

CHAPTER 2—PROPOSED KANAB RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN

The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) has the discretion to select the Proposed Resource Management Plan (RMP) by combining components of the various alternatives presented in the Draft RMP/Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). The selection of the Proposed RMP is based on public comments, BLM review, and providing the best means to accommodate the widest range of public and agency concerns over resources and resource uses. This chapter describes the Proposed RMP. It should be noted that while most of these management actions are RMP level, this Proposed RMP also identifies designation of individual travel routes, which are an implementation-level decision that can change over the life of the plan without amending the RMP (Appendix 7).

Planning decisions establish desired outcomes and actions needed to achieve them. Decisions are reached using the planning process in 43 CFR 1600. When they are presented to the public as proposed decisions, they can be protested to the BLM Director. They are not appealable to the Interior Board of Land Appeals (from *BLM Land Use Planning Handbook*, H-1601-1). Implementation decisions are decisions that take action to implement land use plan (LUP) decisions and are generally appealable to the Interior Board of Land Appeals under 43 CFR 4.410 (from *BLM Land Use Planning Handbook*, H-1601-1). Implementation-level decisions are italicized and marked with an asterisk.

BLM has prepared this Proposed RMP/Final EIS in order to respond to public comment and cooperative agency review of the Draft RMP/EIS. The Proposed RMP is based on Alternative B of the Draft RMP/EIS, and has been modified by public comments, BLM review, and providing the best means to accommodate the widest range of public and agency concerns over resources and resource uses. The changes from the Preferred Alternative (Alternative B in the Draft RMP/EIS) to the Proposed RMP have been shaded gray.

2.1 DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED RMP

This section provides a brief description of the Proposed RMP. The Proposed RMP provides opportunities to use and develop resources within the decision area while ensuring resource protection. The Proposed RMP 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:
 - 17 percent (95,400 acres) open to oil and gas leasing subject to the standard terms and conditions of the lease form
 - 54 percent (296,200 acres) open to oil and gas leasing subject to moderate constraints (timing limitations, controlled surface use [CSU], lease notices)
 - 15 percent (83,400 acres) open to oil and gas leasing subject to major constraints (no surface occupancy [NSO])
 - 14 percent (79,000 acres) closed to leasing.
- Limit vegetation treatments (e.g., wildlife habitat, watershed, and livestock rangeland treatments; wildland fires; fuels treatments; and stewardship contracting) to an annual average of no more than 22,300 acres. Manage sagebrush steppe communities to restore natural disturbance processes with an appropriate pinyon-juniper component for a given ecological site. Manage ponderosa

pine stands to restore natural disturbance processes through treatments, resulting in predominantly park-like stands.

- Close the Water Canyon Allotment to livestock grazing (48 animal unit months [AUM]) in order to protect the Fredonia City Culinary water supply for the life of the plan. In order to have the RMP accurately reflect current management, 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” and 960 acres (5 miles) tentatively classified as “scenic.”
- Designate and manage the potential Cottonwood Canyon Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) (3,800 acres) as an ACEC; designate no additional areas as an ACEC.
- Identify six Special Resource Management Areas (SRMA) with nine recreation management zones (RMZ) (95,100 acres):
 - Manage two RMZs specifically for motorized uses (19,500 acres)
 - Manage five SRMAs/RMZs specifically for non-motorized uses (38,800 acres)
 - Manage two SRMAs/RMZs for both motorized and non-motorized uses (36,800 acres).
- Manage off-highway vehicle (OHV) use according to open, closed, or limited (seasonally and/or spatially) area and “route designations” as follows:
 - Approximately 1,000 acres open to cross-country OHV use
 - 25,000 acres closed to OHV use
 - 528,000 acres of limited OHV use, with 1,403 miles of “designated routes,” 2 miles of routes closed seasonally, and 75 miles of closed routes.
- 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, all the Wilderness Study Areas (WSA), and river corridors associated with “wild” suitable segments. VRM classes and acreages include the following:
 - VRM Class I: 76,000 acres
 - VRM Class II: 94,400 acres
 - VRM Class III: 210,700 acres
 - VRM Class IV: 172,900 acres.
- Manage the following non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics specifically to maintain their wilderness characteristics (27,770 acres): East of Bryce, Moquith Mountain, Orderville Canyon, Parunuweap Canyon, and Upper Kanab Creek.

2.2 MANAGEMENT ACTIONS

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. 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.
- Recognize the unique cultural, historical, and social values of the decision area in developing a plan that manages the land and protects the heritage it engenders.

2.2.1 Resources

Air Quality

Goals and Objectives

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

Management Actions

Air Quality

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 National Environmental Policy Act (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 in disturbed areas without taking appropriate dust abatement measures. Compliance would be obtained through site-specific stipulations identified on a case-by-case basis for new projects and through the use of dust abatement control techniques in problem areas.

Mitigate actions that compromise ambient air quality standards or visibility within the Class I air areas.

BLM will continue to work cooperatively with state, federal, and tribal entities in developing air quality assessment protocols to address cumulative impacts and regional air quality issues.

BLM will continue to work cooperatively with the Utah Airshed Group to manage emissions from wildland and prescribed fire activities.

National Ambient Air Quality Standards are enforced by the Utah Department of Environmental Quality, Division of Air Quality, with Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) oversight. Special requirements to reduce potential air quality impacts will be considered on a case-by-case basis in processing land use authorizations.

BLM will utilize BMPs and site specific mitigation measures, when appropriate, based on site specific conditions, to reduce emissions and enhance air quality. Examples of these types of measures can be found in the Four Corners Air Quality Task Force Report of Mitigation Options, November 1, 2007.

Project specific analyses will consider use of quantitative air quality analysis methods (i.e. modeling), when appropriate as determined by BLM, in consultation with state, federal, and tribal entities.

Soil Resources

Goals and 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 BMPs designed to minimize impacts on soils from ground disturbing activities, as appropriate (Appendix 1).

Reduce soil loss on watersheds by performing appropriate land treatments (Map 5).

Land treatments would be prioritized in the following fifth-field watersheds:

- Upper Sevier River Watershed:
 - Pass Creek/Sevier River
 - City Creek/Sevier River
 - Bear Creek/Sevier River
- Upper Virgin River/Kanab Creek Watersheds:
 - Muddy Creek
 - Upper Kanab Creek
 - Skutumpah/Mill Creek.

Initiate reclamation of surface disturbances, where appropriate, during or upon completion of the authorized project.

Close and reclaim temporary roads upon completion of the project that required the roads.

Remove and reclaim facilities or improvements no longer necessary or desirable, provided no historic properties are affected.

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.

Develop and implement site-specific restrictions and/or mitigations for activities proposed in fragile soil areas on a case-by-case basis. Surface disturbing activities must be approved by the BLM before construction and maintenance is authorized.

Allow surface disturbance in fragile soil areas as long as impacts would be mitigated or disturbance would be beneficial to rangeland health.

Preclude cross-country OHV use in areas identified as fragile soils to minimize soil loss and salinity of water runoff.

Allow land treatments (i.e., vegetation treatment and soil stabilization) in fragile soil areas where such treatment would reduce erosion and restore watersheds.

Manage land uses according to the *Standards for Rangeland Health* to maintain or improve soil conditions.

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.

Water Resources

Goals and 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 watershed objectives.

Implement BMPs designed to protect water quality for all ground disturbing activities (Appendix 1).

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 groundwater 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 1). Coordinate with the Virgin River Management Plan Watershed Advisory Committee (and other applicable committees for other Colorado River tributaries) to reduce salinity.

Improve watershed health by performing appropriate land treatments (Map 5).

Land treatments would be prioritized in the following fifth-field watersheds:

- Upper Sevier River Watershed:
 - Pass Creek/Sevier River
 - City Creek/Sevier River
 - Bear Creek/Sevier River
- Upper Virgin River/Kanab Creek Watersheds:
 - Muddy Creek
 - Upper Kanab Creek
 - Skutumpah/Mill Creek.

Continue to cooperatively implement the Upper Sevier River Watershed Management Plan with the Upper Sevier Watershed Committee.

Manage the Sevier River in accordance with the total maximum daily load (TMDL) and Upper Sevier River Watershed Management Plan.

Avoid or minimize impacts on water quality through the application of specific mitigation measures identified in activity-level plans.

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:

- T 42 S R 6 W Sections 19, 31
- T 42 S R 7 W Sections 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 34, 35.

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 groundwater.

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).

Apply coalbed natural gas BMPs to preserve groundwater quality (Appendix 1).

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.

Do not allow surface discharge of produced water in the Colorado River Basin.

Vegetation

Goals and 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 BLM *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 on 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.

Rehabilitation target would be to manage for 51 percent or higher of Potential Natural Community (PNC) unless site-specific management objectives for other resources dictate otherwise (e.g., special status species adapted to 0 percent to 25 percent of PNC).

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 *Characteristics of Old-Growth Forests in the Intermountain Region* (Hamilton 1993). In

instances where the area of application in the previous document does not apply (for example, *Pinus edulis*), use the document *Recommended Old-Growth Definitions and Descriptions, USDA Forest Service Southwestern Region* (USFS 1992).

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.

