



Chapter 3 • Consultation & Coordination

Chapter 3: Consultation and Coordination

3.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter describes the consultation and coordination efforts conducted by BLM during the planning process for the RMPs for the Beaver Dam Wash and Red Cliffs NCAs and a focused Amendment to the SGFO RMP. This three part land use planning effort was undertaken to satisfy specific mandates from OPLMA that directed BLM to prepare “comprehensive [resource] management plans” for the two NCAs. The legislation also required BLM to take actions and make land use allocations on public lands in Washington County that require the St. George Field Office RMP be amended. The three planning efforts were initiated concurrently, thereby facilitating the preparation of a single EIS.

Land use planning is conducted in accordance with FLPMA and NEPA requirements, CEQ regulations, as well as Departmental and BLM policies and procedures that implement NEPA. To comply with these various legal and regulatory requirements, BLM seeks public involvement at the start of and during the land use planning process to aid in

the development of a reasonable range of alternatives and in the preparation of the analyses that disclose the potential environmental consequences of implementing any of the alternatives. Cooperating agencies collaborate with BLM during all phases of the planning process, while consultation and coordination occurs with other federal agencies, state and local governments, and Indian tribes. The proposed plans are reviewed by BLM to ensure that management decisions are consistent with state and county plans, to the extent that those plans are consistent with federal law.

3.2 COOPERATING AGENCIES

Other federal agencies, state and local governments, and federally-recognized Indian tribes are invited to participate as Cooperating Agencies during the drafting or revision of RMPs (43 CFR 1610.3-1 (b)). These entities are invited to participate because they have jurisdiction by law or can offer specialized expertise on matters pertinent to the planning process. Cooperating Agency status provides a formal framework for

Kit Fox

Vulpes macrotis is nocturnal, and leaves the den at sundown to hunt. Dens usually start out with one entrance, but over a period of years, several other entrances, tunnels, and a birthing chamber may be added. A kit fox litter usually consists of four to seven pups that emerge from the den in late spring or early summer.

Photo 3-1 A Skulk of Kit Foxes, Red Cliffs NCA



© Cameron Rognan

“We must keep on trying to solve problems, one by one, stage by stage, if not on the basis of confidence and cooperation, at least on that of mutual toleration and self-interest.”

—Lester B. Pearson, Canadian Politician, 1897-1972

these governmental units to engage in active collaboration with BLM during the planning process. Cooperating Agencies may assist with issue identification, data collection, the formulation of alternatives, and the analysis of the environmental consequences associated with implementing the alternatives. In 2010, BLM signed MOUs with Mohave County, AZ, Washington County, UT, and the State of Utah, designating these entities as Cooperating Agencies for the planning processes. The Shivwits Band of Paiutes and the Paiute Indian Tribe of Utah were also formally invited to become Cooperating Agencies in the process; neither elected to be a formal cooperator but agreed to participate informally in the alternatives development meetings.

3.3 COORDINATION WITH OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES, STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS, AND INDIAN TRIBES

The Code of Federal Regulations at 43CFR 1601.3 directs that BLM coordinate its planning efforts with other federal agencies, state and local governments, and federally-recognized Indian Tribes. The following summarizes the coordination activities that have been ongoing during this process.

Data sharing and other coordination activities have also been ongoing with the USFWS and UDWR to assist in issue identification and the development of a range of management alternatives for a broad array of wildlife species. The BLM is consulting with the USFWS under Section 7 of the ESA, through Biological Assessments based on the goals, objectives, and decisions contained in the Proposed NCA RMPs and Proposed Amendment. The Biological Assessments will serve as the basis for the Biological Opinions that will be issued by the USFWS for the RMPs and Amendment.

Coordination and data sharing with the Utah SHPO assisted BLM in the

development of management alternatives for these planning efforts. Formal consultations under Section 106 of the NHPA will be conducted on the Proposed RMPs and Proposed Amendment.

The planning effort for Beaver Dam Wash NCA has been coordinated with the NPS-National Trails Intermountain Region Office, as it relates to the development of management alternatives for the Old Spanish Trail National Historic Trail. Coordination has also been conducted with the NPS-National Natural Landmark Program Office in the development of management options for possible boundary adjustments to the Joshua Tree National Natural Landmark.

Federally-recognized Indian Tribes were provided opportunities to review, advise, and offer suggestions on planning issues of concern (pursuant to 43 CFR 1610.3). In June of 2010, BLM provided official notification of the land use planning process to the following Tribes or Bands:

- ▶ The Hopi Tribe
- ▶ The Navajo Nation
- ▶ The Pueblo of Zuni

Photo 3-2 Owens-Illinois Glass Bottle ca. 1935, Beaver Dam Wash NCA



- ▶ The Paiute Indian Tribe of Utah
 - Shivwits Band
 - Cedar Band
 - Indian Peaks Band
 - Kanosh Band
 - Koosharem Band
- ▶ The Kaibab Band of Paiutes
- ▶ The Las Vegas Paiute Tribe
- ▶ The Moapa Band of Paiutes
- ▶ The Pahrump Band of Paiutes
- ▶ The San Juan Southern Paiute Tribe
- ▶ Southern Paiute Consortium
- ▶ The Havasupai Tribe
- ▶ The Hualapai Tribe
- ▶ The Chemehuevi Indian Tribe
- ▶ The Colorado River Indian Tribe
- ▶ The Ute Indian Tribe
- ▶ The Ute Mountain Indian Tribe

A notification letter invited Tribal governments to become involved in the planning processes and outlined potential consultation opportunities during the planning process. The letter also requested input on issues and concerns to be considered during the planning process

Photo 3-3 Ancestral Puebloan Projectile Point Recovered from Red Cliffs NCA



and initiated efforts to identify areas of traditional cultural concern.

Tribes and Bands were updated about the status of the planning efforts through newsletters, informal contacts, and meetings. Copies of the Draft NCA RMPs and Amendment and Draft EIS were provided to Tribes and Bands for review and comment. Coordination with Indian tribes will continue throughout the remainder of the planning process.

3.4 OPLMA-MANDATED CONSULTATIONS CONCERNING THE “NORTHERN TRANSPORTATION ROUTE”

OPLMA at Section 1977 (b) (2) directed that “In developing the travel management plan, the Secretary shall- (A) “in consultation with appropriate Federal agencies, State, tribal, and local governmental entities (including the County and St. George City, Utah), and the public, identify 1 or more alternatives for a northern transportation route in the County.”

The BLM initiated consultation with federal, state, Tribal, local governmental entities, and the public on the identification of alternatives for a northern transportation route, through the publication of its Notice of Intent to prepare Resource Management Plans for the Beaver Dam Wash National Conservation Area, the Red Cliffs National Conservation Area, and an Amendment to the St. George Field Office Resource Management Plan, and an associated Environmental Impact Statement, published in the Federal Register Vol. 75, No. 89, Monday, May 10, 2010, pp. 25876-25877. The identification of at least one alternative for “a northern transportation route” was listed as one of the preliminary planning criteria for the planning process.

