

**To:** Joseph (Gene) Seidlitz[gseidlitz@blm.gov]  
**Cc:** McAlear, Christopher[cmcalear@blm.gov]; Sally Butts[sbutts@blm.gov]; Peter Mali[pmali@blm.gov]; Timothy Fisher[tjfisher@blm.gov]  
**From:** Moore, Nikki  
**Sent:** 2017-06-22T12:41:15-04:00  
**Importance:** Normal  
**Subject:** BLM National Monuments per EO 13792 - email 2 of 3  
**Received:** 2017-06-22T12:49:39-04:00  
[Cascade Siskiyou Data Summary 6 2 2017 \(2\).docx](#)  
[Cascade Siskiyou Executive Summary 6 7 2017 \(1\).docx](#)  
[Craters of the Moon Data Summary 6 7 2017.docx](#)  
[Craters of the Moon Executive Summary 6 7 2017.docx](#)  
[Gold Butte Data Summary 6 13 2017 \(1\).docx](#)  
[Gold Butte Executive Summary 6 13 2017 \(1\).docx](#)  
[Grand Canyon-Parashant Data Summary 6 2 2017.docx](#)  
[Grand Canyon-Parashant Executive Summary 6 2 2017.docx](#)  
[Grand Staircase Data Summary 5 19 2017.docx](#)  
[Grand Staircase Executive Summary 5 19 2017.docx](#)  
[Ironwood NM Data Summary 6 2 2017.docx](#)  
[Ironwood NM Executive Summary 6 2 2017.docx](#)

Nikki Moore

Acting Deputy Assistant Director, National Conservation Lands and Community Partnerships  
Bureau of Land Management, Washington D.C.

202.219.3180 (office)

202.740.0835 (cell)

## **Call for Data Related to Review of National Monuments under EO 13792 (April 26, 2017)**

### **1. Documents Requested**

#### **a. Resource Management Plans/Land Use Plans**

i. The Monument Management Plan (MMP) and Record of Decision (ROD) is located within this Drive

folder (1.GSENM\_mgmt\_plan.pdf).

ii. The entire GSENM RMP (DEIS/FEIS/ROD) can be accessed here:

<https://eplanning.blm.gov/epl-front-office/eplanning/planAndProjectSite.do?methodName=dispatchToPatternPage&currentPagelId=94418>

iii. The Livestock Grazing EIS/Plan Amendment has been initiated. The DEIS has been reviewed by the BLM Utah State Office and BLM Washington Office and is nearing public release: <https://eplanning.blm.gov/epl-front-office/eplanning/planAndProjectSite.do?methodName=dispatchToPatternPage&currentPagelId=100826>

iv. The MMP has also been amended for Greater Sage Grouse habitat conservation (2015), for an electrical transmission line Right-of-Way to support local communities (2011), and for an update to fire management (2005).

#### **b. Record of Decision**

i. The 1999 MMP and ROD is located within this Drive folder (1.GSENM\_mgmt\_plan.pdf).

#### **c. Public Scoping Documents**

i. Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument's (GSENM) Management Plan included substantial outreach, public scoping and comment periods according to land use planning regulations and policies. See Federal Register Notices in Drive folder (1.c.Federal Register, Volume 64 Issue 145 (Thursday, July 29, 1999).pdf).

ii. Public Comments and Responses for the MMP FEIS are located within this Drive folder (1.c.GSENM\_FEIS\_Comments.pdf).

iii. See also Scoping Report for Livestock Grazing EIS (1.c.GSENM\_GrazingEISScopingRpt\_Final.pdf) and at: [https://eplanning.blm.gov/epl-front-office/projects/lup/69026/89803/107384/2014.05.21\\_GSENM\\_ScopingRpt\\_Final\\_508.pdf](https://eplanning.blm.gov/epl-front-office/projects/lup/69026/89803/107384/2014.05.21_GSENM_ScopingRpt_Final_508.pdf).

iv. GSENM worked with multiple agencies, tribes and communities and individuals

and responded to more than 6,800 letters commenting on the 2000 MMP. Nearly all site-specific NEPA analyses include public comment periods. Additionally, GSENM has offered multiple opportunities for public engagement in the Livestock Grazing Plan Amendment/EIS including:

- Development of a Situation Assessment by National Riparian Service Team
- Hosted 12 public scoping meetings and/or workshops
- Hosted 3 Socio-economic workshops
- Five newsletters developed along with a “Fact Sheet Series”
- Press releases published in five Utah newspapers
- Maintained Project website with project updates
- Hosted a Biological Soil Crust Forum
- Public Release of Draft Alternatives
- The inclusion of two Action Alternatives in the PDEIS that were derived from external sources
- Hosted 27 Cooperating Agency Meetings; 12 Forage Team Meetings
- Outreach to local tribes
- Monument Advisory Committee Input
- Joint BLM/NPS Programmatic Agreement for Cultural Resources
- Broad Consulting Party Process
- Other meetings: County Coordination, State of Utah, Earthfest

GSENM demonstrates a commitment to continued public engagement in land use planning processes.

d. Presidential Proclamation

- i. Proclamation 6920 of September 18, 1996 is in this folder (1.d.Presidential\_Proclamation\_6920.pdf).

2. Information on activities permitted at the Monument, including annual levels of activity from the **date of designation to the present**

**Designation date for GSENM is September 18, 1996.**

- a. Recreation - annual visits to site

- i. To protect Monument resources and objects and to provide economic opportunities in the local communities, major facilities including the four visitor centers are located in the gateway towns of Kanab, Cannonville, Escalante, and Bigwater.
- ii. GSENM provides a large variety of multiple-use recreation opportunities including traditional hiking and camping, hunting, fishing, horseback riding, mountain biking, as well as motorized activities for off-highway vehicles.
- iii. Commercial recreation activities (Outfitter and Guides) have risen since Monument designation (2.a.\_GSENM Commercial\_SRP.pdf).
- iv. In 2016, 926,235 million visitors came to GSENM.  
GSENM uses the Recreation Management Information System (RMIS) to report visitor use, which is calculated using data from multiple traffic counters, permits and visitor counts in the four Visitor Centers. BLM's Recreation Management Information System (RMIS) is generally accepted as the agency's official record, however, RMIS was not available until 1999. Prior to 1999, GSENM aggregated data from the Kanab and Escalante offices. (See:  
2.a.GSENM\_RecreationData\_Excel.xls and  
3.a.GSENM\_Recreation\_MMP\_DEIS\_Tables.pdf)
- b. **Energy - annual production of coal, oil, gas and renewables (if any) on site; amount of energy transmission infrastructure on site (if any)**
  - i. All Valid Existing Rights for leasable minerals including coal, and oil and gas are continued.
  - ii. No new leases have been issued since designation. GSENM has no commercial renewable energy.
  - iii. The annual production of oil and gas in the GSENM is currently limited to lands in or adjacent to the Upper Valley Unit (UVU) in the north-central area of the GSENM (Attachments: 2.b.Upper Valley Unit Map.pdf; 2.b.Upper Valley GSE Production.pdf; 2.b.Upper Valley Wells in GSENM.xls; and 2.b.UDOGM\_O&Gprod\_data\_Upper Valley.pdf). GSENM shares the Upper Valley Oil Field with the Dixie National Forest; this field accounts for all oil and gas production in GSENM. Attached documents disclose production for the Upper Valley Field. Four wells within the GSENM are currently producing oil and a small amount of gas. The UVU was approved in 1962 and production from the wells peaked in 1972 at 183,133 barrels. In the last 20 years (1997-2016) production

has slowly declined from about 65,828 barrels of oil and no gas annually to 45,538 barrels of oil and 2,357 thousand cubic feet (mcf) of gas. There is no other oil and gas production in GSENM, or Kane and Garfield Counties.

- iv. No coal lands have been explored or coal produced within the GSENM since the September 18, 1996 designation. Existing coal leases were voluntarily exchanged for Federal payments totaling \$19.5 million (not adjusted for inflation) (2.b.GSENM Coal Lease Cancellation Payments.pdf)
- v. 34 oil and gas leases (45,894 acres) are in suspension while a Combined Hydrocarbon Lease (CHL) conversion application is processed.
- vi. Information related to energy transmission infrastructure and lands and realty actions is included in the table below:

Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument Existing Rights-of-Way/Permits/Authorized 09/25/1996 05/15/2017	
Existing Withdrawals: PSR, PWR, Bureau of Reclamation, Forest Service Wilderness, Power Site, National Park Service, In Trust for Indians	17
Road ROWs	19
Misc. Roads and Associated Uses - Sec 107 Federal Aid Hwy, Revised Statute 2477, Mineral Material Sites	0
Power Transmission Lines and Power Facilities	20
Communication Sites Telephone, Telegraph, Radio Transmission, Global Positioning Systems	15
Water ROWs, Irrigation Facilities	14
Oil and Gas Pipelines, Oil and Gas Facilities	5

Other FLPMA ROWs, Perpetual Easements, Federal Facilities	2
Airport	0
Permit - 302 FLPMA Misc.	0
Permits Film - 302 FLPMA (popular location (closed))	54

c. Minerals - annual mineral production on site

i. Mineral materials

- No new Free Use, commercial, or over-the-counter permits have been issued since Monument designation.
- Valid existing permits, including those in Title 23 (3 Federal Highway Rights of Way), continue to be recognized until permit expiration.
- Significant quantities of gravel and riprap from existing pits continue to be provided for Federal Highways projects, primarily to Utah Department of Transportation.
- According to UGS Circular 93, January 1997, "A Preliminary Assessment of Energy and Mineral Resources within the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument" (2.c.UGS Circular 93 GS Energy and Mineral Resources.pdf) there were five small mining operations on unpatented mining claims, four of which were active alabaster quarries and one, a suspended operation for petrified wood. Annual production of the alabaster was about 300 tons worth \$500 per ton (\$150,000/yr). These claimants failed to pay the required annual filings and therefore, the claims were terminated. The BLM's decision to close the claims was upheld by IBLA in March 2008. Since that time, there have been no mining law operations within the monument.

ii. Locatable Minerals

- No new mining claims were issued after Monument designation, however existing claims and active mines were allowed to continue. (List of active mines in MMP DEIS located within this Drive folder 2.c. MMP\_DEIS Table 3.10\_Locatables.pdf).

- d. Timber - annual timber production on site (in board-feet, CCF, or similar measure)
  - i. No commercial timber production pre/post Monument designation.
  - ii. GSENM does allow continued firewood cutting in two forestry product areas.
- e. Grazing - annual grazing on site (AUMs active and billed)
  - i. Grazing on the Monument Fact Sheet (2.e\_GSENM Grazing EIS Fact Sheet 05-08-2017.pdf).
  - ii. Grazing AUMs/ Active and billed (2.e.\_GSENM Grazing AUMs).
  - iii. When the Monument was designated, there were 106,645 total AUMs, with 77,400 of these active. Today, there are 106,202 total AUMs and 76,957 are active. In 1999, an adjustment in AUM levels was made to resolve riparian resources issues and address recreation conflicts. In the current Livestock Grazing EIS/Plan Amendment process the current preferred alternative will have a slight reduction with 105,765 AUM but an increase of total acres for grazing within the monument.
- f. Subsistence - participation rates for subsistence activities occurring on site (fishing, hunting, gathering); quantities harvested; other quantifiable information where available
  - i. **Subsistence activities** are those that provide the bare essentials for living: food, water, and shelter. The Federal Subsistence Management Program provides opportunities for subsistence way of life in Alaska on federal public lands and waters. There are no formal subsistence programs outside of Alaska. There are no known true subsistence activities occurring on GSENM or prior to its designation. GSENM does provide for the collection of certain natural materials by Native American Indians, under BLM permit. RMIS data provides the number of permitted/guided and recreational hunting activities, fishing activities and gathering activities (See: 2.a.GSENM\_RecreationData\_Excel.xls). These numbers do not reflect the actual number of licensed hunters/fishermen. That data is available from the State of Utah Division of Wildlife Resources. Outside of developed recreation sites, the entire GSENM is open for hunting and fishing, which is regulated by the State of Utah Division of Wildlife Resources.
- g. Cultural - list of cultural uses/values for site; number of sites; other quantifiable information where available
  - i. Archeological/cultural data is provided in the following Utah Division of State History Maps in the google drive (2.g.1\_GSENM\_SiteDensity,

- 2.g.2\_GSENM\_Inventories, 2.g.3\_GSENM\_ArchSites, 2.g.4\_GSENM\_ArchNumofSites).
- ii. Archaeological surveys carried out to date, show extensive use of places within the monument by ancient Native American cultures and a contact point for Anasazi and Fremont cultures. The cultural resources discovered so far in the monument are outstanding in their variety of cultural affiliation, type and distribution. Hundreds of recorded sites include rock art panels, occupation sites, campsites and granaries. Cultural sites include historic and prehistoric sites, Traditional Cultural Properties, Native American Sacred Sites and cultural landscapes.
  - iii. According to the Utah State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), as of March 6, 2017, there are 3,985 recorded archaeological sites within the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument (GSENM)(2.g.4\_GSENM\_ArchNumofSites). However, the GSENM staff estimates that there are more likely around 6,000 recorded archaeological sites within the GSENM, due to a records backlog. This is with only five to seven percent of the Monument surveyed.
  - iv. Cultural Values (Tribal): Prehistoric archaeological sites in the GSENM include pottery and stone tool (lithic) scatters, the remains of cooking features (hearths), storage features such as adobe granaries and subsurface stone lined granaries, prehistoric roads, petroglyphs, pictographs and cliff dwellings. Historic sites include historic debris scatters, roads, trails, fences, inscriptions, and structures. Following the designation of GSENM, consultations were initiated with the Native American tribes associated with the GSENM area, including the Hopi, the Kaibab Paiute, the San Juan Paiute, the Paiute Indian Tribes of Utah, the Zuni, and the Ute, and the Navajo. Over the past 20 years, the Hopi and the Kaibab Paiute have been most closely associated with the Monument and most responsive to continued consultations, as the GSENM area is central to the historic and prehistoric territories of these two tribes. All tribes considered the Monument area to be culturally important; the Hopi (as the modern descendants of the Ancestral Puebloans), for example, can trace the migrations of at least twelve clans through what is today GSENM (Bernardini 2005). The tribal connections to this land are probably best described by an example from the Kaibab Paiute, as related to ethnographers from the University of Arizona, as follows (Stoffle et al 2001): *“The Southern Paiute people continue to maintain a*

*strong attachment to the holy lands of their ethnic group as well as to their own local territory. These attachments continued even though Paiute sovereignty has been lost over portions of these lands due to Navajo ethnic group expansion, encroachment by Euro Americans, and Federal government legislation. Despite the loss of Paiute sovereignty over most traditional lands, Southern Paiute people continue to affiliate themselves with these places as symbols of their common ethnic identity. Additionally, all Southern Paiute people continue to perform traditional ceremonies along with the menarche and first childbirth rites of passage rituals. The locations at which these ceremonies and rituals have been or are currently performed become transformed from secular "sites" to highly sacred locations or places. By virtue of the transformation of locations into sacred places, Southern Paiute people reaffirm their ties to traditional lands because they have carried out their sacred responsibilities as given to them by the Creator."*

- v. **Cultural values (Ranching)** Local ranching began in the 1860s, and became a major focus of area livelihood and increased settlement in the 1870s. Ranching was initially small scale and for local subsistence, but the herds quickly grew so that by the late 1800s the raising of cattle, sheep, and goats was of major economic importance. Ranching and subsistence farming was historically the backbone of the local economies, and this is still reflected in the views of the modern communities surrounding GSENM. In modern times the economic importance of ranching has somewhat diminished, but the culture of, and past history of, livestock grazing and ranching is one of the important "glues" that binds local communities and families in the GSENM area.

### 3. Information on activities occurring during the **five years prior to designation**

#### a. Recreation - annual visits to site

- i. The BLM transitioned to RMIS in 1999. Data prior to 1999 is not available in the same reporting mechanism as from 1999-Present. GSENM did report visitor use beginning in FY97. (See: 2.a.GSENM\_RecreationData\_Excel.xls and 3.a.GSENM\_Recreation\_MMP\_DEIS\_Tables.pdf).

Overall visitation increased prior to designation and the projecting trends based on the historical information would see a continued rise of visitors seeking recreational opportunities. Just prior to designation Escalante Canyon received

373,200 visitors in 1994, 384,800 visitors in 1995 and 456,400 in 1996.

**b. Energy - annual production of coal, oil, gas and renewables (if any) on site; amount of energy transmission infrastructure on site (if any)**

- i. The Upper Valley Oil Field was in production prior to designation; no other oil and gas production existed in Kane and Garfield Counties. From 1992 until 1996, 336,313 barrels of oil were produced in the GSENM. No natural gas was produced during that time. (2.b.Upper Valley GSE Production.pdf).
- ii. No coal was produced from the GSENM in the five years preceding designation. A regional analysis/FEIS for mining was completed in 1979 (3.b.FINAL EIS - Dev of Coal Resources in Southern Utah Title Pages.pdf). Exploration activities and planning for mining operations continued from the 1980's until the monument designation.
  - 64 coal leases (~168,000 acres) were committed and a plan was submitted for Andalex Resources' Smoky Hollow Mine. The plan proposed mining on 23,799 acres of the area leased in GSENM. In the mid-1990's an EIS was initiated (3.b.4.b.Warm Springs Smoky Hollow PDEIS December 1995\_Coveronly.pdf).
  - 600+ exploration drill holes were completed prior to GSENM designation to defined the coal geology to plan for underground mines (See 3.b.BLM 1996-1997 Kaiparowits Coal Report - DRAFT.pdf and <https://pubs.usgs.gov/of/1996/OF96-539>)
- iii. Information related to energy transmission infrastructure and lands and realty actions is included in the table below:

Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument
Existing Rights-of-Way/Permits/All Dispositions
Authorized/Closed/Relinquished/Withdrawn/Expired/Terminated/Cancelled/Pending/ Rejected/Void
01/01/1991 09/24/1996
<i>(In March 1999, BLM added Case Recordation components to the LR2000 Database System; therefore, some of the pre-LR2000 data may remain in the Status Database)</i>

Existing Withdrawals: PSR, PWR, Bureau of Reclamation, Forest Service Wilderness, Power Site, National Park Service, In Trust for Indians	1
Roads ROWs	8
Misc. Roads - Sec 107 Federal Aid Hwy, RS2477, Mineral Material Sites	1
Power Transmission Lines & Power Facilities	1
Communication Sites Telephone, Telegraph, Radio Transmission, Global Positioning Systems	1
Water ROWs, Irrigation Facilities	0
Oil & Gas Pipelines, Oil & Gas Facilities	2
Other FLPMA ROWs, Perpetual Easements, Federal Facilities	6
Airport	0
Permit - 302 FLPMA Misc.	25
Permits Film - 302 FLPMA (popular location (closed))	0

- c. Minerals - annual mineral production on site
  - i. The alabaster quarries were the only authorized locatable minerals operation (dating to 06/30/1986) in the area prior to designation.
  - ii. Mineral materials, primarily sand and gravel and riprap, were extracted from developed pits by counties and commercial entities for local use. There were eight Mineral Material Cases in the monument at designation, and most were Free Use Permits granted to the county.
- d. Timber - annual timber production on site (in board-feet, CCF, or similar measure)
  - i. No commercial timber production pre/post Monument designation.
  - ii. Prior to designation, the Kanab and Escalante Resource Areas were open to firewood cutting.
- e. Grazing - annual grazing on site (AUMs active and billed)
  - i. Grazing on the Monument Fact Sheet (2.e\_GSENM Grazing EIS Fact Sheet 05-08-2017.pdf).
  - ii. Grazing AUMs/ Active and billed (2.e.\_GSENM Grazing AUMs)
  - iii. When the Monument was designated, there were 106,645 total AUMs, with 77,400 of these active. Today, there are 106,202 total AUMs and 76,957 are active. In 1999, an adjustment in AUM levels was made to resolve riparian resources issues and address recreation conflicts. The current Livestock Grazing EIS/Plan Amendment process the current preferred alternative will have a slight reduction with 105,765 AUM but an increase of total acres for grazing within the monument.
- f. Subsistence - participation rates for subsistence activities occurring on site (fishing, hunting, gathering); quantities harvested; other quantifiable information where available
  - i. There are no known true subsistence activities occurring on GSENM or prior to its designation. Recreational fishing, hunting and gathering data from RMIS is not available prior to designation.
- g. Cultural - list of cultural uses/values for site; number of sites; other quantifiable information where available
  - i. In the five year period prior to designation of GSENM, a total of approximately 358 cultural resource sites were documented in what was to become GSENM, or about 72 sites/year. Following designation, approximately 3,219 sites were documented, or about 161 sites/year. This increase reflects the increased

funding and greater research opportunities following GSENM designation.