Retain riparian areas in the public ownership unless it can be clearly demonstrated that specific sites 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.

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).

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.

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 grazing systems would be modified when necessary to meet riparian objectives.

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.

Fencing, erosion control structures, and vegetation treatments would each be an option where changes in use would not meet management objectives within the desired time frame.

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.

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

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.

Allow vegetation materials use (excluding seed collection, which is addressed above; pine nut harvest; and forest and woodland products) and collection in specified areas identified by permit on a case-by-case basis as climatic conditions allow.

Allow the collection/harvesting of vegetative materials in riparian areas in proper functioning condition on a case-by-case basis as climatic conditions allow.

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

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.

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).

Use minimum tool analysis (in designated wilderness) or the non-impairment standard (in WSAs) to identify vegetation treatment methods and approved herbicides to treat invasive plants such as tamarisk and Russian olive for the purpose of restoring ecological conditions and functions.

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

Manage relict plant communities and hanging gardens to maintain and enhance the biological diversity and health of these areas.

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 mineral entry.

Protect hanging gardens by implementing the no surface disturbance actions identified in the Riparian section of this chapter.

Sagebrush Steppe

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.

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., Utah Division of Wildlife Resources [UDWR], local sage-grouse working group, and Utah Partners for Conservation and Development, as necessary, within the range of variability described in the appropriate ecological site description.

Vegetation Restoration Treatments

Limit acres of vegetation treatments (e.g., wildlife habitat treatments, watershed treatments, livestock rangeland treatments, wildland fire use, 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).

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).

Vegetation treatments may be authorized where protection of sensitive resources would be ensured.

Focus restoration or vegetation treatment projects based on the following factors:

- 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
- Restore special status species habitats to achieve long-term conservation and recovery objectives
- Achieve rangeland health objectives.

Manage areas with ponderosa pine to maintain the stand health through use of stand health exams, vegetation 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.

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.

Special Status Species (Threatened, Endangered, and Sensitive)

Goals and 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 BLM-authorized or approved actions 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 UDWR, in managing special status 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 and conservation measures (Appendix 9) to leases and other applicable activities occurring in special status species habitat.

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.

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.

Apply BMPs to avoid or reduce fragmenting habitat, including:

- Collocating communication and other facilities
- Employing directional drilling for oil and gas
- Using topographic and vegetative screening to reduce the influence of intrusions.

The BLM will approach compensatory mitigation on an “as appropriate” basis where it can be performed on site, and on a voluntary basis where it is performed offsite, or in accordance with current guidance.

Bald Eagles and Other Special Status Raptor Species

Implement conservation measures (Appendix 9) on actions affecting bald eagles or their habitat.

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.

Manage stands of ponderosa pine for winter roosting sites for bald eagles and nesting sites for other raptors (see Vegetation section for specific management).

Use BMPs (Appendix 2) 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:

- 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:

- Mar 1–Aug 1: Short-eared owl
- Mar 1–Aug 31: Burrowing owl.

Comply with *Suggested Practices for Raptor Protection on Power Lines: The State of the Art in 2006* (Avian Power Line Interaction Committee 2006) and *Avian Protection Plan (APP) Guidelines* (Avian Power Line Interaction Committee and USFWS 2005) for new powerline construction (including upgrades and reconstruction) to prevent electrocution of raptors.

Protect unoccupied special status species raptor nests in compliance with BLM's raptor BMPs (Appendix 2).

California Condor

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.)

Apply the following avoidance and minimization measures:

- 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

Implement conservation measures (Appendix 9) on actions affecting Utah prairie dogs or their habitat.

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).

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 memoranda of understanding (MOU).

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.

Reroute renewed or amended ROWs on public land that have the potential to disturb active and inactive Utah prairie dog colonies.

Preclude cross-country OHV use in occupied or inactive Utah prairie dog colonies.

Allow for the treatment of plague and other diseases that may impact Utah prairie dogs.

Mexican Spotted Owl

Implement conservation measures (Appendix 9) on actions affecting MSOs or their habitat.

Restrictions (from the Utah Field Office Guidelines for Raptor Protection From Human and Land Use Disturbances [Appendix 2]) include:

- 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 [management actions](#)).
- 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.

Retain, where appropriate, large down logs, large trees (generally greater than 24 inches in 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.

Meet or make significant progress toward meeting BLM Utah's *Standards for Rangeland Health* in protected and restricted (as defined in recovery plan) MSO habitats.

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 9.

Limit special recreation permit (SRP) group size to 12 or fewer according to the recovery plan in protected and restricted (as defined in the recovery plan) MSO habitat.

Bonneville Cutthroat Trout, Roundtail Chub, Bluehead Sucker, and Flannelmouth Sucker

Monitor stream habitat to detect changes every 5 to 10 years in streams with historic or currently occupied habitat, in cooperation with UDWR.

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

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.

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 adversely affect the species or their habitats.

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.

Welsh's Milkweed

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 Coral Pink Sand Dunes to OHV use.

Manage oil and gas leasing as open subject to major constraints (NSO) in Welsh's milkweed designated critical habitat.

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

Implement conservation measures (Appendix 9) on actions affecting Southwestern willow flycatcher or its habitat.

Manage for regeneration and multiple age classes in cottonwood/willow vegetation in yellow-billed cuckoo and Southwestern willow flycatcher habitat.

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.

Prohibit surface disturbing activities within ¼ mile of occupied breeding habitat from May 1 to August 15.

Where possible, collocate roads, new trails, and ROWs and develop stream crossings at right angles to yellow-billed cuckoo and Southwestern willow flycatcher habitat to minimize impacts.

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.

Preclude cross-country OHV use in Greater sage-grouse nesting and brood-rearing habitats.

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 nesting and brood-rearing habitat.

Manage oil and gas leasing as open subject to major constraints (NSO) within ½ 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 nesting and brood-rearing habitat from March 15 to July 15 and in winter habitat from December 1 to March 14.

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.

Prioritize habitat vegetation treatments to maintain and/or improve habitat function in the following areas (Map 5):

- Sage-grouse nesting and brood-rearing habitat
- Sage-grouse winter range.

Management of Pygmy Rabbit Habitat

Apply restrictions (e.g., avoidance or mitigation) to surface disturbing and disruptive activities on a case-by-case basis in occupied and potential pygmy rabbit habitat for the protection of this species and its

associated habitat. Site-specific NEPA documentation would address restrictions around pygmy rabbit 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

Goals and 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 2) 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 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 MOU with Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service/Wildlife Services.

Maintain existing vegetation treatments that benefit wildlife.

Prioritize habitat vegetation treatments to maintain and/or improve habitat function in areas of crucial mule deer winter range (Map 5).

Road crossings of water bodies that support fish would be designed to provide for fish passage.

Management of Deer and Elk Habitats

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 oil and gas exploration and development and ROW construction/reconstruction in identified big game migration and transitional ranges from October 1 to November 15.

Limit OHV use to designated routes.

Management of Bighorn Sheep Habitats

Preclude surface disturbing activities in crucial Desert bighorn sheep habitat during lambing season (April 15 to June 15) (Bighorn Institute 2008).

Do not authorize changes in kind of livestock to sheep or goats within 9 miles of Desert bighorn sheep habitat.

Management of Pronghorn Habitat

Preclude surface disturbing activities in crucial pronghorn habitat from May 15 through June 15 during fawning season.

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.

Authorize construction of wildlife habitat improvement projects (including water developments and vegetation treatments) to meet wildlife goals and objectives, provided that the project complies with NEPA, ESA, and other applicable laws and policies.

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.

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).

Manage livestock grazing in riparian areas/fisheries habitat according to the *Utah Guidelines for Grazing Management*. Livestock grazing in riparian areas/fisheries habitat would be evaluated through compliance with the *Standards for Rangeland Health*.

Minor adjustments to crucial wildlife habitat boundaries periodically made by UDWR would be accommodated through plan maintenance.

Management of Raptor Habitats

Implement raptor guidelines associated with level of duration of activities established by USFWS.

Guide raptor habitat management by use of *Best Management Practices for Raptors and Their Associated Habitats in Utah* (Romin and Muck 2002, as amended) and BLM's raptor BMPs (Appendix 2) using seasonal and spatial buffers and mitigation to maintain and enhance raptor nesting, foraging, and roosting habitat while allowing other resource uses to occur.

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:

- 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:

- 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.

Protect unoccupied raptor nests in compliance with BLM's raptor BMPs (Appendix 2) 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

Allow introduction, translocation, transplantation, restocking, augmentation, and reestablishment 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.

Management of Forage Allocations for Big Game Species (as established by the Division of Wildlife Resources)

Allocate 11,045 AUMs to wildlife as shown in Table 3-24.

Compensatory Mitigation

The BLM will approach compensatory mitigation on an "as appropriate" basis where it can be performed on site, and on a voluntary basis where it is performed offsite, or in accordance with current guidance.

Wildland Fire Ecology

Goals and 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 | 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 |

| Major Vegetation Group | DWFC and Actions Needed to Meet DWFC |
|-------------------------|---|
| | <p>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 private land or other values at risk. • 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 percent) 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 |

| Major Vegetation Group | DWFC and Actions Needed to Meet DWFC |
|------------------------|---|
| | <p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 at 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. • 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> |

| Major Vegetation Group | DWFC and Actions Needed to Meet DWFC |
|------------------------|---|
| | <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 FRCCs, 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. • 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

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 into the Proposed RMP under the Wildland Fire Ecology header.

