

From: Julie ErNSTein
To: [Boone, Whitney](#)
Cc: [Bowman, Randal](#); [Calhoun, John](#); [Charles Cuvelier](#); [Shields, Claire](#); [Tansey, Thomas](#); [Deanna Mitchell](#)
Subject: Re: Bears Ears Comments finished
Date: Monday, June 05, 2017 12:09:40 PM

Hi all,

I just landed and am catching up to these notes between legs of my journey. The questions posed are ones I'd have posed had I been on the call, esp. as relates to comments ostensibly about Bears Ears that then slip in references to another monument.

Best,

Julie

Sent from my iPhone

On Jun 5, 2017, at 8:44 AM, Boone, Whitney <whitney_boone@nps.gov> wrote:

Hi Randy,

NPS comment reviewers had a quick meeting this morning to discuss Bears Ears comments and notes for the next round of review. Here were some of the comments and questions that emerged:

- There was some confusion about when coding was completed for all comments- it would be helpful to develop some sort of notification within the DiscoverText system that lets reviewers know that coding is completed.
- Will the "uncodable" comments be reviewed? As Pete Leary mentioned last week, several Bears Ears comments simply contained text to the effect of, "40 postcards are contained in the attached .pdf" with no clear indication of whether the postcards were in favor or against the monument. These comments were tagged as uncodable.
- For the next round of review, there is preference that NPS staff prioritize reviewing comments on monuments administered by the NPS, as we are generally more familiar with our own units and the regulations and internal policies that guide their management. We are happy to help code the comments on other monuments, but acknowledge that we are less familiar with the units and policies of other bureaus, which may slow our ability to code (depending on the level of analysis required for the next round of review).
- Given that Bears Ears was a relatively new designation, we could generally assume that new information would be limited. For some of the older designations, it may be more challenging to determine whether a comment contains new information. It may be better to "bin" comments by subject and leave it to SME review to determine whether or not a comment contains new information.
- Will the Bears Ears comments that also mentioned other monuments be

revisited during the next round of review? We think that they should be revisited for the other monuments mentioned.

- Several comments were in favor of review to modify the monument boundary, but not completely rescind the designation- it may be valuable to add more nuance to the "in favor" and "against" options.
- The codes "in favor" and "against" review were not intuitive- it seemed more intuitive to be "in favor" or "against" the monument itself.
- There is a desire for clearer guidance on annotation of comments- when should we annotate comments, what information should the annotation contain?

Charles, Claire, Deanna, Jay, Julie, Tom- please feel free to correct my notes or add anything that I missed!

Thanks,
Whitney

On Fri, Jun 2, 2017 at 12:10 PM, Bowman, Randal

<randal_bowman@ios.doi.gov> wrote:

I've been notified by several team members that coding is completed - congratulations to all! This is well ahead of what I anticipated.

Please take some time to think about what you encountered while working on the comments and make some notes to yourself on ideas for the future, lessons learned here and related matters. Then, either later today or early next week, please send me your comments and ideas. Also, please be thinking about we can best address the next round of comments, which will cover multiple monuments and multiple subject issues.

We will have a conference call and - if enough of you can come to Main Interior - meeting early the week of June 11 - to discuss how best to address the comments on the other monuments. I will send some thoughts on what we need from those comments, which will be different from Bears Ears, next week.

--

Whitney Boone
Park Planning and Special Studies
National Park Service
202-354-6970