

#### Version control

- Let's decide on where to save revised documents and naming, so we are sure the most recent version is being used. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] created a "Final drafts" folder in O:/Monuments review. Maybe we can save the "final draft" of each review in there - this doesn't mean that these can't be edited but just means it is the latest draft. I recommend saving a draft in there once it has had the bureau comments and all of the agreed upon decisions from the "Bureau comments" google doc incorporated.

Commented [1]: (b)(5) DPP [REDACTED]

Commented [2]: Let's revisit this tomorrow.

#### LOE:

Bears Ears  
Grand Staircase  
Cascade Siskiyou  
Gold Butte  
Basin & Range

#### Differences across reports. Do they matter?

- Recreation tables vs. graphs Either
- AUM tables vs. graphs (need to double-check any graphs; some things appeared to have moved with movements in the text, e.g., designation year in Carrizo Plain). Either
- Some have pie charts with percent of employment by sector keep what we have, don't make any new ones. If it's a donut chart, make it a pie.
- Some have CS calcs. Add text on CS. Suggested text (incorporates text from below on CS from recreation):

(b)(5) DPP [REDACTED]

(b)(5) DPP [REDACTED]

- Varying styles for the summary chart in the top of right of the doc (e.g., location, managing agencies) standardize so format matches Bears Ears (2" wide, Calibri font, etc)
- Tables/graphs in-text and at the end; difficulties getting tables/graphs into place (and staying put). Put at end
- Inconsistent spelling of tradeoffs, trade-offs. Both are accepted in U.S. Hyphenated in UK. GPO: tradeoffs
- Inconsistent ordering of scientific and cultural resources. Cultural tribal, cultural historic, scientific

(b)(5) DPP [REDACTED]

Deleted: recreational visit

Deleted: FY

Deleted: reported in RMIS

(b)(5) DPP [REDACTED]

Deleted: Christian will look it up

- Is the second level of indentation a hyphen or open bullets? Arrow (see Bears Ears)
- Quality and detail of maps Use same maps
- Line spacing Use 1.15
- Use of ERS (Carrizo, Craters, Hanford Reach, Cascade-Siskiyou, others?) Leave it if it's there, don't add it if not
- Inconsistency in capitalization of national monument when used generically vs. a specific monument generic is lowercase, caps for the rest
- Make sure title has: Economic Values and Economic Contributions

### Bureau comments and proposed approaches

Possibility of breaking out Fed/State/Local employment within "public administration" for pie chart (Bears Ears, Grand Staircase)

**Add to the footnote of the pie chart, as shown below (last 2 sentences in footnote).**

**Here is an example of the footnote:**

\*Other includes agriculture/forestry; utilities; wholesale trade; finance and insurance; real estate; professional, scientific and technical services; admin and support services; waste management; educational services; arts and entertainment; and transportation and warehousing. Each of these represents less than 4% of total employment. While this data source covers most NAICS industries, it excludes crop and animal production; rail transportation; National Postal Service; pension, health, welfare, and vacation funds; trusts, estates, and agency accounts; private households; and public administration. Most establishments reporting government employees are also excluded. Source: 2015 County Business Patterns, U.S. Census Bureau.

- Concerns with the "Cultural, archeological, and historic resources" bullet of the "Activities and Resources..." section (Mojave, Carrizo Plain):

*We have some concerns about this section. The way the document is structured, it appears that cultural resources within the national monument are being considered a commodity and a source of economic potential along with energy, mining, timber, and grazing. As these resources are protected under several laws, this characterization could encourage illegal activity.*

*If this section is meant to be a discussion of resources that is separate from the section above regarding development within the monument, we would recommend a separate subsection. It also seems like it would be appropriate to mention some of the various other resources described in the Proclamation, rather than just singling out cultural resources. E.g. geological features, springs, rare plants, wildlife.*

**Add this boilerplate edited from what Josh provided in Sonoran, Ironwood, Grand Canyon Parashant:**

- **Resource Values:** Monument designation is intended to protect historic landmarks, historic and prehistoric structures, and other objects of historic or scientific interest. In general, these resources are valued by society, but those values are not bought or sold in the marketplace and therefore, are difficult to quantify. Below is a brief overview of the natural, cultural, and scientific features identified in the Proclamation that the designation is intended to protect:

**Add/move this boilerplate to the recreation-specific section (out from under Resource Values, which is specific to the protected resources, not just all non-market resources):**

The value of recreation opportunities and experiences is different from the economic activity supported by visitors to the Monument. Recreationists place a value on the characteristics of a site, including non marketed ones (e.g., dark skies, quiet, scenic views), over and above their expenditures to visit the site (this is referred to as consumer surplus).

