

To: Conant, Kathryn J -FS[kconant@fs.fed.us]; Sallybutts[sbutts@blm.gov]
Cc: Hartman, Chris -FS[chartman01@fs.fed.us]; Meade, Joe -FS[jmeade@fs.fed.us]; Bustam, Tinelle D -FS[tbustam@fs.fed.us]
From: Schmidt, Jaime T -FS
Sent: 2017-05-23T20:38:58-04:00
Importance: Normal
Subject: KATHRYN & SALLY: BLM Info Provided & FS Info Needed re. Bears Ears (E.O. 13792)
Received: 2017-05-23T20:39:10-04:00
[BENM Additional Data Request 052217 \(BLM\).docx](#)
[BENM 3.d.Timber Production 2012 2016 \(BLM 5-23-2017\).pdf](#)

Hi Sally and Kathryn— connecting you two via this email.

- Sally is BLM's Acting National Division Chief for National Conservation Lands
- Kathryn is the FS' Intermountain Regional Director of Lands and Minerals (and our lead POC in Bears Ears NM)

I've confirmed via DOI's Randal Bowman that the FS won't be granted electronic access to the DOI database where info corresponding to the monument data calls is being collected/compiled (due to contracting/security issues). The FS is creating a single spreadsheet for our folks to respond to DOI's 2 data requests and we'll be sending that out to FS regional leads tomorrow.

BLM has the lead on Bear's Ears for this E.O response. Per my discussions with Randal and Sally, our Bears Ears SME(s) need to review/verify BLMs info they've compiled over the last 2 weeks to (if it appears to reflect FS-managed portions of the monument) and/or supplement it with FS-related information. It sounds like the most efficient way for that to occurs is if: 1) our FS SME(s) can review what BLM has provided via a BLM employee with access to a BLM computer; or 2) by sharing email copies of BLM content documents and editing or supplementing those. **Sally & Kathryn— thoughts on most expedient approach here?**

Note that DOI confirmed today that although DOI responses for Bears Eras are already due, since DOI bureaus' had a 2-week head-start on us, the FS' Bears Ears response is due to DOI by June 2nd. (they'd of course appreciate it sooner if possible).

In the meantime to help this along, this afternoon DOI provided me with the attached FYI copies of info BLM has provided them re. Bears Ears Nat'l Monument:

- BLM's response to the "Additional Data Request" DOI provided (not sue whether these replies also cover FS-managed sections?)
- A PDF table of what appears to be a listing of timber production info from BLM's Monticello Field Office.

DOI also indicated they also have additional, more extensive response materials from BLM, but Randal didn't have those on-hand to readily share. **Again—I welcome you both coordinating on most efficient sharing/review approach here (please keep me in cc loop).**

To help ensure we're keeping key folks updated and content coordinated, FS submittal of updates/content should come through me and/or be cc'd to me.

Thx both— much appreciated.

Jaime Schmidt
National Trail
Program Manager
Forest Service
Recreation,
Heritage &
Volunteer
Resources
Washington Office



p: 208-765-7227
c: 202-360-6119
jtschmidt@fs.fed.us
3815 Schreiber Way
Coeur d'Alene, ID
83815
www.fs.fed.us



Caring for the land
and serving
people

From: Conant, Kathryn J -FS
Sent: Tuesday, May 23, 2017 1:33 PM
To: Schmidt, Jaime T -FS <jtschmidt@fs.fed.us>
Subject: RE: URGENT INFO REQUEST: National Monument Info (E.O. 13792)

I will try to call you later, but yes, we are working on the data call, and hope to have the info to you tomorrow.

<< OLE
Object: **Kathryn Conant**
Picture **Director**
(Device **Forest Service, Intermountain Region**
Independent **Lands and Minerals**
Bitmap) >> **p: 801-625-5150**
c: 240-481-5978
f: 801-625-5378
kconant@fs.fed.us
324 25th Street
Ogden, UT 84401
www.fs.fed.us
<< OLE Object: Picture (Device
Independent Bitmap) >> << OLE
Object: Picture (Device Independent
Bitmap) >> << OLE Object: Picture (Device
Independent Bitmap) >>
Caring for the land and serving people

From: Schmidt, Jaime T -FS
Sent: Tuesday, May 23, 2017 1:29 PM
To: Conant, Kathryn J -FS <kconant@fs.fed.us>
Subject: RE: URGENT INFO REQUEST: National Monument Info (E.O. 13792)

Hi Kathryn— I just left a message on your cell. Please me via my cell # below as soon as you have a chance, so we can coordinate on next immediate steps. Thx.

