
CHAPTER 2—ALTERNATIVES

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) states that alternatives “are the heart of the environmental impact statement.” NEPA advises agencies to “rigorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives” and to “devote substantial treatment to each alternative considered in detail ... so that reviewers may evaluate their comparative merits.”

This chapter describes and compares four alternatives, consisting of three action alternatives and the “No Action” Alternative, for management of the decision area. Each alternative varies in context and intensity of potential management actions, and consists of a set of designations, land use allocations, and the management actions needed to implement the alternative. Each alternative is subsequently assessed for potential environmental impacts, which are summarized at the end of this chapter. A detailed discussion of potential impacts by alternative is presented in Chapter 4, Environmental Consequences. The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) has the discretion to select an alternative in its entirety or to combine components of the various alternatives presented in this draft to develop the Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and Proposed Resource Management Plan (RMP). It should be noted that while most of these management actions are RMP level, the alternatives also consider the designation of individual routes, which is an implementation-level decision that can change over the life of the plan without amending the RMP (Appendix K).

To facilitate considering and potentially mixing management actions from each alternative in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS, management actions, allocations, and designations were considered separately regardless of potential overlap with other allocations and designations within an alternative. Limiting management to address the issues raised in Chapter 1 can result in specific resource or use allocations that overlap with other resource or use allocations. Where allocations and management overlap, the more restrictive allocation/management action would be implemented. For example, a potential area of critical environmental concern (ACEC) may have a no surface occupancy (NSO) stipulation for oil and gas leasing in order to specifically protect the limited extent of identified relevant and important values, resources, systems, or hazards. In addition, there may be an overlapping portion of a suitable wild and scenic river (WSR) corridor (¼ mile viewshed) that closes the area to oil and gas leasing. The oil and gas leasing map for the alternative with these two designations would show the overlapping portions as closed to oil and gas leasing.

Issues and concerns received during the public scoping process formed the backbone for developing alternatives and their management actions to ensure that all issues and concerns were addressed. The public scoping process and its results are presented in more detail in Chapter 5.

An interdisciplinary team composed of BLM specialists developed the range of alternatives in consultation with a number of cooperating and federal agencies (see Chapter 5 for list). The BLM coordinated meetings with these agencies to gather input during the alternative development process. The BLM provided preliminary drafts of the alternatives for the cooperating agencies and affected federal and state agencies to review.

2.1 DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVES

This section provides a brief description of the four alternatives. Specific management decisions that are common to all alternatives are in Section 2.2. Specific management decisions for each alternative are described in Section 2.4. Alternative B is the BLM’s preferred alternative based on examination of the following factors:

- Balance of use and protection of resources
- Extent of the environmental impacts
- Incorporation of formal recommendations from the cooperating agencies and the public.

Alternative B was chosen because it resolves the major planning issues while providing for common ground among conflicting opinions and multiple uses of public lands in a sustainable fashion. It provides the best balance of resource protection and use within legal constraints.

2.1.1 Alternative A (No Action)

Alternative A is defined as a continuation of the current management direction contained in the five land use plans (LUP) and travel restriction management actions. This alternative describes the current goals and actions for management of resources and land uses in the decision area. The management direction could also be modified by current law, regulation, and policy. Alternative A represents the baseline to which the other management alternatives are compared. Key resource decisions on public lands within the decision area include the following:

- Oil and gas leasing:
 - 76 percent open to oil and gas leasing subject to the standard terms and conditions of the lease form
 - 9 percent open to oil and gas leasing subject to moderate constraints (timing limitations, controlled surface use [CSU], lease notices)
 - 1 percent open to oil and gas leasing subject to major constraints (no surface occupancy [NSO])
 - 14 percent closed to leasing.
- Prescribe vegetation treatments to improve wildlife habitat, increase forage production for livestock grazing, provide for watershed protection, and reduce soil loss. Direction for vegetation treatments is not consistent across the five LUPs, focusing on treating pinyon-juniper woodlands and old sagebrush stands. No ponderosa pine trees could be removed.
- Do not change livestock grazing for other resource purposes, and continue existing allotments as currently allocated unless otherwise allowed by law or regulation.
- Recommend no rivers or river segments as suitable for designation as a Wild and Scenic River. Suitability determinations would not be made for any of the 15 eligible river segments; they would remain eligible and would be managed on a case-by-case basis to protect their outstandingly remarkable values, free-flowing nature, and tentative classification to the degree that the BLM has authority (BLM lands within the corridor) until such time as suitability determinations are made. Protective management would apply to BLM lands along eligible river segments with 7,680 acres of river corridor (39 miles) tentatively classified as “wild,” 0 acres as “scenic,” and 1,550 acres (7 miles) as “recreational.”
- Continue the existing Water Canyon/South Fork Indian Canyon ACEC designation and management as an ACEC (220 acres); designate no additional areas as an ACEC.
- Manage no areas as a special recreation management area (SRMA), although the area surrounding the Coral Pink Sand Dunes would receive considerable management attention.
- Manage OHV use according to the five LUPs and two travel restriction orders:
 - 466,600 acres open to cross-country OHV use
 - 21,200 acres closed to OHV use
 - 66,200 acres of limited OHV use, with 55 miles of designated routes and 2 miles of routes closed seasonally.
- Manage visual resources to preserve the existing character of the landscape (Visual Resource Management [VRM] Class I) in the portions of the Paria Canyon-Vermilion Cliffs Wilderness Area in the decision area. VRM Classes:

- VRM Class I: 21,200 acres
- VRM Class II: 99,900 acres
- VRM Class III: 68,600 acres
- VRM Class IV: 321,800 acres
- Unknown/no VRM Class: 42,500 acres.
- Require no prescriptions specifically to maintain non-wilderness study area (WSA) lands with wilderness characteristics (WC areas).

2.1.2 Alternative B (Preferred)

Alternative B is the BLM's preferred alternative. It provides opportunities to use and develop resources within the decision area while ensuring resource protection. Alternative B would provide for continued access to and development of resources with stipulations and mitigation to protect natural and cultural resources. Key resource decisions on public lands within the decision area include the following:

- Oil and gas leasing:
 - 48 percent open to oil and gas leasing subject to the standard terms and conditions of the lease form
 - 28 percent open to oil and gas leasing subject to moderate constraints (timing limitations, CSU, lease notices)
 - 10 percent open to oil and gas leasing subject to major constraints (NSO)
 - 14 percent closed to leasing.
- Limit vegetation treatments (e.g., wildlife habitat treatments, watershed treatments, livestock rangeland treatments, wildland fires, fuels treatments, and stewardship contracting) to an annual average of no more than 22,300 acres. Sagebrush steppe communities would be managed to restore natural disturbance processes with an appropriate pinyon-juniper component for a given ecological site. Ponderosa pine stands would be managed to restore natural disturbance processes through treatments, resulting in predominantly park-like stands.
- Reallocate 48 animal unit months (AUM) on the Water Canyon Allotment to wildlife for the life of the plan. Combine the Lydia's Canyon Allotment with the Lydia Allotment, and combine the Sawmill Allotment with the South Canyon Allotment. The BLM would not be party to or accept any contingencies or conditions associated with a relinquishment that would require future BLM actions.
- Apply protective management to river corridors associated with seven suitable river segments, along 4,570 acres (25 miles) tentatively classified as "wild," 960 acres (5 miles) tentatively classified as "scenic," and 780 acres (3 miles) tentatively classified as "recreational."
- Designate and manage the potential Cottonwood Canyon ACEC (3,800 acres) as an ACEC; designate no additional areas as an ACEC.
- Identify seven SRMAs with 12 recreation management zones (RMZ) (125,800 acres):
 - Manage three RMZs specifically for motorized uses (21,700 acres)
 - Manage six RMZs specifically for non-motorized uses (44,900 acres)
 - Manage three RMZs for motorized and non-motorized uses (59,200 acres).
- Manage OHV use according to open, closed, or limited (seasonally and/or spatially) area and route designations as follows:
 - Approximately 1,100 acres open to cross-country OHV use
 - 28,900 acres closed to OHV use
 - 524,000 acres of limited OHV use, with 1,385 miles of designated routes, 2 miles of routes closed seasonally, and 118 miles of closed routes.
- Manage visual resources to preserve the existing character of the landscape (VRM Class I) in the portions of the Paria Canyon-Vermilion Cliffs Wilderness Area in the decision area, all the WSAs, and river corridors associated with "wild" suitable segments. VRM Classes:

- VRM Class I: 76,000 acres
- VRM Class II: 93,600 acres
- VRM Class III: 211,500 acres
- VRM Class IV: 172,900 acres.
- Require no prescriptions specifically to maintain WC areas.

2.1.3 Alternative C

Alternative C emphasizes the protection of the decision area's resource values while allowing commodity uses as consistent with current law, regulation, and policy. Management actions would emphasize resource values such as habitat for wildlife and plant species (including special status species), protection of riparian areas and water quality, preservation of ecologically significant areas, maintenance of wilderness characteristics, and protection of scientifically significant cultural and paleontological sites. Access to and development of resources within the decision area could occur with intensive management and mitigation of surface disturbing and disruptive activities. Key resource decisions on public lands within the decision area include the following:

- Oil and gas leasing:
 - 5 percent open to oil and gas leasing subject to the standard terms and conditions of the lease form
 - 49 percent open to oil and gas leasing subject to moderate constraints (timing limitations, CSU, lease notices)
 - 15 percent open to oil and gas leasing subject to major constraints (NSO)
 - 31 percent closed to leasing.
- Implement vegetation treatments (e.g., wildlife habitat treatments, watershed treatments, livestock rangeland treatments, wildland fires, fuels treatments, and stewardship contracting) on an annual average of at least 4,650 acres, but no more than 22,300 acres annually. Sagebrush steppe communities would be managed to restore natural disturbance processes with an appropriate pinyon-juniper component in a given ecological site. Ponderosa pine stands would be managed to restore natural disturbance processes through treatments, resulting in predominantly park-like stands.
- Suspend 88 AUMs on the Water Canyon, Lower North Fork, and Sawmill Allotments to livestock grazing for the life of the plan. The BLM would not be party to or accept any contingencies or conditions associated with a relinquishment that would require future BLM actions.
- Apply protective management to river corridors associated with the 15 suitable river segments, along 7,680 acres (39 miles) tentatively classified as “wild,” 0 acres (0 miles) tentatively classified as “scenic,” and 1,550 acres (7 miles) classified as “recreational.”
- Designate and manage all five areas with identified relevant and important values (potential Cottonwood Canyon, Welsh's Milkweed, Vermilion Cliffs, White Cliffs, and Parunuweap Canyon ACECs) as ACECs (60,600 acres).
- Identify seven SRMAs with 10 RMZs (129,050 acres):
 - Manage no RMZs specifically for motorized uses (0 acres)
 - Manage seven RMZs specifically for non-motorized uses (60,250 acres)
 - Manage three RMZs for both motorized and non-motorized uses (68,800 acres).
- Manage OHV use according to open, closed, or limited (seasonally and/or spatially) area and route designations as follows:
 - 0 acres open to cross-country OHV use
 - 165,700 acres closed to OHV use
 - 388,300 acres of limited OHV use, with 884 miles of designated routes, 306 miles of routes closed seasonally, and 315 miles of closed routes.

- Manage visual resources to preserve the existing character of the landscape (VRM Class I) on the portions of the Paria Canyon-Vermilion Cliffs Wilderness Area in the decision area, all the WSAs, the Orderville Canyon SRMA, and river corridors associated with “wild” suitable segments. VRM Classes:
 - VRM Class I: 168,300 acres
 - VRM Class II: 100,000 acres
 - VRM Class III: 128,300 acres
 - VRM Class IV: 157,400 acres.
- Manage the 10 WC areas (approximately 89,780 acres) to specifically maintain their wilderness characteristics.

2.1.4 Alternative D

Alternative D emphasizes opportunities to use and develop resources within the decision area. It would provide for motorized access and commodity production with minimal restrictions, while providing protection of natural and cultural resources to the extent required by law, regulation, and policy. This alternative would largely rely on existing laws, regulations, and policies, rather than special management or special designations, to protect sensitive resources. Key resource decisions on public lands within the decision area include the following:

- Oil and gas leasing:
 - 71 percent open to oil and gas leasing subject to the standard terms and conditions of the lease form
 - 12 percent open to oil and gas leasing subject to moderate constraints (timing limitations, CSU, lease notices)
 - 4 percent open to oil and gas leasing subject to major constraints (NSO)
 - 13 percent closed to leasing.
- Limit vegetation treatments (e.g., wildlife habitat treatments, watershed treatments, livestock rangeland treatments, wildland fires, fuels treatments, and stewardship contracting) to an annual average of no more than 22,300 acres. Sagebrush steppe communities would be managed to restore natural disturbance processes with an appropriate pinyon-juniper component for a given ecological site. Ponderosa pine stands would be managed to restore natural disturbance processes through treatments, resulting in predominantly park-like stands.
- Reallocate 40 AUMs on the Lower North Fork and Sawmill Allotments to wildlife for the life of the plan. The BLM would not be party to or accept any contingencies or conditions associated with a relinquishment that would require future BLM actions.
- Determine no eligible rivers or river segments as suitable for congressional WSR designation. Do not apply protective management to any acres within eligible river corridors.
- Do not designate or manage any areas with identified relevant and important values (existing or potential ACECs) as ACECs.
- Identify four SRMAs with seven RMZs (122,800 acres):
 - Manage three RMZs specifically for motorized uses (81,500 acres)
 - Manage three RMZs specifically for non-motorized uses (27,300 acres)
 - Manage one RMZ for motorized and non-motorized uses (14,000 acres).
- Manage OHV use according to open, closed, or limited (seasonally and/or spatially) area and route designations as follows:
 - Approximately 1,100 acres open to cross-country OHV use; in addition, ephemeral washes throughout the decision area would be open.
 - 27,600 acres closed to OHV use.
 - 525,300 acres of limited OHV use, with 1,462 miles of designated routes, 2 miles of routes closed seasonally, and 41 miles of closed routes.

- Manage visual resources to preserve the existing character of the landscape (VRM Class I) on the portions of the Paria Canyon-Vermilion Cliffs Wilderness Area in the decision area and all the WSAs. VRM Classes:
 - VRM Class I: 75,400 acres
 - VRM Class II: 59,900 acres
 - VRM Class III: 245,600 acres
 - VRM Class IV: 173,100 acres.
- Require no prescriptions specifically to maintain WC areas.

2.2 MANAGEMENT COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES

This section lists the RMP goals developed by the BLM with input from cooperating agencies and the public. This section also identifies the objectives and describes management decisions applicable to the decision area. Where management actions/use allocations overlap, the more restrictive action would be implemented. Decisions are organized by resources, resource uses, and special designations.

RMP Goals

- Manage public lands for multiple uses of public resources within the framework of applicable laws, regulations, and agency policies.
- Use adaptive management to meet resource objectives.
- Apply rangeland standards and guidelines to the decision area.
- Implement ecosystem management in an open, cooperative, responsive atmosphere to involve agencies, groups, and individuals in monitoring and addressing resource issues on public lands—issues that often span administrative and ownership boundaries.
- Maintain, improve, and restore (where needed) healthy ecosystems and habitat to support viable populations of fish, plants, and wildlife species while reducing habitat loss and fragmentation.
- Protect and enhance cultural and natural resources and values using the diversity of tools available to the BLM.
- Provide a variety of recreational, educational, and interpretive opportunities for people to experience public land resources and values.
- Reduce conflicts between uses and user groups.
- Enhance the viability of rural communities by providing commodities (e.g., mineral resource development, forest and woodland products, and grazing) and amenities (e.g., access, recreational opportunities, and Recreation and Public Purposes [R&PP] Act leases) within the capability of the ecosystem to sustain these uses.
- Recognize the unique cultural, historical, and social values of the decision area to develop a plan that manages the land and protects the heritage it engenders.

2.2.1 Resources

Air Quality

Objectives

- Maintain air quality in accordance with standards prescribed by federal and state laws and regulations.

Management Actions

Manage air quality in accordance with the air quality standards prescribed by federal, state, and local laws, regulations, and policies including the following:

- Applicable National Ambient Air Quality Standards
- Applicable National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants
- State or tribal implementation plans
- Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD), if applicable
- Conformity analyses and determinations
- Regional haze regulations, including visibility impacts on mandatory federal Class I areas
- Utah Smoke Management Plan.

Comply with the Clean Air Act through the application of the NEPA process on a case-by-case basis.

Comply with Utah Administrative Code Regulation R307-205, which prohibits the use, maintenance, or construction of roadways and disturbed areas without taking appropriate dust abatement measures. Compliance would be obtained through special stipulations as a requirement on new projects and through the use of dust abatement control techniques in problem areas.

Soil Resources

Objectives

- Maintain and/or restore overall watershed health and reduce erosion, stream sedimentation, and salinization of water, with particular emphasis on the Colorado River System.
- Soils would exhibit infiltration, permeability, and erosion rates appropriate for the soil type, climate, and landform.
- Maintain and restore areas of biological soil crust appropriate for the soil type, climate, and landform.
- Maintain or enhance soil stability, productivity, and infiltration to prevent accelerated erosion and to provide for optimal plant growth and the site's potential.

Management Actions

Maintaining Soil Resources

Implement best management practices (BMP) designed to minimize impacts on soils from ground disturbing activities, as appropriate (Appendix A).

Sensitive/Fragile Soils

Identify areas of “fragile soils” during preparation of project-level plans, as well as necessary mitigation measures to minimize risks and degradation.

Water Resources

Objectives

- Maintain and/or restore natural hydrologic functions of watersheds, including the capability to capture, store, and beneficially release water.
- Reduce flood-related damage to infrastructure and downstream private lands.

- Improve watershed conditions on eroding sites and on other sensitive watershed areas, such as riparian areas.
- Maintain and improve water quality to meet state standards for water quality in order to protect established beneficial uses.

Management Actions

Management of Water Quality and Watershed Health

Monitor water quality in coordination with the State Division of Water Quality to determine if progress toward meeting water quality standards and watershed objectives is being achieved.

Monitor the management activities to determine if progress toward meeting watershed objectives is being achieved. Make appropriate adjustments where and when necessary to ensure progress toward meeting the watershed objectives.

Implement BMPs designed to protect water quality for all ground disturbing activities (Appendix A).

Provide for the improvement and protection of water quality of the culinary water supply for Fredonia, Arizona, by limiting livestock grazing and OHV use above the legally approved water collection points for the city in Cottonwood and South Fork Indian Canyons.

Identify public water systems with surface water or ground-water sources (i.e., delineated drinking water source protection zones) that may be affected by BLM-authorized activities. Ensure that BLM-authorized activities do not pose a threat to public water systems.

Coordinate with local, state, tribal, and federal authorities on water- and riparian-related issues.

Implement BMPs designed to improve vegetation cover and reduce soil erosion for surface disturbing activities, especially with regard to sources of saline sediments in the Colorado River Basin (Appendix A). Coordinate with the Virgin River Management Plan Watershed Advisory Committee (and other applicable committees for other Colorado River tributaries) to reduce salinity.

Management of Water to Meet Resource Management Objectives

Cooperate with the State Division of Water Rights, and apply for State water rights to meet resource objectives, as necessary.

Water Resources and Discharge of Produced Waters from Energy Development Activities

Cooperate with the Utah Division of Water Quality; Utah Division of Oil, Gas, and Mining; and affected water users to address permitting requirements for any proposed treatment, surface discharge, or underground injection of water produced during mineral exploration and production (Utah Administrative Rule R649-5, Underground Injection Control of Recovery Operations and Class II Injection Wells).

Vegetation

Objectives

- A mosaic of non-invasive perennial and annual vegetation communities would be present across the landscape with diversity of species, canopy, density, and age class in accordance with ecological site potential.

- Protect, enhance, and/or restore ecological processes and functions by allowing tools that are necessary and appropriate to mitigate adverse impacts of allowable uses and undesirable disturbances and which contribute to meeting the *Utah Standards for Rangeland Health*.
- Sustain or reestablish the integrity of the sagebrush communities to provide the quantity, continuity, and quality of habitat necessary to maintain sustainable populations of Greater sage-grouse and other sagebrush obligate species.
- Manage rangelands to prevent net loss of properly functioning sagebrush steppe habitat.
- Contain or reduce invasive plant species from existing extent; prevent establishment of new invasive species through early detection and rapid response actions.
- Restore native species to meet desired plant community objectives where appropriate.
- Maintain health of ponderosa pine stands within the decision area.
- Maintain and/or restore riparian areas to proper functioning condition, or to making significant progress toward proper functioning condition, where BLM-managed or -authorized activities have been identified as contributing to riparian impairment.
- Ensure water availability for multiple-use management and functioning, healthy riparian and upland systems.

Management Actions

General Vegetation

Apply *Standards for Rangeland Health* to all rangelands.

Apply *Guidelines for Grazing Management for BLM Lands in Utah* (BLM 1997a) and *Guidelines for Recreation Management for Public Lands in Utah* (BLM no date) for maintenance and rehabilitation of rangelands.

Management of Riparian Areas

Maintain and/or enhance riparian areas (Utah Riparian Management Policy 2005) through project design features and/or stipulations that protect riparian resources.

Consult with water rights holders when rights-of-way (ROW) are renewed or amended to determine if water necessary to prevent riparian and aquatic degradation could be left in-stream through design or operation stipulations.

Analyze proposed new or amended ROWs for water diversions to determine the amount of water that must be retained to prevent riparian and aquatic degradation. Incorporate design and operation stipulations as necessary to protect riparian and aquatic resources.

Monitor riparian conditions, as needed, for any surface disturbing activity that could affect riparian areas.

Noxious Weeds and Invasive Species

Implement noxious weed and invasive species control actions as per national guidance and local weed management plans in cooperation with state and federal agencies, affected counties, adjoining private land owners, and other interests directly affected.

Special Status Species (Threatened, Endangered, and Sensitive)

Objectives

- Maintain, protect, and recover habitats of federally listed threatened, endangered, or candidate plant, animal, or fish species, and actively promote recovery to the point that provisions of the Endangered Species Act (ESA) are no longer required.
- Maintain, protect, and enhance habitats of the latest Utah BLM State Director's sensitive plant and animal species list to ensure that actions authorized or approved by the BLM are consistent with the conservation needs of the species and do not contribute to the need to list any species under the ESA.
- Cooperate with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and other agencies, such as Utah Division of Wildlife Resources (UDWR), in managing listed species and their habitat.
- Allow, initiate, and/or participate in scientific research of listed and sensitive species and their habitats.
- To the maximum extent possible, maintain habitat connectivity and avoid habitat fragmentation for special status plant and animal species.
- Develop and implement conservation measures to minimize long-term habitat fragmentation through avoidance and site-specific reclamation in order to provide the habitat quality and quantity to meet ecological requirements and support a natural diversity of species.

Management Actions

Special Status Species Conservation and Habitat Enhancement

Implement Recovery Plan, Conservation Agreement, and Strategy decisions to increase populations and improve habitat of special status species, including federally listed species, by enhancing, protecting, and restoring occupied and potential habitat.

Collaborate with the appropriate local, state, and federal agencies to promote public education on species at risk, their importance to the human and biological community, and reasons for protective measures that would be applied to the lands involved.

Develop and implement monitoring and conservation measures for listed and non-listed special status species and their habitats where land use and human disturbances have been identified as having potential for adverse impacts.

Incorporate USFWS references for listed species, designated critical habitat, down-listed or de-listed species, and non-listed special status species into management actions authorized within the decision area.

Work with the UDWR to implement the Utah Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy (UDWR 2005a) to coordinate management actions that would conserve native species and prevent the need for additional listings (WO IM 2006-114).

Apply lease notices (Appendix M) to leases being offered in special status species habitat.

Bald Eagles

Restrict activities or habitat alterations that may disturb nesting bald eagles from January 1 to August 31 within 1 mile of bald eagle nest sites.

Restrict activities or habitat alterations that may disturb bald eagles within ½ mile of known winter concentration areas from November 1 to March 31. In addition, where daily activities must occur within

these spatial buffers and are approved through subsequent consultation with USFWS, activities should be scheduled to occur after 9 a.m. and terminate at least 1 hour before official sunset to ensure that bald eagles using these roosts are allowed the opportunity to vacate their roost in the morning and return undisturbed in the evening.

Where activities are authorized within breeding habitats or known winter concentration areas, monitoring efforts would document what, if any, impacts occur during project implementation, and to what extent the species was affected. The results of these monitoring efforts would be carried forward in the design and implementation of future projects as part of the adaptive management process.

For all project-related survey and monitoring actions:

- Reports must be provided to the Kanab Field Office within 15 days of completion of survey or monitoring efforts. Reports must follow Kanab Field Office guidance for BLM-specified formats for written and automated databases.
- Any detection of bald eagle presence during survey or monitoring efforts must be reported to the authorized officer within 48 hours of detection.

Do not authorize future ground disturbing activities within ½ mile of active bald eagle nest sites year-round. Deviations may be made only after appropriate levels of consultation and coordination with USFWS.

Conduct surveys in suitable bald eagle nesting habitat or identified concentration areas in accordance with USFWS protocols prior to any activities that may disturb bald eagles. Surveys would be conducted only by BLM-approved individuals or personnel.

The BLM, in coordination with cooperating agencies and/or partners (e.g., UDWR, USFWS, etc.), shall verify annual status (active versus inactive) of all known bald eagle nests and other identified concentration areas within the decision area.

Implement conservation measures (Appendix M) on actions affecting bald eagles or their habitat.

Utah Prairie Dog

Surveys would be required prior to surface disturbance unless species occupancy and distribution information is complete and available. Surveys would be conducted by a BLM-approved biologist. In the event species occurrence is verified, the project proponent may be required to modify operational plans, at the discretion of the authorized officer, to include appropriate protection measures or practices for the minimization of impacts on the Utah prairie dog and its habitats.

The BLM would restrict surface disturbing activities in Utah prairie dog habitats when and where necessary, upon the recommendation of Kanab Field Office biologists to BLM management, and in coordination with USFWS where necessary.

Implement conservation measures (Appendix M) on actions affecting Utah prairie dogs or their habitat.

Mexican Spotted Owl

The BLM would place restrictions on all authorized (permitted) activities that may adversely affect the Mexican spotted owl (MSO) including protected activity centers (PAC), breeding habitat, and designated critical habitat.

Restrictions (from the Utah Field Office Guidelines for Raptor Protection from Human and Land Use Disturbances [Appendix B]) include:

- Surveys, according to USFWS protocol, would be required prior to any disturbance-related activities that have been identified as having the potential to impact MSOs, unless current species occupancy and distribution information is complete and available. All surveys must be conducted by USFWS-certified individuals and approved by the BLM authorized officer.
- Permit no surface disturbing activities or surface occupancy within ½ mile around MSO nests to protect the species from disturbance.
- Permit no surface disturbing activities from March 1 to August 31 in PACs, breeding habitats, or designated critical habitat to avoid disturbance to breeding MSOs.
- If a disruptive or surface disturbing action occurs entirely outside of the MSO breeding season (March 1 to August 31) and leaves no permanent structure or permanent habitat disturbance, the action may proceed without an occupancy survey. Land disposal actions would require breeding season surveys (see Lands and Realty alternative matrix).
- If disruptive actions would occur during the season restriction (March 1 to August 31), surveys according to USFWS protocol for MSOs would be required prior to commencement of activities. If MSOs are detected, activities should be delayed until after the seasonal restriction.

As a condition of approval (COA) on any project proposed within identified PACs, designated critical habitat, or within ½ mile of any MSO nests, ensure that project proponents are notified as to their responsibilities for rehabilitation of temporary access routes and other temporary surface disturbances created by their project, according to individual BLM Field Office standards and procedures or those determined in the project-specific Section 7 consultation.

The BLM would require monitoring of activities in designated critical habitat, identified PACs, or breeding habitats, wherein it has been determined that there is a potential for take. If any adverse impacts are observed to occur in a manner or to an extent that was not considered in the project-specific Section 7 consultation, then consultation must be reinitiated.

Monitoring results should document what, if any, impacts on individuals or habitat occur during project construction/implementation. In addition, monitoring should document successes or failures of any impact minimization or mitigation measures. Monitoring results would be considered an opportunity for adaptive management, and as such would be carried forward in the design and implementation of future projects.

For all survey and monitoring actions:

- Reports must be provided to the Kanab Field Office within 15 days of completion of survey or monitoring efforts.
- Any detection of MSOs during survey or monitoring activities would be reported to the authorized officer within 48 hours.

In areas of designated critical habitat, the BLM would ensure that any physical or biological factors of that habitat (i.e., the primary constituent elements), as identified in determining and designating such habitat, remain intact during implementation of any BLM-authorized activity.

Implement conservation measures (Appendix M) on actions affecting MSOs or their habitat.

Federally Listed and Candidate Plants

Surveys would be required prior to surface disturbance unless species presence and distribution information is complete and available. Surveys would be conducted by a BLM-approved botanist. In the event species presence is verified, the project proponent may be required to modify operational plans, at the discretion of the authorized officer, to include appropriate protection and/or avoidance measures or practices for the minimization of impacts on listed and candidate plants and their habitats.

Initiate Section 7 consultation with USFWS for any planned or authorized activity that is determined to have the potential to result in an impact on listed and candidate plants and their habitats.

Implement the Siler's pincushion cactus recovery plan.

Welsh's Milkweed

Prohibit motorized use in and through islands of vegetation in designated critical habitat for Welsh's milkweed (790 acres).

Implement applicable portions of the *Welsh's Milkweed (Asclepias welshii) Recovery Plan*. Consider new scientific information obtained since completion of the recovery plan. Include this information and management guidance in a joint management plan to be prepared by the BLM and the State of Utah.

Close approximately 790 acres of designated critical milkweed habitat on the BLM-administered portion of the sand dunes to OHV use.

Coral Pink Sand Dunes Tiger Beetle

Implement the conservation actions identified in the *Conservation Agreement and Strategy for the Coral Pink Sand Dunes Tiger Beetle*, as amended.

Maintain the established 370-acre tiger beetle conservation area on BLM-administered lands in the northeast corner of the sand dunes.

Western Yellow-Billed Cuckoo and Southwestern Willow Flycatcher

Surveys would be required prior to operations that "may adversely affect" Southwestern willow flycatcher habitat unless species occupancy and distribution information is complete and available. Only a BLM-approved individual should conduct such surveys. In the event species occurrence is verified, the proponent may be required to modify operational plans, at the discretion of the authorized officer, to include appropriate measures for minimization of affects on the Southwestern willow flycatcher and its habitats.

The BLM would monitor and restrict, when and where necessary, authorized or casual use activities that "may adversely affect" Southwestern willow flycatcher, including but not limited to recreation, mining, and oil and gas activities. Monitoring results should be considered in the design and implementation of future projects.

To monitor the impacts of BLM-authorized projects determined "likely to adversely affect" Southwestern willow flycatcher, the BLM would prepare a report describing the progress, including success of the implementation of all associated mitigation. A report shall be submitted annually to the USFWS Utah Field Office by March 1 beginning 1 full year from date of implementation of the proposed action. The report shall list and describe the following:

- Any unforeseen adverse effects resulting from activities of each site-specific project (may also require re-initiation of formal consultation)
- When, and if, any level of anticipated incidental take is approached (as allowed by separate Incidental Take Statements of site-specific formal Section 7 consultation efforts)
- When, or if, the level of anticipated take (as allowed by separate Incidental Take Statements from site-specific formal consultations) is exceeded
- Results of annual, periodic monitoring that evaluate the effectiveness of the reasonable and prudent measures or terms and conditions of the site-specific consultation.

Implement conservation measures (Appendix M) on actions affecting Southwestern willow flycatcher or its habitat.

Management of Greater Sage-Grouse Habitat

Implement the UDWR Sage-Grouse Strategic Management Plan, BLM National Sage-Grouse Habitat Conservation Strategy, and recommendations from local sage-grouse working groups to protect, maintain, or enhance current Greater sage-grouse populations and habitat.

Recovery Plan Actions for Special Status Species

Consider and implement the appropriate guidelines and management recommendations presented in current and future species recovery or conservation plans (as revised), or alternative management strategies developed in consultation with USFWS and/or UDWR.

Fish and Wildlife

Objectives

- Maintain habitat quantity and quality (forage, water, cover, space, and security) sufficient to sustain diverse wildlife populations, meeting objectives identified in cooperation with UDWR where applicable.
- Maintain and/or improve aquatic stream habitat to support productive and diverse fisheries and other aquatic populations.
- Maintain habitat connectivity and unrestricted wildlife movement between ecological zones to the maximum extent possible.
- Maintain and enhance aquatic and wildlife resources and provide for biological diversity of plants and wildlife resources while ensuring healthy ecosystems.
- Manage habitats on an ecosystem basis, ensuring that all parts of the ecosystem on public lands are preserved.
- Conserve habitat for migratory birds as directed by Executive Order 13186 (Responsibilities of Federal Agencies to Protect Migratory Birds) and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and emphasize management of migratory birds listed on the USFWS current list of Birds of Conservation Concern (BCC) and the Partners-in-Flight (PIF) priority species.

Management Actions

Important Wildlife and Fish Habitat

Consider the USFWS BCC and the Utah PIF Priority Species to identify and conserve priority nesting habitats for migratory birds.

Use *Best Management Practices for Raptors and Their Associated Habitats in Utah* (Appendix B) to guide raptor management, using seasonal and spatial buffers and mitigation to maintain and enhance raptor nesting, foraging, and roosting habitat while allowing other resource uses to occur.

Work cooperatively with other agencies, such as UDWR or Utah Partners for Conservation and Development, to identify and manage habitat for non-listed fish and wildlife species.

Allow, initiate, and/or participate in scientific research of species and their habitats.

Complete and assist with inventories and map current occupied and potential habitats for species.

Conduct habitat improvement treatments for species in accordance with current species-specific guidelines and local working group prescriptions.

Prioritize Bird Habitat Conservation Areas (BHCA) identified in the *Coordinated Implementation Plan for Bird Conservation in Utah* (IWJV 2005, as updated) for conducting bird habitat conservation projects through cooperative funding initiatives such as the Intermountain West Joint Venture.

Coordinate predator management with U.S. Department of Agriculture Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service/Wildlife Services and UDWR in accordance with the guidance provided in the existing Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service/Wildlife Services.

Management of Habitat to Provide for Wildlife Management Objectives as Established by UDWR

Require wildlife passable fences, consistent with the species found in the area, and essential for effective range management or other administrative functions.

Continue to work with UDWR and conservation organizations to establish additional water developments, subject to NEPA consideration, and maintain existing water developments to improve wildlife distribution and encourage habitat use by native wildlife species and introduced non-native species.

Wildland Fire Ecology

Objectives

- Firefighter and public safety would be the primary goal in all fire management decisions and actions.
- Wildland fire would be used to protect, maintain, and enhance resources and, when possible, be allowed to function in its natural ecological role.
- Hazardous fuels would be reduced to restore ecosystems; protect human, natural, and cultural resources; and reduce the threat of wildfire to communities.
- Fires would be suppressed at minimum cost, taking into account firefighter and public safety and benefits and values to be protected, consistent with resource objectives.
- The BLM would provide a consistent, safe, and cost-effective fire management program through appropriate planning (50 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] 402, Counterpart Regulations), staffing, training, equipment, and management.
- Every area with burnable vegetation would have a Fire Management Plan (FMP) based on a foundation of sound science.
- Emergency stabilization, rehabilitation, and restoration efforts would be undertaken to protect and sustain resources, public health and safety, and community infrastructure.

