

Meeting called to order on October 16, 2012 at 1:00 p.m. by Monument Manager Rene Berkhoudt, the Designated Federal Official for the GSENM Advisory Committee (MAC).

**MAC Members in Attendance:** Bob Blackett (Geology), Gordon “Boz” Bosworth (Botany), Jim Bowns (Systems Ecology), Steve Burr (Social Science), Dirk Clayson (Kane County Commissioner), Michael Friedman (Outfitter/Guides), Phil Hanceford (Environmental), Kevin Heaton (State), Don Lofgren (Paleontology), Norm McKee (Wildlife), Leland Pollack (Garfield County Commissioner), Keith Watts (Education) and Steve Westhoff (Grazing Permittee)

**MAC Members Excused from Meeting:** Jerry Spangler (Archaeology)

**MAC Members Not Attending:** Camille Martineau (Tribal Interests)

**Monument Staff In Attendance:** Jabe Beal, Outdoor Recreation Planner; Matt Betenson, Acting Associate Monument Manager; Tom Chatfield, Acting Assistant Monument Manager (AMM), Planning & Support Services; Larry Crutchfield, Public Affairs; Joe David, Environmental Coordinator; Richard Madril, AMM, Resources; Kevin Miller, Science Program Administrator; and Carolyn Shelton, AMM, Science & Visitor Services

**Non-Monument BLM Personnel in Attendance:** Juan Palma, Utah State BLM Director

**Other Agency Personnel in Attendance:** None

**Members of the Public in Attendance:** Brian Bremner, Garfield County Engineer; Jim Catlin, Wild Utah Project; Sky Chaney, Taxpayers Association; Jim Matson, Kane County Commissioner, Noel Poe, President, Grand Staircase Escalante Partners

## Agenda

### 16 October 2012

**Welcome/Introduction of Utah BLM State Director:** Berkhoudt

**State Director’s Brief:** Juan Palma

The election is tight and what that means to us is that we will lose Bob Abbey as director of the BLM and it is unlikely that a director will be named before January at the earliest and I suspect that Mike Pool, who is the acting director will remain in that position for some time. I suspect that once they seat the new secretary (of the Interior) that it will be a while before they seat a new director. Last time, Bob Abbey didn’t come in until August, so it took about eight months, from January to August to get a new director.

---

So what does that mean to you and I. There is a rule that the new director of BLM cannot make movements of state directors until he or she has been in place for four months. So if the new director is named in May, it would be four months after that before any movements of state directors could take place.

I'm excited for the progress we've made here in Utah and I want to share some of that with you.

There is always talk about the 77 leases in Utah that were halted. That's a very small number in the big scheme of oil and gas leasing. Here in Utah, we have about 10,000 producing wells in natural gas or oil drilled over the past 80 or 100 years. That is important revenue for the counties and state, as well as for the federal government. Over the last six months or so we have completed two projects that have been in play. One was the Gasco Project, we call it the greater monument buttes project – and that project is 3,600 proposed new wells and the second one had 1,300 new wells – that's about 5,000 wells, or about half of the total number currently under production...a very significant revenue source for the state and counties. We are looking at about 20,000 proposed new wells...most in Uinta Basin.

Certainly the oil & gas is an important part of Utah's portfolio...but so is recreation and tourism. It is a billion dollar industry for Utah. Our public lands provide for much of the recreational opportunities. For the BLM, oil and gas represents our greatest revenue source, but recreation and tourism clearly holds second place as a revenue source. The BLM gets about a billion dollars for its budget; but it earns \$130 billion for the treasury. The BLM is one of less than a handful of agencies that bring in more revenue than it spends. I hope that is taken into consideration in the coming months and our budget does not get cut to a point it impacts our ability to collect this revenue.

Utah BLM does about 90 film permits a year – some are studio permits like the one for "The Lone Ranger," and they bring in millions to the state and local economies. I work closely with the state and the industry to get those studios here in Utah to film. That's give you just an idea of what we, the BLM, are doing here in Utah to help build the economy. And it happens because of the collaboration between our staffs, our elected officials and the business community.

Partnerships are key to our success. We cannot do everything ourselves. We don't have enough money...enough staff...but if we partner, we are in essence duplicating ourselves...and we can serve the public better.

Now for a couple of things that impact you and the folks here at the Monument. Certainly there is a lot going on here...and one of the things is the discussion of the Grazing EIS.

I really feel we need to move forward with a Grazing EIS. The question some people have is, why? The Monument's proclamation clearly states that grazing will remain. Nothing I have seen...nothing I have read states otherwise. Grazing will be a part of this Monument. So that's not a question on the table, whether or not we are going to have grazing. We are. So why an EIS?

One, when the Monument management plan was created, it did not, include or codify grazing as a component of the Monument – grazing is not in the management plan right now.

---

Two, we are relying on the old documents called MFP's (Management Framework Plans) to provide us management direction, and those are in the range of 30 years old or older.

Three, we do know when this Monument was created, grazing was part of the portfolio of the Monument, we just need to bring it formally into the Monument management plan so it is codified that it is there. We don't need to kick the can down the road anymore.

That's why we need to move forward. We are not, right now, in the process of an EIS, we're simply in a conversation about when we can start an EIS. My timeline right now is to continue these conversations from now until about May. But we wouldn't officially start the process until late spring or early summer.

What would we do between now and then? We need to have strong communication with our cooperators. We need to have a conversation that is facilitated by professional people, and for that, I have set aside some money in 2013 to help us do that. I want to make sure our cooperators are at the table as we move forward from day one. So when we get to May or June of next year, we can start the journey together. You as an advisory committee certainly can and should play a role. But no matter what you hear, we are not in a formal EIS process...just simply in a conversation process. We won't be in a formal process until next May or June, and certainly this winter we will be talking with our cooperators about the specifics how we embark.

