview 1;2).

Conversely, those from the environmental community expressed disappointment with Secretary Zinke’s review process. To begin, most felt that while they had a chance to voice their opinions in the review process, it was insufficient. Upon announcement of the review, the county held County Commission Meetings and City Council Meeting to pass resolutions in support of the Monument (Interview 1). N. Small also cites these four resolutions in being bipartisan and showing diverse community support for the monument (Interview 20). Specifically, G. Vasquez discussed how during the review process, FOMDP convened a meeting at the NMSU Chancellor’s home the last day of Secretary Zinke’s visit to Las Cruces where diverse interests were represented; archaeologists, geologists, and sportsmen attended and focused on making a case for the objects of protection and why current boundaries should remain (Interview 2). In this review process, M. Small believes that, “in that limited time frame, community members rallied
together to do as good of a job as possible, to communicate the gravity and seriousness of the
issue and the importance of keeping the monument intact” and that within this there was a
diverse input from the community including farmers, ranchers and elected officials (Interview
20).

Almost everyone with whom I spoke expressed disappointment that Secretary Zinke did
not attend the Town Hall meeting on July 27th, 2017. Instead claims were made that the
Secretary met with opponents in private—referring to the later discussed meeting at the Farm
and Ranch Museum. J. Hoffman remembered that there was at least 400 people at the Town Hall
while C. Hamblen said this number could have been as high as 700 (Interview 11, 3). J. Hoffman
explained that this Town Hall was organized by a coalition consisting of a number of
environmental organizations in the area: FOMDP, NM Cafe, NM Wildlife Federation, the Green
Chamber of Commerce, NM Wild, Conservation Lands Foundation, Environment New Mexico,
and the National Wildlife Federation. J. Hoffman continued, claiming this coalition created local,
regional and national involvement in the review process (Interview 11).

There is some lack of clarity regarding the relative balance between his meetings with
supporters versus opponents, but those I talked to similarly felt that the opposing side was given
relatively more access to Secretary Zinke. J. Hoffman explains that Secretary Zinke’s absence
from the Town hall was made more disappointing considering that he “had been to other events
on that day that were attended only by people who disagreed with the point view of the rest of
this community” and that “I don’t think we were considered to the degree that we should have
[been]” (Interview 11). However, M. Freyermuth attested that from intel she had from the BLM
staff, Secretary Zinke was actually at Dripping Springs meeting with the BLM at the time the
Town Hall was in session (Interview 1). M. Freyermuth ultimately saw imbalance in the
inclusion of the review process asserting that the Secretary “was meeting with the opposition supposedly for four hours, and then four hours set aside to meet with proponents of the monument” which consisted of many more people (Interview 1). On this note, in speaking to D. Soules, he stated, “the three or four hundred local people that wanted to meet with him did not get an audience but the half a dozen in the opposition in the ranching community did.” C. Hamblen believed that there were 25 people in the community who are against the monument and that Secretary Zinke only met with these “select groups in private sessions and then had a private news conference\textsuperscript{16} that nobody could go to” (Interview 3). Finally, she stated that the Secretary did not meet with the business community, ignoring an invitation to a meeting consisting of the businesses that had been positively impacted by the monument (Interview 3).

However, though these conversations, I learned that Secretary Zinke seemed to have spent some time on the monument during his visit in July, in one case joining a hike with the veterans. M. Freyermuth personally met with the Secretary during this hike in Silver Canyon.

Some in the environmentalist community felt that the review process was pre-decided, politicized, and that Secretary Zinke was not really listening. During our conversation, G. Vasquez expressed that he felt that Secretary Zinke had come in with preconceived notions about the objects of protection and that felt like they were talking to a member of the opposition (Interview 2). J. Steinborn seemed to share this perception, telling me, “Zinke dismissed the voices of support as being nothing other than organized groups” (Interview 4).\textsuperscript{17} He referenced the missed Town Hall claiming, “if the Secretary wanted to really hear from the community, he would have welcomed that opportunity to go to that public meeting…rather than spend a whole day behind closed doors meeting with a group of people we still don’t know.”
Others in the community had rather positive things to say about Secretary Zinke’s interactions with the community. In the end, J. Steinborn believed the Secretary “came to understand that this was a special place that had overwhelming support and he really had no business messing with the work we have done.” B. Digman actually commended Secretary Zinke, describing him as approachable and conversational, though very non-committal (Interview 9).

**The Ranching Community**

While in Las Cruces, I interviewed six individuals from the ranching community, all of whom are active ranchers with connections to leased allotments or to those with leased allotments on BLM monument land. Through these conversations it became apparent that most ranchers see the designation of the Organ Mountains—Desert Peaks National Monument as a negative thing in terms of its predicted impact on their livelihoods, border security, and other impacts they have learned about through their advocacy against the monument designation. This community also largely feels they were excluded from the designation process and inadequately considered during the following review process of 2017.

**Perceptions of the Monument**

Above all else, the prominent concern voiced by ranchers regarding the Organ Mountains—Desert Peaks National Monument was the perceived impact that the monument designation would have in the accessibility of lands leased from the BLM as well as private inholdings within the monument in order to do maintenance and improvements. The ranchers with whom I spoke expressed concern predominantly over the current language of the proclamation as it related to grazing. It states that: “Laws, regulations, and policies followed by the BLM in issuing and administering grazing permits or leases on lands under its jurisdiction
shall continue to apply with regard to the lands in the monument, consistent with the protection of the objects identified above” (Proclamation No. 12508, 2014). In my conversation with Jerry Schickedanz—a lifetime long rancher, a rangeland management advocate, and a Dean at New Mexico State University—he mentioned the difference in this wording to that of the Proclamation for the Establishment of the Basin and Range National Monument in southeastern Nevada which states: “nothing in this proclamation shall be deemed to affect authorizations for livestock grazing, or administration thereof, on Federal lands within the monument. Livestock grazing within the monument shall continue to be governed by laws and regulations other than this proclamation” (Proclamation No. 9297, 2015). This he claimed represents the language many ranchers would prefer this proclamation to have regarding grazing. Similarly, Wes Eaton, another rancher with whom I spoke, believed the proclamation to have the “worst language of any proclamation” (Interview 17). One rancher explained how this language indicates that the priority for the BLM is “the impact that [grazing’s] got to some nebulously described object that it’s protecting” (Interview 15).

Many ranchers seem to be equally concerned regarding the prohibition of new right of ways on land they are leasing within the monument boundaries. They asserted that this prohibition may preclude improvements to the leased land as well as improvements to private land enveloped in the monument. One rancher pointed out that “it’s not actually grazing access that has been limited, it’s vehicular access and soil disturbance” (Interview 10). Because ranchers have always had to get access permits on the leased BLM land prior to the designation, the primary concern dealt with the uncertainty in what the Resource Management Plan will look like and what they will and will not be allowed to do. One rancher said: “The impact at this point has been pretty minor, and maybe it’s just the fact that we don’t know what the Resource
Management Plan is going to look like” (Interview 15). J. Schickedanz explains that due to the designation, he will not be able to build a road or get electricity to this private land within the monument boundaries a concern shared by rancher Bud Deerman. Ranchers also claim that they may have to wait for the Resource Management Plan to be completed before engaging in many maintenance and improvement projects on leased BLM monument land.

A second important concern regarding grazing that the ranchers expressed was the prediction that the National Monument designation would eventually lead to reductions in allowed grazing permits or number of cattle allowed per allotment. Perhaps this is best illustrated by a comment made by a rancher in the Las Cruces area who has asked to remain anonymous:

“Historically if you look at national monuments across the West, over time grazing clearly takes a backseat to other resource management issues...Ranching on this desert is marginal enough that as this becomes more difficult to do, you will see people just eventually go out of business” (Interview 15).

Bud Deerman shares this concern, fearing that ranchers will be asked to reduce livestock to the point that many will no longer be able to make a living (Interview 12). According to the experiences of some ranchers, these reductions in grazing permits may come about due to a future wilderness designation.18 In order to illustrate the gravity of these concerns, one rancher explained:

“Someone who can imagine themselves in various places, careers, ways of living, has much more flexibility in line than someone who is completely embedded in one way of living...and they can’t imagine doing anything else” (Interview 10).

Within this, those in the ranching community expressed how they feel they are stewards of the land and that the monument designation hinders efforts towards sustainable grazing
practices. Wes Eaton practices rotational grazing which with the addition of two new wells this year, will allow every area of the ranch to be rested for a full year. He has already seen drastic improvement in the grass, but that he predicts that the monument designation will impact those conservation efforts. To illustrate his point, W. Eaton attested that the National Conservation Resource Service refuses to work in this area due to the proclamation and local BLM oversight.

W. Eaton also spoke about creosote and the role this species has on ranching and the vegetation in the OMDP National Monument area. As W. Eaton described, creosote spread to this region in the early thirties and forties, and that ranchers and BLM alike have worked to eradicate it through an aerial pellet that prevents root growth and allows for the return of grasses. This year, his ranch treated 1,000 acres of brush and that “things like monument designation prevent us from dealing with it.” W. Eaton further explained: “We are putting our hard earned dollars into it…to be great environmental stewards of the land and we continually get hammered with regulations that prevent us from doing that” (Interview 17).

Finally, ranchers mention how they provide water for wildlife in the region through their wells originally meant for their cattle. On rancher remarked, “one of the joys of my life is to see antelope drinking water and running around and quail and javelina…they’re as much a part of the landscape and I appreciate them as much as anything and happy for them to share that water resource” (Interview 15). Ultimately, it would seem that the ranchers want the larger Las Cruces community to know: “there is a reason why I don’t want the monument…it’s not because I’m not about protecting the land” (Interview 17).

Through my conversations with those in the ranching community, all but one saw the designation as unnecessary for the protection of objects listed in the proclamation and many felt that these objects were not worth protection in the first place. Many of the ranchers I spoke with
did not see disposal of BLM land as a legitimate threat. J. Schickedanz explained that there are restrictions in place that prevent the massive disposal of federal public land\(^1\) (Interview 7). Ranchers also generally expressed their perception that the monument designation isn’t protecting anything that wasn’t already adequately protected and think it’s best to “leave things the way they were” (Interview 12). In referring to the monument designation, W. Eaton held, “I’ve yet got an answer from anybody that can tell me why it needed to be done. I hope you can answer that in your research. I know the answer, I hope you can find out” (Interview 17).