- The BLM would work together with its partners and other affected groups and individuals to reduce risks to communities and restore ecosystems.
- The general Desired Wildland Fire Condition (DWFC) is to have ecosystems that are at a low risk of losing ecosystem components following wildfire, and that function within their historical range. In terms of Fire Regime Condition Class (FRCC), the DWFC outside Wildland-Urban Interface (WUI) is to trend to a lower FRCC using the least intrusive methods possible. In other words, the DWFC is to move lands in FRCC 3 to FRCC 2 and lands in FRCC 2 to FRCC 1 through fire and non-fire treatments where wildland fire use is the preferred method of treatment, when feasible. Inside the WUI, the general DWFC is to have less potential for values to be threatened by wildland fire, usually through some modification of fuels. Table 2-1 identifies DWFC by major vegetation type and actions needed to meet DWFC.

Table 2-1. DWFC by Major Vegetation Group and Actions Needed to Meet DWFC

Major Vegetation Group	DWFC and Actions Needed to Meet DWFC
Salt Desert Scrub	<p>The DWFC, both outside and inside the WUI, is native, open salt desert scrub vegetation with little to no invasive species cover. Fire would be mostly excluded from these vegetation types. Due to the historical lack of surface fuels, the historical fire-return interval is extremely infrequent.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Due to the historical lack of fire and current potential for cheatgrass invasion, do not allow wildland fire to burn into salt desert scrub vegetation types. Wildland fire is not desired due to the high potential for cheatgrass invasion following wildfire and loss of native salt desert scrub communities. • Treat salt desert scrub types using a combination of mechanical, chemical, seeding, and biological treatments to reduce cheatgrass cover and restore native communities. Prescribed fire may be used in conjunction with seeding when part of a cheatgrass control objective. • Due to the high incidence of cheatgrass in this vegetation type, consider seeding following any surface disturbing activity. • Following wildland fire, aggressively seed to reduce potential for cheatgrass and other noxious weed invasion.
Pinyon-Juniper Woodland	<p>Where pinyon and juniper occurred historically, the DWFC outside and inside the WUI is open stands of pinyon and juniper with native grass and shrub understory. Where pinyon and juniper did not occur historically, the DWFC is the native shrub, grass, and forest communities that the pinyon and juniper have invaded. The historical role of fire (estimated 15- to 50-year fire-return interval) prevented encroachment of pinyon and juniper into other vegetation communities. Most pinyon and juniper encroachment has occurred in the past 100 years. Follow treatments with seeding in FRCC 2 and FRCC 3 stands that lack native understory vegetation. Historical occurrence of pinyon and juniper is difficult to map, but pre-settlement trees are generally located in shallow, rocky soils and tend to have unique growth form characterized by rounded, spreading canopies; large basal branches; large irregular trunks; and furrowed fibrous bark. Historic fire-return intervals in these protected sites are more than 100 years.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When possible, allow wildland fire to play its natural role, which mimics the historical fire-return interval and severity in FRCC 1 and FRCC 2 lands that have some cover of native understory vegetation. Due to the high risk of losing key ecosystem components in FRCC 2 (lacking native understory vegetation) and FRCC 3 lands, avoid wildland fires in these areas. Prescribed fires should be applied to pinyon and juniper communities when native surface fuels will carry fire and when there is low risk of invasive species. • Prescribed fire should be used to approximate historical fire-return intervals and promote recovery of the pre-settlement vegetation cover types. Remove most young (less than 100 years old) pinyon and juniper trees through fire or mechanical treatments. In the WUI, construct fuel breaks between BLM and

Major Vegetation Group	DWFC and Actions Needed to Meet DWFC
	<p>private land or other values at risk.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Following wildfire in FRCC 3 (and some FRCC 2 areas that are lacking native understory vegetation), aggressively seed to reduce invasive species establishment and to restore native communities.
Sagebrush	<p>The DWFC, outside and inside the WUI, is healthy sagebrush defined as diverse age classes with an understory of native grasses and forbs. Research suggests that stand-replacement should be burned every 10 to 100 years depending on the particular sagebrush species and its associated habitat. Fire management actions in sagebrush must be carefully balanced between invasive species concerns, wildlife habitat, and the need to restore fire.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When possible, allow wildland fire to play its natural role, which mimics the historical fire-return interval and severity in FRCC 1 and FRCC 2 lands that have a low potential for cheatgrass invasion. Areas with low potential for cheatgrass invasion include higher elevation sites and/or sites that have very low incidence of cheatgrass pre-fire. • Treat dense sagebrush (more than 30%) with fire, mechanical, or chemical treatments to reduce sagebrush canopy cover and improve native grass and forb density and cover; an additional objective in treating sagebrush is to remove encroaching pinyon and juniper trees. In the WUI, construct fuel breaks between BLM and private land (or other values at risk) in dense stands of sagebrush. • Following wildfire in FRCC 2 and FRCC 3 lands, aggressively seed to promote native understory grasses and forbs and reduce invasion of cheatgrass and noxious weeds. Consider including sagebrush in seeding mixes or planting sagebrush seedlings in high-value wildlife areas following large, high-severity wildfires when natural seed sources would be lacking.
Grassland	<p>Where native grasslands occurred historically, the DWFC outside the WUI is native grass and forb communities. Native grasslands have been lost to pinyon and juniper encroachment, cheatgrass invasion, and non-native plant seedlings (e.g., crested wheatgrass, perennial ryegrass, etc.). Where non-native grasslands occur, the DWFC is the restoration of the native grassland or shrub community. The historical role of fire in Utah’s grasslands is similar to pinyon and juniper and sagebrush community types with fires every 15 to 50 years.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When possible, allow fire to play its natural role, which mimics the historical fire-return interval and severity. • Treat native grasslands with fire, mechanical, or chemical treatments to reduce encroaching trees (mainly juniper), shrubs, and invasive plants. Fire treatments alone should be avoided where there is potential for cheatgrass invasion (areas below 7,000 feet elevation that have adjacent cheatgrass populations). In the WUI, consider green stripping between BLM and private lands and other values risk. • Following wildfire in FRCC 2 and FRCC 3 lands, aggressively seed to reduce potential for cheatgrass and other invasive weeds.
Mountain Shrub	<p>The DWFC outside of the WUI is stands with patches of differing age classes. In the WUI, the DWFC is greatly reduced vegetation density or a conversion to less-flammable vegetation between BLM and private lands or other values at risk.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When possible, allow fire to play its natural role, which mimics the historical fire-return interval and severity in all FRCCs. • Treat large expanses of even-aged, dense, homogeneous stands to result in patches of diverse age classes. To achieve greater habitat diversity and decreased potential for large-scale high-severity fire, reduce invasion of pinyon and juniper and reduce the average age of stands through fire, mechanical, or biological (e.g., grazing goats) treatments. In the WUI, consider aggressive vegetation manipulation to create fire breaks in highly flammable shrub types (e.g., Gambel oak) when there are values at risk.

Major Vegetation Group	DWFC and Actions Needed to Meet DWFC
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Because most of these species sprout following wildfire, consider seeding only to reduce potential for invasive weeds.
Mixed Conifer	<p>The DWFC outside the WUI is landscapes with a mosaic of age classes. In the WUI, the DWFC is reduced canopy density and reduced ladder fuels between BLM and private lands and other values at risk.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> When possible, allow fire to play its natural role, which mimics the historical fire-return interval and severity in FRCC 1 and FRCC 2 stands. In FRCC 3 stands (dense stands with high fuels loadings), consider mechanical treatments prior to reintroducing fire. Treat areas to result in a landscape of diverse age classes while retaining patches of large old trees. In the WUI, remove ladder fuels and create shaded fuel breaks between BLM and private land when values are at risk. Consider tree planting following wildland fire to restore or rehabilitate the forest resource to promote forest regeneration.
Ponderosa Pine	<p>The DWFC, outside and inside the WUI, is open stands with a native grass and forb understory.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> When possible, allow fire to play its natural role, which mimics the historical fire-return interval and severity. Restore fire (natural or prescribed fire) to FRCC 1 and FRCC 2 stands. Consider mechanical treatments in dense FRCC 3 stands until they reach a lower FRCC before restoring fire. Reduce juniper encroachment through fire (preferred when fuels conditions allow) or mechanical treatments. In the WUI, remove ladder fuels and create fuel breaks between BLM and private land and other values at risk. Following wildfires, consider seeding to reduce invasive weeds and planting ponderosa pine seedlings for forest restoration and rehabilitation.
Riparian Wetland	<p>The DWFC, outside and inside the WUI, is riparian and wetland areas with the appropriate composition of native species (e.g., reduction of tamarisk and other invasive species).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> When possible, allow fire to play its natural role, mimicking the historical fire-return interval and intensity. Allow low to moderate severity fire to burn into riparian and wetland areas when natural ignitions are managed as wildland fire use. Restore native riparian and wetland species through fire and mechanical treatments. Reduce flammable invasive species along riparian corridors (e.g., tamarisk) through mechanical, chemical, biological, and fire treatments. For prescribed fire, allow low-intensity fire to back into riparian and wetland areas through ignition outside of these areas. Mechanical treatment as the initial treatment would be emphasized where there is a moderate to high potential for riparian and wetland to be burned to a high severity. Consider active restoration options when native riparian and wetland communities are unlikely to recover with passive restoration (due to invasive species, stream bank erosion, etc.).
Aspen	<p>The DWFC, outside and inside the WUI, is healthy clones with diverse age classes represented and ample regeneration.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> When possible, allow fire to play its natural role, mimicking the historical fire-return interval and severity in all FRCC, because aspen readily sprouts following fire. Treat aspen stands with fire or mechanical treatments to reduce encroaching junipers and conifers and to stimulate sprouting. If treated aspen stands are small, consider excluding big game and livestock until the regeneration can withstand grazing. In the WUI, consider increasing aspen cover if possible to create a shaded fuel break between private land (and other high-value areas) and the more flammable conifer trees on BLM land.

Major Vegetation Group	DWFC and Actions Needed to Meet DWFC
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Following wildfire, most aspen stands would need little stabilization, except soil stabilization on steep slopes. However, burned areas may need to be fenced to exclude wildlife and livestock until the regeneration can withstand grazing.

Source: BLM 2005c

Management Actions

Fire Management Strategies and Actions

The appropriate management response would be provided to all wildland fires, emphasizing firefighter and public safety and considering suppression costs, benefits, and values to be protected. The appropriate management response would be consistent with resource objectives, standards, and guidelines. Response to wildland fire would be based on ecological and social costs and benefits of the fire. The circumstances under which the fire occurs and the likely consequences to firefighter and public safety and welfare, natural and cultural resources, and values to be protected would dictate the appropriate management response to the fire. Fire Management Unit objectives (as included in the FMP) would further guide the appropriate management response.

Wildland fire would be used to protect, maintain, and enhance resources and, when possible, would be allowed to function in its natural ecological role. Areas where wildland fire use is appropriate and not appropriate are identified in Table 2-1. The FMPs would provide further operational guidance for wildland fire use.

To reduce risks and to restore ecosystems, the following fuels management tools would be allowed: wildland fire use; prescribed fire; and mechanical, chemical, seeding, and biological actions. As conditions allow, the BLM would employ the least intrusive method over more intrusive methods. For example, wildland fire use is the preferred method of treatment. Where wildland fire use is not feasible, prescribed burning would be the preferred method. Where prescribed burning is not feasible, non-fire fuels treatments would become the preferred method of treatment.

Work with partners in the WUI in wildland firefighting, hazardous fuels reduction, cooperative fire prevention education, and technical assistance. Unauthorized wildland fire ignitions would be prevented through coordination with partners and affected groups and individuals. The full range of prevention and mitigation activities would be used: personal contacts, mass media, education programs, and signage.

The following Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation actions (after wildfire suppression) and restoration for planned actions may be used to reduce potential for soil erosion and invasive species spread: seeding or planting native and/or non-native species; applying approved herbicides; implementing soil stabilization measures (e.g., stabilization structures and mulches); protecting cultural resources; repairing or replacing facilities; fencing, herding, or removing livestock; and resting allotments. Specific actions could include brush/tree chopping; contour tree felling; silt catchments; waddles, straw, or fabric silt traps; mulching; drill seeding; aerial seeding; aerial seeding followed by mechanical seed covering (chaining, harrowing, or other mechanical means); planting seedlings; fence construction or rebuilding; road/trail maintenance or closures; cattle guards; road culvert installation or cleaning; water bars; sign installation and maintenance; herbicidal or mechanical weed treatments; weather station installation and maintenance; and repairing or rebuilding of minor facilities (cross-fencing, wildlife structures, recreational facilities).

Monitoring actions would be undertaken to determine results from fire management decisions and actions. Monitoring results would be used in determining the need for further amendment or revisions.

Wildland Fire Suppression Objectives and Management Actions

Fires would be suppressed at minimum cost, considering firefighter and public safety, benefits, and values to be protected, consistent with resource objectives.

The BLM would provide a consistent, safe, and cost-effective fire management program through appropriate planning, staffing, training, equipment, and management.

Limited Suppression and Wildland Fire Use Objectives and Actions

Wildland fire would be used to protect, maintain, and enhance resources and, when possible, would be allowed to function in its natural ecological role. However, due to resource conditions and proximity to values at risk, fire cannot be allowed to resume its natural role on public lands. The DWFC is that as lands are transitioned from a higher FRCC to a lower FRCC, the applicability of wildland fire use would increase. Therefore, fire managers would periodically assess FRCC following changes in vegetation due to management actions and natural changes. This alternative authorizes wildland fire use as a tool, when appropriate, to reach the DWFC.

Wildland fire use would be an appropriate management response to naturally ignited wildland fires to accomplish specific resource management objectives in predefined designated areas. Operational management of wildland fire use is described in the Wildland Fire Implementation Plan. This alternative attempts to in general clarify the types of areas that are not suitable for wildland fire use while leaving other areas open for possible wildland fire use.

Although specific areas for wildland fires use would be identified in the FMPs, wildland fire use may be authorized for all areas, except when the following resources and values may be negatively impacted and there are no reasonable Resource Protection Measures to protect such resources and values:

- WUI areas
- Areas that are known to be highly susceptible to post-fire cheatgrass or invasive weed invasion
- Important terrestrial and aquatic habitats
- Non-fire adapted vegetation communities
- Sensitive cultural resources
- Areas of soil with high or very high erosion hazard
- Class I air-shed areas and particulate matter (less than 10 microns in diameter) (PM₁₀) non-attainment areas
- Administrative sites
- Developed recreation sites
- Communication sites
- Oil, gas, and mining facilities
- Above-ground utility corridors
- High-use travel corridors, such as interstates, railroads, and/or highways.

The appropriate management response for areas containing these resources or values may be wildland fire use, but Resource Protection Measures would be necessary to protect these values if they are threatened. Additional protection actions may include employing strategies and tactics to avoid these values (e.g., using fire retardant to reduce fire spread in certain areas). In fire situations where these resources or values would not be impacted, wildland fire use may still not be employed due to other parameters (weather, personnel availability, etc.). In these situations, the appropriate management response—from

aggressive initial action to monitoring—would be used. The DWFC would be to restore fire to ecosystems when feasible; therefore, fuel treatments should focus on protecting the resources and values listed above so future wildland fire use actions could be more easily implemented.

Current BLM regulations do not allow for funding of emergency stabilization or rehabilitation actions following wildland fire use. Utah BLM land managers often prefer to evaluate a fire after it occurs to determine if there is a need for any post-fire rehabilitation or stabilization. The inability to rehabilitate or stabilize burned areas following wildland fire use restricts some acres from being considered by BLM managers for wildland fire use.

Prescribed Fire Objectives and Actions

All prescribed fire acres would be for a primary purpose of hazardous fuels reduction or community protection from fires. While these acres would likely also accomplish other resource objectives, this plan aims to directly analyze effects from fire management decisions.

Non-Fire Fuels Objectives and Actions

All non-fire treatment acres would be for a primary purpose of hazardous fuels reduction or community protection from fires. While these acres would likely also accomplish other resource objectives, this plan aims to directly analyze effects from fire management decisions.

Criteria for Establishing Fire Management Priorities

Protection of human life is the primary priority. Setting priorities among protecting human communities and community infrastructure, other property and improvements, and natural and cultural resources would be based on human health and safety, the values to be protected, and the costs of protection. Priorities for all aspects of fire management decisions and actions would be based on the following:

- WUI
- Maintain existing healthy ecosystems
- High priority sub-basin (Hydrologic Unit Code [HUC] 4) or watershed (HUC 5)
- Special status species
- Cultural resources and cultural landscapes.

Resource Protection Measures for Fire Management Practices

Resource Protection Measures for fire management practices to protect natural or cultural resource values are described in Appendix L (obtained from the Utah Land Use Plan Amendment for Fire and Fuels Management Finding of No Significant Impact and Decision Record, Table 2.3).

Cultural Resources

Objectives

- Identify, preserve, and protect significant cultural resources and ensure that they are available for appropriate uses by present and future generations (Federal Land Policy and Management Act [FLPMA], Sections 103(c), 201(a) and (c); National Historic Preservation Act [NHPA], Section 110(a); Archaeological Resources Protection Act, Section 14(a)).
- Seek to reduce imminent threats and resolve potential conflicts from natural or human-caused deterioration, or potential conflict with other resource uses (FLPMA Section 103(c); NHPA Sections 106 and 110(a)(2)) by ensuring that all authorizations for land use and resource use would comply with NHPA Section 106.

- Provide opportunities for scientific and educational uses of cultural resource sites. Interpretation of and education about previous human occupation and use of the area would be accomplished using appropriate sites and methods.
- Provide opportunities for traditional (Native American) uses of cultural resources and sites.
- Ensure compliance with Native American Grave Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA).

Management Actions

Protection of Cultural Resources

Mitigate adverse impacts on cultural resources resulting from authorized surface disturbing activities.

Mitigate and/or preserve cultural and historic values on cultural properties eligible for National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) listing.

Meet responsibilities under the NHPA as addressed in the State Protocol Agreement Between the Utah State Director of BLM and the Utah State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) and the National Cultural Programmatic Agreement.

Complete cultural resources inventories prior to allowing permitted surface disturbing activities, excluding those areas and circumstances identified in BLM-M-8110.23, UT-BLM-H-8110 Section II.C, and UT-BLM-H-8110 Appendix 1.

Continue geographic and archaeological scientific inventories based on imminent threats from natural or human-caused deterioration, potential conflict with other resource uses, and for compliance with NHPA Section 110.

Update the Class I cultural resources inventory every 10 years.

Provide opportunities for local interpretation (for local population) of cultural resources and public education (for general resource users).

Use proactive research; protection; and inventories involving universities, avocational and service groups, site stewards, tribes, and community outreach to gain a better understanding of cultural resources and preserve them for present and future study and use.

Areas and Values of Importance to Native American Tribes

Identify and manage traditional cultural properties in coordination with Native American tribes.

Work with Native American tribes to ensure compliance with NAGPRA, when needed.

Paleontological Resources

Objectives

- Protect scientifically significant paleontological resources.
- Protect paleontological resources with exceptional historic, cultural, or interpretive significance.
- Provide opportunities for scientific, educational, and recreational uses of paleontological resources.
- Cooperate with other federal, state and local agencies in paleontological resources management activities.

Management Actions

Protection of Paleontological Resources

Monitor the highest priority scientifically significant paleontological sites for trend and condition.

Management of Scientific, Traditional, Educational, Public, and Research Paleontological Resource Values

Provide opportunities for local interpretation of paleontological resources.

Visual Resources

Objectives

- Plan, modify, and implement resource management activities in a manner that would minimize impacts on visual resources.
- Manage the diversity of landscapes in the decision area for a desired level of change consistent with and giving consideration to other resource values and uses.

Management Actions

There are no visual resource management actions common to all alternatives.

Non-WSA Lands with Wilderness Characteristics

Objectives

- Maintain wilderness characteristics (appearance of naturalness, outstanding opportunities for solitude, or primitive and unconfined recreation) of WC areas, as appropriate. Manage these primitive and backcountry landscapes for their undeveloped character and to provide opportunities for primitive recreational activities and experiences of solitude, as appropriate.

Management Actions

There are no WC area management actions common to all alternatives.

2.2.2 Resource Uses

Forestry and Woodland Products

Objectives

- Provide a sustainable supply of a variety of commercial and non-commercial forest and woodland products.

Management Actions

There are no forestry and woodland product management actions common to all alternatives.

Livestock Grazing

Allotments in the decision area that are managed under the Escalante and Paria Management Framework Plans (MFPs) will be addressed by the Rangeland Health EIS being prepared by Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument (GSENM).

Objectives

- Maintain or restore healthy, sustainable rangeland ecosystems to meet Utah's *Standards for Rangeland Health* and to produce a wide range of public values such as wildlife habitat, livestock forage, recreation opportunities, clean water, and functional watersheds.
- Integrate livestock use and associated management practices with other multiple-use needs and objectives to maintain, protect, and improve rangeland health.
- Reduce or eliminate livestock-related rangeland resource problems on all allotments not meeting rangeland health standards while maintaining a production goal of livestock forage in the long term.

Management Actions

Manage livestock grazing allotments within the decision area as available for livestock grazing.

Forage Allocation

Use an interdisciplinary allotment evaluation process to provide specific guidance and actions for managing livestock grazing.

Allocate long-term increases and decreases in forage on a case-by-case basis based on an allotment-specific analysis through the NEPA process.

Grazing Management Practices

Manage livestock grazing according to the Utah Guidelines for Grazing Management (BLM 1997a), implementing these guidelines when authorizing livestock grazing use and related activities.

Use livestock grazing to enhance ecosystem health and/or help accomplish resource objectives (e.g., noxious/invasive weed control and hazardous fuel reduction) on allotments where authorized by the authorized officer on a case-by-case basis.

Consider requests for changes in kind of livestock on a case-by-case basis (except as outlined below), and after review evaluate potential impacts on riparian and upland vegetation and other resource uses.

Allow motorized access to range improvements within WSAs according to the *Interim Management Policy for Lands Under Wilderness Review* (IMP).

Recreation

OHV and other transportation decisions are primarily included in the transportation management decisions.

Objectives

- Provide recreational activities in a variety of physical, social, and administrative settings, from primitive to near-urban, that allow visitors to have desired recreational experiences and enjoy the

resulting benefits.

- Provide for public health and safety through interpretation, facility development, and visitor management.
- Manage and protect recreational areas and resources containing significant scenic, natural, and cultural values as well as areas with scientific importance.
- Provide opportunities for visitor use and enjoyment of the area, consistent with resource capabilities and mandated resource requirements; provide for visitor education and interpretation of the recreational opportunities within the decision area.
- Maintain important recreational values and sites in federal ownership to ensure a continued diversity of recreation activities, experiences, and benefits.

Management Actions

General Recreation Management

Develop recreation sites and facilities needed to accommodate users, facilitate recreational uses of public lands, and protect resources.

Implement the necessary safety measures to protect visitors in the Coral Pink Sand Dunes/Moquith Mountain area through coordination between the BLM and the State of Utah. Emphasis would be placed on minimizing interaction between motorized and non-motorized uses on the sand dunes, as well as enforcement of existing state and federal laws and policies. The existing OHV trails adjacent to Hancock Road would be closed. BLM and State Park personnel would continue to cooperate with local authorities on law enforcement matters.

Regulate rock climbing within 300 feet of cultural sites. Climbing routes that impact cultural resource sites would generally not be allowed, and climbing routes designed to access cultural resource sites would not be allowed unless under permit for scientific investigation.

No person or persons should occupy one area on BLM lands within the decision area for longer than 14 consecutive days in any 28-day period; however, extensions beyond the 14-day length of stay could be authorized for permitted uses on a case-by-case basis. Any site on public land within 30 air miles constitutes the same area for the purpose of this management decision.

Transportation

Objectives

- Maintain access, where needed, to meet public and administrative needs including acquiring or maintaining necessary access across non-federal land.
- Compatible traditional, current, and future use of the land would be sustained by establishing a route system that contributes to protection of sensitive resources, accommodates a variety of uses, and minimizes user conflicts.
- Public access, resource management, and regulatory needs would be considered through transportation planning, incorporating consideration of access needs and the effects of and interaction among all forms of travel, including motorized, mechanized, and non-motorized/mechanized travel.
- Coordinate OHV management with adjacent BLM field offices and other agencies where possible.
- Provide opportunities for OHV use on public lands.

Management Actions

Revised Statute (RS) 2477

The RMP does not adjudicate, analyze, or otherwise determine the validity of the claimed ROWs. Update and adjust the transportation plan and elements of this RMP through plan maintenance as RS 2477 ROW assertions are acknowledged administratively or adjudicated by court decision.

Transportation System Management

Coordinate transportation planning with Kane and Garfield counties.

Lands and Realty

Objectives

- Make public lands available for community growth and expansion needs, recreation, and public purposes as well as other infrastructure needs.
- Strive to increase and diversify our Nation's sources of traditional and alternative energy resources, improve our energy transportation network, and ensure sound environmental management in support of minerals and energy development, as required by the President's National Energy Policy and the Energy Policy Act of 2005.
- Retain in public ownership public lands that enhance multiple-use management, allow access to public lands, or contain sensitive or rare resources.
- Acquire lands or interests in lands to complement existing resource values and uses.
- Consider for disposal lands or interests in lands that are difficult and uneconomic to manage as part of the public lands, are no longer needed for a federal purpose, or where disposal would serve important public objectives.
- Resolve any outstanding State Grant entitlements (quantity grants, in-lieu selections).
- Make public lands available for ROWs, permits, and leases. The suitability for these land actions would be judged on a case-by-case basis.
- Consider energy and utility corridors to focus placement of new major ROWs for energy and transportation systems.

Management Actions

Areas Recommended for Withdrawal

Request the cancellation of the Classification and Multiple Use Act of 1964 classifications segregating the following lands from all forms of appropriation including mineral location:

- Township 42 S, Range 7 W, Sec. 4, Lots 5, 6, 11, and 12 (140.05 acres)
- Township 43 S, Range 7 W, Sec. 7, NE¹/₄ (160 acres)
- Township 43 S, Range 7 W, Sec. 14, SE¹/₄ (160 acres)
- Township 43 S, Range 7 W, Sec. 17, NW¹/₄, SE¹/₄SE¹/₄ (200 acres)
- Township 43 S, Range 8 W, Sec. 13, NW¹/₄NW¹/₄ (40 acres)
- Township 43 S, Range 8 W, Sec. 14, NE¹/₄NE¹/₄ (40 acres).

The values for which these lands were classified would be reviewed and if they still warrant protection, specific protective withdrawals under FLPMA Section 203 would be obtained prior to the cancellation of the existing classifications.

Existing Withdrawals

Review existing withdrawals on a case-by-case basis. Determine whether the use is consistent with the intent of the withdrawal and whether the withdrawal should be continued, modified, revoked, or terminated.

Manage land becoming unencumbered by withdrawals in a manner consistent with adjacent or comparable public land within the planning area.

New Withdrawals

Limit the size of proposed withdrawals to the minimum acreage consistent with the demonstrated need.

Existing Classifications and Segregations

Review existing classifications and segregations on a case-by-case basis to determine whether the classification or segregation is appropriate and should be continued, modified, or terminated. A notice of termination and opening order would be published to notify the public when and to what extent the land will be opened, consistent with planning decisions. Land on which a classification or segregation has been terminated would be managed in a manner consistent with adjacent or comparable public land within the planning area.

Alternative Energy Resource Development (Wind Energy and Solar Energy Development)

Adopt programmatic policies and BMPs in the Wind Energy Development Program identified in Record of Decision for Implementation of a Wind Energy Development Program and Associated Land Use Plan Amendments (BLM 2005e).

Consider proposals for ROWs for wind and solar energy development throughout the decision area with the following exceptions:

- Designated wilderness
- WSAs
- ACECs
- Suitable WSR corridors.

Minerals and Energy

Objectives

- Provide opportunities for mineral exploration, development, and reclamation under the mining and mineral leasing laws (e.g., coal mining), subject to legal requirements to protect other resource values.
- Provide salable and free-use mineral materials to meet local demand through the case-by-case issuance of permits and sale contracts.
- Identify lands available for mineral leasing and development.

Management Actions

Oil and Gas Leasing

Close public lands or federal mineral estate within incorporated municipalities to mineral leasing in accordance with the Mineral Leasing Act (30 United States Code [U.S.C.] Section 181).

Exceptions, waivers, or modifications to stipulations on oil and gas leases and other surface disturbing activities may be considered on a case-by-case basis in accordance with Appendix C guidelines.

Manage the following sites as open to leasing subject to major constraints (NSO):

- Cemeteries
- Landfills, existing and closed
- Lands managed under R&PP Act leases
- Developed recreation sites
- Airports
- Federal facilities.

2.2.3 Special Designations

Areas of Critical Environmental Concern

Objectives

- Designate and manage as ACECs areas where special management attention is required to protect and prevent irreparable damage to important historic, cultural, or scenic values; protect fish and wildlife resources or other natural system or processes; or protect life and safety from natural hazards.

Management Actions

Areas of Critical Environmental Concern

Include stipulations for permitted actions within designated ACECs to ensure relevant and important values, resources, processes, systems, and hazards are protected or managed for.

Wild and Scenic Rivers

Objectives

- Preserve selected rivers, or segments of rivers, and their immediate environments in their free-flowing condition for the protection of their outstandingly remarkable values and for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations, giving consideration to other resource values and uses.

Management Actions

Wild and Scenic River Act Recommendations

Management to protect the river segments would be provided in the following ways:

Free-flowing values: The free-flowing characteristics of river segments would not be modified to allow stream impoundments, diversions, channelization, and/or rip-rapping to the extent the BLM is authorized under law.

Outstandingly Remarkable Values: Each river segment would be managed to protect identified outstandingly remarkable values and, to the extent practicable, such values would be enhanced.

Tentative Classification: Management and development of the river and its corridor would not be modified to the degree that its tentative classification would be affected. A river segment's tentative classification would not be changed due to modification from "wild" to "scenic" or from "scenic" to "recreational."

Protective management would apply to BLM lands within the river corridor, which does not exceed "more than 320 acres of land per mile measured from the ordinary high water mark on both sides of the river" (16 U.S.C. Section 1274(b)). The corridors may vary on either side of the river and be narrower or wider to protect outstandingly remarkable values, but the total corridor widths may not exceed 320 acres (half of a mile or 2,640 feet wide) per river mile.

Protective interim management of eligible or suitable rivers would not involve assertion of federal reserved water rights.

Manage rivers determined suitable for congressional designation into the National Wild and Scenic River System in a manner that would protect their outstandingly remarkable values, free-flowing nature, and tentative classification, in accordance with protective management for the river corridors in each alternative.

Wilderness

Objectives

- Manage for the long-term protection and preservation of the area's wilderness character under a principle of non-degradation. The area's natural condition; opportunities for solitude; opportunities for primitive and unconfined types of recreation; and any ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic, or historical value present would be managed so that they remain unimpaired.
- Manage designated wilderness for the use and enjoyment of visitors in a manner that leaves the area unimpaired for future use and enjoyment as wilderness. The wilderness resource would be a dominant factor in all management decisions where a choice must be made between preservation of wilderness character and visitor use.
- Manage designated wilderness using the minimum tools, equipment, and/or structures necessary to accomplish the objective successfully, safely, and economically. The chosen tools, equipment, or structures would be the ones that least degrade wilderness values temporarily or permanently. Management would seek to preserve spontaneity of use and as much freedom from regulation as possible.
- Manage non-conforming but accepted uses permitted by the Wilderness Act and subsequent laws in a manner that would prevent unnecessary or undue degradation of the area's wilderness character. Non-conforming uses are the exception rather than the rule; therefore, emphasis would be placed on maintaining wilderness character.

Management Actions

Management of the Paria Canyon-Vermilion Cliffs Wilderness

Manage the Paria Canyon-Vermilion Cliffs Wilderness cooperatively with Arizona BLM.

Implement the *Paria Canyon-Vermilion Cliffs Wilderness Management Plan*.

The wilderness character of the Paria Canyon-Vermilion Wilderness would be protected and enhanced.

Maintain the current group size and visitor use limits required for use in Paria Canyon, subject to adaptive management decisions deemed necessary through monitoring and evaluation of resources and social conditions.

Wilderness Study Areas

Objectives

- Manage WSAs in a manner that does not impair their suitability for designation as wilderness. Temporary uses that create no new surface disturbance nor involve permanent placement of structures may be allowed in WSAs.

Management Actions

WSA Management

Manage all WSAs according to the IMP (BLM Manual Handbook H-8550-1) until legislation is enacted to either designate the areas as wilderness or release them for uses other than wilderness.

Only Congress can release a WSA from wilderness consideration. Should any WSA, in part or in whole, be released from wilderness consideration, proposals in the released area would be examined on a case-by-case basis for consistency with the goals and objectives of other decisions within this RMP. Actions inconsistent with RMP goals and objectives would be deferred until completion of requisite plan amendments. Because the management direction of the released land would continue in accordance with the goals and objectives established in the RMP, there is no separate analysis required to address resources impacts if any WSAs are released.

Where routes are designated as open for motorized use within WSAs, such use would be subject to the condition that it not impair the area's wilderness suitability (as that concept is described in the IMP). The continued use of these routes is conditioned on non-impairment of wilderness suitability. If such use were to impair wilderness suitability, the BLM would take appropriate steps including use of restrictions or closures, installation of additional signs and barricades, and restoration of affected areas. Further, in the event Congress were to designate a WSA as wilderness, unless Congress specified that specific route(s) were to remain open to motorized use, all routes in the wilderness area would be closed to such use.

Other Designations

Objectives

- Coordinate management of National Scenic Byways, Utah Scenic Byways, and Utah Scenic Backways with other agencies and BLM offices, as appropriate.
- Consider impacts on other designations when evaluating all proposed projects.
- Promote the preservation and appreciation of the Old Spanish National Historical Trail for the enjoyment of the American people.

Management Actions

Old Spanish National Historic Trail

Work with the BLM and National Park Service planning team in the development of a comprehensive management plan for the National Historic Trail.

Prepare an Activity (Trail) Plan for the Old Spanish National Historic Trail to identify specific on-the-ground actions that would be taken to implement the goals and objectives of the Trail.

2.2.4 Social and Economic

Public Safety

Objectives

- The BLM would strive to ensure that human health and safety concerns on public lands remain a major priority.
- Hazardous or potentially hazardous sites and situations, including hazardous materials, hazardous or solid wastes, abandoned mine sites, abandoned well sites, and other potential hazards on public lands would be mitigated or eliminated.
- The potential for intentional or accidental releases of hazardous materials or wastes and solid wastes onto public lands would be minimized or eliminated.

Management Actions

Management of Abandoned Mine Lands

In conformance with the BLM's long-term strategies and national policies regarding Abandoned Mine Lands (AML), this RMP recognizes the need to work with our partners toward identifying and addressing physical safety and environmental hazards at all AML sites on public lands. To accomplish this long-term goal, the criteria discussed in the following paragraphs would be established to assist in determining priorities for site and area mitigation and reclamation.