I will conclude with this...what will the EIS be? Will the EIS be about every specific allotment? The answer to me is, no. This EIS is all about the broader topic of grazing, and how we bring it into our Monument management plan. The specifics will come later in the individual Environmental Assessments that will tie to the EIS.

One more thing, we have litigation on the table. I can't go into specifics here, but we have several attorneys involved in the litigation from DOI and DOJ, and they are very much engaged, and I am confident they are doing a good job for us.

We have a lot going on in Utah...I could talk for hours...but that's all I really wanted to cover right now. Do you have any questions for me?

**Question (Bowns):** You said you had money for a facilitator. Will that (the facilitator) be from in house or a consultant?

**Answer (Palma):** A consultant. I don't have a name...but I think I want our cooperators to be a party of deciding who that might be.

**Question (Hanceford):** I would like a follow-up to the National Riparian Service Team report. It had some suggestions about the MAC and about assessing a collaborative process for the EIS and what that might look like. I have been involved in a collaborative effort and it was a big success. I would like your thoughts on collaboration and who you see bringing to the table. And how does FACA play. And how the MAC might facilitate the collaborative process.

**Answer (Palma):** I would certainly look at that approach...of having the MAC involved. There are actually two avenues we are pursuing...We the BLM cannot go to a single entity and cut a deal...we have to have an open process...a public process. So the safe haven for us to not violate the FACA regulations is under the auspices of this group. We would certainly be well

---

within the legal umbrella with this group. If you organized a subcommittee of this group, and that subcommittee could go talk to people outside of this committee...that is one option.

The other option is to work with our cooperators. There is a different relationship we have with our cooperators, but that does not include many of the interested parties...it includes some, but not everyone. But that's an option, to just work with our cooperators. That's a smaller umbrella, but an option. The broader option is to work with this body...that extends beyond the 15 of you into other folks, keeping it under the auspices of this body.

You asked what I would like? Something under the auspices of this group would be a good approach...where some of you would be a part of the subcommittee and reach out to the public for their ideas would be a good approach...and give us coverage under the FACA umbrella.

So Steve (Burr), if you would like to talk about such an option, we would welcome a discussion. Just be aware that this is an important topic, and it means a lot to a lot of people. That's why the passion is there. We want to hear from you...and work with you and the subcommittee.

**Question (Burr):** Juan, who do you define as cooperators? Are those with grazing allotments on the Monument, or much more broad?

**Answer (Palma):** Much more broad but more narrow in scope. They can be counties...it could be the state...other federal agencies. It does not extend down to individuals

**Question (Hanceford):** So it wouldn't be permittees.

**Answer (Palma):** Not in the sense of cooperators. Let me turn to Matt...

**Answer (Betenson):** Cooperators have some type of jurisdictional authority over the program or geographic area. Obviously the Monument is in the state of Utah, so they would be a cooperator; we'd be looking at grazing on Glen Canyon, so the Park Service would be a cooperator because they would be impacted by the grazing decision. Or a cooperator could have special expertise on the subject.

**Answer (David):** Special expertise is defined as someone having a special expertise or knowledge of an area. Any entity having legal jurisdiction over the area would be allowed to participate as a cooperator.

Hanceford: What about a group of permittees, if one were formed – could they be cooperators?

**Betenson:** If they had special expertise that was needed, or were under the umbrella of the county.

**Palma:** It doesn't have to be either/or...it can be both. Certainly, the MAC subcommittee gives us the ability to reach the broadest number of individuals; while the cooperators allows us to reach out to institutions that can speak about their particular view.

**Comment (Friedman):** Back to recreation for a moment. I would like to commend Jabe for, what I think, was a very good job on the Programmatic EA for SRPs. This EA is really helpful for start-up businesses, and it puts the Monument out in front of many other BLM offices. One thing coming up on the horizon is the insurance requirements for outfitter guides. I think it

---

would be helpful if you would keep an eye on it. There are different limits for different types of activities an outfitter/guide may be doing, but the park service is pushing higher insurance limits and I'm afraid it will creep into the BLM. Our businesses are smaller and more sensitive to costs than the larger, established concessionaires of the Parks. Please keep a watchful eye.

**Palma:** We will try to make sure it is reasonable.

**Comment (Clayson):** I attended some meetings regarding federal highway funds and a fund entitled "Public Access to Federal Lands" is about four times higher than it has ever been. The projection from those funds for Utah for next year is \$11.5 - \$12 million. I want to make you aware of these funds because any request for them must come from the federal agency. And that \$11.5 was specifically identified for BLM; there was another \$4 million or so identified for the Forest Service. It would be nice to get some of those funds for our roads down here.

**Palma:** Thanks for that information. I am sure Rene and his staff will look for opportunities to apply.

**Comment (Watts):** Juan, thank you for getting funding back to the visitor centers...but how about next year?

**Answer (Palma):** We need that public contact that takes place at those centers...whatever it takes to keep them open I am committed to.

**Palma:** Let me close by thanking the management and staffs of the Monument and Field Office for the great work they do. In Utah, I get about \$100 million a year for staff and operations. Our number of BLM employees grow to more than 1,000 during the summer; much higher once you include the fire team. Money is tight, and we will do our best to get the most from what we get. My people know, I have a zero tolerance for wasting or misusing those funds. It must be used for the purposes it was intended to be used. I am committed to that.