- ii. In the five year period prior to designation of GSENM, a total of approximately 3991 acres of new cultural resource surveys were conducted in what was to become GSENM, or about 798 acres/year. Following designation, approximately 41,024 acres of new cultural resource surveys were conducted, or about 2051 acres/year. This increase reflects the increased funding and greater research opportunities following GSENM designation, as well as substantial habitat improvement projects.

4. Information on activities that likely would have occurred annually from the date of designation to the present **if the Monument had not been designated**

**The answers to this question are speculative. The question is best answered with qualitative (rather than quantitative) data. As GSENM was designated 20 years ago, the factors affecting such projections are subject to a wide range of variables (many of which are outside of BLM's purview, such as market prices).**

- a. Recreation - annual visits to site
  - i. Research by external parties (e.g., Headwaters Economics and Pew Trust reports) indicate that protected landscapes are a draw for visitors and do result in increased visitation to a region. Thus, it is reasonable to conclude that visitation would be less if the lands had not been designated as a monument.
- b. Energy - annual production of coal, oil, gas and renewables (if any) on site; amount of energy transmission infrastructure on site (if any)

**Commercial speculation depends on the price of commodities.**

- i. Except for the Upper Valley Field, there have been no oil and gas discoveries within the GSENM. Forty-seven exploratory wells have been drilled; exploration activities were relatively sparse and cover an average of 57 square miles per well (2.c.UGS Circular 93 GS Energy and Mineral Resources.pdf, page iv).
- ii. An Application for a Permit to Drill (APD) was submitted for valid existing leases within the Circle Cliffs Unit. The APD was neither approved nor rejected and the lessee allowed the leases to terminate.
- iii. Four wildcat oil and gas wells have been drilled on GSENM since designation (1997-1999); none went into production.
- iv. Since there have been no discoveries upon which to base production numbers, estimates of the value of production vary widely. The Utah Geological Survey (UGS) projected 2.6 to 10.5 trillion cubic feet (2.6 to 10.5 billion mcf) of coal-bed

methane may be contained in the GSENM. The UGS also projected “...550 million barrels of oil might be contained within tar sands of the monument.” In January 1997, it was speculated that total value of coalbed natural gas and petroleum within the GSENM ranged between \$2.02 and \$18.6 billion (2.c.UGS Circular 93 GS Energy and Mineral Resources.pdf).

- v. It is reasonable to conclude absent a national monument designation, the opportunities for additional oil and gas exploration, discovery and development would be based on the viability of development and the economic value and access to distribution.
- vi. The Kaiparowits plateau, located within the monument, contains one of the largest coal deposits in the United States. The USGS projected “an original resource” of 62 billion tons of coal with a geologic and mining technology adjusted resource of 30 billion tons (<https://pubs.usgs.gov/of/1996/OF96-539>). The DEIS for the Smoky Hollow Mine (3.b.4.b.Warm Springs Smoky Hollow PDEIS December 1995\_Coveronly.pdf) and the Alton coal mine producing from adjacent private lands provide an example of the development potential.
- vii. Andalex coal leases were voluntary sold to the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) at market value. At the time of designation, the Warm Springs Smoky Hollow DEIS was in progress to analyze the proposed mine. Andalex Resources may or may not have actually decided to develop the coal resources based on varying economic projections for the project, particularly the cost of transporting the coal.
- viii. The Utah Geological Service projected 11.36 billion tons are “technologically recoverable” (including 870 million tons in what was previously State of Utah School and Institutional Trust lands (SITLA)(2.c.UGS Circular 93 GS Energy and Mineral Resources.pdf). Recent advances in underground coal mining techniques would likely result in the development of additional large areas of Kaiparowits coal resources not considered minable in the 1990’s.
- ix. The School Institutional Trust Lands Administration (SITLA) lands were exchanged for cash payments and federal coal and oil and gas properties outside the monument. Absent a monument designation, the federal/SITLA land exchange would likely not have occurred.
- x. Applications for rights of way and other energy transmission infrastructure may have continue to occur within the current monument boundaries including

opportunities for mineral development.

**c. Minerals - annual mineral production on site**

- i. Absent monument designation, it is likely relinquished alabaster claims may have been relocated and additional alabaster mining claims may have been filed. For the alabaster quarries, "Over a 30-year period, the quarries should generate \$4.5 million in production." (2.c.UGS Circular 93 GS Energy and Mineral Resources.pdf)
- ii. The Utah Geological Survey mineral report stated, "Various types of metallic-mineral deposits are known to be present in the monument (figure 14). Most of these are small and low-grade with uncertain likelihood of significant development." The report addressed specific minerals with known or potential deposits within the monument, but they determined at that time they were probably not commercial quality due to low, often subeconomic grades and limited tonnage. Thus, it is unlikely that metallic mining would have occurred. (2.c.UGS Circular 93 GS Energy and Mineral Resources.pdf)
- iii. There would most likely be additional mineral material sites for sand and gravel and the existing Free Use Permits granted to Kane County most likely still be in use.

**d. Timber - annual timber production on site (in board-feet, CCF, or similar measure)**

- i. There is little harvestable lumber on the Monument (a little more than 1,000 acres of ponderosa). The mill harvested trees from the surrounding Dixie National Forest. The closure of the mill in Escalante was not connected to timber harvest on BLM lands.

**e. Grazing - annual grazing on site (AUMs Active and billed)**

- i. Grazing/ AUMs active and billed would likely have remained the same.
- ii. Grazing is and was managed by applicable laws and regulations. As stated in the Proclamation; "Nothing in this proclamation shall be deemed to affect existing permits or leases for, or levels of, livestock grazing on Federal lands within the monument; existing grazing uses shall continue to be governed by applicable laws and regulations other than this proclamation."
- iii. Although grazing use levels have varied considerably from year to year due to factors like drought, no reductions in permitted livestock grazing use have been made as a result of the Monument designation.

- f. Subsistence - participation rates for subsistence activities occurring on site (fishing, hunting, gathering); quantities harvested; other quantifiable information where available
  - i. No likely changes or statistically significant differences from the reported RMIS data.
- g. Cultural - list of cultural uses/values for site; number of sites; other quantifiable information where available
  - i. Less inventory would have likely occurred without the Monument designation. The Resource Areas averaged about 72 sites/year inventoried. After designation, the average was about 161 sites/year.
  - ii. More vandalism would have likely occurred without Monument designation. After designation, research, inventory and educational and interpretive outreach programs increased. Between 1996 and 2006, GSENM presented more than 500 talks, classroom visits, field trips and other educational events relating to cultural resources and archeology. Education, increased presence of staff and researchers and improved management likely led to the reduction in numbers of sites looted and rock art panels defaced.
  - iii. Less archeological research would have occurred without the Monument Designation. Early GSENM efforts included initiating large, landscape surveys which recorded and documented hundreds of sites.

**5. Changes to boundaries - dates and changes in size**

- i. Monument Designation September 18, 1996 (1,878,465 acres).
- ii. H.R.3910, Automobile National Heritage Area Act, Public Law 105-355, Nov. 6, 1998, 112 Stat. 3253. 1,884,011 acres, net gain of approximately 5,546 acres (See 5.a.H.R.3910\_Automobile National Heritage Area Act Synopsis)
- iii. H.R.377, Public Law 111-11, 2009, Boundary change and purchase for Turnabout Ranch, approximately 25 acres removed from GSENM (See 5.c.GSENM\_Boundary\_SaleHR3777\_PL111-11\_Turnabout.pdf)
- iv. Utah Schools and Land Exchange Act 1998: State of Utah School and Institutional Trust Lands Administration lands within the boundaries of GSENM were exchanged. The Federal government received all State inholdings in GSENM (176,699 acres) while the State Received \$50 million plus \$13 million in unleased coal and approx 139,000 acres including mineral resources. The Federal Government received additional State holdings within other National

Park Service and US Forest Service units. (See 5.1998\_Utah school Land Exchange\_PL105-335.pdf)

- v. Small acquisitions of inholdings, private land located within the Monument boundary, have occurred since designation. The acquisitions have not resulted in boundary adjustments, but have increased total Federal land ownership. More information is available upon request.

#### 6. Public Outreach prior to Designation - outreach activities conducted and opportunities for public comment

- i. No public outreach documents specifically related to the designation of Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument are available. However, the area in southern Utah had long been considered, discussed and evaluated for the possibility of providing greater recognition of and legal protection for its resources. As early as 1936, the National Park Service (NPS) considered making a recommendation to President Roosevelt to designate a 6,968 square mile "Escalante National Monument."

#### 7. Terms of Designation

- i. Refer to Proclamation for the terms of designation.
- ii. GSENM has additional data describing terms of the designation
  - Presidential remarks announcing the designation of GSENM (7.1\_Remarks Announcing GSENM\_pg1782-2).
  - Secretary of the Interior Memo to the President describing the objects and providing a listing of Monument Objects and a bibliography of Monument object data (7.2\_8-15-96 Secretarial\_Memo).
  - Secretary of the Interior Memo to the BLM Director describing Interim Management Direction for GSENM (7.3\_11-6-96 Secretarial\_Memo).

## Initial Call for Data Related to Grand Canyon-Parashant National Monument under EO 13792 (April 26, 2017)

### Background on Grand Canyon-Parashant National Monument

Grand Canyon-Parashant National Monument (GCPNM, Monument, Parashant) was designated by Presidential Proclamation on January 11, 2000 and is jointly managed by the National Park Service (NPS) and the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) under a Service First Agreement. The Monument contains 808,744 acres of BLM-administered land, 208,447 acres of NPS-administered land, 23,205 acres of Arizona State Trust lands, and 7,920 acres of private land. NPS-administered lands within the monument are part of the Lake Mead National Recreation Area legislated unit, established by Congress in 1964 (PL 88-639; USC 16, Chapter 1, Subchapter LXXII, [see map here](#)).

### Initial Request

Below are responses to the initial (5/10) data request. See the subfolders contained within the [Initial Data Request](#) folder for supporting documents, where appropriate.

#### 1. Documents Requested

##### a. Resource Management Plans/Land Use Plans

- The GCPNM Management Plan, finalized in 2008, provides guidance for managing the 808,744 acres of BLM-administered lands and the 208,447 acres of NPS-administered lands in northern Arizona. These lands are within the Arizona Strip District, BLM; and Lake Mead National Recreation Area (NRA), NPS, in Mojave County, Arizona. See [1a\\_RMP\\_LUP](#) folder for supporting documents.
- Prior to monument designation, the NPS-administered lands in Parashant were managed in accordance with the Lake Mead NRA General Management Plan (GMP) See [LAKE GMP-1986](#) in [1a\\_RMP\\_LUP](#) folder

##### b. Record of Decision (ROD)

- [NPS ROD](#) records the decisions made by the NPS for managing 208,447 acres in the Monument, as detailed in the approved GMP. The NPS-administered lands within the Monument are part of Lake Mead NRA. The approved GMP carries forward relevant decisions from the Lake Mead NRA GMP (1986) with limited modifications to clarify current conditions, remedy recently occurring issues, and/or enhance protection of resource values. The approved GMP emphasizes protection and restoration of natural and cultural resources while still providing for visitor use and enjoyment of the Monument. Where appropriate, it combines various management actions to allow natural processes to continue, applies hands-on treatment methods for restoring degraded resources, and protects remote settings and wilderness character that currently exist in the Monument. All decisions in the approved GMP fulfill the purpose and significance of the Monument and comply with Presidential Proclamation 7265. See [1b\\_ROD](#) folder for supporting documents.

- BLM ROD addresses the 808,744 acres of BLM-administered lands in the Monument except where the BLM administers programs on NPS-administered lands in the Monument (e.g., livestock grazing). The approved GCPNM Management Plan emphasizes protection and restoration of the natural and cultural resources while still providing for resource use and enjoyment. Where appropriate, it proposes a combination of management actions including allowing natural processes to continue, applying more hands-on treatment methods, and protecting the remote settings that currently exist in the Monument. All decisions in the approved GCPNM Management Plan must meet the purpose and significance of the Monument and comply with Proclamation 7265. See 1b ROD folder for supporting documents.

**c. Public Scoping Documents**

- The public was invited to provide input on the planning process through questionnaires, e-mails, the Internet, and public open-house meetings. Eleven open-house meetings were held in three states between May 28 and July 22, 2002, and four planning bulletins were released. More than 2,000 comments were received from across the U.S. as well as 10 other countries. In addition, five open house meetings were held during the first week of June 2003 and an additional planning bulletin was released to update the public and provide them the opportunity to comment on the preliminary alternatives. Over 6,000 public comments were received from that effort.
- Public Scoping documents are part of the administrative record for the Monument Management Plan and have been uploaded to the 1c Public Scoping Docs folder.

**d. Presidential Proclamation**

- January 11, 2000- Grand Canyon-Parashant National Monument established (Proc. No. 7265, Jan. 11, 2000, 65 F.R. 2825). See 1d Proclamation folder.

**2. Information on activities permitted at the Monument, including annual levels of activity from the date of designation to the present (Designation date is January 11, 2000)**

**a. Recreation - annual visits to site**

- Monument visitors pursue a variety of recreation activities including exploring, sightseeing, hiking, backpacking, camping, hunting, off-highway vehicle (OHV) use, and mountain bike riding.
- GCNM does not have any public use/fee sites within its boundaries. There are no entrance stations and no paved roads. Most access points are approximately one to two hours away from paved roads. Due to the remote nature of much of the area and the dispersed nature of most recreation activities in which visitors engage, it is difficult to obtain actual numbers of most visits.

Available data (shown below) is compiled and calculated from electronic traffic counters. Years noted with an asterisk (\*) are those where traffic counters malfunctioned, coverage was limited, or data is questionable.

Fiscal Year	Vehicles Counted	Estimated Number of Visitors
2016*	8,190	43,043
2015*	15,652	30,350
2014*	Missing/Incomplete Data	32,467
2013*	5,637	90,631
2012*	7,126	102,181
2011*	13,736	164,291
2010	21,441	68,348
2009	30,533	57,023
2008*	60,557	636,846
2007	30,139	30,113
2006	31,021	58,609
2005	30,992	No Estimated Data Available
2004	28,709	No Estimated Data Available
2003	17,242	No Estimated Data Available
2002*	104,977	No Estimated Data Available
2001	18,352	No Estimated Data Available
2000**	12,779	No Estimated Data Available
1999	12,130	No Estimated Data Available
1998	10,665	No Estimated Data Available
1997	10,813	No Estimated Data Available
1996	12,459	No Estimated Data Available
1995	9,017	No Estimated Data Available

\*\* Monument Designation January 11, 2000

- See [2a Recreation](#) folder for .pdf containing recreation numbers for 2000- 2016.

**b. Energy - annual production of coal, oil, gas and renewables (if any) on site; amount of energy transmission infrastructure on site (if any)**

- None - coal, oil, gas, and renewable energy development is not permitted on the Monument. Energy transmission infrastructure is not permitted on the Monument.
- [2b Energy](#) folder contains a .pdf with above summary.

**c. Minerals - annual mineral production on site**

- None - upon designation, Parashant lands were withdrawn from location, entry, and patent under the mining laws, subject to valid existing rights. There are no active mining claims in Parashant; however, non-federal mineral estate exists in the Monument and is not subject to the decisions in the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS).
- As stated in the Parashant proclamation, "All federal lands and interests in lands within the boundaries of Parashant are hereby appropriated and withdrawn from all forms of entry, location, selection, sale, or leasing or other disposition under the public land laws, including but not limited to withdrawal from location, entry, and *patent under the mining laws*, and from disposition under all laws relating to mineral and geothermal leasing, other than by exchange that furthers the protective purposes of the Monument" (2008 Arizona Strip FEIS,

p. 3-144 and 3-116, emphasis added).

- See [2c Minerals](#) folder for supporting documents.

**d. Timber - annual timber production on site (in board-feet, CCF, or similar measure)**

- None - following designation, timber sales or stewardship contracting can only be enacted through science based forest restoration efforts as per the proclamation. Timber production on the Monument has not been active since the 1960s according to the [affected environment section of the FEIS for the Arizona Strip RMP in 2008](#). The relatively small acreage of timber resources, distance to a mill, road conditions, and remoteness of the area, are factors that make timber-related work of little interest prior to or after Monument designation.
- See [2d Timber](#) folder for supporting documents.

**e. Grazing - annual grazing on site (AUMs permitted and sold)**

- AUMs have largely remained stable with few changes made. Some allotment AUM totals have changed based on allotment boundary modifications, vegetation projects that increase AUMs, or corrected data entry errors. Thirteen of the allotments attributed to GCPNM cross Monument boundaries. Numbers of AUMs vary based on how they are calculated with respect to allotment boundaries, billing offices of record, and available Geographic Information System (GIS) data. The AUMs reported in the [2e Grazing.pdf](#) is a gross count that does not take into account portions of allotments in other management units outside of the GCPNM. Data from 1999 is included based on the fact that the grazing year begins in March and ends in February.
- The Monument proclamations state that laws, regulations, and policies followed by the BLM in issuing and administering livestock grazing permits or leases on all lands under its jurisdiction shall continue to apply with regard to the lands in the Monument. The Parashant proclamation also states that BLM shall continue to issue and administer grazing leases within the NPS portion of the Monument, consistent with the Lake Mead NRA enabling legislation.
- See [2e Grazing](#) folder for a .pdf with AUMs from 1999- 2017.

**f. Subsistence - participation rates for subsistence activities occurring on site (fishing, hunting, gathering); quantities harvested; other quantifiable information where available**

- Subsistence activities are those that provide the bare essentials for living: food, water, and shelter. The Federal Subsistence Management Program provides opportunities for subsistence way of life in Alaska on federal public lands and waters. There are no formal subsistence programs outside of Alaska. There are no known true subsistence activities occurring on Parashant.
- There are no fishing opportunities within the GCPNM.
- Hunting occurs annually and is managed by [Arizona Game and Fish Department \(AZGF\)](#). The harvest numbers of deer, pronghorn, bighorn sheep, trapping, and upland game birds are not kept by BLM or NPS, but by AZGF. The Monument proclamation allows for hunting activities.
- Gathering activities, such as pinyon pine (pine-nut) harvesting or native tobacco harvesting, is allowed within the GCPNM, but only in personal use quantities. Quantifiable data for

pine-nut or tobacco harvesting is not counted by the BLM or NPS.

- Collection of dead and down wood for campfires is allowed.
- 2f Subsistence folder contains a .pdf with above summary.

**g. Cultural - list of cultural uses/values for site; number of sites; other quantifiable information where available**

- Nearly all of the cultural sites within the GCPNM are classified for scientific use with 9 sites on BLM and 2 sites on NPS classified as public use sites.
- Since the designation of the Monument, 825 archeological sites have been recorded on GCPNM. There is one archeological district on the Monument.
- There are 24 historic structures within the GCPNM. Of these, 20 have been determined eligible for listing in the National Register by the Arizona State Historic Preservation Officer.
- There are 3 Cultural Landscape Inventories (CLIs) for the GCPNM. Waring CLI has 44 contributing features, 8 contributing landscape characteristics. Tassi Ranch CLI has 16 contributing features and 7 contributing landscape characteristics. The other CLI has not been fully documented.
- There are numerous landscape features that are important to tribes affiliated with the Monument.
- A small percentage of the Monument has been inventoried for cultural resources. In total, without regard to Monument designation, approximately 9% of BLM lands and 19% of NPS lands have been inventoried for cultural resources.
- 2g Cultural folder contains a .pdf with above summary.

**3. Information on activities occurring during the 5 years prior to designation**

**a. Recreation - annual visits to site**

- Due to the remote nature of much of the area and the dispersed nature of most recreation activities in which visitors engage, it is difficult to obtain actual numbers of most visits. The GCPNM does not have any public use/fee sites within its boundaries. There are no entrance stations or paved roads. Most access points are approximately one to two hours away from paved road

Available data (shown below) is compiled and calculated from electronic traffic counters. Years noted with an asterisk (\*) are those where traffic counters malfunctioned, coverage was limited, or data is questionable.