Fire Management Strategies and Actions

The appropriate management response would be applied 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 (e.g., 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 the 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 8 (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

Goals and 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) and 201(a) and (c); National Historic Preservation Act [NHPA] Section 110(a); and 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, on 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.

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).

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.

Establish a comprehensive monitoring program emphasizing:

- 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

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:

- South Fork Indian Cave (42Ka1576), Helldive Canyon (42Ka1695), and Mansard (42Ka4427) 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:

- 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 available. Consult with the SHPO and Native American tribes as appropriate.

Proactive Cultural Resource Inventories

Prioritize new field inventories (Class II or III) directed by NHPA Section 110 as follows:

- 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 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.

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.

Establish and maintain agreements with all Native American tribes interested in specific projects or areas on which they wish to consult.

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.

Paleontological Resources

Goals and 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.

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.

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.

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.

Proactive Paleontological Inventories

Conduct non-Section 106 proactive inventories intermittently as resources allow.

Prioritize paleontological resource inventories in the following areas (Map 3-14 of the Draft RMP/EIS):

- High resource potential
- Medium resource potential
- Low resource potential.

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

Provide opportunities for local interpretation of paleontological resources.

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.

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.

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

Goals and 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

Visual Resource Management Classes

Designate the following acreages for the objectives defined for each VRM class (Map 6):

- Class I: 76,000 acres
- Class II: 94,400 acres
- Class III: 210,700 acres
- Class IV: 172,900 acres.

WUI areas would be in VRM Class III or IV.

Visual Intrusions

To the extent practicable, bring existing visual contrasts into VRM class conformance as the opportunity arises.

Non-WSA Lands with Wilderness Characteristics

Goals and Objectives

- Protect, preserve, and maintain wilderness characteristics (appearance of naturalness, outstanding opportunities for solitude, or primitive and unconfined recreation) of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics, 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

Maintenance of Non-WSA Lands with Wilderness Characteristics

Manage the following non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics (27,770 acres) specifically to protect, preserve, and maintain their wilderness characteristics: East of Bryce (850 acres), Moquith Mountain (9,600 acres), Orderville Canyon (2,700 acres), Parunuweap Canyon (120 acres), and Upper Kanab Creek (14,500 acres) (Map 7).

Protect, preserve, and maintain wilderness characteristics through the following prescriptions:

- Designate as VRM Class II (Map 6).
- 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.
- Limited to designated routes (Map 10).

- Avoid new ROWs (linear, communication sites, and wind and solar projects) (Map 11).
- Retain public lands in federal ownership
- Close to mineral material disposals.
- Open to fluid mineral leasing with major constraints (NSO) (Map 14).

Drought and Natural Disasters

Management Actions

Coordinate appropriate management responses with affected parties when natural resources may be affected by drought, insects, diseases, or natural disasters. A variety of emergency or interim actions may be necessary to minimize land health degradations such as reduced forage allocations, reductions in the number of livestock and/or wildlife, increased mitigation measures to ensure reclamation, and limitations on energy field activities and recreational uses.

Incorporate current Utah BLM *Standards for Rangeland Health*, as appropriate, across all resource programs. Management prescriptions in the form of constraints to use, terms and conditions, and stipulations may be needed to sustain rangeland health and viability. Management prescriptions will consider the following:

- Surface disturbing activities—These will be closely monitored to ensure compliance with authorizations and permit's conditions of approval or terms and conditions. Action minimizing new surface disturbance, allowed by regulations, and actions ensuring successful reclamation, will be emphasized. During periods of drought, the BLM could require additional actions such as changes to standard seed mix compositions, amount, and/or method of application. Additionally, methods to ensure successful revegetation following disturbance could include hydromulching, installation of drip irrigators, and fencing to exclude ungulate grazing/browsing.
- Livestock grazing—During periods of prolonged drought use will be allowed in both quantity and timing that will not result in a downward shift in rangeland health and/or production. The BLM will work cooperatively to effect a grazing strategy specific to a grazing permittee's individual grazing allotment(s) and make changes to the grazing authorizations, as appropriate, in accordance with the grazing regulations. In the case of drought, the BLM could temporarily close the range, or portions of it, to livestock grazing.
- Wildlife management—During periods of prolonged drought to the extent that vegetation monitoring indicate that habitat for wildlife ungulate populations cannot be sustained and overall animal health is compromised, the BLM will enter into discussions with the UDWR regarding herd numbers and overall management options to combat the effects of drought.
- Recreation—During periods of prolonged drought, the BLM, in cooperation with local and state fire management agencies, will limit campfires to established fire rings or fully contained fires. The last resort will be to close the public lands to campfires of any kind.
- OHVs—Off-highway/road vehicle use during periods of prolonged drought could be further restricted, or if site-specific conditions warrant, closure to OHVs could be implemented to minimize vehicle-induced injury or damage to rangeland and/or woodland resources and to minimize the potential of spark-caused fires.

2.2.2 Resource Uses

Forestry and Woodland Products

Goals and Objectives

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

Management Actions

Commercial Timber Harvest

Permit commercial timber harvest on a case-by-case basis for the purposes of promoting or sustaining forest health.

Woodland Product Harvest

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.

Close WSAs and non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics to woodland product harvest, except for incidental collection for onsite campfire use and administrative purposes.

Permit harvesting of woodland products in riparian areas in proper functioning condition on a case-by-case basis for the maintenance and/or improvement of riparian ecosystems.

Prohibit the removal of ponderosa pine for Christmas trees.

Develop a Forest Woodland Management Plan as required in the *Utah Forest and Woodland Management Action Plan*.

Native American Use of Forestry and Woodland Products

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

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

Goals and Objectives

- Maintain or restore healthy, sustainable rangeland ecosystems to meet BLM 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.

Allocate forage for livestock as noted in Table 3-24, except as noted below:

- Close the Water Canyon Allotment to livestock grazing for the life of the plan in order to protect the Fredonia City Culinary water supply.
- In order to have the RMP accurately reflect current management, combine the Lydia's Canyon Allotment with the adjacent Lydia Allotment. The resulting Lydia Allotment would be available for livestock grazing with no additional livestock AUMs.
- Maintain existing forage allocations on the Lower North Fork Allotment.
- Maintain existing forage allocations on the Zion Park Allotment.
- In order to have the RMP accurately reflect current management, combine the Sawmill Allotment with the adjacent South Canyon Allotment. The resulting South Canyon Allotment would be available for livestock grazing with no additional livestock AUMs.

Grazing Management Practices

Manage livestock grazing according to the *Guidelines for Grazing Management on BLM Lands in Utah* (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).

Design grazing systems and range improvements to achieve and maintain healthy rangelands.

Analyze conversions in kind of livestock (such as from sheep to cattle) in light of the *Standards for Rangeland Health*. 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.

Limit allocation of AUMs to the following kinds of livestock:

- Domestic cattle
- Horses
- Sheep
- Goats.

Do not authorize changes in kind of livestock to sheep or goats within 9 miles of Desert bighorn sheep habitat (same as decision in the Fish and Wildlife section).

Allocation of Relinquished Preference for Livestock Forage

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

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.

Range Treatments for Livestock Grazing

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 5):

- South Canyon
- 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 *Standards for Rangeland Health*.

Recreation

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

Goals and 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

Special and Extensive Recreation Management Areas

Identify the following Recreation Management Areas (RMA) (Map 8):

- Kanab Community SRMA (community) (33,100 acres)
- Paria SRMA (destination) (21,200 acres)
- Moquith Mountain SRMA (community) (15,000 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) (458,900 acres).

Recreation management direction for each SRMA is outlined in Appendix 4. This includes direction for the following recreation management components:

- Recreation Niche
- Recreation Management Objectives
- Primary Activities
- Experiences
- Benefits
- Setting Character Conditions.

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.

Kanab Community SRMA

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:

- **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.

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 (outside the Moquith Mountain non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics area) (10,700 acres):

- **OHV:** Limit to designated routes to access trail heads
- **VRM:** Class II
- **Minerals:** Open to oil and gas leasing subject to major constraints (NSO)
- **Facilities:** Provide support facilities for recreation experience.

Required Management (inside the Moquith Mountain non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics area) (3,900 acres):

- Designate as VRM Class II.
- 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.
- Limited to designated routes.
- Avoid new ROWs (linear, communication sites, and wind and solar projects).
- Retain public lands in federal ownership
- Close to mineral material disposals.
- Open to fluid mineral leasing with major constraints (NSO).

Paria SRMA

Market Strategy: Destination

Canyon RMZ (1,100 acres)

Recreation Niche: World-class wilderness trekking adventure viewing deeply entrenched slickrock canyon and associated slot canyon features.

Primary Activities: Hiking and scrambling, backpacking, canyoneering, outdoor photography, camping, viewing scenic vistas, viewing cultural sites, and wilderness exploration.