Jaime Schmidt
National Trail
Program Manager
Forest Service
Recreation,
Heritage &
Volunteer
Resources
Washington Office

p: 208-765-7227
c: 202-360-6119
jtschmidt@fs.fed.us
3815 Schreiber Way
Coeur d'Alene, ID
83815
www.fs.fed.us

**Caring for the land
and serving
people**

From: Conant, Kathryn J -FS
Sent: Tuesday, May 23, 2017 11:56 AM
To: Schmidt, Jaime T -FS <jtschmidt@fs.fed.us>
Cc: Pentecost, Brian M -FS <bpentecost@fs.fed.us>; Hartman, Chris -FS <chartman01@fs.fed.us>; Dudley, Mike -FS <mdudley@fs.fed.us>
Subject: RE: URGENT INFO REQUEST: National Monument Info (E.O. 13792)

Jaime- Let me know when you have a sec to chat on the Tribal listening sessions. At this point, given the location of the sessions (Portland, Billings, and Phoenix), we were thinking that it is most efficient to have the local regions/units attend, rather than us fly to these areas. In addition, since we only have one monument under review in R4 that effects NFS lands, it doesn't seem to be the best use of our time. But I wanted to see if you heard back from the other Regions on their attendance. If needed, we could have someone fly to the Phoenix session as a day trip.

In addition, what is the expectation of FS rep? I am assuming it is just to listen and take notes, but let us know if you have a different expectation.

Thanks!
Kathryn

Kathryn Conant
Director
Forest Service, Intermountain Region
Lands and Minerals

<< OLE
Object: **p: 801-625-5150**
Picture **c: 240-481-5978**
(Device **f: 801-625-5378**
Independent **kconant@fs.fed.us**
Bitmap) >> **324 25th Street**
Ogden, UT 84401
www.fs.fed.us
<< OLE Object: Picture (Device
Independent Bitmap) >> << OLE
Object: Picture (Device Independent
Bitmap) >> << OLE Object: Picture (Device
Independent Bitmap) >>
Caring for the land and serving people

From: Schmidt, Jaime T -FS
Sent: Monday, May 22, 2017 10:54 AM

To: Conant, Kathryn J -FS <kconant@fs.fed.us>; Bacon, James - FS <jamesbacon@fs.fed.us>; Olson, Alan D -FS <aolson@fs.fed.us>; Weierbach, Neal -FS <nweierbach@fs.fed.us>; Khung, Kevin -FS <kkhung@fs.fed.us>; Rich, Kathryn D -FS <kdrich@fs.fed.us>; Cole, Mary V -FS <marycole@fs.fed.us>; Bokach, Matthew - FS <matthewbokach@fs.fed.us>; Govan, Jihadda - FS <jihaddagovan@fs.fed.us>; Tophooven, Tracy -FS <ttophooven@fs.fed.us>; Drivas, Teri -FS <tdrivas@fs.fed.us>; Chung, Diane - FS <dchung@fs.fed.us>

Cc: Meade, Joe -FS <jmeade@fs.fed.us>; Clark, Fred P -FS <fclark@fs.fed.us>; Barnes, Martina -FS <martinabarnes@fs.fed.us>; Gehrke, Andrea - FS <agehrke@fs.fed.us>; Bustam, Tinelle D -FS <tbustam@fs.fed.us>; Mast, Jeffrey - FS <jmast@fs.fed.us>

Subject: URGENT INFO REQUEST: National Monument Info (E.O. 13792)

Importance: High

Hi Folks—

Some quick updates and requests re. FS-managed National Monuments:

1. **FOIAs:** We've received 2 agency-wide FOIAs re. FS records/documents, info, messages, etc. regarding national monuments. We're working with our national FOIA Office to verify the scope of these requests and our most efficient approach for responding. No need for additional email discussion yet-- we'll let you know more regarding this request soon.
2. **URGENT - 4 Tribal Listening Sessions:** We learned late last week that DOI will be hosting 4 Tribal Listening Sessions within the next 2 wks, beginning this Thurs in Portland (see attached). I'll be reaching out to Region 2, 4, 5 and 6 Directors later today or early tomorrow to verify which reps you can send to these sessions on behalf of the FS (I'm including R6 in this email due to the location of the 1st meeting, which is in Portland this Thursday). We're thinking that, if possible, we'd like to have the following representation at each session: 1 RO Rec/Lands Director (or rep); 1 RO Tribal Liaison, and 1 monument manager. Please coordinate between regions re. best/available reps.
3. **URGENT - Monument Data Call:** DOI has initiated a data call and we're working with them to coordinate how data will be submitted and reviewed. We'll share more info as we get things learn more about where data is to be sent/entered, etc. In the meantime, here's a heads-up copy of the info being requested. Please notify your specialists and ask them to compile the requested info. The data call is on a very quick turn-around:
 - a. Bears Ears info is needed by mid-wk. BLM has the lead on compiling this info. Please let me know the name of FS lead contact to work with the local BLM lead to review/update the info BLM has already provided into the DOI database being used for this request. BLM is advising the most efficient approach will be working on-site with the BLM lead via their computer access to the DOI database
 - b. Info on other monuments likely needed later this wk early next wk. FS will be lead on Sand to Snow, working with local BLM counterparts.
 - c. We'll be providing more info re. needed WO review of any associated econ analysis data supplied by regions.
4. **Monument Point of Contacts:** Please complete your section of the attached Contact spreadsheet to identify regional and monument contacts, and update any additional info. Send any updates back to me with a cc to Martina Barnes.

Apologies for the quick turn on this. We greatly appreciate your help.

<< File: Interior Listening Sessions on E.O. 13792 (5-18-2017).docx >> << File: E.O. 13792 - DOI Initial

Data Request Related to Review of National Monuments (5-18-2017).docx >> << File: E.O.13792 - DOI Data Call 2 (5-18-2017).docx >> << File: USFS_Presidentially Proclamed Nat'l Monument_contacts (DRAFT 5-22-2017).xlsx >>

Jaime Schmidt
National Trail
Program Manager
Forest Service
Recreation,
Heritage &
Volunteer
Resources
Washington Office

p: 208-765-7227
c: 202-360-6119
jtschmidt@fs.fed.us
3815 Schreiber Way
Coeur d'Alene, ID
83815
www.fs.fed.us

Caring for the land
and serving
people

This electronic message contains information generated by the USDA solely for the intended recipients. Any unauthorized interception of this message or the use or disclosure of the information it contains may violate the law and subject the violator to civil or criminal penalties. If you believe you have received this message in error, please notify the sender and delete the email immediately.

May 22, 2017

To: Ann Miller

Re: BENM Data Call Follow-up Questions

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).

Please see the attached Excel file (Attachment 1. MLP_BENM_Acres.xls). A map can also be provided by tomorrow 5/23.

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?

Information related to nominated acres prior to 2014 is only available in hardcopy format. Collection of this information would require an extensive record review. In an attempt to provide additional information, we have gathered information from BLM oil and gas files from 2010 to 2014. The year 2010 was selected as the starting point because this is when the BLM started offering lease sales on a rotating schedule among field offices. Since 2010, lease sales have been held each February in the Canyon Country District (i.e., Moab and Monticello Field Offices). Between 2010 and 2013, up to 108,375 acres within the area that is now BENM may have been nominated. Because we do not have GIS data for this time period, generic legal descriptions (Township and Range) were used to identify nominated acreage *in and around* the BENM.

The BENM boundaries are not tied to legal descriptions or public lands survey system land lines. Only portions of some township/ranges fall within the BENM. Therefore, 108,375 nominated acres is likely an overestimation of what was actually nominated within BENM. Existing data does not allow for a more accurately calculate nominated acreage.

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?

All 250 wells previously drilled in BENM are plugged and abandoned. The last producing well was plugged and abandoned in October of 1992. The attached spreadsheet (Attachment 2. BENM_OGWells.xls) shows total oil and gas production for all wells in BENM.

Minerals:

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

Sand and Gravel is being produced at the site.

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

Between 2008 and 2015, the BLM received 35 potassium (potash) prospecting permit applications (PPAs) in the area that is now BENM. In December of 2016, the BLM completed the Moab Master Leasing Plan (MLP). Within the MLP, the BLM made new decisions on mineral leasing and development for potash. Under the MLP, potash leasing is only allowable in identified Potash Leasing Areas (PLAs). There are no PLAs in the BENM. All PPAs submitted prior to completion of the Moab MLP (2016) have been rejected. The attached document (Attachment 3. BENM Potash PPAs.docx) includes a list of the PPAs submitted in the BENM.

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) and “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.