During the 60 day public scoping process, the identification of a “northern transportation route” was highlighted as one of the planning issues through media

“So when you are listening to somebody, completely, attentively, then you are listening not only to the words, but also to the feeling of what is being conveyed, to the whole of it, not part of it.”

—Jiddu Krishnamurti, Philosopher, 1895-1986

releases and a public scoping newsletter that was mailed to federal, state, and local governmental entities, and the public. Graphic display boards and written materials provided to the public at four scoping meetings (Photo 3-4 and Photo 3-5), held between June 14 and June 17, 2010, in St. George, Hurricane, and Salt Lake City in Utah and in Mesquite, Nevada, requested public input on alternatives for a “northern transportation route in the County”. In October of 2010, Scoping Reports were made available to Cooperating Agencies as hard copies and to the public through a posting on the BLM-St. George Field Office website. These reports displayed comments received during scoping on an alternative for the “northern transportation route” that would cross the Red Cliffs NCA. Many of the scoping comments addressed the potential conflicts that would be associated with the construction of a new multi-lane road through the NCA and recommended that BLM not authorize this proposed land use. Members of the public cited the apparent conflict with the Congressionally-defined purposes of conservation, protection, and enhancement of resource values on the public

lands of the NCA. Other public scoping comments addressed the potential impacts on cultural resources or recreational uses, as reasons not to authorize the proposed new multi-lane road through the NCA (refer to 3.5.3 Scoping Report). Others noted that authorizing this proposed new multi-lane road through the NCA would result in the loss of acres of designated critical habitat and impacts on populations of threatened and endangered species. It could also violate commitments made by BLM, Washington County, the State of Utah, and other entities, through the HCP Implementation Agreement, as they relate to managing the lands within the boundaries of the NCA and Red Cliffs Desert Reserve to protect listed species and habitats. Some commenters noted that development of this proposed multi-lane road through the NCA could invalidate Washington County’s Incidental Take Permit for desert tortoise populations and critical habitat, issued by the USFWS under Section 10 of the Endangered Species Act in 1996. This permit has allowed growth and development to occur in an orderly and predictable manner on

Photo 3-4 Public Open House for Scoping in St. George, Utah



“The most important thing in communication is hearing what isn’t said.”
 –Peter Drucker, Businessman, 1909–2005

private lands in desert tortoise habitat in Washington County since 1996. On March 30th and April 26th of 2011, the BLM hosted meetings, facilitated by the Washington County Commissioners, with various entities to discuss the “northern transportation route” and identify possible alignments, as mandated by OPLMA. The following entities were represented at these meetings:

- ▶ Federal Highways Administration
- ▶ USFWS
- ▶ Utah Department of Natural Resources
- ▶ UDWR
- ▶ UDOT
- ▶ Five County Association of Governments
- ▶ City of St. George
- ▶ City of Washington
- ▶ Washington County HCP Administrator’s Office
- ▶ DMPO

The DMPO provided BLM with two studies to consider as part of the process to identify possible alignments for the “northern transportation route”. The stated need for this proposed multi-lane

road (previously labeled the Northern Corridor, Great Northern Corridor, and, most recently, the Washington Parkway in local transportation plans) would be to reduce projected traffic pressure on existing roads in the greater St. George metropolitan area (studies are available for review at <http://www.dixiempo.org>). In combination with other traffic-reducing measures, the “northern transportation route” would afford measurable traffic congestion relief, based on projections of travel demand in 2040 (Horrocks Engineers 2011).

The Washington County Commissioners requested that the BLM evaluate several route alignments for a “northern transportation route” multi-lane highway through the Red Cliffs NCA. Each of the alternative alignments crossed the NCA, although one would primarily be located on lands managed by the US Forest Service, Pine Valley Ranger District of the Dixie National Forest.

In compliance with the legislative mandate of OPLMA Section 1977 (b) 2 (A), and acknowledging Washington County’s role as a Cooperating Agency, BLM proposed in one management alternative in

Photo 3-5 Public Open House for Scoping in Salt Lake City, Utah



“An individual without information cannot take responsibility; an individual with information cannot help but take responsibility.”
 – Jim Carlson, Businessman, 1941–

“Whether you’re hiking, biking, canoeing, or camping—exploring the outdoors is part of the American life.”

—Gale Norton,
Secretary of the Interior
2001–2006, 1954–

the Draft RMP to designate a new utility and transportation corridor through the Red Cliffs NCA that could accommodate any of the route alignments for a “northern transportation route” submitted by Washington County and the DMPO. The supporting Draft EIS evaluated the potential environmental consequences of selecting this alternative on the resource values of the NCA.

3.5 PUBLIC SCOPING

3.5.1 Notice of Intent

In May 2010, the SGFO initiated the public scoping period with the publication of a NOI to prepare resource management plans for the Beaver Dam Wash NCA and the Red Cliffs NCA and to amend the SGFO RMP to address specific mandates from OPLMA, Subtitle O, Section 1974 and 1975. Public scoping is required by NEPA in the early stages of developing an EIS to determine the scope and significance of issues related to a proposed action, such as the development of RMPs or an RMP Amendment (40 CFR 1501.7). Scoping helps identify issues important to the management of the public lands of the NCAs and SGFO, as well as issues and conflicts to be examined in the planning process and, ultimately, decisions in the NCA RMPs or the SGFO RMP Amendment. The scoping process is designed to encourage public participation and to solicit public input.

3.5.2 Open Houses, Newsletters, and Project Website

The NOI announced the dates, meeting locations, and times for the four public scoping open houses that were held for this planning process. It also included instructions for providing comments by the end date for the scoping period, July 19, 2010. This same information was included in a press release published in local and regional newspapers in May of 2010. These meetings were announced in the media, as well as through a planning newsletter that was mailed to

hundreds of individuals, organizations and agencies and made available at each of the scoping meetings. The newsletter provided information about the scoping process and instructions for submitting comments. It also included information about the NCAs, the purposes for which Congress had designated them to the National Conservation Lands, and their resource values. The newsletter requested public input related to potential issues that could be considered in the planning process and requested input on alternatives for long-term management of the public lands within each NCA. The mandates that required amendment of the SGFO RMP were identified in the newsletter and the public invited to submit nominations for ACECs to provide special management attention to priority biological species. The newsletter and other information about the planning process was also posted and updated on the BLM website.