Required Management:

- Manage according to the management actions for the Paria Canyon-Vermilion Cliffs Wilderness

Uplands RMZ (20,100 acres)

Recreation Niche: Unique, world-class primitive and backcountry adventure recreation viewing unique upland geologic features.

Primary Activities: Hiking and scrambling, outdoor photography, viewing wildlife and scenic vistas, wilderness exploration, equestrian, and camping.

Required Management:

- Manage according to the management actions for the Paria Canyon-Vermilion Cliffs Wilderness

Moquith Mountain SRMA

Market Strategy: Community

Dunes RMZ (1,000 acres)

Recreation Niche: Unique, scenic, and expansive sand dunes OHV opportunities.

Primary Activities: Driving among sand dunes, camping along dune fringes, photography, and spending time with friends and family.

Required Management (the Dunes RMZ is entirely within the Moquith Mountain WSA):

- According to IMP
- **OHV:** Open beyond vegetated and conservation areas. All vehicles on the dunes are required to stay at least 10 feet from vegetation.
- **VRM:** Class I.
- **Facilities:** Provide support facilities for recreation experience.

Non-Dunes Wooded RMZ (14,000 acres)

Recreation Niche: Scenic and extensive OHV trail network accessing vistas, overlooks, flora and fauna, and cultural sites.

Primary Activities: Driving OHVs; viewing flora/fauna, geology, and cultural sites; hiking; equestrian; camping; hunting; photography; and spending time with friends and family.

Required Management (the Non-Dunes Wooded RMZ is partially inside the Moquith Mountain WSA) (10,600 acres):

- According to IMP
- **OHV:** Limit to designated routes to access trail heads
- **VRM:** Class I.
- **Facilities:** Provide support facilities for recreation experience.

Required Management (the Non-Dunes Wooded RMZ is partially inside the Cottonwood Canyon ACEC) (3,700 acres):

- **OHV:** Limit to designated routes to access trail heads
- **VRM:** Class II.
- **Minerals:** Open to oil and gas leasing subject to major constraints (NSO), recommend withdrawing from mineral entry, close to mineral material disposals
- **Facilities:** Provide support facilities for recreation experience.

Required Management (for the remainder of the Non-Dunes Wooded RMZ):

- **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 for recreation experience.

Dry Lakebed (*Implementation-Level Decision*)*

- 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.

* This is an implementation-level decision that cannot be protested under the planning regulations. Please see the cover letter for further information.

Ponderosa Grove Campground (*Implementation-Level Decision*)*

- 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.

Orderville Canyon SRMA

Market Strategy: Undeveloped

(1,950 acres)

Recreation Niche: Spectacular, primitive riparian canyon travel with abundant geologic formations and diverse flora and fauna.

Primary Activities: Canyoneering, hiking, backpacking, hunting, camping, outdoor photography, viewing nature and wildlife, equestrian, and studying geology.

Required Management (the Orderville Canyon SRMA is entirely within the Orderville Canyon WSA and 500 acres of the SRMA are within the Orderville Canyon suitable “wild” segment):

- According to IMP
- **OHV:** Limit to designated routes except closed to OHV use within the 500 acres of the Orderville Canyon suitable “wild” segment
- **VRM:** Class I
- **Facilities:** Provide support facilities for recreation experience.

North Fork Virgin River SRMA

Market Strategy: Undeveloped

(1,050 acres)

Recreation Niche: Spectacular, primitive riparian canyon travel with abundant geologic formations and diverse flora and fauna.

Primary Activities: Canyoneering, hiking, backpacking, hunting, camping, outdoor photography, viewing nature and wildlife, equestrian, and studying geology.

Required Management (the North Fork Virgin River SRMA is entirely within the North Fork Virgin River WSA and 200 acres of the SRMA are within the North Fork Virgin River suitable “wild” segment):

- According to IMP
- **OHV:** Limit to designated routes except closed to OHV use within the 200 acres of the North Fork Virgin River suitable “wild” segment
- **VRM:** Class I
- **Facilities:** Provide support facilities for recreation experience.

* This is an implementation-level decision that cannot be protested under the planning regulations. Please see the cover letter for further information.

Escalante SRMA

Market Strategy: Community

(22,800 acres)

Recreation Niche: Town-accessible OHV touring, mountain biking, and hiking/equestrian trail networks offering outstanding views and varied terrain.

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.

Required Management:

- **OHV:** Limit to designated routes
- **VRM:** Class III
- **Minerals:** Open to leasing subject to standard terms and conditions
- **Facilities:** Provide support facilities for recreation experience.

Kanab Field Office ERMA

(458,900 acres)

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.

Required Management:

- **Facilities:** Provide support facilities for recreation experience.

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.

Close areas to rock climbing within the distance and time restrictions identified in the management of raptor habitat decisions.

Use the minimum necessary signage to provide for public safety and information or to control unauthorized use.

Design facilities to be compatible with the local landscapes and recreation experience.

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.

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).

Developed recreation sites would be fenced to exclude grazing use.

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

Allow dispersed camping throughout the decision area without permit, unless specified in the plan.

Limit vehicle parking for dispersed camping within 150 feet of designated routes.

Interpretation and Environmental Education

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 area's cultural and natural resources through outreach programs (e.g., organizations, schools, and partnerships) to build emotional, intellectual, and recreational ties with the area.

Public information would be provided only for those cultural sites designated for public use.

Heritage Tourism

Coordinate with local communities and other groups to foster heritage tourism throughout the decision area.

Big Game Retrieval

Allow use of non-motorized wheel carriers to retrieve game kills outside of WSAs.

Acquisition of Easements

Acquire legal access to areas of high recreation interest from willing parties.

Night Skies and Soundscapes

Impacts on 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 restrictions on the use of strobe lights.

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:

- Use conforms to the recreation goals and objectives outlined in the Resource Management Plan
- 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.

Vending would be authorized in conjunction with organized events when it directly supports the recreation experience and is appropriate to support the experience and setting as outlined in the Resource Management Plan and 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.

In protected and restricted MSO habitat, limit SRP group size to no more than 12 according to recovery plan.

Prohibit OHV or mountain bike tours in the following areas:

- Where compliance with the Utah Riparian Policy would not be achieved
- The loop within Moquith Mountain WSA
- The Elephant Cove Way within Parunuweap WSA.

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.

Group size would be limited to 12 people total (including tour guides) in the following areas:

- Wetlands/riparian zones
- WSAs
- Designated critical habitat for special status species.

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.

SRPs would be subject to the following restrictions unless specifically authorized:

- 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

Goals and 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

OHV Area Designations

Management of motorized access would balance protection of resources while providing for resource use needs. Area designations would be as follows (Map 9):

- Open to cross-country OHV use: 1,000 acres
- Limited to designated routes: 528,000 acres
- Closed to OHV use: 25,000 acres.

See Recreation section for specific management of OHV use in SRMAs.

Areas Open for Cross-Country OHV Use

Designate the following managed open areas:

- Moquith Mountain SRMA: Dunes RMZ beyond vegetated and conservation areas
- DD Hollow topsoil pit.

Areas Where OHV Use Would Be Limited Spatially or Seasonally

Spatial Limitations

Management of OHV use in areas not designated as open or closed would be limited to designated routes (528,000 acres) (Map 9).

Seasonal Limitations

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). If no nesting behavior is initiated prior to June 1, a BLM authorized officer could open the route to motorized use. During the remainder of the year OHV use would be limited to designated routes.

Designated Routes (Implementation-Level Decision)*

Manage inventoried routes as follows (Map 10):

- Open to motorized vehicle use: 1,403 miles
- Limited (closed seasonally) to motorized vehicle use: 2 miles
- Closed to motorized vehicle use: 75 miles.

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 7).

Areas Closed to OHV Use

Designate the following areas as closed to OHV use:

- Paria SRMA—both RMZs
- Designated wilderness (by Congressional designation)
- In and through islands of vegetation in Welsh's milkweed designated critical habitat (790 acres)
- Suitable "wild" river corridors.

Transportation System Management

Coordinate transportation planning with Kane and Garfield counties.

The BLM would continue to repair, maintain, and rehabilitate routes 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.

Pursue maintenance agreements with highway authorities in the decision area.

BLM, in preparing its RMP designations and its implementation-level travel management plans, is following policy and regulation authority found at 43 CFR 8340, 43 CFR 8364, and 43 CFR 9268.

* This is an implementation-level decision that cannot be protested under the planning regulations. Please see the cover letter for further information.

Where the authorized officer determines that OHVs are causing or would cause considerable adverse impacts, the authorized officer shall close or restrict such areas. Local highway authorities would be consulted as appropriate. The public would be notified.

BLM could impose limitations on the types of vehicles allowed on specific designated routes if monitoring indicates that a particular type of vehicle is causing disturbance to the soil, wildlife habitat, cultural or vegetative resources, especially by off-road travel in an area that is limited to designated routes.

As per the *State of Utah v. Andrus*, October 1, 1979 (Cotter Decision), BLM would grant the State of Utah reasonable access to state lands for economic purposes on a case-by-case basis.