The criteria that would be used to establish physical safety hazard program priorities are:

- The AML physical safety program's highest priority would be cleaning up those AML sites where (a) a death or injury has occurred; (b) the site is situated on or in immediate proximity to developed recreation sites and areas with high visitor use; and (c) upon formal risk assessment, a high or extremely high risk level is indicated.
- AML would be factored into future recreation management area designations, land use planning assessments, and all applicable use authorizations.
- The site is listed or is eligible for listing in the Abandoned Mine Site Cleanup Module of the Protection and Response Information System.
- AML hazards should be, to the extent practicable, mitigated or remediated on the ground during site development.

The criteria that would be used to establish water quality-based AML program priorities are:

- The site has identified the watershed as a priority based on (a) one or more water laws or regulations, (b) threat to public health or safety, and (c) threat to the environment.
- The project reflects a collaborative effort with other land management agencies.
- The site is listed or is eligible for listing in the Abandoned Mine Site Cleanup Module of the Protection and Response Information System.
- The project would be funded by contributions from collaborating agencies.

Maintain the State Multi-Year Work Plan and update as needed to reflect current policies for identifying program physical safety and water quality AML site priorities for reclamation and remediation.

2.2.5 Adaptive Management

Adaptive management is a formal, systematic, and flexible approach to learning from the results of management actions, accommodating change, and improving management. It involves synthesizing existing knowledge, exploring alternative actions, and making explicit forecasts about their results. Management actions and monitoring programs are carefully designed to generate reliable feedback and clarify the reasons underlying results. Actions and objectives are then adjusted based on this feedback and improved understanding in order to continue to try to achieve the desired outcomes. In addition, decisions, actions, and results are carefully documented and communicated to others, so that knowledge gained through experience is passed on rather than lost when individuals move or leave the organization.

Land use plan level decisions would not be immediately adaptable. These include the goals and objectives, allowable uses, management actions, and special designations. Plan amendments would be required to change these decisions. Implementation or activity-level decisions could be adapted. Future activity-level plans would follow NEPA procedures and involve the public.

This Draft RMP/EIS recommends an adaptive management strategy. This adaptive management process is flexible and generally involves four phases: planning, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation. As the BLM obtains new information, it is able to evaluate monitoring data and other resource information to periodically refine and update desired outcomes (goals and objectives), management actions, and allowable uses. This allows for the continual refinement and improvement of management prescriptions and practices.

2.3 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT NOT ANALYZED IN DETAIL

Several organizations and individuals provided components of alternatives and management actions as possible ways of resolving individual resource management issues and conflicts. However, none of the submittals address the purpose and need of this RMP revision or the multiple-use requirements as identified in the FLPMA. The submitted components were considered during alternative development; however, none provided the full range of decisions required by the purpose and need.

2.3.1 Vermilion Cliffs Heritage Plan

The Vermilion Cliffs Heritage Plan was developed and/or endorsed by a number of state and national organizations and was provided to the BLM during the public comment period. Vermilion Cliffs Heritage Plan, as presented, incorporated many timely issues and concerns that would be required of any balanced approach to managing public lands. Specifically, the plan identifies several points to be considered during the route designation process and identifying stipulations to be attached to oil and gas leases. The BLM gave careful consideration to the Vermilion Cliffs Heritage Plan, and incorporated parts of the plan into the range of RMP alternatives. While the Vermilion Cliffs Heritage Plan appears multiple-use in nature, it does not meet the purpose and need for the RMP revision because it does not address all resource values and uses that the BLM is required to manage on public lands.

2.3.2 Closing the Decision Area to Livestock Grazing

An alternative that proposes to close the entire decision area to livestock grazing would not meet the purposes and need of this Draft RMP/EIS. NEPA requires that agencies study, develop, and describe appropriate alternatives to recommended courses of action in any proposal that involves unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources. No issue or conflict has been identified

during this land use planning effort that requires the complete elimination of grazing within the decision area for its resolution. Where appropriate, closures and adjustments to livestock use have been incorporated into the alternatives on an allotment or area basis to address issues identified in the RMP. Because the BLM has considerable discretion through its grazing regulations to determine and adjust stocking levels, seasons of use, and grazing management activities and to allocate forage to uses of the public lands in RMPs, the analysis of an alternative to entirely eliminate grazing is not needed.

An alternative that proposes to close the entire decision area to grazing would also be inconsistent with the intent of the Taylor Grazing Act, which directs the BLM to provide for livestock use of BLM lands; adequately safeguard grazing privileges; provide for the orderly use, improvement, and development of the range; and stabilize the livestock industry dependent upon the public range.

FLPMA requires that public lands be managed on a “multiple use and sustained yield basis” (FLPMA Sections 302(a) and 102(7)) and includes livestock grazing as a principal or major use of public lands. While multiple use does not require that all lands be used for livestock grazing, complete removal of livestock grazing on the entire decision area would be arbitrary and would not meet the principle of multiple use and sustained yield.

Livestock grazing is and has been an important use of the public lands in the decision area for many years and is a continuing government program. Although the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) guidelines for compliance with NEPA require that agencies analyze the “No Action Alternative” in all EISs, for purposes of this NEPA analysis the “No Action Alternative” is to continue the status quo, which includes livestock grazing (CEQ Forty Most Asked Questions, Question 3). For this reason and those stated above, a no grazing alternative for the entire decision area has been dismissed from further consideration in this RMP.

2.4 ALTERNATIVE TABLES

Alternative A is based on the five LUPs and two travel restriction actions related to OHV use. The LUPs from which the decisions are derived is noted in the alternatives in superscript text associated with each decision or component of a decision. The following list notes the superscript numbers associated with each LUP (including all amendments associated with each plan):

1. Escalante MFP
2. Paria MFP
3. Vermilion MFP
4. Zion MFP
5. Cedar-Beaver-Garfield-Antimony (CBGA) RMP
6. Temporary Emergency Off-Road Vehicle Limitations
7. Notice of Travel Restriction and Seasonal Closure to OHVs.

Where allocations and management overlap, the more restrictive allocation/management action would be implemented. For example, a potential ACEC may have a NSO stipulation for oil and gas leasing in order to specifically protect the limited extent of identified relevant and important values, resources, systems, or hazards. In addition, there may an overlapping portion of a suitable WSR corridor ($\frac{1}{4}$ mile viewshed) that closes the area to oil and gas leasing. The oil and gas leasing map for the alternative with these two designations would show the overlapping portions as closed to oil and gas leasing.

2.4.1 Resources

Air Quality

Air Quality Management Actions			
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Air Quality			
No similar action.	Mitigate actions that compromise ambient air quality standards or visibility within the Class I air areas.		

Soil Resources

Soil Resources Management Actions			
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Maintaining Soil Resources			
Reduce soil loss on identified areas by performing land treatments, such as removing sagebrush, pinyon, and juniper trees by mechanical means followed by reseeding with grasses or forbs and/or removing sagebrush by spraying or burning and pinyon and juniper trees by cutting. ^{1,3,4}	Reduce soil loss on watersheds by performing appropriate land treatments (Map 2-3 and Map 2-4). Land treatments would be prioritized in the following fifth field watersheds. Upper Sevier River Watershed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pass Creek/Sevier River • City Creek/Sevier River • Bear Creek/Sevier River. Upper Virgin River/Kanab Creek Watersheds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Muddy Creek • Upper Kanab Creek • Skutumpah/Mill Creek. 		
No similar action.	Initiate reclamation of surface disturbances, where appropriate, during or upon completion of the authorized project.		
No similar action.	Close and reclaim temporary roads upon completion of the project that required the roads.		
No similar action.	Remove and reclaim facilities or improvements no longer necessary or desirable, provided no historic properties are affected.		
Sensitive/Fragile Soils			
No similar action.	Develop and implement site-specific restrictions and/or mitigations for activities proposed in fragile soil	Preclude surface disturbing activities in fragile soil areas unless long-term impacts on soil resources would be	Allow for activities in fragile (or sensitive) soil areas with appropriate mitigations to minimize impacts.

Soil Resources Management Actions			
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
	<p>areas on a case-by-case basis. Surface disturbing activities must be approved by the BLM before construction and maintenance would be authorized.</p> <p>Allow surface disturbance in fragile soil areas as long as impacts would be mitigated or disturbance would be beneficial to rangeland health.</p>	beneficial.	
Limit off-road vehicle use to existing roads and trails on areas identified as highly erodible, frail soils to minimize soil loss and salinity of water runoff. ³	Preclude cross-country OHV use in areas identified as fragile soils to minimize soil loss and salinity of water runoff.		
Do not allow any mechanical land treatments in these areas with frail watershed. ³	Allow land treatments (i.e., vegetation treatment and soil stabilization) in fragile soil areas where such treatment would reduce erosion and restore watersheds.		
Do not allow livestock grazing on treated areas for an initial period of two full growing seasons (April 1 through July 15). ⁴	Manage land uses according to the <i>Standards for Rangeland Health</i> to maintain or improve soil conditions.		
Incorporate erosion control measures into any developments for livestock, recreation, wildlife, and realty purposes that are done in frail watershed areas. ³	Incorporate BMPs and soil protection measures into developments on sensitive soils. Measures to stabilize soils and minimize surface water runoff would be required for slopes greater than 15 percent, both during project activities and following project completion.		
Continue to control wildfires on frail watersheds. ³	See fire decisions.		
A let wildfire burn policy on areas recommended to use burning as a land treatment would not be accepted on sandy soils that are highly susceptible to wind erosion. ⁴	See fire decisions.		

Water Resources

Water Resources Management Actions			
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Management of Water Quality and Watershed Health			
Reduce flood runoff from public land on 1,140 acres in the Muddy Creek drainage by performing land treatments. The exact number and type of treatments cannot be stated until a complete activity plan is completed for the area. ⁴	Improve watershed health by performing appropriate land treatments (Map 2-3 and Map 2-4). Land treatments would be prioritized in the following fifth field watersheds: Upper Sevier River Watershed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pass Creek/Sevier River • City Creek/Sevier River • Bear Creek/Sevier River. Upper Virgin River/Kanab Creek Watersheds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Muddy Creek • Upper Kanab Creek • Skutumpah/Mill Creek. 		
Prepare Watershed Management Plans for the Garfield planning unit. The management plan would provide for assessments of current information regarding significant erosion areas, groundwater, surface water, floodplains, salinity, municipal watersheds, the identification of data gaps, field inventories to verify existing data or fill in data gaps, and a ranking or prioritization of problem areas for activity planning purposes. ⁵	Continue to cooperatively implement the Upper Sevier Watershed Management Plan with the Upper Sevier Watershed Committee.		
No similar action.	Manage the Sevier River in accordance with the total maximum daily load (TMDL) and Upper Sevier River Watershed Management Plan.		
No similar action.	Avoid or minimize impacts on water quality through the application of specific mitigation measures identified in activity-level plans.		
No similar action.	Manage oil and gas leasing as open to leasing subject to moderate constraints to protect culinary water supply as directed by the Land Use Agreement for Kanab City Existing Wells in the following sections:	Manage oil and gas leasing as open subject to major constraints (NSO) to protect culinary water supply as directed by the Land Use Agreement for Kanab City Existing Wells in the following sections:	Same as Alternative B.

Water Resources Management Actions			
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • T 42 S R 6 W Sections 19, 31 • T 42 S R 7 W Sections 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 34, 35. <p>In these areas (1) oil and gas well placement would be relocated to eliminate potential contamination sources or pollution sources, and/or (2) design standards would be implemented to prevent contaminated discharges to ground water.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • T 42 S R 6 W Sections 19, 31 • T 42 S R 7 W Sections 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 34, 35. 	
Water Resources and Discharge of Produced Waters from Energy Development Activity			
No similar action.	Apply coalbed natural gas BMPs to preserve groundwater quality (Appendix A).		
No similar action.	Encourage treatment (as needed) and onsite or offsite beneficial use of produced water, so long as that water is of adequate quality and the rate of use does not cause adverse impacts on other resources. If treatment of produced water is not practical, require reinjection or offsite disposal.	Encourage treatment (as needed) and onsite beneficial use of produced water (e.g., aquifer recharge, enhanced streamflow, and livestock watering), so long as that water is of adequate quality and the rate of use does not cause adverse impacts on other resources. If treatment of produced water is not practical, require reinjection or offsite disposal.	Allow disposal of produced water in any manner approved by the State.
No similar action.	Do not allow surface discharge of produced water in the Colorado River Basin.	Same as Alternative B.	Allow surface discharge of produced water that meets State standards for water quality in the Colorado River Basin. Individual projects that propose to discharge surface water would be considered on a site-specific basis.

Vegetation

Vegetation Management Actions			
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
General Vegetation			
Do not use supplemental seed where an ample native seed source of grasses, forbs, and desirable browse is present. ² Native species of grasses, forbs, and browse of ample amounts should be used in the seed mixture whenever possible to avoid monotype vegetation and to ensure good forage species for wildlife and for livestock. ²	Rehabilitation target would be to manage for 51 percent or higher of Potential Natural Community (PNC).	Rehabilitation target would be to manage for 76 percent or higher of PNC.	Same as Alternative B.
No similar action.	Identify, maintain, and restore forest and woodland old-growth stands to a pre-fire suppression condition. Adopt the U.S. Forest Service (USFS) old-growth definitions and identification standards as per the USFS document <i>Characteristics of Old-Growth Forests in the Intermountain Region</i> (Hamilton 1993). In instances where the area of application in the previous document does not apply (for example, <i>Pinus edulis</i>) use the document, <i>Recommended Old-Growth Definitions and Descriptions, USDA Forest Service Southwestern Region</i> (USFS 1992).		
Management of Riparian Areas			
No similar action.	Retain riparian areas in the public ownership unless it can be clearly demonstrated that specific sites are so small or isolated that they cannot be managed in an effective manner by the BLM or through agreements. Exchanges involving public land containing riparian areas would generally not be allowed unless it could be shown that parcels containing superior public values are being acquired or that existing riparian areas would be enhanced.		
No similar action.	Prioritize monitoring in functioning at-risk and then non-functioning riparian areas. Additional monitoring would occur on an as-needed basis (e.g., to assess impacts of specific projects or to establish reference conditions).		
No similar action.	Prioritize rehabilitation efforts and management adjustments in functioning at-risk and then non-functioning riparian areas where livestock grazing has been determined to be a significant contributing factor. As opportunities arise (e.g., cooperative proposals), actions would also be taken to initiate recovery and rehabilitation within the site's potential in non-functioning riparian areas.		
No similar action.	Emphasize management of uses rather than structural efforts when rehabilitating degraded riparian areas. As necessary and appropriate (indicated by monitoring results and interdisciplinary analysis), livestock numbers, seasons of use, and	Same as Alternative B, except structural efforts would be a primary means of accomplishing riparian objectives.	Emphasize maintaining current livestock use when rehabilitating degraded riparian areas. Structural efforts would be a primary means of accomplishing riparian objectives.

Vegetation Management Actions			
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
	<p>grazing systems would be modified when necessary to meet riparian objectives.</p> <p>Existing and new water developments would be maintained and/or managed to reduce detrimental impacts on riparian areas (i.e., dewatering) and to change grazing management within riparian areas when grazing has been identified as a significant contributing factor.</p> <p>Fencing, erosion control structures, and vegetation treatments would each be an option where changes in use would not meet management objectives within the desired timeframe.</p>		
<p>Allow livestock grazing on riparian habitat as proposed in the range management section. Monitor the grazing systems to be developed and implemented and make adjustments as necessary to achieve the wildlife objectives for riparian habitat.¹</p> <p>Protect riparian areas from all surface disturbing activities and graze livestock according to <i>Standards for Rangeland Health</i> and <i>Guidelines for Grazing Management</i>.⁴</p> <p>Restrict motorized vehicle use to existing roads in riparian areas.⁴</p> <p>Do not allow lease operations or sale of mineral materials from riparian areas.⁴</p> <p>Require protective stipulations on any actions taken under land and minerals decisions to protect riparian areas. Construct water lanes as</p>	<p>Do not allow new surface disturbing activities within 330 feet of riparian/wetland areas unless it could be shown that (1) there are no practical alternatives, (2) all long-term impacts could be fully mitigated, or (3) the activity would benefit and enhance the riparian area.</p>	<p>Do not allow new surface disturbing activities within 660 feet of riparian/wetland areas unless it could be shown that (1) there are no practical alternatives, (2) all long-term impacts could be fully mitigated, or (3) the activity would benefit and enhance the riparian area.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative B.</p>

Vegetation Management Actions			
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
needed. ² No occupancy or other surface disturbance will be allowed within 400 feet of the identified rivers/creeks. This distance may be modified when specifically approved in writing by the Field Office Manager, with the concurrence of the authorized officer of the federal surface management agency. ⁵			
No similar action.	Consider in-kind offsite compensatory mitigation for unavoidable impacts on riparian areas for oil and gas authorizations and energy ROWs. Offsite mitigation would be considered on a site-specific basis only after other forms of mitigation have been used to the maximum extent practicable. In-kind mitigation would require that substitute habitats be of the same type as impacted habitats (e.g., if willow-cottonwood habitat is impacted, offsite mitigation must focus on willow-cottonwood habitat).	Same as Alternative B, except that offsite mitigation must occur in close proximity to the impacted habitats and must be implemented such that there is no temporal loss of habitat. Offsite mitigation would occur within the same fifth-field watershed as the impacts. Offsite mitigation actions must be implemented and meet initial criteria for success (e.g., survival of plantings, completion of earthwork, etc.) prior to initiation of resource impacts.	Consider in-kind or out-of-kind offsite compensatory mitigation for unavoidable impacts on riparian areas for oil and gas authorizations and energy ROWs. Offsite mitigation would be considered on a site-specific basis only after other forms of mitigation have been used to the maximum extent practicable. Out-of-kind mitigation may address riparian habitat types other than the impacted habitat (e.g., herbaceous wetland instead of willow-cottonwood riparian), but may not substitute upland or open water habitats for riparian or wetland habitat.
No similar action.	Maintain sufficient water, to the extent possible, to sustain native flora and fauna when developing/redeveloping springs. Return unused or overflow water to its original drainage.		
Plant and Seed Collection			
Leave the identified area open to small-scale removal of wildings and other vegetative products upon application and permit. ² Continue to authorize harvest of pine nuts areawide. ⁵	Permit commercial seed collection. Areas and species available for commercial collection would be determined on a case-by-case basis as climatic conditions allow, in accordance with statewide guidance and policy.	Preclude commercial seed collection.	Permit commercial seed collection in accordance with statewide guidance and policy as climatic conditions allow.
No similar action.	Allow vegetation materials use (excluding seed collection, which is addressed above; pine nut harvest;	Preclude commercial use of vegetative materials.	Permit vegetation materials use and collection as climatic conditions

Vegetation Management Actions			
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
	and forest and woodland products) and collection in specified areas identified by permit on a case-by-case basis as climatic conditions allow.	Require permits for non-commercial collection or use of vegetative materials (excluding seed collection, pine nut harvest, and forest and woodland products).	allow.
No similar action.	Allow the collection/harvesting of vegetative materials in riparian areas in proper functioning condition on a case-by-case basis as climatic conditions allow.	Close riparian areas to collection/harvesting of vegetative materials on a case-by-case basis except for traditional Native American and administrative use.	Same as Alternative B.
No similar action.	Allow Native American non-commercial traditional use of vegetation products for the collection of herbs, medicines, traditional use items, or items necessary for traditional, religious, or ceremonial purposes, through permits.		
Noxious Weeds and Invasive Species			
No similar action.	Apply approved weed control methods to all invasive species in an integrated weed management program (including preventive management; education; and mechanical, biological, wildland or prescribed fire, and chemical techniques).	Emphasize natural processes (i.e., wildland and/or prescribed fire, disease, and insects), preventive management, and education to reduce the spread of noxious and invasive species. Other methods, including biological and hand cutting, could be used to remove noxious weeds and non-native invasive species to restore ecological condition of a site.	Same as Alternative B.
Use non-motorized hand tools (such as clippers, axes, and Pulaskis) and approved herbicides to treat invasive plants such as tamarisk and Russian olive within designated wilderness for the purpose of restoring ecological conditions and functions.			
No similar action.	Require certified weed-free feed for all stock to limit the introduction and spread of noxious weeds and other undesirable species.		
Relict Plant Communities and Hanging Gardens			
No similar action.	Manage relict plant communities and hanging gardens to maintain and enhance the biological diversity and health of these areas.		
Protect the relict characteristics and values on Diana's Throne (90 acres) by segregating it from mineral entry and land disposals. ²	Restrict surface occupancy (NSO) for surface disturbing activities to protect relict vegetation at Diana's Throne and Elephant Butte. Recommend Diana's Throne and Elephant Butte for withdrawal from	Close relict plant communities to permitted surface disturbing activities. Recommend Diana's Throne and Elephant Butte for withdrawal from mineral entry.	No similar action.

Vegetation Management Actions			
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
	mineral entry.		
No similar action.	Protect hanging gardens by implementing the no surface disturbance actions identified in the Riparian section of this chapter.		
Sagebrush Steppe			
No similar action.	<p>Treat sagebrush steppe communities to restore natural disturbance processes and a healthy, diverse mosaic of different height and age structures with components of native grasses and forbs and an appropriate pinyon-juniper component for a given ecological site. Mosaics may include stands of young and old sagebrush, openings (ranging from bare ground to short or sparse vegetation to high-density grasslands), wet meadows, seeps, healthy streamside (riparian) vegetation, and other interspersed shrub and woodland habitats.</p> <p>Follow the Connelly guidelines (Connelly et al. 2000) for vegetation treatment prescriptions for projects occurring in occupied and/or historic Greater sage-grouse habitat. Adjust and/or modify these guidelines with cooperators (e.g., UDWR, local sage-grouse working group, Utah Partners for Conservation and Development (UPCD), as necessary, within the range of variability described in the appropriate ecological site description.</p>		
Vegetation Restoration Treatments			
No similar action.	<p>Limit acres of vegetation treatments (e.g., wildlife habitat treatments, watershed treatments, livestock rangeland treatments, wildland fires, fuels treatments, and stewardship contracting) to an annual average of no more than 22,300 acres (446,000 acres over the life of the plan).</p> <p>Use the full range of upland vegetation treatment methods and tools (i.e., prescribed fire, mechanical, chemical, biological, woodland product removal, and wildland fire use).</p>	<p>Implement vegetation treatments (e.g., wildlife habitat treatments, watershed treatments, wildland fires, fuels treatments, and stewardship contracting) on an annual average of at least 4,650 acres (93,000 acres over the life of the plan). However, do not exceed an annual average of 22,300 acres (446,000 acres over the life of the plan).</p> <p>Implement treatments with an emphasis on restoration of natural processes, prioritizing treatments in areas not functioning properly. Treatment methods that use or mimic natural processes would be preferred (prescribed fire, biological, and hand cutting). Other methods would be allowed on a case-by-case basis and would be applied to protect life and property and to lead to or ensure proper ecosystem function.</p>	<p>Limit acres of vegetation treatments (e.g., wildlife habitat treatments, watershed treatments, livestock rangeland treatments, wildland fires, fuels treatments, and stewardship contracting) to an annual average of no more than 22,300 acres (446,000 acres over the life of the plan).</p> <p>Use the full range of vegetation treatment methods and tools (i.e., prescribed fire, mechanical, chemical, biological, woodland product removal, and wildland fire use).</p> <p>Implement treatments with an emphasis on increasing commodity production, prioritizing treatments in areas where treatments could increase forage quality and quantity or provide maximum woodland products.</p>
General Treatment Stipulations: • Prepare a modified fire suppression	Vegetation treatments may be authorized where protection of	Vegetation treatments may be authorized where protection of	Same as Alternative B.

Vegetation Management Actions			
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
<p>plan for all areas where private, State, and USFS properties would not be jeopardized.²</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use prescribed burning in lieu of mechanical treatment wherever vegetation would carry a fire and is deemed suitable.² • All treatments should conform to VRM standards.² • Evaluate each treatment site for soil suitability and stability prior to manipulation.² • Mechanical treatments should leave the residue in place, without windrowing or burning the litter. This would help reduce erosion and provide a good seedbed.² • Obtain threatened and endangered (T&E) species and cultural resource clearances prior to vegetation manipulation.² • Design mechanical treatments to provide an “edge” effect for wildlife benefits. This is done by “feathering” the edges, leaving tree islands and peninsulas, and treating in strips, preferably on the contour.² • Refrain from large solid blocks of treated area when possible.² • Livestock would be excluded from all treatment areas until seedlings are established—a minimum of two growing seasons.² • All the above stipulations should be considered and incorporated in an Environmental Assessment (EA) for each treatment area.² 	<p>sensitive resources would be ensured.</p> <p>Focus restoration or vegetation treatment projects based on the following factors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restore areas functioning at less than 51 percent of PNC. • Restore areas with noxious weed and/or non-native invasive plants. • Maintain previously treated areas. • Achieve other objectives identified in this RMP. • Achieve rangeland health objectives. 	<p>sensitive resources would be ensured.</p> <p>Focus restoration or vegetation treatment projects based on the following factors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase indigenous rare or uncommon species. • Restore areas functioning at less than 51 percent of PNC. • Restore areas with noxious weed and/or non-native invasive plants. • Maintain previously treated areas (not to include treatments where the sole objective is to increase forage for livestock). • Achieve other objectives identified in this RMP. • Achieve rangeland health objectives. 	
Do not treat areas containing	Manage areas with ponderosa pine to maintain the stand health through use of stand health exams, vegetation		

Vegetation Management Actions			
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
ponderosa pine trees unless these trees can be protected. ²	<p>treatments, wildland fire, and prescriptions on permitted activities on a case-by-case basis. Manage stands to be predominantly park like, resilient to low-intensity fire, and have normally expected levels of mortality.</p> <p>Focus treatment objectives in ponderosa pine vegetation communities on restoring natural disturbance processes such as fire; increasing vegetative ground cover of native grasses, forbs, and shrubs; and removing invasive, non-native species.</p>		

Special Status Species (Threatened, Endangered, and Sensitive)

Special Status Species (Threatened, Endangered, and Sensitive) Management Actions			
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Special Status Species Conservation and Habitat Enhancement			
No similar action.	Avoid, control, or regulate surface disturbing and disruptive activities on a case-by-case basis to minimize impacts on identified crucial habitat for sensitive species for the purpose of protecting these species and their associated habitats.	Prohibit surface disturbing and disruptive activities in identified crucial habitat for sensitive species for the purpose of protecting these species and their associated habitats.	Same as Alternative B.
No similar action.	Should special status species be found, temporarily stop surface disturbing and disruptive activities until species-specific protective and/or mitigative measures are developed and implemented, in consultation with USFWS and/or UDWR when applicable.		
Not specifically addressed in existing plans.	<p>Apply BMPs to avoid or reduce fragmenting habitat, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collocating communication and other facilities • Employing directional drilling for oil and gas • Using topographic and vegetative screening to reduce the influence of intrusions. <p>Mitigate habitat losses for listed and sensitive species at a minimum 1:1 ratio (2:1 ratio for riparian loss). This ratio could be increased if mitigation</p>	Same as Alternative B.	<p>Apply BMPs to reduce fragmenting habitat, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collocating communication and other facilities • Employing directional drilling for oil and gas • Using topographic and vegetative screening to reduce the influence of intrusions. <p>Mitigate the effects of proposed projects that have the potential to cause long-term or permanent habitat impacts or losses by restoring other</p>

Special Status Species (Threatened, Endangered, and Sensitive) Management Actions			
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
	does not occur prior to disturbance, if replacement habitat is not comparable to lost habitat, or if habitat fragmentation is causing broad-scale impacts on remaining available habitats. Direct and indirect habitat losses would be considered and mitigated. Mitigation would include enhancement, restoration, and/or creation of comparable habitat.		habitat within the project's region of influence. Protect the habitat when the habitat type is rare and under oil and gas development pressures.
Bald Eagles and Other Special Status Raptor Species			
Maintain ponderosa pine as winter roosting sites for bald eagles and nesting sites for other raptors by not allowing any cutting of live or dead standing trees. ^{3,4} Underground coal mining would be allowed in areas containing ponderosa pine. ⁴	Manage stands of ponderosa pine for winter roosting sites for bald eagles and nesting sites for other raptors (see Vegetation section for specific management).		
Protect bald eagle feeding and concentration areas, peregrine falcon use areas, and other raptor nest sites on public lands from undue intrusions of all kinds (e.g., OHV use, mineral or sale operations, and land treatments). A minimum of ¼ mile buffer zone would be required around bald eagle concentration areas, peregrine falcon use areas, and other raptor nest sites to ensure proper protection. ¹ Restrict exploration, drilling, and other development activity by managing oil and gas as open with NSO stipulations within ¼ mile of bald eagle roost and perch sites from November 1 to April 30. ⁵	Use BMPs (Appendix B) to implement raptor guidelines established by USFWS. Work with UDWR to identify locations for all known special status raptor species nests, roost sites, and winter roost sites on or within ½ mile of BLM lands. Prohibit surface disturbing activities within ½ mile around special status raptor species nest sites during the following time periods: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Mar 1–Aug 1: Ferruginous hawk• Mar 1–Aug 15: N. Goshawk. Prohibit surface disturbing activities within ¼ mile around special status raptor species nest sites during the following time periods:	Use BMPs (Appendix B) to implement raptor guidelines established by USFWS. Work with UDWR to identify locations for all known special status raptor species nests, roost sites, and winter roost sites on or within ¾ mile of BLM lands. Prohibit surface disturbing activities within ¾ mile around special status raptor species nest sites (Ferruginous hawk, N. Goshawk, Short-eared owl, Burrowing owl).	Use BMPs (Appendix B) to implement raptor guidelines established by USFWS. Work with UDWR to identify locations for all known special status raptor species nests, roost sites, and winter roost sites on or within ¼ mile of BLM lands. Prohibit surface disturbing activities within ¼ mile around special status raptor species nest sites during the following time periods: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Mar 1–Aug 1: Ferruginous hawk• Mar 1–Aug 15: N. Goshawk. Prohibit surface disturbing activities within 1/8 mile around special status raptor species nest sites during the following time periods:

Special Status Species (Threatened, Endangered, and Sensitive) Management Actions			
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mar 1–Aug 1: Short-eared owl • Mar 1–Aug 31: Burrowing owl. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mar 1–Aug 1: Short-eared owl • Mar 1–Aug 31: Burrowing owl.
No similar action.	Comply with <i>Suggested Practices for Raptor Protection on Power Lines: the State of the Art in 2006</i> (Avian Power Line Interaction Committee 2006) and <i>Avian Protection Plan (APP) Guidelines</i> (Avian Power Line Interaction Committee and USFWS 2005) for new powerline construction (including upgrades and reconstruction) to prevent electrocution of raptors.		
No similar action.	Protect unoccupied special status species raptor nests in compliance with BLM's raptor BMPs (Appendix B).		
California Condor			
No similar action.	<p>Avoid disruptive activities in California condor communal roosting or nesting areas. Appropriate measures would depend on whether the proposed activity is temporary or permanent, and whether it occurs within or outside the condor nesting season. (A temporary action is completed outside of the breeding season, leaving no permanent structures and resulting in no permanent habitat loss. A permanent action continues for more than one breeding season and/or causes a loss of condor habitat or displaces condors through disturbances, i.e., creation of a permanent structure.)</p> <p>Apply the following avoidance and minimization measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surveys could be required prior to implementation of a proposed action to determine presence/absence if information suggests birds could be present. Surveys must be conducted by qualified individuals, be conducted according to protocol, and be acceptable to the BLM. • Preclude disruptive activities within 1 mile of a California condor nest site during the breeding season. • Monitor recreation uses within 1 mile of condor nest sites and temporarily restrict activities if necessary to protect the condor. • Preclude special use permit group events within 1 mile of condor nest sites during the breeding season. • Preclude placement of new permanent structures or roads within 1 mile of condor nest sites. 		
Utah Prairie Dog			
Manage oil and gas leasing subject to major constraints (NSO) or other activity on the surface of occupied Utah prairie dog habitat. ⁵	Permit no surface disturbing activities or surface occupancy within ½ mile of active, suitable (currently inactive), or potential reintroduction (BLM 2002b) Utah prairie dog habitats/sites. Seismic activities would avoid these areas, particularly during the active season (April 1 to September 30).		
No similar action.	Allow introduction, augmentation, restocking, translocations, transplantation, and/or reestablishments of special status species in cooperation and collaboration with USFWS, UDWR, and other agencies as necessary, subject to guidance provided by BLM's 6840 policy and by existing or future MOUs.		
No similar action.	Require deterrent devices designed to prevent raptors from perching on powerline structures on all new construction (including upgrades and reconstruction) to discourage predation on Utah prairie dogs.		
No similar action.	Reroute renewed or amended ROWs on public land that have the potential to disturb active and inactive Utah prairie dog colonies.		

Special Status Species (Threatened, Endangered, and Sensitive) Management Actions			
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
No similar action.	Preclude cross-country OHV use in occupied or inactive Utah prairie dog colonies.		
No similar action.	Allow for the treatment of plague and other diseases that may impact Utah prairie dogs.		
Mexican Spotted Owl			
No similar action.	Retain large down logs, large trees (generally greater than 24 diameter at breast height [DBH]), and snags as prey habitats in occupied and suitable MSO habitat. Allow fuels treatments and prescribed fire on a case-by-case basis to reduce fire hazard and improve habitat condition for MSO prey.		
No similar action.	Meet or make significant progress toward meeting BLM Utah's <i>Standards for Rangeland Health</i> for livestock grazing in protected and restricted (as defined in recovery plan) MSO habitats.		
Comply with conservation measures in Appendix M.	Prohibit new recreation facilities or trails within PACs. Continue maintenance restrictions and seasonal closure (March 1 to August 31) of existing facilities. Comply with conservation measures in Appendix M.	Prohibit new recreation facilities or trails within PACs and within ½ mile of PAC boundary. Continue maintenance restrictions and seasonal closure (March 1 to August 31) of existing facilities. Comply with conservation measures in Appendix M.	Same as Alternative B.
No similar action.	Limit special recreation permit (SRP) group size to 12 or fewer according to recovery plan in protected and restricted (as defined in recovery plan) MSO habitat.	Limit SRP group size to eight or fewer in protected and restricted (as defined in recovery plan) MSO habitat.	Same as Alternative B.
Bonneville Cutthroat Trout, Roundtail Chub, Bluehead Sucker, and Flannelmouth Sucker			
No similar action.	Monitor stream habitat to detect changes every 5 to 10 years in streams with historic or currently occupied habitat, in cooperation with UDWR.		
No similar action.	Maintain or improve stream habitat for those locations with historic or currently occupied habitat identified in cooperation with UDWR. Maintain, improve, or provide missing habitat components using appropriate habitat improvement techniques.		
Federally Listed and Candidate Plants			
No similar action.	Manage oil and gas leasing as open subject to moderate constraints (CSU) in federally listed and candidate plant species occupied and suitable habitat. In these areas, well placement would be located to not	Manage oil and gas leasing as open subject to major constraints (NSO) in federally listed and candidate plant species occupied and suitable habitat.	Same as Alternative B.