The four public open houses were held over a one-week period in June 2010, and were attended by 269 members of the public and representatives from other federal agencies, as well as State and local governments. BLM resource specialists were available to answer questions and provide additional information about

Photo 3-6 Hiking Above Ivins, Red Cliffs NCA



specific issues throughout the meeting. Informational posters and maps were on display during the open houses and were designed to stimulate questions from the public and assist the preparation of scoping comments, which were accepted through written comment forms, emails, and postings to the BLM website.

In January of 2011, a second planning newsletter was sent out to all governmental agencies, organizations, and members of the public who had requested to be placed on the mailing list. This newsletter provided an overview of the results of scoping, the availability of the scoping report, and the announcement of an Economic Strategies Workshop that was held in St. George, Utah, on February 18, 2011.

3.5.3 Scoping Report

More information on the scoping process is available in the *Scoping Report for the Resource Management Plans for the Beaver Dam Wash and Red Cliffs National Conservation Areas and Amendment to the St. George Field Office Resource Management Plan and Associated Environmental Impact Statement*. This report summarized issues identified by the public and includes all of the specific comments that resulted from the public

scoping period. The report can be viewed on the BLM ePlanning website <http://biy.ly2av3Q1i>.

3.5.4 Economic Strategies Workshop

A public Economic Strategies Workshop was conducted on February 18, 2011 (facilitated by a USDA TEAMS Enterprise Unit) to identify management opportunities involving public lands that would further the social and economic goals of area communities. Members of the public and representatives of local municipalities and county government attended the workshop. Participants explored the role of public lands in the socioeconomic sector of local communities and helped to identify those activities and uses on public lands that should be considered during the planning process.

Recreation on public lands was identified as an important part of the area economy and vital to area quality of life (Photo 3-6). Participants expressed interest in a variety of recreation experiences (e.g., solitude for hiking, OHV, competitive recreation) and sought continued access to trails and routes that provided recreation opportunities. Incorporation of the motorized High Desert Trail into the BLM route system was also suggested. Heritage tourism was noted to be an important recreation attraction, as well. In addition, marketing and advertising of these routes and recreation opportunities by BLM was emphasized, since local businesses depend on these opportunities and could benefit from further marketing. Education and public outreach were recommended as methods to help resolve conflicts between non-motorized and motorized users.

Access for other uses of public land, such as grazing, mineral development, and emergency response, was identified as an issue of concern for some participants. Some who provided comments stated that public land should continue to be

Heritage Tourism

The National Trust for Historic Preservation defines heritage tourism as “traveling to experience the places, artifacts and activities that authentically represent the stories and people of the past.” Heritage tourism can include cultural, historic, and natural resources.

“You’ve got to be very careful if you don’t know where you are going, because you might not get there.”

–Yogi Berra, former Major League Baseball Player and Manager, 1925–2015

available for the development of new power transmission lines, water pipelines, and other types of ROWs that support community growth. Livestock grazing on public land was reported as having direct economic benefits for area families who had been engaged in this activity for generations.

The designation of new ACECs to protect water quality and biodiversity was identified by members of the public as important and compatible with multiple uses. Some participants identified concerns about the use of special designations, such as ACECs, as a back door approach to wilderness designation. A report summarizing the comments received during this Economic Strategies Workshop is available on the BLM ePlanning website <http://biy.ly2av3Q1i>.

3.5.5 Notice of Availability of Draft NCA RMPs/Draft Amendment/Draft EIS

On July 17, 2015, the BLM and EPA each published a Notice of Availability in the Federal Register, which marked the beginning of the 90-day public review and comment period, ending on October 15, 2015. The BLM provided hard copies

and CDs of the Draft NCA RMPs/Draft Amendment/Draft EIS to Cooperating Agencies, other federal, state, and local government agencies, and American Indian Tribes. Hard copies and CDs were made available to the public at the Interagency Public Information Center in St. George, Utah State Office, and at the public Open Houses. The Draft RMPs/Draft Amendment/Draft EIS were also posted on the BLM’s website, and available at the Salt Lake City Main Library, and the Washington County Library. In addition, BLM distributed a newsletter to the planning mailing list announcing the availability of the draft plans, the dates of the public comment period, the dates and locations of the three public Open Houses. It also provided information about how to provide comments.

3.5.6 Public Open Houses

During the 90-day public comment period, the BLM held public Open Houses in three locations (Table 3-1) to provide information and respond to questions from interested parties about the draft plans. The public was also able to request hard copies or CDs of the draft plans and submit written comments at the meetings. The public meetings were

announced in a press release in local and state-wide newspapers, on the project website, and through the newsletter. These Open Houses were attended by approximately 176 people (Photo 3-7 and Photo 3-8).

3.5.7 30-day Extension of the Public Comment Period and Additional Outreach

After receiving several requests for additional time to comment on the draft plans the Utah BLM Acting State Director extended the comment period for an additional 30 days, closing on November 16, 2015. The BLM St. George Field Office extended its regular office hours before the comment period closed on November 16, making BLM managers and staff available to answer specific plan-related questions from 5 to 7 p.m. on the following dates: Tuesdays: October 27, November 3, and November 10;

Table 3-1 Public Meetings

Meeting Location	Date	Attendance
City of St. George	9/1/15	119
Hurricane City	9/2/15	51
Salt Lake City	9/3/15	6
Total Attendance		176

and from 9 to 11 a.m. on the following Saturdays: October 24 and November 7.

3.5.8 Public Comment Response Process

According to NEPA, the BLM is required to identify and formally respond to all substantive public comments. The BLM developed a systematic process for sorting, reviewing, determining if substantive or non-substantive, and responding to substantive comments to ensure all substantive comments were tracked and the content seriously considered.

The coding and comment response processes assisted the BLM Planning Team to determine whether the substantive issues raised by the public warranted modification of one or more of the alternatives or further analysis of issues and impacts. With the information provided through the public review process, the BLM reconsidered the draft alternatives, made changes as appropriate, and developed the Proposed NCA RMPs/Proposed Amendment/Final EIS.

Opinions, feelings, and preferences for one element or one alternative over another, and comments of a personal and/or philosophical nature were all read,

Photo 3-7 Public Open House for Comments in St. George, Utah



Photo 3-8 Public Open House for Comments in Hurricane, Utah



“You have your way. I have my way. As for the right way, the correct way, and the only way, it does not exist.”

–Freidrich Nietzsche, Philosopher, 1844–1900

“Opinions, feelings, and preferences for one element or one alternative over another, and comments of a personal and/or philosophical nature were all read, analyzed, and considered, but as these types of comments are not substantive in nature, the BLM did not respond to them.”

analyzed, and considered, but as these types of comments are not substantive in nature, the BLM did not respond to them.