Where routes would remain available for motorized use within WSAs, such use could continue on a conditional basis. Use of the existing routes in the WSAs (“ways” when located within WSAs) could continue as long as the use of these routes does not impair wilderness suitability, as provided by the IMP (BLM 1995). If Congress designates the area as wilderness, the routes will be closed. In the interim, if use and/or non-compliance are found through monitoring efforts to impair the area’s suitability for wilderness designation, BLM would take further action to limit use of the routes or close them. The continued use of these routes, therefore, is based on user compliance and non-impairment of wilderness values.

Lands and Realty

Goals and 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

Management of ROWs and ROW Corridors

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.

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, restricting height of towers to less than 200 feet, and installing minimum lighting with use of white strobe lights rather than red (strobe or non-strobe) lights. The addition of new communications devices on existing towers will be considered where it is practical and does not present a safety or operational risk.

Require a feasibility study and site plan for new communications locations.

Exclude new ROWs (including communication sites) (75,700 acres) in the following areas (Map 11):

- WSAs
- Wilderness areas
- Suitable WSR corridors with a tentative classification of “wild” or “scenic.”

Avoid new ROWs (106,670 acres) in the following areas (Map 11):

- The five non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics managed to protect, preserve, and maintain those characteristics (27,700 acres)
- Within 1 mile of an active Greater sage-grouse lek (avoid ROWs with high-profile structures [e.g., buildings, storage tanks, overhead powerlines, wind turbines, towers, and windmills])
- Within Greater sage-grouse nesting and brood-rearing habitat (avoid ROWs with high-profile structures [e.g., buildings, storage tanks, overhead powerlines, wind turbines, towers, and windmills]).

Preference would be to locate ROW developments in common (within existing ROWs/disturbance areas).

Consider burying new and reconstructed utility lines (including powerlines up to 24 kilovolts [kV]) unless:

- Visual quality objectives can be met without burying
- Geologic conditions make burying infeasible
- Burying would produce greater long-term site disturbance.

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.

Construct powerlines greater than 230 kV using non-reflective wire. Towers would be constructed using non-reflective material. Powerlines would not be high-lined unless no other location exists.

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

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 204 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.

In addition to the 24,591 acres withdrawn, recommend the following areas (9,500 acres) for withdrawal from mineral entry (Map 12):

- 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 the purposes for which they were withdrawn.

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.

Areas and Lands Available for Land Tenure Adjustment

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:

- 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.

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 others after consultation with and concurrence by USFWS.

Retain non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics in federal ownership where identified to protect, preserve and maintain their wilderness characteristics.

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.

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 13; Appendix 5).

Manage oil and gas with NSO stipulations on R&PP leases. If these sites are no longer required, they would be managed as are adjacent lands.

Give land exchanges with the State of Utah priority consideration to resolve inholdings issues.

As per the Cotter Decision, reasonable access to state lands would be authorized for economic purposes.

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.

Management of Filming Permits

Filming may be authorized throughout the decision area after site-specific NEPA analysis is completed.

Minerals and Energy

Goals and Objectives

- Provide opportunities for mineral exploration, development, and reclamation under the mining and mineral leasing laws (e.g., coal mining, alabaster gypsum), 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.] 181 and 43 CFR 3100.0-3(a)(2)(iii) and 3100.0-3(b)(2)(ii)).

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 3 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.

Manage fluid mineral leases as shown on Map 14:

- Open to leasing subject to standard terms and conditions: 95,400 acres
- Open to leasing subject to moderate constraints (seasonal and CSU): 296,200 acres
- Open to leasing subject to major constraints (NSO): 83,400 acres
- Closed to leasing: 79,000 acres.

In accordance with an UDEQ-DAQ letter dated June 6, 2008, (see Appendix 12) requesting implementation of interim nitrogen oxide control measures for compressor engines; BLM will require the following as a Lease Stipulation and a Condition of Approval for Applications for Permit to Drill:

- All new and replacement internal combustion gas field engines of less than or equal to 300 design-rated horsepower must not emit more than 2 gms of NO_x per horsepower-hour. This requirement does not apply to gas field engines of less than or equal to 40 design-rated horsepower.
- All new and replacement internal combustion gas field engines of greater than 300 design rated horsepower must not emit more than 1.0 gms of NO_x per horsepower-hour.

Geophysical Exploration

Limit vehicular use for necessary tasks, such as geophysical exploration including project survey and layout, to OHV designations. Exceptions may be granted by permit on a case-by-case basis.

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

Lease geothermal resources consistent with oil and gas leasing stipulations and consistent with other resource objectives.

Areas Available for Further Coal Leasing Consideration

Make available for further coal leasing consideration approximately 113,629 acres (Map 15) (Appendix 6). Approximately 37,580 acres (Map 15) are determined to be unsuitable based on the 20 criteria identified in Appendix 6.

Additional areas could be found unsuitable based on site-specific analysis (Appendix 6).

Incorporate erosion control stipulations in mining plans for surface mining disturbance as per Surface Mining Control Reclamation Act regulations.

Locatable Minerals

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.

In addition to the 24,591 acres withdrawn, recommend withdrawing the following areas (9,500 acres) from mineral entry (Map 12):

- Cottonwood Canyon ACEC
- Developed recreation sites
- Suitable “wild” river corridors
- Suitable “scenic” river corridors
- Relict vegetation areas (Diana’s Throne and Elephant Butte).

Mineral Materials

Allow mineral material disposals on a case-by-case basis subject to site-specific environmental analysis excluding the following areas (105,000 acres) (Map 16):

- Cottonwood ACEC
- Relict Vegetation (Diana’s Throne and Elephant Butte)
- WSAs
- Non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics
- Paria Canyon–Vermilion Cliffs Wilderness area (closed to mineral material disposals by congressional designation)
- Suitable “wild” river corridors
- Suitable “scenic” river corridors
- Developed recreation sites.

Incorporate erosion control and rehabilitation stipulations into mining plans.

2.2.3 Special Designations

Areas of Critical Environmental Concern

Goals and 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

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

Designate and manage the 3,800 acres as the Cottonwood Canyon ACEC (Map 17). Manage the relevant and important values as follows:

Scenic:

- 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.

Cultural:

- 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.

Hazard/Safety/Public Welfare:

- Close the Water Canyon Allotment (48 AUMs) to livestock grazing in order to protect the Fredonia City Culinary water supply for the life of the plan.

Approximately 2,400 acres (63 percent) of the Cottonwood Canyon ACEC are inside the Moquith Mountain WSA. The relevant and important values in this portion of the ACEC would be managed according to the IMP and the following management prescriptions:

Scenic:

- Designate as VRM Class I
- Limit OHV use to designated routes
- Recommend withdrawing from mineral entry

Cultural:

- 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.

Hazard/Safety/Public Welfare:

- Close the Water Canyon Allotment (48 AUMs) to livestock grazing in order to protect the Fredonia City Culinary water supply for the life of the plan.

Wild and Scenic Rivers

Goals and Objectives

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

Management Actions

Wild and Scenic Rivers 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 ORVs 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. 1274(b)). The corridors may vary on either side of the river and be narrower or wider to protect ORVs, 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 Rivers System (NWSRS) in a manner that would protect their ORVs, free-flowing nature, and tentative classification, in accordance with protective management for the river corridors.

Six eligible river segment corridors (Map 18) would be determined suitable for WSR designation (5,530 acres/30 miles), with the tentative classifications of "wild" (4,570 acres/25 miles) or "scenic" (960 acres/5 miles).

North Fork Virgin River—Segment 48-49

Suitable—Wild

Manage the portion of the North Fork Virgin River (segment 48-49) suitable “wild” river segment inside the North Fork WSA to protect the tentative classification and ORVs through the following specific management prescriptions (within ¼ mile of each side of the river or the viewshed from the river, whichever is less):

- According to the IMP
- VRM: Class I
- Recommend for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry
- Motorized Travel: Close to OHV use
- ROW exclusion area.

Manage the portion of the North Fork Virgin River (segment 48-49) suitable “wild” river segment outside the WSA to protect the tentative classification and ORVs through the following specific management prescriptions (within ¼ mile of each side of the river or the viewshed from the river, whichever is less):

- 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
- ROW exclusion area.

East Fork Virgin River—Segment 37-40a

Suitable—Scenic

Manage the East Fork Virgin River (segment 37-40a) suitable “scenic” river segment inside the Parunuweap WSA to protect the tentative classification and ORVs through the following specific management prescriptions (within ¼ mile of each side of the river or the viewshed from the river, whichever is less):

- According to the IMP
- VRM: Class I
- Recommend for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry
- Motorized Travel: Limit to designated routes
- ROW exclusion area.

East Fork Virgin River—Segment 40a-41

Suitable—Wild

Manage the East Fork Virgin River (segment 40a-41) suitable “wild” river segment inside the Parunuweap WSA to protect the tentative classification and ORVs through the following specific management prescriptions (within ¼ mile of each side of the river or the viewshed from the river, whichever is less):

- According to the IMP
- VRM: Class I
- Recommend for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry
- Motorized Travel: Close to OHV use

- ROW exclusion area.

