

**From:** Moore, Nikki  
**To:** [Simon, Benjamin](#)  
**Subject:** Re: BENM data call follow-up questions  
**Date:** Tuesday, May 30, 2017 8:40:41 AM

---

Thanks Ben - we are happy to help!

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)

On Tue, May 30, 2017 at 8:30 AM, Simon, Benjamin <[benjamin\\_simon@ios.doi.gov](mailto:benjamin_simon@ios.doi.gov)> wrote:  
Hi Nikki,

I just wanted to say thank you for BLM's very timely and responsive answers to what may seem like simplistic questions.

Ben

On Fri, May 26, 2017 at 10:16 AM, Moore, Nikki <[nmoore@blm.gov](mailto:nmoore@blm.gov)> wrote:  
Hi Ann,

Please find attached the responses to the additional follow up questions on BENM.

Nikki

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)

On Thu, May 25, 2017 at 5:08 PM, Miller, Ann <[ann\\_miller@ios.doi.gov](mailto:ann_miller@ios.doi.gov)> wrote:  
Hi Nikki,

We have just a few more follow-up questions related to Bears Ears. Again, if it would be easier to address these through I call, I would be happy to set one up. Thank you again to everyone who has been so helpful in addressing our inquiries.

1. For mineral production, is the given rate (in this case \$1.08 per cu yd) the rate that the producing company pays BLM? How would you characterize this payment (fee? royalty?)
2. Were potash prospecting permit applications denied because they were inconsistent with protection of cultural resources in the area?

3. Does the Moab MLP still apply to lands now within BENM boundaries?
4. Are there economic activities on the SITLA land blocks within BENM boundaries? Are there grazing leases or mineral production?
5. What is the status of the MMP? Has it been drafted?
6. Are the areas in the proposed San Juan MLP within the BENM boundaries that would have been open to oil and gas/mineral leasing be subject to the terms of the 2008 Monticello RMP? For example, under the current RMP, the Valley of the Gods ACEC is closed to mineral leasing - would that have still applied under the proposed San Juan MLP?
7. Are all pre-designation grazing activities allowed, including maintenance of stock water facilities?
8. The response to the data call regarding energy production states "There are 25 authorized federal oil and gas leases (29,416 acres) that are partially or wholly contained within the area that is now the BENM. The effective date on these leases ranges from 1972-2012." Can you clarify what is meant by "effective date"?

Thanks!

Ann

On Mon, May 22, 2017 at 4:30 PM, Moore, Nikki <[nmoore@blm.gov](mailto:nmoore@blm.gov)> wrote:  
Got it - we will add these and send a compiled response.

Thanks!

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)

On Mon, May 22, 2017 at 4:10 PM, Miller, Ann <[ann\\_miller@ios.doi.gov](mailto:ann_miller@ios.doi.gov)> wrote:  
Thanks Nikki, we appreciate all the work that has gone into this so far. A couple of additional questions that I left off:

1. Did BLM buy out any grazing permits with the designation of the monument?
2. We noticed a significant drop in mineral production from 44,444 cu yds in 2014 to 2,914 cu yds in 2015 - is it possible to provide any insight to this drop?

Thanks again!

Ann

On Mon, May 22, 2017 at 12:43 PM, Moore, Nikki <[nmoore@blm.gov](mailto:nmoore@blm.gov)> wrote:

Hi Ann,

Our Utah team is helping respond to the questions now. Once they have them pulled together, I will let you know if a conference call is needed for any clarification but I think we are good so far!

Thanks!

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)

On Mon, May 22, 2017 at 11:51 AM, Miller, Ann <[ann\\_miller@ios.doi.gov](mailto:ann_miller@ios.doi.gov)> wrote:

Hi Nikki,

Thank you for all of the information you and your colleagues have amassed and shared with us on Bears Ears National Monument. We appreciate the time you all have taken to respond to our data call as well as all of the supplemental documents you provided. We have some follow-up and clarification questions below. I can set up a call at your convenience to talk through the questions if that is easier than responding via email. Just let me know what your preference is - if you would like me to set up a call, please let me know who to include on the invite.

Oil & Gas:

1. Is there any information about the area that the proposed San Juan Master Leasing Plan would have encompassed? It is our understanding that it would have overlapped with at least part of what is now Bears Ears National Monument (BENM).
2. Is it possible to provide information on why acres nominated for leasing for O&G within what is now BENM were not included in quarterly lease sales? Is there any sense of levels of interest in lease nominations prior to 2014?
3. Are all existing wells on BENM now abandoned? While the last producing well was drilled in 1984, when did production actually cease on what are now monument lands?

Minerals:

4. What material is being produced at the one commercial mineral

materials site?

5. What are the land use decisions that precluded processing of potash prospecting applications prior to designation?

Recreation:

6. While generally visitation increased substantially between FY15 and FY16, a couple of activities in particular increased as a percentage of total visitation. Notably:

- “driving for pleasure” increased from 5,445 visitor days in FY15 (2% of total visitor days) to 33,496 visitor days in FY16 (6% of total visitor days)
- “climbing - mountain/rock” increased from 4,132 visitor days in FY15 (1% of total visitor days) to 29,363 visitor days in FY16 (6% of total visitor days)

Is there any insight into what is driving these jumps? I am mostly curious because in FY12-FY15, the top 5 activities by visitor day were consistently camping, backpacking, hiking/walking/running, row/float/raft, and viewing-cultural sites; but in FY16, driving for pleasure and rock climbing unseated row/float/raft and viewing-cultural sites in the top 5 activities.

7. Is Kane Gulch the only ranger station in BENM? Can visitation to Kane Gulch ranger station be considered a fairly representative proxy for visitation to BENM?

Timber:

8. We have not yet received information on timber production from the Forest Service regarding timber activities in Manti-La Sal National Forest. Do you know if commercial timber production is permitted in Manti-La Sal NF?

Cultural Resources:

9. What surveys and catalogues have been developed for cultural resources? Maps that have been shared with us indicated that only 9.2% of BENM has been inventoried for archaeological resources. Are there plans to survey the remainder of the monument?

Thanks!

Ann

--

Ann Miller

Office of Policy Analysis

U.S. Department of the Interior

1849 C St. NW

Washington, DC  
p: 202.208.5004  
[ann\\_miller@ios.doi.gov](mailto:ann_miller@ios.doi.gov)

--

Ann Miller  
Office of Policy Analysis  
U.S. Department of the Interior  
1849 C St. NW  
Washington, DC  
p: 202.208.5004  
[ann\\_miller@ios.doi.gov](mailto:ann_miller@ios.doi.gov)

--

Ann Miller  
Office of Policy Analysis  
U.S. Department of the Interior  
1849 C St. NW  
Washington, DC  
p: 202.208.5004  
[ann\\_miller@ios.doi.gov](mailto:ann_miller@ios.doi.gov)

--

Benjamin Simon, Ph.D., Chief DOI Economist  
Office of Policy Analysis  
U.S. Department of the Interior  
1849 C St. NW  
Washington DC  
202 208 4916  
[benjamin\\_simon@ios.doi.gov](mailto:benjamin_simon@ios.doi.gov)