Special Status Species (Threatened, Endangered, and Sensitive) Management Actions			
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
	adversely affect the species or their habitat.		
No similar action.	Limit species for rehabilitation and emergency stabilization in federally listed and candidate species habitat to species that would not inhibit the listed or candidate species.	Limit species for rehabilitation and emergency stabilization in federally listed and candidate species habitat to native species that would not inhibit the listed or candidate species.	Same as Alternative B.
Western Yellow-Billed Cuckoo and Southwestern Willow Flycatcher			
No similar action.	Manage for regeneration and multiple age classes in cottonwood/willow vegetation in yellow-billed cuckoo and Southwestern willow flycatcher habitat.		
No similar action.	Identify sites where Southwestern willow flycatcher habitat restoration (i.e., occupied, suitable, and potentially suitable sites) is warranted. Prioritize riparian restoration in Southwestern willow flycatcher habitat consistent with riparian rehabilitation decisions in the Water section.		
No similar action.	Prohibit surface disturbing activities within ¼ mile of occupied breeding habitat from May 1 to August 15. Where possible, co-locate roads, new trails, and ROWs and develop stream crossings at right angles to yellow-billed cuckoo and Southwestern willow flycatcher habitat to minimize impacts.	Permit no surface disturbing activities within ¼ mile from suitable and potentially suitable riparian habitats.	Same as Alternative B.
Management of Greater Sage-Grouse Habitat			
Limit OHV recreational use to existing roads and trails on crucial Greater sage-grouse strutting grounds (seasonal limitation March 15 to May 1). During the remainder of the year OHV use would be open to cross-country travel. ⁵	Preclude cross-country OHV use in Greater sage-grouse brooding habitats.		
No similar action.	Avoid new ROWs with high-profile structures (e.g., buildings, storage tanks, overhead powerlines, wind turbines, towers, and windmills) within 1 mile of an active Greater sage-grouse lek or in brood rearing habitat.	Exclude new ROWs with high-profile structures (e.g., buildings, storage tanks, overhead powerlines, wind turbines, towers, and windmills) within 1¼ miles of an active Greater sage-grouse lek or in brood rearing or winter habitats.	Avoid new ROWs with high-profile structures (e.g., buildings, storage tanks, overhead powerlines, wind turbines, towers, and windmills) within ¼ mile of an active Greater sage-grouse lek. Authorize ROWs and high-profile structures where no

Special Status Species (Threatened, Endangered, and Sensitive) Management Actions			
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
			reasonable alternative location exists on a case-by-case basis from ¼ mile to 1 mile of an active Greater sage-grouse lek.
Restrict exploration, drilling, and other development activity by managing oil and gas as open to leasing subject to major constraints (NSO) within ½ mile of Greater sage-grouse leks from March 15 to May 1. ⁵	Manage oil and gas leasing as open subject to major constraints (NSO) within ½ mile of a Greater sage-grouse lek site.	Manage oil and gas leasing as open subject to major constraints (NSO) within 2 miles of a Greater sage-grouse lek site.	Manage oil and gas leasing as open subject to major constraints (NSO) within ¼ mile of a Greater sage-grouse lek site.
	Allow no surface disturbing or otherwise disruptive activities (e.g., construction and maintenance) within 2 miles of a Greater sage-grouse lek in brood rearing habitat from March 15 to July 15 and in winter habitat from December 1 to March 14.	Allow no surface disturbing or otherwise disruptive activities (e.g., construction and maintenance) within 2 miles of a Greater sage-grouse lek in brood rearing habitat, from March 15 to July 15. Allow no surface disturbing or otherwise disruptive activities in Greater sage-grouse winter habitat from December 1 to March 14.	Allow no surface disturbing or otherwise disruptive activities (e.g., construction and maintenance) within 2 miles of a Greater sage-grouse lek in brood rearing habitat, from March 15 to July 15.
No similar action.	Avoid insecticide use in Greater sage-grouse nesting and early brood rearing habitats during the early developmental stage (March 15 to July 15) of Greater sage-grouse chicks.		
No similar action.	Prioritize habitat vegetation treatments to maintain and/or improve habitat function in the following areas (Map 2-3 and Map 2-4): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sage-grouse brood-rearing habitat • Sage-grouse winter range. 		

Fish and Wildlife

Fish and Wildlife Management Actions			
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Important Wildlife and Fish Habitat			
No similar action.	Maintain existing vegetation treatments that benefit wildlife.		
Land treatments would be implemented to improve crucial big	Prioritize habitat vegetation treatments to maintain and/or improve habitat function in areas of crucial mule deer winter range (Map 2-3 and Map 2-4).		

Fish and Wildlife Management Actions			
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
game habitat (Map 2-2). ⁵ Treat pinyon-juniper in important mule deer use areas. ⁴			
No similar action.	Road crossings of water bodies that support fish would be designed to provide for fish passage.	Design road crossings of water bodies that support fish to accommodate natural stream processes (e.g., sediment and debris transport).	Same as Alternative B.
Management of Deer and Elk Habitats			
Restrict exploration, drilling, and other development activity by managing oil and gas as open with NSO stipulations within big game winter ranges from January 1 to April 30. ⁵	Preclude surface disturbing activities in crucial mule deer and elk winter range from November 15 to April 15 unless the activity would improve mule deer or elk habitat.	Preclude surface disturbing activities in mule deer and elk crucial and high-value winter range from November 15 to April 15 for protection of winter habitats.	Allow surface disturbing activities in mule deer and elk crucial winter range on a case-by-case basis.
No similar action.	Preclude oil and gas development and ROW construction/reconstruction in identified big game migration and transitional ranges from October 1 to November 15.	Same as Alternative B.	Allow surface disturbing and disruptive activities in big game migration and transitional ranges on a case-by-case basis.
Continue OHV management as outlined in current LUPs.	Limit OHV use to designated routes.	Close deer and elk crucial winter range to OHV use from November 15 to April 15.	Require no specific OHV restrictions for wildlife.
Management of Bighorn Sheep Habitats			
No similar action.	Preclude surface disturbing activities in crucial Desert bighorn sheep habitat during lambing season (April 15 to June 15).	Same as Alternative B.	Require no special stipulations; however, require mitigation for surface disturbing activities resulting in long-term disturbance in crucial Desert bighorn sheep habitat during lambing season (April 15 to June 15).
No similar action.	Do not authorize changes in kind of livestock to sheep or goats within 9 miles of Desert bighorn sheep habitat.		
Management of Pronghorn Habitat			
Restrict exploration, drilling, and other development activity by managing oil and gas as open with NSO stipulations within big game winter ranges from January 1 to	Preclude surface disturbing activities in crucial pronghorn habitat from May 15 through June 15 during fawning season.	Same as Alternative B.	Require no special stipulations.

Fish and Wildlife Management Actions			
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
April 30. ⁵			
Management of Habitat to Provide for Wildlife Management Objectives as Established by the Division of Wildlife Resources			
No similar action.	Authorize construction of wildlife habitat improvement projects (including water developments and vegetation treatments) to meet wildlife goals and objectives, provided the project complies with NEPA, ESA, and other applicable laws and policies.		
No similar action.	Retain crucial wildlife habitat in public ownership, unless the land tenure adjustment would meet one or more of the land tenure adjustment criteria identified in Lands and Realty management.	Retain all crucial wildlife habitat in public ownership.	Crucial wildlife habitat may be disposed of through R&PP patents for important public purposes (as defined in the R&PP Act).
Seven Habitat Management Plans (HMP) would be written and would include the objectives of improving wildlife habitat condition from poor to fair or good on mule deer habitat, elk habitat, and pronghorn habitat. ⁵	No similar action.		
Develop present use area water needs for pronghorn, Desert bighorn sheep, Gambel's quail, and chukar (by priority) as capabilities exist; maintain water throughout the spring and fall in all existing livestock range improvements (e.g., tanks and pipelines) within pronghorn, Gambel's quail, and chukar current use areas. ² Improve mule deer habitat and mule deer distribution by developing reservoirs, catchments, and tricklers in areas with limited water sources and fencing to prevent trampling damage from livestock. ³ Livestock water developments in the vicinity of proposed wildlife water developments would be designed to serve wildlife and livestock purposes. ³	Develop present use area water needs for wildlife as capabilities exist; maintain water throughout the spring and fall in existing and new livestock range improvements (e.g., tanks and pipelines).		
Riparian/fisheries habitat would be	Manage livestock grazing in riparian areas/fisheries habitat according to the <i>Standards for Rangeland Health</i> . Livestock		

Fish and Wildlife Management Actions			
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
improved by restricting or eliminating livestock grazing in identified areas. These areas are included in the HMPs. ⁵	grazing in riparian areas/fisheries habitat would be evaluated through compliance with the <i>Standards for Rangeland Health</i> .		
Management of Raptor Habitats			
No similar action.	Implement raptor guidelines associated with level of duration of activities established by USFWS. Guide raptor habitat management by use of <i>Best Management Practices for Raptors and Their Associated Habitats in Utah</i> (Romin and Muck 2002, as amended) and BLM's raptor BMPs (Appendix B), using seasonal and spatial buffers and mitigation to maintain and enhance raptor nesting, foraging, and roosting habitat while allowing other resource uses to occur.	Implement raptor guidelines associated with level of duration of activities established by USFWS. Manage raptor habitat by implementation of <i>Best Management Practices for Raptors and Their Associated Habitats in Utah</i> (Romin and Muck 2002, as amended) and BLM's raptor BMPs (Appendix B), using and/or increasing seasonal and spatial buffers and mitigation to protect and/or enhance raptor nesting, foraging, and roosting habitat while allowing other resource uses to occur.	No similar action.
No similar action.	Prohibit disruptive activities within 1 mile of peregrine falcon nest sites from February 1 to August 31. Prohibit disruptive activities to nesting raptors within ½ mile of raptor nests during the following time periods: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jan 1–Aug 31: golden eagle • Mar 15–Aug 15: red-tailed hawk • Mar 15–Aug 31: Cooper's hawk, sharp-shinned hawk • Mar 1–Aug 31: Swainson's hawk • Apr 1–Aug 15: Northern harrier • Apr 1–Aug 31: merlin, osprey • May 1–Aug 15: Turkey vulture. Prohibit disruptive activities to nesting raptors within ¼ mile of a raptor nest during the following time periods:	Prohibit activities disruptive to nesting raptors within 1½ miles of a raptor nest during the following time periods for the protection of raptor nesting areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feb 1–Jul 15: golden eagle, barn owl, red-tailed hawk, Great-horned owl • Apr 1–Jul 31: osprey, merlin, sharp-shinned hawk, kestrel, prairie falcon, Northern harrier, Swainson's hawk, Cooper's hawk • Mar 1–Jul 31: long-eared owl, peregrine falcon, screech owl. 	Prohibit activities disruptive to nesting raptors within ½ mile of a raptor nest during the following time periods for the protection of raptor nesting areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feb 1–Jul 15: golden eagle, barn owl, red-tailed hawk, Great-horned owl • Apr 1–Jul 31: osprey, merlin, sharp-shinned hawk, kestrel, prairie falcon, Northern harrier, Swainson's hawk, Cooper's hawk • Mar 1–Jul 31: long-eared owl, peregrine falcon, screech owl.

Fish and Wildlife Management Actions			
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dec 1–Sep 31: Great-horned owl • Feb 1–July 31: boreal owl • Feb 1–Aug 15: long-eared owl • Mar 1–Aug 15: W. screech owl • Mar 1–Aug 31: N. saw-whet owl • Apr 1–Aug 1: N. pygmy owl • Apr 1–Aug 31: prairie falcon • Apr 1–Sep 30: Flammulated owl 		
No similar action.	Protect unoccupied raptor nests in compliance with BLM's raptor BMPs (Appendix B) yet allow for permanent (long-term) facilities and structures to be constructed within the spatial buffer zone, identified above by alternative, outside of the breeding season as long as they would not cause the nest site to become unsuitable for future nesting. Non-permanent (short-term) activities would be allowed within the spatial buffer of nests during the nesting season as long as those activities are shown to be non-impacting to nesting raptors.		
Fish and Wildlife Reintroductions			
<p>UDWR has identified the Garfield Planning Unit as a potential pronghorn transplant area. The BLM would cooperate with UDWR in establishing a population goal in balance with habitat availability. The actions would be fully addressed during the development of the Garfield HMPs.⁵</p> <p>Investigate the possibility of introducing beaver and constructing structures in streams. This investigation must include coordination with UDWR, the State Engineer, owners of water rights, and the public. If beaver can be introduced and structures can be built, develop plans to identify what structures, if any, would be needed in the interim to maximize habitat potential. If beaver cannot be introduced but structures can be put in place, construct structures as needed that are identified in the</p>	<p>Allow introduction, translocation, transplantation, restocking, augmentation, and re-establishment of native and naturalized fish and wildlife species in cooperation and collaboration with UDWR, subject to guidance provided by BLM's 1745 policy and by existing or future MOUs with UDWR.</p>		

Fish and Wildlife Management Actions			
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
recommendations. ¹			
Management of Forage Allocations for Big Game Species (as established by the Division of Wildlife Resources)			
Big game would be provided forage in the short term and the long term if big game numbers increase to prior stable or long-term levels and habitat is improved. ⁵ Allocate forage to mule deer as recommended. ^{1, 2, 3, 4}	Allocate 11,093 AUMs to wildlife as shown in Table 3-24, except as noted below.	Allocate 11,045 AUMs to wildlife as shown in Table 3-24, except as noted below.	Allocate 11,085 AUMs to wildlife as shown in Table 3-24, except as noted below.
No similar action (cross-referenced from Livestock Grazing decisions).	Reallocate AUMs to wildlife as follows (cross-referenced from Livestock Grazing decisions): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 48 AUMs on Water Canyon Allotment. 	Suspend AUMs for livestock for the life of the plan as follows (cross-referenced from Livestock Grazing decisions): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 48 AUMs on Water Canyon Allotment • 10 AUMs on Lower North Fork Allotment • 30 AUMs on Sawmill Allotment. 	Reallocate AUMs to wildlife as follows (cross-referenced from Livestock Grazing decisions): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 AUMs on Lower North Fork Allotment • 30 AUMs on Sawmill Allotment.

Wildland Fire Ecology

The September 2005 completion of the *Finding of No Significant Impact and Decision Record* (UT-USO-04-01) for the *Utah Land Use Plan Amendment for Fire and Fuels Management* amended the wildland fire ecology portions of the existing LUPs. No significant changes in resource condition, data, or policy have become available since completion of this amendment. Therefore the decisions from the 2005 document have been brought forward in their entirety and are located in the Management Common to All Alternatives section under the Wildland Fire Ecology header.

Cultural Resources

Cultural Resources Management Actions			
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Protection of Cultural Resources			
Allow land tenure adjustments that would result in net gain of significant cultural sites. ^{2, 3, 4, 5}	Consider land acquisitions from willing parties to preserve cultural resources, as appropriate (as identified in criteria #2 for land tenure adjustments in the lands and realty alternatives).		
No similar action.	Preclude surface disturbing activities within ¼ mile or within the visual horizon, whichever is closer, of cultural sites where landscape association contributes to eligibility for the NRHP. Unevaluated portions of the setting would be managed as contributing until a cultural inventory and evaluation is completed and the setting is determined to be contributing or non-contributing.	Preclude surface disturbing activities within ¼ mile or within the visual horizon, whichever is farther, of cultural sites where landscape association contributes to eligibility for the NRHP. Unevaluated portions of the setting would be managed as contributing until a cultural inventory and evaluation is completed and the setting is determined to be contributing or non-contributing.	Follow guidance from Section 106 in preserving NRHP eligible sites.
No similar action.	Establish a comprehensive monitoring program emphasizing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cultural sites that have been previously identified as being impacted (e.g., from vandalism, erosion, grazing, or other) • Cultural sites identified on maps, brochures, or other media that bring the site into public awareness • Sites that are known to be popular for public visitation (e.g., public use site) • A representative sample of sites known to be prone to impacts from predictable sources (e.g., vandalism, recreation, grazing, or development). 		
Management of Scientific, Traditional, Educational, Public, and Research Cultural Resource Values			
Nominate the Crescent Butte Ruins (42KA1549) to the NRHP. ³ Ensure that cultural values are protected from recreation use by stabilization, excavation, or other appropriate means. ^{1, 3}	Allocate and manage cultural resource sites for scientific, public, conservation, traditional, and experimental uses and discharged from management categories described in BLM-M-8110.4 as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South Fork Indian Cave (42Ka1576) would be placed in the Public Use category. • Sites identified as Native American Traditional Cultural Properties would be placed in the Traditional Use category. • All other sites considered eligible to the NRHP would be placed in the Most Appropriate Use category. Sites would be included in the Discharged from Management category if both of the following conditions are met and documented: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The BLM and the SHPO have formally agreed that the site is not eligible for listing on the NRHP. • The site has no value for other cultural uses (as described in BLM-M-8110.4). Allocations should be reevaluated and revised by site or area when circumstances change or when new data becomes		

Cultural Resources Management Actions	
Alternative A	Alternative B
Alternative C	Alternative D
	available. Consult with the SHPO and Native American tribes as appropriate.
Proactive Cultural Resource Inventories	
<p>Complete a cultural resource inventory and map depicting site densities and archaeological values within the Garfield Planning Unit. The map would be used as a planning tool to identify avoidance areas and gauge potential impacts on cultural resources before projects are proposed that may affect cultural values.⁵</p> <p>Provide funding for a Class II sample-oriented inventory of the Paria Planning Unit. The inventory would involve development of an appropriate research design. Although implementation of a Class II inventory is a cultural resource program decision, it also functions in a support role to other activities. While timing and funding of the survey may best coincide with other activity needs, development of the research design should be carried out well in advance of anticipated large-scale resource conflicts.²</p>	<p>Prioritize new field inventories (Class II or III) directed by NHPA Section 110 as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recreation areas identified for public use (i.e., OHV open areas) • 100 feet (30 meters) (depending on topography) on either side from the centerline of designated OHV routes • Areas of special cultural designation (ACECs, National Register sites, etc.) that have not been fully inventoried • Resources eligible for the NRHP at a national level of significance that have not been fully inventoried • Road systems—100 feet (30 meters) (depending on topography) on either side from the centerline of road • Areas lacking existing inventories (large areas with no inventory data) • 5-mile vulnerability zones surrounding cities and towns • Hiking/equestrian trails.
Areas of Importance to Native American Tribes	
No similar action.	<p>Work with Native American tribes to protect their rights including access to sacred sites and traditional cultural areas. Accommodate tribal access to sacred sites and traditional cultural properties when planning and implementing land uses. Prevent or mitigate physical damage or intrusions that might impede use of sacred sites and traditional cultural properties.</p> <p>Establish and maintain agreements with all Native American Tribes interested in specific projects or areas on which they wish to consult.</p>
No similar action.	<p>Allow Native American non-commercial traditional use of vegetation and forest and woodland products for the collection of herbs, medicines, traditional use items, or items necessary for traditional, religious, or ceremonial purposes, through permits.</p>

Paleontological Resources

Paleontological Resources Management Actions			
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Protection of Paleontological Resources			
No similar action.	Require on-the-ground paleontological inventories (field surveys) prior to permitting surface disturbing activities in paleontological Class I areas. Require paleontological assessments (formal analysis of existing data) prior to permitting surface disturbing activities in paleontological Class II areas.	Require on-the-ground paleontological inventories (field surveys) prior to permitting all surfacing disturbing activities.	Require paleontological assessments (formal analysis of existing data) prior to permitting surface disturbing activities in Class I areas.
Collection of common invertebrate and botanical paleontological resources would be allowed for personal use.	Allow surface collection (as defined in BLM manual 8270) of common invertebrate and botanical paleontological resources for personal (non-commercial) use without permits unless such resources are of critical scientific or recreational value and need to be protected, or where collection is incompatible with other resource protection.	Allow collection of common invertebrate and botanical paleontological resources for personal (non-commercial) use without permits only in specifically designated fossil collecting areas.	Same as Alternative B.
No similar action.	Consult/coordinate with other local, state, and federal land agency paleontological resource specialists (if available) before undertaking significant ground disturbing activities in Class I areas to ensure protection of adjacent resources.	Same as Alternative B.	No similar action.
Proactive Paleontological Inventories			
No similar action.	Conduct non-Section 106 proactive inventories intermittently as resources allow. Prioritize paleontological resource inventories in the following areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High resource potential • Medium resource potential 	Conduct non-Section 106 proactive inventories on a limited but annual basis. Prioritize paleontological resource inventories in the following areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High resource potential • Medium resource potential 	Non-Section 106 proactive inventories would not be required.

Paleontological Resources Management Actions			
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low resource potential. (Map 3-14)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low resource potential. (Map 3-14)	
Management of Scientific, Traditional, Educational, Public, and Research Paleontological Resource Values			
No similar action.	When appropriate, target fossil sites with high scientific value for excavation and curation either by the BLM or by an outside academic or curatorial/research facility to protect them from theft, erosion, and/or vandalism. If excavation is not carried out within one field season, periodic monitoring should be conducted to document the integrity of the site until complete collection is accomplished.		
No similar action.	Monitor high significance (scientific or interpretive) sites with fossil resources that are not feasible or desirable to excavate or collect when possible to document their condition. Frequency of monitoring action for identified sites would be determined by the physical nature of the resource and potential threats.		
No similar action.	Develop onsite or community-based interpretation for significant sites/specimens to foster an appreciation for the unique nature of the resource and to create opportunities for public access to such resources.		

Visual Resources

Visual Resources Management Actions			
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Visual Resource Management Classes			
Designate VRM Classes (Map 2-5) ^{1, 2, 3, 4, 5} as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Class I: 21,200 acres • Class II: 99,900 acres • Class III: 68,600 acres • Class IV: 321,800 acres • Unknown: 42,500 acres. 	Designate the following acreages for the objectives defined for each VRM Class (Map 2-6): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Class I: 76,000 acres • Class II: 93,600 acres • Class III: 211,500 acres • Class IV: 172,900 acres. 	Designate the following acreages for the objectives defined for each VRM Class (Map 2-7): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Class I: 168,300 acres • Class II: 100,000 acres • Class III: 128,300 acres • Class IV: 157,400 acres. 	Designate the following acreages for the objectives defined for each VRM Class (Map 2-8): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Class I: 75,400 acres • Class II: 59,900 acres • Class III: 245,600 acres • Class IV: 173,100 acres.
No similar action.	WUI areas would be in VRM Class III or IV.		
Visual Intrusions			
Rehabilitate visual intrusions. ^{2, 3, 4} As time and funds permit, check the intrusions that remain on public land and either mitigate the impact they	To the extent practicable, bring existing visual contrasts into VRM Class conformance as the opportunity arises.		

Visual Resources Management Actions			
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
<p>cause or have them removed. Most of the visual intrusions have either been removed, corrected, or are not under the management authority of the BLM. The remainder are currently being improved through management actions.¹</p> <p>Close and rehabilitate only those ways, seismic lines, etc. that are causing resource damage or are definitely detracting from the visual resources. Rehabilitation must be possible without worsening the situation. Careful consideration must be given on a case-by-case basis before any such "way" is closed.¹</p> <p>Do not permit access/work trails or roads, earth cuts or fills, structures or other improvements, other than active drilling rigs, in the foreground and middle ground visual zones of VRM Class II areas that can be viewed from U.S. Highway 89.⁵</p>			

Non-WSA Lands with Wilderness Characteristics

Non-WSA Lands with Wilderness Characteristics Management Actions			
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Maintenance of Non-WSA Lands with Wilderness Characteristics			
<p>No similar action.</p>	<p>Require no prescriptions specifically to maintain WC areas.</p>	<p>Manage the following WC areas specifically to maintain their wilderness characteristics: Black Hills, Canaan Mountain, Carcass Canyon, East of Bryce, Heaps Canyon, Jolly Gulch, Little Valley Canyon, Moquith Mountain, North</p>	<p>Same as Alternative B.</p>

Non-WSA Lands with Wilderness Characteristics Management Actions			
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
		<p>Escalante Canyons, Orderville Canyon, Paria/Hackberry, Paria/Pine Hollow, Parunuweap Canyon, Upper Kanab Creek, Vermilion Cliffs, Wide Hollow (Map 3-15).</p> <p>Maintain wilderness characteristics through the following prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designate as VRM Class I (Map 2-7). • Close to commercial and personal-use forest and woodland product harvest (e.g., pole, post, firewood cutting, Christmas trees, seed collection, and wildings) except for incidental collection for onsite campfire use and administrative purposes. • Close to OHV use (Map 2-14 and Map 2-18). • Exclude new ROWs (linear, communication sites, and wind and solar projects) (Map 2-21). • Retain in federal ownership. • Close to fluid mineral leasing (Map 2-31). • Recommend withdrawing from mineral entry (Map 2-24). • Close to mineral material disposal (Map 2-35). 	

2.4.2 Resource Uses

Forestry and Woodland Products

Forestry and Woodland Products Management Actions			
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Commercial Timber Harvest			
<p>Exclude all designated recreation sites, outstanding natural areas, and areas of recent surface reclamation work from commercial wood product disposals.¹</p> <p>Prohibit cutting of standing ponderosa pine in all commercial wood product contracts.¹</p> <p>To the extent feasible, schedule commercial sales on those sites identified by other resources for woodland removal through land treatments.¹</p>	<p>Permit commercial timber harvest on a case-by-case basis for the purposes of promoting or sustaining forest health.</p>	<p>Preclude commercial timber harvest.</p>	<p>Permit commercial timber harvest areawide, while meeting other resource objectives.</p>
Woodland Product Harvest			
<p>The unit would remain open to the collection of fuelwood for private use, subject to the following stipulations^{1, 5}:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collection (of ponderosa pine¹) would be limited to down wood only.^{1, 4, 5} • Granting of permits would avoid surface protection and reclamation areas.¹ • The Area Manager may designate areas where harvesting of green wood would be permitted under conditions that he or she would specify.¹ <p>Establish two harvest areas totaling 3,090 acres, containing less than 29,450 cords of fuelwood⁴:</p>	<p>Permit commercial and non-commercial harvest of green or dead pinyon and juniper woodland products (e.g., cedar posts, Christmas trees, fuel wood, and biomass utilization) areawide unless otherwise designated or stipulated. Permit harvest of other woodland species on a case-by-case-basis.</p>	<p>Permit commercial and non-commercial harvest of woodland products (e.g., cedar posts, Christmas trees, fuel wood, and biomass utilization) on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p>Permit green tree cutting only where it would be shown that this cutting would meet resource objectives (i.e., for the purposes of promoting woodland health).</p>	<p>Permit commercial and non-commercial harvest of woodland products (e.g., cedar posts, Christmas trees, fuel wood, and biomass utilization) areawide.</p>

Forestry and Woodland Products Management Actions			
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sales and free use disposals of fuelwood both may be conducted in these areas.⁴ • All pinyon and juniper stems larger than 3 inches diameter at 1 inch above the ground, and oak stems greater than 3 inches diameter and 6 inches tall, may be harvested. All juniper posts harvested from these areas must be sold.⁴ • Areas recommended for protective watershed management are excluded from harvest area boundaries.⁴ • Reduce impact on vegetation treatment recommendations by concentrating harvest activity in small subdivisions in overlapping recommendation areas, according to treatment priorities prescribed by other resources.⁴ • Rangeland treatments would be delayed in these areas until sufficient funding is obtained to perform land treatments.⁴ <p>VRM Class II areas would be avoided but may be used at a future date with appropriate stipulations incorporated to protect these areas.¹</p> <p>Omit identified areas of heavily used vegetation from pinyon-juniper and oak harvesting.⁴</p> <p>Manage the woodland stands within the Beaver Planning Unit for the sustained production of woodland products (includes a portion of the decision area). Establish green wood cutting areas and provide additional access to and within those areas.⁵</p>			

Forestry and Woodland Products Management Actions			
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
<p>Allow the harvest of woodland species with a maximum allowable harvest of 6,000 cords per year for the entire Cedar and Beaver planning units. Reduce from the maximum allowable harvest by 10 cords per acre as woodlands are taken out of the sustained yield base by land treatment (chainings, burnings) to a minimum of 3,750 cords per year. Place priority on salvaging woodland products before land treatments.⁵</p>			
<p>Allow harvesting of all dead and down tree species unitwide.⁴</p> <p>Continue to authorize the sale of fuelwood and posts through the environmental assessment (EA) process within the Garfield Planning Unit. Dead and downed wood would be sold areawide and harvest of green fuelwood would be limited to green cutting areas to be established on a case-by-case basis as needed.⁵</p> <p>Allow post and woodcutting activities on three areas (4,190 acres). This would be done on a trial basis to determine if tree cutting activities can be used as a successful land treatment practice to increase the composition of native grass and forb species. Perform an EA on each post and woodcutting project and design the project in such a way as to eliminate or substantially mitigate the conflicts with VRM Classes and wildlife habitat as identified in the impact analysis above.³</p>	<p>Close WSAs to woodland product harvest, except for incidental collection for onsite campfire use and administrative purposes.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative B. In addition, close non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics to commercial and personal-use forest and woodland product harvest (e.g., pole, post, firewood cutting, Christmas trees, seed collection, and wildings) except for incidental collection for onsite campfire use and administrative purposes.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative B.</p>
<p>Leave the unit open to harvesting of juniper posts. Stipulations to avoid conflicts on specific sites (i.e.,</p>	<p>Permit harvesting of woodland products in riparian areas in proper functioning condition on a case-by-</p>	<p>Close riparian areas to harvesting of woodland products except for traditional Native American and</p>	<p>Same as Alternative B.</p>

Forestry and Woodland Products Management Actions			
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
potential recreation sites or riparian areas) would be included in individual permits. ^{1, 2, 5}	case basis for the maintenance and/or improvement of riparian ecosystems.	administrative use.	
Leave entire unit open to harvesting of pinyon pine for Christmas trees ^{1, 2, 5} . <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removal of ponderosa pine is expressly prohibited.¹ • Christmas tree harvest would not be permitted in riparian areas and in potential recreation sites.² 	Prohibit the removal of ponderosa pine for Christmas trees.	Same as Alternative B.	Leave entire area open to harvesting of all species for Christmas trees.
Complete a Woodland Management Plan for Beaver Planning Unit. ⁵	Develop a Forest Woodland Management Plan as required in the <i>Utah Forest and Woodland Management Action Plan</i> .		
Native American Use of Forestry and Woodland Products			
No similar action.	Allow Native American non-commercial traditional use of forest and woodland products for the collection of herbs, medicines, traditional use items, or items necessary for traditional, religious, or ceremonial purposes, through permits.		

Livestock Grazing

Alternative A for livestock grazing does not include decisions from the Escalante and Paria MFPs. These decisions are being addressed by the Rangeland Health EIS being prepared by GSENM. Allotments in the decision area that are managed under the Escalante and Paria MFPs will be addressed by the Rangeland Health EIS being prepared by GSENM.

Livestock Grazing Management Actions			
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Forage Allocation			
Allocate forage for livestock as noted in Table 3-24, except as noted below.			
Allocate forage for the Water Canyon Allotment as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Active livestock permitted use: 	Reallocate 48 AUMs on Water Canyon Allotment to wildlife for the life of the plan. Allocate forage as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Active livestock permitted use: 	Suspend 48AUMs on the Water Canyon Allotment for the life of the plan. Allocate forage as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Active livestock permitted use: 	Same as Alternative A.

Livestock Grazing Management Actions			
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
48 AUMs • Wildlife allocation: 51 AUMs.	0 AUMs • Wildlife allocation: 99 AUMs.	0 AUMs • Wildlife allocation: 51 AUMs.	
Allocate forage for the Lydia's Canyon Allotment as follows: • Active livestock permitted use: 0 AUMs • Wildlife allocation: 41 AUMs. Allocate forage for the Lydia Allotment as follows: • Active livestock permitted use: 58 AUMs • Wildlife allocation: 171 AUMs.	Combine Lydia's Canyon Allotment with adjacent Lydia Allotment. The resulting Lydia Allotment would be available for livestock grazing with no additional livestock AUMs. Allocate forage as follows: • Active livestock permitted use: 58 AUMs • Wildlife allocation: 212 AUMs. AUMs identified through future forage surveys would be allocated for livestock.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Allocate forage for the Lower North Fork Allotment as follows: • Active livestock permitted use: 10 AUMs • Wildlife allocation: 36 AUMs.	Same as Alternative A.	Suspend an additional 10 AUMs on Lower North Fork Allotment for life of the plan. Allocate forage as follows: • Active livestock permitted use: 0 AUMs • Wildlife allocation: 36 AUMs.	Reallocate 10 AUMs on Lower North Fork Allotment to wildlife for the life of the plan. Allocate forage as follows: • Active livestock permitted use: 0 AUMs • Wildlife allocation: 46 AUMs.
Allocate forage for the Zion Park Allotment as follows: • Active livestock permitted use: 0 AUMs • Wildlife allocation: 42 AUMs.	Same as Alternative A, except AUMs identified through future forage surveys would be allocated for livestock.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative C, except AUMs identified through future forage surveys would be allocated to wildlife.
Allocate forage for the Sawmill Allotment as follows:	Combine Sawmill Allotment with adjacent South Canyon Allotment. The resulting South Canyon Allotment would be available for livestock grazing with no additional livestock AUMs. Allocate forage as	Suspend 30 AUMs on Sawmill Allotment for life of the plan. Allocate forage for the Sawmill Allotment as follows:	Reallocate 30 AUMs on Sawmill Allotment to wildlife for the life of the plan. Allocate forage for the Sawmill Allotment as follows:

Livestock Grazing Management Actions			
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Active livestock permitted use: 30 AUMs Wildlife allocation: Wildlife AUMs in the CBGA planning area not allocated by allotment (Table 3.23 note *). <p>Allocate forage for the South Canyon Allotment as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Active livestock permitted use: 900 AUMs Wildlife allocation: Wildlife AUMs in the CBGA planning area not allocated by allotment (Table 3.23 note *). 	<p>follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Active livestock permitted use: 930 AUMs Wildlife allocation: Wildlife AUMs in the former CBGA planning area not allocated by allotment (Table 3.23 note *). <p>AUMs identified through future forage surveys would be allocated for livestock.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Active livestock permitted use: 0 AUMs Wildlife allocation: Wildlife AUMs in the former CBGA planning area not allocated by allotment (Table 3.23 note *). <p>Allocate forage for the South Canyon Allotment as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Active livestock permitted use: 900 AUMs Wildlife allocation: Wildlife AUMs in the former CBGA planning area not allocated by allotment (Table 3.23 note *). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Active livestock permitted use: 0 AUMs Wildlife allocation: 30 AUMs in addition to wildlife AUMs already allocated to allotments in the former CBGA planning area (Table 3.23 note *). <p>Allocate forage for the South Canyon Allotment as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Active livestock permitted use: 900 AUMs Wildlife allocation: Wildlife AUMs in the former CBGA planning area not allocated by allotment (Table 3.23 note *).
Grazing Management Practices			
No similar action.	Design grazing systems and range improvements to achieve and maintain healthy rangelands.	Implement grazing systems and range improvements to enhance wildlife, watershed, and riparian values while reducing livestock conflicts with other resources.	Implement grazing systems and range improvements to maximize livestock production while maintaining other resource values.
No similar action.	Analyze conversions in kind of livestock (such as from sheep to cattle) in light of the <i>Standards for Rangeland Health</i> . Allow conversion where they would not be adverse to achieving a standard, or they would not be in conflict with other decisions in this plan.		
No similar action.	Limit allocation of AUMs to the following kinds of livestock: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Domestic cattle Horses Sheep Goats. 	Same as Alternative B.	Limit allocation of AUMs to the following kinds of livestock: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Domestic cattle Domestic bison (<i>Bison bison</i>) Llamas/alpaca Horses/mules Sheep Goats Domestic upland game.
No similar action.	Do not authorize changes in kind of livestock to sheep or goats within 9 miles of Desert bighorn sheep habitat (same as		

Livestock Grazing Management Actions			
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
	decision in the Fish and Wildlife section).		
Allocation of Relinquished Preference for Livestock Forage			
No similar action.	A grazing permittee may voluntarily relinquish in writing all or a percentage of the grazing preference that is attached to the base property they own for any reason they may choose. This action would not require consent or approval by the BLM or any other entity. The BLM would not be a party to or accept any contingencies or conditions associated with a relinquishment that would require future BLM action(s) such as discontinuing livestock grazing. Once the preference and associated permitted use has been relinquished in whole or in part, it would remain available for application for preference and a grazing permit. However, upon relinquishment, the BLM may determine through a site-specific evaluation and associated NEPA analysis that the public lands within a grazing allotment are better used for other purposes such as recreation, wildlife, watershed for a culinary water source, disposal, etc. or a combination of these and/or other uses. Grazing may then be discontinued on the allotment through an amendment to the existing RMP or a new RMP effort. Any decision issued concerning discontinuance of livestock grazing on federal lands would not be permanent and would be subject to reconsideration during subsequent revision or amendment of the RMP. The evaluation and associated NEPA analysis may also determine that resource conditions are such that livestock grazing should be temporarily discontinued until site-specific resource objectives have been achieved. This evaluation and NEPA analysis would include a narrative with an evaluation time frame and process identified, indicating that once the objectives have been achieved the BLM would reconsider application(s) for grazing use.		
Mitigating Conflicts Between Livestock Grazing and Other Uses			
No similar action.	Give emphasis to changes in grazing management practices (e.g., changing season of use and fencing) before reducing AUMs on allotments to resolve conflicts with other uses. Suspend authorization of AUMs in areas of intensive surface disturbance (such as surface coal mining) until rehabilitation is complete.	Give emphasis to suspending AUMs in areas where conflicts with other uses cannot be mitigated. Suspend authorization of AUMs in areas of intensive surface disturbance (such as surface coal mining) until rehabilitation is complete.	Same as Alternative B.
Range Treatments for Livestock Grazing			
Complete land treatments to provide additional AUMs needed to meet the demand for livestock forage and divide the AUMs proportionally among all operators, with the following exclusions ³ : • Identify band-tailed pigeon roost sites in the Barracks Point and Poverty Flat Allotments and do not	Complete land treatments to maintain or provide additional AUMs needed to meet the demand for livestock forage and divide the AUMs proportionally among all operators within the affected allotments. Prioritize treatments on the following allotments (Map 2-3): • South Canyon	No range treatments would be implemented for the primary purpose of increasing forage for livestock (Map 2-4).	Same as Alternative B.