Fiscal Year	Vehicles Counted	Estimated Number of Visitors
2016*	8,190	43,043
2015*	15,652	30,350
2014*	Missing/Incomplete Data	32,467
2013*	5,637	90,631
2012*	7,126	102,181
2011*	13,736	164,291
2010	21,441	68,348
2009	30,533	57,023
2008*	60,557	636,846
2007	30,139	30,113
2006	31,021	58,609
2005	30,992	No Estimated Data Available
2004	28,709	No Estimated Data Available
2003	17,242	No Estimated Data Available
2002*	104,977	No Estimated Data Available
2001	18,352	No Estimated Data Available
2000**	12,779	No Estimated Data Available
1999	12,130	No Estimated Data Available
1998	10,665	No Estimated Data Available
1997	10,813	No Estimated Data Available
1996	12,459	No Estimated Data Available
1995	9,017	No Estimated Data Available

\*\* Monument Designation January 11, 2000

- See [3a Recreation](#) folder for a .pdf containing recreation numbers for 1995- 2000.

**b. Energy - annual production of coal, oil, gas and renewables (if any) on site; amount of energy transmission infrastructure on site (if any)**

- None - coal, oil, gas, and renewable energy development was not permitted five years prior to Monument designation. No energy transmission infrastructure existed five years prior to Monument designation.
- [3b Energy](#) folder contains a .pdf with above summary.

**c. Minerals - annual mineral production on site**

- Five years prior to Monument designation, there were no known mineral production sites. Thirteen unpatented mining claims existed when the Monument was proclaimed with none of these claims being patented based on the Monument designation and reaffirmed in planning documents.
- See [3c Minerals](#) folder for supporting documents.

**d. Timber - annual timber production on site (in board-feet, CCF, or similar measure)**

- Timber production on the Monument has not been active since the 1960s according to the affected environment section of the FEIS for the RMP in 2008. The relatively small acreage of timber resources, distance to a mill, road conditions, and remoteness of the area are factors that made timber-related work of little interest prior to Monument designation.
- See [3d Timber](#) folder for supporting documents.

**e. Grazing - annual grazing on site (AUMs permitted and sold)**

- Five years prior to the Monument designation, AUM billing has remained relatively stable. Numbers of AUMs vary based on how they are calculated with respect to allotment boundaries, billing offices of record, and available GIS data. The AUMs reported in [3e Grazing.pdf](#) is a gross count that does not take into account portions of allotments in other management units outside of the GCPNM that are managed by BLM. The AUMs permitted are estimated on available planning data. Data from 1994 is included based on the fact that the grazing year begins in March and ends in February.
- See [3e Grazing](#) folder for a .pdf containing recreation numbers for 1994- 2000.

**f. Subsistence - participation rates for subsistence activities occurring on site (fishing, hunting, gathering); quantities harvested; other quantifiable information where available**

- Subsistence activities are those that provide the bare essentials for living: food, water, and shelter. The Federal Subsistence Management Program provides opportunities for subsistence way of life in Alaska on federal public lands and waters. There are no formal subsistence programs outside of Alaska. There were no known true subsistence activities occurring on Parashant during the five years prior to designation.
- There were no fishing opportunities within the GCPNM.
- Hunting occurred annually and was managed by Arizona Game and Fish Department. The harvest numbers of deer, pronghorn, bighorn sheep, trapping, and upland game birds are not kept by BLM or NPS, but by AZGF.
- Gathering activities, such as pinyon pine (pine-nut) harvesting or native tobacco harvesting, was allowed within the GCPNM, but only in personal use quantities. Quantifiable data for pine-nut or tobacco harvesting is not counted by the BLM or NPS.
- [3f Subsistence](#) folder contains a .pdf with above summary.

**g. Cultural - list of cultural uses/values for site; number of sites; other quantifiable information where available**

- Nearly all cultural sites within the GCPNM are classified for scientific use, with nine sites on BLM and two sites on NPS lands that are classified as public use sites. Public use sites were classified previous to the five year period before Monument designation. During this period (1995-2000) 307 sites were recorded.
- [3g Cultural](#) folder contains a .pdf with above summary.

**4. Information on activities that likely would have occurred annually from the date of designation to the present if the Monument had not been designated**

- Under the above scenario, BLM and NPS Monument lands would likely be managed under the pre-existing planning documents for each agency (Lake Mead 1986 GMP for NPS lands and 1992 Arizona Strip Resource Management Plan for BLM lands). Activities occurring prior to designation would have likely continued in a similar manner and degree.
- 4 Undesignated Scenario folder contains a .pdf of above summary

**5. Changes to boundaries- dates and changes in size**

- No changes to the Monument boundaries have been made since Monument designation.
- Listing of Acreage Reports dating back to 1934 that provide an accounting Federal and private acreage are available at: [http://landsnet.nps.gov/tractsnet/documents/ Listing of Acreage/](http://landsnet.nps.gov/tractsnet/documents/Listing_of_Acreage/)
- 5 Boundaries folder contains a .pdf of above summary

**6. Public Outreach prior to Designation - outreach activities conducted and opportunities for public comment**

- Public outreach began over a year prior to the GCPNM designation. Public meetings were held in the Arizona communities of Flagstaff, Fredonia, and Colorado City and in St. George, Utah.
- Details of the meetings and GCPNM related outreach are chronicled with letters, news releases, PowerPoint presentations, maps, internal memos, public petitions, and news articles in [6 Public Outreach.pdf](#)

**7. Terms of Designation**

- Terms of designation can be found in the [Presidential Proclamation that established Grand Canyon Parashant National Monument](#).

## Call for Data Related to Review of Craters of the Moon National Monument under EO 13792 (April 26, 2017)

### Background on Craters of the Moon National Monument

Craters of the Moon National Monument (CMNM, Monument) was designated in 1924 by President Coolidge to preserve its 'lunar' landscape thought to resemble that of the Moon and was described in the Proclamation as a, "weird and scenic landscape peculiar to itself." Between 1924 and 2000, four other presidential proclamations adjusted the Monument boundary, from roughly 25,000 to 53,000 acres. In November 2000, Presidential Proclamation 7373 expanded CMNM from approximately 50,000 acres to nearly 750,100 acres. Presidential Proclamation 7373 transferred management of the area's exposed lava flows from the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) to the National Park Service (NPS), and included BLM-managed lands to assure protection for the entire Great Rift volcanic zone, a "remarkable fissure eruption together with its associated volcanic cones, craters, rifts, lava flows, caves, natural bridges, and other phenomena characteristic of volcanic action which are of unusual scientific value and general interest." In 2002, Congress passed PL 107-213, which re-designated as preserve the approximately 411,475 acres of NPS-managed land added through Proclamation 7373. Within the Craters of the Moon National Monument and Preserve boundary are 275,100 acres of BLM land; 465,300 acres of NPS land; 8,200 acres of state land; and 6,600 acres of private land.

### Initial Request

Below are summaries of responses to the initial (5/10) data request. See the subfolders contained within the [Initial Data Request](#) folder for supporting documents, where appropriate.

#### 1. Documents Requested

##### a. Resource Management Plans/Land Use Plans

- Craters of the Moon National Monument and Preserve Management Plan summarizes the selected alternative from the Proposed Plan / Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS), July 2005. ([CRMO-Management Plan 2007](#))
- Craters of the Moon National Monument and Preserve Proposed Management Plan/FEIS ([CRMO-2005-Proposed Management Plan-FEIS](#) sub-folder) presents an overview of the planning process and planning issues, describes all alternatives and their associated impacts, summarizes public comment received on the Draft Plan/Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), and provides responses to the substantive issues raised. Alternative D, which is identified as the Proposed Plan, is largely based on the Preferred Alternative (Alternative D) presented in the Draft Plan/EIS. However, the Proposed Plan adopts several recommendations received from the public to increase the amount of Pristine Zone (providing an undeveloped, primitive and self-directed experience, and reduce the amount of Passage Zone (intended to accommodate the flow of people and traffic) in the selected alternative. It also incorporates clarifications and additions recommended by reviewers regarding various management actions,

including those relating to transportation, access, grazing allotments, and fire history. Many of these recommendations incorporated select portions of Alternatives A, B, and C in the Draft Plan/EIS into the Proposed Plan (Alternative D) presented in this document.

- Land Use Plan Amendment ([CRMO-Draft-Management Plan Amendment 2016](#))-In 2008, Western Watersheds Project (WWP) filed a complaint in the United States District Court for the District of Idaho (Court) alleging the Secretary of the Interior and the BLM violated the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (FLPMA) when the BLM issued Records of Decision on 16 Resource Management Plans between 2004 and 2008, including the Craters of the Moon National Monument and Preserve Management Plan. In November 2012, the Court ordered the BLM to complete a plan amendment with an EIS for the 2007 Craters of the Moon National Monument and Preserve Management Plan to analyze no grazing and reduced grazing alternatives for BLM managed lands within the Monument, and develop measures for greater sage-grouse conservation within the Monument. It is important to note that the 2012 Court Order did not vacate the 2007 Craters of the Moon National Monument and Preserve Management Plan; management direction found the existing plan will remain in effect until the amendment is completed. As such, alternatives developed for this planning effort are consistent with the management objectives found in the 2007 Craters of the Moon National Monument and Preserve Management Plan. The Management Plan Amendment is currently in draft. Related documents can be found on the [BLM's Craters of the Moon National Monument and Preserve Management Plan Amendment ePlanning page](#).

**b. Record of Decision (ROD)**

- The ROD, approved by both agencies in September 2006, is included in the 2007 Craters of the Moon National Monument and Preserve Management Plan as an appendix (Appendix A). The ROD includes a summary of changes to the plan made following release of the Proposed Plan / FEIS in response to public and interagency review. (See [CRMO ROD-2006](#) in folder [1b ROD](#))

**c. Public Scoping Documents**

- The Notice of Intent (NOI) to jointly prepare a land use plan and the associated EIS for the Craters of the Moon National Monument and Preserve was published in the Federal Register on April 24, 2002. The NOI initiated the public scoping process by inviting participation in identifying planning issues and developing planning criteria ([CRMO-2002-Monument Management Plan NOI](#))
- Newsletters were developed to inform interested stakeholders about the planning process and to solicit input. ([CRMO-Monument Management Plan-newsletters](#) sub-folder)
- Chapter 5 of the Craters of the Moon National Monument and Preserve Management Plan/FEIS contains a summary of the public comments received on the Draft EIS, as well as a description of public involvement, consultation with Native American Tribes, and coordination with other government agencies ([CRMO-FEIS Chapter 5](#))

- Appendix L of the Craters of the Moon National Monument and Preserve Management Plan/FEIS contains all 570 substantive comments received on the Draft Management Plan/EIS during the 90-day comment period (April 30 to July 29, 2004). ([CRMO-FEIS Appendix L](#))
  - [Folder 1c Public Scoping Docs](#) contains these materials.
- d. **Presidential Proclamations** (See [CRMO-Proclamations Enabling Legislation](#) in [1d Proclamations](#) folder)
- May 2, 1924- Craters of the Moon National Monument established (*Proclamation 1694, 43 Stat. 1947*)
  - July 23, 1928- Monument expanded- added to the monument to include certain springs for water supply and additional features of scientific interest (*Proclamation 1843, 45 Stat. 2959*)
  - July 9, 1930- boundary adjustment- (*Proclamation 1916, 46 Stat. 3029*)
  - July 18, 1941- boundary adjustment- (*Proclamation 2499, 55 Stat. 1660*)
  - November 19, 1962 – boundary adjustment (*Proclamation 3506, 77 Stat. 960*)
  - November 9, 2000 - expansion- 661,287 acres added, joint management by NPS and BLM (*Proclamation 7373, 65 F.R. 69221*)
  - On November 20, 1989, Congress passed legislation to change the monument boundaries and redesignate portions of the monument as preserve. See the summary below in “Legislative Language”

**2. Information on activities permitted at the Monument, including annual levels of activity from the date of designation to the present**

**a. Recreation - annual visits to site**

- [2a Recreation](#) folder contains annual and monthly data, as well as a description of methods.

2000	211,642
2001	185,799
2002	183,573
2003	178,824
2004	183,111

2005	203,332
2006	176,998
2007	221,672
2008	227,179
2009	194,046
2010	215,698
2011	198,545
2012	197,529
2013	200,525
2014	214,993
2015	246,826
2016	255,436

**b. Energy - annual production of coal, oil, gas and renewables (if any) on site; amount of energy transmission infrastructure on site (if any)**

- None - there are no known natural gas or oil deposits within the Monument boundaries. The proclamation expanding the Monument withdrew all federal lands and interests in lands within the Monument from entry, location, selection, sale, lease, or other dispositions (except for exchanges that would further the protective purposes of the Monument) under the public land laws, including the mineral leasing and mining laws.
- [2b Energy](#) folder contains a .pdf with above summary.

**c. Minerals - annual mineral production on site**

- None - there are no known mineral deposits within the Monument boundaries. The proclamation expanding the Monument withdrew all federal lands and interests in lands within the Monument from entry, location, selection, sale, lease, or other dispositions (except for exchanges that would further the protective purposes of the Monument) under the public land laws, including the mineral leasing and mining laws. Thus, new federal mineral leases or prospecting permits may not be issued, nor may new mining claims be located within the Monument. No mining claims existed in the Monument on the date of Proclamation 7373.
- There was one Free Use Permit in existence in the BLM Monument on the date of Proclamation 7373. Once the permit expired, it was not re-issued.
- The Idaho Transportation Department also holds three right-of-way grants for five pumice/cinder material sites in the Monument. These right-of-way grants are valid existing rights unaffected by Proclamation 7373.
- See [2c Minerals](#) folder for supporting documents.

**d. Timber - annual timber production on site (in board-feet, CCF, or similar measure)**

- None - this area is not conducive to timber production.
- [2d Timber](#) folder contains a .pdf with above summary.

**e. Grazing - annual grazing on site (AUMs permitted and sold)**

- The Monument is cooperatively managed by the NPS and BLM National Park Service and the Bureau of Land Management. The NPS administers 465,047 acres, or 62% of Craters of the Moon National Monument and Preserve; the NPS-administered areas are not available for livestock use. These areas consist primarily of exposed lava flows, which are mostly devoid of available forage and/or inaccessible to livestock; therefore, prohibiting grazing in these areas has little to no impact on the livestock industry.
- Three BLM field offices manage livestock grazing on approximately 290,000 acres (including BLM, private, and state lands) in the Monument. Current permitted Animal Unit Months (AUMs) in the Monument total 36,965. Direction contained in the Craters of the Moon National Monument and Preserve Management Plan prohibits new livestock developments in the North Laidlaw Park pasture and Bowl Crater allotment. The Shoshone Field Office recently released a Proposed Plan Amendment that analyzes alternatives for livestock grazing management on BLM managed lands. The Proposed Plan includes minor changes to the total number of AUMs permitted in the Monument- see [CRMO-Draft-Management Plan Amendment 2016](#) for

details.

- Data on number of billed and permitted AUMs is contained in the [2e Grazing](#) folder.
- f. Subsistence - participation rates for subsistence activities occurring on site (fishing, hunting, gathering); quantities harvested; other quantifiable information where available**
- Subsistence activities are those that provide the bare essentials for living: food, water, and shelter. The Federal Subsistence Management Program provides opportunities for subsistence way of life in Alaska on federal public lands and waters. There are no formal subsistence programs outside of Alaska.
- The Idaho Fish and Game Commission sets hunting seasons and other regulations for hunting in Idaho. Most of the Monument and Preserve is within Idaho Fish and Game Hunting Unit 52A (see Figure 10 in Monument Management Plan). The southern part of the area, including all of the Wapi Lava Field, is included in Unit 68. A very small portion of the northern edge of the Monument and Preserve falls within Units 49 and 50. The length of season and number of available controlled-hunt tags vary annually on the basis of wildlife population levels and other factors.
- In the Fort Bridger Treaty (15 Statute 673), the tribes relinquished claims on approximately 20 million acres to the United States. The treaty retains the tribes' rights to hunt, fish, and gather natural resources, and provides other associated rights necessary to effectuate these rights on open and unoccupied lands of the United States. A small amount of hunting occurs by members of the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes.
- [2f Subsistence](#) folder contains a .pdf with above summary.

**g. Cultural - list of cultural uses/values for site; number of sites; other quantifiable information where available**

- There are 238 known archeological sites in Craters of the Moon National Monument and Preserve. However, it is estimated from previous survey reports that less than 15% of Craters of the Moon National Monument and Preserve has been surveyed for archeological sites.
  - Of the known and documented sites, many have in situ materials that make them regionally significant for the National Register of Historic Places. The importance of these sites is referenced in the Archeological Overview and Assessment for the Craters of the Moon National Monument and Preserve as well as a Ph.D. dissertation by Lael Suzanne Henrickson.
  - There are also known, undocumented sites associated with the nationally significant overland migration event (Goodale's Cutoff).
- There are 2 known significant historic events (Overland Migration and Mission 66) at Craters of the Moon National Monument and Preserve. Further research and documentation is needed for both. These areas have not had Cultural Landscape Inventories completed yet.
- There are 12 historic structures at Craters of the Moon National Monument and Preserve.
- There are several areas within Craters of the Moon National Monument and Preserve that are significant to the Shoshone-Bannock Tribe. One of these areas has been noted as sacred.
- [2g Cultural](#) folder contains a .pdf with above summary.

**3. Information on activities occurring during the 5 years prior to designation**

**a. Recreation - annual visits to site**

- [3a Recreation](#) folder contains annual and monthly data, as well as a description of methods.

1995	236,008
1996	217,586
1997	218,036
1998	193,304
1999	215,567
2000	211,642

**b. Energy - annual production of coal, oil, gas and renewables (if any) on site; amount of energy transmission infrastructure on site (if any)**

- None - there are no known natural gas or oil deposits within the Monument boundaries.
- [3b Energy](#) folder contains a .pdf with above summary.

**c. Minerals - annual mineral production on site**

- Free Use Permits at two sites within the Monument produced 12,750 cubic yards in 1997 and 1053 cubic yards in 1998.
- See [3c Minerals](#) folder for supporting documents.

**d. Timber - annual timber production on site (in board-feet, CCF, or similar measure)**

- None - this area is not conducive to timber production.
- [3d Timber](#) folder contains a .pdf with above summary.

**e. Grazing - annual grazing on site (AUMs permitted and sold)**

- AUMs permitted on lands that are currently in the Monument are managed by three BLM field offices in two BLM districts. The total number of AUMs allocated in the Monument were determined by the proportion of AUMs permitted in each allotment affected by the Monument expansion. Permitted AUMs can be changed during the Land Use Planning process; however, no changes to livestock grazing were analyzed at the time that the 2007 CRMO Management Plan was completed. No permit renewals have been completed since the expansion of the Monument. The BLM has just released the Proposed Plan/Final EIS for livestock grazing in the Monument and expects to have a signed decision at the end of July 2017.
- Data on number of billed and permitted AUMs is contained in the [3e Grazing](#) folder.

**f. Subsistence - participation rates for subsistence activities occurring on site (fishing, hunting, gathering); quantities harvested; other quantifiable information where available**

- Subsistence activities are those that provide the bare essentials for living: food, water, and shelter. The Federal Subsistence Management Program provides opportunities for subsistence way of life in Alaska on federal public lands and waters. There are no formal subsistence programs outside of Alaska.
- The Idaho Fish and Game Commission sets hunting seasons and other regulations for hunting in Idaho. Most of the Monument and Preserve is within Idaho Fish and Game Hunting Unit 52A (see Figure 10 in Monument Management Plan). The southern part of the area, including all of the Wapi Lava Field, is included in Unit 68. A very small portion of the northern edge of the Monument and Preserve falls within Units 49 and 50. The length of season and number of available controlled-hunt tags vary annually on the basis of wildlife population levels and other factors.
- In the Fort Bridger Treaty (15 Statute 673), the tribes relinquished claims on approximately 20 million acres to the United States. The treaty retains the tribes' rights to hunt, fish, and gather natural resources, and provides other associated rights necessary to effectuate these rights on open and unoccupied lands of the United States. During the 5 years prior to designation a small amount of hunting occurred by members of the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes.
- [3f Subsistence](#) folder contains a .pdf with above summary.

**g. Cultural - list of cultural uses/values for site; number of sites; other quantifiable information where available**

- The same cultural sites, values, and historical events described in 2g existed on the land during the 5 years prior to designation, though they may not have been documented.
- [3g Cultural](#) folder contains a .pdf of the above summary.