- Concerns with the “Land management tradeoffs” section (Mojave, Carrizo Plain):

*This section only seems to discuss tradeoffs between energy/mineral/grazing uses vs. recreation and cultural resources. Should at least mention the various other objects protected by the Proclamation, including geological, ecological, and hydrological resources, and other public values such as dark skies and solitude*

**Decided to move the “Land management tradeoffs” section to the intro materials, and to add some text regarding scientific and cultural resources (Adam will do this). Boilerplate text in this section for each review should be deleted. Monument-specific tradeoffs can be discussed in each review with a sentence directing the reader to the “Land management tradeoffs” section in the intro for more information.**

- More specific citation for economic impact estimates of recreation.

**Please insert this citation information from BLM for estimates of economic contributions from rec:**

Draft Regional Economic Contributions of National Monuments and National Conservation Areas, BLM, 2016

- Does something like this belong in all with energy/minerals? Continue to standalone? Abbreviate and indicate, “As discussed in the opening,...”

(b)(5) DPP  
[Redacted text block]

**We discussed putting the material above into the Background and Overview and adding the following boilerplate for monuments with energy and/or mineral production:**

The total value or amount of energy or mineral production forgone as a result of the designation cannot be determined. For more information, see the Background and Overview materials.

**Add this boilerplate:**

## Land Management Tradeoffs

Managing land for multiple use requires the consideration of a variety of users, resource needs, and legal requirements, among others. Not all of the competing uses are compatible with one another. Regardless of designation, legal authorities would continue to apply. See the Background and Overview materials for more information on trade off considerations.

(b)(5) DPP

Commented [8]: (b)(5) DPP

Deleted: recreational visitation and cultural resources

If there are some details available on what would likely happen in the absence of designation, add the following intro:

If the Monument had not been designated:

If there are tribal cultural resources, could double-check the Proclamation and likely add the following:

If the monument had not been designated:

- Legal authorities would continue to apply, including the American Indian Religious Freedom Act (42 U.S.C. 1996) and Executive Order 13007 of May 24, 1996 (Indian Sacred Sites).

- Move these definitions out of Mojave?

### Definitions

**Value Added:** A measure of economic contributions; calculated as the difference between total output (sales) and the cost of any intermediate inputs.

**Economic Value:** The estimated net value, above any expenditures, that individuals place on goods and services; these are particularly relevant in situations where market prices may not be fully reflective of the values individuals place on some goods and services.

**Employment:** The total number of jobs supported by activities.

These boxes can be removed from each review. The definitions will be addressed in a glossary in the intro materials.

- Comment in Mojave on recreation to include in opening?

For recreation data, there should be some acknowledgement (maybe in a footnote) that visitation data is imprecise. Oftentimes data is extrapolated based on trailhead registers, vehicle counters, etc. For a monument as large as Mojave Trails with so many access points, visitation is likely underestimated.

Commented [9]: (b)(5) DPP

Maybe also add (in Mojave edits):

BLM utilizes the Recreation Management Information System (RMIS) to report visitation. The RMIS, implemented in 1984, is the agency's official system of record for recreation information relating to recreation visitation, permits, and partnerships. Visitation information is based on the best available collection tools and data. Providing definitive visitation information at each National Monument is difficult to quantify, given the numerous factors influencing visitation and collection of visitor information data. Federal land managers are continually improving the methodology and technological resources for visitation reporting.

An equivalent for NPS?

The above paragraph from BLM ("BLM utilizes the RMIS...") will be footnoted after the mention of # of visits in the bullet that discusses the economic contributions of recreation for each report. If you decide to go with some of this material in the background and overview, Lynne provided the following sentence that could be inserted after BLM's description and before the summary info (Lynne agreed that these summary statements also apply to NPS):

The NPS Visitor Use Statistics Office compiles detailed park level visitation data for 376 of the 417 National Park units and publishes this data in an annual Statistical Abstract. Visitation information is based on the best available collection tools and data. Providing definitive visitation information at each National Monument is difficult to quantify, given the numerous factors influencing visitation and collection of visitor information data. Federal land managers are continually improving the methodology and technological resources for visitation reporting.

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial, 9.5 pt, Not Bold, Font color: Custom Color(RGB(34,34,34)), Highlight

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Font color: Auto

Formatted: Font color: Auto

- Boilerplate in Mojave:

**Energy:** In general, the scope, magnitude, and timing of energy and minerals activities are closely related to supply and demand conditions in world markets and the market prices of mineral commodities. Local or regional cost considerations related to infrastructure, transportation, etc. also may play a role in defining the supply conditions.

We somehow missed this in our discussion today anyone have thoughts?

**Growth Trends from Headwaters + Statement that the Monument did not have a negative economic effect**

We will not be citing any of the Headwaters studies/data in any of these reviews, but reviewers are free to present trend information that they calculate themselves (with citations for the data sources). Any conclusions on the impacts of the designation should be avoided.