Furthermore, one rancher noted opposition to the overlaying land designations. Bud Deerman stated: “It doesn’t make any sense to have a designation on top a designation on another designation,” referring to land he leases that consists of Areas of Critical Environmental Concern that are within the monument boundaries (Interview 12). Management of these overlapping designations would be addressed through a later resource management planning process, but for this rancher who’s leased land consists of these overlapping designations, it’s seems redundant.

Many of the ranchers I talked with do not agree that the objects in the monument necessarily warrant protection. F. Dubois claims: “A lot of the things that are mentioned are in fact widespread in New Mexico. The idea that this is somehow a unique habitat or a unique object is just not accurate” (Interview 5).\(^2\) J. Schickedanz shares his view that the monument largely makes up a barren desert that is not worth saving in the first place (Interview 7). Yet one rancher I talked to did not hold these same views, suggesting that there may be a contingent of ranchers who support the protection of these objects under a monument designation:

“I think that the scattered nature of this monument makes some ranchers see it as a little contrived. It doesn’t feel contrived to me because...it’s basically just drawing together}
these mountain islands that surround the city and that makes sense to me...as an ecological...way of talking about them” (Interview 10).

That said, ranchers expressed concern that this monument designation was an overreach of the Antiquities Act for several reasons. Both W. Eaton and F. Dubois claimed that there are objects listed in the monument that are not actually on public land, but private. Some ranchers also believed that the size of the monument vastly supersedes the area needed for the protection of the objects in the monument proclamation and that this designation may have been used to protect land rather than objects protected by the Antiquities Act. In this way, F. Dubois explained how he felt that the Antiquities Act is being viewed as a land protection measure rather than a means to protect Native American objects (Interview 5). F. Dubois said that it seemed that the boundaries of the monument were drawn first and that objects were found in retrospect to justify the size of the monument (Interview 5). J. Schickedanz corroborated this, claiming that it seemed objects were found to “fill in the blanks” (Interview 7).23 Both J. Schickedanz and F. Dubois expressed their perception that ecosystems are not considered an object viable for protection under the 1906 Antiquities Act, which they claimed deals primarily with historic and prehistoric objects.

Relatedly, the majority of ranchers also challenged the claimed economic benefits that the monument brings, even citing potential economic disadvantages. During my meeting with J. Schickedanz, he explained how the “monument has been oversold in terms of economic development” by the report written by the Green Chamber of Commerce.24 Ranchers also feared that their value of their private land now inside the monument will decrease due to increased difficulty in getting right-of ways and easements from the BLM (Interview 12; 17). One of the ranchers told me that “you will find nobody wants to come back and buy these operations with
an additional layer of federal oversight” and that it is harder to get loans from banks (Interview 15). Finally, W. Eaton argued that the economic investment that ranchers make needs to be considered in any economic assessment the monument, stating: “Next week we are starting drilling two more wells. That is twenty-thousand dollars a well. That’s the kind of investment that we are putting into our ranching operation” (Interview 17).

On par with the aforementioned economic disadvantages, ranchers were concerned that the monument designation will displace development. Ranchers cite the already limited amount of private property around Las Cruces exacerbated the negative impact of the National Monument. F. Dubois claims that “only 10% of Doña Ana County is in private property” (Interview 5). 25 According to one rancher, it may be dangerous “to eliminate federal lands from ongoing economic development or potential uses for solar installations or wind generation” because it is “very difficult at this point to see what we need...years from now” (Interview 15). F. Dubois explained how the monument designation “is going to force all that development into this private property up and down the river which is going to impact the amount of farmland and in some ways the culture of the community” (Interview 5). In contrast, one rancher I spoke to felt that while it has been sad to see farmland “gobbled up”, ultimately there would be a pressure for development and erasure of these areas regardless of the monument designation (Interview 10).

A final economic concern brought up by the ranching community was the potential for less company investment in Las Cruces because of the designation. One rancher mentioned a proposed model city “that would be located in this area and bring lots of economic development and jobs, but they had basically said they would not come if the property was burdened by this National Monument” (Interview 15). The model city this rancher refers to is the ghost city proposal from Pegasus Global Holdings known as the Center for Innovations, Testing and
Evaluation which is expected to bring up to one billion dollars in regional economic impact (Gibbs, 2015). This city would be an empty city used to test technological solutions. As of an article published May 2016, plans for this city are expected to continue, lending evidence to the contrary that they decided to withdraw because of the monument designation (Mraz, 2016).

Border security was another prominent concern among the ranchers I talked too. In fact, five of the six ranchers brought it up as a problem in our conversations. Some ranchers asserted that border patrol agents are not able to adequately do their job by not being able to patrol inside of the monument (Interview 7, 17). B. Deerman believed that drug money may even have been involved in the monument designation (Interview 12). According to one rancher, the primary concern regarding border security is in the Portrillo Mountain area and the western portion of Las Uvas (Interview 15). Two ranchers cited the alleged illegal immigration and drug trafficking corridor that the Organ Pipe Cactus National Monument has created: “We simply have seen the national monument in Arizona where it has become basically a corridor for illegal immigration…That’s just not what we want our community to be” (Interview 15). W. Eaton expected similar results in Las Cruces, claiming that they already “see drug trafficking over here and we’re kind of isolated” (Interview 17). F. Dubois pointed out that border security was the principle reason for the opposition by many in the business community of Las Cruces to the OMDP National Monument designation, notably those of the Las Cruces Chamber of Commerce (Interview 5). The only rancher who wasn’t concerned about border security told me, “I have heard some rhetoric around border security and I wasn’t super convinced. That seemed like that was maybe being hyped more than it needed to be” (Interview 10). Little was said about how exactly the monument designation would impact border security except for the prevention of routine patrols inside the monument and comparisons made to the Arizona national monument.
Involvement of the Ranching Community

Many of the ranchers felt that they were not sufficiently included in either the designation or the review process of the Organ Mountains—Desert Peaks National Monument. Within this, many ranchers perceived their ability to engage with the designation process as nonexistent. Frank Dubois claimed that, “we had virtually zero participation” (Interview 5).

Prior to the presidential proclamation, the ranching community has fought the decade long effort to designate the monument legislatively through Congress since 2006. Frank Dubois asserted that it is important to consider these numerous failed legislative attempts as evidence for a lack of support for the monument (Interview 5).

During efforts to designate the monument via a presidential, ranchers felt left in the dark. Ranchers explained that they were approached by Senator Udall and Senator Heinrich’s staff, but that they did not feel heard at these meetings. One rancher stated: “Senator Udall’s office called and asked for a couple of quick questions, but really it looked like to me they were checking off lists of everybody who had ranch that was located within the monument, they weren’t really listening to anything” (Interview 15). W. Eaton also met with the staff aids of one of the senators, but, “didn’t see any maps for what they were proposing” and next thing he knew, “they had the Secretary of the Interior, Ms. Jewell down to discuss a proposed monument” (Interview 17).

The ranchers were disenchanted with the meeting held by Secretary of the Interior Sally Jewell. F. Dubois claimed that ranchers had 36 hours of notice that Secretary Jewell was coming to Las Cruces to meet with community members regarding the proposed national monument and it seemed that monument proponents had a much longer notice (Interview 5). Three ranchers brought up that people were bussed in from Albuquerque, Silver City, and El Paso to attend this
meeting (Interview 5;12;17). Both Frank Dubois and Wes Eaton remembered that these outsiders "filled out all the seats so that a lot of the local community was turned away" (Interview 5; 17).27 Outside of that public meeting W. Eaton claimed that ranchers were not involved in any other meetings with Secretary Jewell (Interview 17). He stated: “Nobody is involved in this decision. The people that it affects are not involved at all. El Paso Electric, people who own private property within, people who own leases…why does one man get to designate an entire person’s life and livelihood?” (Interview 17).

Another rancher felt, “being it a proclamation, rather than any kind of legislative process, it sort of just happened on us” and that the previous legislative process was “hijacked by the presidential designation” (Interview 15). This rancher also implied that the sudden nature of the proclamation was intentional: “The proclamation was never made available prior to it being issued so that people could have time to look at what’s in this proclamation” (Interview 15).

One that note, a few of the ranching representatives I talked to expressed their belief that the environmentalists behind the monument designation, notably NM Wild had ulterior motives in designating this land and that the designation process was driven by politics. B. Deerman asserted that Jeff Steinborn wants grazing completely eradicated and is fueled by political motives rather than economic concerns. In my conversation with W. Eaton he stated, “somebody has a bigger agenda than any of us and they don’t care about land preservation” (Interview 17). However, one rancher felt that these sentiments within their community is only an issue of perception and that ranchers simply “mistrust the motives of people who want these types of designation” (Interview 10).

Ranchers explained that many in both the ranching and larger community were not adequately informed regarding the monument designation. Both J. Schickedanz and W. Eaton
felt that the larger Las Cruces community only thought that the monument consisted of the Organ Mountains because that is that was portrayed by monument advocates (Interview 5, 17). Specifically regarding the ranching community, one rancher perceived the community as overall not informed, stating, “I expect that a few individuals are examining it carefully, but I think that most people were responding on a gut level” (Interview 10).

One last point I would like to address here is the notable exclusion of Hispanic ranchers from the list of ranchers I interviewed. This absence may have something to do with the fact that few Hispanic ranchers lease on BLM land in Doña Ana County, due to the history of the area, but more information is needed here to corroborate this.

While the review process was seen initially as a positive course of action by most in the ranching community, ultimately ranchers felt its actualization a disappointment largely due to the short timeframe, a perceived pre-decision, and the involvement of politics in the review by Secretary of the Interior Ryan Zinke. F. Dubois chaired a group meeting at the Farm and Ranch Museum with Secretary Zinke which included ranchers, a representative for the soil and water district, El Paso Electric, and two county commissioners (Interview 5). W. Eaton gave a presentation at this meeting (Interview 17). Furthermore, F. Dubois explained that “the Western Heritage Alliance…submitted 75 pages…that included maps and photos and text explaining the various problems with the designation…so they were very well informed and very much engaged in the process” (Interview 5).