**4. Information on activities that likely would have occurred annually from the date of designation to the present if the Monument had not been designated**

Under the above scenario, the lands added during the 2000 expansion would likely be managed under the pre-existing BLM planning documents ([1986 Monument RMP](#)). Quantitative data regarding recreation, energy production, mineral extraction, timber harvesting, subsistence activities, and cultural uses are not available. See [4 Undesignated Scenario](#) folder for supporting documents.

## 5. Changes to boundaries - dates and changes in size

- Presidential Proclamation No. 1843, July 23, 1928 (43 Stat. 2959), revised the boundary to include the lands described.
- Presidential Proclamation No. 1916, July 9, 1930 (46 Stat. 3029), revised the boundary to include the lands described.
- Act of June 5, 1936 (P.L. 74-669, 49 Stat. 1484), revised the boundary to exclude the lands described.
- Presidential Proclamation No. 2499, July 18, 1941 (55 Stat. 1660), revised the boundary to exclude the lands described.
- Presidential Proclamation No. 3506, November 19, 1962, revised the boundary to include the lands described.
- Act of November 12, 1996, revised the boundary to add approximately 210 acres and to exclude approximately 315 acres, as described.
- Presidential Proclamation No. 7373, November 9, 2000, revised the boundary of the national monument to include an additional 661,287 acres of Federal lands and interests in lands.
- See [5 Boundaries](#) folder for supporting documents.
- Listing of Acreage Reports dating back to 1934 that provide an accounting Federal and private acreage are available at:  
[http://landsnet.nps.gov/tractsnet/documents/ Listing of Acreage/](http://landsnet.nps.gov/tractsnet/documents/Listing_of_Acreage/)

## 6. Public Outreach prior to 2000 Designation - outreach activities conducted and opportunities for public comment

- According to newspaper articles published in the early 2000s (prior to expansion), there had been numerous attempts by local boosters to expand the Monument, most recently in the 1980s.
- Secretary Bruce Babbitt visited the area in April 2000, meeting with local government officials, permittees, and others to have conversations regarding ways to protect the special volcanic resources found in the area. Babbitt returned to the area to meet with local ranchers in the area the following month and, with their input, mapped out what would become the boundaries of the expansion.
- In June 2000, Senator Larry Craig held a Hearing of the US Senate Subcommittee on Forests and Public Land Management in Twin Falls, Idaho. Three panels were convened from a mix of local government officials, environmental organizations, permittees, and others. There were approximately 75 people in attendance. Over 30 people provided oral testimony in addition to the people on the panels. Oral testimony was about split between those testifying for the expanded Monument and those testifying against. (Document posted - *Hearing\_June2000.pdf*)
- On the NPS-administered portion of the 2000 monument expansion, the primary public concern surrounded hunting restrictions on the expanded monument lands. The re-designation of this area to national preserve assuaged these concerns, as hunting became

permitted under the preserve designation.

- See [6 Public Outreach](#) folder for supporting documents.

## **7. Terms of Designation**

See the [proclamations and public laws associated with Craters of the Moon National Monument and Preserve](#) for terms of designation.

## **Executive Summary of Review of National Monuments under EO 13792 (April 26, 2017)**

### **Key Information about Gold Butte National Monument**

Gold Butte National Monument was established by Presidential Proclamation on December 28, 2016. Prior to designation, the area was managed by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) (285,158 acres) and Bureau of Reclamation (11,779 acres) and continues to be following designation. The BLM manages for multiple use within the Monument (hunting, fishing, recreation, grazing, and valid existing rights such as oil production, etc.), while protecting the vast array of historic and scientific resources identified in the Proclamation and providing opportunities for scientific study of those resources. The resources identified in the Proclamation include the threatened desert tortoise, the once-thought-extinct relic leopard frog, archaeological sites and important areas of spiritual significance to American Indian tribes, historic ranching and mining sites, rare plants such as the Las Vegas buckwheat and Las Vegas bearpoppy, dinosaur tracks, and a large sinkhole. Overall, multiple use activities are allowed in Gold Butte National Monument that are compatible with the protection of resources and objects identified in the Presidential Proclamation. Multiple use activities are subject to decisions made in current and future BLM resource management planning efforts which include public participation. National Monuments and other conservation areas managed by the BLM continue to allow for multiple uses according to the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (depending on proclamation language).

### **Summary of Public Engagement Prior to Designation**

Beginning in 2008, when Representative Shelley Berkley (D-1-NV) first introduced legislation to establish a more than 350,000-acre Gold Butte National Conservation Area, legislation to provide lasting protection for the larger Gold Butte area has been introduced repeatedly. Most recently, in 2015 Senator Harry Reid (D-NV) and Representative Dina Titus (D-1-NV) introduced S. 199 and H.R. 856, the Gold Butte National Conservation Area Act. DOI attended a public meeting hosted by Senator Reid and Representative Titus on February 18, 2015, to hear from the public about protection and conservation of Gold Butte and other areas in Southern Nevada. Many members of the overflow crowd of more than 300 people spoke in support of protecting the Gold Butte area, including representatives from local tribal nations, the travel and tourism industry, local business owners, recreationists, professional and amateur scientists, and state and local elected officials. In 2011, a roundtable at the Las Vegas Chamber of Commerce where local elected and appointed officials and stakeholders discussed the economic benefits that could be generated by national recognition of Gold Butte and other public lands in the region.

### **Summary of Public Scoping in Development of Resource Management Plan**

No public scoping has been conducted for GBNM.

### **Summary of National Monument Activities since Designation**

Since designation, the BLM-Las Vegas Field Office has developed informational materials including maps, brochures, and website material for GBNM. A Gold Butte Public Information Forum was conducted in Mesquite and included a short presentation that was followed by a question-and-answer period. A portal sign design was developed and approved, and three portal signs have been installed at major access points along the GBNM boundary. There have been multiple volunteer activities including seed collection, habitat restoration, sign installation, and marking of designated routes. The BLM-Las Vegas Field Office has received \$1.7 million through the Southern Nevada Public Lands Management Act (SNPLMA) to complete a Historic Properties Treatment Plan to protect three important cultural resource complexes within GBNM. The National Conservation Lands Scientific Studies Support Program awarded \$49,768 to the BLM for assistance agreements with Northern Arizona University and the University of Nevada Las Vegas to research, inventory, and assess the diverse plant communities within GBNM.

**Summary of Activities in Area for Five years Preceding Pre-Designation**

These lands have been managed according to the 1998 Las Vegas Resource Management Plan, which includes multiple-use management objectives. BLM lands that are within the monument were managed with some level of a protective designation either under the existing land use plan such as Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) or as designated Wilderness or Wilderness Study Areas. The GBNM is completely overlapped by ACECs. There has been no change in day-to-day management since designation of GBNM.

**Summary of Available Economic Information since Designation**

Economic information has not been developed for GBNM because of its recent designation.

**Summary of Any Boundary Adjustments since Designation**

There have been no boundary adjustments to GBNM since the designation.

## **Executive Summary of Review of National Monuments under EO 13792 (April 26, 2017)**

### **Key Information about Grand Staircase Escalante National Monument**

Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument (GSENM), established by Presidential Proclamation on September 18, 1996, was the BLM's first national monument. Prior to designation, the area was managed by the BLM and continues to be following designation. The BLM manages for multiple use within the Monument (hunting, fishing, recreation, grazing, and valid existing rights such as oil production, etc.), while protecting the vast array of historic and scientific resources identified in the Proclamation and providing opportunities for scientific study of those resources. The resources identified in the Proclamation include geologic features of exposed stratigraphy and structures, renowned paleontological sites, archaeological sites that demonstrate extensive use of the area by ancient Native American cultures with thousands of recorded cultural sites, a rich expanse of human history, and five life zones of outstanding biological resources. Overall, multiple use activities are allowed in GSENM that are compatible with the protection of resources and objects identified in the Presidential Proclamation. Multiple-use activities are subject to decisions made in current and future BLM resource management planning efforts which include public participation. National Monuments and other conservation areas managed by the BLM continue to allow for multiple uses according to the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (depending on proclamation language).

### **Summary of Public Engagement Prior to Designation**

GSENM was designated in 1996 without public engagement. However, the area in southern Utah had long been considered, discussed and evaluated for the possibility of providing greater recognition of and legal protection for its resources. In 1936, the National Park Service (NPS) considered making a recommendation to President Roosevelt to designate a 6,968 square mile "Escalante National Monument" (which also extended to portions of Bears Ears National Monument). A second NPS proposal proposed a 2,450 square mile National Monument (Background folder-Google Drive). In the late 1970s, under the authority of Section 603 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (FLPMA), the BLM evaluated the area for its wilderness characteristics. The Section 603 process ultimately led to the establishment of more than a dozen wilderness study areas (WSAs), totaling about 900,000 acres, in the area that is now GSENM.

### **Summary of Public Scoping in Development of Resource Management Plan**

GSENM's Monument Management Plan included substantial outreach, public scoping and comment periods according to land use planning regulations and policies. Over 6,800 individual letters were received during the public scoping period. Similar public outreach efforts are underway for the Livestock Grazing Monument Management Plan Amendment and Environmental Impact Statement.

### **Summary of National Monument Activities since Designation**

In the 20 years since Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument was designated, a wealth of scientific knowledge has been discovered, with significant archaeological, paleontological, biological, ecological and geological discoveries on the Monument. The Kaiparowits Plateau contains a plethora of

paleontological specimens: twelve new dinosaur species have been discovered since designation. The scientific research and discoveries were outlined and highlighted through a series of three “Learning from the Land” Symposiums, in 1997, 2006 and 2016 (Symposium folder on Google drive). A Monument Management Plan was completed in 2000, ensuring continued management of multiple uses and valid existing rights. Recreational use, including commercial Special Recreation Permits has increased substantially. GSENM provides visitor services and information at four visitor centers in neighboring towns to support the increasing visitor and commercial use on the Monument and to foster tourism in gateway communities. A summary of GSENM activities for 2016 can be found in the Monument Manager’s Report in the Background folder on the google drive.

### **Summary of Activities in Area for Five years Preceding Pre-Designation**

Prior to the 1996 designation of GSENM, the public land was managed by the Bureau of Land Management, within two resource areas: the Kanab Resource Area and the Escalante Resource Area. The lands were used primarily for scientific study, primitive recreation and livestock grazing. Overall permitted livestock grazing use within the Monument is at roughly the same level now as it has been since the early 1990s. When the Monument was designated, there were 106,645 total Animal Unit Months (AUMs), with 77,400 of these active. Today, there are 106,202 total AUMs and 76,957 are active. In 1999, an adjustment in AUM levels was made to resolve riparian resources issues and address recreation conflicts. In October 1991, the Utah Statewide Wilderness Study Report was submitted to Congress. Within that recommendation, 881,997 acres within 16 WSAs were included within the area that would become GSENM (47 percent of the Monument). Under Section 603 of FLPMA, the BLM manages WSAs so as not to impair the suitability of such areas for preservation as wilderness.

### **Summary of Available Economic Information since Designation**

Visitors to GSENM generated \$60,637,361 expenditures creating additional 1,024 non-federal jobs within the region for a total economic output of \$91,476,382 (reference FY 2016 Economic Snapshot). Economic research by external parties has been completed and includes GSENM-specific information in several reports including the 2016 Economic Snapshot-Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument, the 2011 and 2014 Headwaters Economic Report, and a 2004 research paper by Dr. Steven Burr, Director of the Institute for Outdoor Recreation and Tourism at Utah State University. In addition, a Socioeconomic Baseline Report was completed for the Livestock Grazing Plan Amendment EIS in 2015. These documents, along with additional economic research, are provided in the Economic subfolder in Google Drive.

### **Summary of Any Boundary Adjustments since Designation**

Since designation, there have been two congressional boundary adjustments as well as an exchange of all of the State of Utah School and Institutional Trust Lands Administration (SITLA) lands within the Monument boundaries. When the Monument was designated, it encompassed 1,878,465 acres. In 1998, H.R. 3910, the Automobile National Heritage Area Act (Public Law 105-355), resulted in a boundary change to 1,884,011 acres, a net gain of approximately 5,546 acres. In 2009, H.R. 377, the Omnibus

Public Land Management Act (Public Law 111-11), directed a boundary change and purchase for the Turnabout Ranch, resulting in the removal of approximately 25 acres from GSENM. The Utah Schools and Land Exchange Act of 1998 exchanged State/SITLA lands within the boundaries of GSENM. The federal government received all State inholdings in GSENM (176,699 acres) while the State received \$50 million in cash plus \$13 million in unleased coal and approximately 139,000 acres, including mineral resources. The federal government received additional State holdings within other NPS and US Forest Service units as part of the same exchange.

## **Executive Summary of Review of National Monuments under EO 13792 (April 26, 2017)**

### **Key Information about Grand Canyon-Parashant National Monument**

The Grand Canyon National Monument was established by Presidential Proclamation on January 11, 2000 consisting of 1,048,321 acres. Prior to designation, the area was managed by the BLM and the NPS and continues to be following designation, yet cooperatively under Service First Authority, as directed in Proclamation 7265. NPS-administered lands within the Monument are part of the Lake Mead National Recreation Area legislated unit, established by Congress in 1964. The BLM and NPS manage for multiple use within the Monument (hunting, fishing, recreation, grazing, and research activities), while protecting the vast array of historic and scientific resources identified in the Proclamation and providing opportunities for scientific study of those resources.

All of the Monument is open to hunting and fishing. The resources identified in the Proclamation include a wide variety of resources, not limited to cultural resources (historic and prehistoric), geologic and paleontological resources, natural resources (vegetation and wildlife), ranching heritage, historic mining, Mt. Trumbull and Logan, the Grand Wash Cliffs, Designated Wilderness, solitude, vast open spaces. There are four Wilderness Areas located on the Monument, the southern portion of the Paiute Wilderness (35,278 acres), Grand Wash Cliffs Wilderness (35,272 acres), Mt. Trumbull Wilderness (7,999 acres), and Mt. Logan Wilderness (14,560 acres).

Overall, multiple use activities are allowed in Grand Canyon-Parashant National Monument that are compatible with the protection of resources and objects identified in the Presidential Proclamation. Multiple use activities are subject to decisions made in current and future BLM and NPS resource/general management planning efforts which include public participation. National Monuments and other conservation areas managed by the BLM can allow for multiple uses according to the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (depending on proclamation language).

### **Summary of Public Engagement Prior to Designation**

Public outreach began a year prior to the Grand Canyon-Parashant National Monument designation. Public meetings were held in the Arizona communities of Flagstaff, Fredonia, and Colorado City and in St. George, Utah. Details of the meetings and related outreach are chronicled in the response to the internal data call with letters, news releases, powerpoint presentations, maps, internal memos, public petitions, and news articles.

### **Summary of Public Scoping in Development of Resource Management Plan**

Public outreach for the BLM 2008 Arizona Strip Resource Management Plan and NPS General Management Plan began in 2003. Regulatory processes were followed for Resource and General Management Plans that involve public scoping meetings in accordance with BLM and NPS planning guidelines and Council for Environmental Quality Guidance. A draft Environmental Impact Statement was published in 2005 in conjunction with a public comment period and related public meetings. In 2007, the Final Environmental Impact Statement related to the Resource/General Management Plan was released to the public. In February of 2008, a Record of Decision was issued by the BLM and NPS that set the parameters for management for the Monument.

### **Summary of National Monument Activities since Designation**

The Grand Canyon-Parashant National Monument has been in place for over 17 years. Many activities since designation include, but are not limited to an emphasis on recreation, education, public outreach/interpretation events, science based research projects, tribal consultation and involvement in youth initiatives, ongoing grazing management, vegetation restoration projects, Wilderness signing and management in pre-Monument Wilderness areas, prescribed fire in the ponderosa pine plant community, and fire suppression in the Mojave portions of the Monument.

Planning documents were completed for the Monument in 2008, which carried over and emphasized proclamation protections of Monument objects.

### **Summary of Activities in Area for Five years Preceding Pre-Designation**

Pre-designation activities include much of the same interests as previously described above although fewer staff were available to conduct the work. In addition limited coordination with NPS staff occurred during this time since Lake Mead National Recreation staff and BLM Arizona Strip staff were not integrated under Service First authority. Mining and timber harvesting were not a large part of the workload associated with the area prior to Monument designation. The remoteness of the area and relatively small acreages of timber did not allow for economic harvesting beyond the 1960's. No mining activities in the region are affected by the Monument.

### **Summary of Available Economic Information since Designation**

The RMP/GMP FEIS, indicated that the region relies upon tourism in 2008. Grazing activities across the Monument do contribute to the local economies, although not to the degree that tourism does for the region. In the past couple of years, the Monument has seen greater interest in commercial OHV-related tourism proposals. The Monument is finalizing work to issue Special Recreation Permits/Conditional Use Authorizations for commercial day-trip use. As

awareness of the Monument has grown, a larger number of visitors/users has been realized. Plans are underway to accommodate visitors through more interpretation kiosk installations and limited restroom facilities. Presently, an estimated average of over 27,000 vehicles use the Monument each year with an estimated 119,000 average visitors per year since the Monument was designated.

**Summary of Any Boundary Adjustments since Designation**

None have occurred.

**Call for Data Related to Review of National Monuments under EO 13792 (April 26, 2017)**

Please help us gather information about each of the items listed below, for each of the National Monuments listed below in Table 1.

## 1) Documents Requested

## a) Resource Management Plans/Land Use Plans

- i. Gold Butte National Monument (GBNM) has not yet initiated a Resource Management Plan (RMP). The 1998 Las Vegas Resource Management Plan (RMP) will be followed in the interim. A PDF document of the Las Vegas RMP/Record of Decision has been uploaded to the Google Drive ([LV\\_RMP\\_ROD\\_1998.PDF](#)).

## b) Record of Decision

- i. GBNM has not yet initiated a RMP. The 1998 Las Vegas RMP will be followed in the interim. A PDF document of the Las Vegas RMP/Record of Decision has been uploaded to the Google Drive ([LV\\_RMP\\_ROD\\_1998.PDF](#)).

## c) Public Scoping Documents

- i. Public scoping has not yet been initiated for a GBNM RMP. The first public comment period post-designation associated with GBNM is the DOI Notice of Opportunity for Public Comment on the Review of Certain National Monuments Established Since 1996 (82 FR 22016 (May 11, 2017)).

## d) Presidential Proclamation

- i. A PDF document of the Gold Butte Presidential Proclamation (December 28, 2016) was uploaded to the [Google Drive \(Gold Butte Presidential Proclamation 2006.pdf\)](#).

2) Information on activities permitted at the Monument, including annual levels of activity from the **date of designation to the present** (Designation date for GBNM is December 28, 2016 - information is not yet available for most of FY17)

## a) Recreation - annual visits to site

- i. The BLM uses the Recreation Management Information System (RMIS) to report visitor use. GBNM is a subset of the Las Vegas Field Office. Full reporting for annual visitation 2017 will not be available until the end of September. A PDF document of the visitor use data for 2011-2016 for the Gold Butte area has been uploaded to the Google Drive ([GBNM Visitor Use Data 2012-2016 \(RMIS\).pdf](#)).
- ii. Specific visitation information to the GBNM is not available at this time.

## b) Energy - annual production of coal, oil, gas and renewables (if any) on site; amount of energy transmission infrastructure on site (if any)

- i. There has been no coal, oil, gas, or renewable production within the GBNM since the designation. There is no energy transmission infrastructure within GBNM.

## c) Minerals - annual mineral production on site

- i. There has been no mineral production within the GBNM since designation.
- ii. There are no mineral developments or processing facilities adjacent to or impacted by the

National Monument designation.