**Old Business:** Burr (MAC Chairman)

- Review/Discuss/Approve April 2012 MAC Meeting Minutes
  - **Discussion:** Westhoff – Please add (Livestock permittee) to his name. Hanceford misspelled in a couple of places.
  - **Motion to Approve (with noted corrections)** – Bosworth/Lofgren seconded
    - **Motion Approved** – Unanimously
- Review/Discuss/Approve MAC Bylaws
  - **Discussion:** (Burr) Bylaws were approved at the last meeting. I updated the bylaws based on our discussion at the last meeting and sent out a draft containing those changes (highlighted in red) last August.
    - Hanceford – Do we need the bylaws to include language about subcommittees for the EIS?
      - Burr – The issue is really whether an EIS subcommittee should be a "standing subcommittee" or "ad hoc." The bylaws address this issue.

- 
- Hanceford – Maybe we will discuss the subcommittee and the collaborative effort later in this meeting.

## Division Briefs

### Planning Division Report (Betenson)

- See presentation
- Escalante Canyons Artist in Residence Program
  - New NLCS initiative – supported by BLM WO-420 Division of Education, Interpretation & Partnerships
  - Piloted FY2012 at GSENM and Canyon of the Ancients NM
  - Partnership project – GSENM, Envision Escalante, Escalante Canyons Art Festival Committee
  - ECAF Residency details include:
    - 2 week or 1 month option - September
    - Two community events/projects required
    - Exhibit of work during arts festival
  - Nancy Lewis, Palisade, CO selected for residency
- Information Technology
  - IT “Tech Refresh” this winter
  - Approximately 120 desktops may be available to the surrounding school district and local governments
  - Dell Optiplex 745; Intel Core 2 Duo Processors; they are Windows XP/7 compatible
  - GSENM will migrate to Windows 7
  - Google mail coming soon, unknown if our email addresses will be changing
    - **Question (Pollock):** Was Gmail selected over Hotmail because of security issues?
    - **Answer (Chatfield):** We are changing Department-wide as the result of a settlement with Google.
- Planning
  - Monument Plan Implementation Framework
    - Currently, updating and tracking our projects
  - Newly initiated goals:
    - Dance Hall Rock Site Improvements
    - Assessment of Dry Fork Slot Canyons
- General Special Recreation Permit Programmatic EA
  - GSENM authorized 75 SRPs in FY12.
  - Approximately 12 new permits are received annually.
  - This EA provides a programmatic document to authorize general SRP applications received (43 CFR 2932.5).

- 
- Analysis includes day hikes, backpacking, horseback riding, ATV tours, auto and bus tours, photography workshops, educational institutions, and mountain biking.
  - Will not review wilderness therapy programs, climbing, or canyoneering.
  - NEPA Status: EA finalized/Decision – October 15, 2012
  - Current GSENM NEPA Projects
    - Programmatic Special Recreation Permit EA
      - Decision record signed 10/15/12
    - Center Knoll EA: Spring Development
      - Public comment period completed, reviewing comments
    - Nephi Pasture EA
      - Decision record signed 10/15/12
    - GSENM Weed Programmatic EA
      - Public comment period completed, reviewing comments
    - Other minor projects
      - ROW renewals
      - Research permits/paleo collections
  - Visual Resource Inventory
    - UTAH BLM began revising Visual Resources Inventories statewide in 2010
    - Includes three analysis components:
      - Scenic Quality Rating Analysis
      - Sensitivity Rating Analysis
      - Distance Zones determinations
    - Field work began spring FY12 continuing into FY13
    - Phipps-Death Hollow Rating Unit received highest scenic quality rating score in state to date
    - Student interns in SO preparing final report
  - Head of the Rocks Wayside Construction Project
    - Partnership project – GSENM, UDOT, Scenic Byway 12 Foundation
    - Project includes:
      - ADA viewing platform
      - Delineated parking and separate from highway travel lanes
      - Drainage and erosion control
    - Construction start Sept.2012 – completion date Nov. 2012
    - UDOT Enhancement Funding - \$140K
    - Harward & Rees (Wayne County company) contractor
  - Hwy 89 Wildlife Crossings
    - GSENM awarded a Public Lands Highway Grant (FHWA) \$1.525 Mil to construct Phase 2 of the US-89 Wildlife Crossings Construction Project
    - Partner contributions (UDOT, DWR, Kane County, sportsmen groups, etc.) = \$1.020 Mil

- 
- UDOT is project Lead
  - Project includes:
    - four (4) undercrossings
    - 11.5 miles of fencing on both sides of ROW
  - Project will:
    - improve motorist safety along US-89 between Kanab, Utah and Page, Arizona
    - reduce deer mortality for Paunsaugunt Deer Herd
    - reduce costs to public associated with deer vehicle collisions
  - **Comment (Clayson):** This project couldn't have happened without the BLM.
  - **Comment (McKee):** Project was proposed years ago; good to see it finally moving forward.
  - **Question (Blackett):** When will it start? **Answer:** This winter
  - **Comment (Burr):** This is a good opportunity for education and outreach to the public...to let them know that good things are happening as well as showcase the collaborative effort.
  - Visitor Experience Baseline Study – Colorado Mesa University
    - Cooperative Agreement established September 2012
    - Documenting and understanding visitor experience will allow GSENM to track changes through time and manage appropriately
    - Study to include both focus groups and intercept interviews
    - Funded by NLCS Science Grant and Recreation Fees
    - Phase 1 - HTR corridor using focus groups
    - Orientation site visit scheduled for October 19-21
    - To begin work before end of 2012
  - Lands
    - Expiring ROW Renewals:
      - Garkane Energy, Cottonwood 169kV transmission line from Buckskin Substation to Henrieville
      - Deer Creek inholding, irrigation water right
    - Garkane Energy, Buckskin to Kanab 169kv transmission line (along HWY 89), amend/upgrade existing ROW
      - **Question (Hanceford):** What Act designated the utility corridor?
      - **Answer (Crutchfield):** 1998 Automobile Heritage Act, Title II
    - Kane County Water Conservation District, Water Well Construction in Johnson Canyon
    - Film Permits: processed 2, numerous inquires
    - Trespass: Identifying potential trespasses along Monument boundary and inholdings; coordinating notification of trespass.
      - **Question (Westhoff):** How are trespasses handled?
      - **Answer (Betenson):** We use BLM cadastral surveys. We have several issues on the Monument with trespass and are working to resolve

---

them. Cadastral surveys are not cheap. When we act on trespasses is up to the Monument manager.