Despite being engaged in the review process, many ranchers felt that it was rushed. At the aforementioned Farm and Ranch meeting with Secretary Zinke, F. Dubois remembered that this meeting only consisted of 45 minutes with the Secretary (Interview 5). Another rancher testified that this meeting went about an hour to an hour and a half, but admitted that, “not
everybody got to speak, and not everybody got to engage in a conversation with Secretary Zinke” (Interview 15).

Many of the ranchers with whom I spoke saw the review as pre-decided (Interview 12; 5). F. Dubois contended, “the deal was cut before Zinke ever got here” explaining how “Senator Heinrich sits on the authorizing committee for any bill that affects Interior and Senator Udall sits on the appropriations committee which controls their budget.” Referring to Secretary Zinke, F. Dubois stated, “I think he looked at that and I think the Navy Seal blinked” (Interview 5). W. Eaton concurred, wishing the review “would actually look at the issues and try to come up with solutions” (Interview 12).

Finally, ranchers generally felt that politics played a role in the review process as it did in the designation. J. Schickedanz noted that while Secretary Zinke seemingly listened well, politics took over explaining why nothing was done about their concerns. J. Schickedanz claimed that in both cases politics set up the guest list. He explained that while Secretary Zinke may have gotten criticism for not engaging more with NM Wild or FOMDP, the ranchers only got two seats at the table when Secretary Jewell visited. He told me that Congressman Steve Pearce set up this meeting with Secretary Zinke (Interview 7). Comparatively, F. Dubois believed that monument proponents had much more time and access to Secretary Zinke during the review process than ranchers had had with Secretary Jewell during the original designation process (Interview 5).

Frank Dubois summarized the sentiment of the ranching community surrounding involvement in both the designation and review processes of the OMDP National Monument:

“The ranching community that was so demoralized by what Obama did since they were able to win every legislative battle that came along...then along comes Trump, and they get their hopes all up all over again, they do all this work...and then to be totally
ignored. They have been zapped twice. They’ve been zapped by the democrats, they’ve been zapped by the republicans” (Interview 5).

Recreationists

Within the recreationist stakeholder group, there were two drastically different takes on the national monument designation. Overall, motorized vehicle recreationists tended to think poorly of the monument and the designation processes, whereas hikers, mountain bikers, and the sportsmen I talked to spoke more of the benefits and tended to hold similar views as the environmental community.

Perceptions of the monument

Many of the recreationists with whom I spoke cited visitor and business increases due to the hype of the monument designation. Dan Carter, a biologist and recreation and trail advocate in Las Cruces, told me, “just having this name and designation has brought some visibility and notoriety to this place”, making Las Cruces a destination both nationally and internationally (Interview 19). Similarly, David Crider, owner of Southwest Expeditions, a local recreation company, explained the benefit of the monument to his business: “We just, as a for-profit business, want the time as a monument status to build our business. To us it is a huge advantage...another three years from now we should be doing this full time” (Interview 16). Since the designation, D. Crider has noticed increased national attention of his business with interested recreationists from New York and Arizona and a tour company from Chicago. He also mentioned how a five-star hotel that will be contracting them is moving into the old courthouse, a decision he believes is at least partly due to the monument designation. Dan Carter has noticed more recreation out on the trailheads—primarily runners, hikers, climbers, and mountain bikers. He also notes that the numbers for the Sierra Vista Trail Runs have grown significantly since the
designation, jumping to 300 participants from 140 participants from races prior to the designation. A new route, the Monumental Loop, has also been spurred by the designation (Interview 19).

Contrarily, David Beyer from the Las Cruces Four-Wheeler Club noted that these economic benefits are only one side of the story. He explained the supporters of the monument don’t account for what he estimates is a $6 million impact of the Chili Challenge—an annual chili cook off attended by 300-400 people that is put on by the Las Cruces Four-Wheeler Club which has been displaced because of the monument designation. Furthermore, he explains that “the reality is somebody with a jeep that breaks down…and uses fuel is going to spend a lot more money than a guy with a Prius and a water bottle….they just don’t spend a lot of money” (Interview 18).

Many of the recreationists with whom I spoke explained how in many ways the monument designation protects recreation access, both through better regulation and prevention of disposal and thus development. D. Crider says that without rules in place out on public land, it becomes trashed for everybody (Interview 16). John Cornell, from the Doña Ana County Associated Sportsmen and NM Wild, asserted that “National Monuments are beneficial for what we like to do and not a hindrance” because they prevent areas from being opened up for development which would otherwise impact habitat and wildlife, and thus hunting. J. Cornell explained that after the designation, “the hunting out there has been as good or better than it’s been in a lot of years” (Interview 29). D. Crider was similarly concerned about potential development that would happen without the monument in place—from roads, commercial buildings, houses, and mining—pointing to El Paso as the example of uncontrolled development (Interview 16). D. Carter elaborated on this point, claiming, “there is tons of in-fill development
that can be done in the city of Las Cruces” (Interview 19). Finally, while the no-new-roads requirement of the proclamation may have some recreationists worried, D. Crider wasn’t concerned, stating “there’s tons of trails out there, there’s …bike groups that have gone out and are re-working the trails” (Interview 16).

As mentioned, not all the recreationists shared this optimistic viewpoint. Recreationists are also worried that the monument designation will hinder recreation access, especially those from the four-wheeler community. Much of this concern seemed to deal with the uncertainty following the designation and preceding the Resource Management Plan with regard to trail access and changes in regulation. One anonymous motorized vehicle business manager stated that while the monument status might prevent development and protect recreation access that way, ultimately, he felt the monument status instills more “you-cannots” (Interview 13). David Beyer from the four-wheel club expressed how the monument designation is “an affront to our freedoms” out on public land. The motorized vehicle business manager I talked to said that there was a very real fear among his community that all the trails would be closed off to motorists and that no one was sure which if any would be open (Interview 13). D. Carter expressed that the only downside he sees of the designation is that the Resource Management Plan has interfered with trail work and maintenance due to the BLM being reluctant to be “pre-decisional” prior to the completion of the management plan. D. Carter believed that, “creating new trails for mountain bikes appears to be completely off limits because the proclamation says no new trails for mechanized vehicles” (Interview 19). He continued, explaining how areas that were originally set to become special recreation areas and proposed new trails have been put on hold. D. Carter concluded, claiming that while recreation use would be easier without the designation through simpler management, ultimately he feels like “you need every protection you can get”
Recreationists, particularly those from the motorist community, expressed their strong desire to keep the area multi-use and ideally not change anything regarding recreation access. While the one motorized vehicle business owner I talked with claimed that some areas should be protected from motorized use, he primarily wants to see a continuance of multi-user ability (Interview 13).

**Involvement of Recreationists**

From these conversations, it was clear that the motorists did not feel included in the designation process, but that those from the hiker, biker, and sportsmen community felt more than adequately involved. The way in which the motorists communicated their engagement in the designation process speaks to the division present between motorists and other recreationists. This is most noted in the following quote from David Beyer of the Four-Wheeler Club:

“The sad thing is the division between the outdoor enthusiasts...I get it...there’s guys out there with four-wheel drives that don’t obey the rules and they make new roads and stuff. We are not about that. We’re about conservation, we’re about staying the trail, tread lightly...But the backpackers, the REI, those kind of people, they for some reason they are against us” (Interview 18).

Recreationists from the motor community echoed some of the mistrust communicated by ranchers towards NM Wild. David Beyer from the Four-Wheeler Club noted, “the Wilderness Alliance or whoever the group is that is promoting the monument and promoting wilderness…they don’t promote the truth a lot of the times” (Interview 18). Within this conversation, a quote that stuck out to me was, “the group does not have one name…the sportsman alliance, the Wilderness Alliance” (Interview 18). I noticed much the same during this research. NM Wild during the review process had hired people from different community or
stakeholder groups, including recreation, primarily for the purpose of advocacy for the monument designation.

From my conversations with motorists, I came to realize that this community felt largely left out of the original designation process and rather uninformed about the monument designation. One motorist vehicle business owner indicated that he felt his community to be unaware and uninformed in the original designation process (Interview 13). Those from the four-wheeler club indicated much the same. David Smith stated: “For the overall four-wheeling community, I would say that people are pretty uninformed, maybe even misinformed. What they would know would be mostly heresy stuff. It’s either too calamitous or just total ignorance of what really happens in the process” (Interview 18). D. Beyer claimed that there is a misconception among members of the general motorist community that the monument is completely off limits to four wheelers, while in fact this will be later determined by a Resource Management Plan. In this designation process, he claims that it has become the responsibility of his club to keep their community informed.

Additionally, D. Beyer explained how the motorist community felt completely blindsided by the proclamation. D. Smith stated that their group only saw an announcement for the community meeting with Secretary Jewell week before it was to happen. He also complained that people were bussed people in from Albuquerque and El Paso (Interview 18). However, D. Smith made an effort to be involved, attending a press conference with Senators Heinrich and Udall along with Secretary Zinke out by Magdalena peak thirty five minutes from Las Cruces. D. Smith described the press conference as a “dog and pony show,” but that he had had the chance to tell Secretary Zinke that he believed the designation process not to be a local initiative given that non-locals were bussed into her community meeting.
Conversely, the conversations I had with those I identified to be primarily from the hiker and biker community indicated a higher level of involvement. David Crider from Southwest Expeditions who focuses in hiking, biking, and rafting tours, noted that he definitely saw the designation as a one-party effort, but the Democrats specifically Jeff Steinborn and Nathan Small reached out to him and his company prior to the designation. D. Crider explained his own involvement: “We did what we could do in having functions…to get these people out…bringing different groups onto the land.” In the designation process, D. Crider explained that he and his company were involved in three to five years of work with local politicians, environmental organizations, and the Green Chamber of Commerce. During our conversation D. Crider stated, “for this particular monument…the people’s will went through just because of the loudness and the persistence and the longevity of that. Nobody gave up”, indicating the high level of involvement he saw within his community (Interview 16). However, Dan Carter, a mountain bike enthusiast and trail advocate, didn’t feel his group or community was quite as involved in this designation process, noting that “trail users weren’t really represented in the proclamation, whether by pure oversight, or by design, who knows” (Interview 19). He noted the problematic nature of this given the overwhelming focus that advocates of the monument placed on the benefits of recreation, while the proclamation may simultaneously exclude mountain bikers and trail development. Since the proclamation, his group has been involved with NM Wild and FOMDP, but prior to the designation D. Carter noted insufficient engagement.