East Fork Virgin River—Segment 36-37

Not Suitable

Orderville Gulch (Esplin Gulch)—Segment 44-45

Suitable—Wild

Manage the portion of the Orderville Gulch (Esplin Gulch) (segment 44-45) suitable “wild” river segment inside the Orderville Canyon WSA to protect the tentative classification and ORVs through the following specific management prescriptions (within ¼ mile of each side of the river or the viewshed from the river, whichever is less):

- According to the IMP
- VRM: Class I
- Recommend for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry
- Motorized Travel: Close to OHV use
- ROW exclusion area.

Manage the portion of the Orderville Gulch (Esplin Gulch) (segment 44-45) suitable “wild” river segment outside the Orderville Canyon WSA to protect the tentative classification and ORVs through the following specific management prescriptions (within ¼ mile of each side of the river or the viewshed from the river, whichever is less):

- 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
- ROW exclusion area.

Meadow Creek/Mineral Gulch—Segment 33-35, 35-38

Suitable—Wild

Manage the portion of the Meadow Creek/Mineral Gulch (segment 33-35, 35-38) suitable “wild” river segment inside the Parunuweap WSA to protect the tentative classification and ORVs through the following specific management prescriptions (within ¼ mile of each side of the river or the viewshed from the river, whichever is less):

- According to the IMP
- VRM: Class I
- Recommend for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry
- Motorized Travel: Close to OHV use
- ROW exclusion area.

Manage the portion of the Meadow Creek/Mineral Gulch (segment 33-35, 35-38) suitable “wild” river segment outside the Parunuweap WSA to protect the tentative classification and ORVs through the following specific management prescriptions (within ¼ mile of each side of the river or the viewshed from the river, whichever is less):

- 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
- ROW exclusion area.

Deep Creek—Segment 50-51

Not Suitable

Cottonwood Creek—Segment 28-29

Not Suitable

Indian Canyon—Segment 26-27

Not Suitable

South Fork Indian Canyon—Segment 22-23

Not Suitable

North Branch of South Fork Indian Canyon—Segment 24-25

Not Suitable

Water Canyon—Segment 20-21

Not Suitable

Hell Dive Canyon—Segment 30-31

Not Suitable

Paria River—Segment 68-69

Suitable—Wild

ORVs in the Paria River would be preserved through the following management approach (from the *Final Arizona Statewide Wild and Scenic Rivers Study Report/Record of Decision* [BLM 1997b], which determined eligibility for the Paria River and is carried forward in this document):

- 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 ORVs 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.
- Construction of new routes for motorized travel would be prohibited.

Three Mile Creek—Segment 56-57

Not Suitable

Management of Suitable Rivers

Allow other activities within the suitable river segment corridors on a case-by-case basis as long as their ORVs, free-flowing nature, and tentative classification would be protected. See BLM Manual-8351, Section 5, for implementation guidance.

Coordination with State Agencies, Federal Agencies, and Tribal Governments

BLM would work with the State of Utah, local and tribal governments, and other federal agencies, in a state-wide study, to reach consensus regarding recommendations to Congress for the inclusion of rivers in the NWSRS. Besides applying consistent criteria across agency jurisdictions, the joint study would avoid piecemealing of river segments in logical watershed units in the state. The study would evaluate, in detail, the possible benefits and effects of designation on the local and state economies, agricultural and industrial operations and interests, outdoor recreation, natural resources (including the outstandingly remarkable values for which the river was deemed suitable), water rights, water quality, water resource planning, and access to and across river corridors within, and upstream and downstream from the proposed segments(s). Actual designation of river segments would only occur through congressional action or as a result of Secretarial decision at the request of the Governor in accordance with provisions of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (the Act). BLM will work with the state, local and tribal governments, and the agencies involved to coordinate its decision-making on wild and scenic river issues and to achieve consistency wherever possible.

BLM recognizes that water resources on most river and stream segments within the State of Utah are already fully allocated. Before stream segments that have been recommended as suitable under this Proposed RMP are recommended to Congress for designation, BLM will continue to work with affected local, state, federal, and tribal partners to identify in-stream flows necessary to meet critical resource needs, including values related to the subject segments. Such quantifications would be included in any recommendation for designation. BLM would then seek to jointly promote innovative strategies, community-based planning, and voluntary agreements with water users, under State law, to address those needs.

Should designations occur on any river segment as a result of Secretarial or congressional action, existing rights, privileges, and contracts would be protected. Under Section 12 of the Act, termination of such rights, privileges, and contracts may happen only with the consent of the affected non-federal party. A determination by the BLM of eligibility and suitability for the inclusion of rivers on public lands to the NWSRS does not create new water rights for the BLM. Federal reserved water rights for new components of the NWSRS are established at the discretion of Congress. If water is reserved by Congress when a river component is added to the NWSRS, it would come from water that is not appropriated at the time of designation, in the amount necessary to protect features which led to the river's inclusion into the system. BLM's intent would be to leave existing water rights undisturbed and to recognize the lawful rights of private, municipal, and state entities to manage water resources under state law to meet the needs of the community. Federal law, including Section 13 of the Act and the McCarren Amendment (43 U.S.C. 666), recognizes state jurisdiction over water allocation in designated streams. Thus, it is BLM's position that existing water rights, including flows apportioned to the State of Utah interstate agreements and compacts, including the Upper Colorado River Compact, and developments of such rights would not be affected by designation or the creation of the possible federal reserved water right. BLM would seek to work with upstream and downstream water users and applicable agencies to ensure that water flows are maintained at a level sufficient to sustain the values for which affected river segments were designated.

Wilderness

Goals and 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 Cliffs 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.

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 requiring the least expenditure of public funds.

A resource advisor would be consulted when fire occurs in the Wilderness.

Use natural processes to restore areas of preexisting human imprints. Where proactive restoration of wilderness conditions is desirable, require the minimum requirement standards; plans to address restoration of preexisting human impacts may be required.

Ensure that any change in the landscape is very low.

Manage to protect or restore the natural quiet and natural soundscapes of the area.

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:

- 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

Goals and 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 on a case-by-case basis.

Management Actions

WSA Management

Planning decisions in this RMP will not affect the existence of or recommendations on WSAs identified as a result of inventory conducted under Section 603 of FLPMA and awaiting action by Congress. Further, although the formal Section 603 wilderness review process was determined to have expired on October 21, 1993, BLM may and will continue to inventory public lands for resource values including wilderness characteristics on lands that have not been reviewed, or where new information is provided that shows additional inventory is necessary. However, additional Wilderness Study Areas will not be designated through this planning process.

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 whole or in part, be released from wilderness consideration, such released lands will be managed in accordance with the goals, objectives, and management prescriptions established in this RMP, unless otherwise specified by Congress in its releasing legislation. BLM will examine proposals in the released areas on a case-by-case basis but will defer all actions that are inconsistent with RMP goals, objectives, and prescriptions until it completes a land use plan amendment. Because any released lands will continue to be managed consistent with the prescriptions identified in this plan unless and until the plan is amended, no separate analysis is required to address impacts to released lands.

Where routes would remain available for motorized use within WSAs, such use could continue on a conditional basis. Use of the existing routes in the WSAs (“ways” when located within WSAs) could

continue as long as the use of these routes does not impair wilderness suitability, as provided by the IMP (BLM 1995). If Congress designates the area as wilderness, the routes will be closed. In the interim, if use and/or non-compliance are found through monitoring efforts to impair the area's suitability for wilderness designation, BLM would take further action to limit use of the routes or close them. The continued use of these routes, therefore, is based on user compliance and non-impairment of wilderness values.

Designate WSAs as VRM Class I.

OHV Use in WSAs

Manage OHV use in WSAs as shown in Table 2-2 and on Map 9.

Table 2-2. OHV Area Designations in WSAs

| WSA | OHV Designation | Acres |
|--|------------------------|--------------|
| Canaan Mountain | Limited | 4,300 |
| Acquired Land Managed as Part of the Canaan Mountain WSA | Limited | 600 |
| Moquith Mountain | Closed | 400 |
| | Limited | 13,800 |
| | Open | 1,000 |
| North Fork Virgin River | Closed | 200 |
| | Limited | 850 |
| Orderville Canyon | Closed | 500 |
| | Limited | 1,450 |
| Parunuweap Canyon | Closed | 6,200 |
| | Limited | 24,600 |

Designate 25.0 miles of inventoried ways in WSAs (Moquith Mountain–8.5 miles; Parunuweap Canyon–15.9 miles; Orderville Canyon–0.6 miles) as open for OHV use (Map 10) (*implementation-level decision*).*

Other Designations

Goals and 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.

* This is an implementation-level decision that cannot be protested under the planning regulations. Please see the cover letter for further information.

Management Actions

National and State Scenic Byways and State Scenic Backways

Cooperate with state and local authorities to implement the purposes of designation.

Old Spanish National Historic Trail

Work with the BLM and National Park Service (NPS) 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.

Highway 89/20 Segment, Garfield County

Work in cooperation with Utah State Parks and Recreation, Garfield County, Old Spanish Trail Association, and the NPS on interpretive and recreation opportunities for this segment:

- Provide interpretive information at appropriate locations (e.g., kiosks, road junctions, Garfield County line)
- Retain public lands in federal ownership
- 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

Work in cooperation with Utah State Parks and Recreation, Kane County, Old Spanish Trail Association, and the NPS on interpretive and recreation opportunities for this segment:

- Provide interpretive information at appropriate locations (e.g., kiosks, road pullouts, Kane County line).