3.5.9 Public Comments

During the 120-day public comment period, the BLM received 6,022 comments. The comments were submitted at public meetings, through the planning website, e-mail, and regular mail from the public, Cooperating Agencies, other federal and state agencies, Indian tribes, local governments, and organizations. The BLM responded to substantive comments by making revisions to the Proposed NCA RMPs and Proposed Amendment, where appropriate. If no change was warranted, the BLM responded to the substantive comment in writing. A summary of the comments received and responses to substantive comments are in Appendix J. The BLM considered every comment in the content analysis process, whether it came repeatedly from many people with the same message or from a single person raising a technical or personal point. In analyzing comments, the BLM emphasized the content of the comment rather than the number of times a comment was received.

Respondents invested considerable time and effort to submit comments on the draft plans. Comments covered a wide spectrum of thoughts, opinions, ideas, and concerns. The most commonly addressed topics included protection for the Mojave desert tortoise (Photo 3-9), livestock grazing (Photo 3-10), the proposed “northern transportation route” through Red Cliffs NCA, and possible socio-economic impacts related to the implementation of an alternative. While each person’s viewpoint was considered, the threshold analysis involved determining whether a comment was substantive or non-substantive. Because NEPA requires that BLM respond only to substantive comments, BLM relied on the CEQ’s regulations to determine what constituted a substantive comment.

A substantive comment does one or more of the following:

- ▶ Questions, with a reasonable basis, the accuracy of the information and/or analysis in the EIS;
- ▶ Questions, with a reasonable basis, the adequacy of the information and/or analysis in the EIS;
- ▶ Presents reasonable alternatives other than those presented in the

Draft EIS that meet the purpose and need of the proposed action and addresses significant issues;

- ▶ Questions, with a reasonable basis, the merits of an alternative or alternatives;
- ▶ Causes changes in or revisions to the proposed action;
- ▶ Questions, with a reasonable basis, the adequacy of the planning process itself.

The BLM NEPA Handbook (H-1790-1) identifies the following types of substantive comments:

- ▶ Comments on the Adequacy of the Analysis. Comments that express a professional disagreement with the conclusions of the analysis or assert that the analysis is inadequate are substantive in nature but may or may not lead to changes in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS. Interpretations of analyses should be based on professional expertise. Where there is disagreement within a professional discipline, a careful review of the various interpretations is warranted. In some cases, public comments may necessitate a reevaluation of analytical conclusions.

If, after reevaluation, the manager responsible for preparing the EIS (authorized officer (AO)) does not think that a change is warranted, the response should provide the rationale for that conclusion.

- ▶ Comments Which Identify New Impacts, Alternatives, or Mitigation Measures. Public comments on a Draft EIS that identify impacts, alternatives, or mitigation measures that were not addressed in the draft are substantive. This type of comment requires the AO to determine if it warrants further consideration. If it does, the AO must determine whether the new impacts, new alternatives, or new mitigation measures should be analyzed in either the Final EIS, a supplement to the Draft EIS, or a completely revised and recirculated Draft EIS.
- ▶ Disagreements with Significance Determinations. Comments that directly or indirectly question, with a reasonable basis, determinations regarding the significance or severity of impacts are substantive. A reevaluation of these determinations may be warranted and may lead to changes in the Final EIS. If

“May your belly never grumble, may your heart never ache, may your horse never stumble, may your cinch never break.”
—Anonymous

Photo 3-9 Commonly Addressed Comment Topic: Protection for the Mojave Desert Tortoise



Photo 3-10 Commonly Addressed Comment Topic: Livestock Grazing



after reevaluation, the AO does not think that a change is warranted, the response should provide the rationale for that conclusion.

Non-substantive comments simply state a position in favor of or against an alternative or a management action proposed in an alternative, merely agree or disagree with BLM policy, provide information not directly related to issues or impact analyses, or otherwise express an unsupported personal preference or opinion. For additional clarification, types of non-substantive comments are as follows:

- ▶ Expressions of Personal Preferences or Opinion. Comments that express personal preferences or opinions on the proposals are non-substantive and thus do not require further agency action. This includes comments in favor of or against the proposed action or alternatives; comments that only agree or disagree with BLM policy; or comments that question a point of fact or policy. However, such comments are summarized whenever possible and brought to the attention of the AO.

The BLM has reviewed and considered all non-substantive comments, but has not provided formal responses to such comments. Although non-substantive comments, including personal preferences and opinions, may be considered by the decision-maker as he or she chooses the agency's proposed plan, they generally will not affect the analysis.

3.6 CONSISTENCY WITH STATE AND LOCAL PLANS

FLPMA at Section 202 (b) (9) directs that the BLM provide for involvement of state and local government officials in the land use planning process and consider the provisions of tribal, state, and local plans that are relevant to the planning areas. BLM should attempt to resolve inconsistencies between federal and non-federal government plans, in the development of

land use decisions for public lands, to the extent that those plans are consistent with the purposes, policies, and programs of federal laws and regulations applicable to public lands and the purposes of FLPMA. As part of this planning effort, the following approved plans were reviewed for consistency:

- *Gunlock State Park Resource Management Plan (2006);*
- *Mohave County General Plan (1995, revised 2010);*
- *Sand Hollow State Park Resource Management Plan (2010);*
- *Snow Canyon State Park Resource Management Plan (1998);*
- *Washington County Resource Management Plan (2009);*
- *Washington County General Management Plan (2010, amended 2012).*

As noted in Section 3.2, the Cooperating Agencies (Washington County, Mohave County (AZ) and the State of Utah) were provided opportunities to provide input throughout the planning process. Consistency with agency and local and state government plans was primarily accomplished through communications and cooperative efforts (meetings and communications) between the BLM Planning Team and these Cooperating Agencies.

The BLM is aware that there are specific county and state plan decisions relevant to aspects of public land management that are discrete from and independent of federal law. FLPMA requires that the development of an RMP for public lands be coordinated and consistent with county plans to the extent possible by law and that inconsistencies between federal and non-federal government plans be resolved to the extent practical (FLPMA, Title II, Section 202 (c)(9)). However, the BLM is bound by federal law and, as a consequence, there will be an inconsistency that cannot be resolved

or reconciled where state and local plans conflict with federal law.

Thus, while county and federal planning processes under FLPMA are required to be as integrated and be as consistent as practical, the federal agency planning process is not bound by or subject to county plans, planning processes, or planning stipulations. In addition, the relevant goals, objectives, or policies of a county are often equivalent to an activity or implementation-level decision and not an RMP-level decision. The very specific county goals would be addressed in any

subsequent BLM activity or implementation-level decision.

Table 3-2 through Table 3-5 compare the consistency of the Proposed NCA RMPs and Proposed Amendment to approved Washington County, Mohave County (AZ), and State of Utah management Plans.

3.7 LIST OF PREPARERS

Table 3-6 through Table 3-8 show the preparers of the Proposed NCA RMPs, the Proposed Amendment, and the Final EIS and their areas of responsibility.