Sportsmen seem to be the recreationist group that was most involved in the original designation process based on the comments made by John Cornell of Doña Ana County Associated Sportsman and advocate for NM Wild. J. Cornell explained how he was hired by NM Wild to work with the sportsmen community to inform them about what a monument designation
means to them, largely showing them the benefits. Given this experience, J. Cornell explained, “Through the whole process that I was involved with it was ‘what do the sportsmen want?’, ‘Are the sportsmen supporting this” and I honestly Sy don’t think that we would have got our monument designated if the sportsmen hadn’t supported it and been on board” (Interview 29).

By contrast, the review process seems to have been exclusive of all recreationists in Las Cruces based on my conversations from community representatives. The motor vehicle dealer I spoke to mentioned how a lot of his community tried to be involved but felt left out (Interview 13). D. Beyer claimed the motorist community was represented, but there wasn’t much involvement nor direct representation of the motorist community (Interview 18). This suggests that the review process involved motorists more so than the designation, even if not by much.

During my visit with David Crider, the nature of the hike with the Vet Voice and Zinke was clarified. D. Crider explained how Southwest Expeditions organized this outing to hike and river raft with Secretary Zinke and that forty people were in attendance (Interview 16). D. Carter described his attempts to be more involved in the review process in order to make sure biker and trail advocate voices were heard. However, he explained how he ultimately was not able to engage in this review, stating, “Secretary Zinke did not contact the trail alliance or myself. No one from the BLM was contacting us during the review.” From this experience, D. Carter claimed that “it really just seems like the administration...doesn’t really care what the public input is” and that their minds were already made up (Interview 19).

Lastly, John Cornell outlined his involvement in the review process and that of the sportsmen community, explaining that he thinks the sportsmen voices were heard despite limited engagement on Secretary Zinke’s part. For instance, J. Cornell told me he was able to speak at the Town Hall. However, apart from this, J. Cornell expresses disappointment that Secretary
Zinke ignored requests to meet with sportsmen, stating, “he chose not to hear what our message was” (Interview 29).

**Tribal Communities**

During my time in Las Cruces, I met with Rafael Gomez, tribal council official of the Ysleta Del Sur Pueblo. I later had a phone conversation with Alex Mares who served as the tribal liaison for NM Wild. Despite attempts to get in contact with a representative from the Mescalero Apache and the Fort Sill Apache communities within the timeline of this research, I was unsuccessful.

**Perceptions of the Monument Designation**

The principal benefit of the monument designation brought up by both tribal representatives was that it protects against development, which in turn protects the history and the land of the area. R. Gomez from the Ysleta Del Sur Pueblo stated, “as a whole it’s good for Las Cruces and El Paso, for tourists, for saving the environment. The time to protect these lands is now, before the cities overdevelop it and it’s too late.” R. Gomez continued, describing the equal importance of the lands west of the freeway: “There’s a lot of history out there…At least now there is that extra layer of protection” (Interview 23). Meanwhile, Alex Mares cited what he calls his ethic as a ranger and ties to his Diné morals: “The land has to be the determining factor.” That said, A. Mares claimed, “You have to have a system in place that is looking at the land”—a function which the monument designation will hopefully complete. Within this conversation, A. Mares brought up his concern regarding recreationists, emphasizing the importance of prioritizing the “needs, wants, and desires” of the land over those of the client in
land management practices. He explained that while humans are part of the environment, we must immerse ourselves in a responsible, educated way.

*Involvement of the Tribal Communities*

Our conversations were much more focused on the level of involvement that the tribal communities in Doña Ana County had in the designation and review processes respectively and indicated a high level of involvement of the tribal communities as represented by these two interviewees.

Based on my conversation with R. Gomez, there was significant involvement of the Ysleta del Sur Pueblo in the designation. The Ysleta del Sur Pueblo Tribal Council initially passed a resolution in support of the monument designation and had actually been involved in the wilderness bills preceding the monument designation process. Throughout the designation process, R. Gomez claimed that Nathan Small and NM Wild kept them involved. In the Town Hall meeting with Secretary Jewell, he and members from his community got to meet with her. During this time, R. Gomez detailed a few trips he took to Washington D.C: “When I went to Washington, I had a stack of letters, support letters, reports, everything that I gave to Secretary Jewell.” While he personally had an obligation to be present at a community meeting, there were other members of his community who were present at the signing. In this conversation, R. Gomez noted the partisan nature of the designation process—describing the meetings held by Representative Steve Pearce where everybody in attendance opposed the monument. At the same time, R. Gomez concluded that Senators Udall and Heinrich have been champions of coordinating Native American perspectives in this process.
Alex Mares expanded on this perspective, communicating his belief that the monument would not have been designated if not for the support of the Native communities in the area. At the beginning of the process, after being contacted by Nathan Small, A. Mares noted the seeming lack of Native American and Mexican American history or connection to this monument on the part of NM Wild, allegedly due to a lack of contacts with these communities. In this A. Mares asked, “how can you succeed in this effort to establish a national monument and to impress upon the public and our representatives and congressmen the significance of this area when you are ignoring people who have up to a 12,000 yearlong history to these lands” (Interview 30). Thus, as the tribal liaison for NM Wild, A. Mares helped cultivate Native American inclusion. Because of this, A. Mares stated, “I don’t find it ironic or coincidental that once the Native American community was involved, engaged, invited, reached out to that it happened in less than 3 years.” A. Mares argued that the nature of the unique government to government relationship between Native American communities and the U.S. Federal Government and the presence of strong Native American support and artifacts on the land made it easier and more justifiable for President Obama to designate the monument through a presidential proclamation.

However, A. Mares also noted how he saw many people from Native American and Mexican American communities as largely uninformed regarding the monument designation. He perceived that while they know what is out on the land, they don’t know what has changed post-designation. Part of this, he explained, is due to the high percentage of people who work blue-collar jobs on a survival income, leaving little free time to engage and inform themselves in this process. He also described a perception among these communities that the government is going to do whatever they want regardless.
These conversations revealed that the Native American communities represented in this research were involved in the review process but only to a limited extent. Ralph Gomez described the meeting with Secretary Zinke as far too short given the number of tribal governors and groups lined up to speak. In the end, “no one really had that much time to talk.” R. Gomez also spoke to the common sentiment that the Secretary was only working through the process, his mind already made up (Interview 23). On this note, A. Mares criticized the Secretary for not attending the Town Hall at the Convention and Tourist Bureau. A. Mares mentioned the meeting with the non-environmentalists at the Farm and Ranch Museum, criticizing that it wasn’t public despite being in a public facility headed by the Secretary who should be working for all. A. Mares asserted that above everything, he thought that the meeting with Vet Voice and the former navy seals out on the monument truly had the biggest impact in this review process.

**Scientific Community**

In this section I outline any interests that scientists in the area have regarding the National Monument land and make some scientific clarifications regarding claims that have been brought up prior, specifically relating to creosote treatment and the impacts of grazing on monument land. I determined this community group based on primary occupation or formal training in either ecology or archeology.

**Perceptions of Monument Designation**

Above all else, the scientists with whom I spoke explained how the monument designation protects desert ecosystems and wildlife through preventing disposal and development on land, while also potentially improving the regulatory ability of the BLM. In my discussion with a local botanist, all of the endemic species within the monument area are found
within the Organ Mountains section. This botanist also mentioned how there are other rare plants and endemic snails throughout the entire monument area. This botanist saw the threat of grazing as the main issue yet mentioned that its impact on endemic and rare species is small given that many of these species are cliff plants, where intense grazing would largely not occur. Ecologists Fernando Clemente and Gregory Penn were similarly concerned about continued practices of overgrazing, especially given the compounding impacts of drought (Interview 24; 26). F. Clemente also addressed some of the uncertainty regarding creosote treatment on rangelands, explaining that the success of this treatment is dependent on significant rainfall and a high (at least 20%) coverage of grass within the treated area (Interview 24). This may explain why ranchers have difficulty getting permits to treat for creosote on their own.

Outside of this commentary, the focus from the scientific community was on the beneficial impact for wildlife the monument status brings, echoing much of what was said by the environmental and sportsmen communities. Both F. Clemente, the Wildlife biologist for NM Wild, and Dan Carter clarified in many ways why such large spaces are needed for wildlife populations and the ecosystem as a whole. D. Carter summarized this point, stating: “the desert requires much larger space because it is low water and low forage” (Interview 19). He also stressed the importance of protecting the island ecosystems created by the mountain ranges with buffer zones around them. F. Clemente noted how the monument area provides a home range for wildlife and how “the habitat is very very fragile” (Interview 24).

While some from the scientific community of Las Cruces were notably worried about the risk of development as previously detailed, most focused on the role that improved management would have in protecting the ecology and archeology of the monument area. G. Penn pointed out that “without knowing how the land is going to be managed we can’t even begin to predict what
the impacts will be” (Interview 26). He saw the designation as beneficial primarily in that with it comes a mandate and associated funding for inventory and assessment of resources on the monument which comprise a scientific basis of knowledge not yet attained. G. Penn advocated for a management policy that should neither completely shut out grazing and tourists nor degrade the land through overuse. Archeologist and jeweler Margaret Berrier noted that, “in the past, the ranchers have pretty much done whatever they wanted…they let their cattle running over archeological sites” and that “hopefully the BLM will be required to do better surveying” post-designation (Interview 28).