The Recreation Management Information System (RMIS) is BLM’s official repository for data relating to the recreational and social use on public lands and waters, including National Conservation Lands. It is an internal system accessible only by BLM personnel. Data within the system includes, but is not limited to, the number of recreation visits, recreation visitor days, type of activities, permits issued, recreation site details, Travel and Transportation Management Areas (which contain the off-highway-vehicle designation acreage), and partnership agreement details.

The RMIS Database uses formulas developed by field staff (usually Outdoor Recreation Planners) that are designed from observational data coupled with visitor use estimates to

account for the time visitors spend participating in different activities. RMIS automatically converts this data into estimates of visitor hours and visitor days.

A full overview of BLM's RMIS process is available here:

<https://www.ntc.blm.gov/krc/viewresource.php?courseID=313&programAreaId=180>

Annually, the mid-year RMIS data calls require BLM offices to review Visitor Use Formulas and make adjustments, as necessary. Additionally, the Monticello Field Office experienced turnover in the key positions that input RMIS data between 2015 and 2017. Likely the variances noted above are the result of new recreation specialists adjusting the formulas based on their observational experiences in the field.

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?

Kane Gulch is the only ranger station in BENM. It is primarily used for pick-up of overnight backpacking permits for Grand Gulch and day-use Moonhouse permits, as well as for long-term parking. The Ranger Station is only open during high-use season (spring and fall) and is only guaranteed to be staffed from 8 am to noon during its operating season. Kane Gulch is located in the Cedar Mesa area, at the southern end of the monument. The majority of recreational use occurs in the Indian Creek area, at the northern end of BENM. Thus, visitation to Kane Gulch is not a 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?

A cursory web review indicates that the Manti-La Sal National Forest does periodically analyze commercial timber sales but the BLM has not yet asked the Forest Service to verify the information as part of this data request.

<https://www.fs.usda.gov/wps/portal/fsinternet/cs/projects/mantilasal/landmanagement/projects?archive=1&sortby=1>

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?

In 2016, the Monticello Field Office contracted with SWCA, Inc. to complete a Class I - Existing Information Inventory (Class I). The purpose of this Class I, scheduled to be completed in fall of 2017, is to gain a comprehensive view of all of the known archaeological, historic, cultural and traditional places within the field office. Part of this contract is also to gather public input from consulting parties.

Also in 2016, the Monticello Field Office started an ethnographic literature review of the field office. The field office selected Living Heritage Anthropology to compile and summarize all ethnographic studies and sources within one document. The estimated completion data for this document is early 2018.

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?

Since the designation in December 2016, BLM has not completed a full strategic plan to survey the rest of the monument. Because conducting Class III survey can be costly and time consuming (~\$50/acres or more than \$2,300/mile for linear surveys), the field office has focused Class III surveys to areas of high cultural resource visitation, where archaeological site stabilization will occur or where special recreation permits for motorized activities will be permitted.

The Monticello Field Office Record of Decision - Resource Management Plan (2018) directs the field office to prioritize new cultural resource survey in areas where there is little previous survey. The overall majority of Class III survey conducted in the field office and new monument boundaries has occurred because of federal undertakings related to the development or permitted use of public lands and their related National Historic Preservation Act - Section 106 compliance.

Almost on a yearly basis, the field office conducts Class III-Intensive Pedestrian Surveys (Class III), to facilitate route designations or to permit special-recreation permits for motorized events such as the San Juan County ATV Safari or Easter Jeep Safari.

10. Did BLM buy out any grazing permits with the designation of the monument?
No.

11. 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?

The current permit allows the permittee to extract 200K cubic yards over a 10 year period. The amount extracted on an annual basis is not dictated by the agency (generally subject to market forces and however much is remaining out of the 200K cu yds.)

Monticello Field Office- Timber Production												
		Report FY	2016	2016	2015	2015	2014	2014	2013	2013	2012	2012
Resource Area Name	Category	Unit Measure	Standard Units	Received	Standard Units	Received	Standard Units	Received	Standard Units	Received	Standard Units	Received
Monticello FO	Christmas Trees	Number	11.00	\$110	16	\$160	15	\$150	17	\$170		
Monticello FO	Wood Products (posts)	Cubic Feet	7,092	\$1,138	5,228	\$1,147	5,469.24	\$1,215	3,535.72	\$1,410	1,765	\$489
Monticello FO	Wood Products (firewood)	Green Tons	3,398	\$9,995	3,333	\$9,685	2,993	\$8,795	3,260	\$9,610	1,115	\$3,290
Monticello FO	Total	Total	n/a	\$11,513	n/a	\$11,124	n/a	\$10,205	n/a	\$11,392	n/a	\$3,787