“BLM is bound by federal law and, as a consequence, there will be an inconsistency that cannot be resolved or reconciled where state and local plans conflict with federal law.”

“Although non-substantive comments, including personal preferences and opinions, may be considered by the decision-maker as he or she chooses the agency's proposed plan, they generally will not affect the analysis.”

Photo 3-11 Gila Monster Amongst Spring Flowers, Red Cliffs NCA



Table 3-2 Mohave County General Plan 2005 Consistency

Resource	Mohave County General Plan 2005	Consistent
Air Quality	To increase County efforts to maintain or improve existing air quality. To establish construction and development standards that maintain or improve existing air quality.	Yes
Water Resources	To preserve the quantity and quality of water resources, in perpetuity, throughout the County.	Yes
Vegetation/Habitat for Special Status Species (Threatened, Endangered, and Sensitive)	To protect Mohave County's environmental amenities and sensitive areas in recognition of their importance to the County's quality of life.	Yes
Noise	To minimize noise levels throughout the County and, wherever possible, mitigate the effects of noise to provide a safe and healthy environment.	Yes
Historical Preservation	To preserve Mohave County's historic resources as physical reminders of the County's past and as unique focal points to shape its identity, now and in the future.	Yes
Wildland Fire	To reduce the effect on County residents of wildland fire hazards. To plan and provide for adequate fire protection services at levels that are appropriate to the County's urban, suburban and rural areas.	Yes
Visual Resources	To preserve, protect and enhance scenic routes and vistas that characterize the rural beauty of Mohave County.	Yes
Transportation	To plan, construct and maintain an efficient transportation system that is adequate to meet the mobility needs of County residents and businesses. To promote compatibility between roadway improvements, land use patterns and natural features. To minimize the impacts of automobile travel on the County's air quality, natural environment and developed communities.	Yes
Recreation Management	To meet the recreational and open space needs of residents Countywide, with sites that provide for active recreation, specialized recreational opportunities and enjoyment of natural areas.	Yes

Table 3-3 Washington County Resource Management Plan 2009 Consistency

Resource	Washington County RMP 2009	Consistent	Discussion
Air Quality	"Maintain Air & Water Quality."	Yes	
Water Resources	"The county encourages and supports the efficient management and use of its water resources. The county also supports the development, adoption, and implementation of water collection, storage, and distribution, as well as the development of conservation plans by municipalities, the water conservancy district, and private water companies. The county also encourages continued cooperation among all water managers and users as water management decisions are made. The county needs to be involved with state and federal managers in the development of any plans for monitoring of air and water quality. Findings must be coordinated with the county. The county supports	Yes	

Resource	Washington County RMP 2009	Consistent	Discussion
	management practices that protect vital watersheds."		
Vegetation	"The county supports efforts to conduct plant surveys to validate existing data and add new plant inventory data. Recovery planning efforts for sensitive, threatened, and endangered plant species shall evaluate, mitigate, and support the county's customs and culture and economic viability. The county supports locally driven efforts to identify desired plant communities that do not compromise the customs and culture and economy of the county."	Yes	
Noxious/Invasive Weeds	"Federal and state land management agencies shall participate in cooperative efforts with federal, state, county and private land managers to enhance cooperative weed management in the county. Early detection and control of noxious weed and insect infestations are essential to the public health, welfare and economy of the citizens of the county. Neither the county, nor the public land managers can be successful in controlling noxious weeds without joint cooperation."	Yes	
Special Status Species (Threatened, Endangered, and Sensitive)	"Recovery planning efforts for sensitive, threatened, and endangered plant species shall evaluate, mitigate, and support the county's customs and culture and economic viability. Recovery efforts for sensitive, threatened and endangered species must evaluate, mitigate, and support the county's customs and culture and economic viability. Wildlife management efforts shall reduce predation of sensitive species, increase hunting and fishing opportunities within appropriate carrying capacities, decrease game damage conflicts, and generally balance wildlife numbers with other factions, representing the customs and culture and multiple use values of the county. The county supports responsible wildlife habitat preservation, development, and management."	Yes	
Fish and Wildlife	"The county supports responsible wildlife habitat preservation, development, and management."	Yes	
Wildland Fire	"Fire management strategies shall consider fire fighter and public safety and protect human life, property and communities. There shall be a high level of cooperation between agencies and fire	Yes	

Resource	Washington County RMP 2009	Consistent	Discussion
	fighter organizations in the county. Federal agencies will incorporate local fire department plans and policies into fire suppression and control plans."		
Visual Resources	"Washington County recognizes that different levels of scenic values on federal lands in the county require different levels of management. While management of an area with high scenic value might be focused on preserving the existing character of the landscape, management of an area with little scenic value might allow for major modifications to the landscape. Federal land management agencies shall conduct assessments of visual impacts in determining how an area should be managed, with the goal of protecting the visual resource while not burdening authorized land uses and maintaining economic stability. It is Washington County's policy in considering visual resource management objectives, federal and state land management agencies shall recognize the importance of communication sites, electric transmission lines, and transportation corridors to the security, health and welfare of the county's residents."	Yes	
Forestry and Woodland Products	"The private use of timber products from federal and state lands in the county for posts, poles, wood cutting to provide fuel for those in the county needing fuel for winter heating, and Christmas trees, etc., shall be continued as an allowable use. A sustainable wood products industry on federal and state lands in the county is an important aspect of economic diversity. Fire, timber harvesting, and treatment programs are to be managed in a way to promote the forest health, reduce disease and insect infestation, and prevent waste of forest products while providing opportunities for local residents or small business."	No	The Proposed RMPs for Beaver Dam Wash and Red Cliffs NCA continue to manage the public lands as closed to harvesting of forest and woodland products, to protect designated critical habitat for listed species and wilderness values in Cottonwood Canyon Wilderness and Red Mountain Wilderness.
Transportation	"Transportation is critically important to Washington County. The county believes that proper access to public lands is essential, and is an inherent right of every citizen. It is the county's position that no access should be closed except in situations of duplication, danger to the public, or serious threat to the resource, and then only with input and consultation with the county. The county further believes that no closure should occur on	Partial	The Proposed RMPs for the two NCAs make no decisions related to R.S. 2477 roads. Chapter 1 of the plans states that resolution of this issue is outside of the purview and scope of public land planning efforts and must be adjudicated by a court of law or other legal means.