2.2.4 Social and Economic

Public Safety

Goals and 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 Proposed RMP/Final 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 submissions address the purpose and need of this RMP revision, including the multiple-use requirements identified in FLPMA. While BLM considered components of some of the submissions in developing alternatives, 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 scoping period. The 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 to be 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.

2.3.3 Livestock Grazing Adjustments Alternative

During scoping and comment on the Draft EIS it was suggested that the BLM consider adjustments to livestock numbers, livestock management practices, and the kind of livestock grazed on allotments within the Kanab Field Office in order to benefit wildlife and protect and promote land health including soils, hydrologic cycles, and biotic integrity.

BLM policy regarding adjustments to the levels of livestock use authorized is to monitor and inventory range conditions under existing stocking levels and make adjustments to livestock use as indicated by this data to help ensure that *Standards for Rangeland Health* and resource objectives are met. Regulations at 43 CFR 4130.3 require that the terms and conditions under which livestock are authorized “ensure conformance with the provisions of subpart 4180” (*Standards for Rangeland Health*) and further that “livestock grazing use shall not exceed the livestock carrying capacity of the allotment.” It would be inappropriate and unfeasible to estimate and allocate the available forage, design specific management practices, and determine if changes to the kind of livestock are necessary for each allotment in the Kanab Field Office or in the area as a whole in the RMP/EIS. Such changes would not be supportable considering the type and amount of data required and the analysis necessary to make such changes.

According to BLM policy decisions regarding authorized livestock use, levels and the terms and conditions under which they are managed is an implementation decision (H-1610-1, Appendix C, page 15). BLM assesses the condition of rangeland health, conducts monitoring and inventories, and evaluates this data on a periodic basis, normally on an allotment and/or watershed basis. After NEPA analysis, necessary changes to livestock management and implementation of Utah’s *Guidelines for Rangeland Management* are implemented through a proposed decision in accordance with 43 CFR 4160. These decisions determine the exact levels of use by livestock in conformance with the LUP and to meet resource objectives and maintain or enhance land health. For these reasons this alternative has been dismissed from further consideration in this LUP revision.

2.3.4 No Leasing Alternative

During scoping for the Draft RMP/EIS it was suggested that BLM should address a "No Leasing Alternative" and that No Leasing must be addressed because it is the "No Action Alternative" that must be analyzed in all EISs.

The “No-Leasing Alternative” in an RMP revision is actually an action alternative because where lands have already been leased, the no-action for NEPA purposes continues to allow for (honor) valid existing rights. Proposing a “No-Leasing Alternative” would require revisiting existing leases and either buying them back from the leasee, or allowing them to expire on their own terms. The first option (buying back), is outside the scope of any RMP. This is a political decision that BLM has no authority to undertake in planning. As a result, BLM does not regularly include a “No-Leasing Alternative”.

The purpose and need for the land use plan is to identify and resolve potential conflicts between competing resource uses rather than to eliminate a principle use of the public lands in the Kanab Field Office Area. Leasing of the public lands for oil and gas exploration and production is required by the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 as amended and BLM’s current policy is to apply the least restrictive management constraints to the principal uses of the public lands necessary to achieve resource goals and objectives. A field office-wide No Leasing Alternative would be an unnecessarily restrictive alternative for mineral exploration and production on the public lands.

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA Section 102 (E)) requires that agencies "study, develop, and describe appropriate alternatives to recommended courses of action in any proposal which involves unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources". No issues or conflicts have been identified during this land use planning effort which requires the complete elimination of oil and gas leasing within the planning area for their resolution. BLM's Land Use Planning Handbook (BLM Manual Ref. 1-1693), Appendix C, item H, requires that land use plans identify areas as open or unavailable for leasing.

Given these potential categories of decisions, the alternatives analyzed in the Draft RMP/EIS included no leasing for certain areas, but a field office-wide no leasing alternative was not necessary in order to resolve issues and protect other resource values and uses.

As mentioned above, a "No Leasing Alternative" should not be confused with the "No Action Alternative" for purposes of NEPA compliance. Leasing and No Leasing on the public lands has previously been analyzed in several NEPA documents. In 1973 the Department of Interior published the Final Environmental Impact Statement on the Federal Upland Oil and Gas Leasing Program. The proposed action was to lease Federal lands for production of oil and natural gas resources. Alternatives included the No Action Alternative, which at initiation of the program was "No Leasing". To supplement that EIS, BLM prepared a series of high intensity Environmental Assessments (then titled "Environmental Analysis Records or EARs") including the Oil and Gas Leasing Program Kanab District Environmental Analysis Record (EAR), 1976 which addressed oil and gas leasing for the public lands in the Kanab Field Office area. Alternatives again included the No Action or "No Leasing" alternative. The outcome was a category system for leasing which categorized all public and Forest Service lands into four groups: 1) open to leasing with standard lease stipulations, 2) Special Stipulations to address special concerns, 3) No surface occupancy and 4) No Leasing. Since completion of the EAR in 1976, oil and gas leasing in the Kanab Field Office Area has been an ongoing federal program under the established categories.

The Council on Environmental Quality notes that Section 1502.14(d) of NEPA requires the alternatives analysis in an EIS to "include the alternative of no action", but explains that there are two distinct interpretations of "no action" that must be considered, depending on the nature of the proposal being evaluated. "The first situation might involve an action such as updating a land management plan where ongoing programs initiated under existing legislation and regulations will continue, even as new plans are developed. In these cases "no action" is "no change" from current management direction or level of management intensity. To construct an alternative that is based on no management at all would be a useless academic exercise. Therefore, the "no action" alternative may be thought of in terms of continuing with the present course of action until that action is changed." (CEQ Forty Most Asked Questions, Question 3). Therefore, for the Kanab Draft RMP/EIS, the No Action Alternative would continue the status quo which is to lease under the oil and gas categories established in the current land use plans.

2.4 COMPARATIVE SUMMARY OF IMPACTS

Table 2-3 presents a comparison summary of impacts from management actions proposed for the four management alternatives. Chapter 4 provides a more detailed impact analysis.

Table 2-3. Summary Comparison of Impacts

| Alternative A | Proposed RMP | 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. 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. The Proposed RMP 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. 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. Alternative D (3,629 tons per year) also produces emissions levels lower than Alternative A, but higher than for the Proposed RMP and Alternative 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 1) and mitigation measures would protect and maintain current soil resources and minimize erosion. Compared to the other alternatives, management actions to limit surface</p> | <p>The Proposed RMP would place more restrictions on surface disturbing activities, including cross-country OHV use (1,000 acres) and mineral development, and help reduce impacts on soil resources described in Alternative A. Management actions to restrict surface disturbance and implement performance measures in areas with fragile soils would reduce impacts on 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). 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 the Proposed RMP and Alternative 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 | Proposed RMP | 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>The Proposed RMP would place more restrictions on surface disturbing activities and help reduce impacts on 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 less 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 the Proposed RMP and Alternative C. This would slightly reduce the extent</p> |

| Alternative A | Proposed RMP | 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 Alternative A and the Proposed RMP and ensure continuity of and restoration within the same watershed.</p> <p>Implementing vegetation treatments on an annual average of at least 4,650 acres, 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>of 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. Impacts from vegetation and forest and woodland treatments would be the same as described in the Proposed RMP.</p> |
| Impacts on Special Status Species | | | |
| <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>The Proposed RMP would place more restrictions on surface disturbing activities (e.g., mineral exploration and development ROW construction) and help reduce</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> |
| <p>Special status species habitat within the Alton coal field could be lost in the 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> | | | |

| Alternative A | Proposed RMP | 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>impacts described in Alternative A. Managing OHV use throughout the majority of the decision area (528,000 acres, 95 percent) as limited to 1,403 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 percent) 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 the Proposed RMP and Alternative C. Managing OHV use throughout the majority of the decision area (525,300 acres, 95 percent) 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 disturbing 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 placing 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 Alternative A and the Proposed RMP. 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 placing 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 the Proposed RMP and Alternative 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</p> |

| Alternative A | Proposed RMP | Alternative C | Alternative D |
|---|---|--|--|
| <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>more acres could be treated.</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>The Proposed RMP 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 (528,000 acres, 95 percent) as limited to 1,403 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 percent) 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 the Proposed RMP and Alternative C.</p> <p>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 percent) 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 | Proposed RMP | 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 disturbing 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 placing 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 Alternative A and the Proposed RMP. 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 placing 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 the Proposed RMP and Alternative 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 | Proposed RMP | Alternative C | Alternative D |
|--|--|--|--|
| <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 and 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. Wildfire suppression costs would be maintained under this alternative.</p> | <p>shelter.</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. 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>treatment methods.</p> <p>Impacts from implementing vegetation treatments would be the same as described in the Proposed RMP, 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. This alternative would have the most restrictions on surface disturbing activities. This could result in fuels build-up and increased risk of catastrophic wildfires. Wildfire suppression costs could increase under this alternative as compared to Alternative A.</p> | <p>forbs.</p> <p>Impacts from vegetation treatments and permitting commercial and non-commercial harvest of forest and woodland products would be the same as the Proposed RMP. Under this alternative, harvest could occur over a larger area than the other alternatives, although the level of harvest would likely remain the same. 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>Not managing the decision area as open to cross country OHV use except for small areas of previous disturbance that have been</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 | Proposed RMP | 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>inventoried for cultural resources would reduce the potential for inadvertent unmitigated damage from such use compared to Alternative A. Impacts from OHVs would be limited to use on 1,403 miles of designated routes which would result in minimal additional impacts on cultural resources due to existing use on these routes. Because the designated routes currently exist, the damage to cultural sites adjacent to them would also be minimal. Designated routes would be one of the highest inventory priorities to reduce the potential for impacts.</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</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</p> |