- d) **Timber - annual timber production on site (in board-feet, CCF, or similar measure)**
  - i. Commercial seed collection (managed under the forestry program), is allowed and permitted in areas in the GBNM that are not in desert tortoise critical habitat. 2017: 700 lbs of globemallow. According to the 1998 Las Vegas RMP, all desert tortoise critical habitat is closed to commercial seed collection within the Southern Nevada District Office (SNDO). A 1/3 of the 186,566 acre Gold Butte Part A ACEC (desert tortoise critical habitat) overlaps the GBNM.
- e) **Grazing - annual grazing on site (AUMs permitted and sold)**
  - i. **Mesquite Community Allotment (AZ04832):** currently administered by the Arizona Strip Field Office. Approximately 131 AUMs have been billed based on the acreage of the allotment within the Gold Butte NM from 12/29/2016 to 5/30/2017.
  - i. **Lime Spring Allotment (AZ02012):** currently administered by the Arizona Strip Field Office. The Lime Spring Allotment is available for grazing. An annual application for grazing use can be submitted, and grazing can be approved. Because the allotment is currently classified as ephemeral, there is no set number of AUMs. Since the date of monument designation on 12/28/2016 no application for grazing has been received or approved. Zero AUMs have been authorized or billed since monument designation through the present 5/30/2017.
- f) **Subsistence - participation rates for subsistence activities occurring on site (fishing, hunting, gathering); quantities harvested; other quantifiable information where available**
  - i. The GBNM provides for the collection of certain natural materials by Native American Indians, including firewood, under a BLM permit. Information regarding firewood collection is included under the discussion of timber production.
  - ii. Availability to hunt/fish within the 296,937 acres of GBNM would be based on regulations (open/closed) by the State of Nevada. The designation does not prevent hunting or fishing from occurring in the Monument. Hunting/fishing permit data is tracked by the State of Nevada and not BLM.
- g) **Cultural - list of cultural uses/values for site; number of sites; other quantifiable information where available**
  - i. The GBNM includes important cultural values. Local tribes, particularly the Moapa Tribe whose homeland covered the monument, use the monument for ceremonies and to visit sacred sites. Traditions of hunting is still practiced by tribal members, as is collection of medicinal and ceremonial plants, edible herbs, and materials for crafting items like baskets and footwear.
  - ii. According to the Nevada State Historic Preservation Office (NV SHPO) database and the BLM GIS Cultural data, there are 614 recorded archaeological sites and potentially five archaeological districts, or densely clustered large prehistoric and historic sites within the

bounds of the monument.

- iii. More than 60 percent of these sites are prehistoric (pre-dating the 1800s) and contain rock art, rock shelters, roasting pits, ceramics stone tools, and prehistoric trails. Many contain datable remains such as thermal features (hearths) and storage features. Historic sites include a historic mining town, concentrations of historic features and debris, including roads, fences, and evidence of mining activities. Mines in the area date from World War I and II.
- iv. The BLM has not completely surveyed the monument. Between 2006 and 2008, when the Gold Butte area was surveyed for cultural resources, about 19,212 acres was subjected to sample survey, followed by a non-random survey of approximately 11,984 acres. The total percentage of acreage that has been surveyed for cultural resources is about 10 percent.

### 3) Information on activities occurring during the **5 years prior to designation**

#### b) Recreation - annual visits to site

- i. The BLM uses the RMIS to report visitor use. GBNM is a subset of the Las Vegas Field Office. A PDF document of the visitor use data for 2012-2016 for the Gold Butte area has been uploaded to the Google Drive (**GBNM Visitor Use Data 2012-2016 (RMIS).pdf**).

#### c) Energy - annual production of coal, oil, gas and renewables (if any) on site; amount of energy transmission infrastructure on site (if any)

- i. There has been no production of coal, oil, gas or renewables 5 years prior to designation. There is no energy transmission infrastructure within GBNM.

#### d) Minerals - annual mineral production on site

- i. There was no production of minerals 5 years prior to designation. The area was closed to mineral materials in the 1998 Las Vegas RMP and was withdrawn to mineral entry in 2002.

#### e) Timber - annual timber production on site (in board-feet, CCF, or similar measure)

- i. Commercial seed collection (managed under the forestry program), is allowed and permitted in areas in the GBNM that are not in desert tortoise critical habitat. 2013: 2,000 lbs of globemallow. No requests for permits occurred in 2012, or 2014-2016.

#### f) Grazing - annual grazing on site (AUMs permitted and sold)

- i. **Mesquite Community Allotment (AZ04832):** currently administered by the Arizona Strip Field Office. Authorized use based on grazing bills in Rangeland Administration System (RAS) and adjusted by the acreage (13%) within the GBNM.  
 10/1/2016 – 12/28/2016 = 76 AUMs  
 3/1/2016 – 5/30/2016 = 78  
 10/1/2015 – 2/28/2016 = 129  
 3/1/2015 – 6/1/2015 = 80  
 10/1/2014 – 2/28/2015 = 129  
 3/1/2014 – 6/30/2014 = 105  
 10/1/2013 – 2/28/2014 = 129
- ii. **Lime Spring Allotment (AZ02012):** currently administered by the Arizona Strip Field Office.

Authorized use based on grazing bills in RAS.

2016: 155 AUMs (ephemeral)

2015: No bill – zero AUMs

2014: Non-use – zero AUMs

2013: 173 AUMs (ephemeral)

2012: 173 AUMs (ephemeral)

2011: 190 AUMs

- g) Subsistence - participation rates for subsistence activities occurring on site (fishing, hunting, gathering); quantities harvested; other quantifiable information where available

- i. The monument does provide for the collection of certain natural materials, under BLM permit.

- h) Cultural - list of cultural uses/values for site; number of sites; other quantifiable information where available

- i. See response to 2.g.

- 4) Information on activities that likely would have occurred annually from the date of designation to the present **if the Monument had not been designated**

The answer to this question is highly speculative. The question is best answered with qualitative (rather than quantitative) data. As GBNM was designated less than five months ago, there has been very little change in the management of activities since the date of designation.

- a) Recreation - annual visits to site

- i. The BLM uses the Recreation Management Information System (RMIS) to report visitor use. GBNM is a subset of the Las Vegas Field Office. Full reporting for annual visitation 2017 will not be available until the end of September.

- b) Energy - annual production of coal, oil, gas and renewables (if any) on site; amount of energy transmission infrastructure on site (if any)

- i. There would not have been opportunities for production of coal, oil, gas or renewables because of the current restrictions from the 1998 Las Vegas RMP. There is no energy transmission infrastructure within GBNM.

- c) Minerals - annual mineral production on site

- i. The area would still be closed to mineral material production and withdrawn from mineral entry regardless of designation. There are two mining claims located in the GBNM which could see production in the future. The mining claims would be considered valid existing rights, but production on these claims would first require a validity exam due to the 2002 mineral withdrawal.

- d) Timber - annual timber production on site (in board-feet, CCF, or similar measure)

- i. Commercial seed collection (managed under the forestry program), is allowed and permitted in areas in the GBNM that are not in desert tortoise critical habitat. 2017: 700 lbs of globemallow.

- e) Grazing - annual grazing on site (AUMs permitted and sold)
    - i. **Mesquite Community Allotment (AZ04832):** currently administered by the Arizona Strip Field Office. In the Arizona Strip Resource Management Plan (2008), the Mesquite Community Allotment is available for grazing. The grazing permittee would have had the opportunity to use the entire permitted active AUMs with no reductions in AUMs because of the monument. Approximately 13% of the allotment is now within the Gold Butte NM based on GIS acreage.
    - ii. **Lime Spring Allotment (AZ02012):** currently administered by the Arizona Strip Field Office. In the Arizona Strip Resource Management Plan (2008), the Lime Spring Allotment is available for grazing. An annual application for grazing use could have been submitted, and grazing could have been approved. Because the allotment is currently classified as ephemeral, there is no set number of AUMs.
  - f) Subsistence - participation rates for subsistence activities occurring on site (fishing, hunting, gathering); quantities harvested; other quantifiable information where available
    - i. The BLM does not have sufficient information to predict how designation of the monument has impacted participation rates in subsistence activities.
  - g) Cultural - list of cultural uses/values for site; number of sites; other quantifiable information where available
    - i. The BLM does not have sufficient information to predict how designation of the monument has impacted cultural uses of the monument. The monument proclamation requires that the BLM provide access by members of Indian tribes for traditional cultural and customary uses, consistent with the American Indian Religious Freedom Act (42 U.S.C. 1996) and Executive Order 13007 of May 24, 1996 (Indian Sacred Sites).
- 5) Changes to boundaries - dates and changes in size
- i. There have been no changes to boundaries.
- 6) Public Outreach prior to Designation - outreach activities conducted and opportunities for public comment
- i. The public process preceding designation is outlined in the Fast Facts and Q&A regarding GBNM. A PDF document of the Fast Facts and Q&A was uploaded to the Google Drive (Fast Facts and Q&A.pdf).
- 7) Terms of Designation
- i. Refer to the Gold Butte Presidential Proclamation for the terms of designation. A PDF of the Gold Butte Presidential Proclamation was uploaded to the Google Drive (Gold Butte Presidential Proclamation 2006.pdf).

**Call for Data Related to Review of National Monuments under EO 13792 (April 26, 2017)****Ironwood Forest National Monument****1. Documents Requested****a) Resource Management Plans/Land Use Plans**

- i. The Ironwood Forest National Monument Approved Resource Management Plan (RMP) and Record of Decision (ROD) is located within this drive ([1ab.IFNM mgmt plan.pdf](#))

**b) Record of Decision**

- i. RMP Record of Decision (ROD) approved February 2014. It is included in the RMP document located within this drive ([1ab.IFNM mgmt plan.pdf](#))

**c) Public Scoping Documents**

- i. RMP Scoping report, completed February 12, 2004, is located within this drive ([1c.IFNM scoping report](#))

**d) Presidential Proclamation**

- i. Presidential Proclamation 7320- Establishment of the Ironwood Forest National Monument, June 9, 2000 is located within this drive ([1d.IFNM proclamation](#))

**2. Information on activities permitted at the monument, including annual levels of activity from the date of designation to the present****Designation Date for IFNM is June 9, 2000.****a) Recreation - annual visits to site**

- i. IFNM uses the Recreation Management Information System (RMIS) to report recreation use, which is calculated from limited traffic counts. BLM is currently working on changes to RMIS that will improve our visitation reporting and addressing an anomaly for 2016 data.

YEAR	VISITS
2001	15,900
2002	11,974
2003	21,025
2004	27,550
2005	22,500
2006	16,200
2007	17,100
2008	17,900
2009	19,300
2010	23,026
2011	26,000
2012	30,373
2013	43,640
2014	47,435

2015	58,020
------	--------

Note: The 2014 IFNM RMP closed the monument to recreational target shooting activity.

- b) Energy - annual production of coal, oil, gas and renewables (if any) on site; amount of energy transmission infrastructure on site (if any)
- i. No production of coal, oil, gas or renewable energy has occurred on IFNM since designation.
  - ii. The amount of energy transmission infrastructure on IFNM has not changed since designation. Current energy transmission infrastructure on IFNM is listed in the table below.

SERIAL NUMBER	Sum Miles	Comment
A-19136	0.3	Electric Transmission
A-2024	5.8	Electric Transmission
A-2205	0.7	Electric Transmission
A-7274	5.7	Electric Transmission
A-7872	7.3	Electric Transmission
A-7874	1.7	Electric Transmission
AR-023490	20.7	Electric Transmission
AR-025949	1.4	Electric Transmission
AR-030401	5.1	Electric Transmission
AR-031023	2.1	Electric Transmission
AR-03905	3.0	Electric Transmission
AR-05586	1.8	Natural Gas
AR-0612	2.0	Electric Transmission
AZA-23405	1.1	Electric Transmission
PHX-083253	8.8	Natural Gas
PHX-084351	1.7	Electric Transmission
PHX-086067	6.9	Natural Gas

Total	76.1 Miles	
-------	------------	--

c) **Minerals - annual mineral production on site**

- i. Since monument designation, no mineral production has occurred on federal land within the IFNM boundary.
- ii. Mining claims existing at the time of monument designation and remaining active would require a validity exam and Mining Plan of Operation before mineral production. Monument lands were withdrawn from mineral entry by the proclamation.
- iii. The 4200-acre Silver Bell copper mine on adjacent private land was discovered, after designation, to have an unauthorized pipeline across monument land. The operator moved the pipeline and completed the regrading and revegetation required by the BLM, as this was less expensive than completing a Mining Plan of Operations in order to authorize the pipeline. Although authorizing the pipeline after designation would have also required a validity exam, whereas authorizing the pipeline prior to designation would have only required a Mining Plan of Operations, in either case moving the pipeline was less expensive and therefore the more appealing option for the operator.
- iv. The 120-acre Pioneer Materials mineral materials quarry on adjacent private lands has not been impacted by activities on the monument since designation. BLM issued and administers a right-of-way for hauling material across monument lands.
- v. The 40-acre Kalamazoo minerals material quarry opened on adjacent private land after monument designation. This quarry was permitted by the Arizona State Mine Inspector.

d) **Timber - annual timber production on site (in board-feet, CCF, or similar measure)**

- i. No timber production has occurred on IFNM since designation. The Sonoran Desert ecosystem has no timber resource nor provides timber products.

e) **Grazing – annual grazing on site (AUMs permitted and sold)**

- i. The number of AUMs permitted (7,849) has not changed since designation. The number of AUMs sold each year is at the lessee's discretion based on weather and forage production, with numbers being lower during drought years. See tables located within this Drive: [2e.IFNM Billed AUMs](#), [2e.IFNM Permitted Active AUMs by Allotment as of 2017-5-23](#)

f) **Subsistence - participation rates for subsistence activities occurring on site (fishing, hunting, gathering); quantities harvested; other quantifiable information where available**

- i. No subsistence activities have occurred on the IFNM since designation. There are no formal subsistence activities outside of Alaska. IFNM does provide for the

collection of certain natural materials by Native American Indians. There have never been sport fish on the IFNM. The terms of the Proclamation ("The establishment of this monument is subject to valid existing rights. Nothing in this proclamation shall be deemed to enlarge or diminish the jurisdiction of the State of Arizona with respect to fish and wildlife management.") state that regulation of hunting and fishing in the monument remains with the State.

- ii. Arizona Game and Fish Department does not measure hunting participation rates for the IFNM separate from the remainder of the Game Management Unit in which the monument is located.

g) Cultural - list of cultural uses/values for site; number of sites; other quantifiable information where available

- i. Cultural resources data are compiled from the *Ironwood Forest National Monument Proposed RMP and Final EIS* (2011), the AZSite online database (administered by the Arizona State Museum), and the cultural heritage program files at the BLM Tucson Field Office.
- ii. To date, approximately 12.5 percent of BLM-administered lands within the monument (~16,000 acres) has been inventoried for cultural resources. Roughly half of the current survey data was generated after the date of the Monument Proclamation, resulting in a net doubling of the number of known and/or documented cultural resources sites within the monument.
- iii. The various surveys within the monument have resulted in the documentation of 310 archaeological and historical sites; approximately half of the known sites have been identified and documented since the date of Monument Proclamation. Analysis of current data provides an average density of approximately 11 cultural resources sites per square mile on BLM-administered lands with a projected total estimate of 3,000 to 6,000 sites likely to exist across the entirety of the monument.
- iv. Cultural Values. Evidence of Paleoindian occupation (circa 12,000-8,000 B.C.) within the monument is currently limited to isolated spear points (Agenbroad 1967; Ayres 1970; Doelle 1985; Huckell 1984). Several Late Archaic/Early Agricultural era sites (circa 1,500 B.C.-A.D. 650) have been discovered along the course of the Santa Cruz River southeast of the monument (Gregory and Mabry 1998; Mabry et al. 1997); these sites include some of the oldest known canal systems and pottery types in southern Arizona (Gregory 1999; Heidke 1997; Heidke and Ferg 1998; Mabry 1999). Formative era sites (circa A.D. 650-1400) dominate the regional archaeological record and reflect an adaptation based on farming villages. Around A.D. 500, a culture referred to as the Hohokam began to flourish and occupied much of what is now southern and central Arizona for approximately a millennium. Evidence of the Hohokam occupation dominates the archaeological record of the monument. Other identified cultural affiliations

include historic-era Euro-American, Protohistoric and/or historic O'odham, possible Patayan components, and a possible Apache component.

- v. Tribal Interests. The BLM regularly consults with five Native American tribes who claim ancestral and/or traditional interest in the lands and resources of the monument: the Hopi Tribe, Pascua Yaqui Tribe, Tohono O'odham Nation, White Mountain Apache Tribe, and the Yavapai-Apache Nation. There is limited information regarding specific places within the monument that have been identified as having traditional cultural significance; however, tribes with ancestral ties to the region are known to have concerns about the treatment of human remains, funerary objects, sacred objects, and objects of cultural patrimony.

Members of the Tohono O'odham Nation, which borders the monument to the west, likely consider stands of saguaro where fruit was or may be collected as having significance (c.f., Nabhan 1987, 1982). The Cocoraque Butte area also is known to have some significance as a potential traditional cultural place. Tribal interests in the lands and resources of the monument as expressed through ongoing consultations with the O'odham include indigenous plant resources, access for tribal members (various purposes), protection/preservation of archaeological and historical O'odham sites, coordinated management of archaeological sites that overlap the monument-Tohono O'odham Nation boundary, and an overarching concern about the impacts of encroaching development.

### 3. Information on activities occurring during the **5 years prior to designation**

#### a) Recreation - annual visits to site

- i. No estimates of recreation use were made prior to designation. A recreation study completed shortly after monument designation indicated approximately 10,000 annual visits for various dispersed recreational activities (OHV driving for pleasure, hunting, sightseeing, hiking, camping).

#### b) Energy - annual production of coal, oil, gas and renewables (if any) on site; amount of energy transmission infrastructure on site (if any)

- i. No coal, oil, gas, or renewable energy production occurred on the site during the five years prior to designation.
- ii. All existing energy transmission infrastructure was developed prior to designation, including a total of 76.1 miles of right of way.

#### c) Minerals - annual mineral production on site

- i. Jenott Mining operated a 5-acre mineral material sale quarry on IFNM which ended production prior to monument designation. Reclamation was complete one year after designation.
- ii. Prior to designation, a Mining Plan of Operation was required for active mining

- over 5 acres or more of unpatented claims.
- iii. The adjacent Silver Bell copper mine, on private land, was not impacted by activities on BLM land prior to designation. The Silver Bell mine was permitted by the Arizona State Mine Inspector.
  - iv. The adjacent Pioneer Materials mineral materials quarry, on private land, was not impacted by activities on BLM land prior to designation. The main product is limestone aggregate. The Pioneer quarry was permitted by the Arizona State Mine Inspector.
- d) Timber - annual timber production on site (in board-feet, CCF, or similar measure)
- i. No timber production occurred on IFNM in the 5 years prior to designation. The Sonoran Desert ecosystem has no timber resource nor provides timber products.
- e) Grazing - annual grazing on site (AUMs permitted and sold)
- i. Designation did not change the number of AUMs permitted; 7,849 AUMs were permitted each of the five years prior to designation. The number of AUMs sold each year is at the lessee's discretion based on weather and forage production, with numbers being lower during drought years.  
See tables located within this Drive: [2e.IFNM Billed AUMs](#),  
[2e.IFNM Permitted Active AUMs by Allotment as of 2017-5-23](#)
- f) Subsistence - participation rates for subsistence activities occurring on site (fishing, hunting, gathering); quantities harvested; other quantifiable information where available
- i. No subsistence activities have occurred on the IFNM since designation. There are no formal subsistence outside of Alaska. IFNM does provide for the collection of certain natural materials by Native American Indians. There have never been sport fish on the IFNM. The terms of the Proclamation ("The establishment of this monument is subject to valid existing rights. Nothing in this proclamation shall be deemed to enlarge or diminish the jurisdiction of the State of Arizona with respect to fish and wildlife management.") state that regulation of hunting and fishing in the monument remains with the State.
  - ii. Arizona Game and Fish Department does not measure hunting participation rates for the IFNM separate from the remainder of the Game Management Unit in which the monument is located.
- g) Cultural - list of cultural uses/values for site; number of sites; other quantifiable information where available
- i. In the five-year period prior to monument designation, approximately 8,000 acres of BLM-administered land that later became the monument had been inventoried for cultural resources. These surveys were primarily conducted in support of BLM-permitted activities associated with grazing, mining, and/or utility line construction projects.