Within these conversations, these scientists mentioned the importance of preserving these lands for the purposes of academic scientific study. From both the ecological and archeological side of things, all those with whom I spoke agreed that this area remains understudied. Angel Peña, cultural resource specialist for NM Wild, explained:

“It’s really expensive to do archeology and it takes schools or organizations a long time to build up these grants...10 years from now when there is more money or there’s a student that is energized to use this monument, if the boundaries are altered in any way it might open access for development” (Interview 25).

According to A. Peña, the current archaeological record “makes it very apparent that something big was happening down here” (Interview 25). M. Berrier concurred with this perspective, claiming that only 10% of the monument has actually been surveyed for archeological sites and that BLM land is the most accessible for research compared to state and private land. She claimed that this area is particularly important for archeology because of its connection to Mesoamerican culture. M. Berrier mentioned how the American Rock Art Research Association came to Las Cruces in 2016 after the designation to do field trips with 300 people, donating to
both the Friends of the Organ Mountain Desert Peaks and NM Wild (Interview 28). Similarly, biologist F. Clemente talked about his program of two years, where he takes students from both the U.S. and Mexico out into monument to teach them about conservation and research.

Involvement of the Scientific Community

Alike other community groups, those from the scientific community emphasized the lengthy process of legislative attempts for monument designation pre-proclamation. During our conversations, both F. Clemente and A. Peña brought up the meetings with Secretary Jewell, mentioning that she held at least a few meetings and attended the Town Hall. A. Peña claims there were over 1,000 people there (Interview 25). F. Clemente dismissed the claims made by monument opponents that they weren’t let in and remembers seeing the same 10-15 monument opposers at the public meetings he attended. Members from the scientific community that I talked to also highlighted the extensive involvement and engagement from the larger Las Cruces community. F. Clemente described his work creating dialogue between community members and Senators Heinrich and Udall. He saw the designation as being largely based off studies (Interview 24). In this process, G. Penn claimed, “there was a lot of communication between the BLM and the local community and our local representatives” (Interview 26).

As with other communities, the scientists with whom I spoke in Las Cruces were not able engage in the review process as much as they wanted to. G. Penn stated, “I was not invited to have anything to do with it and I felt like I had no opportunity to be involved in it if I had wanted to be” (Interview 26). M. Berrier got to talk with Secretary Zinke during the hike organized by Southwest Expeditions, yet was ultimately disappointed that he didn’t see any of the archaeological resources while on this hike. She remembered, “the amount of time that I got to talk to Secretary Zinke about the cultural resources was very small”, which she noted is even
more problematic given that she is not a professional. Continuing, M. Berrier noted, “most of the
professionals like the BLM archaeologist or the contract archaeologist in this area couldn’t
actually speak up and talk to Zinke because their livelihood would be threatened...It’s very easy
to get blacklisted...if you cross the government” (Interview 28).

As for other complaints about the review process—that it was pre-decided, there was insufficient time, not all were heard, and it was largely a closed-door process—there was no notable differentiation in what those from the scientific community said from what was communicated by other community groups.37

Local Government and other local BLM representatives

In this section I summarize the highlights from my conversations with the former Supervisor for Recreation/Cultural/Wilderness Programs at the local Las Cruces BLM office, Tom Phillips, a former employee of the Soil and Conservation District, Joel Delk, and a representative from the Elephant Butte Irrigation District. These conversations shed light on the level of involvement that local agencies had in the designation and review process and the impact that the monument designation has had on watershed management, utility right of ways, and BLM operations. As with other groups, a lack of certainty regarding regulations post-designation seems to be a prominent issue.

One of the main concerns mentioned by various groups is the claim that the utility corridors, namely of El Paso Electric, will be compromised as a result of the National Monument designation. From information obtained from various interviewees, through the eastern part of the monument run electrical transmission lines from El Paso Electric and gas pipelines. As an anonymous flood water manager explained, a main concern focuses around the restrictions of
utility right of ways within the monument when considering future growth and demand for electricity and gas in Las Cruces. There is concern regarding the ability to upgrade down the road need be. Various interviewees mention the case of the Burlington Northern rail which was originally planned to run through the now designated monument area. The new route is proposed to cut through the valley to connect to Union Pacific which many claim will endanger farmland (Interview 27).

Tom Phillips made several clarifications regarding the potential impact of the monument designation on grazing permits, recreation, and permitting to make improvements and maintenance on the land. T. Phillips predicted that rancher grazing permits could be reduced, explaining that the proclamation directs the BLM to protect these objects above all other land uses. This includes recreation, explaining that because recreation is not mentioned in the proclamation, recreational use might be curtailed. Conversely, T. Phillips didn’t think that there will be any real difference in the time-frame and effort it would take for ranchers to get a permit to do maintenance and land improvements on BLM leased land post-designation once the Resource Management Plan is in place. Until then, decisions that are made concerning land use will be stringent as to not preclude management options later in the resource management planning process.

Finally, T. Phillips addressed his belief that the monument designation was an overreach of the Antiquities Act, mirroring the concerns held by many ranchers and recreationists. T. Phillips claimed that the language of the proclamation not only “took a common resource and created this mystical elevated value…you know Chihuahuan desert species as this mystical, endangered object”, but also included many objects as natural resources, which are not particularly described as part of the Antiquities Act (Interview 14). That said, T. Phillips
expressed his view that the National Monument designation was not an appropriate tool in this case and that the Antiquities Act was never about retaining public land. Lastly, T. Phillips claims that the objects were found after the land was designated and that some objects listed in the proclamation are not on public land. He claimed this includes: the Butterfield Stage Station, Providence Cone, Summerford Mountain, and El Camino Real de Tierra Adentro.

The two watershed and flood water managers with whom I spoke expressed their concern that watershed management will be negatively impacted due to possible limitations in access within monument boundaries. While the dams themselves were left outside of the monument boundaries, they explained that effective flood management starts on the land before the dams, currently inside of monument boundaries. Joel Delk gave an idea of scale, stating that there are at least 100 flood control dams on either side of the Las Cruces valley from 50 miles North of Las Cruces down to the State line. J. Delk explained:

“In the world of storm water management...the most effective and most economical storm water management measures begin or are shaped in the upper reaches of the watershed. That is where you have the opportunity to create some kind of structure or use some methods to slow the water down” (Interview 21).

One of these methods is brush-control to allow the return of grasses. While they have not been told that they will not have access, there is still a lot of uncertainty. The flood water manager from EBID shared these concerns, especially when it comes to working with the BLM, explaining that they are not sure if the BLM is an agency that understands water, given their focus on land management (Interview 27). The flood water manager explained: “It’s going to be almost impossible to go through the requirements under the Resource Management Plan to get that job done...When we do have to interact with [the BLM] it is a very slow and tedious process
to get things done” (Interview 27). The flood water manager explained the complications related to mineral rights claimed by the BLM and the removal of silt behind the NRCS Flood Dams because of BLM requirements. That said, they suggested that a reduction of the monument to the Organ Mountains area would greatly reduce these concerns.

Finally, Joel Delk claimed that the monument designation threatens the tax base of Doña Ana County, given that taxes paid on cattle creates revenue for the county—grazing restrictions could decrease this property tax (Interview 21).38

Involvement of Local Government/BLM

Prior to the presidential proclamation, the BLM had significant input into the legislative designation process according to T. Phillips who at the time was still working for the BLM. In this process, T. Phillips claims that the BLM did a lot of mapping and were involved in providing the background information about the resources in the now designated monument area. During these various legislative attempts, sometimes the BLM reviewed the language on the legislative bills and provided input for the agency testifying in Congress. Throughout the years, T. Phillips described how the level of involvement depended on the administration, and “whether they sought that input actively or grudgingly” (Interview 14). However, in the designation process via presidential proclamation, T. Phillips noted the limited role the local BLM office had, claiming, “the proclamation did not have any local field office input. We became aware of it, but it wasn’t driven by input from the local field office, which, to me, was a little disconcerting since it was an administration approach…It was disheartening to say the least” (Interview 14). T. Phillips believed that this lack of local BLM involvement contributed to the problems of the proclamation.
My conversations with the two water managers indicated an attempt on behalf of Senators Udall and Heinrich to involve these agencies in the designation process. Both Joel Delk of the Soil and Water Conservation District and the representative from EBID claimed that the Senators worked with them prior to the proclamation, but that ultimately this involvement didn’t amount to the changes they would have liked to have seen. One floodwater manager from EBID remembered:

“Both Senator Udall and Senator Heinrich’s office came in and visited with us about our concerns. So did Congressman Pearce. But it seemed that they were focused on making this a monument and anything we tried to do didn’t resonate with them enough to change what course finally came out, which they designated quite a bit of our watershed into the monument” (Interview 27).

Similarly, this EBID representative stated, “I was pleased that they were working with us, but at the same I don’t think that they understood that if we ever have a 500 year storm our here it is going to be devastating to the valley floor” (Interview 27). However, through this process, both water managers felt that the government representatives were accommodating and worked with them to “cherry-pick” out the 27 flood control dams that were originally part of the monument boundaries (Interview 27). Additionally, EBID did participate in the public meetings prior to the proclamation according to the representative with whom I spoke.

In the review process, it would seem that the water managers and El Paso Electric were involved to a limited degree while the involvement of the local BLM field office remains uncertain. Both the EBID representative and T. Phillips concurred that the following groups attended the Farm and Ranch meeting with Secretary Zinke: Doña Ana County Soil and Water Conservation District, EBID, and El Paso Electric. However, the EBID representative expressed
his belief that at this meeting Secretary Zinke, “might have been pressured into not taking the concerns of those in the room to heart”, speaking to the aforementioned perception that the review process was pre-decided (Interview 27). Within this conversation, T. Phillips noted that he believed Secretary Zinke did a good job getting a variety of opinions and that one on one meetings were more effective than any Town Hall meeting would have been.
Discussion and Recommendations

While I received a lot of input regarding what should be done to change the monument—downsizing, changes to language in the proclamation, or monument additions—in this study I am not addressing these. Here, I speak to the affect that the monument has had on the Doña Ana county community, the various levels of involvement in the designation and review process, and finally, how local community in this case could have been better involved.