Livestock Grazing Management Actions			
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
<p>destroy roosting sites through tree changes.³</p> <p>Complete land treatments to provide additional livestock AUMs needed to balance pastures for intensive grazing systems with the following restrictions⁴:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On frail watershed areas where treatments are proposed, chaining pinyon-juniper trees with slash left in place and spraying big sage would be the only accepted land treatment method.⁴ • Existing seedings would be modified as necessary to lessen the negative visual impacts.⁴ • Before burning on areas identified for proposed strip mining, a clearance would be conducted in identified areas to prevent any exposed coal seam from becoming ignited.⁴ • In areas identified as sandy soils that are highly susceptible to wind erosion, spraying sagebrush would be the only acceptable method of land treatment.⁴ • Provide 618 additional livestock AUMs and graze 115 cattle needed to balance pastures for intensive grazing systems.³ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sethy's Canyon • Sandy Creek • Sanford Bench • Sugar Knoll • Spring Hollow • Circleville Cove • Kane Spring (non-WSA portion) • Buck Knoll • Spencer Bench • Clay Flat • Harris Flat • Three Mile • Limestone Canyon • Spry • Chris Spring • Big Flat • Limekiln Creek • Poverty Flat (non-WSA portion) • Roller Mill • Oak Spring • Yellowjacket (non-WSA portion) • Dog Valley • Bald Knoll • Alton Cove • Coop Creek • Areas that are not achieving <i>Standards for Rangeland Health</i>. 		

Recreation

OHV and other transportation decisions are included in the transportation management decisions.

Recreation Management Actions			
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Special and Extensive Recreation Management Areas			
No areas would be managed as an SRMA.	Identify the following RMAs (Map 2-9): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kanab Community SRMA (community) (33,100 acres) • Paria SRMA (destination) (21,200 acres) • Moquith Mountain SRMA (community) (14,900 acres) • Parunuweap SRMA (undeveloped) (30,800 acres) • Orderville Canyon SRMA (undeveloped) (1,950 acres) • North Fork Virgin River SRMA (undeveloped) (1,050 acres) • Escalante SRMA (community) (22,800 acres) • Kanab Field Office Extensive Recreation Management Area (ERMA) (428,200 acres). 	Identify the following RMAs (Map 2-10): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kanab Community SRMA (community) (20,700 acres) • Paria SRMA (destination) (21,200 acres) • Moquith Mountain SRMA (undeveloped) (19,300 acres) • Parunuweap SRMA (undeveloped) (37,700 acres) • Orderville Canyon SRMA (undeveloped) (6,300 acres) • North Fork Virgin River SRMA (undeveloped) (1,050 acres) • Escalante SRMA (community) (22,800 acres) • Kanab Field Office ERMA (424,950 acres). 	Identify the following RMAs (Map 2-11): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kanab Community SRMA (destination) (78,300 acres) • Paria SRMA (destination) (21,200 acres) • Moquith Mountain SRMA (community) (14,900 acres) • Parunuweap SRMA (destination) (8,400 acres) • Kanab Field Office ERMA (431,200 acres).
No similar action.	Recreation management direction for each SRMA is outlined in Appendix D. This includes direction for the following recreation management components: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recreation Niche • Recreation Management Objectives • Primary Activities • Experiences • Benefits • Setting Character Conditions. 		
No similar action.	Develop SRMA management plans that identify site-specific development needs to achieve recreation benefits, experiences, and objectives.		
Portions of the decision area not identified as an SRMA would be identified as an ERMA. ERMAs would receive only custodial management (which addresses only activity opportunities) of visitor health and safety, user conflict, and resource protection issues with no activity-level planning. Therefore, actions within ERMAs would generally be implemented directly from LUP decisions.			

Recreation Management Actions			
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Kanab Community SRMA			
<p>Do not identify a SRMA, but manage recreation in this area as noted in the travel restriction action (see Transportation section).</p>	<p>Market Strategy: Community OHV RMZ (18,500 acres) Recreation Niche: Close-to-town OHV travel in an exceptionally scenic setting with a variety of trails for different skill levels. Primary Activities: Driving OHVs, viewing scenery and wildlife, photography, spending time with friends and family, and participating in and/or viewing competitive/organized events. Required Management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OHV: Minimal designated routes to access RMZ and provide a variety of OHV opportunities • VRM: Class III • Minerals: Open to oil and gas leasing subject to major constraints (NSO) • Facilities: Provide support facilities for recreation experience. <p>Non-motorized RMZ (14,600 acres) Recreation Niche: Town-accessible hiking and equestrian trail network offering outstanding views and varied terrain. Primary Activities: Hiking, rock-scrambling, viewing scenery and wildlife, photography, equestrian, spending time with friends and family, and participating in and/or viewing competitive/organized events. Required Management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OHV: Limit to designated routes to access trail heads 	<p>Market Strategy: Community OHV RMZ (0 acres) No similar action.</p> <p>Non-motorized RMZ (20,700 acres) Recreation Niche: Town-accessible hiking and equestrian trail network offering outstanding views and varied terrain. Primary Activities: Hiking, rock-scrambling, viewing scenery and wildlife, photography, equestrian, spending time with friends and family, and participating in and/or viewing competitive/organized events. Required Management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OHV: Limit to designated routes to access trail heads 	<p>Market Strategy: Destination OHV RMZ (78,300 acres) Recreation Niche: Close-to-town OHV travel in an exceptionally scenic setting with a variety of trails for different skill levels. Primary Activities: Driving OHVs, viewing scenery and wildlife, photography, spending time with friends and family, and participating in and/or viewing competitive/organized events. Required Management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OHV: Sufficient designated routes to accommodate all development opportunities • VRM: Class III • Minerals: Open to leasing subject to standard lease terms and conditions • Facilities: Provide support facilities for recreation experience. <p>Non-motorized RMZ (0 acres) No similar action.</p>

Recreation Management Actions			
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • VRM: Class II • Minerals: Open to oil and gas leasing subject to major constraints (NSO) • Facilities: Provide support facilities for recreation experience. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • VRM: Class II • Minerals: Open to oil and gas leasing subject to major constraints (NSO), recommend for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry, and close to mineral material disposals • Facilities: Provide support facilities for recreation experience. 	
Paria SRMA			
No similar action.	<p>Market Strategy: Destination</p> <p>Canyon RMZ (1,100 acres)</p> <p>Recreation Niche: World-class wilderness trekking adventure viewing deeply entrenched slickrock canyon and associated slot canyon features.</p> <p>Primary Activities: Hiking and scrambling, backpacking, canyoneering, outdoor photography, camping, viewing scenic vistas, viewing cultural sites, and wilderness exploration.</p> <p>Required Management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OHV: Close to OHV use • VRM: Class I • Minerals: Wilderness area is closed to all mineral laws (location, leasing, salables) (Chapter 3). <p>Uplands RMZ (20,100 acres)</p> <p>Recreation Niche: Unique, world-class primitive and backcountry adventure recreation viewing unique upland geologic features.</p> <p>Primary Activities: Hiking and scrambling, outdoor photography, viewing wildlife and scenic vistas, wilderness exploration, equestrian, and camping.</p> <p>Required Management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OHV: Close to OHV use • VRM: Class I • Minerals: Wilderness area is closed to all mineral laws (location, leasing, salables) (Chapter 3). 		
Moquith Mountain SRMA			
Do not identify as an SRMA, but manage recreation in this area as follows: Develop a small overnight camping	<p>Market Strategy: Community</p> <p>Dunes RMZ (900 acres)</p> <p>Recreation Niche: Unique, scenic, and expansive sand dunes OHV</p>	<p>Market Strategy: Undeveloped</p> <p>Dunes RMZ (2,600 acres)</p> <p>Recreation Niche: Unique, scenic, and expansive sand dunes non-</p>	<p>Market Strategy: Community</p> <p>Dunes RMZ (900 acres)</p> <p>Recreation Niche: Unique, scenic, and expansive sand dunes OHV</p>

Recreation Management Actions			
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
<p>and trailhead facility at Sand Springs, involving about 40 acres, when visitor use data shows that Ponderosa Grove and Coral Pink Sand Dunes State Park cannot meet the recreational needs of the area³:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developments would include about three camp units, vault type restrooms, parking area, road improvements, fencing, and water development.³ • An activity plan is needed to guide specific management activities. The plan should be developed in conjunction with activity planning for the Water Canyon/South Fork Indian Canyon ACEC.³ • A hiking trail of about 1.5 miles should be constructed to link Sand Springs with the South Fork Indian Canyon Pictograph Site. The access road to the site should be closed from the point it intersects with the road that leads south from Sand Springs to Moquith Mountain.³ • The segregation from mineral entry in the Sand Spring area should be maintained and mineral leasing operations prohibited.³ <p>The Sand Springs area should be designated closed to OHV.³</p> <p>Camping rules in the Coral Pink Sand Dunes/Moquith Mountain area would be standardized for both State Park and BLM-designated campgrounds. The dry lakebed and Sand Spring would continue to be available for dispersed motorized camping. Limits</p>	<p>opportunities.</p> <p>Primary Activities: Driving among sand dunes, camping along dune fringes, photography, and spending time with friends and family.</p> <p>Required Management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OHV: Open beyond vegetated and conservation areas. All vehicles on the dunes are required to stay at least 10 feet from vegetation. • VRM: Class II with Class III where vegetation treatments for rangeland health and vegetation and habitat restoration would be necessary. • Minerals: Close to oil and gas leasing. • Facilities: Provide support facilities for recreation experience. <p>Non-dunes wooded RMZ (14,000 acres)</p> <p>Recreation Niche: Scenic and extensive OHV trail network accessing vistas, overlooks, flora and fauna, and cultural sites.</p> <p>Primary Activities: Driving OHVs; viewing flora/fauna, geology, and cultural sites; hiking; equestrian; camping; hunting; photography; and spending time with friends and family.</p> <p>Required Management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OHV: Limit to designated routes to access trail heads • VRM: Class III • Minerals: Open to oil and gas leasing subject to major constraints (NSO) • Facilities: Provide support facilities 	<p>motorized recreation opportunities.</p> <p>Primary Activities: Hiking among sand dunes, camping along dune fringes, photography, and spending time with friends and family.</p> <p>Required Management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OHV: Close to OHV use • VRM: Class II • Minerals: Close to oil and gas leasing, and recommend for withdrawal and close to mineral material disposal • Facilities: Provide support facilities for recreation experience. <p>Non-dunes wooded RMZ (16,700 acres)</p> <p>Recreation Niche: Scenic and extensive trail network accessing vistas, overlooks, flora and fauna, and cultural sites.</p> <p>Primary Activities: Viewing flora/fauna, geology, and cultural sites; hiking; equestrian; camping; hunting; photography; and spending time with friends and family.</p> <p>Required Management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OHV: Limit to designated routes to access trail heads • VRM: Class II • Minerals: Close to oil and gas leasing, recommend for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry, and close to mineral material disposal • Facilities: Provide support facilities for recreation experience. 	<p>opportunities.</p> <p>Primary Activities: Driving among sand dunes, camping along dune fringes, photography, and spending time with friends and family.</p> <p>Required Management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OHV: Open beyond vegetated and conservation areas. All vehicles on the dunes are required to stay at least 10 feet from vegetation. • VRM: Class II. • Minerals: Close to oil and gas leasing. • Facilities: Provide support facilities for recreation experience. <p>Non-dunes wooded RMZ (14,000 acres)</p> <p>Recreation Niche: Scenic and extensive OHV trail network accessing vistas, overlooks, flora and fauna, and cultural sites</p> <p>Primary Activities: Driving OHVs; viewing flora/fauna, geology, and cultural sites; hiking; equestrian; camping; hunting; photography; and spending time with friends and family.</p> <p>Required Management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OHV: Sufficient designated routes to accommodate all development opportunities • VRM: Class III • Minerals: Open to leasing subject to major constraints (NSO) • Facilities: Provide support facilities for recreation experience.

Recreation Management Actions			
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
<p>on numbers of recreation units camping in the dry lakebed would be based on continued monitoring (but would not exceed 50 units). The area available for camping would not exceed 4 acres in size.³</p> <p>A contact station and parking area (up to 5 acres) would be constructed at the junction of the Yellowjacket and Hancock roads. The purpose of the contact station would be to provide information regarding management of the Coral Pink Sand Dunes and to act as the access point prior to entry to both the BLM-administered portion of the dunes and the State Park. The facility would accommodate visitors who are interested in obtaining both a motorized and non-motorized type of recreation experience and would direct visitors to the area where they would obtain an optimum experience for the type of recreation they are seeking.³</p> <p>Expand and improve facilities at Ponderosa Grove. An activity plan should be developed to guide future development. Needed improvements would include a well and water system, traffic circulation and parking, and additional picnic units. Space is available in the present site for most improvements with the possible exception of the well site.³</p> <p>The Ponderosa Grove Campground would be expanded up to 5 acres to include additional camping units and a day-use area. A day-use facility (up to 2 acres) would be developed and</p>	<p>for recreation experience.</p> <p>Dry Lakebed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No dumping of grey water or black water from RV units. • Firepans required for all open fires, and firewood must be packed in from outside the SRMA. • No digging of holes or pits. • No construction of fire-rings. • All trash and fire residue must be packed out and not left in the SRMA. <p>Ponderosa Grove campground</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No dumping of grey water or black water from RV units. • No fires outside of established campsite fire grates. • No digging of holes or pits. • All trash must be packed out and not left in the SRMA. 		

Recreation Management Actions			
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
<p>maintained near the junction of the Hancock and Sand Spring roads. Once these (as well as State Park improvements to camping facilities) are in place, no camping or OHV riding would be allowed for one-quarter mile north of Hancock Road.³</p>			
Parunuweap SRMA			
<p>No similar action.</p>	<p>Market Strategy: Undeveloped Non-motorized Canyon RMZ (6,100 acres)</p> <p>Recreation Niche: Spectacular, primitive riparian canyon travel with abundant geologic formations and diverse flora and fauna.</p> <p>Primary Activities: Hiking, backpacking, canyoneering, hunting, camping, equestrian, outdoor photography, viewing nature and wildlife, and studying geology.</p> <p>Required Management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OHV: Close to OHV use • VRM: Class I • Minerals: Close to oil and gas leasing. <p>Motorized Canyon RMZ (2,300 acres)</p> <p>Recreation Niche: Spectacular, backcountry riparian canyon OHV travel with abundant geologic formations and diverse flora and fauna.</p> <p>Primary Activities: Driving OHVs, hiking, hunting, camping, outdoor</p>	<p>Market Strategy: Undeveloped Non-motorized Canyon RMZ (8,400 acres)</p> <p>Recreation Niche: Spectacular, primitive riparian canyon travel with abundant geologic formations and diverse flora and fauna.</p> <p>Primary Activities: Hiking, backpacking, canyoneering, hunting, camping, equestrian, outdoor photography, viewing nature and wildlife, and studying geology.</p> <p>Required Management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OHV: Close to OHV use • VRM: Class I • Minerals: Close to oil and gas leasing, recommend for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry, and close to mineral material disposals. <p>Motorized Canyon RMZ (0 acres)</p> <p>No similar action.</p>	<p>Market Strategy: Destination Non-motorized Canyon RMZ (6,100 acres)</p> <p>Recreation Niche: Spectacular, primitive riparian canyon travel with abundant geologic formations and diverse flora and fauna.</p> <p>Primary Activities: Hiking, backpacking, canyoneering, hunting, camping, equestrian, outdoor photography, viewing nature and wildlife, and studying geology.</p> <p>Required Management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OHV: Close to OHV use • VRM: Class II • Minerals: Close to oil and gas leasing • Facilities: Provide support facilities for recreation experience. <p>Motorized Canyon RMZ (2,300 acres)</p> <p>Recreation Niche: Spectacular, backcountry riparian canyon OHV travel with abundant geologic formations and diverse flora and fauna.</p> <p>Primary Activities: Driving OHVs, hiking, hunting, camping, outdoor</p>

Recreation Management Actions			
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
	<p>photography, viewing nature and wildlife, studying geology, and participating in and/or viewing organized group events.</p> <p>Required Management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OHV: Limit to single designated route in canyon bottom • VRM: Class II • Minerals: Close to oil and gas leasing • Facilities: Provide support facilities for recreation experience. <p>Uplands RMZ (22,400 acres)</p> <p>Recreation Niche: Spectacular, backcountry driving and hiking/equestrian opportunities with abundant geologic formations and diverse flora and fauna.</p> <p>Primary Activities: OHV touring, hiking, picnicking, backpacking, hunting, camping, equestrian, outdoor photography, and viewing nature and wildlife.</p> <p>Required Management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OHV: Minimal designated routes to access RMZ and provide variety of OHV opportunities • VRM: Class III • Minerals: Open to leasing subject to major constraints (NSO) • Facilities: Provide support facilities for recreation experience. 	<p>Uplands RMZ (29,300 acres)</p> <p>Recreation Niche: Spectacular, backcountry driving and hiking/equestrian opportunities with abundant geologic formations and diverse flora and fauna.</p> <p>Primary Activities: Hiking, picnicking, backpacking, hunting, camping, equestrian, outdoor photography, and viewing nature and wildlife.</p> <p>Required Management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OHV: Limit to designated routes to access trail heads • VRM: Class II • Minerals: Close to oil and gas leasing, recommend for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry, and close to mineral material disposals • Facilities: Provide support facilities for recreation experience. 	<p>photography, viewing nature and wildlife, studying geology, and participating in and/or viewing organized group events.</p> <p>Required Management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OHV: Limit to designated routes • VRM: Class III • Minerals: Close to oil and gas leasing • Facilities: Provide support facilities for recreation experience. <p>Uplands RMZ (0 acres)</p> <p>No similar action.</p>
Orderville Canyon SRMA			
No similar action.	<p>Market Strategy: Undeveloped (1,950 acres)</p> <p>Recreation Niche: Spectacular,</p>	<p>Market Strategy: Undeveloped (6,300 acres)</p> <p>Recreation Niche: Spectacular,</p>	<p>(0 acres)</p> <p>No similar action.</p>

Recreation Management Actions			
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
	<p>primitive riparian canyon travel with abundant geologic formations and diverse flora and fauna.</p> <p>Primary Activities: Canyoneering, hiking, backpacking, hunting, camping, outdoor photography, viewing nature and wildlife, equestrian, and studying geology.</p> <p>Required Management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OHV: Limit to designated routes • VRM: Class II • Minerals: Open to leasing subject to major constraints (NSO) • Facilities: Provide support facilities for recreation experience. 	<p>primitive riparian canyon travel with abundant geologic formations and diverse flora and fauna.</p> <p>Primary Activities: Canyoneering, hiking, backpacking, hunting, camping, outdoor photography, viewing nature and wildlife, equestrian, and studying geology.</p> <p>Required Management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OHV: Limit to designated routes • VRM: Class I • Minerals: Close to oil and gas leasing, recommend for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry, and close to mineral material disposals • Facilities: Provide support facilities for recreation experience. 	
North Fork Virgin River SRMA			
No similar action.	<p>Market Strategy: Undeveloped (1,050 acres)</p> <p>Recreation Niche: Spectacular, primitive riparian canyon travel with abundant geologic formations and diverse flora and fauna.</p> <p>Primary Activities: Canyoneering, hiking, backpacking, hunting, camping, outdoor photography, viewing nature and wildlife, equestrian, and studying geology.</p> <p>Required Management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OHV: Limit to designated routes • VRM: Class II • Minerals: Close to oil and gas leasing • Facilities: Provide support facilities for recreation experience. 	<p>Market Strategy: Undeveloped (1,050 acres)</p> <p>Recreation Niche: Spectacular, primitive riparian canyon travel with abundant geologic formations and diverse flora and fauna.</p> <p>Primary Activities: Canyoneering, hiking, backpacking, hunting, camping, outdoor photography, viewing nature and wildlife, equestrian, and studying geology.</p> <p>Required Management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OHV: Close to OHV use • VRM: Class I • Minerals: Close to oil and gas leasing, recommend for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry, and close to mineral material disposals 	<p>(0 acres) No similar action.</p>

Recreation Management Actions			
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Facilities: Provide support facilities for recreation experience. 	
Escalante SRMA			
<p>Do not identify an SRMA, but manage recreation in this area as follows:</p> <p>Coordinate with Utah State Department of Parks and Recreation in future efforts on its part to develop an intensive OHV use area as per the Escalante Petrified Forest State Park Development Plan.¹</p>	<p>Market Strategy: Community (22,800 acres)</p> <p>Recreation Niche: Town-accessible OHV touring, mountain biking, and hiking/equestrian trail networks offering outstanding views and varied terrain.</p> <p>Primary Activities: OHV touring, mountain biking, hiking, rock-scrambling, viewing scenery and wildlife, photography, equestrian, spending time with friends and family, and participating in and/or viewing competitive/organized events.</p> <p>Required Management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> OHV: Limit to designated routes VRM: Class III Minerals: Open to leasing subject to moderate constraints (timing limitation stipulation from May 1 to September 30) Facilities: Provide support facilities for recreation experience. 	<p>Market Strategy: Community (22,800 acres)</p> <p>Recreation Niche: Town-accessible hiking/equestrian trail network offering outstanding views and varied terrain.</p> <p>Primary Activities: Hiking, rock-scrambling, viewing scenery and wildlife, photography, equestrian, spending time with friends and family, and participating in and/or viewing competitive/organized events.</p> <p>Required Management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> OHV: Limit to designated routes VRM: Class II Minerals: Open to leasing subject to major constraints (NSO) Facilities: Provide support facilities for recreation experience. 	<p>(0 acres)</p> <p>No similar action.</p>
Kanab Field Office ERMA			
No similar action.	<p>(428,900 acres)</p> <p>Primary Activities: OHV touring; hiking; picnicking; backpacking; hunting; fishing; camping; equestrian; outdoor photography; viewing geologic features, nature, and wildlife; and participating in and/or viewing competitive/organized events.</p>	<p>(424,950 acres)</p> <p>Primary Activities: OHV touring; hiking; picnicking; backpacking; hunting; fishing; camping; equestrian; outdoor photography; viewing geologic features, nature, and wildlife; and participating in and/or viewing competitive/organized events.</p>	<p>(431,200 acres)</p> <p>Primary Activities: OHV touring; hiking; picnicking; backpacking; hunting; fishing; camping; equestrian; outdoor photography; viewing geologic features, nature, and wildlife; and participating in and/or viewing competitive/organized events.</p>

Recreation Management Actions			
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
	Required Management: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Facilities: Provide support facilities for recreation experience. 	Required Management: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Facilities: Provide support facilities for recreation experience. 	Required Management: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Facilities: Provide support facilities for recreation experience.
General Recreation Management			
No similar action.	Close areas to rock climbing within the distance and time restrictions identified in the management of raptor habitat decisions.		
Provide directional signing to features when appropriate. ¹	Use the minimum necessary signage to provide for public safety and information or to control unauthorized use.		
No similar action.	Design facilities to be compatible with the local landscapes and recreation experience.		
No similar action.	Management responses to unacceptable resource and/or social conditions would range from least restrictive methods (e.g., information and education) to most restrictive (e.g., visitor limits, supplemental rules, or restrictions). Where feasible, the least restrictive methods would be the first priority. (Recognize that various levels of regulations and limits are necessary. Restrictions and limitations on public uses should be as small as possible without compromising the primary goal.) Use on-the-ground presence as a tool to protect public lands.		
No similar action.	Developed recreation sites would be recommended for withdrawal from mineral entry, closed to mineral material disposal, and open to oil and gas leasing subject to major constraints (NSO).		
No similar action.	Developed recreation sites would be fenced to exclude grazing use.		
No similar action.	Identify areas for rock crawling where impacts could be minimized or eliminated and where such use would be compatible with other resource goals and objectives.		
Dispersed Camping			
No similar action.	Allow dispersed camping throughout the decision area without permit, unless otherwise described in the alternatives.		
No similar action.	Limit vehicle parking for dispersed camping within 150 feet of designated routes.	Limit vehicle parking for dispersed camping within 100 feet of designated routes. Dispersed group camping within SRMAs would be limited to designated camp sites or areas.	Limit vehicle parking for dispersed camping within 200 feet of designated routes.
Interpretation and Environmental Education			
Enhance sightseeing associated with geology in the Vermilion Planning Unit by developing an interpretive program involving three geologic features (sand dunes at Ponderosa Grove and Sand Springs; Sevier	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide information regarding recreation opportunities, interpretation of natural and human history, and specific rules and regulations pertaining to use of public lands to visitors. Provide education and outreach programs such as Tread Lightly or Leave No Trace. Provide information on the areas cultural and natural resources through outreach programs (e.g., organizations, schools, and partnerships) to build emotional, intellectual, and recreational ties with the area. 		

Recreation Management Actions			
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
<p>Fault White Cliffs at U.S. Highway 89/Yellowjacket Road; and Vermilion at existing turnout near Johnson Canyon). This would involve development of new turnouts along roads, including one on U.S. Highway 89, and installation of interpretive signs. A plan would be developed to guide interpretation and development for each feature.³</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public information would be provided only for those cultural sites designated for public use. 		
Heritage Tourism			
<p>Preserve physical remains of the Civilian Conservation Corps developments at Pine Springs. Inventory and interpret through signing.²</p> <p>Increase sightseeing opportunities for archaeological resources within the Paria Planning Unit through protective development and interpretation of two sites. Adequate protective measures to prevent loss of educational or scientific and sightseeing values must precede actions that increase accessibility to the public.²</p>	<p>Coordinate with local communities and other groups to foster heritage tourism throughout the decision area.</p>		
Big Game Retrieval			
<p>No similar action.</p>	<p>Allow use of non-motorized wheel carriers to retrieve game kills outside of WSAs.</p>	<p>Preclude the use of game carriers off of designated routes.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative B.</p>
Acquisition of Easements			
<p>See Lands and Realty section. No specific priorities for recreation-related acquisitions or easements.</p>	<p>Acquire legal access to areas of high recreation interest from willing parties.</p>		
Night Skies and Soundscapes			
<p>No similar issue.</p>	<p>Impacts to night sky would be considered and mitigated through the application of specific mitigation measures (e.g., down lighting and low-level lighting) identified in activity-level planning and NEPA review. See also Lands and Realty</p>		

Recreation Management Actions			
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
	restrictions on the use of strobe lights.		
No similar issue.	Impacts to soundscapes around national parks would be considered and mitigated through the application of specific mitigation measures identified in activity-level planning and NEPA-level review.		
Special Recreation Permits			
	Issue SRPs after evaluation of the various factors including the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nature of proposed event or activity (i.e., commercial versus competitive) • Size (acreage) and sensitivity of land and resources affected (ACEC, WSA, VRM) • Compatibility with other uses, activities, and visitors in that area • Proposed number of participants and group size • Associated vehicle and equipment • Time (daily, seasonally) and duration of proposed use • Potential social impacts (crowding, group encounters, conflicting activities, and/or experiences) • Specific resources impacted (e.g., wildlife, cultural, paleontology, visual, riparian, soil, air, and water) • Rehabilitation and monitoring needs and feasibility • Support needs (people, equipment, supplies, vehicles) • Safety issues. 		
No similar action.	Vending would be authorized in conjunction with organized events or when the vending is necessary to support resource protection or appropriate recreation use. Vending along scenic byways and backways would be coordinated with the Scenic Byway coordination committees and local government and highway authorities.		
No similar action.	In protected and restricted MSO habitat, limit SRP group size to no more than 12 according to recovery plan.	In protected and restricted MSO habitat, limit SRP group size to no more than eight.	Same as Alternative B.
No similar action.	Prohibit OHV or mountain bike tours in the following areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where compliance with the Utah Riparian Policy would not be achieved • The loop within Moquith Mountain WSA • The Elephant Cove Way within Parunuweap WSA. 		
No similar action.	Limit camping associated with SRPs to areas beyond 200 feet of riparian areas unless specific campsites are required during permitting. Approval of these specific campsites would be considered on a case-by-case basis.		
No similar action.	Group size would be limited to 12 people total (including tour guides) in the following areas:	Group size would be limited to 12 people total (including tour guides) in the following areas:	Group size would be limited to 20 people total (including tour guides) in the following areas:

Recreation Management Actions			
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wetlands/riparian zones • WSAs • Designated critical habitat for special status species. <p>Group size would be limited to 25 people total in the remainder of the decision area, with permits for groups of more than 25 people being considered on a case-by-case basis in areas where resources would not be damaged.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wetlands/riparian zones • WSAs • Designated critical habitat for special status species. <p>Group size would be limited to 20 people total in the remainder of the decision area, with permits for groups of more than 20 people being considered on a case-by-case basis in areas where resources would not be damaged.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wetlands/riparian zones • WSAs • Designated critical habitat for special status species. <p>Group size would be limited to 40 people total in the remainder of the decision area, with permits for groups of more than 40 people being considered on a case-by-case basis in areas where resources would not be damaged.</p>
No similar action.	<p>SRPs would be subject to the following restrictions unless specifically authorized:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No collection of natural resources (not including firewood for personal onsite use). • No SRP activities would be authorized in bald eagle winter roost areas from November 15 through March 15 during critical roosting hours (from 1 hour after sunset to 9 a.m.). • If surveys reveal the presence of nesting Southwestern willow flycatchers, authorize no SRP activities in these locations between May 15 and June 30. • No Greater sage-grouse lek areas would be advertised by SRP holders or the BLM. • Implement seasonal/area closures during Greater sage-grouse breeding (March 1 to April 30) and/or wintering (November 1 to February 28) seasons if BLM biologists determine that breeding or wintering is being impacted by SRP activities. 		

Transportation

Transportation Management Actions			
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
OHV Area Designations			
<p>Manage OHV use according to existing area designations (Map 2-12)^{1, 2, 3, 4, 5}:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open to cross-country OHV use: 466,600 acres • OHV use limited to existing or 	<p>Management of motorized access would balance protection of resources while providing for resource use needs. Area designations would be as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open to cross-country OHV use: 	<p>Management of motorized access would emphasize protection of resources while providing for intensively managed resource uses. Area designations would be as follows:</p>	<p>Management of motorized access would receive the minimum restrictions necessary to protect resources while providing for resource use needs. Area designations would be as follows:</p>

Transportation Management Actions			
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
<p>designated routes: 66,200 acres</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Closed to OHV use: 21,200 acres. 	<p>Approximately 1,100 acres</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited to designated routes: 524,000 acres • Closed to OHV use: 28,900 acres. <p>(Map 2-13)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open to cross-country OHV use: 0 acres • Limited to designated routes: 388,300 acres • Limited seasonally: 84,500 acres (Areas with seasonal limitations overlap areas where OHV use is limited to designated routes; these areas are closed to OHV use for a portion of the year. See Fish and Wildlife Management Actions under Management of Deer and Elk Habitats.) • Closed to OHV use: 165,700 acres. <p>(Map 2-14)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open to cross-country OHV use: 1,100 acres (in addition, ephemeral washes throughout the decision area would be open) • Limited to designated routes: 525,300 acres • Closed to OHV use: 27,600 acres. <p>(Map 2-15)</p>
Develop an OHV Management Plan. ⁵	See Recreation section for specific management of OHV use in SRMAs.		
Areas Open for Cross-Country OHV Use			
<p>The decision area would be open to OHV use except those areas noted below.^{1, 2, 3, 4, 5}</p> <p>Rules and regulations regarding OHV riding at the Coral Pink Sand Dunes/Moquith Mountain area would be standardized for those areas of the sand dunes remaining open to motorized use. These rules would apply to both BLM and State Park-administered sand dunes.³</p> <p>The portion of the Moquith Mountain WSA open to motorized use would be monitored to ensure that no new routes would develop and the character of existing routes would not change. If monitoring indicates that impairment may be occurring, then management actions would be implemented to protect wilderness values. Potential actions could</p>	<p>Designate the following managed open areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moquith Mountain SRMA: Dunes RMZ beyond vegetated and conservation areas • DD Hollow topsoil pit. 	<p>Do not designate any areas for cross-country OHV use.</p>	<p>Designate the following managed open areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moquith Mountain SRMA: Dunes RMZ beyond vegetated and conservation areas • DD Hollow topsoil pit • Identified and signed ephemeral wash bottoms • Garfield County motocross • Kaneplex area.