- ii. In the five-year period prior to monument designation, approximately 150 cultural sites had been documented on BLM-administered land in the areas that later became the monument. These sites were primarily identified through the previously referenced inventories.
  - iii. Cultural Values. Prior to monument designation, three historic properties had been recognized as having special significance by being listed on the National Register of Historic Places. These include the Los Robles Archaeological District (listed in 1989), the Cocoraque Butte Archaeological District (listed in 1975), and the Santa Ana de Cuiquiburitac Mission Site (listed in 1975).
- 4. Information on activities that likely would have occurred annually from the date of designation to the present **if the Monument had not been designated**
  - a) Recreation - annual visits to site
    - i. It is likely that dispersed recreational use would have continued at relatively low levels (estimated at less than 10,000 annual visits) for hunting, camping, OHV driving and target shooting.
  - b) Energy - annual production of coal, oil, gas and renewables (if any) on site; amount of energy transmission infrastructure on site (if any)
    - i. No production of coal, oil or gas would have likely occurred because the monument lacks the geologic formations in which these resources are formed.
    - ii. BLM completed several BLM-wide EISs for renewable energy and none identified the area as having high potential for renewable energy development.
  - c) Minerals - annual mineral production on site
    - i. Without monument designation, it is possible but not likely that mineral material production would have occurred on a small scale. Based on the geology, the area might have supported two 2-4-person operations.
    - ii. Without monument designation, it is likely that mineral claims would have been located. Mineral development of those claims would have been less likely. The existing adjacent copper mine has a Mining Plan of Operation, because of active mining over five acres or more of unpatented claims. BLM has not received any new Mining Plans of Operation since monument designation.
  - d) Timber - annual timber production on site (in board-feet, CCF, or similar measure)
    - i. No timber production would have occurred on IFNM without designation. The Sonoran Desert ecosystem has no timber resource nor provides timber products.
  - e) Grazing - annual grazing on site (AUMs permitted and sold)
    - i. Without monument designation, AUMs permitted and sold would likely not have been different than they have been with designation. The number of AUMs billed varies with the based on weather and forage production.
  - f) Subsistence - participation rates for subsistence activities occurring on site (fishing,

hunting, gathering); quantities harvested; other quantifiable information where available

- i. No subsistence activities would have occurred on the IFNM without designation. There are no formal subsistence outside of Alaska. Designation did not impede collection of certain natural materials by Native American Indians. There have never been sport fish on the IFNM. Hunting participation rates would have been the same without designation, because regulation of hunting and fishing in the monument remains with the State.

g) Cultural - list of cultural uses/values for site; number of sites; other quantifiable information where available

- i. Without monument designation, it is likely that less cultural resources inventory would have occurred. Monument designation generated additional research interest, resulting in several cooperative university projects including cultural resources inventory and assessment (c.f., Heilen and Reid 2006). Likewise, recent ethnographic research on Borderlands smuggling and undocumented immigrant activities would not have been possible (c.f., Warren 2013).
- ii. Without monument designation, it is likely that additional vandalism would have occurred to cultural sites. After designation, research, inventory, and educational and interpretive outreach programs increased. Education, increased presence of staff and researchers, and improved management likely led to the reduction in numbers. Continued monitoring by BLM Archaeologists, Law Enforcement, and Site Stewards serves to deter potential looting and vandalism.
- iii. Without monument designation, protective measures at the National Register of Historic Places-listed Cocoraque Butte Archaeological District and Santa Ana de Cuiquiburitac Mission Site likely would not have been prioritized and funded.

5. Changes to boundaries - dates and changes in size

- i. The IFNM boundary encompasses 188,628 acres of land; this number of acres has not changed since designation. At designation, 128,398 of these acres were BLM-administered. The balance of the land consisted of approximately 54,700 acres of State Trust land (administered by the Arizona State Land Department [ASLD]) and approximately 6,000 acres of privately owned land, and a 299-acre Department of Defense withdrawal. The decisions in the Approved RMP (2012) currently apply to approximately 129,358 acres within the monument boundaries which is public land administered by the BLM.
- ii. There have been no changes to the monument boundary since monument designation. Acquisitions since designation have all been private land within the boundaries of the monument, from willing sellers.
- iii. In 2014, the BLM acquired 358 acres of private land within the monument from willing sellers, with the assistance of Land and Water Conservation Funds and

the Arizona Land and Water Trust. The majority of the acreage was patented mining claims in the Waterman Mountains in habitat for the Endangered Nichol Turks-head cactus, and containing a major bat roost.

- iv. In 2016, the BLM acquired 602 acres of private land within the monument from willing sellers, with the assistance of Land and Water Conservation Funds and the Arizona Land and Water Trust.

**6. Public Outreach prior to Designation - outreach activities conducted and opportunities for public comment**

- i. BLM conducted no public outreach activities prior to designation. Monument designation was a citizen's proposal.
- ii. The Board of Supervisors of Pima County, Arizona, proposed the establishment of an "Ironwood Preserve" and signed Resolution 2000-63 "Request(ing) that the United States of America through the Secretary of the Department of the Interior, consistent with the Sonoran Desert Conservation Plan, work cooperatively with Pima County to establish the Ragged Top and Silverbell Ironwood Preserve in the Silverbell Mountains." in March of 2000.

**7. Terms of Designation**

- i. The terms of designation are from the Presidential Proclamation 7320- Establishment of the Ironwood Forest National Monument, June 9, 2000, which is located within this Drive ([1d.IFNM proclamation](#)):

**Call for Data Related to Review of National Monuments under EO 13792 (April 26, 2017)****1. Documents Requested****a. Resource Management Plans/Land Use Plans**

BLM combines Resource Management Plans and Records of Decision (RMP/RODs). See item 1.b below.

**b. Record of Decision**
















- i. Only the Original Cascade-Siskiyou National Monument (CSNM) has a stand-alone Monument RMP, which was completed in August 2008 (1.a and b.RMP-ROD\_CSNM\_8-15-08.pdf):  
[https://www.blm.gov/or/districts/medford/plans/files/CSNM%20ROD%20and%20RMP\\_8-15-08.pdf](https://www.blm.gov/or/districts/medford/plans/files/CSNM%20ROD%20and%20RMP_8-15-08.pdf)
- ii. The Expansion Area is currently covered by two RMP/RODs that will require Amendment to establish management provisions within agency discretion and the parameters of the Presidential Proclamations.
  - Oregon portion (1.a and b.RMP-ROD\_Southwestern Oregon\_8-2016):  
<https://www.blm.gov/or/plans/rmpswesternoregon/rod/index.php> (with links to complete documents and individual maps)
  - California portion (1.a and b.RMP-ROD\_Redding\_1993\_OCR):  
<https://archive.org/details/recordofdecision13unit>

**c. Public Scoping Documents**

Planning for the original CSNM included substantial outreach, public scoping and comment periods. See the *Federal Register* Notice of Intent in the CSNM Drive folder (1.c.Public Scoping.CSNM NOI 2011-28064\_10-31-2011, and online at:  
<http://docs.regulations.justia.com/entries/2011-10-31/2011-28064.pdf>).

Prior to original Monument designation, the BLM designated the Cascade Siskiyou Ecological Emphasis Area (CSEEA) and conducted scoping in support of eventual publication of a Draft RMP/Environmental Impact Statement (see question 6 and Drive folder documents 6.Outreach.Cascade Siskiyou Eco Emph Area\_Draft RMP-EIS Vol 1\_March 2000 [and Vol 2]). The Monument Proclamation drew heavily from the Draft RMP alternatives.

Following is a listing of many scoping and public comment documents associated with the Ecological Emphasis Area and subsequent National Monument management planning. These documents are in the subfolder labeled “Scoping” in the CSNM Drive folder:

-  1999\_Notice of Intent to prepare a management plan and EIS for Cascade-Siskiyou Ecological Emphasis Area
-  2000\_Federal Register Notice of Intent to Prepare an RMP and Initiation of Scoping
-  2002\_Federal Register Notice of Availability to comment
-  2005\_Federal Register Notice of Availability to comment
-  Appendix MM DRMP Summary of Meetings Held (1)
-  Appendix MM DRMP Summary of Meetings Held
-  April 18 2005 Summary of Governor's Consistency Review
-  CSEEA v1
-  CSEEA v2
-  One page summary of Scoping Process in draft RMP and FEIS 2005
-  Public Meeting Ad
-  Request for comments on DEIS 2002
-  Scoping described in Executive Summary page ix of Draft RMP DEIS released 2002
-  Scoping from 1999 Cascade-Siskiyou Ecological Emphasis Area CSEEA draft mgmt plan
-  Summary of Comments on the CSNM PRMP

Resource Management Planning, including public scoping, has not yet been initiated for the Expansion Area.

- d. **Presidential Proclamation**
  - i. Original Monument: 1.d.CSNM Orig Proclamation 7318\_6-9-2000.pdf
  - ii. Monument Expansion: 1.d.CSNM\_Monument Expansion Proclamation\_1-12-2017.pdf
- 2. Information on activities permitted at the Monument, including annual levels of activity from the **date of designation to the present**
  - a. Recreation - annual visits to site

The Monument lands have long been recognized for their biological versus recreational values, so overall recreation use has been little affected by Monument designation. Use level trends generally parallel those of the surrounding region.

Average Annual Visits data from the date of Monument designation to present (derived from the Recreation Management Information System [RMIS] database) are provided in the first two columns of the spreadsheet located in the CSNM Drive folder as 2.a and 3.a\_CSNM\_Recreational Annual Visits pre- and post-designation.xlsx. For the Expansion Area, such data is not available, since expansion occurred in January 2017.

- b. Energy - annual production of coal, oil, gas and renewables (if any) on site; amount of energy transmission infrastructure on site (if any)

There has been no production of coal, oil, gas, and renewables in the Monument since

designation. The potential for these energy resources within the Monument is low to non-existent. There are 17.78 miles of electrical transmission lines in the original Monument. There are 17.82 miles of electrical transmission lines and 7.67 miles of gas line in the expanded Monument.

**c. Minerals - annual mineral production on site**

Since designation, no rock has been commercially sold from within the CSNM. Rock from CSNM quarries has been utilized to maintain Monument roads since designation, as described in the RMP/ROD for the Monument. There are no mining claims in the Monument.

**d. Timber - annual timber production on site (in board-feet, CCF, or similar measure)**

Under Proclamation 7318, “[t]he commercial harvest of timber or other vegetative material is prohibited, except when part of an authorized science-based ecological restoration project aimed at meeting protection and old growth enhancement objectives. Any such project must be consistent with the purposes of this proclamation. No portion of the monument shall be considered to be suited for timber production, and no part of the monument shall be used in a calculation or provision of a sustained yield of timber. Removal of trees from within the monument area may take place only if clearly needed for ecological restoration and maintenance or public safety.”

**Original CSNM Designation:**

**Summary:** Since the original designation, only 36 thousand board feet have been harvested from within the original monument area; timber was removed only for the purposes of public safety.

**More Details:** Approximately 9 thousand board feet was removed as part of Hyatt Lake Hazard for public safety in the fall of 2000. Following a severe wind event in the winter of 2015, approximately 25 thousand board feet of blow down trees were removed from the Hyatt Lake Campground in the CSNM for the purpose of public safety and maintenance of campground facilities.

**Expanded CSNM Designation (expansion area only):**

**Summary:** Since monument expansion, approximately 310 thousand board feet has been harvested from within the Oregon portion of the expansion area under timber sale contracts that were entered into prior to January 12, 2017. These contracts are considered valid existing rights and will be completed, including the approximately 2.9 million board feet of timber that remain to be harvested.

**More Details:** Howard, South Fork Little Butte and Pine Plantation Thin, Surveyor Salvage, Jigsaw, and Mid-Spencer timber sales were under contract at the time of CSNM Expansion on January 12, 2017. Timber harvesting on Surveyor Salvage and Mid-Spencer timber sales was almost entirely completed prior to the monument expansion.

About 238 acres and 1,212 thousand board feet (MBF) of the Howard Timber Sale is located within the expansion boundary; about 191 acres and 1,600 MBF of the South Fork Little Butte Timber Sale is located within the expansion boundary. Pine Plantation Thin is 82 acres and 121 MBF and located entirely within the CSNM Expansion Area. Since January 12, 2017, approximately 310 thousand board feet has been harvested within the CSNM Expansion Area under the Howard and Jigsaw timber sale contracts.

The site conditions of the California portion of the Expansion Area do not support commercial-grade timber resources.

**e. Grazing - annual grazing on site (AUMs permitted and sold)**

Language included in the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 enabled grazing leases within the CSNM to be voluntarily retired. The Soda Mountain, Keene Creek, and Jenny Creek leases administered by the Medford District in the Monument were voluntarily relinquished by the lessees, and after a third party bought out the leases they were permanently retired. A small lease (5 AUM) on the Box R Ranch was voluntarily relinquished and retired as part of a congressionally-authorized land exchange within the CSNM. Two allotments were vacant at the time of designation (Agate and Siskiyou), and Proclamation language directed that these voluntarily relinquished allotments not be reallocated for forage.

Data on annual AUMs permitted and sold by allotment is included in the file 2.e.Grazing.AUMs\_CSNM\_5\_25\_17 final.xlsx in the CSNM Drive folder. Note on this file: the four columns reflect by year the total allotment acres, the number of acres of the allotment within the CSNM, the permitted use for the entire allotment, and the sold AUMs for the entire allotment. The BLM does not currently have data on what amount of utilization occurred within vs. outside of the CSNM, so the AUM numbers reported are for the entire allotment.

**f. Subsistence - participation rates for subsistence activities occurring on site (fishing, hunting, gathering); quantities harvested; other quantifiable information where available**

Subsistence activities are those that provide the bare essentials for living: food, water, and shelter. The Federal Subsistence Management Program provides opportunities for subsistence way of life in Alaska on federal public lands and waters. There are no formal

subsistence programs outside of Alaska. CSNM does provide for the collection of certain natural materials by Native American Indians under BLM permit. Dead and down wood is allowed to be collected for campfires within the CSNM, and the noncommercial gathering of fruits, nuts, berries, and mushrooms is also allowed. No data are available on the quantities harvested. Hunting and fishing is allowed within the entire CSNM and is regulated by the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, which has data available on the numbers of licenses issued.

In the California portion of the Expansion Area, the Horseshoe Ranch area managed by the BLM Redding Field Office has checker-boarded ownership with California Dept. of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). The area is known as the Horseshoe Ranch Wildlife Management Area, and BLM's management of the area closely conforms with CDFW management of the area.

**g. Cultural - list of cultural uses/values for site; number of sites; other quantifiable information where available**

- The Cascade-Siskiyou National Monument is culturally significant to the Grand Ronde, Siletz, Shasta and Klamath Tribes. All of the Tribes have stated that the Monument has special significance to them and has a number of places that are considered sacred. Tribes also conduct hunting, fishing, wood cutting and gathering of subsistence plants in addition to collecting medicinal and ceremonial plants and basket materials within the Monument boundaries.
- According to BLM Medford cultural resource databases, there are 214 cultural resource sites recorded within the Monument area that are managed by the Medford District. There are prehistoric and historic sites within the Monument. Prehistoric sites are those that were made by early Native Americans for a variety of resource gathering activities as well as habitation. Historic sites are those that were made by Euro-American emigrants to the area. Many historic sites are related to early 18<sup>th</sup> century homesteading and livestock rearing activities.
- Klamath Tribal members participate in a Pan-Indian Sundance Ceremony that is held annually within the original Monument. Although numbers vary from year to year, the ceremony attracts up to 500 people of both native and non-native ancestry who witness or participate in the Sundance.
- Less than 5 percent of the original Monument has been surveyed for cultural resources.
- Archaeological surveys cover 94 percent of the Klamath Falls Resource Area (KFRA) portion of the Expansion Area, with less than 756 acres left unsurveyed. Nine sites (three prehistoric and six historic) are located within this area.

- In the California portion of the Expansion Area, the Redding RMP designated the 320-acre Jenny Creek Area of Critical Environmental Concern to protect Native American sacred sites.

3. Information on activities occurring during the **5 years prior to designation**

a. Recreation - annual visits to site

The spreadsheet located in the CSNM Drive folder as 2.a and 3.a\_CSNM\_Recr Av Annual Visits pre- and post-designation.xlsx shows a general increase in average annual visits for most individual recreation activities and at key sites since Monument designation, as compared to the 5-year period preceding designation. But the Monument lands have long been recognized for their biological versus recreational values, so overall recreation use has been little affected by Monument designation. This upward trend in average annual visits generally parallels that of the surrounding region.

b. Energy - annual production of coal, oil, gas and renewables (if any) on site; amount of energy transmission infrastructure on site (if any)

There was no production of coal, oil, gas, and renewables in the Monument in the five years prior to designation, because the potential for these energy resources is low to non-existent. There were 17.78 miles of electrical transmission lines in the original Monument in the five years prior to designation. There were 17.82 miles of electrical transmission lines and 7.67 miles of gas line in the expanded Monument five years prior to designation.

c. Minerals - annual mineral production on site

During the 5 years prior to designation, there were no mining claims or rock sold from quarries in the original Monument. During that time, there was an average of 342 cubic yards per year of rock sold from quarries in the expansion area. There were no mining claims in the expansion area during the five years prior to the Monument expansion.

d. Timber - annual timber production on site (in board-feet, CCF, or similar measure)

**Original CSNM Designation:** Approximately 272 thousand board feet were harvested in the 5 years prior to the Original Monument designation.

**Expanded CSNM Designation:** Approximately 9,500 thousand board feet were harvested within the Oregon portion of the CSNM Expansion Area during the 5 years prior to the expansion. Looking back to 1995, the date of the original monument designation, brings this number up to around 50 million board feet from within this expansion area. The site conditions of the California portion of the Expansion Area do not support commercial-grade timber resources.

e. Grazing - annual grazing on site (AUMs permitted and sold)

Data on annual AUMs permitted and sold by allotment is included in the file 2.e.Grazing.AUMs\_CSNM\_5\_25\_17 final.xlsx in the CSNM Drive folder. Note on this file: the four columns reflect by year the total allotment acres, the number of acres of the allotment within the CSNM, the permitted use for the entire allotment, and the sold AUMs for the entire allotment. The BLM does not currently have data on what amount of utilization occurred within vs. outside of the CSNM, so the AUM numbers reported are for the entire allotment.

- f. **Subsistence - participation rates for subsistence activities occurring on site (fishing, hunting, gathering); quantities harvested; other quantifiable information where available**  
Hunting and fishing was allowed on BLM lands and was regulated by the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, which has data available on the numbers of licenses issued. Fruits, nuts, berries, and mushrooms were collected on BLM lands prior to monument designation. No data is available on the quantities harvested.
  - g. **Cultural - list of cultural uses/values for site; number of sites; other quantifiable information where available**  
In the 5-year period prior to original Monument designation and to Expansion, all sites, uses, and special designations identified in item 2.g were in existence.
4. **Information on activities that likely would have occurred annually from the date of designation to the present if the Monument had not been designated**
- a. **Recreation - annual visits to site**  
Many of the same recreation activities would have occurred had the Monument not been designated, so annual visitation trends would not likely change substantially.
  - b. **Energy - annual production of coal, oil, gas and renewables (if any) on site; amount of energy transmission infrastructure on site (if any)**  
Had the Monument not been designated, it is likely there would still be no production of coal, oil, gas, and renewables, because the potential for these energy resources is low to non-existent. There would still be 17.78 miles of electrical transmission lines in the original Monument area, and 17.82 miles of electrical transmission and 7.67 miles of gas lines in the expanded Monument area.
  - c. **Minerals - annual mineral production on site**  
It is likely that gravel production would have continued from the quarries had the monument not been designated. Although speculative, it is possible that the pre-Monument expansion average of 342 cubic yards of rock would have continued to have been sold from quarries annually.

d. Timber - annual timber production on site (in board-feet, CCF, or similar measure)

**Original CSNM Designation:** Under the 1995 Medford District Resource Management Plan, approximately 19,400 acres of BLM-administered lands (of the roughly 52,000 acres originally designated in 2000) were allocated to Southern General Forest Management Area with a primary objective of providing a sustainable supply of timber and other forest products. However, no current information is readily available regarding the amount of volume that may have been produced from these acres since Monument designation in 2000. It is well known that this part of the Ashland Resource Area is characterized by low site capabilities, and relative to other areas in the Medford District, is considered a low timber production area. Some timber harvest would have occurred for improving forest stand survival and growth, fuels reduction, pine site restoration, and regeneration harvest; however, it would be overly speculative to estimate actual timber volumes that may have been produced.

**Expanded CSNM Designation:**

**Summary:** Based on preliminary analysis, the Oregon portion of the expansion likely reduces sustained yield timber production opportunities by 4-6 million board feet per year, and commercial harvest in reserved land use allocations by 400 thousand board feet per year. Over a 50-year period, annual sustained-yield timber harvest is projected to be 200 – 300 million board feet less than it would have been without the designation. This is due to explicit restrictions in the proclamation prohibiting sustainable timber harvest. Commercial harvesting in reserved land use allocations would likely be reduced by 20 million board feet over the same 50-year time period. The site conditions of the California portion of the Expansion Area do not support commercial-grade timber resources.