- **Comment (Clayson):** I have several questions regarding surveys. Maybe we could talk more later about the issue.
- Calf Creek Subdivision parcel acquisitions with
- Land and Water Conservation Fund. Two phases, should close on 1<sup>st</sup> phase (20 ac.) in Oct. and 2<sup>nd</sup> phase (5 ac.) in Feb. 2014
  - **Comment (Pollock):** Garfield County has a zero-loss of private property policy in the county. We ask that the Monument work more closely with us in the future.
- Foreground in photos representative of lands being acquired

#### Resources Division Report: Madril

- See presentation
- Resources staff have spent a great deal of time inventorying what is out on the ground. As we move forward, the emphasis is shifting from inventory work to monitoring and to the EIS.
- Resources FY 2012 Accomplishments:
  - 10,000 Acres Inventory Shrub, Grassland, PJ Vegetation
  - 10,000 Acres Inventory for Presence of Noxious Weeds and Invasive Species
  - 10,000 Acres Inventory Forest and Woodland Vegetation
  - 203 Acres Inventory of Lakes/Wetland Areas
  - 27 Miles Inventory Streams/Riparian Areas
  - 20,000 Acres of Wildlife/Plan Habitat
  - 217 Vegetative Permits/Contracts
  - 2,239 Tons Biomass Utilization From Stewardship Permits
  - 804 Acres of Noxious Weed Treatments
  - Riparian Assessments:
    - 166 Acres Restore Forest and Woodland Through Sales
    - 6 Acres Lake Wetland Treatments
    - 3 Miles Stream Riparian Treatments
    - 17 TE&S Recovery Actions
    - 10 Evaluate Land Health
    - 815 Acres Evaluation of Weed Treatments
    - 6,000 Acres Monitoring Shrub Treatments
  - Humming Bird Pollen Study & Bat Inventory Continuing
  - Actively Participating on the Monument ID Team for NEPA and Land Health
  - Working across Divisions to accomplish approved work
  - Dedicated Hunter programs on Monument continuing
  - Peregrine Monitoring Found the Raptors at all Sites
  - Wildlife Ladders critical & require constant maintenance – ladders have greatly reduced the mortality of eagles and hawks.

- 
- Willow and Cottonwood Plantings (1,000 Plantings)
    - Birch Creek, Henrieville Creek, Dry Valley, and Paria
  - Other Projects:
    - Stewardship contracting continues
    - BIA Youth Conservation Crew worked repairing fencing and other range improvements, and installed Archaeological Site protections
    - Botany Program continues to work with local high schools
      - Gives the youth a different prospective of what we do by learning on the ground and getting experience
      - Allows them to get dirty, and to know that regardless of what they hear from parents... we do work, and work hard.
    - Road Repair & Maintenance – Continue work with Glen Canyon NRA/Kane and Garfield Counties
    - HAZMAT – Dynamite found in the Buckskin Gulch area. Worked with local agencies to determine how to dispose of the material. Turned out to be old movie props. We all had a good laugh.

**Science & Visitor Services Division Report:**

- See presentation
- New BLM Manuals
  - National Monuments & NCAs
  - Wilderness Study Areas
  - Wild & Scenic Rivers
  - National Historic Trails
- Visitor Services
  - September 2012 Visitor Center Visitation :
    - Kanab - 2,249
    - Escalante - 11,432
    - Cannonville - 4,033
    - Big Water - 3,721
  - Two Contact Stations:
    - Boulder (staffed)
    - Glendale (not staffed)
  - Projected 2013: Reduced federal budget = reduced staffing & hours
- Recreation – Backcountry Visitation 2012
  - All WSAs
    - Dry Fork : Approx. 15,000 hikers
    - Upper Calf Creek: 18,000
    - Lower Calf Creek: 22,000
    - Toadstools: 9,000 hikers
    - Paria-Hackberry: 132, 244 All Uses
- Recreation – Projects

- Nephi Pasture Trailhead EA
- Web-Based Recreation Orientation/Trip Planning
- WSA Patrols
- New signage
- New Calf Creek Brochure
- Scenic Byway 12 Guide & CD
- Cottonwood Geology Road Guide
- Recreation – NAU Backcountry Monitoring
  - On-going recreation impact inventory/monitoring partnership between GSENM & Northern AZ University (Dr. Pam Foti)
  - Initiated 1998; all areas monitored 5 to 7-year rotation
  - Use “Limits of Acceptable Change” (LAC) approach
  - Web-based monitoring mgmt. tool to access data & assessments
  - Analysis to include:
    - Monitoring statistics & trends
    - Comparison from baseline to current conditions
    - ID of proposed mgmt. actions to best achieve desired conditions
- Recreation – NAU Road Inventory 2012 (Report due this winter)
  - Follow-up to *Year 2000 GSENM Rapid Site Inventory of Roads* by Dr. Pam Foti/NAU
  - Use “Limits of Acceptable Change” (LAC) approach
  - Collect data on:
    - Road location/description
    - Assess off road impacts
    - Recreation impacts along roads, including dispersed recreation sites
  - Analysis to include:
    - Monitoring statistics & trends
    - Implications of current impacts related to desired conditions
- Interpretation & Environmental Education – Programs for Kids
  - Youth Internships & CORP employment (40 students)
  - Walks & Talks Lecture Series
  - Exhibits & Signing
  - Junior Scientist Program – Activity guide & backpacks (500 children)
  - Arch & Paleo Discovery Trunks Pilot Project
  - Web-based Curriculum
  - In-school Natural & Cultural Resource Awareness Presentations
  - Visitor Center-Based School Fieldtrips (1,000 students)
  - Outreach Events:
    - Audubon Xmas Bird Count (3,000 students)
    - Earth Day (800 students)
    - Western Legends; (700 students)
    - Escalante Art Festival (300 students)