Transportation Management Actions			
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
include restricting the number of visitors or expanding the OHV closure. ³			
Areas Where OHV Use Would Be Limited Spatially or Seasonally			
Spatial Limitations			
<p>Areas where vehicle use would be limited to designated routes would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developed sites and facilities specifically provided for vehicle use, such as roads and parking areas² • Areas that have received artificial vegetative manipulation (i.e., range, watershed, or wildlife land treatments) for a minimum of 2 years after treatment^{2, 4} • All other areas that are suitable for livestock grazing (indicated to recreationists by on-the-ground signing or identification on maps or brochures, as appropriate)² • Riparian areas^{2, 4, 5} • Frail watersheds⁴ • Identified critical watershed areas. (The remaining frail watershed would remain open with a monitoring program developed to identify conflicts if they arise.)³ 	<p>Management of OHV use in areas not designated as open or closed would be limited to designated routes (524,000 acres, Map 2-13).</p>	<p>Management of OHV use in areas not designated as open or closed would be limited to designated routes (388,300 acres, Map 2-14).</p>	<p>Management of OHV use in areas not designated as open or closed would be limited to designated routes (525,300 acres, Map 2-15).</p>
<p>Cross-country travel within Parunuweap Canyon, Orderville Canyon, and North Fork Virgin River WSAs is prohibited. OHV travel in these WSAs is limited to routes and ways identified during the original 1980 wilderness inventory and shown on the inventory maps located at the BLM Kanab Field Office. These</p>			

Transportation Management Actions			
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
<p>limitations apply to all motorized vehicle use with the exception of law enforcement and emergency personnel or administrative uses authorized by the BLM. The travel limitations would remain in effect until the threats to WSA impairment are eliminated or until permanent OHV designations are effected through land use planning (see 43 CFR 8341.2(a)).⁶</p>			
<p>OHV cross-country travel is prohibited in Hog Canyon. This restriction would remain in effect until the considerable adverse effects giving rise to the restriction are eliminated and measures are implemented to prevent recurrence of these adverse effects.⁷</p>			
Seasonal Limitations			
<p>An area on the north side of Pugh Canyon is closed annually to motorized use between February 1 and August 31 (to protect the reproductive success of a breeding pair of raptors). During the remainder of the year OHV use would be limited to designated routes. This seasonal closure would remain in effect until the considerable adverse effects giving rise to the seasonal closure are eliminated and measures are implemented to prevent recurrence of these adverse effects.⁷</p> <p>Limit OHV recreational use to existing roads and trails on crucial Greater sage-grouse strutting grounds (seasonal limitation between March 15 to May 1), nesting and</p>	<p>Designated routes on the north side of Pugh Canyon are closed annually to motorized use between February 1 and August 31 if a breeding pair of raptors is using the area (to protect the reproductive success of a breeding pair of raptors). During the remainder of the year OHV use would be limited to designated routes.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative B, plus deer and elk crucial winter range would be closed from November 15 to April 15. During the remainder of the year OHV use would be limited to designated routes.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative B.</p>

Transportation Management Actions			
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
<p>roosting sites for bald and golden eagles (seasonal limitation between February 15 and June 30), or critical prairie dog habitat (yearlong limitation). During the remainder of the year OHV use would be open to cross-country travel.⁵</p>			
Designated Routes (Implementation-Level Decisions)			
<p>Manage routes according to existing designations^{3, 6, 7}:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open to motorized vehicle use: 55 miles • Limited (closed seasonally) to motorized vehicle use: 2 miles • Closed to motorized vehicle use: 6 miles • Undesignated inventoried routes: 1,442 miles. <p>(Map 2-16)</p>	<p>Manage inventoried routes as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open to motorized vehicle use: 1,402 miles • Limited (closed seasonally) to motorized vehicle use: 2 miles • Closed to motorized vehicle use: 101 miles. <p>(Map 2-17)</p>	<p>Manage inventoried routes as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open to motorized vehicle use: 884 miles • Limited (closed seasonally) to motorized vehicle use: 306 miles • Closed to motorized vehicle use: 315 miles. <p>(Map 2-18)</p>	<p>Manage inventoried routes as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open to motorized vehicle use: 1,462 miles • Limited (closed seasonally) to motorized vehicle use: 2 miles • Closed to motorized vehicle use: 41 miles. <p>(Map 2-19)</p>
<p>Travel by all motorized vehicles in Hog Canyon would be limited to specific identified routes (a map showing these routes is available in the BLM Kanab Field Office). This restriction would remain in effect until the considerable adverse effects giving rise to the restriction and seasonal closure are eliminated and measures are implemented to prevent recurrence of these adverse effects.⁷</p>			
<p>The Hancock Road OHV access route would be closed when a contact station is constructed at the intersection of Hancock and Yellowjacket roads. The existing OHV trails adjacent to Hancock Road (within ¼ mile north of Hancock</p>			

Transportation Management Actions			
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Road) would be closed. (Note: The contact station has yet to be completed, and therefore this closure is not currently applicable.) ³			
No similar action.	Consideration of route and trail modifications (new or existing) would be conducted on a case-by-case basis in accordance with resource/use objectives and after appropriate NEPA review and analysis (Appendix K).		
Areas Closed to OHV Use			
<p>The following areas would be closed to OHV use:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Frail watershed and riparian areas.¹ • Inventoried critical species habitat.² • Cottonwood Canyon drainage (except for maintenance vehicles).³ • Camping and trailhead areas for Sand Springs (Farm Canyon Allotment).³ • Identified archaeological sightseeing areas.³ • Riparian areas that are fenced to exclude livestock grazing.^{3,4} • Land treatment areas would be temporarily closed to OHV use for no less than 2 years following the land treatment.³ • 1,280 acres in the Water Canyon/South Fork Indian Canyon area, but allow for maintenance vehicles for Fredonia’s water pipelines.³ • Trail Canyon. This restriction remains in effect until the considerable adverse effects giving rise to the closure are eliminated and measures are implemented to prevent recurrence of these adverse effects.⁷ • ¼ mile north of Hancock Road between the Sand Spring and 	<p>Designate the following areas as closed to OHV use:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paria SRMA – both RMZs • Designated wilderness • Parunuweap SRMA – non-motorized Canyon RMZ • In and through islands of vegetation in Welsh’s milkweed designated critical habitat (790 acres) • Suitable “wild” river corridors. 	<p>Designate the following areas as closed to OHV use:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cottonwood Canyon ACEC • Designated wilderness • Paria SRMA – both RMZs • Moquith Mountain SRMA – Dunes RMZ • Parunuweap SRMA – non-motorized Canyon RMZ • North Fork Virgin River SRMA • In and through islands of vegetation in Welsh’s milkweed designated critical habitat (790 acres) • Non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics • WSAs • Suitable “wild” river corridors. 	<p>Designate the following areas as closed to OHV use:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paria SRMA – both RMZs • Designated wilderness • Parunuweap SRMA – non-motorized Canyon RMZ • In and through islands of vegetation in Welsh’s milkweed designated critical habitat (790 acres).

Transportation Management Actions			
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
<p>Yellowjacket roads (500 acres) when a contact station is constructed at the intersection of Hancock and Yellowjacket roads. (Note: The contact station has yet to be completed, and therefore this closure is not currently applicable.)³</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within or through islands of vegetation located within the Coral Pink Sand Dunes/Moquith Mountain area that would remain open to OHV use. Signs, barriers, and education efforts would accompany this action designed to maintain the naturalness of these areas.³ 			
Transportation System Management			
No similar action.	<p>Allow route repair, maintenance, and rehabilitation to maintain existing route conditions. Route modifications (new facilities or expansion of existing facilities) would be determined on a case-by-case basis in accordance with resource/use objectives and after appropriate NEPA review and analysis.</p> <p>Pursue maintenance agreements with highway authorities in the decision area.</p>		

Lands and Realty

Lands and Realty Management Actions			
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Management of ROWs and ROW Corridors			
No similar action.	<p>Prepare communication site plans for all existing communication sites before any new types of uses or new facilities would be authorized on the site. Site plans would be prepared for all new communication sites before any development of the site(s) would be authorized.</p>		
No similar action.	<p>Evaluations for the siting and construction of communications towers will take into account potential impacts on migratory birds. Measures to avoid and minimize impacts would be considered during design, including avoiding known bird migration corridors, eliminating guy wires, combining communication devices on existing towers, restricting height of towers to less</p>	<p>Allow strobe lights on communication sites in order to meet aircraft safety requirements.</p>	

Lands and Realty Management Actions			
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
	than 200 feet, and installing minimum lighting with use of white strobe lights rather than red (strobe or non-strobe) lights.		
No similar action.	Require a feasibility study and site plan for new communications locations.		
No similar action.	<p>Exclude new ROWs (including communication sites) (75,700 acres) in the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WSAs • Wilderness areas • Suitable WSR corridors with a tentative classification of “wild” or “scenic.” <p>Avoid new ROWs (including communication sites) within the WSR corridor of the East Fork Virgin River tentatively classified as a “recreational” segment (segment 36-37).</p> <p>Avoid new ROWs with high-profile structures (e.g., buildings, storage tanks, overhead powerlines, wind turbines, towers, and windmills) in the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 1 mile of an active Greater sage-grouse lek • Within Greater sage-grouse brood rearing habitat. <p>(Map 2-20; total avoidance areas 78,900 acres)</p> <p>Preference would be to locate ROW developments in common (within existing ROWs/disturbance areas).</p>	<p>Exclude new ROWs (including communication sites) (255,200 acres) in the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cottonwood Canyon ACEC • Welsh’s Milkweed ACEC • Vermilion Cliffs ACEC • White Cliffs ACEC • Non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics • WSAs • Wilderness areas • Suitable WSR corridors with a tentative classification of “wild.” <p>Exclude new ROWs with high-profile structures (e.g., buildings, storage tanks, overhead powerlines, wind turbines, towers, and windmills) in the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 1¼ mile of an active Greater sage-grouse lek • Within Greater sage-grouse brood rearing and winter habitats. <p>Avoid new ROWs (including communication sites) (3,400 acres) in the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parunuweap Canyon ACEC • WSR corridor of the East Fork Virgin River tentatively classified as a “recreational” segment (segment 36-37). <p>(Map 2-21)</p> <p>Locate ROW developments in</p>	<p>Exclude new ROWs (including communication sites) (75,200 acres) in the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WSAs • Wilderness areas. <p>(Map 2-22)</p>

Lands and Realty Management Actions			
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
		common (within existing ROWs/disturbance areas).	
No similar action.	Consider burying new and reconstructed utility lines (including powerlines up to 34.5 kilovolts) unless: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visual quality objectives can be met without burying • Geologic conditions make burying infeasible • Burying would produce greater long-term site disturbance. 	Bury new and reconstructed utility lines (including powerlines up to 34.5 kilovolts) unless: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visual quality objectives can be met without burying • Geologic conditions make burying infeasible • Burying would produce greater long-term site disturbance. 	No requirement to bury utility lines.
No similar action.	New and reconstructed powerlines must meet non-electrocution standards for raptors. If electrocution or line strike issues develop with existing powerlines, corrective actions to meet these non-electrocution standards would be taken.		
No similar action.	Construct powerlines using non-reflective wire. Towers would be constructed using non-reflective material. Powerlines would not be high-lined unless no other location exists.	Construct powerlines using non-reflective wire. Towers would be constructed using non-reflective material. Powerlines would not be high-lined.	Construct powerlines using non-reflective wire. Towers would be constructed using non-reflective material.
No similar action.	Linear crossings, such as pipelines, utilities, or roads, across riparian areas and/or ephemeral channels would be considered on a case-by-case basis to protect the above areas. Surface disturbing activities would be avoided on unstable areas, such as landslides, and slumps.		
Areas Recommended for Withdrawal			
Review existing withdrawals (24,591 acres) to determine whether they are serving the purposes for which they were withdrawn.	In addition to the 24,591 acres withdrawn, recommend the following areas (9,500 acres) for withdrawal from mineral entry (Map 2-23): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cottonwood Canyon ACEC • Developed recreation sites • Suitable “wild” river corridors • Suitable “scenic” river corridors • Relict vegetation areas (Diana’s Throne and Elephant Butte). Review existing withdrawals to determine whether they are serving	In addition to the 24,591 acres withdrawn, recommend the following areas (158,800 acres) for withdrawal from the public land laws (including mineral entry) (Map 2-24): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cottonwood Canyon ACEC • Welsh’s Milkweed ACEC • Vermilion ACEC • White Cliffs ACEC • Parunuweap Canyon ACEC • Developed recreation sites • Suitable “wild” river corridors 	In addition to the 24,591 acres withdrawn, recommend the following areas (7 acres) for withdrawal from mineral entry (Map 2-25): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developed recreation sites.

Lands and Realty Management Actions			
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
	the purposes for which they were withdrawn.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relict vegetation areas (Diana’s Throne and Elephant Butte) • Non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics • Kanab Community SRMA – Non-motorized RMZ • Moquith Mountain SRMA – Dunes RMZ • Moquith Mountain SRMA – Non-Dunes Wooded RMZ • Parunuweap SRMA – Non-motorized Canyon RMZ • Parunuweap SRMA – Uplands RMZ • Orderville Canyon SRMA • North Fork Virgin River SRMA. <p>Review existing withdrawals to determine whether they are serving the purposes for which they were withdrawn.</p>	
Areas and Lands Available for Land Tenure Adjustment			
<p>Public lands, except for Escalante Planning Unit, in order to be considered for any form of land tenure adjustment, including exchanges, in-lieu selections, desert land entries, R&PP, etc. (except FLPMA Section 203 sales), must meet one or more of the following criteria^{2, 3, 4, 5}:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is in the public interest; accommodates the needs of state, local, or private entities, including for the economy and community growth and expansion; and is in accordance with other land use goals and objectives and RMP/MFP planning decisions^{2, 3, 4, 5} 	<p>Public lands, in order to be considered for any form of land tenure adjustment (including exchanges, in-lieu selections, desert land entries, R&PP, easement acquisitions, etc.), except for FLPMA Section 203 sales, must meet one or more of the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is in the public interest; accommodates the needs of state, local, or private entities, including for the economy and community growth and expansion; and is in accordance with other land use goals, objectives, and planning decisions • Results in net gain of important and manageable resource values on public lands such as crucial wildlife habitat, significant cultural sites, high-value recreation areas, high-quality riparian areas, live water, special status species habitat, or areas key to maintenance of productive ecosystems • Ensures the accessibility of public lands in areas where access is needed and cannot otherwise be obtained • Is essential to allow effective management of public lands in areas where consolidation of ownership is necessary to meet resource management objectives • Results in the acquisition of lands that serve a national priority as identified in national policy directives. <p>Habitat for listed threatened, endangered, and candidate species would be retained in federal ownership unless land tenure adjustments would result in a net increase of habitat. All actions involving listed species or their habitat would result in the proper consultation with USFWS. Land tenure adjustments may be considered with the State of Utah and</p>		

Lands and Realty Management Actions			
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Results in net gain of important and manageable resource values on public lands such as crucial wildlife habitat, significant cultural sites, high-value recreation areas, high-quality riparian areas, live water, T&E species habitat, or areas key to maintenance of productive ecosystems^{2, 3, 4, 5} • Ensures the accessibility of public lands in areas where access is needed and cannot otherwise be obtained^{2, 3, 4, 5} • Is essential to allow effective management of public lands in areas where consolidation of ownership is necessary to meet resource management objectives^{2, 3, 4, 5} • Results in the acquisition of lands that serve a national priority as identified in national policy directives.^{2, 3, 4, 5} <p>Acquire legal access only on the roads and trails that are most in demand for public access according to the following priority lists⁴:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • North Fork Virgin River⁴ • Orderville Gulch⁴ • Cogswell Point Road⁴ • Branch of Cogswell Point Road.⁴ 	<p>others after consultation with and concurrence by USFWS.</p> <p>Retain non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics in federal ownership.</p> <p>Lands with mining claims could be considered for disposal if the following apply: (1) the new surface owner is the mining claimant, or (2) the new surface owner agrees to accept the surface with the claim encumbrance.</p>		
<p>Protect the relict characteristics and values on Diana's Throne (90 acres) by segregating it from all land disposals.³</p>	<p>Approximately 6,400 acres of public land would be available for FLPMA Section 203 sales with NEPA compliance and consistent with other decisions in this RMP (Map 2-26; Appendix E).</p>	<p>Approximately 2,500 acres of public land would be available for FLPMA Section 203 sales with NEPA compliance and consistent with other decisions in this RMP (Map 2-27; Appendix E).</p>	<p>Approximately 20,500 acres of public land would be available for FLPMA Section 203 sales with NEPA compliance and consistent with other decisions in this RMP (Map 2-28; Appendix E).</p>
<p>Manage oil and gas with no</p>	<p>Manage oil and gas with NSO stipulations on R&PP leases. If these sites are no longer required, they would be</p>		

Lands and Realty Management Actions			
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
occupancy or other activity on airport lease. If this site was no longer required to meet management objectives, it would be managed as open with standard stipulations. ⁵	managed as are adjacent lands.		
No similar action.	Identify state trust lands desired for acquisition by the BLM through land tenure adjustments.		
Management of Filming Permits			
No similar action.	Filming may be authorized throughout the decision area after site-specific NEPA analysis is completed.		

Minerals and Energy

Minerals and Energy Management Actions			
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Oil and Gas Leasing			
Manage oil and gas leasing according to oil and gas leasing Map 2-29 ^{1, 2, 3, 4, 5} . <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open to leasing subject to standard lease terms and conditions: 422,200 acres • Open to leasing subject to moderate constraints (seasonal and CSU): 51,200 acres • Open to leasing subject to major constraints (NSO): 5,500 acres • Closed to leasing: 75,100 acres. Prohibit mineral leasing operations in the Sand Spring area. ³	Manage fluid mineral leases as shown on Map 2-30: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open to leasing subject to standard lease terms and conditions: 263,400 acres • Open to leasing subject to moderate constraints (seasonal and CSU): 156,700 acres • Open to leasing subject to major constraints (NSO): 58,100 acres • Closed to leasing: 75,800 acres. 	Manage fluid mineral leases as shown on Map 2-31: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open to leasing subject to standard lease terms and conditions: 28,400 acres • Open to leasing subject to moderate constraints (seasonal and CSU): 269,900 acres • Open to leasing subject to major constraints (NSO): 83,100 acres • Closed to leasing: 172,600 acres. 	Manage fluid mineral leases as shown on Map 2-32: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open to leasing subject to standard lease terms and conditions: 391,300 acres • Open to leasing subject to moderate constraints (seasonal and CSU): 64,600 acres • Open to leasing subject to major constraints (NSO): 23,000 acres • Closed to leasing: 75,100 acres.
Geophysical Exploration			
No similar action.	Limit vehicular use for necessary tasks, such as geophysical exploration including project survey and layout, to OHV designations.	Limit vehicular use for necessary tasks, such as geophysical exploration including project survey and layout, to OHV designations.	Same as Alternative B.

Minerals and Energy Management Actions			
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
	Exceptions may be granted by permit on a case-by-case basis.		
The oil and gas leasing stipulations do not apply to geophysical exploration, which is administered under the Notice of Intent process (43 CFR 3150). ⁵	Allow geophysical operations consistent with existing regulations and policies and subject to constraints in areas with special designations (WSA, ACEC, WSR segments tentatively classified as "wild" or "scenic") as determined through site-specific NEPA analysis.		
Other Leasable Minerals			
This area is presently open to leasable geothermal steam exploration and would remain so until some action is taken to the contrary. ⁴ Prohibit mineral leasing operations in the Sand Spring area. ³	Lease geothermal resources consistent with oil and gas leasing stipulations and consistent with other resource objectives.		
Areas Available for Further Coal Leasing Consideration			
All areas are presently open for leasable coal opportunities and would remain open unless some action is taken to the contrary. ⁴ Determine that the area within the Alton/Kanab Known Recoverable Coal Resource Area is acceptable for further consideration for leasing except as follows. ² <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not further consider leasing those areas where there are interactions with wildlife and forestry unless it is determined that mining can take place and still protect these values.² • Where the coal unsuitability criteria have been identified (VRM Class II), do not further consider the area for leasing unless it is determined that mining can take place and still meet the VRM Class II requirements.² 	Make available for further coal leasing consideration approximately 113,629 acres (Map 2-33) (Appendix F). Approximately 37,580 acres (Map 2-33) are determined to be unsuitable based on the 20 criteria identified in Appendix F. Additional areas could be found unsuitable based on site-specific analysis (Appendix F).		

Minerals and Energy Management Actions			
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
<p>Determine that this area is acceptable for further consideration for coal leasing (where presently unleased) and development (where presently leased) except as follows⁴:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not further consider unleased lands for leasing unless future mining plans can be developed to protect the ponderosa pine area, provide for the protection of wildlife habitat and livestock grazing, provide for watershed protection, and meet visual classes as much as is practical.⁴ • On unleased lands where coal unsuitability criteria have been identified, do not further consider the area for leasing unless it is determined that mining would not adversely affect the value which is to be protected.⁴ <p>The Potential Coal Development Areas within the Alton and Johns Valley Coal Fields are suitable for further leasing consideration as described below⁵:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based on the coal lease screening process, the following lands would be considered suitable for further leasing consideration for underground and surface mining: Alton Coal Field, 837 acres; and Johns Valley Coal Field, 12,506 acres. An additional 3,900 acres, identified under criteria numbers 2, 3, 9, 11, 12, and 15, would be considered suitable for further leasing consideration for underground mining, but would be 			

Minerals and Energy Management Actions			
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
<p>considered unsuitable for surface mining. It should be noted that application of unsuitability criterion 16 (floodplains) was not completed, and unsuitability criterion 19 (alluvial valley floors) was not applied to any of the potential coal areas. These criteria would be applied prior to any leasing and would result in additional acreages considered unsuitable.⁵</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apply coal unsuitability criteria 16 (floodplains) and 19 (alluvial valley floors) prior to leasing (43 CFR 3461.4-1).⁵ <p>Prohibit mineral leasing operations in the Sand Spring area.³</p>			
<p>Allow surface mining instead of grazing management on the identified areas under conflict. Incorporate erosion control stipulations into the mining plan as per Surface Mining Control Reclamation Act regulations.⁴</p>	<p>Incorporate erosion control stipulations in mining plans for surface mining disturbance as per Surface Mining Control Reclamation Act regulations.</p>		
Locatable Minerals			
<p>Review existing withdrawals (24,591 acres) to determine whether they are serving the purposes for which they were withdrawn.</p> <p>Protect the relict characteristics and values on Diana’s Throne (90 acres) by segregating it from mineral entry.³</p> <p>The segregation from mineral entry in the Sand Spring area should be maintained.³</p>	<p>Allow location, exploration, and development of locatable minerals on public lands except where withdrawn. Evaluate operations for exploration and development in the context of its requirement to prevent unnecessary and undue degradation of other resources.</p> <p>In addition to the 24,591 acres withdrawn, recommend withdrawing the following areas (9,500 acres) from mineral entry (Map 2-23):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cottonwood Canyon ACEC 	<p>Allow location, exploration, and development of locatable minerals on public lands except where withdrawn. Evaluate operations for exploration and development in the context of its requirement to prevent unnecessary and undue degradation of other resources.</p> <p>In addition to the 24,591 acres withdrawn, recommend withdrawing the following areas (158,800 acres) from mineral entry (Map 2-24):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cottonwood Canyon ACEC 	<p>Allow location, exploration, and development of locatable minerals on public lands except where withdrawn. Evaluate operations for exploration and development in the context of its requirement to prevent unnecessary and undue degradation of other resources.</p> <p>In addition to the 24,591 acres withdrawn, recommend withdrawing the following areas (7 acres) from mineral entry (Map 2-25):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developed recreation sites.

Minerals and Energy Management Actions			
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developed recreation sites • Suitable “wild” river corridors • Suitable “scenic” river corridors • Relict vegetation areas (Diana’s Throne and Elephant Butte). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welsh’s Milkweed ACEC • Vermilion ACEC • White Cliffs ACEC • Parunuweap Canyon ACEC • Developed recreation sites • Suitable “wild” river corridors • Relict vegetation areas (Diana’s Throne and Elephant Butte) • Non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics • Kanab Community SRMA – Non-motorized RMZ • Moquith Mountain SRMA – Dunes RMZ • Moquith Mountain SRMA – Non-Dunes Wooded RMZ • Parunuweap SRMA – Non-motorized Canyon RMZ • Parunuweap SRMA – Uplands RMZ • Orderville Canyon SRMA • North Fork Virgin River SRMA. 	
Mineral Materials			
<p>Allow disposal of sand and gravel through free-use permits and material sale contracts to meet legitimate demand.^{1, 2, 3, 4, 5}</p> <p>Require stipulations in any sale or permit for disposal of sand and gravel to protect the following features^{1, 2, 3, 4, 5}:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Riparian area (perennial stream bottoms and banks)¹ • VRM Class II areas¹ • Floodplains.¹ <p>When areas are mined out, they</p>	<p>Allow mineral material disposals on a case-by-case basis subject to site-specific environmental analysis excluding the following areas (78,500 acres) (Map 2-34):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cottonwood ACEC • Relict Vegetation (Diana’s Throne and Elephant Butte) • WSAs • Paria Canyon – Vermilion Cliffs Wilderness area (closed to mineral material disposals by congressional designation) 	<p>Allow mineral material disposals on a case-by-case basis subject to site-specific environmental analysis excluding the following areas (175,000 acres) (Map 2-35):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cottonwood ACEC • Welsh’s Milkweed ACEC • White Cliffs ACEC • Relict Vegetation (Diana’s Throne and Elephant Butte) • Non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics • WSAs 	<p>Allow mineral material disposals on a case-by-case basis subject to site-specific environmental analysis excluding the following areas (21,200 acres) (Map 2-36):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paria Canyon – Vermilion Cliffs Wilderness area (closed to mineral material disposals by congressional designation) • Developed recreation sites.

Minerals and Energy Management Actions			
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
<p>would be reclaimed and revegetated so that the sites would support livestock and wildlife, meet the appropriate visual class, and provide for watershed protection.⁴</p> <p>Sand and gravel removal would be excluded from the following areas³:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Crescent Butte, Shinarump Cliffs, and Vermilion Cliffs recreation sites³ • The 40-acre ponderosa pine area.⁴ <p>Consider petrified wood exploration and sales anywhere within the known and inferred deposit areas to meet demand except two identified recreation sites (i.e., Shinarump Cliffs Ruin and potential Red Canyon Picnic Site).³</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suitable “wild” river corridors • Suitable “scenic” river corridors • Developed recreation sites. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paria Canyon – Vermilion Cliffs Wilderness area (closed to mineral material disposals by congressional designation) • Suitable “wild” river corridors • Kanab Community SRMA – Non-motorized RMZ • Paria SRMA – both RMZs • Moquith Mountain SRMA – Dunes RMZ • Moquith Mountain SRMA – Non-Dunes Wooded RMZ • Parunuweap SRMA – Non-motorized Canyon RMZ • Parunuweap SRMA – Uplands RMZ • Orderville Canyon SRMA • North Fork Virgin River SRMA • Developed recreation sites. 	
<p>Allow material sales of sand and gravel or burnt shale aggregate on the areas in conflict. Incorporate erosion control and rehabilitation stipulations into the mining plans.⁴</p>	<p>Incorporate erosion control and rehabilitation stipulations into mining plans.</p>		

2.4.3 Special Designations

Areas of Critical Environmental Concern

Areas of Critical Environmental Concern Management Actions			
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC)			
<p>Designate and manage 220 acres of public land within the Water</p>	<p>Designate and manage the following</p>	<p>Designate and manage the following</p>	<p>Do not designate any ACECs.</p>

Areas of Critical Environmental Concern Management Actions			
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
<p>Canyon/South Fork Indian Canyon area as an ACEC (Map 2-37).</p>	<p>areas as ACECs (Map 2-38):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cottonwood Canyon (3,800 acres). 	<p>areas as ACECs (Map 2-39):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cottonwood Canyon (3,800 acres) • Welsh’s Milkweed (1,300 acres) • Vermilion Cliffs (23,400 acres) • White Cliffs (26,000 acres) • Parunuweap Canyon (6,100 acres). 	
Existing Water and Indian Canyon/Potential Cottonwood Canyon ACEC			
<p>The Water Canyon/South Fork Indian Canyon ACEC (220 acres) would be administered to give primary emphasis to scenic, recreational, botanical, and biological values. The management for this area would be as follows³:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue the present OHV restrictions (limited to existing roads and trails).³ • All future oil and gas leases would have a NSO stipulation.³ • The area would be retained in public ownership.³ • Retain the existing public water reserve to protect the hanging garden/relict area habitat.³ • Withdraw the area from mineral entry.³ • Complete an activity plan to provide a more detailed management strategy for the area.³ • Until an activity plan is developed, fire suppression would be determined on a case-by-case basis as an interim management tool.³ • The BLM would not consider nor recommend any change in air quality classification as part of the 	<p>Manage the relevant and important values for the Cottonwood Canyon ACEC (3,800 acres), which includes the existing Water Canyon/South Fork Indian Canyon ACEC, as follows:</p> <p>Scenic:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designate as VRM Class II. • Limit OHV use to designated routes. • Open to oil and gas leasing subject to major constraints (NSO). • Recommend withdrawing from mineral entry. • Close to mineral material disposals. <p>Cultural:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitor specific sites on a regular basis. • Retain all lands and interests in land in federal ownership. • Work with the School and Institutional Trust Lands Administration (SITLA) to acquire state inholdings. <p>Hazard/Safety/Public Welfare:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allocate 0 AUMs for livestock grazing in the Water Canyon Allotment. 	<p>Manage the relevant and important values for the Cottonwood Canyon ACEC (3,800 acres), which includes the existing Water Canyon/South Fork Indian Canyon ACEC, as follows:</p> <p>Scenic:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designate as VRM Class II. • Close area to OHV use. • Close to oil and gas leasing. • Recommend withdrawing from mineral entry. • Close to mineral material disposals. • Close to new ROWs. <p>Cultural:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitor specific sites on a regular basis. • Retain all lands and interests in land in federal ownership. • Work with SITLA to acquire state inholdings. <p>Hazard/Safety/Public Welfare:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allocate 0 AUMs for livestock grazing in the Water Canyon Allotment. 	<p>Remove the Water Canyon/South Fork Indian Canyon ACEC designation and manage relevant and important values according to prescriptions in the remainder of the alternative.</p>

Areas of Critical Environmental Concern Management Actions			
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
<p>ACEC designation.³</p> <p>Protect 1,280 acres in the Water Canyon/South Fork Indian Canyon area beyond the ACEC³:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close to OHV use, but allow for maintenance vehicles for Fredonia’s water pipelines.³ • Open to leasing subject to major constraints (NSO).³ • Prepare a management plan. During management plan preparation consider means of improving and/or removing all or part of Fredonia’s water system to better conform to the surrounding natural values if it can be ensured that another source of water can be developed feasibly.³ 			
Potential Welsh’s Milkweed ACEC			
<p>No similar action.</p>	<p>Do not designate as an ACEC. Manage relevant and important values according to prescriptions in the remainder of the alternative.</p>	<p>Manage the relevant and important values for the Welsh’s Milkweed ACEC (1,300 acres) as follows:</p> <p>Scenic:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designate Class A scenery as VRM Class II. • Open to oil and gas leasing subject to major constraints (NSO). • Recommend withdrawing from mineral entry. • Close to mineral material disposals. • Close to new ROWs (including communication sites). <p>Welsh’s Milkweed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement Welsh’s Milkweed recovery plan. • Prohibit motorized use in and 	<p>Do not designate as an ACEC. Manage relevant and important values according to prescriptions in the remainder of the alternative.</p>

Areas of Critical Environmental Concern Management Actions			
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
		<p>through islands of vegetation in designated critical habitat for Welsh's Milkweed (790 acres).</p> <p>Coral Pink Sand Dunes Tiger Beetle:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement the conservation actions identified in the Conservation Agreement and Strategy for the Coral Pink Sand Dunes Tiger Beetle, as amended. • Maintain the established 370-acre tiger beetle conservation area on BLM-administered lands in the northeast corner of the sand dunes. <p>General Prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cooperate with State Park for law enforcement. • Close to forest product sales (woodcutting, Christmas trees, and posts). • Close to wilding collection without a permit. • Retain all lands and interest in land in federal ownership. 	
Potential Vermilion Cliffs ACEC			
No similar action.	Do not designate as an ACEC. Manage relevant and important values according to prescriptions in the remainder of the alternative.	<p>Manage the relevant and important values of the Vermilion Cliffs ACEC (23,400 acres) as follows:</p> <p>Scenic:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designate as VRM Class II. • Limit OHV use to designated routes. • Open to oil and gas leasing subject to major constraints (NSO). • Recommend withdrawing from mineral entry. 	Do not designate as an ACEC. Manage relevant and important values according to prescriptions in the remainder of the alternative.

Areas of Critical Environmental Concern Management Actions			
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close to new ROWs (including communication sites). • Retain all lands and interest in lands in federal ownership. • Work with SITLA to acquire state inholdings. <p>Vegetation and Wildlife:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include USFWS lease notices for T&E flora and fauna (Appendix M). • Restrict climbing within spatial and seasonal buffers surrounding raptor nests (see Wildlife alternatives, Raptors section). <p>Cultural:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop interpretive displays (e.g., cultural and wildlife). • Manage grazing activities to minimize impacts to at-risk cultural sites. 	
Potential White Cliffs ACEC			
No similar action.	Do not designate as an ACEC. Manage relevant and important values according to prescriptions in the remainder of the alternative.	Manage the relevant and important values of the White Cliffs ACEC (26,000 acres) as follows: <p>Scenic:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designate as VRM Class II. • Limit OHV use to designated routes. • Open to oil and gas leasing subject to major constraints (NSO). • Recommend withdrawing from mineral entry. • Close to mineral material disposals. • Close to new ROWs (including communication sites). • Retain lands and interests in land in 	Do not designate as an ACEC. Manage relevant and important values according to prescriptions in the remainder of the alternative.

Areas of Critical Environmental Concern Management Actions			
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
		federal ownership. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work with SITLA to acquire state inholdings. Cultural: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop interpretive displays (e.g., cultural and wildlife). • Manage grazing activities to minimize impacts to at-risk cultural sites. Vegetation and Wildlife: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include USFWS lease notices for T&E flora and fauna (Appendix M). • Restrict climbing within spatial and seasonal buffers surrounding raptor nests (see Wildlife alternatives, Raptors section). 	
Potential Parunuweap Canyon ACEC			
No similar action.	Do not designate as an ACEC. Manage relevant and important values according to prescriptions in the remainder of the alternative.	Manage the relevant and important values of the Parunuweap Canyon ACEC (6,100 acres) as follows: Scenic: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designate as VRM Class II. • Limit OHV use to designated routes. • Open to oil and gas leasing subject to major constraints (NSO). • Recommend withdrawing from mineral entry. • Avoid new ROWs. • Retain all lands and interest in lands in federal ownership. Cultural: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limit camping associated with SRPs to areas/sites identified during permitting. 	Do not designate as an ACEC. Manage relevant and important values according to prescriptions in the remainder of the alternative.

Areas of Critical Environmental Concern Management Actions			
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regulate rock climbing within 300 feet of cultural sites. Climbing routes that impact cultural resource sites would not be allowed, and climbing routes designed to access cultural resource sites would not be allowed unless under permit for scientific investigation. • Preclude SRP tours or visitation of sites without prior consultation/clearance with BLM archaeologists and other specialists. • Develop interpretive/education displays for relevant and important resources (e.g., cultural and wildlife). <p>Wildlife and Sensitive Species:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include USFWS lease notices for T&E flora and fauna (Appendix M). • Restrict climbing within spatial and seasonal buffers surrounding raptor nests (see Wildlife alternatives, Raptors section). 	