Resource	Washington County RMP 2009	Consistent	Discussion
	any of its R.S. 2477 rights-of way assertions without express consent of the county commission. The county's intent is to complete a county-wide transportation plan as a part of the General Plan of the county and will make every effort to coordinate such plan with public land managers to reach consensus insofar as possible. The county supports general public access through private lands as historically provided and allowed. The county will continue to work with individual land owners as necessary to maintain these traditional thoroughfares while also protecting private rights. It is vitally important that all existing public rights-of-way, including both R.S. 2477 as well as proscriptive rights across private lands, be maintained."		
Special Designations	"Washington County was opposed to additional land being designated as wilderness, over and above the original BLM and Forest Service recommendations. The county supported designation of those areas identified in the plan generally approved by the broad coalition of stake holders that reviewed the public land in the county and precipitated submission of the land use plan to Congress. Additional land was designated in the bill approved by Congress after the county had submitted their recommendation. There have now been numerous special land designations in Washington County. These include eighteen (18) designated wilderness areas, two (2) National Conservation Areas (NCA), one (1) large Habitat Conservation Area, ten (10) Areas of Special Environmental Concern, many thousands of acres of Critical Habitat, and other special designations. Washington County, while not in support of many areas of this type, will accept the decisions that have been made on the public lands, and will work closely with the public land managers to develop management plans that will meet the requirements of the public lands, and also be able to be identified as a part of the Washington County General Plan. The only way to make this successful is for close cooperation between the county and the public land	Yes	

Resource	Washington County RMP 2009	Consistent	Discussion
	managers. The county looks forward to this type of cooperation."		
Recreation Management	"Activities which traditionally define recreation and tourism in Washington County include, but are not limited to big game hunting, trapping, fishing, off-road vehicle use, mountain biking, hiking, camping, boating, etc. A majority of these activities are found on public lands. Visitors to these areas directly impact the county by drawing on county-provided infrastructure such as, law enforcement, emergency-medical, search and rescue, waste disposal services, and general commercial services. Many of the store owners, restaurants, hotels and motels, and many more interests depend on seasonal recreation and tourism for their livelihoods. Much of the recreational activity in the county is found in the unincorporated area of the county, outside of the organized recreation facilities found in many of the cities and towns. This recreation, mostly found through using the public lands, is a tremendous economic asset to the county. It is the county's position that federal and state land managers should do everything possible to enhance recreational opportunities on public lands and that such management should be compatible with the principles of multiple use, and sustained yield. Any management decisions which restrict recreational activities or access to recreation area must be done in consultation with the county and must be based on best scientific information."	Yes	
Livestock Grazing	"Livestock grazing on federal and state lands in the county shall continue, at levels consistent with the custom and culture, and proper stewardship of the resource. The continued viability of livestock operations within the county by management of land and forage resources, by proper optimization of animal unit months for livestock in forage resources, in accordance with supportable science and the multiple use provisions of federal and state law. Federal land management agencies will not adjust animal unit months (AUMs) on public lands, without scientifically based justification and full consultation between the permittee and the administering agency. Federal management	Partial	Under the Proposed RMPs, livestock grazing continues to be authorized at current levels in Beaver Dam Wash NCA and in two of three allotments that are currently available for grazing in the Red Cliffs NCA.

Resource	Washington County RMP 2009	Consistent	Discussion
	agencies will not permit the relinquishment, transfer, or retirement of livestock grazing AUMs in favor of conservation, wildlife, or other uses besides livestock grazing."		
Lands and Realty	"Washington County supports efforts to sell, exchange, or consolidate state and federal lands within the county if doing so improves manageability of these lands, benefits county residents, supports the county economic base, or addresses the problem of checkerboard ownership. Specifically, the county will work to identify and consolidate areas and resources that promote economic growth, allow additional or improved resource development, protect watershed, reduce access problems, and/or improve management. The county, through the county commission, will actively participate in all exchange or consolidation discussions. Federal land management agencies need to continue to make suitable lands available for disposal under the Recreation and Public Purposes Act (R&PP), Special Uses Act, and follow the requirements of the land use plan approved by Congress for the disposal of certain BLM lands in the county."	No	Management decisions related to sale, exchange or disposal of public lands in the NCAs not included in Proposed RMPs, as both NCAs were withdrawn by OPLMA (Subtitle O, sections 1974 and 1975) from all forms of entry, appropriation, and disposal under the public land laws. Management decisions for Lands and Realty do not authorize disposal under R&PP, to comply with OPLMA withdrawals.

Table 3-4 Washington County General Plan 2012 Consistency

Resource	Washington County General Plan 2012	Consistent	Discussion
Water and Soils	Any changes regarding water development, water shed plan, and soils, should be coordinated with the County prior to any change being made consistent with the General plan. There are significant riparian resources in the county with many such areas on BLM land. The county will work closely with the BLM to review these areas, as well as vegetation resources, special plant varieties and animal species that are identified in the Resource plan.	Yes	
Lands and Realty	There are many major utility corridors running through and within Washington County. In the 1980's the Intermountain Power Agency made application for a 500 kW power line through the county from the power plant north of Delta, Utah to the Nevada border north of Mesquite. There was much discussion at the time as to whether to allow narrow, individual corridors	Partial	Management decisions related to sale, exchange or disposal of public lands in the NCAs not included in Proposed RMPs, as both NCAs were withdrawn by OPLMA (Subtitle O, sections 1974 and 1975) from all forms of entry, appropriation, and disposal under the public land laws. Management decisions for Lands and Realty do not authorize disposal

Resource	Washington County General Plan 2012	Consistent	
	<p>or to have one wide corridor for the power line and any other subsequent utilities that might also need a right-of-way along the same alignment. The decision was made to have a single corridor. Since the original power line, there have been two underground natural gas lines in the same corridor as well as a second power line and a fiber optic cable. Moreover, there is another underground line, a refined petroleum line, currently being proposed. The General Plan supports the continued use of this corridor for major utility lines and the continued maintenance of the current one mile width of the corridor for future utilities that may need a corridor through the county. The General Plan would support expansion of this corridor as necessary in the future. Another major utility corridor contains the Navajo 500 kV power line that is located in the southern part of the county as it goes from the Navajo generating plant near Glen Canyon Dam through Washington County and into Arizona and Nevada. All such corridors should remain available for additional utility systems. Both corridors are designated in BLM's 1999 St. George Field Office Resource Management Plan and the Department of Energy's Utility Corridor Plan and Environmental Impact Statement.</p> <p>Land exchanges would be permitted on land not specifically identified for exchange or disposal if such changes are determined to be in the public interest and would accommodate the needs of local and state governments including needs for the economy, public purposes, and community growth. Lands previously identified for transfer, but not yet transferred, and which may be available through the approval of the land use plan by Congress, are identified for acquisition as well as lands identified for recreation and public purposes, where known.</p>		under R&PP, to comply with OPLMA withdrawals.
Special Status Species	To provide a permanent protection for the desert tortoise after the USFWS permit expired and/or recovery objectives were achieved, the HCP called for the creation of a national conservation area. The goal of the General Plan is to continue the highly collaborative process	Yes	

