

To: Finch, Kimberly[kfinch@blm.gov]
Cc: Mueller, Brian[bmueller@blm.gov]; Allison Ginn[aginn@blm.gov]
From: Ashcroft, Tyler
Sent: 2017-02-10T19:14:29-05:00
Importance: Normal
Subject: Re: New map stats for fact sheet, etc BENM
Received: 2017-02-10T19:14:36-05:00

I think that your calculations are appropriate. However, this would only apply to oil and gas, not to coal.

On Fri, Feb 10, 2017 at 4:44 PM, Finch, Kimberly <kfinch@blm.gov> wrote:

Thanks all! My goal is to be able to say to the public that only a small amount of coal, oil and gas leasing was affected.

I saw this map posted in the hallway:

Leasing Category Check 2017.01.24 Plot of Raw Data map

and it shows areas where leasing seems to be allowed (yellow and blue) and not allowed (red), if I understand it correctly, which I may not!

[See attached photos of the map]

Is it too simplistic to say that the acreage included in the leasing categories: timing & controlled, controlled, timing, and NSO are what was available to leasing prior to designation? And now those areas no longer are open to leasing unless valid existing rights exist?

My calculation

A - Acreage of Monticello FO before Dec. 28 open to leasing: open with minor constraints (timing), major constraints (NSO): xxx acres

B - Acreage of Monticello FO currently being leased: xx acres (valid existing rights)

A - B = C (total acreage that is no longer open to leasing, but that once was)

IS THIS TOO SIMPLISTIC? Or is it not even accurate leasing terminology? My portfolio is natural resources, I may not know what I'm saying.

Kimberly Finch
Bureau of Land Management
Utah State Office
Public Affairs Specialist
Natural Resources, Recreation, & Heritage Planning
kfinch@blm.gov
801 539 4195

On Fri, Feb 10, 2017 at 4:37 PM, Mueller, Brian <bmueller@blm.gov> wrote:

Yes. I sent a note to Shauna to see if she could run the LR2000 reports and at least get a serial number to start double checking what was withdrawn.

On Fri, Feb 10, 2017 at 4:35 PM, Ashcroft, Tyler <tashcrof@blm.gov> wrote:

Most mineral withdrawals are located a mineral withdrawals, which do not preclude mineral leasing. We would need to check the specific language of the withdrawal to determine what resources are impacted.

On Fri, Feb 10, 2017 at 4:17 PM, Mueller, Brian <bmueller@blm.gov> wrote:

There are 5 existing mineral withdrawals (LR2000 Case Type of 231116) within the Monticello FO as well. We would have to work with Lands to generate the Serial Register pages, since they are in Status and not Case Rec, and my Status database query skills are weak.

We could then compare and see if they overlap the Monticello FO "closed" areas.

I called down to Shauna to see if she could run that Status report for me, but it looks like she went home for the day.

On Fri, Feb 10, 2017 at 4:00 PM, Ashcroft, Tyler <tashcrof@blm.gov> wrote:

Brian and Kim,
The question regarding leasing is complex. First, there are multiple types of mineral leasing. I am assuming you are talking about fluid mineral leasing, which includes oil and gas. If so, here is some potential information to help.

All lands within WSAs are closed to leasing. They were formally closed in 1987 under the Federal Onshore Oil and Gas Leasing Reform Act (FOOGLRA). The Dark Canyon Wilderness is would be formally withdrawn from mineral leasing.

The Monticello Field Office does have additional areas outside the WSAs that are "closed" to leasing. The decision to close those areas was made through a planning process, not through congressional action.

Of course, the lands that are open are subject to various stipulations, including some areas that are no surface occupancy.

The most simple answer to the question is that you could take the Monticello RMP and identify the acres that are identified as closed and use that for your number. We would also need to get the Forest Service's mineral leasing decisions. I am happy to request that layer.