- 
- Interpretation & Environmental Education – GSENM Traveling Exhibits
    - Six GSENM Traveling Exhibits
    - Exhibited at regional schools and public venues
      - 30 Events reaching over 8,000 participants, including 3,750 school children
    - 41 cultural presentations this year to schools & special interest groups
    - GSENM hosted Paiute Day at our visitor center in Cannonville. Kaibab Paiute tribal members gave ethnobotanical talks & constructed a traditional wickiup
  - Science – Research Permits
    - Primary GSENM mission: science & research
    - 31 ongoing science research projects on GSENM
    - 12 new research permits in 2012 in fields of botany, ecology, geology, recreation & zoology
  - Botany – Escalante River Watershed Partnership
    - Primary objective: remove Russian olive in Escalante River watershed
    - Grants received from BLM & Walton Foundation thru GSEP for student work crews
    - ERWP named by Secretary of Interior Salazar as a top river initiative in US
    - ERWP facebook page for updates
  - Botany – Threatened & Endangered Species
    - T&E species monitored annually on GSENM
      - Ute Ladies Tresses’
      - Jones’ Cycladenia
      - Kodachrome Bladderpod – seedlings found in September!
    - Special Status Species (SSSp)
      - There are 12 SSSp on GSENM that are on Utah BLM list
      - Five need data collected to determine locations, numbers, health & trend
      - Plan to set up monitoring plots this fall/winter & possibly work with volunteer citizen stewards to regularly monitor sites
  - Hydrology/Soils/Geology – Cottonwood Road
    - Main north-south road across GSENM; parallels Cottonwood Creek & Paria River
    - Constructed on stream floodplain due to steep canyon
    - During flood events, stream moves and impacts road – Sept 2011 and Aug 2012
    - GSENM working with Kane Co. on repairs/permits
    - To comply with Clean Water Act, Utah requires permit to protect stream function from road construction & operation
  - Hydrology/Soils/Geology – Hurricane Wash Well
    - Discovered during ranger patrol of Hole in the Rock Road
    - Old well casing at surface venting unknown gas

- 
- Determined depth >800 ft into Navajo Sandstone/groundwater at 333 ft/gas not harmful
  - Well casing extended above ground with locking cap to protect groundwater aquifer
  - Well is permitted by State for groundwater monitoring
  - May be utilized by USGS in GSENM groundwater study
  - Paleontology – Mosasaur Find on Glen Canyon NRA
    - North America’s oldest true mosasaur.
      - Found February 2012 in Tropic Shale (93 mya) by Scott Richardson in Last Chance Canyon, just outside GSENM.
      - Highly significant specimen, being presented at 2012 Society of Vertebrate Paleontology mtg. in North Carolina.
  - Paleontology – Helicopter Inventory
    - Helicopter Supported Inventory May, 2012.
      - Twelve days in May-June. Crew of 12. Joint Denver-NHMU-GSENM effort.
      - Inventory and collection in remotest Kaiparowits Fm. outcrops.
      - Several new significant sites including baby dinosaur with skin.
  - Paleontology – New Parasaurolophus Skull – Most complete so far.
  - Paleontology – New Wahweap Formation Nodosaur skeleton and skull
    - August 2012 A. Titus discovered first armored dinosaur skeleton from Wahweap Fm. (80 mya).
    - Appears to be first middle Campanian nodosaur from the continent.
  - Paleontology – Cretaceous Book
    - 824 page volume on the Cretaceous Geology and Paleontology of the GSENM area
    - “At the Top of the Grand Staircase: The Late Cretaceous of Southern Utah”
    - Release in Spring of 2013
  - Cultural Resources – Historic Watson Cabin
    - Stabilization, limited reconstruction, and fencing of historic Frank Watson Cabin initiated April 2012
    - Early historic structure on GSENM dating late 1890s/early 1900s
    - Local ranchers used as line shack for decades
    - Contractor John Azar working for GSEP + volunteers to insure cabin remains for decades
    - In WSA: supplies brought in by backpack or pack train
    - Favorite stopover for hikers in Hackberry Canyon
  - Cultural Resources – Site Stewards
    - Year 2 of the successful Site Steward Program
    - Working through grants provided by BLM to GSEP, coordinators work with volunteers.
    - GSENM conducted 3 trainings in Kanab & Escalante

