

WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS REVIEW

Date of Submission: N/A

Date(s) of Field Office Review: 02/06-07/07

Submitter: N/A

Name of Area to be Reviewed: Monticello Field Office

BLM Field Office(s) Affected: Monticello

EVALUATION

1.) Was new information submitted by a member of the public for this area?

YES _____. NO **X**.

2.) If new information was submitted, describe the submission. For example, did the submission include a map that identifies the specific boundaries of the area(s) in question; a narrative that describes the wilderness characteristics of the area and documents how that information differs from the information gathered and reviewed in prior BLM inventories; photographic documentation; etc?

The area reviewed depicted were derived from a GIS Data Layer provided by the Utah Wilderness Coalition (UWC). Additional materials such as maps, photographs, or narratives were not included.

3. As a result of interdisciplinary review of relevant information (which may include aerial photographs, state and county road information, road maintenance agreements, documentation from prior BLM inventories, field observations, maps, master title plats, evidence presented as new information by a proponent, etc.), do you conclude:

N/A a) the decision reached in previous BLM inventories that the area lacks wilderness characteristics is still valid.

(or)

N/A b) some or all of the area has wilderness characteristics as shown on the attached map.

4. Describe your findings regarding specific wilderness characteristics and provide detailed rationale.

The attached list identifies polygons that are less than one acre in size. These polygons generally consist of discrepancies between existing GIS data layers, including Wilderness Study Areas (WSA), Wilderness Inventory Areas (WIA), and the Utah Wilderness Coalition (UWC) proposal. After comparing the GIS data layers with WSA and WIA inventory files, it has been determined that these polygons are considered to be mapping errors resulting from the fact that the data provided by UWC has not been vertically integrated.

Some of these discrepancies may be addressed, via realignments, etc., when the wilderness character review areas are vertically integrated with existing BLM data layers. The remaining discrepancies will not be corrected because current BLM policy does not allow for the vertical integration of externally produced data.

5. Document all information considered during the interdisciplinary team review (e.g. aerial photographs, state and county road information, road maintenance agreements, documentation from prior BLM inventories, field observations, maps, master title plats, evidence presented as new information by a proponent, etc.)

*Utah Wilderness Coalition (UWC) GIS Data Layer Proposal (2005)
GIS Aerial Photography (NAIP 2006: San Juan County north and south)
BLM 1999 Utah Wilderness Inventory
BLM 1999 Utah Wilderness Inventory Revised
Utah Wilderness Report to Congress (1995)*

Attachments:

- *Complete List of Units*
- *Regional Maps*

6. List the members of the interdisciplinary team and resource specialties represented.

NAME	RESOURCE (S) REPRESENTED
Gary Torres	Planner, NEPA Coordinator
Brad Colin	Recreation, OHV, Wilderness
Paul Leatherbury	GIS

Field Office Manager _____.

Date _____.

This determination is part of an interim step in BLM's internal decision-making process and does not constitute a decision that can be appealed.