Engagement of local community: what this means for community-based collaboration

In terms of the equality of participation across community groups in the original designation and subsequent review of the Organ Mountains—Desert Peaks National Monument, there was not a perceived equality of participation. In the designation, ranchers and motorized vehicle owners felt largely left out of this process. These conversations revealed that in Secretary Zinke’s review process, almost every community group had the chance to voice their opinions, almost all felt it inadequate. From this, it would seem that while an attempt was made to better engage the community, the review did not fully complete its stated goals of including local voices.

As discussed previously, it is equally important to consider the equality of voices of the community in order to ensure a just process of participation or collaboration (Díez et al., 2015; Robbins, 2006; Apostolopoulou and Pantis, 2010; Reed, 2007; Squillace, 2013). Through these conversations, I noticed a surprisingly high occurrence of assumptions about other community groups. For instance, a perception that ranchers were uninformed, anti-environment, and dishonest generally came from those I spoke with in the environmentalist group. On the ‘other side’, a few of the ranching representatives I talked to expressed their belief that the environmentalists behind the monument designation, notably NM Wild, had ulterior motives in
designating this land and that the designation process was driven by politics.\textsuperscript{40} I see this as speaking to what Robbins discussed as the problem of collaborative processes of local participation potentially elevating certain voices while ‘denigrating’ others “in the presence of inevitable uncertainty” (2006, p. 198).

There was also evidence of a development centric viewpoint in the debate surrounding the monument that authors in the field warned of in processes of public participation (Schwartz, 2012; Squillace, 2013; Finewood and Porter, 2010; Reed, 2007). The argument made by Finewood and Porter, noting how environmentalists and scientists feel the need to restructure their concerns through a more economic and public welfare frame (2010,p. 138), seems particularly relevant in this case. Proponents of the monument largely focused on the economic and other welfare benefits the monument would bring to the community.

Additionally, my conversations with community members revealed somewhat of a balance between private and more publicly minded interests. We can consider the maintenance of current ranching leases as well as recreation access as largely private interests. Also present in these conversations was a focus on the economic tourism to the area and the ability of future generations to experience the monument, which are debatably public interests, if not local. Finally, a discussion should be had regarding the role that money may have had in elevating certain voices in the designation process particularly. For instance, the wilderness organizations had the money to hire advocates and to advertise when ranchers and recreationists largely didn’t.

\textit{Recommendations for the Resource Management Plan based on impact analysis}

From conclusions drawn from the assessment of impact of the monument on the local community, recommendations are based largely on the upcoming Resource Management Plan.
Prior to addressing these, there are a series of concerns that were brought up by respondents that merit a revisiting of the provisions and the restrictions laid out by the proclamation of the OMDP National Monument.

One of the main concerns mentioned primarily by ranchers and the irrigation and soil and water district representatives with whom I spoke was the potential compromised ability for El Paso Electric to upgrade their transmission and pipelines. However, the proclamation specifically addresses this in, “nothing in this proclamation shall be construed to preclude the Secretary from renewing or authorizing the upgrading of existing utility line rights-of-way within the physical scope of each such right-of-way that exists on the date of this proclamation” (Proclamation No. 12508, 2014).

Relatesly, concerns regarding potential flood water management within monument boundaries are addressed by the proclamation which explicitly states: “watershed restoration projects and small-scale flood prevention projects may be authorized if they are consistent with the care and management of such objects” (Proclamation No. 12508, 2014).

While many in the community, particularly ranchers, expressed concern about border security, ultimately the designation of the National Monument is unlikely to impact border security based on a memorandum of understanding between the Department of the Interior and Homeland Security and significant communication and collaboration in considering border security in monument plans. This is also addressed explicitly by the proclamation: “Nothing in this proclamation shall be deemed to affect the provisions of the 2006 Memorandum of Understanding between the U.S. Department of Homeland Security, the U.S. Department of the Interior, and the U.S. Department of Agriculture regarding ‘Cooperative National Security and Counterterrorism Efforts on Federal Lands along the United States' Borders’” (Proclamation No.
12508, 2014). While border security may be a concern, the monument designation does not seem to impact this one way or another.

Many respondents finally cited that this designation is an overreach of the Antiquities Act, primarily in that it includes objects that are not on public land. There does seem to be some uncertainty, but this was somewhat clarified by David Soules through his research on the objects within the monument and their locations. With this information in mind, this does not seem to be a concern that merits ongoing debate with other issues at hand. Some respondents doubted that objects listed in the proclamation that included ecosystems and endemic species are protected under the Antiquities Act. While of course they may or may not strictly fall under objects of scientific interest, previous Supreme Court cases have largely given standing presidents wide discretion regarding defining the objects identified for protection. Examining the evidence used by the Obama Administration to base the proclamation could help further clarify some of these concerns.

Aside from these issues which are largely addressed by the proclamation and/or outside of the purview of this research, I have identified a series of recommendations for land planners as they develop the Research Management Plan at the Las Cruces BLM field office. The overwhelming opinion from community leaders in support of the monument is that effective protection of the ecology in the monument area rests largely on how this area is managed, pointing to the importance of communication between scientists, community groups, and BLM managers during the RMP planning process.

My conversations with ranchers suggested that the monument designation may very well present a risk to their livelihoods. This seems to be a valid concern that was largely dismissed by the environmental and scientific communities in Las Cruces. Many of the environmentalists and
scientists I talked to contradictorily claimed that grazing endangered the objects listed in the proclamation, but that the monument designation would not impact grazing. A study conducted by Greenwire looked at how permitted grazing levels have changed post-designation looking at 11 national monuments similarly managed as National Conservation Lands under the BLM. While not finding evidence for the maximum number of livestock allowed to graze, the study did find evidence for restricted range improvements and an across the board reduction animal unit months amounting to eight percent (AUMs). Secretary Zinke’s review came to a similar conclusion: “The designation could prevent access to parts of allotments. Further, vegetative management and other maintenance work could be restricted and further degrade the ability for ranchers to run cattle” (Zinke, 2018, p. 16). That said, these points illustrate how the monument designation may indeed impact grazing practices and that land managers should recognize this in future discussion.

Given that recreation is not mentioned in the proclamation, land planners should be especially careful to include recreationists—motorists or otherwise—in the process. On that note, in January of 2018, a coalition of universities from the Public Lands Research Partnership published a study to better inform the BLM to “incorporate Outcomes Focused Management into the Resource Management Plan,” looking specifically at visitorship and recreation characteristics and expectations within the monument (Fix et al., 2018, p. iii).

Regarding the comments made by the floodwater managers with whom I spoke, in the RMP planning process, an open dialogue should be maintained with watershed and floodwater managers to do work within the monument.

Given these concerns, Secretary Zinke made the following recommendation, largely favoring current multiple-user ability as much as possible—"Proclamation amendment to protect
objects and prioritize public access, infrastructure upgrades, repair, and maintenance, traditional use; tribal cultural use; and hunting and fishing rights” (Zinke, 2018, p. 16). However, this recommendation likely precludes the type of management that would be needed to protect the objects listed in the proclamation, particularly ecosystems and habitats.

**Suggestions for Better Local Involvement**

Despite the contention surrounding the designation and review of the OMDP National Monument, community members came together to suggest improvements to and expansion of public participation in the national monument management process. Overall the suggestions can be categorized into three main umbrellas: (1) increases in funding and staff, (2) more opportunities for community engagement, and (3) transparency and communication from land management agencies.

**1. Increases in Funding and staff**

“It’s back to budgets” —David Crider

By far the most notable criticism that was brought up was a lack of funding—an issue that has been noted to not only hurt effective management of the newly designated monument, but severely limit the potential for effective public participation in land management. At least one person from every community group brought this up as a serious problem. David Crider from Southwest Expeditions explained, “it’s back to budgets. They can direct the BLM to do anything, but if they don’t have the money to do it…it’s just words” (Interview 16). In this, he explains that not giving the BLM a budget to appropriately manage the land takes away the chance it has to succeed. In fact, some thought this underfunding was justification enough for a downsizing, as David Beyer from the Four-Wheeler Club of Las Cruces expressed (Interview
This doesn’t seem to be entirely based on the politics of the administration involved, as attested Alex Mares of NM Wild: “No matter what administration’s in power, BLM has been underfunded, it has been undermanned and understaffed” (Interview 30). It also isn’t entirely separated from politics either, as a comment from R. Gomez of Ysleta del Sur Pueblo illustrated: “There’s always ways to find funding. Don’t give such big tax break right?” (Interview 23). A. Mares touched on this as well, claiming that the current administration’s lack of support has seemingly created more obstacles for funding. Two of the BLM volunteers I spoke with, Meg Freyermuth and Chuck Glyph both agreed that because of understaffing, volunteers are heavily relied upon at local BLM facilities (Interview 1,6). They have yet to even hire a new monument director. Bill Childres is still taking on the role of acting monument director. Several individuals pointed to the fact that the BLM has two patrol officers for almost half a million acres let alone sufficient office staff to handle the creation of a management plan (Interview 18; 30; 15; 16). Part of this may be due to the BLMs relative inexperience in the field of recreation, having historically focused on extraction and ranching (Interview 19). That said, recreation is not considered a priority for funding (Interview 6). In fact, Secretary Zinke came the same conclusion, recommending: “The DOI should work with Congress to secure funding for adequate infrastructure and management needs to protect objects effectively” (Zinke, 2018, p.16). Given this lack of funding, A. Mares emphasized the importance in finding ways to bring money to national monument communities—such as targeting the older generation who are most likely to retire in Las Cruces and hold the majority of wealth—as a means to avoid a scenario where land is inadequately managed or becomes available exclusively to those who can afford entrance fees.
This relates to a second significant point that community members brought up—the inefficiency in the Resource Management Plan and permitting processes post-designation. This may be especially impactful for ranchers, whose business often times relies on timely BLM responses. One rancher explained how “sometimes the timing of what needs to happen on the ranch is not compatible with that” (Interview 10). Funding is most definitely one major step towards making more efficient processes happen.

