

Conversation Contents

Thank you/Bluff Area

Attachments:

/106. Thank you/Bluff Area/1.1 BearsEars_FINAL_36x48_09122016.pdf
/106. Thank you/Bluff Area/1.2 ProposedAcquired_Bluff_11x17_09122016.pdf

UT SITLA Staff <UT SITLA Staff@utah.gov>

From: [REDACTED] <UT SITLA Staff@utah.gov>
Sent: Tue Sep 13 2016 14:45:02 GMT-0600 (MDT)
To: "Buffa, Nicole" <[REDACTED]@ios.doi.gov>, <[REDACTED]@blm.gov>
Subject: Thank you/Bluff Area
Attachments: BearsEars_FINAL_36x48_09122016.pdf
ProposedAcquired_Bluff_11x17_09122016.pdf

Nikki;

Thank you to yourself, Neil Kornze, Tommy Boudreaux and the rest of your team for meeting with [REDACTED], [REDACTED] and myself last week to talk over southeast Utah land exchange issues. We truly appreciate the amount of time your office has devoted to the school trust land issue.

Per your request at the meeting, we have re-done our conceptual exchange map (attached) to be more clear about where there are conflicts with the so-called "redrock" wilderness proposal. There are only two - one on the large block of lands northwest of Moab, and a much smaller one near Lisbon Valley in San Juan County. We think we can get past this fairly minor issue.

You also asked about the Bluff area, and subsequently forwarded material from Friends of Cedar Mesa about the SITLA proposal in that area. We have now mapped existing oil and gas leasing and other encumbrances (also attached) on the existing SITLA lands at Bluff, and the proposed acquisition area.

The entire existing SITLA Bluff block is leased for oil and gas (shown by the double cross-hatching). In addition, the proposed NCA boundary in the PLI that follows Highway 191 would include a sizeable existing sand and gravel operation (shown in brown), plus powerlines, a large substation, etc. that are not compatible with a conservation designation. We continue to believe that a boundary that tracks the western boundary of the SITLA block makes more sense. We would be happy to engage with FCM about perhaps creating some sort of visual buffer on the cliffs above the town that would

FOR COMMITTEE USE ONLY

preclude any visual impact from the town.

As to the BLM lands proposed for exchange to SITLA, there are existing federal oil and gas leases on most of the lands, and active oil and gas wells (green dots), as well as lots of historic oil and gas wells. We think the horse is pretty much out of the barn on the leasing/development of this area. SITLA does apply a cultural resources regime equivalent to that of BLM, so there would be protection of any specific cultural resources found in the area. Finally, as we have previously noted, SITLA will be under considerable pressure from the county and the Utah legislature to acquire substantial land in southern San Juan County, and if Bluff isn't the place, it may be difficult to find anything else.

We are happy to engage further with FCM on this issue, as well as your team - I'm sure there may be some middle ground somewhere. Thanks again.

[Redacted]

--

UT SITLA Staff
[Redacted]

Utah School and Institutional Trust Lands Administration
[Redacted]
Salt Lake City, Utah 84102

[Redacted]