**More Details:** The Harvest Land Base in the Oregon expansion area designated under the recently signed 2016 Southwest Oregon RMP was estimated to produce approximately 1-2 million board feet per year in the Medford sustained yield unit, and 3-4 million board feet per year in the Klamath Falls sustained yield unit. An additional 400 thousand board feet of timber was projected to come from restorative commercial harvests in lands allocated to reserves in Medford.

Under Proclamation 7318 “[t]he commercial harvest of timber or other vegetative material is prohibited, except when part of an authorized science-based ecological restoration project aimed at meeting protection and old growth enhancement objectives. Any such project must be consistent with the purposes of this proclamation. No portion of the monument shall be considered to be suited for timber production, and no part of the monument shall be used in a calculation or provision of a sustained yield of timber. Removal of trees from within the monument area may take place only if clearly needed for ecological restoration and maintenance or public safety.”

**e. Grazing - annual grazing on site (AUMs permitted and sold)**

If the Monument had not been designated, it is likely that grazing would have continued within the original CSNM, as the legislated grazing buyout would likely not have occurred. Grazing would likely have continued at a similar level to the pre-designation utilization (see file 2.e.Grazing.AUMs\_CSNM\_5\_25\_17 final.xlsx in the CSNM Drive folder) as well as to post-designation levels in the Expansion Area. The two allotments that were vacant for the five years preceding original Monument designation (the Agate and Siskiyou allotments) likely would not have been utilized had the Monument not been designated, as outside factors appear to have led to their vacant status.

**f. Subsistence - participation rates for subsistence activities occurring on site (fishing, hunting, gathering); quantities harvested; other quantifiable information where available**

Hunting and fishing would have occurred on BLM lands and been regulated by the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife at levels relatively unchanged from current levels. Fruits, nuts, berries, and mushrooms would still be collected on BLM lands.

**g. Cultural - list of cultural uses/values for site; number of sites; other quantifiable information where available**

The sites, uses, and special designations listed in item 2.g would still exist. The BLM does not have sufficient information to predict whether designation of the monument has impacted cultural uses of the monument. However, the monument proclamation requires that the BLM provide access by members of Indian tribes for traditional cultural and customary uses, consistent with the American Indian Religious Freedom Act (42 U.S.C. 1996) and Executive Order 13007 of May 24, 1996 (Indian Sacred Sites).

**5. Changes to boundaries - dates and changes in size**

The CSNM was expanded by presidential proclamation on January 12, 2017, adding 47,660 acres to the Monument. To date, BLM has acquired 13,355 acres of private inholdings within the original Monument boundary. Acquisitions have been by purchase (primarily through Land & Water Conservation Funds) and Exchange (primarily legislated exchanges).

**6. Public Outreach prior to Designation - outreach activities conducted and opportunities for public comment**

**a. Engagement March 1999 through May 2000:**

There was substantial public engagement both prior to and after the area's designation as the Cascade Siskiyou Ecological Emphasis Area (CSEEA) in the 1995 Medford District Resource Management Plan and during the early development stages in 1999 of a management plan for the EEA. Flyers went out to interested publics and ads were placed in five local newspapers

announcing the start of the management plan process for the CSEEA and additional public engagement included:

- Four public field trips and one public meeting;
- One meeting took place between BLM and Siskiyou county officials;
- A briefing was given to the Jackson County Commissioners; and
- A panel discussion organized by Congressman Greg Walden took place with the Secretary of the Interior, local government, and representative from local interest groups.

A total of 580 comments were submitted by the public. Substantive comments related to the following issues or resources: grazing, roads, timber harvest, mining, habitat fragmentation, protection of the unique natural and biological values of the area, fire suppression, BLM work capacity, hiking and other non-motorized recreation opportunities, the Pacific Crest National Scenic Trail, and concerns about increased government control.

A draft management plan for the CSEEA was published in March 2000 (see file 6.Outreach.Cascade Siskiyou Eco Emph Area\_Draft RMP-EIS Vol 1\_March 2000 [and Vol 2] and available online at: Vol I, <http://soda.sou.edu/awdata/020730x1.pdf>, and Vol II, <http://soda.sou.edu/awdata/020730y1.pdf>). The Monument Proclamation drew heavily from the most protective alternatives in this Draft Plan, which never reached Final publication due to the Monument's designation.

Engagement from April to June 2000 prior to June 9, 2000 original monument designation:

- Multiple meetings with Jackson and Siskiyou County Commissioners;
- One teleconference between the Secretary of the Interior, local government official, interested local groups, and the media;
- Additional field trips; and
- A public forum was held at Southern Oregon University to present the draft plan and environmental impact statement.

Upon original Monument Designation, the Council on Environmental Quality issued an announcement (6.Outreach.CEQ Announcement-Background\_Cascade-Siskiyou Natl Monument\_June 2000) that summarized the BLM designation of the Ecological Emphasis Area and visits/meetings by Secretary of Interior Bruce Babbitt and Congressman Greg Walden, plus two subsequent roundtable meetings.

b. Engagement April to December 2016, prior to Monument Expansion:

- Five studies or reports from the scientific community were provided to the Department of Interior from 2011 to 2015. Following these publications, 85 scientists sent a letter to the former Secretary of Interior, Sally Jewell, requesting consideration of monument

expansion in order to adequately protect the resources, objects, and values for which the original monument was designated;

- A heavily attended public hearing was held in Ashland with Senator Merkley and the former Deputy Secretary of the Interior, Mike Connor, in October 2016. The purpose of the hearing was to solicit public input on the proposed expansion of the monument. Approximately 500 citizens attended. The three counties of Jackson (OR), Klamath (OR), and Siskiyou (CA) also hosted additional public meetings to allow for public input into the monument expansion. Collectively, approximately 600 people attended these county meetings. A written comment period was also sponsored by Senators Wyden and Merkley. A total of 5,488 comments were received with approximately three-fourths in favor of the expansion.

## **7. Terms of Designation**

The terms of designation are spelled out in Presidential Proclamation 7318 dated June 9, 2000, as well as the expansion Proclamation, dated January 12, 2017 (both available in the CSNM Drive folder as 1.d.CSNM Orig Proclamation 7318\_6-9-2000.pdf and 1.d.CSNM\_Monument Expansion Proclamation\_1-12-2017.pdf).

## **Executive Summary of Review of National Monuments under EO 13792 (April 26, 2017)**

### **Key Information about Craters of the Moon National Monument and Preserve**

Craters of the Moon National Monument, the first national monument in Idaho, was established on May 2, 1924 (Presidential Proclamation 1694), to protect some of the unusual landscape of the Craters of the Moon Lava Field. This “lunar” landscape was thought to resemble that of the moon and was described in the proclamation as “a weird and scenic landscape peculiar to itself.”

Since 1924, the original Monument was expanded and boundary adjustments were made through five presidential proclamations issued pursuant to the Antiquities Act (34 Statute 225, 16 U.S. Code 431). Presidential Proclamation 1843 of July 23, 1928, expanded the NPS Monument by 25,413 acres to include certain springs for water supply and additional features of scientific interest. Further adjustments to include a spring through Proclamation 1916 of July 9, 1930, added approximately 37 acres; Presidential Proclamation 2499 of July 18, 1941 excluded the 93-acre right-of-way for Highway 22; and Presidential Proclamation 3506 of November 19, 1962 added 5,361 acres to incorporate an additional kipuka within the boundary. In 1936, a law enacted during the second session of the 74th Congress removed 464 acres the Monument (P.L. 74-669, 49 Stat. 1484). In 1996, Section 205 of the Omnibus Parks and Public Lands Management Act of 1996 (PL 104- 333, 110 Statute 4093, 4106) added 162 acres and removed 315 acres from the original NPS Monument.

Presidential Proclamation 7373 of November 9, 2000, expanded the boundary to 737,700 acres of federal land (from about 53,400 acres) to include many more of the area’s volcanic features — including the 60-mile-long Great Rift. It also enlarged the Monument’s administration by adding the efforts of the Bureau of Land Management to those of the National Park Service, all under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior. Through Congressional legislation (PL 107-213, 116 Statute 1052), on August 21, 2002, made one further adjustment by designating the area within the expanded NPS boundaries of Craters of the Moon National Monument as a National Preserve, to allow hunting on lands closed to this activity by the November 2000 proclamation. All of BLM lands are open for hunting and fishing.

The BLM manages for multiple use within the Monument (hunting, fishing, recreation, grazing, and valid existing rights such as oil production, etc.), while protecting the vast array of historic and scientific resources identified in the Proclamation and providing opportunities for scientific study of those resources. The resources identified in the Proclamation include 1) sagebrush steppe, found on approximately 60 percent of the Monument and covering the more developed soils of the rangelands, kipukas, cinder cones, older lava flows, and the foothills of the Pioneer Mountains; 2) the entire Great Rift volcanic zone and associated lava features; 3) kipukas which provide a window on vegetative communities of the past that have been erased from most of the Snake River Plain; and, 4) Craters of the Moon Wilderness Area, the first in the National Park

Service, and all or part of four wilderness study areas. Overall, multiple use activities are allowed on the BLM portions of Craters of the Moon National Monument and on the NPS Preserve that are compatible with the protection of resources and objects identified in the Presidential Proclamations and relevant laws. Multiple use activities are subject to decisions made in current and future BLM resource management planning efforts which include public participation. National Monuments and other conservation areas managed by the BLM continue to allow for multiple uses according to the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (depending on proclamation language).

### **Summary of Public Engagement Prior to Designation**

According to newspaper articles published in the early 2000s (prior to expansion), there had been numerous attempts by local boosters to expand the Craters of the Moon, most recently in the 1980s. Secretary Bruce Babbitt visited the area in April 2000, meeting with local government officials, permittees, and others to have conversations regarding ways to protect the special volcanic resources found in the area. Babbitt returned to the area to meet with local ranchers in the area the following month and, with their input, mapped out what would become the boundaries of the expansion.

In June 2000, Senator Larry Craig held a Hearing of the US Senate Subcommittee on Forests and Public Land Management in Twin Falls, Idaho. Three panels were convened from a mix of local government officials, environmental organizations, permittees, and others. There were approximately 75 people in attendance. Over 30 people provided oral testimony in addition to the people on the panels. Oral testimony was about split between those testifying for the expanded national monument and those testifying against.

### **Summary of Public Scoping in Development of Resource Management Plan**

Initial information about the Monument planning process and opportunities for involvement were posted on websites for the National Park Service and the Bureau of Land Management. Comments were accepted by mail and via e-mail.

Local and regional newspapers and radio stations throughout the planning area were used to disseminate information on the Management Plan process. Press releases, announcing scoping meetings and inviting the public to provide input, were prepared and distributed to print and broadcast media.

Open houses were held at Arco, Carey, Shoshone, American Falls, Rupert, Fort Hall, Hailey, and Boise. More than 166 people attended the initial scoping meetings.

During the 60-day public scoping period, 169 letters were received with 536 comments. Letters were received from 29 states, with more than 40 percent coming from Idaho. Of the 169 letters received, 148 came from individuals; 9 from federal, state, and local agencies; and 12 from

interest groups. Comments were received from 26 different communities in Idaho, with the majority originating in Boise.

Preliminary alternatives were developed and sent out to the public with a request for comments. Three public workshops were held for the public to provide input and assistance on the conceptual alternatives. A total of 86 people attended the three workshops held in Arco, Carey, and Rupert. More than 160 letters or comment cards were received. The planning team also received a response developed as a Wilderness Society Alert from more than 2,500 individuals.

The EPA announced the availability of the Draft Plan/ EIS for public review and comment in the Federal Register in April 2004. This announcement began the required 90-day comment period.

The Draft Plan/EIS was sent to agencies, organizations and people who had participated in the planning process and requested a copy. Copies of the Draft Plan/EIS were also available for review online at the website for the NPS and the BLM. Copies of the Draft Plan/EIS were placed in the following Idaho libraries: American Falls, Arco, Burley, Carey, Hailey, Idaho Falls, Rupert, Shoshone, and Twin Falls. Copies of the Draft Plan/EIS could also be requested in either a printed copy or on a compact disc (CD) by contacting the agencies through e-mail, phone, or fax.

Public comment meetings took place in an “open house” format to provide members of the public an opportunity to interact with resource specialists from the NPS and BLM. Four public comment meetings were held in Arco, American Falls, Rupert, and Carey.

During the 90-day comment period, 153 letters were received which contained 570 substantive comments. In addition, 975 form letters were received by e-mail, in response to three alerts, one from The Wilderness Society (611 total), one from the Idaho Conservation League (354 total) and one from Western Watersheds (10 total).

Letters came from: Twenty-five federal, state, city and county organizations, Twelve groups (Gem State Grotto, Republicans for Environmental Protection, Power County Historical Society, Western Watersheds Project, Wilderness River Outfitters, Great Old Broads for Wilderness, Idaho Conservation League, The Wilderness Society, Idaho Wool Growers, Northern Rockies Chapter Sierra Club, Lava Lake Land and Livestock, and the Blue Ribbon Coalition), and 116 individuals. Thirty late form letters were also received, plus one late letter from the National Trust for Historic Preservation.

The Proposed Plan/FEIS was published in the Federal Register in August 2005, beginning the 30-day protest period and 60-day governor’s consistency review.

A letter was received from Idaho Governor Dirk Kempthorne in support of a feasibility study of a proposed upgrade of the Arco-Minidoka Road. Three protests were filed within the 30-day protest period by the Idaho Conservation League, The Wilderness Society, and Western

Watersheds Project. The Idaho Conservation League and The Wilderness Society subsequently withdrew their protests, following separate negotiations with the planning team to make minor adjustments and clarifications in the Proposed Plan. Issues raised in the remaining protest, from Western Watersheds Project, were addressed in a protest response letter from the Assistant Director (AD) of BLM, prior to signing of the ROD. The AD concluded that the Idaho State Director and the Shoshone field office manager followed the applicable planning process, and all regulations and policies; therefore, there was no basis for changing the Proposed Plan as a result of the WWP protest.

### **Summary of National Monument Activities since Designation**

Since the expansion in 2000, several things have occurred in the Monument:

Year	Activities
2000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expansion</li> <li>• Wildfires burned – 9,800 acres</li> <li>• Rehabilitation – 56,400 acres</li> </ul>
2001	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Initiated BLM/NPS Management Plan</li> <li>• Developed BLM/NPS education curriculum</li> <li>• Wildfires burned – 50 acres</li> <li>• Rehabilitation – 20,400 acres</li> </ul>
2002	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cadastral survey of entire boundary</li> <li>• Initiated re-signing of entire Monument with interagency signage</li> <li>• Weed inventories – 44,200 acres</li> <li>• Cultural inventories – 130 acres</li> <li>• WSA monitoring – 72,313 acres</li> <li>• Botanical surveys – 151,300</li> <li>• Wildfires burned – 20 acres</li> <li>• Rehabilitation – 4,100 acres</li> </ul>
2003	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Completed interagency signing effort</li> <li>• BLM Educational programs delivered – 5</li> <li>• Wildlife inventories – 10,000 acres</li> <li>• Cave inventories – 285,000 acres</li> <li>• Weed inventories – 16,000 acres</li> <li>• Cultural inventories – 1,600 acres</li> <li>• WSA monitoring – 72,313 acres</li> <li>• Botanical surveys – 11,600</li> <li>• Rehabilitation – 1,800 acres</li> </ul>
2004	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Draft BLM/NPS Management Plan published</li> <li>• BLM Educational programs delivered – 5</li> <li>• Wildlife inventories – 116,500 acres</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Weed inventories – 16,000 acres</li> <li>• Cultural inventories – 100 acres</li> <li>• WSA monitoring – 72,313 acres</li> <li>• Botanical surveys – 5,700 acres</li> <li>• Wildfires burned – 400 acres</li> </ul>
2005	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Great Rift (Craters) Science Symposium, ISU</li> <li>• HFC developed new hybrid BLM/NPS sign design</li> <li>• BLM Educational programs delivered – 3</li> <li>• Wildlife inventories – 216,500 acres</li> <li>• Road maintenance – 25 miles</li> <li>• Weed inventories – 90,000 acres</li> <li>• Cultural inventories – 500 acres</li> <li>• WSA monitoring – 72,313 acres</li> <li>• Wildfires burned – 56,000 acres</li> <li>• Rehabilitation – 15,700 acres</li> </ul>
2006	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BLM/NPS Record of Decision signed</li> <li>• BLM Educational programs delivered – 15</li> <li>• Wildlife inventories – 155,000 acres</li> <li>• Road maintenance – 25 miles</li> <li>• Weed inventories – 30,000 acres</li> <li>• Cultural inventories – 100 acres</li> <li>• WSA monitoring – 72,313 acres</li> <li>• Wildfires burned – 64,400 acres</li> <li>• Rehabilitation – 42,800 acres</li> </ul>
2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Geologic map of the Craters of the Moon published</li> <li>• BLM Educational programs delivered – 13</li> <li>• Wildlife inventories – 5,000 acres</li> <li>• Species populations monitored –</li> <li>• Road maintenance – 20 miles</li> <li>• Weed inventories – 34,000 acres</li> <li>• Cultural inventories – 100 acres</li> <li>• WSA monitoring – 72,313 acres</li> <li>• Wildfires burned – 33,200 acres</li> <li>• Rehabilitation – 9,200 acres</li> </ul>
2008	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WWP files complaint</li> <li>• TMP initiated</li> <li>• BLM Educational programs delivered – 122</li> <li>• Recreation sites maintained – 5</li> <li>• Wildlife inventories – 32,500 acres</li> <li>• Species populations monitored – 71</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Botanical surveys – 30,000 acres</li> <li>• Road maintenance – 20 miles</li> <li>• Weed inventories – 36,000 acres</li> <li>• Cultural inventories – 100 acres</li> <li>• WSA monitoring – 72,313 acres</li> <li>• Wildfires burned – 9,800 acres</li> <li>• Rehabilitation – 29,700 acres</li> </ul>
2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BLM TMP decision signed</li> <li>• BLM Educational programs delivered – 125</li> <li>• Recreation sites maintained – 8</li> <li>• Wildlife inventories – 46,500 acres</li> <li>• Species populations monitored – 15</li> <li>• Botanical surveys – 10,000 acres</li> <li>• Road maintenance – 57 miles</li> <li>• Weed inventories – 36,400 acres</li> <li>• Cultural inventories – 100 acres</li> <li>• WSA monitoring – 72,313 acres</li> <li>• Rehabilitation – 8,300 acres</li> </ul>
2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BLM Educational programs delivered – 131</li> <li>• Recreation sites maintained – 8</li> <li>• Wildlife inventories – 21,000 acres</li> <li>• Species populations monitored – 70</li> <li>• Road maintenance – 20 miles</li> <li>• Weed inventories – 30,000 acres</li> <li>• Cultural inventories – 100 acres</li> <li>• WSA monitoring – 73,672 acres</li> <li>• Wildfires burned – 2,000 acres</li> <li>• Rehabilitation – 2,700 acres</li> </ul>
2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Judge Winmill issues judgement</li> <li>• BLM Educational programs delivered – 129</li> <li>• Roads decommissioned – 5 miles</li> <li>• Recreation sites maintained – 9</li> <li>• Wildlife inventories – 61,000 acres</li> <li>• Species populations monitored – 101</li> <li>• Road maintenance – 82 miles</li> <li>• Weed inventories – 150,000 acres</li> <li>• Cultural inventories – 100 acres</li> <li>• WSA monitoring – 73,672 acres</li> <li>• Wildfires burned – 6,600 acres</li> <li>• Rehabilitation – 8,000 acres</li> </ul>

2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Judge Winmill issues final order</li> <li>• BLM Plan Amendment initiated</li> <li>• BLM Educational programs delivered – 122</li> <li>• Recreation sites maintained – 1</li> <li>• Wildlife inventories – 25,000 acres</li> <li>• Species populations monitored – 31</li> <li>• Botanical surveys – 104,500 acres</li> <li>• Road maintenance – 55 miles</li> <li>• Weed inventories – 180,000 acres</li> <li>• Cultural inventories – 100 acres</li> <li>• WSA monitoring – 73,672 acres</li> <li>• Wildfires burned – 41,400 acres</li> <li>• Rehabilitation – 12,900 acres</li> </ul>
2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BLM Educational programs delivered – 6</li> <li>• Recreation sites maintained – 9</li> <li>• Species populations monitored – 17</li> <li>• Botanical surveys – 190,000 acres</li> <li>• Weed inventories – 157,000 acres</li> <li>• Cultural inventories – 100 acres</li> <li>• WSA monitoring – 73,672 acres</li> <li>• Rehabilitation – 20,700 acres</li> </ul>
2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BLM Educational programs delivered – 147</li> <li>• Recreation sites maintained – 2</li> <li>• Wildlife inventories – 85,000 acres</li> <li>• Species populations monitored – 12</li> <li>• Road maintenance – 55 miles</li> <li>• Weed inventories – 157,000 acres</li> <li>• Cultural inventories – 50 acres</li> <li>• WSA monitoring – 73,672 acres</li> <li>• Wildfires burned – 100 acres</li> <li>• Rehabilitation – 2,800 acres</li> </ul>
2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BLM Educational programs delivered – 132</li> <li>• Recreation sites maintained – 2</li> <li>• Wildlife inventories – 242,000 acres</li> <li>• Species populations monitored – 122</li> <li>• Road maintenance – 55 miles</li> <li>• Weed inventories – 157,000 acres</li> <li>• Cultural inventories – 150 acres</li> <li>• WSA monitoring – 73,672 acres</li> <li>• Wildfires burned – 1,000 acres</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Rehabilitation – 7,700 acres</li> </ul>
2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Draft Plan Amendment published</li> <li>● BLM Educational programs delivered – 133</li> <li>● Recreation sites maintained – 2</li> <li>● Wildlife inventories – 80,000 acres</li> <li>● Road maintenance – 55 miles</li> <li>● Weed inventories – 150,000 acres</li> <li>● Cultural inventories – 6,600 acres</li> <li>● WSA monitoring – 73,672 acres</li> <li>● Wildfires burned – 46,600 acres</li> <li>● Rehabilitation – 45,800 acres</li> </ul>

### Summary of Activities in Area for Five years Preceding Pre-Designation

Year	Activities
1995	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Wildfires burned – 4,700 acres</li> </ul>
1996	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Wildfires burned – 31,200 acres</li> <li>● Rehabilitation – 2,800 acres</li> </ul>
1997	
1998	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Wildfires burned – 100 acres</li> </ul>
1999	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Proposed decision – Laidlaw Park Allotment</li> <li>● Wildfires burned – 87,200 acres</li> <li>● Rehabilitation – 25,800 acres</li> </ul>

### Summary of Available Economic Information since Designation

The Craters of the Moon National Monument and Preserve falls within a five-county area in Idaho. The counties in which the Monument boundaries lie are Blaine, Butte, Lincoln, Minidoka, and Power. The Craters of the Moon National Monument and Preserve falls within a five-county area in Idaho. The counties in which the Monument boundaries lie are Blaine, Butte, Lincoln, Minidoka, and Power.