T. Phillips suggested the implementation of an interim management plan—a strategy he used as supervisor for the Trackways National Monument in New Mexico. He explained that this interim plan would not take a lot of involvement or time but gives an interpretation of the proclamation and what the options are, helping keep both the public and local agency informed. The 1993 tri-county plan could serve as the background for this plan. Otherwise, he warns, ODMP could wait over 10 years for a Resource Management Plan, as was the case in Trackways National Monument (Interview 14).

2. Opportunities for Engagement:

“Relationships and Responsibilities not Rights and Privileges” —Alex Mares

Partnerships: “Thinking outside the box” —Carrie Hamblen

Since increased funding to the BLM is by far not an immediate solution, respondents encouraged “thinking outside the box” (Interview 3) to build partnerships with various organizations and community groups in order to not only improve the management of the monument but build support and inclusion. Each community group offered their own suggestion of what a possible partnership would look like. Frank Dubois recalled the success of the Grazing Advisory Boards and multi-use advisory groups and suggests a return and focus on this model in
land management. However, T. Phillips warned against too much of a reliance on partnerships, referring to the difficulty inherent to contracting BLM work out. He argued that BLM staff still needs to be personally involved in management planning (Interview 14). David Crider from Southwest Expeditions also offered a partnership with the BLM:

“They don’t have a budget to enforce anything right now. They have one ranger...they can’t be everywhere at once...so that we are telling them is that we are a professional guide service...we’re actually your eyes and ears out there, we’ll work with you. That’s the kind of relationship we are trying to develop with them” (Interview 16).

Despite the earlier divisions mentioned between motorists and the hiker/biker community, David Beyer of the Four-Wheeler Club of Las Cruces offered a similar partnership: “The reality is the law abiding off-road individuals, a club like us, we’re their eyes and ears...now there is... a trash app for the Doña Ana County” (Interview 18). Volunteers from Friends of the Organ Mountains–Desert Peaks National Monument also clean and maintain trails (Interview 28, 23). Alex Mares from NM Wild suggested the inclusion of the community even in the science and research surrounding the monument area warning, “because otherwise we fall back to the old paternalistic patriarchal thing where ‘we are the government and we know better’” (Interview 30). This is in fact already being utilized to some degree. The proclamation mandates inventory and assessment of the resources within the monument which helps inform management strategies and long-term protection of resources. Within this, Dr. Greg Penn among others from NMSU are doing habitat and niche occupancy modeling for plant species within the monument boundaries. Somewhat alternatively, former water manager for the Soil and Water Conservation District Joel Delk suggested the implementation of coordination strategy as a means to return some control to the local community. In many ways speaking to this type of community-based collaboration, in his
memorandum, Secretary Zinke recommended: “The President should request congressional authority to enable tribal co-management of designated cultural areas” (Zinke, 2017, p. 16).

Inclusion: “The community has to be engaged at every level” —Alex Mares

Members from all sides of the Las Cruces/Doña Ana County highlighted the importance of including everyone who wants to be involved during both the designation and planning processes to build support and trust while providing for effective land management. Illustrating this, one rancher stated, “I think that whenever you can involve stakeholders, it builds a culture of trust” (Interview 10). Likewise, R. Gomez of the Ysleta del Sur Pueblo believed that if a side has no say in the management plan, they’re naturally going to be against it (Interview 23). A. Mares brought up the legal obligation for the government to consult native nations as a result of the Archaeological Resource Protection Act 1979 of and The Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 1990. A. Mares believed that land management agencies should consult and dialogue constantly with Native groups and the larger community in general, noting that otherwise, “you run the risk of running afoul.” Adding to this, A. Mares explains, “if the community is engaged at every level, then they are in a much better position to determine how to manage the land.” A. Mares further explains that this type of engagement encourages people to think about their responsibility to the land rather than their rights to access the land.

For instance, A. Mares cautions against the term stakeholder in these discussions, claiming that it is a legal and political term that shouldn’t be used when you are trying to educate and bring the community together. He claimed that it focuses on, “my rights and privileges as opposed to my responsibilities” (Interview 30). J. Hoffman of Friends of the Organ
Mountains–Desert Peaks believes that this term should be expanded to include wildlife and plants and thus somehow representing them in management plan (Interview 11).

Finally, these conversations revealed that the community believes the BLM to have an important role in fostering inclusion and community engagement in designation and management processes, noting their relative success in this during the designation and prior land management in Doña Ana County. T. Phillips spoke to his experience as a planner with the BLM, remembering the difficulty in understanding different community needs and meshing interests together (Interview 14). J. Hoffman of Friends commended the local BLM office: “They deserve a lot of credit for the work that they’ve done. Trying to be fair. Respecting the opinions and needs of all the different stakeholder groups. They have generally tried very hard” (Interview 11). Similarly, one rancher pointed out, “I think the ranchers see the BLM as being in the environmentalist pocket and the environmentalists see the BLM as being in the rancher’s pocket and that’s maybe a good sign. That means they are managing to walk the line between the two” (Interview 10). A. Mares attested that the BLM has a lot of sincere people who try to do the best for the resource. R. Gomez encouraged the BLM to continue to “have that open-door policy and listen, really listen” (Interview 23).

Many respondents, especially from the recreation and ranching communities, claimed insufficient involvement in the original designation process, leading to some decisions that are too late to do anything about. Thus, community members advocated the involvement of the community from the beginning to avoid presumptuous decisions and create a fair final product. Frank Dubois described the limitations of retroactively involving ranchers in the Resource Management Plan process stating, “the management plan has to comply with the language in the proclamation, so no matter what the local community says…the federal agency is bound by that
language” (Interview 5). Instead, one rancher promoted, “the public needs to be brought into the federal land management in that junction where you can actually affect a change and not after the fact” (Interview 15). Advocate John Cornell likewise stated: “You have to do your up-front work, make sure that everybody comes to the table all the stakeholders and make sure that pre-proclamation these things are all covered and taken care of where you don’t have any problems afterwards” (Interview 29). Angel Peña from NM Wild agreed, explaining that good legislation starts with building a proposal from the ground up (Interview 25). Completing the pan-community agreement on this point, tribal liaison A. Mares explained, that while it is intensive and inconvenient, “the community has to be involved and engaged at every level. ...There has to be a constant communication and dialogue” (Interview 30).

One suggestion that many respondents brought up was the renewal of the Resource Advisory Councils (RACs) that the current administration dissolved in 2017 in order to review the “charter and charge” of each council as a part of the larger national monument review (Streater, 2018). Dan Carter explained how these RACs had provided direct public input and consisted of community volunteer positions that met regularly with the BLM to discuss the management of public lands (Interview 19). David Crider suggested the implementation of a similar tactic: “We need a regulatory group comprised of people that have a say in it down here, local community guys...to look at the things going on, to help propose more regulations” (Interview 16). Rancher Frank Dubois also mentioned the potential benefits of Resource Advisory Councils but laments that there had been prior politicization of the appointment process to these boards (Interview 5).

Many of the charters of the Resource Advisory Councils of the BLM have recently been reinstated by Secretary Zinke and the Trump Administration. As explains Streater of E&E News,
who interviewed an anonymous BLM official, these charters have been amended to direct the RACs to recommend methods for the implementation of executive and secretarial orders and identify costly regulations to repeal or modify. The article claims that many see this as narrowing the focus of these broad RACs, imposing bias from the Trump Administration goals, and thus politicizing the process (Streater, 2018). The Las Cruces field office for the BLM has confirmed that the Las Cruces RAC, which previously had their charter reviewed, has been reinstated and held a meeting in January 2018.

That said, RACs are in many ways the essentially the implementation of community-based collaboration. This demonstrates that mechanisms for local public participation are already in place. However, the recent dissolution of these councils, the potential political bias of the modified charters, and a claimed politically influenced appointment process suggest the fallibility of these councils. Conversely, the modified charters forbid any RAC member from voting or discussing issues in which the member has a direct financial interest (Streater, 2018). I see this as a limitation on the impact that private interests have in collaborative land management such as this, a concern voiced by some in the field of political ecology. In the future years, it will be interesting to watch the involvement and the impact of the Las Cruces RAC in assisting in the management of the OMDP National Monument, especially considering these changed charter guidelines.

Knowledge over Immediacy: “The devil is in the details.” —Tom Phillips and Greg Penn

In this research, I initially in part sought to determine if there was a preference for immediate land conservation methods over time consuming and expensive attempts to engage the community. Almost everyone I spoke to agreed that rushed attempts to protect land shouldn’t
dismiss community engagement, noting that “the Devil is always going to be in the details,” thus necessitating extensive community engagement and work (Interview 14). Jerry Schickedanz pointed out that during the designation and review processes decisions were being made without full knowledge. However, not quite everybody felt this way. Nathan Small of NM Wild argued, “the space of convergence is after protection,” demonstrating the sense of immediacy I discussed prior (Interview 20). Recognizing this motive behind wanting to quickly protect lands and resources, Frank Dubois proposed the Secretary of the Interior to withdraw land up to 20 years as a short term measure to protect land while community interests and needs are assessed in the meantime (Interview 5). However, I must note that Section 204(e) of FLPMA only allows for three-year emergency withdrawals.

Weighting Interests versus Equal Voice

There was one category of answers in which respondent answers became divided—whether those with higher reliance, locality, and connection to the land should be given a weighted voice in the management process or if everyone should have an equal voice. Some members of the community generally felt that voices that are local and land-centric deserve more weight in the management process. J. Schickedanz saw environmental organizations drown out the voices of those really impacted, thus he argued that those with vested interests should have more weight in the process (Interview 7). Rancher Wes Eaton held the same view, proposing that those who work the land know the most about it, and thus their voices should weigh more heavily in management processes. He humorously made this point, asking: “Why does a grandma in Florida have as much say as the person leasing the land and is in charge of the stewardship of the land?” continuing to claim, “the only people that understand that is the local
BLM and…the stewards—whoever is managing that land day to day—which typically is the ranching community in the West” (Interview 17).