- 
- 20 trained volunteer stewards monitor dozens of sites; over 100 site visits recorded
  - Stewards attended BLM GIS training & a flint-knapping demonstration
  - Cultural Resources – Master’s Degrees
    - Michael Terlep (NAU) completed MS Archaeology studying rock art forms he terms “Cup & Channel Glyphs” (known locally as “water-glyphs”)
    - Unique to Kanab area, his research indicates likely ceremonial features associated with need for water by Basketmaker II people –earliest agriculturalists in SW
    - Jared Lundell (NAU) completed MS Archaeology studying conflicts between road systems, increasing ATV use, and cultural resource sites & concerns
    - GSENM staff archaeologist, Matt Zweifel, was invited to serve as member of the graduate committee for both graduate students
  - Cultural Resources – Lake Pasture Pollen Core Project
    - Investigate vegetation changes associated with historic & prehistoric use
    - Extract & collect pollen cores to look at past climatic conditions & fire regimes on Kaiparowits Plateau (past 5,000 years)
    - 640 acres of inventory on Fiftymile Mountain
    - Collaborative project between BLM, CPAA, No.Arizona University (NAU) & Glen Canyon NRA
    - Develop picture of rise & fall of Fremont & Anasazi agriculture, & what changes occurred with intro of livestock in late 1800s
  - **Question (Hanceford):** How involved, if at all, is the Monument with the sage grouse project work?
  - **Answer (Madril):** The Utah State BLM office is taking the lead on the project and are actively involved. Quincy Barr from the state planning office is the project lead. The maps that have been created of the habitat area down here encompass the Kanab Field Office and approaches the Monument, but currently doesn’t show on the Monument.

**1530 - Subcommittee Break-out Meetings** – Science and Hole-In-The-Rock Corridor  
Subcommittees met in separate conference rooms for working meetings. These meetings were open to the public. Reports will be presented during tomorrow’s (October 17) MAC meeting.

**1700 - Public comment period:** Burr opened the meeting for public comment.

- **Laura Welp** commented on the development of a proposed Grazing Environmental Impact Statement for the Monument. She stressed the need for the use of a collaborative process that would be open and transparent. She also expressed a need for an independent facilitator to be used for the process. She was happy to see BLM was seeking an outside contractor to write the EIS.
- **Noel Poe**, President, GSEP – A lot of the work that the Divisions do, GSEP is heavily involved in, so you’ve already received a lot of information I was going to tell you.

- 
- Currently focused on four things we call the “Four Legs of our Stool.” One is education – more than 1,000 school children came to the visitor centers for presentations by our environmental education specialist and other staff/volunteers; we work with the local high schools on a native plant program; and we created discovery boxes for teachers to use as teaching tools. Two, the Escalante River Watershed Partnership – partners is managing the Russian olive removal program. Three, the archaeological site steward program discussed in the science division brief is managed by GSEP. The fourth thing is the Paleo Lab Coordinator, a GSEP employee working with Alan Titus to manage the Paleo Lab.
- **Jim Catlin**, Wild Utah Project, shared his positive experiences with collaboration, mostly with the USFS. He concurred with Welp’s comments.
    - **Comment (Burr):** Jim has just completed service as a member of the BLM’s Utah State Resource Advisory Committee and was invited to participate on the MAC subcommittee.
  - **Sky Chaney** wanted to say a few words “as a local citizen. I have lived here for eight years and from what I have witnessed, the Monument has been impacted by grazing.” He noted stark differences in rangeland health across the Monument. He also noted that, from the Taxpayer Association’s perspective, grazing accounts for less than 1% of the county’s gross economy, whereas tourism provides the bulk of the GDP. I am not suggesting that the ranching community be ignored. We have a history of ranching in this area – the whole cultural of this area...why tourists come to this area is to see cowboys...and to see cows out there to get a feel for what it is like to be out in the West...there has to be a balance. Also, when tourists are on the Monument, they have to see that it is managed well. Anything that improves land management improves the tourist experience. Taxes have doubled in Kane County, and while the current commission has rolled them back some, and they should be commended for that, the main reason for the increase is law suits. The collaborative process for the EIS can help reduce the need for legal actions, saving the taxpayer money.
  - **Don Fox**, “a local citizen, avid hiker and lover of the Monument,” was concerned about the Grazing EIS...”I just want it to be done in an open process using the best science available.”
    - **Question (Pollock):** Would you be open to circumventing the EIS process by going allotment by allotment basis?
    - **Answer (Fox):** I’m not a range expert. I’ll have to leave that up to the range experts and the BLM of how best to proceed.
  - **Greg Taylor**, Hole-In-The-Rock Foundation. Expressed the Foundation’s willingness and eagerness to work with the Monument and the MAC in any way they can to promote the historic significance of the HITR corridor is preserved, and to improve the visitor experience along the corridor.
  - **Discussion**

- 
- **Hanceford:** Commissioner Pollock, you brought up the question of an allotment by allotment review that was actually tried in the original EIS that didn't go anywhere. Do you have an opinion on that?
  - **Pollock:** I don't know that I have an opinion. There are areas on the Monument managed well; some areas need a little work. But you simplify the whole process by taking the areas and the allotments that need upgrading, and you upgrade them by analyzing each allotment and determining what is needed. If you open up the EIS process, you open up a can of worms. Say on this side of the Monument there is an allotment that is fine; and on the other side, there is one that needs work...identify that by an allotment basis and upgrade it. It's that simple. The ranchers know what they are doing...they love the land...they don't want to wear it out. Doing it by an allotment basis you open the door on a process that will work.
  - **Hanceford:** It is my understanding that the process proposed by the BLM takes a landscape view of acres available/not available...determining acres that need improved would be done on a case-by-case analysis.
  - **Berkhoudt:** That's right. The old EIS became too detail oriented and got too much into the weeds about operationally what would happen with the grazing program. What we would like to do is have an EIS, which would be a high level document that would basically look at availability/non-availability and potential resource conflicts. We need to have that document so we can tether the (allotment-specific) Environmental Assessments to the Monument Management Plan. Right now there is no programmatic oversight for the (grazing) program in the MMP. We are using Management Framework Plans that go back to 1982/83. Those MFPs are not based on NEPA; there is no NEPA analysis, which, quite frankly, puts the grazing program at some risk. The MFPs are old and we need to bring the grazing program into the current MMP.
  - **Catlin:** Commissioner, I agree that we need to tie together what's really on the ground in an allotment with this more abstract planning process: but I agree with BLM staff that there needs to be some legal framework to do it in. We have to have both. I suggested earlier that as we move forward in this planning process that we choose a couple of allotments that are coming up for renewal and use them as a model for both designing the process that goes into the plan and for making decisions on the allotments. I like your idea of working on a real place. That's good.
  - **Friedman:** It sounds like the public's desire and the ranching community's is ultimately the same – it's all about the integrity of the document and the decision that's produced. As long as good science is used and people move into this discussion putting a good faith effort into it then it seems that this time it could conceivably be successful. There