Wild and Scenic Rivers

Wild and Scenic Rivers Management Actions			
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Wild and Scenic River Act Recommendations			
Existing LUPs contain no decisions regarding WSRs. The Wild and Scenic River Evaluation (Appendix G) contains eligibility determinations for all river	Seven eligible river segment corridors (Map 2-41) would be determined suitable for WSR designation (6,310 acres/33 miles), with the tentative classifications of	Fifteen eligible river segment corridors (Map 2-42) would be determined suitable for WSR designation (9,230 acres/46 miles) with the tentative classifications of	No river corridors would be determined suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System.

Wild and Scenic Rivers Management Actions			
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
<p>segments in the decision area. As directed by BLM IM-2004-196, manage all 15 <i>eligible</i> river segment corridors (9,230 acres/46 miles; Map 2-40) to protect their outstandingly remarkable values, free-flowing nature, and tentative classification, as follows:</p> <p>In keeping with BLM Manual 8351, .32C and .33C, suitability determinations would not be made for any of the eligible river segments. They would remain eligible and would be managed to protect their outstandingly remarkable values, free-flowing nature, and tentative classification to the degree that the BLM has authority (i.e., BLM lands within the corridor) and within the parameters of decisions made in the previous planning documents until such time as suitability determinations are made.</p>	<p>“wild” (4,570 acres/25 miles), “scenic” (960 acres/5 miles), or “recreational” (780 acres/3 miles).</p>	<p>“wild” (7,680 acres/39 miles) or “recreational” (1,550 acres/7 miles).</p>	
North Fork Virgin River—Segment 48-49			
Eligible—Wild	Suitable—Wild	Suitable – Wild	Not Suitable
East Fork Virgin River—Segment 37-40a			
Eligible—Wild	Suitable—Scenic	Suitable – Wild	Not Suitable
East Fork Virgin River—Segment 40a-41			
Eligible—Wild	Suitable—Wild	Suitable – Wild	Not Suitable
East Fork Virgin River—Segment 36-37			
Eligible—Recreational	Suitable—Recreational	Suitable – Recreational	Not Suitable
Orderville Gulch (Esplin Gulch)—Segment 44-45			
Eligible—Wild	Suitable—Wild	Suitable – Wild	Not Suitable
Meadow Creek/Mineral Gulch—Segment 33-35, 35-38			
Eligible—Wild	Suitable—Wild	Suitable – Wild	Not Suitable

Wild and Scenic Rivers Management Actions			
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Deep Creek—Segment 50-51			
Eligible—Wild	Not Suitable	Suitable – Wild	Not Suitable
Cottonwood Creek—Segment 28-29			
Eligible—Wild	Not Suitable	Suitable – Wild	Not Suitable
Indian Canyon—Segment 26-27			
Eligible—Wild	Not Suitable	Suitable – Wild	Not Suitable
South Fork Indian Canyon—Segment 22-23			
Eligible—Wild	Not Suitable	Suitable – Wild	Not Suitable
North Branch of South Fork Indian Canyon—Segment 24-25			
Eligible—Wild	Not Suitable	Suitable – Wild	Not Suitable
Water Canyon—Segment 20-21			
Eligible—Wild	Not Suitable	Suitable – Wild	Not Suitable
Hell Dive Canyon—Segment 30-31			
Eligible—Wild	Not Suitable	Suitable – Wild	Not Suitable
Paria River—Segment 68-69			
Eligible—Wild	Suitable – Wild	Suitable – Wild	Not Suitable
Three Mile Creek—Segment 56-57			
Eligible—Recreational	Not Suitable	Suitable – Recreational	Not Suitable
Management Actions for the Suitable Paria River Segment			
<p>Outstandingly Remarkable Values in the Paria River would be preserved through the following management approach (from the <i>Final Arizona Statewide Wild & Scenic Rivers Study Report/Record of Decision</i> [BLM 1997b], which determined eligibility for the Paria River and is carried forward in the document):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developed campgrounds, interpretive centers, or administrative headquarters within the river corridor would be prohibited. Simple comfort and convenience facilities would be permitted. • New electric transmission lines, natural gas lines, water lines, and other ROWs would be prohibited. • Woodcutting would not be permitted except where needed to clear trails, for visitor safety, or to control fire. • Livestock grazing would be managed to protect outstandingly remarkable values within the area. • No new flood control dams, levees, or other water works would be permitted. • Hydroelectric power facilities would be prohibited. • All water supply dams and major diversions would be prohibited. 			<p>No river segments would be determined suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System.</p>

Wild and Scenic Rivers Management Actions			
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction of new routes for motorized travel would be prohibited. 			
Management of Suitable Rivers			
No similar action.	Manage eligible river segments that are not determined suitable according to the prescriptions in the remainder of the alternative.	No similar action.	Same as Alternative B.
No similar action.	<p>Manage river segment corridors found suitable and classified as “wild” (except the Paria River segment, which is addressed above) to protect the tentative classification and outstandingly remarkable values through the following specific management prescriptions (within ¼ mile of each side of the river or the viewshed from the river, whichever is less):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • VRM: Class I • Minerals: Close to oil and gas leasing, recommend for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry, and close to mineral material disposal • Motorized Travel: Close to OHV use • Close to new ROWs. 	Same as Alternative B.	No river segments would be determined suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System.
No similar action.	<p>Manage the East Fork Virgin River segment 37-40a suitable “scenic” river segment corridor to protect the tentative classification and outstandingly remarkable values through the following specific management prescriptions (within ¼ mile of each side of the river or the viewshed from the river, whichever is less):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • VRM: Class II • Minerals: Open to oil and gas 	No river segments would be determined suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System with a “scenic” tentative classification.	No river segments would be determined suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System.

Wild and Scenic Rivers Management Actions			
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
	leasing subject to major constraints (NSO), recommend for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry, and close to mineral material disposal <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Motorized Travel: Limit to designated routes • Close to new ROWs. 		
No similar action.	No similar action.	Manage the Three Mile Creek suitable “recreational” river segment corridor to protect the tentative classification and outstandingly remarkable value through the following specific management prescriptions (within ¼ mile of each side of the river or the viewshed from the river, whichever is less): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain or improve stream habitat for those locations identified in cooperation with UDWR. Maintain, improve, or provide missing habitat components using appropriate habitat improvement techniques (see Special Status Species section). 	No river segments would be determined suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System.
No similar action.	Manage the East Fork Virgin River segment 36-37 suitable “recreational” river segment corridor to protect the tentative classification and outstandingly remarkable values through the following specific management prescriptions (within ¼ mile of each side of the river or the viewshed from the river, whichever is less): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • VRM: Class II • Minerals: Open to oil and gas leasing subject to major constraints (NSO) 	Same as Alternative B.	No river segments would be determined suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System.

Wild and Scenic Rivers Management Actions			
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Motorized Travel: Limit to designated routes • Avoid new ROWs. 		
No similar action.	Allow other activities within the suitable river segment corridors on a case-by-case basis as long as their outstandingly remarkable values, free-flowing nature, and tentative classification would be protected. See BLM Manual-8351 Section 5 for implementation guidance.	Same as Alternative B.	No river segments would be determined suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System.

Wilderness

Wilderness Management Actions			
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Management of the Paria Canyon-Vermilion Cliffs Wilderness			
For fire and fuels management, the use of earth-moving equipment must be authorized by the Field Office Manager. Fire management actions would rely on the most effective methods of suppression that are least damaging to wilderness values, other resources, and the environment while requiring the least expenditure of public funds. A resource advisor would be consulted when fire occurs in wilderness.	Restore lands within the wilderness area where ecological integrity is outside the range of natural variability and where compatible with wilderness objectives. Restore ecological functions and structure in wilderness using the minimum requirement standard for BLM wilderness areas and the best mix of chemical, biological, or mechanical means with fire and natural processes. For fire and fuels management, the use of earth-moving equipment must be authorized by the Field Office Manager. Fire management actions would rely on the most effective methods of suppression that are least damaging to wilderness values, other resources, and the environment while	Use only fire (natural and prescribed) to restore ecological functions and structure in the wilderness.	Same as Alternative B.

Wilderness Management Actions			
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
	requiring the least expenditure of public funds. A resource advisor would be consulted when fire occurs in the Wilderness.		
No similar action.	Use natural processes to restore areas of pre-existing human imprints. Where proactive restoration of wilderness conditions is desirable, require the minimum requirement standards; plans to address restoration of pre-existing human impacts may be required.	Use natural processes to restore wilderness conditions where they are degraded.	Same as Alternative B.
No similar action.	Ensure that any change in the landscape is very low.		
No similar action.	Manage to protect or restore the natural quiet and natural soundscapes of the area.		
No similar action.	Prohibit all motorized vehicles, motorized equipment, aircraft landing, and other forms of mechanical transport (including mountain bikes and wheeled game carriers). Exceptions may be authorized per the Wilderness Act Section 4(d) when it is: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Necessary to meet minimum requirements for the administration of the area • Required in emergencies involving the health and safety of persons within the areas • For the exercise of a private existing right or other special provision. 		

Wilderness Study Areas

Wilderness Study Areas Management Actions			
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
WSA Management			
Manage VRM in WSAs as currently designated: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Class I: 0 acres • Class II: 30,900 acres • Class III: 300 acres 	Designate WSAs as VRM Class I.		

Wilderness Study Areas Management Actions			
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Class IV: 22,700 acres. 			
OHV Use in WSAs			
<p>Continue managing OHV use in WSAs as limited to designated ways (Map 2-16).</p> <p>Approximately 14,100 acres of the Moquith Mountain WSA (95%), including 790 acres of the sand dunes, would be closed to OHV use.³</p> <p>Approximately 730 acres of sand dunes (including approximately 15 acres in the Sand Wash area) would remain open to OHV use.³</p>	<p>Manage OHV use in WSAs as limited to designated ways, except for approximately 1,100 acres of sand dunes open to cross-country OHV use in the Moquith Mountain WSA (Map 2-17).</p>	<p>Manage WSAs as closed to OHV use (Map 2-18).</p>	<p>Manage OHV use in WSAs as limited to designated ways, except for approximately 1,100 acres of sand dunes open to cross-country OHV use in the Moquith Mountain WSA (Map 2-19).</p>
<p>The 9 miles of routes (inventoried ways) on Moquith Mountain (approximately 20 acres), identified in the July 13, 1998 Federal Register Notice, would continue to be open to vehicle use.³</p>	<p>Designate 15 miles of routes (inventoried ways) in WSAs as open for OHV use (implementation-level decision).</p>	<p>Designate 0 miles of routes (inventoried ways) for OHV use in WSAs (implementation-level decision).</p>	<p>Designate 32 miles of routes (inventoried ways) in WSAs as open for OHV use (implementation-level decision).</p>

Other Designations

Other Designations Management Actions			
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
National and State Scenic Byways and State Scenic Backways			
No similar action.	Cooperate with state and local authorities to implement the purposes of designation.		
Old Spanish National Historic Trail			
Highway 89/20 Segment, Garfield County			
No similar action.	Work in cooperation with Utah State Parks and Recreation, Garfield County, the Old Spanish Trail Association, and the National Park Service on interpretive and recreation opportunities for this segment.		
The newly designated Old Spanish National Historic Trail would be managed to protect the resource	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide interpretive information at appropriate locations (kiosks, etc., road junctions, Garfield County line) • Retain public lands in federal ownership 		

Other Designations Management Actions	
Alternative A	Alternative B
values for which it was designated (Public Law 107-325).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limit OHV use to designated routes • Manage for VRM objectives (VRM Class II in Circleville Canyon and VRM Class III and Class IV elsewhere).
Highway 89 Segment, Kane County	
No similar action.	Work in cooperation with Utah State Parks and Recreation, Kane County, the Old Spanish Trail Association, and the National Park Service on interpretive and recreation opportunities for this segment.
The newly designated Old Spanish National Historic Trail would be managed to protect the resource values for which it was designated (Public Law 107-325).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ Provide interpretive information at appropriate locations (kiosks, etc., road pullouts, Kane County line).

2.5 COMPARATIVE SUMMARY OF IMPACTS

Table 2-2 presents a comparison summary of impacts from management actions proposed for the four management alternatives. Chapter 4 provides a more detailed impact analysis.

Table 2-2. Summary Comparison of Impacts

Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Impacts on Air Quality			
<p>The highest amount of emissions expected. However, the emission increase would not cause ambient air quality standards to be exceeded.</p> <p>Under Alternative A, emissions have been calculated for the base year (2006) and 20-year (2026) time horizons, which serves as the basis for comparing alternatives. The total emissions of criteria pollutants increased from 2,694 tons per year in the base year (2006) to 3,670 tons per year by 2026 for Alternative A. Most of the increase is a result of non-oil and gas activities, primarily OHV activities.</p>	<p>The second lowest amount of emissions expected. However, the emission increase would not cause ambient air quality standards to be exceeded.</p> <p>Alternative B produces lower emissions than Alternative A with 3,554 tons per year in 2026.</p>	<p>The lowest amount of emissions expected. However, the emission increase would not cause ambient air quality standards to be exceeded.</p> <p>Alternative C produces lower emissions than Alternative A with 2,841 tons per year in 2026.</p>	<p>The second highest amount of emissions expected. However, the emission increase would not cause ambient air quality standards to be exceeded.</p> <p>Alternative D (3,629 tons per year) also produces emissions levels lower than Alternative A, but higher than for Alternatives B and C.</p>
Impacts on Soil Resources			
<p>Surface disturbing activities could remove vegetation and topsoil, and result in compaction or loss of some of the exposed soil surface, resulting in the majority of impacts on soil resources. Management actions that limit surface disturbing activities or implement BMPs (Appendix A) and mitigation measures would protect and maintain current soil resources and minimize erosion.</p> <p>Compared to the other alternatives, management actions to limit surface</p>	<p>Alternative B would place more restrictions on surface disturbing activities, including cross-country OHV use (1,100 acres) and mineral development, and help reduce impacts to soil resources described in Alternative A.</p> <p>Management actions to restrict surface disturbance and implement performance measures in areas with fragile soils would reduce impacts to these soil resources.</p>	<p>Alternative C management actions would place the greatest restrictions on surface disturbing activities and thus provide the greatest amount of protection to soil resources (particularly fragile soil areas).</p> <p>Increasing restrictions on surface disturbing activities could reduce impacts on soil resources. The additional restrictions on surface disturbance could decrease localized erosion and maintain soil productivity.</p>	<p>The surface disturbance restrictions would be slightly more restrictive than Alternative A. Compared to Alternatives B and C, fewer surface disturbance restrictions could increase localized erosion and decrease soil productivity. Alternative D could allow some activities in fragile soil areas which could increase the potential for soil loss and erosion.</p>

Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
<p>disturbing activities are the least restrictive, which would provide the least amount of protection to soil resources. Fewer surface disturbance restrictions could increase localized erosion and decrease soil productivity.</p> <p>Cross-country OHV use (466,600 acres) could increase soil compaction, reduce water infiltration, and increase the potential for soil loss and erosion.</p>			
Impacts on Water Resources			
<p>Surface disturbing activities could remove vegetation and topsoil and result in increased erosion and sedimentation, reducing watershed health and water quality.</p> <p>Management actions that limit surface disturbing activities or implement BMPs and mitigation measures could protect and maintain current water quality and minimize erosion and sedimentation.</p> <p>Compared to the other alternatives, management actions to limit surface disturbing activities are the least restrictive, which would provide the least amount of protection to water resources. Fewer surface disturbance restrictions could increase localized erosion and sediment loading and decrease water quality.</p>	<p>Alternative B would place more restrictions on surface disturbing activities and help reduce impacts to water resources described in Alternative A.</p> <p>Management actions that restrict surface disturbance and implement performance measures in areas with fragile soils reduce impacts on water resources.</p>	<p>Alternative C management actions would place the greatest restrictions on surface disturbing activities and thus provide the greatest amount of protection to water resources.</p> <p>Increasing restrictions on surface disturbing activities could reduce impacts on water quality. More surface disturbance restrictions could decrease localized erosion and sediment loading and maintain water quality and watershed health.</p>	<p>The surface disturbance restrictions would be slightly more restrictive than Alternative A. Fewer surface disturbance restrictions could increase localized erosion and sediment loading and decrease water quality.</p>
Impacts on Vegetation			
<p>Surface use and disturbances could remove components of vegetation communities. Disturbances could alter the composition and structure of vegetation communities, increase the</p>	<p>Compared to Alternative A, more restrictions on surface disturbing activities would reduce the extent of associated impacts on vegetation communities. Not allowing surface</p>	<p>This alternative would have the most restrictions on surface disturbing activities, reducing the extent of associated impacts on vegetation communities compared to Alternative</p>	<p>The restrictions on surface disturbing activities would be slightly more than Alternative A, but less than Alternatives B and C. This would slightly reduce the extent of</p>

Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
<p>potential for the introduction and establishment of noxious weeds, and reduce species diversity, primary production, and recruitment of new plants. This, in turn, could make upland, riparian, and forest and woodland communities less resilient to disease, drought, fire, invasive species, and other natural disturbances/stressors.</p> <p>Protecting riparian areas from all surface uses and disturbances through protective stipulations and not allowing occupancy or other surface disturbance within 400 feet of rivers and creeks would minimize the potential for these impacts on riparian and wetland communities.</p> <p>Implementing vegetation treatments and managing vegetation resources to meet desired vegetation conditions would generally maintain or improve vegetation communities. Vegetation treatments under this alternative would not be conducted in areas containing ponderosa pine trees, which would continue to lead to increased understory and fuel loads and possibly lead to larger crown fires and associated loss of ponderosa pine stands.</p>	<p>disturbance within 330 feet of riparian and wetland areas and implementing in-kind offsite compensatory mitigation would minimize and mitigate impacts on riparian and wetland communities.</p> <p>Implementing additional measures to manage and improve vegetation, including an annual average of no more than 22,300 acres, could improve vegetation health compared to Alternative A. This would result in a more systematic approach to treating vegetation communities, which would likely further improve vegetation conditions. Treatments would be conducted in areas containing ponderosa pine trees, which would reduce fuel loads and reduce the potential for larger crown fires and associated loss of ponderosa pine stands. Restoring forest and woodland old-growth stands to a pre-fire suppression condition would increase tree spacing and encourage understory vegetation production.</p>	<p>A. Not allowing surface disturbance within 660 feet of riparian and wetland areas and implementing in-kind offsite compensatory mitigation near the project site would provide more protection than under Alternatives A and B and ensure continuity of and restoration within the same watershed.</p> <p>Implementing vegetation treatments on an annual average of at least 4,650, not to exceed an annual average of 22,300 acres and preferring the use of vegetation treatment methods that mimic natural processes would result in a slower process of vegetation enhancement. Prioritizing treatments in areas not functioning properly would help maintain or improve the health of vegetation communities.</p>	<p>associated impacts on vegetation communities. Not allowing surface disturbance within 330 feet of riparian and wetland areas and implementing in-kind or out-of-kind offsite compensatory mitigation would minimize and mitigate these impacts on riparian and wetland communities.</p> <p>Impacts from vegetation and forest and woodland treatments would be the same as described in Alternative B.</p>
Impacts on Special Status Species			
<p>Special status species habitat within the Alton coal field could be lost short and long term due to surface coal mining activities on and adjacent to these areas. Specifically, this would affect the southern-most population of the Greater sage-grouse. Development of the coal mine, removal of the overburden, and surface mining operations would result in the long-term (life of the RMP) loss of habitat resources and displacement of individual birds and could result in the loss of the local population.</p>			
<p>Surface disturbing activities affect habitat components resulting in habitat alteration, fragmentation, and/or loss of habitat components needed for species survival (e.g.,</p>	<p>Alternative B would place more restrictions on surface disturbing activities (e.g. mineral exploration and development, ROW construction) and help reduce impacts described in</p>	<p>Alternative C management actions would place the greatest restrictions on surface disturbing activities (e.g. mineral exploration and development, ROW construction) and further</p>	<p>Compared to Alternative A, Alternative D would place more restrictions on surface disturbing activities (e.g. mineral exploration and development, ROW construction)</p>

Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
<p>forage and cover). This results in a reduction in usable ranges and disruption of movements among habitats, transitional areas, and breeding areas.</p> <p>OHV use has the potential to cause direct mortality of special status species through accidental kills by vehicles, stress-related mortality caused by human and OHV presence, or incidental harassment, and modification of habitat as a result of loss of vegetation, soil compaction, and introduction of weed species. Cross-country OHV use (466,600 acres) could result in the incidental loss of special status species, of which plants would be most susceptible because they are stationary and have specialized habitat needs, including unique soil substrates.</p>	<p>Alternative A.</p> <p>Managing OHV use throughout the majority of the decision area (524,000 acres, 95%) as limited to 1,387 miles of designated routes and restricting cross-country OHV use would minimize surface disturbances to special status species and their habitats, greatly reducing surface disturbance of special status species habitat as compared to Alternative A.</p>	<p>reduce impacts described in Alternative A.</p> <p>Managing OHV use throughout the majority of the decision area (388,300 acres, 70%) as limited to 1,190 miles of designated routes and precluding cross-country OHV use would minimize surface disturbances to special status species and their habitats, greatly reducing surface disturbance of special status species habitat as compared to Alternative A.</p>	<p>but fewer restrictions than Alternatives B and C.</p> <p>Managing OHV use throughout the majority of the decision area (525,300 acres, 95%) as limited to 1,464 miles of designated routes and restricting cross-country OHV use would minimize surface disturbances to special status species and their habitats, greatly reducing surface disturbance of special status species habitat as compared to Alternative A.</p>
<p>Displacement from activities such as cross-country OHV use, motorized recreation, dispersed recreation, and/or surface disturbance activities may move animals into less desirable habitat and increase competition for available resources with other species and uses.</p>	<p>Limiting OHV use to designated routes on 95 percent of the decision area would limit the potential for displacement of special status species. In addition, restricting surface disturbing activities (e.g., mineral exploration and development, ROW construction) and restrictions on recreation use in special status species habitats would reduce the potential for displacement compared to Alternative A. Displacement of special status wildlife species during vegetation treatments would be the same as described in Alternative A, except more acres could be treated.</p>	<p>Not allowing cross-country OHV use would eliminate potential impact from displacement. In general, OHV use on 884 miles of designated routes that result in increased human presence could temporarily displace special status species. Seasonal restrictions on 306 miles of OHV routes for raptor species and deer and elk crucial winter range would provide protection from disturbance and habitat degradation during the closure periods. In addition, access to several open routes would be limited due to the seasonal closures, which would increase protection from disruptive activities compared to Alternatives A and B.</p> <p>Displacement of special status wildlife species during vegetation</p>	<p>Limiting OHV use to designated routes on 95 percent of the decision area would limit the potential for displacement of special status species. In addition, restricting surface disturbing activities (e.g., mineral exploration and development, ROW construction) and restrictions on recreation use in special status species habitats would reduce the potential for displacement compared to Alternative A. However, there would be fewer restrictions in comparison to Alternatives B and C, increasing the potential for displacement. Displacement of special status wildlife species during vegetation treatments would be the same as described in Alternative A, except more acres could be treated.</p>

Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
		<p>treatments would be the same as described in Alternative A, except more acres could be treated.</p>	
<p>Vegetation treatments would result in temporary displacement of special status species wildlife during treatment. However, over the long term, the treated areas would provide improved forage conditions and reduced erosion, which would enhance special status species wildlife habitat and fisheries.</p>	<p>Focusing vegetation treatments on identified high-priority areas and increasing the potential treatment acres would target areas where habitat function could be most improved. These treatments would improve overall habitat conditions in targeted habitats. This would result in an increase in habitat components, including increased forage and shelter.</p>	<p>Requiring at least an annual average of 4,650 acres to be treated would help reintroduce natural disturbance rates over the long term. Special status plant species in vegetation communities that are adapted to regular disturbances could benefit from this reintroduction of natural disturbance rates. This would improve habitat values in decadent vegetation communities. Preferring treatment methods that use or mimic natural processes could reduce impacts associated with human presence and more disruptive treatment methods.</p>	<p>Management of vegetation treatments to emphasize commodity production to increase forage and woodland products would likely convert habitats to early seral stages, resulting in habitat that is less desirable to special status species.</p>
Impacts on Fish and Wildlife Habitat			
<p>Surface disturbing activities affect habitat components resulting in habitat alteration, fragmentation, and/or loss of habitat components needed for species survival (e.g., forage and cover). This results in a reduction in usable ranges and disruption of movements among habitats, transitional areas, and breeding areas.</p> <p>OHV use has the potential to cause direct mortality of special status species through accidental kills by vehicles, stress-related mortality caused by human and OHV presence, or incidental harassment, and modification of habitat as a result of loss of vegetation, soil compaction, and introduction of weed species. Cross-country OHV use (466,600 acres) could result in the incidental</p>	<p>Alternative B would place more restrictions on surface disturbing activities (e.g. mineral exploration and development, ROW construction) and help reduce impacts described in Alternative A.</p> <p>Managing OHV use throughout the majority of the decision area (524,000 acres, 95%) as limited to 1,387 miles of designated routes and restricting cross-country OHV use would minimize surface disturbances to wildlife species and their habitats, reducing surface disturbance of habitat as compared to Alternative A.</p>	<p>Alternative C management actions would place the greatest restrictions on surface disturbing activities (e.g. mineral exploration and development, ROW construction) and further reduce impacts described in Alternative A.</p> <p>Managing OHV use throughout the majority of the decision area (388,300 acres, 70%) as limited to 1,190 miles of designated routes and precluding cross-country OHV use would minimize surface disturbances to wildlife species and their habitats, greatly reducing surface disturbance of wildlife species habitat as compared to Alternative A.</p>	<p>Compared to Alternative A, Alternative D would place more restrictions on surface disturbing activities (e.g. mineral exploration and development, ROW construction) but fewer restrictions than Alternatives B and C. The potential for habitat changes from surface disturbing activities would remain.</p> <p>Managing OHV use throughout the majority of the decision area (525,300 acres, 95%) as limited to 1,464 miles of designated routes and restricting cross-country OHV use would minimize surface disturbances to wildlife species and their habitats, reducing surface disturbance of habitat as compared to Alternative A.</p>

Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
<p>loss of wildlife species, although the loss of habitat components in areas that receive frequent and/or intense cross-country OHV use would be a greater impact.</p>			
<p>Displacement from activities such as cross-country OHV use, motorized recreation, dispersed recreation, vegetation treatments and/or surface disturbance activities may move animals into less desirable habitat and increase competition for available resources with other species and uses.</p>	<p>Limiting OHV use to designated routes on 95 percent of the decision area would limit the potential for displacement of wildlife species. In addition, restricting surface disturbing activities (e.g., mineral exploration and development, ROW construction) and restrictions on recreation use in wildlife species habitats would reduce the potential for displacement compared to Alternative A. Displacement of wildlife species during vegetation treatments would be the same as described in Alternative A, except more acres could be treated.</p>	<p>Not allowing cross-country OHV use would eliminate potential impact from displacement. In general, OHV use on 884 miles of designated routes that result in increased human presence could temporarily displace special status species. Seasonal restrictions on 306 miles of OHV routes for raptor species and deer and elk crucial winter range would provide protection from disturbance and habitat degradation during the closure periods. In addition, access to several open routes would be limited due to the seasonal closures, which would increase protection from disruptive activities compared to Alternatives A and B.</p> <p>Displacement of wildlife species during vegetation treatments would be similar to those described in Alternative A, except focusing on treatments that use or mimic natural processes would decrease displacement due to a decreased presence of humans.</p>	<p>Limiting OHV use to designated routes on 95 percent of the decision area would limit the potential for displacement of special status species. In addition, restricting surface disturbing activities (e.g., mineral exploration and development, ROW construction) and restrictions on recreation use in special status species habitats would reduce the potential for displacement compared to Alternative A. However, there would be fewer restrictions in comparison to Alternatives B and C, increasing the potential for displacement, moving wildlife to less desirable habitat and increasing competition. Displacement of special status wildlife species during vegetation treatments would be the same as described in Alternative A, except more acres could be treated.</p>
<p>Vegetation treatments would result in temporary displacement of wildlife species during treatment. However, over the long term, the treated areas would provide improved forage conditions and reduced erosion, which would enhance wildlife habitat and fisheries.</p>	<p>Focusing vegetation treatments on identified high-priority areas and increasing the potential treatment acres would target areas where habitat function could be most improved. These treatments would improve overall habitat conditions in targeted habitats. This would result in an increase in habitat components, including increased forage and</p>	<p>Requiring at least an annual average of 4,650 acres to be treated would help reintroduce natural disturbance rates over the long term. This would improve habitat values in decadent vegetation communities. Preferring treatment methods that use or mimic natural processes could reduce impacts associated with human presence and more disruptive</p>	<p>Management of vegetation treatments to emphasize commodity production to increase forage and woodland products would likely convert habitats to early seral stages, resulting in habitat that is less desirable to diverse wildlife populations. It could also favor grazing ungulates and other wildlife species that prefer grasses and</p>

Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
	shelter.	treatment methods.	forbs.
Impacts on Wildland Fire Ecology			
<p>Implementing vegetation treatments and permitting commercial and non-commercial harvest of forest and woodland products would continue to reduce fuel and subsequently reduce wildland fire intensity. Vegetation treatments and harvests under this alternative would not be conducted in areas containing ponderosa pine trees, which would continue to lead to increased understory and fuel loads, which could lead to larger crown fires and associated loss of ponderosa pine stands.</p> <p>Restricting surface disturbing activities could preclude certain types of fire suppression activities, which would limit the ability to control fires.</p> <p>Wildfire suppression costs would be maintained under this alternative.</p>	<p>Impacts from implementing vegetation treatments and permitting commercial and non-commercial harvest of forest and woodland products would be the same as described in Alternative A, except additional measures to manage and improve vegetation would further reduce fuel loading and the intensity of wildfire. Treatments would be conducted in areas containing ponderosa pine trees, which would reduce fuel loads and reduce the potential for larger crown fires. Managing for old-growth forests and woodlands stands would reduce the amount of dead and downed fuels.</p> <p>Increasing the restrictions on surface disturbing activities would limit mechanical land treatments, which could result in fuels build-up and increased risk of catastrophic wildfires.</p> <p>Wildfire suppression costs would likely be reduced under this alternative as compared to Alternative A.</p>	<p>Impacts from implementing vegetation treatments would be the same as described in Alternative B, except using treatment methods that mimic natural processes would result in a short-term increase in the potential for larger, more intense wildland fires. Precluding commercial forest and woodland product harvest could lead to higher fuel loads and pinyon-juniper encroachment.</p> <p>This alternative would have the most restrictions on surface disturbing activities. This could result in fuels build-up and increased risk of catastrophic wildfires.</p> <p>Wildfire suppression costs could increase under this alternative as compared to Alternative A.</p>	<p>Impacts from vegetation treatments and permitting commercial and non-commercial harvest of forest and woodland products would be the same as Alternative B. Under this alternative, harvest could occur over a larger area than the other alternatives, although the level of harvest would likely remain the same.</p> <p>Increasing the restrictions on surface disturbing activities would limit mechanical land treatments, which could result in fuels build-up and increased risk of catastrophic wildfires.</p> <p>Wildfire suppression costs would likely be reduced under this alternative as compared to Alternative A.</p>
Impacts on Cultural Resources			
<p>The BLM would continue to mitigate impacts on cultural resources from authorized uses through project abandonment, redesign, and if necessary data recovery investigations. However, cultural resources would continue to deteriorate through natural agents and inadvertent damage.</p>			
<p>Due to inventories associated with mineral development (mineral materials, locatable minerals, oil and gas, and coal), between 28 (low site density) and 658 (high site density) cultural sites would be identified over the life of the plan. Most identified sites would be avoided, although sites identified during development of the surface coal mine (between 9 and 219) would likely be eliminated following data recovery.</p>			
<p>Cross-country OHV use would generally impact surface features and break artifacts, otherwise disturb cultural resources at the surface, and</p>	<p>Managing small areas of previous disturbance as open to cross-country OHV use could result in inadvertent unmitigated damage of sites and</p>	<p>No areas would be managed as open for OHV use, so there would be no impacts from cross-country OHV travel.</p>	<p>Managing small areas of previous disturbance as open to cross-country OHV use could result in inadvertent unmitigated damage of sites and</p>

Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
<p>increase the potential for inadvertent damage.</p> <p>OHV use on 1,495 miles of designated or existing routes would result in minimal additional impacts on cultural resources due to existing use on these routes. Because the designated routes currently exist, the damage adjacent to them would also be minimal.</p>	<p>associated inadvertent damage. These areas have either had Section 106 compliance (mineral developments) completed or are the highest priority for cultural resource inventories in compliance with Section 106.</p> <p>OHV use on 1,404 miles of designated routes would result in minimal additional impacts on cultural resources due to existing use on these routes. Because the designated routes currently exist, the damage adjacent to them would also be minimal.</p>	<p>OHV use on 1,190 miles of designated routes would result in minimal additional impacts on cultural resources due to existing use on these routes. Because the designated routes currently exist, the damage adjacent to them would also be minimal.</p>	<p>associated inadvertent damage. These areas have either had Section 106 compliance (mineral developments) completed or are the highest priority for cultural resource inventories in compliance with Section 106.</p> <p>OHV use on 1,464 miles of designated routes would result in minimal additional impacts on cultural resources due to existing use on these routes. Because the designated routes currently exist, the damage adjacent to them would also be minimal.</p>
Impacts on Paleontological Resources			
<p>Paleontological resource assessments would be performed on a case-by-case basis prior to proposed land uses. While assessments would minimize the potential for unmitigated impacts on known paleontological resources, they would not require an onsite inventory prior to all disturbances. This could result in the inadvertent damage of paleontological resources that were not identified prior to surface disturbance. Inadvertent damage to vertebrate fossils or other scientifically significant paleontological resources would generally be a significant impact, although mitigation could reduce the magnitude of damage through data recovery.</p> <p>Managing 84 percent of the decision area as open to OHV use could result in direct damage to paleontological resources, but it also allows for motorized access to paleontological</p>	<p>Requiring on-the-ground paleontological inventories prior to permitting surface disturbing activities in paleontological Class I areas would result in the identification, evaluation, and protection, where appropriate, of scientifically significant fossil resources. By focusing on paleontological Class I areas, the formation and facies most likely to contain scientifically significant fossils would be scrutinized.</p> <p>Requiring assessments in paleontological Class II areas would allow for mitigation needs to be identified and implemented in areas less likely to contain significant fossils. There is a potential for some localities in Class II areas to be damaged after surface disturbance begins if a field inventory were not performed.</p> <p>Restricting motorized use to designated routes would protect</p>	<p>Requiring paleontological inventories throughout the decision area prior to permitting surface disturbing activities, regardless of paleontological Class, would result in the inventory, identification, and collection of paleontological resources throughout the decision area. This would result in the lowest potential for incidental damage to paleontological resources because no surface disturbance would occur until an on-the-ground inventory cleared the area to proceed and any paleontological resources were identified and avoided or recovered. In addition, increases in the acres inventoried would result in more paleontological localities identified than the other alternatives.</p> <p>While precluding cross-country OHV use would eliminate the potential for direct damage from OHVs, it would also limit access for paleontological study and excavations compared to</p>	<p>Requiring paleontological assessments prior to permitting surface disturbing activities in paleontological Class I areas would identify new paleontological localities. While assessments would minimize the potential for unmitigated impacts on known paleontological resources, they would not require an on-the-ground inventory prior to all disturbances. This could result in the inadvertent damage of paleontological resources that were not identified prior to surface disturbance. Inadvertent damage to vertebrate fossils or other scientifically significant paleontological resources would generally be a significant impact, although mitigation could reduce the magnitude of damage through data recovery. Not requiring assessments or inventories for Class II areas could result in damage to paleontological resources after surface disturbance commences, resulting in the loss of</p>

Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
<p>localities. Motorized access is important for the study and excavation of paleontological resources because such activities often require the use of heavy equipment and the extraction of large specimens.</p>	<p>paleontological resources from damage associated with OHV use, but it could also limit access for paleontological study and excavations.</p>	<p>Alternative A. In addition, reducing the number of routes open for motorized use could further reduce the accessibility of remote paleontological localities.</p>	<p>scientifically significant paleontological resources. Impacts from OHV decisions would be same as Alternative B.</p>
Impacts on Visual Resources			
<p>Development affecting scenic quality would be designed to conform to an area’s designated VRM Class objectives. Although areas available for mineral development vary by alternative, development of all minerals is anticipated to disturb 8,426 acres (Appendix I, Reasonably Foreseeable Development [RFD]) in every alternative. Any areas within the viewshed of the disturbances would be affected, reducing visual quality over larger areas. These disturbances would alter the landform, remove vegetation, and introduce human-made structures to the landscape. Contrast would occur in the color, line, and texture of the vegetation community. The complete magnitude of this impact would vary depending on the topography, vegetation and size of disturbances, viewer sensitivity, and any mitigation actions that could be applied to reduce visual impacts.</p>			
<p>Acres managed as Class I (21,200 acres) would be approximately the same as inventoried acres, preserving the landscape in the Paria Canyon/Vermilion Cliffs Wilderness Area. Approximately 166,600 acres inventoried as VRM Class II and Class III would be managed as VRM Class IV, allowing major modifications to the landscape in areas of high visual quality. Impacts from oil and gas exploration and development could occur within 473,400 acres (86%) open to oil and gas leasing subject to the standard terms on the lease form or subject to moderate constraints. The density of development (well spacing) would affect the overall degree of impact; small and localized or evident at a broader landscape level. Managing 466,600 acres (84%) for cross-country OHV use could decrease vegetation and expose soil, increasing visual contrast from line, color, and texture. Limiting OHV use</p>	<p>Compared to Alternative A, there would be a 255 percent increase in acres managed as VRM Class I (76,000 acres) than were inventoried as Class I. The acres that would be managed by Class I objectives mostly inventoried as Class II and were adjusted due to the presence of a WSA. There would also be a shift of Class IV inventoried areas to Class III management objectives on approximately 24,600 acres. This change in management would require visually obtrusive activities to decrease their visual impact through mitigation measures. In addition, the portion of the decision area southwest of Highway 89 between Kanab and Mt. Carmel Junction would be managed as VRM III while much of it was inventoried as VRM II to allow for vegetation treatments to be implemented to a greater extent in area of pinyon-juniper encroachment. Impacts from oil and gas exploration and development would be the same as Alternative A, but could occur</p>	<p>Acres managed as Class I would increase to 168,300 acre compared with inventoried acres (694% increase), protecting not only high quality and sensitive landscapes, but also limiting visible landscape changes to support other management actions in this alternative. VRM Class II, Class III, and Class IV would decrease compared to their inventoried acres. The decision areas’ landscape would experience the least amount of change in this alternative. Impacts from oil and gas exploration and development would be the same as Alternative A, but could occur within 298,300 acres (54%) open to oil and gas leasing subject to the standard terms on the lease form or subject to moderate constraints. Impacts from OHV use would be the similar to Alternative B, except there would be no impacts from cross-country OHV use and impacts from OHV use on designated routes would</p>	<p>Impacts from VRM management would be similar to Alternative B, except many areas managed as Class II in Alternatives A and B would be managed as Class III, specifically around the White Cliffs area north of Highway 89 and south of Alton. This shift in management direction would result from prescriptions aimed at allowing vegetation treatments in areas heavily encroached by pinyon-juniper woodlands and providing for increased OHV recreation opportunities. Impacts from oil and gas exploration and development would be the same as Alternative A, but could occur within 455,900 acres (82%) open to oil and gas leasing subject to the standard terms on the lease form or subject to moderate constraints. Only allowing cross-country OHV use on approximately 1,100 acres would decrease visual impacts compared to Alternative A. Nearly all visual impacts from OHV use would be</p>

Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
<p>to 57 miles of designated routes on 66,200 acres (12%) would maintain the visible lines on the landscape from the routes. Where OHV use is limited to designated routes impacts on the landscape would be limited to the existing transportation system, eliminating the creation of new routes that would result in further changes to the landscape and visual quality.</p> <p>Vegetation management actions could alter vegetation composition, which could improve visual variety, by introducing a mosaic of vegetation patterns in the landscape. Maintenance of existing pinyon-juniper treatments would retain the existing vegetative character of the landscape.</p>	<p>within 420,100 acres (76%) open to oil and gas leasing subject to the standard terms on the lease form or subject to moderate constraints.</p> <p>Only allowing cross-country OHV use on approximately 1,100 acres would decrease visual impacts compared to Alternative A. Nearly all visual impacts from OHV use would be associated with maintaining the visible lines of disturbance associated with 1,387 miles of designated routes.</p> <p>Impacts from vegetation would be the same as Alternative A, except more acres could be affected by treatments.</p>	<p>occur on only 1,190 miles of routes. Focusing on using vegetation treatment methods that use or mimic natural processes would reduce the short-term impacts in visual quality associated with the treatments. More acres would be impacted by fire-related treatments.</p> <p>Impacts associated with vegetation treatments would be the same as Alternative A, except treatment types used would reduce the long-term impacts on visual quality.</p>	<p>associated with maintaining the visible lines of disturbance associated with 1,465 miles of designated routes.</p> <p>Impacts from vegetation would be the same as Alternative B.</p>
Impacts on Non-WSA Lands with Wilderness Characteristics			
<p>Cross-country OHV use would be allowed on 98 percent of these areas. While OHV registration and use continues to climb, this would result in a long-term loss of naturalness due to loss of vegetation during the creation of new routes.</p> <p>VRM Classes in WC areas would be managed as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Class I 0 acres • Class II 29,330 acres • Class III 4,970 acres • Class IV 46,600 acres • Unknown 8,880 acres. <p>The potential for some impacts from mineral exploration and development would remain. However, were all acres of disturbance anticipated in the RFD to occur on WC areas, less than 1 percent of all WC areas would</p>	<p>OHV use would be limited to 101 miles of designated routes, decreasing impacts compared to Alternative A. There would be short-term perceived loss of opportunities for solitude and primitive recreation.</p> <p>VRM Classes in WC areas would be managed as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Class I 310 acres • Class II 46,410 acres • Class III 32,440 acres • Class IV 10,620 acres. <p>Impacts from mineral exploration and development would be the same as Alternative A, except oil and gas leasing in WC areas would be managed as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standard Stipulations 50,610 acres • Moderate Constraints 21,850 acres 	<p>WC areas would be closed to OHV use, eliminating impacts described in Alternatives A and B.</p> <p>VRM Classes in WC areas would be managed as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Class I 89,780 acres • Class II 0 acres • Class III 0 acres • Class IV 0 acres. <p>Impacts from mineral exploration and development would be eliminated. Oil and gas leasing in WC areas would be managed as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standard Stipulations 0 acres • Moderate Constraints 0 acres • Major Constraints 0 acres • Closed 89,780 acres. 	<p>OHV use would be limited to 105 miles of designated routes, decreasing impacts compared to Alternative A. There would be short-term perceived loss of opportunities for solitude and primitive recreation.</p> <p>VRM Classes in WC areas would be managed as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Class I 0 acres • Class II 20,620 acres • Class III 62,840 acres • Class IV 6,320 acres. <p>Impacts from mineral exploration and development would be the same as Alternative A, except oil and gas leasing in WC areas would be managed as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standard Stipulations 80,060 acres • Moderate Constraints 7,340 acres

Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
<p>be directly impacted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standard Stipulations 83,050 acres • Moderate Constraints 5,600 acres • Major Constraints 1,130 acres • Closed 0 acres. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Major Constraints 17,020 acres • Closed 300 acres. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Major Constraints 2,380 acres • Closed 0 acres.
Impacts on Forest and Woodland Products			
<p>Designated harvest areas would continue to facilitate product harvest. Commercial harvest of forest and woodland products would continue to be excluded in all designated recreation sites, outstanding natural areas, areas of recent surface reclamation work, areas recommended for protective watershed management, VRM Class I and II areas, ACECs, WSRs, and areas that are heavily used for vegetation.</p> <p>Implementing vegetation treatments and managing vegetation resources to meet desired vegetation conditions would maintain or improve the quality of products available for harvest.</p>	<p>Permitting commercial timber harvest on a case-by-case basis to promote or sustain forest health, unless otherwise designated or stipulated, would limit the potential for harvest.</p> <p>Permitting commercial and non-commercial harvest of pinyon-juniper areawide and other woodland species on a case-by-case basis, unless otherwise designated or stipulated, would facilitate woodland products harvest.</p> <p>Impacts from implementing vegetation treatments would be the same as described in Alternative A, except additional measures to manage and improve vegetation would be implemented.</p>	<p>Precluding commercial timber harvest would eliminate the potential for commercial harvest in the decision area.</p> <p>Impacts from commercial and non-commercial harvest of woodland products would be the same as described in Alternative B.</p> <p>Impacts from implementing vegetation treatments would be the same as described in Alternative B, except using treatment methods that mimic natural process would reduce the quantity and quality of forest and woodland products available for harvest in the short term.</p>	<p>Permitting commercial timber harvest and commercial and non-commercial harvest of woodland products areawide, unless otherwise designated or stipulated, would facilitate product harvest. Under this alternative, harvest could occur over a larger area.</p> <p>Impacts from implementing vegetation treatments would be the same as described in Alternative B.</p>
Impacts on Livestock Grazing			
<p>Surface disturbing activities, cross-country OHV use, and general human disturbance could lead to site-specific loss of forage, spread of noxious weeds, and displacement of livestock. These impacts would be minor due to the low levels of disturbance and use throughout the decision area.</p> <p>Vegetation treatments would generally help to offset forage losses by increasing forage production in treatment areas.</p>	<p>Limiting OHV use to designated routes would limit loss of forage due to surface disturbance to 4,056 acres over the long term. The potential for harassment would also decrease. In addition, the management of SRMAs (125,800 total acres) could focus recreation use and lead to site-specific loss of forage and displacement of livestock.</p> <p>Vegetation treatments would be prioritized to restore areas functioning at less than 51 percent of PNC, restore areas with noxious</p>	<p>Same as Alternative B, except the management of SRMAs (129,050 total acres) would focus on non-motorized recreation uses. This could decrease displacement of livestock and interference with grazing management due to OHV use. Surface use restrictions would be applied to SRMAs, which could also decrease the degree of forage removal and disturbance to livestock. Vegetation treatments would occur. However, treatment methods that use or mimic natural processes would be</p>	<p>Same as Alternative B, except the management of SRMAs (122,800 total acres) would focus on motorized recreation uses. This could increase the degree of disturbance to livestock and interference with grazing management due to OHV use. However, these impacts would be less than Alternative A due to limiting OHVs to designated routes.</p> <p>Impacts from vegetation treatments would the same as Alternative B.</p>

Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
	weed and/or non-native invasive plants, maintain previously treated areas, and achieve other objectives identified in the RMP. This would likely further improve vegetation conditions and increase forage production.	preferred. Using these preferred methods would result in a slower process of vegetation enhancement and related forage increases.	
Impacts on Recreation			
<p>Development activities would create surface disturbances that would displace recreationists, reduce opportunities for primitive/unconfined recreation, and diminish the recreation setting and experience for those wanting a natural or undeveloped setting.</p> <p>Impacts would also occur in the form of conflicts among recreation users. Motorized recreation use would conflict with primitive/unconfined recreation when they occur in close proximity and would result in degradation of the setting and experience associated with primitive/unconfined recreation activities.</p> <p>Land use restrictions would help to reduce these impacts by enhancing the setting in which recreation activities take place and precluding certain activities in areas of user conflict. However, some restrictions could limit opportunities for motorized and hunting activities.</p>	<p>Although the types of impacts would be the same as described in Alternative A, the degree of impact would change. Increased land use restrictions to mitigate impacts from mineral development and to protect vegetation and biological resources would be implemented. This would help to maintain recreation opportunities and enhance the recreation setting and experience.</p> <p>Recreational user conflicts would be reduced through management of SRMAs (125,800 acres). Management of these areas would focus on preservation of scenic, cultural, and biological resources and allocating lands to different types of recreation uses. In addition to reducing user conflicts, this would enhance the recreation setting and experience.</p> <p>Opportunities for cross-country OHV use would be considerably reduced, because open OHV areas would be reduced by 99 percent. However, trail-based OHV opportunities would remain over most of the decision area.</p>	<p>Although the types of impacts would be the same as described in Alternative A, the degree of impact would change. Areas managed as SRMAs would be increased to 129,050 acres, the majority of the decision area would be subject to moderate and major constraints on leasable mineral development, nearly half of the decision area would be managed according to VRM Class I and II objectives, and 60,600 acres would be designated as ACECs. These intensive land use management actions and restrictions would provide the greatest level of protection to recreation opportunities, settings, and experience.</p> <p>However, cross-country OHV use would be prohibited across the entire decision area. Although this would eliminate opportunities for this type of OHV use, it would protect opportunities for solitude and primitive/unconfined recreation and reduce the potential for user conflicts. Trail-based OHV use would still be allowed across most of the decision area.</p>	<p>Although the types of impacts would be the same as described in Alternative A, the degree of impact would change and fall somewhere between that of Alternatives A and B. Surface disturbing activities would displace recreationists, reduce opportunities for primitive/unconfined recreation, and degrade the recreation setting and experience, but to a lesser extent than under Alternative A because increased land use restrictions would reduce surface disturbances and, subsequently, impacts on recreation.</p> <p>Management of SRMAs would serve to reduce recreation user conflicts to the same degree identified for Alternative B.</p> <p>Opportunities for cross-country OHV use would be reduced to the same degree identified for Alternative B.</p>
Impacts on Transportation			
Cross-country access would be provided for most of the decision	Motorized access would be allowed on 1,387 miles of routes. The	Motorized access would be allowed on 1,190 miles of routes. The	Motorized access would be allowed on 1,464 miles of routes. The

Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
<p>area. While most motorized use within these acres would use the 1,499 miles of routes, the availability of cross-country use would allow motorized access regardless of the presence of a route. Designating 57 miles of routes on 66,200 acres would provide for motorized access to most of these areas, where non-motorized access would be retained in the areas beyond the designated routes.</p> <p>Impacts on transportation and access via state-maintained highways and BLM-maintained system roads would occur as a result of land tenure adjustments. Acquiring legal access within the North Fork Virgin River, Orderville Gulch, Cogswell Point Road, and Branch of Cogswell Point Road would increase access to these areas and facilitate travel across the decision area and to adjacent public lands through the creation of a more contiguous decision area.</p>	<p>designated routes in these areas would provide for motorized access to most of the decision area, where non-motorized access could be obtained in the areas beyond the designated routes. The 118 miles of routes closed to use would not eliminate access to any portion of the decision area, although in some areas motorized access would require travel on more miles of routes to access the same area.</p> <p>Impacts on transportation and access via state-maintained highways and BLM-maintained system roads would occur as a result of land tenure adjustments.</p> <p>The disposal (via Section 203 sales) of 6,400 acres of public land could improve access to private and public land parcels and facilitate travel across the decision area through consolidating public lands and creating a more cohesive transportation system. However, these disposals could also reduce access due to the loss of public access to those areas.</p>	<p>designated routes in these areas would provide for motorized access to most of the decision area, where non-motorized access could be obtained in the areas beyond the designated routes. However, closing 306 miles seasonally and 315 miles yearlong would reduce access to various areas of the decision area. Specifically, motorized access to the Orderville SRMA would be eliminated, as would motorized access within the WSAs. On a seasonal basis, motorized access would be eliminated between the Canaan Mountain and Parunuweap WSAs, in an area between Mt. Carmel Junction and Kanab, as well as south of highway 143 southwest of Panguitch.</p> <p>Impacts from lands and realty would be similar to those identified for Alternative B, except the extent of disposals (via Section 203 sales) would decrease to 2,500 acres.</p>	<p>designated routes in these areas would provide for motorized access to most of the decision area, where non-motorized access could be obtained in the areas beyond the designated routes. The 41 miles of routes closed to use would not eliminate access to any portion of the decision area, although in some areas motorized access would require travel on more miles of routes to access the same area.</p> <p>Impacts from lands and realty would be similar to those identified for Alternative B, except the extent of disposals (via Section 203 sales) would increase to 20,500 acres. While this could increase opportunities to consolidate public lands, allowing the sale of lands along the Arizona border would result in at least eight routes no longer being in public ownership, eliminating motorized and non-motorized access in these areas.</p>
Impacts on Lands and Realty			
<p>ROW restrictions include protection of riparian areas from lands and realty actions and VRM management actions to rehabilitate visual intrusions that could possibly restrict placement of facilities.</p> <p>The ROW seasonal limitation would be the ¼ mile restriction around bald eagle roost and perch sites from November 1 to April 30, which could limit access and delay project construction of new ROWs and</p>	<p>ROW avoidance (78,900 acres) and exclusion areas (75,700 acres) could lead to the placement of ROWs in less desirable locations or areas with restrictions on accessibility or construction. These restrictions could affect associated costs on new or amended ROWs.</p> <p>Public lands that contain riparian areas, crucial wildlife habitat, Cottonwood Canyon ACEC, sensitive cultural sites, and the Old Spanish</p>	<p>The intensity and magnitude of impacts associated with ROW exclusion and avoidance areas would increase compared to Alternatives A and B. ROW avoidance (3,400 acres) and exclusion areas (255,200 acres) could lead to the placement of ROWs in less desirable locations or areas with restrictions on accessibility or construction. These restrictions could affect associated costs on new or amended ROWs. The majority of the</p>	<p>Alternative D would have the fewest restrictions on ROWs. ROWs avoidance (15,200 acres) and exclusion areas (75,200 acres) could require design and siting requirements and affect associated costs on new ROWs or amended ROWs.</p> <p>Public lands that contain riparian areas, crucial wildlife habitat, sensitive cultural sites, and the Old Spanish National Historic Trail</p>

Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
<p>maintenance activity on existing ROWs. Allowing land tenure adjustments would facilitate access, improve management ability, accommodate resource management needs and reduce conflicts between private landowners and uses. Diana's Throne and the Water Canyon/South Fork Indian Canyon ACEC would be retained in public ownership.</p>	<p>National Historic Trail (Highway 89/20 segment in Garfield County) would be retained in public ownership. Land tenure adjustments, including FLPMA Section 203 disposals, would be allowed on 6,400 acres.</p>	<p>ROW exclusion areas occur along U.S. Highway 89, which could hinder the ability of approving future ROW requests. Public lands that contain riparian areas, crucial wildlife habitat, WC areas, Cottonwood Canyon ACEC, Welsh's Milkweed ACEC, Vermilion Cliffs ACEC, White Cliffs ACEC, sensitive cultural sites, and the Old Spanish National Historic Trail (Highway 89/20 segment in Garfield County) would be retained in public ownership. Land tenure adjustments, including FLPMA Section 203 disposals, would be allowed on 2,500 acres.</p>	<p>(Highway 89/20 segment in Garfield County) would be retained in public ownership. Land tenure adjustments, including FLPMA Section 203 disposals, would be allowed on 20,500 acres.</p>
Impacts on Minerals and Energy			
<p>This alternative would have the least restriction on oil and gas leasing compared to the other alternatives. Approximately 76 percent of the decision area would be open to oil and gas leasing subject to standard terms and conditions and 15 percent would have a NSO stipulation or be closed to leasing.</p>	<p>While management actions under this alternative would not reduce the projected number of wells, the management actions could increase costs associated with exploration and development and could require the installation of facilities in less desirable locations. Approximately 48 percent of the decision area would be open to oil and gas leasing subject to standard terms and conditions and 24 percent would have a NSO stipulation or be closed to leasing.</p>	<p>This alternative would have the greatest restriction on oil and gas leasing compared to the other alternatives. While management actions under this alternative would not reduce the projected number of wells, they could increase costs associated with exploration and development and could require the installation of facilities in less desirable locations. Approximately 5 percent of the decision area would be open to oil and gas leasing subject to standard terms and conditions and 46 percent would have a NSO stipulation or be closed to leasing.</p>	<p>The impacts from this alternative are similar to Alternative A, but slightly more restrictive. Approximately 71 percent of the decision area would be open to oil and gas leasing subject to standard terms and conditions and 18 percent would have a NSO stipulation or be closed to leasing.</p>
<p>Approximately 24,591 acres (4%) is currently withdrawn from locatable mineral entry. Areas withdrawn from locatable mineral entry would prohibit locatable mineral development, but due to low development potential this</p>	<p>Same as Alternative A, plus an additional 9,500 acres of areas recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry would not further affect exploration and</p>	<p>Same as Alternative A, plus this alternative would recommend the most acres for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry. However, due to low development potential, the 158,800 acres of areas</p>	<p>Same as Alternative A, but this alternative would recommend the least acres for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry. The 7 acres of areas recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral</p>

Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
would minimally affect the ability to meet the demand for locatable minerals.	development activities.	recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry would not affect exploration and development activities.	entry would not affect exploration and development activities.
This alternative would close the fewest acres to mineral material disposals. The Crescent Butte, Shinarump Cliffs, and Vermilion Cliffs recreation sites and the 40-acre ponderosa pine area would be closed to mineral material disposals. Closing these areas to mineral material sales would not decrease the ability to meet the overall demand for mineral materials throughout the decision area.	The majority of the 78,500 acres of areas closed to mineral material disposals do not coincide with sand and gravel high development potential areas, and the closed areas do not overlap areas with potential for stone deposit disposals.	This alternative would close the most acres to mineral material disposals. The majority of the 175,000 acres of areas closed to mineral material disposals do not coincide with sand and gravel high development potential areas, and the closed areas do not overlap areas with potential for stone deposit disposals	The 21,200 acres closed to mineral material sales do not include areas of high development potential for sand, gravel, and stone.
Coal management actions would allow for the leasing and development of coal resources on lands identified as suitable. Based on the coal unsuitability criteria under Alternative A, the Alton, Kolob, Kapairowits, and Johns Valley coal fields would be suitable for further leasing consideration.	Coal management actions would allow for the leasing and development of coal resources on lands identified as suitable (Appendix F). Based on the coal unsuitability criteria, approximately 113,629 acres would be suitable for further leasing consideration.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.
Impacts on Areas of Critical Environmental Concern			
Management associated with the existing ACEC would protect the associated relevant and important values. At least one relevant and important value in all five of the potential ACECs would be at threat of irreparable damage due to the potential for unmitigated threats.	Management associated with the potential Cottonwood Canyon ACEC (and therefore the Water Canyon/South Fork Indian Canyon ACEC) would protect the associated relevant and important values. Management from other decisions in this alternative would provide protection to the relevant and important values associated with the other four potential ACECs.	All relevant and important values would be protected through special management associated with the designation of the ACECs.	Although no ACECs would be designated, management from other decisions in this alternative would provide protection to the relevant and important values associated with the Parunuweap Canyon ACEC. At least one relevant and important value in the four other potential ACECs would be at threat of irreparable damage due to the potential for unmitigated threats.
Impacts on Wild and Scenic Rivers			
Impacts on WSR tentative	Impacts on WSR would be similar to	Impacts on WSR would be similar to	No eligible river segments would be

Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
<p>classification would primarily result from increased OHV use access to “wild” river segments and from land treatments that could potentially impact “wild” river segments’ natural character. Impacts to outstandingly remarkable values (ORV) would primarily occur from land treatments and habitat management. However, impacts associated with such actions would likely be short term in duration and over the long term would likely result in protections to the ORVs.</p>	<p>those described in Alternative A; however, impacts on the tentative classification and ORVs of suitable river segments would decrease because of management associated primarily with WSA, recreation, VRM, and WSR. Under this alternative, greater restrictions would be placed on surface disturbance, OHV use, and on maintaining the natural character of the areas in which the suitable river segments are located. By not finding some river segments suitable, there is a potential that impacts could occur on the ORVs and tentative classification that could be severe enough to preclude them from any future opportunities for WSR consideration.</p>	<p>those described in Alternative B; however, there would be greater indirect protections to the tentative classifications and ORVs from increased restrictions on actions that could impact these values.</p>	<p>considered as suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System, and as such no direct protections would be afforded any eligible rivers. Any protections to the ORVs or tentative classification identified in Alternative A would be indirect, resulting from management associated with other resource programs. Because no direct protections would be afforded to eligible river segments, there is a potential that impacts could occur on the ORVs and tentative classification that could be severe enough to preclude them from any future opportunities for WSR consideration.</p>
Impacts on Wilderness			
<p>Implementation of the Wilderness Management Plan allows for periodic adjustments to site-specific management to ensure wilderness characteristics are preserved. Solitude could be eliminated in the short term by vegetation manipulation projects. Over the long term, naturalness would be restored.</p>	<p>Implementation of the Wilderness Management Plan allows for periodic adjustments to site-specific management to ensure wilderness characteristics are preserved. Impacts from vegetation manipulation would be the same as described in Alternative A, except having a full suite of restoration tools would allow the broadest approach to controlling invasive species and restoring ecological function.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative B, except using only natural and prescribed fire to restore ecological functions would reduce short-term impacts from vegetation treatments, but could also increase impacts on natural character and functions of the wilderness area over the long term.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative B.</p>
Impacts on Wilderness Study Areas			
<p>Wilderness characteristics within WSAs would be protected under this alternative. Motorized use along 32 miles of designated routes in the Parunuweap Canyon and Moquith Mountain WSAs would result in short-term loss of</p>	<p>Same as Alternative A, except impacts from OHV use would decrease because 17 miles or routes/inventoried ways would be closed to OHV use. In addition, limiting group size associated with SRPs within WSAs to 12 would protect opportunities for solitude and</p>	<p>Wilderness characteristics within WSAs would be protected under this alternative. Designating no routes for motorized use within WSAs would eliminate any impact from that use. Limiting group size associated with SRPs within WSAs to 12 would</p>	<p>Same as Alternative A, except increasing group sizes associated with SRPs within WSAs to 20 could result in the temporary loss of opportunities for solitude or unconfined recreation for users from other groups.</p>

Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
<p>solitude and perceived naturalness. In the long term, motorized use along designated routes (inventoried ways) would not result in the areas being disqualified from wilderness consideration by Congress.</p> <p>High concentrations of recreation users (large group sizes and/or frequent group encounters) would decrease outstanding opportunities for solitude in WSAs. This would be most evident in the areas currently receiving high levels of use, such as the North Fork Virgin River, Orderville Canyon, and Parunuweap Canyon WSAs.</p>	<p>primitive unconfined recreation. In addition to the reduction in the number of users as compared to Alternative A, supporting education and outreach programs such as “Tread Lightly” and “Leave No Trace” would reduce impacts from increasing numbers of overnight users as campers recreate in a manner that leaves fewer impacts.</p>	<p>protect opportunities for solitude and primitive unconfined recreation. In addition, limitations on group size within sensitive Mexican spotted owl habitat would increase protections on opportunities for solitude and primitive unconfined recreation within the Orderville Canyon, North Fork Virgin River, and western portions of the Parunuweap Canyon WSAs. However, further reductions in group sizes due to MSO habitat could also result in fewer opportunities for recreationists to access these areas.</p>	
Impacts on Other Designations			
<p>Under this alternative, the lack of any specific management for either segment of the Old Spanish National Historic Trail could result in alteration of the trail corridor or associated resources, which could impact the character and historic setting of the Old Spanish National Historic Trail.</p>	<p>Management would provide for consideration of the historic values present along the corridor and the subsequent developments that have occurred. In addition, coordination and interpretative efforts would increase public appreciation for the trail’s values and significance in the region and nation’s history.</p> <p>Management of the trail components in the Kanab Field Office would be consistent with a Comprehensive Management Plan’s intent and would help lead to a consistent approach along the entire trail. This could lead to an enhanced experience for a trail visitor.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative B.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative B.</p>
Impacts on Social and Economic Conditions			
<p>The total economic impacts from coal mining, oil and gas drilling and production, and livestock grazing from activities directly attributable to decision area lands were estimated using IMPLAN and data and assumptions based on professional judgment. Employment and income generated by activities associated with the BLM lands in this RMP/EIS are a small percentage of total employment and personal income in the two-county socioeconomic study area.</p> <p>For coal mining, oil and gas drilling, and oil and gas production, the IMPLAN analysis was based on Alternative A because insufficient information is available to allow quantification of economic differences between the alternatives. Coal mining would provide between 167 and 237 direct and indirect jobs and \$10,827,000</p>			

Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
<p>and \$15,446,000 in direct and indirect income. Oil and gas drilling would provide approximately 12 direct and indirect jobs and approximately \$859,000 in direct and indirect income. Oil and gas production would provide between 1 and 7 direct and indirect jobs and \$11,000 and \$211,000 in direct and indirect income.</p> <p>In the case of livestock grazing, the alternatives include differences in the number of AUMs allocated to livestock. However, the resulting differences in the value of production, when run through the IMPLAN model, produced differences for employment of well less than one job and differences in labor income of only a few hundred dollars for both current active AUMs and total permitted AUMs—in both cases well within the margin of error of any economic model and within the rounding margin for reporting of results. Livestock production from the decision area would provide between 11 and 26 direct and indirect jobs and \$56,000 and \$132,000 in direct and indirect income.</p> <p>For some resources, quantification of economic impacts was not possible. The lack of quantifiable differences in economic impacts does not mean that differences would not occur. Some differences are simply not quantifiable given the available data. The following sectors for are likely to have economic impacts, but quantification of was <i>not</i> possible: locatable minerals (specifically, septarian concretions and gypsum); salable minerals (specifically, sand and gravel, stone, clay); lands and realty (e.g., ROWs, disposals); recreation; and transportation (OHV use). In particular, recreational activities (including OHV-based recreation) no doubt generate substantial employment and income. For these sectors, qualitative description of economic impacts is provided in chapter 4 if there are any economically discernable differences in the alternatives.</p>			
<p>This alternative would allow coal, oil, and gas development to occur as expected under the RFD. Coal mining would generate some additional population growth that could result in increased demands on community services.</p> <p>Alternative A continues most current land management policies and practices, which would be welcomed by some users in and beyond the socioeconomic study area but found less desirable by many others, who see a variety of adverse impacts and foregone opportunities under current management. Specifically, the cross-country OHV use throughout 466,6000 acres (82%) would continue to provide ample opportunities for motorized recreation while resulting in increased user conflicts between those interested in motorized recreation and those interested in preservation and non-motorized recreation. It is likely that given current trends, conflicts between these and other resource users would increase</p>	<p>Alternative B would provide improved management approaches to use of resources that would address many potential resource use conflicts. Alternative B's closure of almost all land to cross-country OHV use would produce some impacts on local custom and culture such as some motorized recreation users of BLM lands could be restricted. At the same time, Managing 92 percent of existing OHV routes and provision of increased facilities and other improvements would improve the recreational experience for many motorized recreation users and would reduce some conflicts with non-motorized users. Alternative B would include land treatments to increase livestock forage availability that would be welcomed by livestock grazing interests. Preservation interests would welcome Alternative B's increased constraints on natural resource development compared to Alternative A. At the same time, natural resource development interests would still find substantial development opportunities available</p>	<p>Alternative C would allow for resource uses for economic benefits while maximizing protection of natural values. As such, it would have more pronounced adverse impacts on individuals and groups who favor resource development over preservation.</p> <p>Alternative C would somewhat favor persons and groups interested in non-motorized recreation and preservation of habitat, ecosystem, visual, and similar values of natural landscapes. However, opportunities for oil and gas development, motorized recreation, and other more traditional uses of BLM lands would still exist, but would likely require extensive mitigation.</p>	<p>Alternative D would maximize resource uses for economic benefits while providing some protection of natural values. As such, it would have more pronounced adverse impacts on individuals and groups who favor preservation over resource development.</p> <p>Alternative D would be most preferred by individuals and groups interested in natural resource development and motorized recreation and less favored by those with preferences for less development and use of public lands, although it would still provide important protections for the local environment.</p>

Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
	under Alternative B.		
Impacts on Tribal Interests			
<p>The BLM will protect and preserve access to religiously/spiritually significant Native American sites for the exercise of traditional religions and worship through ceremonials and traditional rites. Sacred sites would be identified on a case-by-case basis through consultation efforts with Native American tribes. As these sacred sites are identified, the BLM would protect them and allow access to them through site-specific means identified on a case-by-case basis.</p>			
<p>Existing LUPs do not specifically address tribal issues or Native American religious concerns. Identification and protection of sites and traditional use areas would take place on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p>Managing wildland fire to restore pre-European settlement conditions could result in a short-term loss of traditional use opportunities, but in the long term vegetation conditions would move toward a pre-European settlement state, improving the condition of traditionally used species. However, if during rehabilitation non-native plant species replaced native plant species culturally important to Native American tribes, there would be a decrease in future opportunities for traditional use of native species.</p> <p>None of the 80 acres available for FLPMA Section 203 sale include the areas that the Kaibab-Paiute Tribe requested be made available for disposal.</p>	<p>Proactive coordination with interested tribes could result in the identification and management of traditional use areas and Native American religious sites prior to disruptive projects being proposed.</p> <p>Impacts from restoring vegetation to pre-European settlement conditions would increase compared to Alternative A due to implementing up to 22,300 acres of vegetation treatments annually. These treatments could result in a short-term loss of traditional use opportunities, but in the long term vegetation conditions would move toward a pre-European settlement state, improving the condition of traditionally used species.</p> <p>None of the 6,400 acres available for FLPMA Section 203 sale include the areas that the Kaibab-Paiute Tribe requested be made available for disposal.</p>	<p>Proactive coordination with interested tribes could result in the identification and management of traditional use areas and Native American religious sites prior to disruptive projects being proposed.</p> <p>Impacts from restoring vegetation to pre-European settlement conditions would increase compared to Alternative A due to implementing 4,650 acres of vegetation treatments annually. Limiting treatments methods to emphasize restoration of natural processes could reduce the rate at which vegetation communities are restored compared to Alternatives B and D.</p> <p>None of the 2,700 acres available for FLPMA Section 203 sale include the areas that the Kaibab-Paiute Tribe requested be made available for disposal.</p>	<p>Proactive coordination with interested tribes could result in the identification and management of traditional use areas and Native American religious sites prior to disruptive projects being proposed.</p> <p>Impacts from restoring vegetation to pre-European settlement conditions would be the same as Alternative B.</p> <p>Making 20,500 acres available for potential FLPMA Section 203 sale would include all the areas the Kaibab-Paiute Tribe requested be made available for disposal except acres within WSAs. This would help the Tribe's interest in obtaining lands within the State of Utah, although they would still have to purchase the land.</p>
Impacts on Public Safety			
<p>The potential for impacts from hazardous material and waste would be low, because hazardous waste sites do not currently exist within the decision area. Impacts would be further limited through federal regulation of hazardous materials, substances, and waste; national contingency plans; BLM policy on hazardous waste disposal; and continued coordination with federal and state partners regarding hazardous materials and waste issues (e.g., abandoned mine lands). BLM-administered public land sites contaminated with hazardous wastes would be reported, secured, and remediated according to applicable federal and state regulations and contingency plans.</p>			