Resource	Washington County General Plan 2012	Consistent	
	currently in place in the development of planning, management strategies, and administration of the NCA. In addition to the 1995 HCP and the 1996 implementation agreement, current direction for use and management of the reserve is spelled out in great detail by the public use plan approved by the commission in June of 2000, and formally adopted by the BLM in 2002 after extensive public input and NEPA analysis. The county expects, and the General Plan strongly recommends, that the documents cited above continue to be the basis for the day-to-day management of the new NCA and the county plans to continue to make its resources available to support a collaborative approach in developing the NCA management plan called for in the legislation. Moreover, it is essential that the federal government recognize the Section 10 permit issued to the county under the Endangered Species Act, and support all provisions of the HCP developed in support of the permit. The economic and ecological wellbeing of the county is dependent upon this plan and its continuation.		
Fire Management	When fire threatens lives, property, or public safety, the county supports the policy to suppress fires that could become a threat to the health, safety, and welfare of the public. This policy should be continued and extended to other management areas, such as those described below. General wild-fires include lightning strikes, accidental fires, etc., and prescribed burns. The General Plan agrees that there will be wildfires from time to time, especially in wet summer seasons, and the plan also agrees that from time to time, after consultation with state, local and other federal land managers, that a prescribed burn might be useful in improving range conditions and improving grazing. The General Plan recommends that the public land managers look for new and improved means of fire management and suppression that would protect the natural resources, including air quality. The General Plan recommends that in order to protect the health, safety and welfare of the public, wild land fires, with the possible exception of a limited prescribed burn or other types of burns	Yes	

Resource	Washington County General Plan 2012	Consistent	
	should be suppressed as quickly as possible with the least damage to, and loss of, burned acreage.		
Trails	Trails have become an important part of the exceptional quality of life and livability of Washington County and are a major draw for tourists and residents alike. Numerous trail systems have been completed by city planners within incorporated limits with the intent to link with trails in adjoining communities to make an unprecedented trail system allowing non-motorized commuting in addition to extraordinary recreational opportunities in the urban zone. Outside of the communities, the county has worked with public agencies to foster over 200 miles of trails and numerous trail heads, the majority of which link with those coming out of the cities and towns. The overall goal, as established by the Three Rivers Trail Initiative, is to create a fully linked trail system allowing continuous travel on authorized trails from the Shivwits Indian Reservation on the west to the south entrance of Zion National Park on the east. Funding for most of the trail components has come through the Utah Division of Parks and Recreation with matching contribution from local agencies and towns. The General Plan supports the completion of this system along with other trail developments including the High Desert Trail system that is called for in the Land Bill.	Yes	
Transportation	One of the most important aspects of planning on the BLM land involves transportation planning. In the context of the Land Bill, the BLM is required to prepare a transportation plan for the BLM land within the next 3 years. Washington County is developing a transportation plan for the County which includes roads on the BLM land. The county desires to work closely with the BLM in their development of such a plan.	Yes	
Northern Corridor	As a result of the act of Congress approving the Washington County Land Use Bill, the BLM is required to identify one or more routes making up a Northern Corridor. This corridor would link State Highway 18 with Interstate 15 Freeway at mile post 13 or some other point, such as a North Leeds	Yes	The Proposed RMPs and Proposed Plan Amendment all contain in the Comprehensive Transportation and Travel Management sections and objectives to comply with OPLMA Section 1977 (which references the identification of one or more alternatives for a “northern transportation route in the

Resource	Washington County General Plan 2012	Consistent	
	interchange. Four alternative routes are identified on the Washington County Transportation Map. The county is prepared to work closely with the BLM to determine the final right-of-way route, or routes. At least one alternative route would pass through a portion of the Red Cliffs Desert Reserve established for the protection of the desert tortoise. By 2030 a Northern Corridor will be critical to alleviate traffic gridlock in St. George City to and from large, growing community development along Highway 18. Residents and businesses need access to I-15 for travel north to Cedar City, Salt Lake City, Provo, and employment centers in the eastern parts of the county. St. George City projected such a corridor in their major transportation plan approved in the mid 1980's. More recently, as a part of the Vision Dixie citizen involvement element of the plan, many citizens show various transportation elements through parts of the HCP. The General Plan believes that such a route is possible with further study by the agencies involved.		County”). In the Proposed Red Cliffs NCA RMP, Washington County’s preferred alignment for a “northern transportation route” is within a ROW avoidance area, which would allow for an application for a new ROW. Any ROW application would have to undergo land use plan conformance and a site specific NEPA analysis.
R.S. 2477 Assertions	The 1866 mining law known as Revised Statute 2477 granted rights-of-ways for what are known as “R.S. 2477 Roads.” A great many roads in Washington County and elsewhere were created under this authority and remain in use until this day. The statute was repealed in 1976 under the Federal Land Management and Policy Act, but existing rights were preserved. State and local governments, under Utah State law, have the right to administer the use and maintenance of roads created under the statute. Over the years much controversy as various entities, including the federal government, have attempted to close such roads without the consent of the governing local or state authority. The General Plan supports the retention of such roads where legitimate use and rights remain in place. Throughout Utah, many claims for and against R.S. 2477 rights-of- way have been taken to federal court with mixed results. The General Plan supports Utah's efforts to get the matter to the U.S. Supreme Court with the goal of obtaining a definitive ruling and settlement on the matter.	Yes	The Proposed RMPs for the Beaver Dam Wash and Red Cliffs NCAs make no decisions related to R.S. 2477 roads. Chapter 1 of the Draft RMPs states that resolution of this issue is outside the purview and scope of public lands planning efforts and must be adjudicated by a court of law or other legal means.