---

are certain legal obligations that Rene has to fulfill as the Monument manager that ultimately aren't up for negotiation...they're laws...federal laws...but that doesn't preclude this group of people from taking a local, personal view of how this is going to affect our lives. The final product has to reflect what the science is telling us and what we know to be essential requirements economically in order to make a living as a rancher. It seems like the door is open for something productive to happen this time around.

- **Pollock:** To add to that, that route sounds good in a perfect world; but you would save a lot of money going allotment by allotment. The current litigation alone is costing both sides; so talking about these solutions, you have to bear in mind the litigation aspect. I do understand what Rene has stated, it (grazing) is not in the current management plan; Juan Palma, who I greatly respect has told me the same thing. It is a complicated issue.
- **Westhoff:** When you start the new grazing EIS, how long do you think it will take this time?
- **Berkhoudt:** We're hoping to wrap it up in two-to-three years.
- **Hanceford:** We (MAC) need to develop some type of recommendation of how to go forward, whether its through a collaborative effort, or by subcommittee – we need to make a recommendation of how to proceed.
- **Burr:** A recommendation to be forwarded to Rene similar to what we did in the last meeting with the letter on visitor center manning. We will do that.
- **Chaney:** Was it said that the subcommittee would be the collaborative stakeholders or was the subcommittee going to go out and work with people to pull ideas together? It's not clear to me.
- **Hanceford:** It wasn't clear to me either. I think he (Palma) was talking about a subcommittee of the MAC...
- **Watts:** The MAC subcommittee might find a way to build an approach to move forward to reach an agreement...a catalyst to pull it all together. It would be helpful to go out and look at one of the allotments.
- **Burr:** I don't think we know enough at this meeting to move forward with creating a subcommittee. Our role as a MAC is to provide recommendations to Monument management. I like your idea, Keith. Maybe we need a field trip to go out and look at an allotment or two to learn more about it. I'm not a range guy...going out and looking at an allotment with a range specialist informs us and allows us to make a better recommendation to the Monument.
- **McKee:** An earlier MAC had an ad hoc grazing subcommittee. A report was written and provided to the Monument. It would be good to get that report and review it.

- 
- **Action Item:** Provide MAC members with previous grazing report.

**1815 - Meeting Adjourned:** Chair/DFO

## **October 17, 2012**

**MAC Members in Attendance:** Bob Blackett (Geology), Gordon “Boz” Bosworth (Botany), Jim Bowns (Systems Ecology), Steve Burr (Social Science), Michael Friedman (Outfitter/Guides), Phil Hanceford (Environmental), ), Don Lofgren (Paleontology), Norm McKee (Wildlife), Keith Watts (Education) and Steve Westhoff (Permittee)

**MAC Members Excused:** Dirk Clayson (Kane County Commissioner), Kevin Heaton (State), Leland Pollock (Garfield County Commissioner), Jerry Spangler (Archaeology)

**MAC Members Not Attending:** Camille Martineau (Tribal Interests)

**Monument Staff In Attendance:** Alyssia Angus, Land Use Planner; Jabe Beal, Outdoor Recreation Planner; Matt Betenson, Assistant Monument Manager (AMM), Planning & Support Services; Larry Crutchfield, Public Affairs; Joe David, Environmental Coordinator; Karol Jones, Lead Law Enforcement Officer; Richard Madril, AMM, Resources; Kevin Miller, Science Program Administrator; and Carolyn Shelton, AMM, Science & Visitor Services

**Non-Monument BLM Personnel in Attendance:** None

**Other Agency Personnel in Attendance:** None

**Members of the Public in Attendance:** Brian Bremner, Garfield County Engineer; ASU crew

**8:00 Meeting Called to Order:** Chair/DFO

### **Appreciative Inquiry Team Introductions**

- AI Team Members: Dr. Gyan Nyaupane, Dr. Timothy Dallen and Angela Farnsworth.
  - Purpose of the study is to explore how Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument can play a part in stimulating regional tourism and creating benefits for local communities.
  - Led by Dr. Gyan Nyaupane, Associate Professor and Graduate Program Director in the School of Community Resources & Development, the Arizona State University team includes two professors and five graduate students from Arizona State University and an undergraduate researcher from Southern Utah

---

University. The study will identify critical relationships between community development, tourism, and conservation.

- Appreciative inquiry projects build a working network of partners that function cooperatively to identify and reach a future that contributes positively to the interests of all stakeholders.
- The Arizona State University research team will be conducting interviews with local business owners and stakeholders from communities ringing the southern boundary of the National Monument from December 16 through December 22. The team will be back in January to interview leaders and community business interests in Garfield County in early January. These interviews, combined with an analysis of community assets, will lead to community stakeholder meetings in early spring.
- A one-day Appreciative Inquiry summit is planned for mid-April, 2013. Stakeholders will share their goals and aspirations for enhanced partnerships and cooperative efforts between the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument and local tourism, recreation, and associated business interests.