Yet, others in the community completely disagreed with this point of view, arguing that everyone should have an equal voice in the process. Business owner B. Digman stated, “everyone should have an equal voice as a member of the public…you are still a single owner of the land” regardless of locality or interest. He explained that Americans have a fiduciary responsibility to public lands. The botanist with whom I spoke pointed out that while it could be beneficial to consider people’s opinions to the extent that they are affected, he didn’t see any way to codify this and stressed the importance to remember that this is public land (Interview 8).

Ultimately, perhaps the answer to this debate lies elsewhere: in how informed each person is in the process. Rancher Bud Deerman in fact promoted equal voices in land management processes with the caveat that community members and outsiders alike work on informing themselves, noting the prior problem of “uninformed and mislead outsiders” (Interview 12). Not unrelatedly, tribal liaison A. Mares of NM Wild stressed the importance that recently arrived community members or outsiders learn from the pre-existing, intergenerational community groups about how to manage the land.

Individual Responsibility to Engage and Inform

With this in mind, responses focused on the necessity for community members to engage and inform themselves and their role in ensuring involvement regardless of interests or locality.

Several community members predicted much less community involvement in the Resource Management Plan process. G. Penn noted, “there has been much less push to
participate in the development of a management plan,” which he explains is the backbone of the impacts the monument designation will have. G. Penn continued, noting his perception that,

“Most people don’t make any attempt to be involved with the people who are actually managing the lands. That is with one big exception: the people whose livelihoods are subsidized by taxpayer dollars for grazing on public lands tend to be very involved...and as a result, their interests are much more represented in the way that those lands are actually managed” (Interview 26).

The implication here is, the level of involvement one has, the more say you will have in the process, and that is in part the responsibility of the individual. Thus, respondents urge their community members to attend public meetings and voice opinions at every opportunity (Interview 12; 29). As mentioned before, this requires a certain amount of time, something that some parts of the community might not have an excess of such as ranchers and blue-collar workers (Interview 12; 30).

3. Transparency and communication

Another prominent suggestion pointed out by respondents was the necessity for more transparent and open communication from the BLM. Many believed that the BLM has generally done a good job with transparency, as indicated by J. Cornell: “So far they’ve been really open and transparent and I think really done a good job of it” (Interview 29). However, there is definitely room for improvement. Chuck Glymph, a volunteer at the BLM, explained his perception of the problem: “The government is so convoluted in the way they do things bureaucratically, they don’t go out and make it clear to people and so people’s paranoias certainly are well founded at times” (Interview 6). D. Carter noted a seeming lack of
coordination between local entities such as the BLM, the Las Cruces government, Doña Ana County, irrigation districts, and private landholders—something that needs to change (Interview 19).

One suggestion is the creation of a user-friendly website to improve communication regarding restrictions within the monument and better engage the public in the management of the land (Interview 13). D. Carter exemplified the Planning 2.0 program proposed under FLPMA that used the internet to engage the public and expedite public engagement and the planning process.

Lastly, the community members of Las Cruces would like to see less influence of money and politics on land management processes. As Jerry Schicendanz stated, “if you follow the money, you’ll find what the issues are.” There is a perception that outside resources benefited environmental interests which headed the monument designation effort in Las Cruces. David Smith from the Four-Wheeler Club highlighted this apparent disparity of financial resources between community groups: “Outside interest and money came in and saw an opportunity to lock up a lot of land hoping to turn it into wilderness. Nobody who is anti-monument has ever put up an anti-monument television ad. It’s a lot of money” (Interview 18). B. Digman noted that while the availability of funds benefited the environmental interests in this scenario, he would still like to see less influence from money on the process, noting how easily this could be turned on these same interests.

During these conversations, a lot of respondents voiced their concerns regarding the politics involved in the upper administration of the BLM. The representative of EBID feared that land management decisions will be due to decisions made higher up rather than local stakeholder and community interests. Bud Deerman similarly claimed that the BLM is already sided as they
have directive from “D.C.” that they must follow (Interview 12). R. Gomez from Ysleta del Sur Pueblo stated, “Overall I think that the BLM does good job it’s just...really who’s at the top who has the final say” (Interview 23). On this note, R. Gomez wished that Republicans would stand up for the land as well as to depoliticize this issue.
Limitations and Future Research

In this study, the opinions of the business community were not adequately explored due to a difficulty in finding interview participants from the Las Cruces Chamber of Commerce on a short time frame. My interview with Carrie Hamblen indicated that they were originally opposed to the monument designation. Additionally, there was a lack of input from the Mescalero Apache Tribe and Fort Sill Apache community despite attempts to set up interviews. That said, these community groups deserve future attention in this type of research.

This research revealed several themes relating to community-based collaboration and participation in federal land management that warrant further research. To begin, most of those with whom I spoke believed that if there were fossil fuel resources in the monument, the level of inclusion of the community would be diminished and the monument downsized. That said, it would be interesting to do a comparative study as a means to see the impact that energy security goals impact the public participation process. I found that in these conversations, rhetoric and talking points were heavily used by many participants. Coding the interviews to analyze this phenomenon and determine if different groups relied on talking points and rhetoric more or less may reveal the role this has on the discourse. The role of place-based attachment on the opinions and interests of the community also should be explored in depth.

The Las Cruces Sun News was integrally involved in representing the different interests of the Las Cruces community regarding the OMDP National Monument.47 Thus, the role and impact that media may have in this and other cases of collaboration in federal land management merit further assessment. Finally, deeper analysis is currently needed with regards to public comments. One remaining question I have is: How much does the public comment process
matter in the review and designation process of National Monuments? An analysis of public comments would also clarify differences in local and non-local involvement and interests.
Final Words: The future of community-based collaboration

There is room for improvement for effective community-based participation and collaboration in the case of the Organ Mountains—Desert Peaks National Monument—both in the original designation and following review processes. While Secretary Zinke’s review process made an attempt to better engage the community, it did not fully complete its stated goals of including local voices. More time and resources would have needed to be put towards this effort.

However, as was expressed by many in Las Cruces, monument opponent and proponent alike, the monument designation is far from the end of community engagement regarding the management of this land. This includes both the Resource Management Plan and any other attempts to designate wilderness areas within the monument.49 That said, the already completed designation and review processes may lend insight into how future community-based collaboration might work for this monument and other BLM managed monuments across the country. It is important to find ways to manage the land to preserve the objects listed in the proclamation without making the local community feel powerless over these actions, especially when their livelihoods are dependent on multiple-use public lands. As discussed, in both the designation and the review of the monument, the collaborative process managed to silence some parts of the community. In contrast, further inclusion of all parties in the effort would have lent legitimacy and support to the process and may have alleviated tensions. Clearly, improving the public participation in management will necessitate increased investment of time and resources, but may be offset by embracing community partnerships.

Above all, this study illustrates that if community-based collaboration is going to be used in cases of monument management, there is an importance of furthered efforts for equal,
balanced, and complete engagement. These lessons at the least could be applied in the upcoming resource management plan.
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According to the Doña Ana County statistics, this number is closer to 15% (https://donaanacounty.org/assessor/taxfaq)
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Those from the four-wheeler club also discussed the circumstances around the Chili Challenge having to be moved in 2014 Prehistoric Trackways site to Southern edge of Sierra County now not even on BLM land due to the hassle of obtaining a permit

“Before we were ever talking about a NM designation, it had gone through number of reiterations.” The wilderness bill was too much for the community. There was a 10 year process to the National Monument auction which went through a number of senators (Interview 25); “The designation took over 7 years with a lot of passing the message about what the community wanted” (Interview 24)

Scientific community complaints on nature of review– “He claimed to have listened to everyone and got the perspective of everyone, but that’s not the case” (Interview 25); “This was a question that was
settled…with years and years of documented support…Yet, Zinke somehow thinks that a 90 day review they were going to be able to get a better sense” (Interview 25); “In the review process, I feel like it has all happened behind closed doors” (Interview 26); “It was a very unsatisfactory visit. He had spent 4 hours the night before with the cattleman association. He obviously had already made up his mind” (Interview 28); “I didn’t perceive that he was listening to what we said as opposed when I talked to Udall who asked questions that were relevant” (Interview 28); “It was such a short period for responses, they didn’t really want the response…they were just going through the motions” (Interview 28)

“In the law, one of the things that we have to do is help to protect the tax base by helping the ranchers make good use of their resources, so they can operate a viable operation…we don’t tolerate overuse” (Interview 21)

Two examples of this noted earlier are: “it is hard to have a conversation with these people who refuse to understand or are willingly lying” (Interview 1) and “You have hyperboles designed to instill fear…frankly for selfish motivations so that someone can retain sole possession” (Interview 4)

Two prominent examples: “somebody has a bigger agenda than any of us and they don’t care about land preservation” (Interview 17), and “The Wilderness Alliance or whoever the group is that is promoting the monument and promoting wilderness…they don’t promote the truth a lot of the times” (Interview 18)
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I have requested a FOIA for this information. As of 24 April, 2018 I have not yet received these items. If received, FOIA request materials will be forwarded on with this research

Monuments in Greenwire review: Sonoran Desert and Cascade-Siskiyou, Agua Fria, Grand Canyon-Parashant, Vermilion Cliffs and Ironwood Forest in Arizona; Carrizo Plain in California; Canyons of the Ancients in Colorado; Craters of the Moon in Idaho; Upper Missouri River Breaks in Montana; and Grand Staircase-Escalante in Utah (Taylor, 2016)

“When you come from the position and standpoint of relationships and responsibilities all those other issues of rights and privileges they get taken care of pretty quickly” (Interview 30)

The Sun News “Did their jobs as journalists, presented both sides of the story.” “They certainly published every single letter that opponents wrote…I think they did their due diligence and journalism that way” (Interview 11). “The paper actually did a very fair presentation of both sides of this argument” (Interview 15)

This information was requested in a FOIA and not yet received as of 24 April, 2018. If received, the information will be disseminated

Senator Tom Udall testified in Senate in February of 2018 in attempts to establish wilderness areas inside of the monument (Udall, 2018)