Table 3-5 State of Utah Code Consistency

Resource	State of Utah Code 63j-401, as affected by 6311-1-263	BLM
ACECs	"The state's support for designation of an Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC), as defined in 43 U.S.C. Sec. 1702, within federal land management plans will be withheld until:	The potential ACECs brought forward for designation into the Proposed Amendment have undergone the review process
	<p>(i) it is clearly demonstrated that the proposed area satisfies all the definitional requirements of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, 43 U.S.C. Sec. 1702(a);</p> <p>(ii) it is clearly demonstrated that the area proposed for designation as an ACEC is limited in geographic size and that the proposed management prescriptions are limited in scope to the minimum necessary to specifically protect and prevent irreparable damage to the relevant and important values identified, or limited in geographic size and management prescriptions to the minimum required to specifically protect human life or safety from natural hazards;</p> <p>(iii) it is clearly demonstrated that the proposed area is limited only to areas that are already developed or used or to areas where no development is required;</p> <p>(iv) it is clearly demonstrated that the proposed area contains relevant and important historic, cultural or scenic values, fish or wildlife resources, or natural processes which are unique or substantially significant on a regional basis, or contain natural hazards which significantly threaten human life or safety;</p> <p>(v) the federal agency has analyzed regional values, resources, processes, or hazards for irreparable damage and its potential causes resulting from potential actions which are consistent with the multiple-use, sustained-yield principles, and the analysis describes the rationale for any special management attention required to protect, or prevent irreparable damage to the values, resources, processes, or hazards;</p> <p>(vi) it is clearly demonstrated that the proposed designation is consistent with the plans and policies of the state and of the county where the proposed designation is located as those plans and policies are developed according to Subsection (3);</p> <p>(vii) it is clearly demonstrated that the proposed ACEC designation will not be applied redundantly over existing protections provided by other state and federal laws for federal lands or resources on federal lands, and that the federal statutory requirement for special management attention for a proposed ACEC will discuss and justify any management requirements needed in addition to those specified by the other state and federal laws;</p> <p>(viii) the difference between special management attention required for an ACEC and normal multiple-use management has been identified and justified, and that any determination of irreparable damage has been analyzed and justified for short and long-term horizons.</p>	<p>required under FLPMA, the planning regulations at 43 CFR 1600, Land Use Planning Handbook (H-1601-1), and in accordance with BLM Manual 1613 and ACEC Policy and Procedures Guidelines (45 CFR 57318). The size of the proposed ACECs is limited the area(s) of geography where the relevance and importance values are manageable to protect and prevent irreparable damage. In the Proposed Amendment, the potential ACECs do not have redundant special designations and/or other existing protections applied.</p> <p>The potential ACECs carried forward into the Proposed Plan Amendment necessitate an ACEC designation because special management protection is necessary (outside of normal multiple-use management) to specifically protect the relevance and importance values within the areas identified. The special management prescriptions that have been proposed are narrowly tailored to protect the identified relevant and important values, none of which are recognized as wilderness resources. For these reasons, the potential ACEC decisions carried forward into the Proposed Plan Amendment are considered by BLM to be consistent with Utah Code 63j-4-401.</p>

Resource	State of Utah Code 63j-401, as affected by 6311-1-263	BLM
Grazing	<p>Land management plans, programs, and initiatives should provide that the amount of domestic livestock forage, expressed in animal unit months, for permitted, active use as well as the wildlife forage included in that amount, be no less than the maximum number of animal unit months sustainable by range conditions in grazing allotments and districts, based on an on-the-ground and scientific analysis.</p> <p>The state opposes the relinquishment or retirement of grazing animal unit months in favor of conservation, wildlife, and other uses.</p>	<p>Grazing decisions carried forward into the Proposed RMPs for the Beaver Dam Wash and Red Cliffs NCAs are considered by BLM to be consistent with Utah Code 63j-4-401. Proposed RMP decisions on public lands would continue to allow grazing in the Beaver Dam Wash NCA at current levels. Numerous RMP decisions under</p>
		<p>other identified resources allow for the restoration and maintenance of rangeland and watershed health.</p>
Wilderness Characteristics	<p>Managing public lands for "wilderness characteristics" circumvents the statutory wilderness process and is inconsistent with the multiple-use and sustained-yield management standard that applies to all Bureau of Land Management and U.S. Forest Service lands that are not wilderness areas or wilderness study areas.</p>	<p>The Proposed RMPs for the Beaver Dam Wash and Red Cliffs NCAs do not identify any areas to be managed for wilderness characteristics, as the conservation purposes of the NCAs, as defined by OPLMA at sections 1974 and 1975, adequately conserve and protect the wilderness character of areas evaluated to have wilderness characteristics.</p>
R.S. 2477 Assertions	<p>As a coholder of R.S. 2477 rights-of-way with the counties, the state supports its recognition by the federal government and the public use of R.S. 2477 rights-of-way and urges the federal government to fully recognize the rights-of-way and their use by the public as expeditiously as possible;</p> <p>(b) it is the policy of the state to use reasonable administrative and legal measures to protect and preserve valid existing rights-of-way granted by Congress under R.S. 2477, and to support and work in conjunction with counties to redress cases where R.S. 2477 rights-of-way are not recognized or are impaired; and</p> <p>(c) transportation and access routes to and across federal lands, including all rights-of-way vested under R.S. 2477, are vital to the state's economy and to the quality of life in the state, and must provide, at a minimum, a network of roads throughout the resource planning area that provides for:</p> <p>(i) movement of people, goods, and services across public lands;</p> <p>(ii) reasonable access to a broad range of resources and opportunities throughout the resource planning area.</p>	<p>The Proposed RMPs for the Beaver Dam Wash and Red Cliffs NCAs makes no commitments with respect to any valid existing rights, particularly those concerning R.S. 2477. Chapter 1 of the Draft RMPs states that resolution of this issue is outside the purview and scope of public lands planning efforts and must be adjudicated by a court of law or other legal means. Therefore, nothing in the Proposed NCA RMPs extinguishes any valid rights-of-way or alters, in any way, the legal rights of the State of Utah to assert R.S. 2477 rights or to challenge any use restrictions imposed by the RMPs that they believe are inconsistent with their rights.</p>

Table 3-6 BLM NCA Core ID Team

Name	Title	Areas of Responsibility
Dawna Ferris-Rowley	NCA Manager	Project Management, Heritage Resources, Old Spanish Trail, Document Assembly, Technical Review and Editing, Comment Analysis and Response
John Kellam	NCA Wildlife Biologist	Special Status Species, Comment Analysis and Response
Dave Kiel	NCA Outdoor Recreation Planner	Recreation and Visitor Services, Travel Management, VRM, Wilderness, Lands with Wilderness Characteristics, Natural Soundscapes, Comment Analysis and Response
Tom Lilly	NCA GIS Specialist	Cartography, GIS Maps, Analysis
Keith Rigrtrup	Land Use Planner (Color Country District Office)	Project Management, ACECs, Document Assembly Technical Review, Comment Analysis and Response
Lynne Scott	NCA Landscape Architect	Recreation and Visitor Services, Interpretation, Document Graphic Design and Assembly, and Technical Review and Editing
Kyle Voyles	NCA Outdoor Recreation Planner	Geology, Paleontology, Caves and Karsts

Table 3-7 Other BLM Preparers

Name	Title	Areas of Responsibility
Teresa Burke	Realty Specialist, SGFO	Lands and Realty
Dave Corry	Natural Resource Specialist, SGFO	Soil and Water Resources, Livestock Grazing, Other Fish and Wildlife
Leonard Herr	Air Quality, Utah State Office	Air Quality
Bill Stevens	Outdoor Recreation Planner, Moab District Office	Socioeconomic Conditions, Environmental Justice
Brian Tritle	Field Office Manager, SGFO	Project Management

Table 3-8 Contracted Services to Assist Planning Efforts

Entity	Services Provided
US Forest Service Enterprise Team	Comment Analysis