**Presentation by Matt Zweifel, GSENM Archaeologist**

- Paria River Canyon Inventory
  - BLM + volunteers + Colorado Plateau Archaeological Alliance (CPAA) personnel conduct baseline inventory on 20 miles of main & side canyons, covering 1100 acres
  - Assess impact to cultural resource sites from decades of recreational use, particularly ATVs
  - 28 new sites recorded
  - Primarily historic signature panels: late 1800s/early 1900s
  - Prehistoric structural, residential & rock art sites
  - Some vandalism observed
  - Inventoried more than 1100 acres between Little Dry Valley and Kitchen Canyon
  - Final Report – Risky Business: Farming Along and Travel Through the Upper Paria River Corridor (before 1960)

**Science Subcommittee Report: Clayson**

**Science Plan: Miller**

- See presentation
- Science Plan revision/update
  - Purpose: to define how GSENM will achieve broad science goals
    - to gain scientific understanding of NLCS resources and landscapes and the benefits they provide the American public; and

- to apply scientific understanding to management, education, and outreach
- Starting point: integration of two previous efforts
  - original Science Plan (2007)
  - *Scientific Adaptive Management of GSENM* (2007)
  - MAC Science Subcommittee (**R.E. Blackett**, P. Evangelista, J.C. Janetski,  
**N.R. McKee**, S.D. Sampson, L.E. Stevens)
- Update with current status/research results/information needs from specialists, managers
- Science Plan progress/timeline
  - Previous reports integrated/specialist input completed December 2011
  - Internal review of initial draft January 2012
  - Internal review indicated need for restructuring/rewriting
  - Revised draft to MAC for review April 2012
- Questions for MAC (from April 2012 meeting)
  - Broad review: Are we headed in the right direction?
  - What key management questions we have missed?
  - Detailed review (for each subject area): Are we asking the right questions? What key issues have we missed?
- Comments/Discussion (from April 2012 meeting)
  - Schlanger:
    - useable 5-yr plan
    - living document (review/update frequently)
    - request feedback on approach—other directions?
  - Shelton:
    - review/comments from members' constituencies (draft sent outside MAC)
    - request comments by next meeting (Oct 2012)
  - Clayson – add section on outreach, education and dissemination; need for strategic partners
  - Friedman -- need for emphasis on science and education; researchers sharing info with public is a requirement
- MAC Science Subcommittee
  - MAC Science Subcommittee created to coordinate review
  - Clayson (chair), Blackett, Bowns, Heaton, Lofgren McKee
  - MAC Science Subcommittee met September 2012 and yesterday
  - Comments received from MAC members and their constituencies, summarized and reviewed
  - Recommendations to whole MAC
- Subcommittee Recommendations

- 
- Increase priority and time available for specialists to improve technical level of Science Plan (make it more even)
  - Comments recommended for adoption
    - #1
  - Comments recommended for rejection
    - #2-5
  - Other Possible Recommendations Discussed
    - Prioritizing management needs for science
    - Mechanism to develop strategic recommendations
      - *ad hoc* vs standing committee?
  - Next steps
    - Subcommittee needs more time to complete review of specific comments received
    - Subcommittee needs to develop mechanism for ongoing comment/review process (phone meetings?)
    - Initial triage (obvious yes/no, need for additional info)
    - Direct discussions among subcommittee members, specialist authors, Science Program Administrator
    - Next subcommittee meeting will be scheduled after triage (late 2012 or early 2013?)
    - Discussion/recommendations from MAC (this meeting)
    - Revisions
      - Incorporate MAC recommendations
      - Recreation section rewrite
      - Biological sciences improvements
      - Editing
      - Final reviews
    - Continued subcommittee review and subsequent discussion/recommendations from MAC (next meeting?)
    - Completion by ? (mid-2013?)
  - **Recommendation:** Increase priority and time available for specialists to improve technical level of Science Plan.
    - **Motion:** Clayson/Bosworth seconded. To approve the recommendation. Passed unanimously.

**Hole-In-The-Rock Corridor Subcommittee Report:** Brian Bremner

- Subcommittee Chair Pollock was excused from today's meeting. Brian Bremner, a non-MAC member of the subcommittee, was asked to present on Pollock's behalf.
- The HITR Subcommittee developed two recommendations for the MAC's consideration.

- 
- **Recommendation:** Monument Management should take the steps necessary to identify the original hole in the rock trail and its associated sites...and develop a plan to preserve, protect and manage the cultural/historic/natural value of the trail as well as to capitalize on the educational and recreational value of the trail where appropriate.
    - **Motion:** Clayson/Watts seconded. To approve the recommendation. Passed unanimously.
  - **Recommendation:** Monument Management should take the steps necessary to develop vault-style restroom facilities at Dance Hall Rock and work with Glen Canyon to develop vault-style restroom facilities at Hole-in-the Rock itself.
    - **Motion:** Hanceford/Lofgren seconded. To approve the recommendation. Passed unanimously

**New Business:** Burr (MAC Chairman)

- Termination of service of MAC Member (Martineau)
  - MAC Charter allows for termination of MAC membership for member having more than one unexcused absence. The Tribal representative has missed more than one meeting. The MAC unanimously requested that Berkhoudt (DFO) make contact with the member to ensure that she desires to be on the committee and that her contact information be verified for accuracy before making any decision on her membership.
    - **Action:** Berkhoudt will verify both contact information and desire to participate on the committee and report back to the Chair.

Motion to allow our chairman to refine and issue a letter to Juan Palma as report to the finding of this meeting after sending it out to the MAC for review.

Dirk/norm Passed unanimously

- **Next Meeting:** Tues May 7 1 p.m., through Wednesday May 8, 5 p.m.

Cooperating Agency handbook to MAC  
Documentation of CMU study to MAC

**1255 – Motion to adjourn:** Hanceford/Friedman seconded.

- Passed unanimously