On Fri, Feb 10, 2017 at 2:04 PM, Mueller, Brian <bmueller@blm.gov> wrote:

Great, thanks Kim. I just wanted to make sure we aren't throwing around multiple sets of numbers here...

I generated the acres, and I think these should just stay internal until we can finalize how we want to report them to the public.

So, rough numbers...

The Monument itself encompasses approx. 1.478 million acres. Of that, approx. 1,351,900 acres are Federal Lands. BLM accounts for roughly 1,062,900 acres and the USFS has approx. 289,000 acres (roughly 243,000 of USFS and 46,000 of USFS Wilderness).

No other federal or tribal lands are found in the Monument. HOWEVER, if the public runs this query, they will find 612 acres of Tribal and 171 acres of NPS lands within the Monument. Those are SMA mapping errors caused by using disparate PLSS data sets.

Private lands account for approx. 12,800 acres, and State lands make up roughly 112,700 acres.

As for acres available prior to, and currently available for leasing, I'm not sure what has been withdrawn previously, and we would need the lands staff to look into that.

On Fri, Feb 10, 2017 at 12:27 PM, Finch, Kimberly <kfinch@blm.gov> wrote:

This is the proclamation:

...reserve as part thereof all lands and interests in lands owned or controlled by the Federal Government within the boundaries described on the accompanying map, which is attached to and forms a part of this proclamation. These reserved Federal lands and interests in lands encompass approximately 1.35 million acres. The boundaries described on the accompanying map are confined to the smallest area compatible with the proper care and management of the objects to be protected.

Kimberly Finch
Bureau of Land Management
Utah State Office
Public Affairs Specialist
Natural Resources, Recreation, & Heritage Planning
kfinch@blm.gov
801 539 4195

On Fri, Feb 10, 2017 at 12:21 PM, Mueller, Brian <bmueller@blm.gov> wrote:

Can someone tell me what the proclamation said as far as BENM acres are concerned? Was that included?

On Fri, Feb 10, 2017 at 11:53 AM, Finch, Kimberly <kfinch@blm.gov> wrote:

Hi Brian,

Is there an "easy" way to run land management acreage? The BENM fact sheets for the USFS and BLM use different numbers

USFS: 289,000 acres of usfs land

BLM: 290,000 acres of usfs land

With the new/final GIS data, can we get accurate numbers to revise the table located here on page

3: <https://www.blm.gov/sites/blm.gov/files/documents/files/BE%20QA%20Fast%20Facts%201.pdf>

?

I think it would be helpful to know the following:

1. NPS acreage
2. USFS acreage
3. State of Utah acreage (a) SITLA and b) "other state lands" broken down separately if possible)
4. BLM acreage
5. WSAs acreage
6. USFS Wilderness acreage (Dark Canyon)
7. BLM SRMAs and ACECs (if the fact sheet isn't correct on page 2, last paragraph)

Also, is this possible?

1. Acreage available to leasing prior to designation
2. Acreage available to leasing after designation

Thank you! This information would be used to update the website/fact sheet and to prepare for the proposed public meetings.

Kimberly Finch
Bureau of Land Management
Utah State Office
Public Affairs Specialist
Natural Resources, Recreation, & Heritage Planning
kfinch@blm.gov
801 539 4195

--

Brian Mueller
Geospatial Program Manager
Utah State Office/ Bureau of Land Management
801.539.4154

--

Brian Mueller
Geospatial Program Manager
Utah State Office/ Bureau of Land Management
801.539.4154

--

Tyler Ashcroft
Project Manager
Bureau of Land Management
(801)-539-4068

--

Brian Mueller
Geospatial Program Manager
Utah State Office/ Bureau of Land Management
801.539.4154

--

Tyler Ashcroft
Project Manager
Bureau of Land Management
(801)-539-4068

--

Brian Mueller
Geospatial Program Manager
Utah State Office/ Bureau of Land Management
801.539.4154

--

Tyler Ashcroft
Project Manager
Bureau of Land Management
(801)-539-4068