County	County Total Acres	Monument Acres per County	% of Monument per County
Blaine	1,700,338	383,322	23%
Butte	1,435,061	136,632	10%
Lincoln	772,219	17,190	2%
Minidoka	488,427	164,014	34%

Power	924,874	52,085	6%
TOTAL	5,320,918	753,244	14% of the 5 counties is in the Monument

Socioeconomic conditions in these counties have followed roughly the same pattern as the rest of the U.S. in recent years: A long upward trajectory in economic variables such as personal income, employment, and so on was interrupted by the 2007-2009 recession. Although growth has resumed, the growth rate has slowed from what it was prior to the onset of the recession. In contrast with many other parts of the U.S. and Idaho, the five-county region has experienced net out-migration. In other words, more residents have moved away from the area than have moved to the area. In spite of this out-flow of residents, total population has increased due to local births.

Over time, unearned income (income from investments, rental properties, retirement accounts, etc.) has become an increasingly large source of total income within the five counties, reaching a high of around 45% of all income as of 2009. This implies that the local economy could be enjoying benefits of stability that come with income that is not dependent on the labor market, and it corresponds with an aging population. Ups and downs in employment are less likely to translate into ups and downs in demand for consumer goods and services within the study area. On the other hand, market disruptions that negatively impact asset values at the national level could disproportionately affect the wealth and economic stability of local residents.

From 1970 to 2000, job growth in services, construction, and retail-related industries outpaced growth in every other economic sector in the region. Services industry jobs increased by a much larger number than did jobs in any other industry during those same years, but since 2000, most sectors' employment numbers have remained fairly steady. Personal income in the area has followed the same pattern as that exhibited in the job market: large gains from 1970 to 2000 in the services industry has been followed by more stability in that and other industries since the year 2000. It is important to note that in previous recession and recovery cycles, the region experienced positive job growth during the recovery period. Since the end of the 2007-2009 recession, the five-county region has continued to experience job losses, losing at twice the percentage since 2009 as during the recession itself (5.1% in comparison with 2.5% during the recession). In spite of those negative job growth figures, per capita income and average income per job have both performed well in comparison with the State of Idaho, with per capita income growing at more than 12% from 2000 to 2011, compared with 2% for Idaho as a whole. A recent NPS economic report shows that 200,525 visitors to Craters of the Moon National Monument and Preserve in 2013 spent \$6.6 million in communities near the park. That spending supported 94 jobs in the local area [USDI NPS, 2013].

At 12.5% in 2012, farm earnings as a percentage of total earnings are quite a bit higher in the

five-county region than in the U.S., for which the percentage was 1% in the same year. This indicates that agriculture plays a much larger role in the economy in the study area than in the rest of the U.S. Total gross revenue to agriculture has shown strong growth in the past decade, with growth in both crop and livestock-related revenue. In 2007, beef cattle operations comprised nearly 30% of all farm enterprises in the study area.

Permitted AUM levels, set at slightly less than 40,000, for livestock grazing on public lands within the BLM Monument have not changed since 2000.

#### **Summary of Any Boundary Adjustments since Designation**

- July 23, 1928- Monument expanded- (*Proclamation 1843, 45 Stat. 2959*)
- July 9, 1930- boundary adjustment- (*Proclamation 1916, 46 Stat. 3029*)
- July 18, 1941- boundary adjustment (*Proclamation 2499, 55 Stat. 1660*)
- November 19, 1962 – boundary adjustment (*Proclamation 3506, 77 Stat. 960*)
- November 12, 1996- boundary adjustment (*Pub. L. 104–333, div. I, title II, §205, 110 Stat. 4106*)
- November 9, 2000 - 661,287 acres added, under joint management by NPS and BLM (*Proclamation 7373, 65 F.R. 69221*)

## **Executive Summary of Review of National Monuments under EO 13792 (April 26, 2017)**

### **Key Information about Cascade-Siskiyou National Monument**

Cascade-Siskiyou National Monument (CSNM) was established by Presidential Proclamation 7318 on June 9, 2000. The 65,000-acre Monument was the first such area to be established primarily to protect biodiversity. A January 12, 2017, Proclamation expanded the Monument by almost 48,000 acres to provide habitat connectivity, watershed protection, and landscape-level resilience for the area's ecological and other values. Under the authority of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, the BLM manages national monuments and other conservation areas to allow for multiple uses. CSNM's 113,341 acres accommodate hunting, fishing, recreation, grazing, and valid existing rights such as leases and rights-of-way, among other activities, while protecting the historic and scientific resources identified in the Proclamation as well as providing opportunities for scientific study. The Monument contains rare and endemic plants such as Greene's Mariposa lily, Gentner's fritillary, and Bellinger's meadowfoam. It also includes 38 miles of the Pacific Crest National Scenic Trail and the 24,707-acre Soda Mountain Wilderness within its borders. Activities are subject to decisions made in current and future BLM resource management plans, which include public participation.

### **Summary of Public Engagement Prior to Designation**

Prior to Monument designation, an earlier designation existed for this area – the Cascade Siskiyou Ecological Emphasis Area (CSEEA). The CSEEA was established in the 1994 Northwest Forest Plan and the 1995 Medford District Resource Management Plan (RMP) primarily because of its unique, diverse ecological and biological characteristics. In developing the CSEEA RMP, the BLM conducted five field tours and held one meeting in 1999, covering both Oregon and Northern California. During the scoping period, the agency received 427 letters, cards, and e-mails and recorded 153 comments from the public meeting. The majority of comments fell into two groups: those supporting the special ecological emphasis designation (218) and those against further restriction of public land uses (128). Some letters supported a more middle-ground approach (29) while others requested more information without voicing an opinion (47). After coding and analyzing the letters and comments, the BLM identified 54 issues, including ecological concerns, land use, and government control, among others. The comments supporting the CSEEA designation generally emphasized preservation and restoration of ecological values. Those against the designation generally raised concerns about restrictions on access to public resources and increased Federal control over public and private lands. The original Monument Proclamation drew heavily from the most-protective alternatives in the CSEEA Draft Plan.

### **Summary of Public Scoping in Development of Resource Management Plan**

Throughout the preparation of the CSNM RMP, the BLM maintained an extensive public participation process aimed at providing frequent opportunities for interaction with the public

through a variety of mechanisms. Formal scoping began on July 31, 2000, with a notice of intent to prepare a plan published in the *Federal Register*. The BLM evaluated the public comments and incorporated them into the subsequent planning process.

Initially, the BLM sent a letter to landowners adjacent to the Monument—and other interested parties—announcing the establishment of the Monument and detailing the forthcoming planning process. A 30-day comment period (July 31–August 31, 2000) took place prior to the agency initiating development of a draft plan. The BLM evaluated the public comments received to determine whether they presented substantive issues to be addressed in the draft management plan for the CSNM. Agency staff also evaluated comments received during the scoping period for the CSEEA RMP.

The BLM released the CSNM Draft Resource Management Plan/Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DRMP/DEIS) in 2002. A 180-day comment period followed, during which the BLM received approximately 17,000 comments. Three public meetings occurred in 2002, with Monument staff on hand to answer questions about the draft plan and related EIS. Additionally, the BLM held 12 individual briefing sessions for local groups and officials. In 2005, the agency released the CSNM Proposed Resource Management Plan/Final Environmental Impact Statement (PRMP/FEIS). A 30-day protest period resulted in 12 protests, all of which the BLM resolved. Concurrent with the protest period for the Proposed RMP/FEIS, the BLM received and evaluated approximately 13,000 comments.

### **Summary of National Monument Activities since Designation**

CSNM is a destination for hunters, with the area's diverse habitat contributing to a range of hunting experiences. Deer, elk, bear, mountain lion, and waterfowl are all popular game species hunted within the Monument. Fishing and dispersed camping are popular, too, as are snowmobiling, hiking, riding ATVs (on existing roads as designated by the RMP), hiking, birdwatching, and wildlife viewing, among other activities.

The 745-acre Hyatt Lake Recreation Area provides opportunities for developed camping, hiking, fishing, and boating. In 2012, working in partnership with the Oregon State Marine Board, both boat launch ramps within the Monument were replaced. During the winter, the area provides groomed shared-use trail opportunities open to snowmobiles and Nordic skiers. About 75 miles of winter trails are adjacent to the Hyatt Lake Campground, within the CSNM expansion area.

CSNM has developed a strong education and outreach program since its designation in 2000. The Monument has a curriculum-based education outreach program that services all K-12 public school students in the Rogue Valley. The program is a cooperative venture between CSNM, Southern Oregon University's graduate program in Environmental Education, and *Friends of CSNM*. Since designation, the Monument's education program has directly reached more than

10,000 K-12 students.

Interpretation and education outreach activities are also accomplished through the Monument's Friends Group. Since the Monument's 2000 designation, the *Friends of Cascade-Siskiyou National Monument* (a nonprofit community partner organization) has reached more than 5,500 participants through its *Hike and Learn* public programming and other outreach activities. The *Hike and Learn* events are offered free of charge to community members during the summer months and allow participants an immersive experience in the Monument. Many of the participants end up being strong Monument supporters after their CSNM Friends Group participation.

The Monument's education and outreach efforts also include Youth Events. Examples of Youth Events the Monument has participated in since 2000 are: Earth Day, Bear Creek Salmon days, CAST for kids and Free Fishing Day. These events have become increasingly popular with visitors of all ages, with more than 20,000 attendees having visited these events. Each contact provides an opportunity for visitors to make emotional and intellectual connections with their public lands and the unique resources of CSNM.

Since its designation in 2000, CSNM has forged new and strengthened existing partnerships. These partnerships have allowed Monument management to leverage resources to complete important Monument projects and activities. Current Monument partnerships include: Oregon State Snowmobile Association, Friends of Cascade-Siskiyou National Monument, Southern Oregon University, Siskiyou Mountain Club, Pacific Crest Trail Association (PCTA), Southern Oregon Nordic Club, among others. The PCTA relies heavily on the involvement of community volunteers, who donate countless hours to maintain the Pacific Crest Trail inside the Monument.

### **Summary of Activities in Area for Five years Preceding Designation**

**Original CSNM Designation:** The area was used for hunting and fishing, as well as snowmobiling, hiking, birdwatching, wildlife viewing, sledding, riding ATVs, and dispersed camping. Developed camping was available at Hyatt Lake Campground prior to Monument designation.

### **Expanded CSNM Designation:**

A portion of the expanded CSNM is in an area allocated under BLM's 2016 Southwest Oregon Resource Management Plan (SW OR RMP) as: 1) Harvest Land Base (16,716 acres) for the primary purpose of sustained timber production (ASQ (Allowable Sale Quantity) timber targets), and 2) Late-successional Reserves (25,600 acres) with the purpose of maintaining and developing habitat to provide for northern spotted owls (non-ASQ timber harvest). Not all of the CSNM expansion area is covered under the 2016 SW OR RMP. There are also 5341 acres in California that don't fall under the SW OR RMP.

Before 2016, BLM's 1995 Medford District RMP allocated the majority of lands in the expansion area portion of the CSNM to Southern General Forest Management Area for the purpose of sustained timber harvest.

The California portion of the expansion area is co-mingled with State Lands managed by the California Department of Fish & Wildlife. The State lands are designated as the Horseshoe Ranch Wildlife Management Area, and intermingled BLM lands are managed compatible with the state Wildlife Management Area.

#### **Summary of Available Economic Information since Designation**

A summary of economic performance of communities surrounding the Cascade-Siskiyou National Monument from 2001 to 2015 can be found in the CSNM Drive folder as Exec Summary CascadeSiskiyou Headwaters Economic Performance Summary 2001-2015.pdf. Additionally, a 2016 snapshot of economic contributions of the CSNM is located in the Drive folder as Exec Summary Cascade Siskiyou NM - Economic Snapshot.pdf. The two reports reveal a growing economy in Jackson County since the original Monument designation, continuing previous growth trends. Traditional jobs, which were becoming an overall smaller share of the Jackson County economy before Monument designation, held steady from 2001 to 2015. The 2016 economic snapshot shows that CSNM visitors contributed nearly \$12 million in total expenditures within the local communities, amounting to over \$24 of economic output per \$1 of the Monument's Fiscal Year 2015 budget.

#### **Summary of Any Boundary Adjustments since Designation**

To date, the BLM has acquired 13,355 acres of private inholdings within the original Monument boundary. Acquisitions have been by purchase (primarily through Land & Water Conservation Funds) or exchange (primarily legislated exchanges). A map of acquisitions as of 2015 is in the Drive folder as Exec Summary CSNM Acquisition Map as of 9.2015.pdf

## **Executive Summary of Review of National Monuments under EO 13792 (April 26, 2017)**

### **Key Information about Ironwood Forest National Monument**

Ironwood Forest National Monument (IFNM) was established by Presidential Proclamation 7320 on June 9, 2000. Prior to designation, the area was managed by the BLM and continues to be following designation. The Proclamation designated “approximately 128,917 acres” and states that acreage is “the smallest area compatible with the proper care and management of the objects to be protected.” The BLM manages for multiple use within the Monument (hunting, recreation, grazing, and valid existing rights such as mining claims, etc.), while protecting the vast array of historic and scientific resources identified in the Proclamation and providing opportunities for scientific study of those resources. The resources identified in the Proclamation include biological, geological and archaeological objects. Overall, multiple use activities are allowed in Ironwood Forest National Monument that are compatible with the protection of resources and objects identified in the Presidential Proclamation. Multiple use activities are subject to decisions made in current and future BLM resource management planning efforts which include public participation. National Monuments and other conservation areas managed by the BLM continue to allow for multiple uses according to the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (depending on proclamation language).

### **Summary of Public Engagement Prior to Designation**

The BLM conducted no public outreach activities prior to designation. Monument designation was a citizen’s proposal. The Board of Supervisors of Pima County, Arizona, proposed the establishment of an “Ironwood Preserve” and signed Resolution 2000-63 “Request(ing) that the United States of America through the Secretary of the Department of the Interior, consistent with the Sonoran Desert Conservation Plan, work cooperatively with Pima County to establish the Ragged Top and Silverbell Ironwood Preserve in the Silverbell Mountains.” in March of 2000.

### **Summary of Public Scoping in Development of Resource Management Plan**

The BLM engaged in a collaborative planning process in developing the RMP. The BLM conducted public informational meetings August 2000 - March 2002. Working groups for Lands and Minerals, Vegetation, Wildlife, Recreation, and Cultural Resources were established to identify, define, and articulate issues that would need to be addressed in the RMP. Public scoping was initiated on April 24, 2002, followed by informal scoping at community meetings, special interest group meetings, and coordination with elected representatives. The BLM conducted nine public scoping meetings in an open house format during July 2002, in the Arizona communities of Mesa, Casa Grande, Eloy, Arizona City, Tucson, Sells, Picture Rock, Marana, and Green Valley. A Spanish-speaking BLM employee attended each of these meetings to provide translation. Media releases were sent to over 400 addresses, and releases and Public Service Announcements went to more than 23 newspapers, television and radio stations.

### **Summary of National Monument Activities since Designation**

Included below is a summary of monument activities since designation:

- Recreation use has increased from 15,900 visits in 2001 to 23,600 visits in 2016. No production of coal, oil, gas or renewable energy has occurred since designation.
- The amount of energy transmission infrastructure (76.1 miles of right of way) has not changed since designation.
- Since monument designation, no mineral production has occurred.
- No timber production occurred since designation. No timber resource is present.
- The number of AUMs permitted (7,849) has not changed since designation. The number of AUMs sold each year is at the lessee's discretion based on weather and forage production, with numbers being lower during drought years.
- Native American Indians collect some natural materials; no permit is required.
- Sport fish do not exist on the IFNM. Regulation of hunting remains with the State.
- Approximately 12.5 percent of BLM-administered lands within the monument has been inventoried for cultural resources. The number of known and/or documented cultural resources sites has doubled since monument designation. 310 sites have been documented, with an average density of approximately 11 cultural resources sites per square mile. Projected total estimate is 3,000 to 6,000 sites likely to exist across the entirety of the monument.

### **Summary of Activities in Area for Five years Preceding Pre-Designation**

Included below is a summary of monument activities five years preceding designation:

- No estimates of recreation use were made prior to designation. A recreation study completed shortly after monument designation indicated approximately 10,000 annual visits.
- No coal, oil, gas, or renewable energy production occurred on the site during the five years prior to designation.
- All existing energy transmission infrastructure was developed prior to designation, including a total of 76.1 miles of right of way.
- A small mineral material sale (decorative rock) quarry was operating prior to designation. No other mining operations or mineral production occurred on federal lands during the five years prior to designation.
- No timber production occurred on IFNM in the five years prior to designation.
- Designation did not change the number of AUMs permitted; 7,849 AUMs were permitted each of the five years prior to designation. The number of AUMs sold each year was at the lessee's discretion based on weather and forage production, with numbers being lower during drought years.
- In the five-year period prior to monument designation, approximately 8,000 acres had been inventoried for cultural resources, and approximately 150 sites had been documented. The surveys were primarily conducted in support of BLM-permitted activities associated with grazing, mining, and/or utility line construction projects.

### **Summary of Available Economic Information since Designation**

According to the Bureau of Land Management's economic analysis for FY2016, total visitor spending at IFNM was \$1,401,970 and average expenditures per visit was \$59.41. The total non-BLM jobs supported by the Monument is 21 with a total labor income supported of \$726,234. This resulted in a total economic output supported by the Monument of \$1,995,362. An economic snapshot summarizing economic information is located within this drive ([Ironwood Forest NM-Economic snapshot.pdf](#))

### **Summary of Any Boundary Adjustments since Designation**

The IFNM boundary encompasses 188,628 acres of land; this number of acres, and the configuration of the boundary, have not changed since designation. Acquisitions from willing sellers of private land within the monument boundary added 358 acres in 2014 and 602 acres in 2016, bringing the BLM-administered acres from 128,398 at monument designation to 129,358.