| Alternative A | Proposed RMP | 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>designated routes would protect paleontological resources from damage associated with cross country 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>commences, resulting in the loss of scientifically significant paleontological resources. Impacts from OHV decisions would be same as the Proposed RMP.</p> |
| Impacts on Visual Resources | | | |
| <p>Development affecting scenic quality would be designed to conform to an area's designated VRM class objectives.</p> | | | |
| <p>Although areas available for mineral development vary by alternative, development of all minerals is anticipated to disturb 8,426 acres (Appendix 15, Reasonably Foreseeable Development [RFD]) in every alternative. Any areas within the watershed 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, 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.</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 Class III while much of it was inventoried as VRM Class II to allow for vegetation treatments to be implemented to a greater extent in areas of pinyon-juniper encroachment.</p> | <p>Acres managed as Class I would increase to 168,300 acres compared with inventoried acres (a 694 percent 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 area's landscape would experience the least amount of change in this alternative.</p> | <p>Impacts from VRM management would be similar to the Proposed RMP, except many areas managed as Class II in Alternative A and the Proposed RMP 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.</p> |
| <p>Impacts from oil and gas exploration and development could occur within 473,400 acres (86 percent) 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)—small and localized or evident at a broader landscape level—would affect the overall degree of impact.</p> | <p>Impacts from oil and gas exploration and development would be the same as Alternative A, but could occur within 298,300 acres (54 percent) 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 similar to the Proposed RMP, except there would be no impacts from cross-country OHV use and impacts from OHV use on designated routes and development would be the same</p> | <p>Impacts from oil and gas exploration and development would be the same as Alternative A, but could occur within 455,900 acres (82 percent) open to oil and gas leasing subject to the standard terms on the lease form or subject to moderate constraints. Allowing cross-country OHV use on only approximately 1,100 acres would decrease visual impacts compared to Alternative A. Nearly all</p> | <p>Impacts from oil and gas exploration and development would be the same as Alternative A, but could occur within 455,900 acres (82 percent) open to oil and gas leasing subject to the standard terms on the lease form or subject to moderate constraints. Allowing cross-country OHV use on only approximately 1,100 acres would decrease visual impacts compared to Alternative A. Nearly all</p> |

| Alternative A | Proposed RMP | Alternative C | Alternative D |
|--|--|--|---|
| <p>color, and texture. Limiting OHV use to 57 miles of designated routes on 66,200 acres (12 percent) 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. 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>as Alternative A, but could occur within 95,400 acres (17 percent) open to oil and gas leasing subject to the standard terms on the lease form or subject to moderate constraints. Allowing cross-country OHV use on only approximately 1,000 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 1,403 miles of designated routes. Impacts from vegetation would be the same as Alternative A, except more acres could be affected by treatments.</p> | <p>would 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. 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>visual impacts from OHV use would be associated with maintaining the visible lines of disturbance associated with 1,465 miles of designated routes. Impacts from vegetation would be the same as the Proposed RMP.</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. VRM classes in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics 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</p> | <p>All or portions of five non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would receive direct management to protect, preserve and maintain their wilderness characteristics. Wilderness characteristics in the remaining areas could receive indirect protection from other management or could be impacted by other resources or uses. OHV use would be limited to 118 miles of designated routes (27.75 miles in areas managed for protection of wilderness characteristics and 90.25 in the remaining non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics), decreasing impacts compared to Alternative A. OHV use along these</p> | <p>Non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be closed to OHV use, eliminating impacts described in Alternative A and the Proposed RMP. VRM classes in these 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 non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be managed as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standard Stipulations 0 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. VRM classes in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics 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 non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be</p> |

| Alternative A | Proposed RMP | Alternative C | Alternative D |
|---|---|---|--|
| <p>acres of disturbance anticipated in the RFD to occur on non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics, less than 1 percent of all these areas would 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 | <p>routes in inventoried non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would result in a short-term perceived loss of opportunities for solitude and primitive recreation.</p> <p>VRM classes in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be managed as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Class I 320 acres • Class II 50,050 acres • Class III 29,390 acres • Class IV 10,020 acres <p>Impacts from mineral exploration and development would be the same as Alternative A, except oil and gas leasing in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be managed as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standard Stipulations 8,470 acres • Moderate Constraints 40,810 acres • Major Constraints 38,700 acres • Closed 1,800 acres | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moderate Constraints 0 acres • Major Constraints 0 acres • Closed 89,780 acres | <p>managed as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standard Stipulations 80,060 acres • Moderate Constraints 7,340 acres • 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</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. Permitting commercial and non-commercial harvest of pinyon-juniper areas 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,</p> | <p>Precluding commercial timber harvest would eliminate the potential for commercial harvest in the decision area. Impacts from commercial and non-commercial harvest of woodland products would be the same as described in the Proposed RMP. Impacts from implementing vegetation treatments would be the same as described in the Proposed RMP, except using treatment methods that mimic natural processes would reduce the quantity and quality of forest and woodland</p> | <p>Permitting commercial timber harvest and commercial and non-commercial harvest of woodland products area-wide, unless otherwise designated or stipulated, would facilitate product harvest. Under this alternative, harvest could occur over a larger area. Impacts from implementing vegetation treatments would be the same as described in the Proposed RMP.</p> |

| Alternative A | Proposed RMP | Alternative C | Alternative D |
|---|--|---|---|
| <p>to meet desired vegetation conditions would maintain or improve the quality of products available for harvest.</p> <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>except additional measures to manage and improve vegetation would be implemented.</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 (95,100 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 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.</p> | <p>products available for harvest in the short term.</p> <p>Same as the Proposed RMP, except the management of SRMAs (129,050 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 preferred. Using these preferred methods would result in a slower process of vegetation enhancement and related forage increases.</p> | <p>Same as the Proposed RMP, except the management of SRMAs (122,800 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 OHV's to designated routes. Impacts from vegetation treatments would be the same as the Proposed RMP.</p> |
| Impacts on Livestock Grazing | | | |
| <p>Impacts on Recreation</p> <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</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. Recreational user conflicts would be reduced through management of SRMAs (95,100 acres). Management of these areas would focus on</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</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 Alternative A and the Proposed RMP. 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> | | | |

| Alternative A | Proposed RMP | Alternative C | Alternative D |
|---|--|--|---|
| <p>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>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>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>Management of SRMAs would serve to reduce recreation user conflicts to the same degree identified for the Proposed RMP.</p> <p>Opportunities for cross-country OHV use would be reduced to the same degree identified for the Proposed RMP.</p> |
| Impacts on Transportation | | | |
| <p>Cross-country access would be provided for most of the decision 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>Motorized access would be allowed on 1,403 miles of routes. The 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 75 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,</p> | <p>Motorized access would be allowed on 1,190 miles of routes. The 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, and south of highway 143 southwest of Panguitch.</p> <p>Impacts from lands and realty would be similar to those identified for the Proposed RMP, except the extent of disposals (via Section 203 sales) would decrease to 2,500 acres.</p> | <p>Motorized access would be allowed on 1,464 miles of routes. The 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 the Proposed RMP, 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> |

| Alternative A | Proposed RMP | Alternative C | Alternative D |
|--|--|---|---|
| Impacts on Lands and Realty | | | |
| <p>ROW restrictions include protection of riparian areas from lands and reactivity 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 1/4-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 maintenance activity on existing ROWs.</p> <p>Allowing land tenure adjustments would facilitate access, improve management ability, accommodate resource management needs, and reduce conflicts between private landowners and users. Diana's Throne and the Water Canyon/South Fork Indian Canyon ACEC would be retained in public ownership.</p> | <p>ROW avoidance (106,670 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 National Historic Trail (Highway 89/20 segment in Garfield County) would be retained in public ownership.</p> <p>Land tenure adjustments, including FLPMA Section 203 disposals, would be allowed on 6,400 acres.</p> | <p>The intensity and magnitude of impacts associated with ROW exclusion and avoidance areas would increase compared to Alternative A and the Proposed RMP. 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 ROW exclusion areas occur along U.S. Highway 89, which could hinder the ability to approve future ROW requests.</p> <p>Public lands that contain riparian areas, crucial wildlife habitat, non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics, 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.</p> <p>Land tenure adjustments, including FLPMA Section 203 disposals, would be allowed on 2,500 acres.</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 (Highway 89/20 segment in Garfield County) would be retained in public ownership.</p> <p>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</p> | <p>While management actions under this alternative would not reduce the projected number of wells, the management actions could increase</p> | <p>This alternative would have the greatest restriction on oil and gas leasing compared to the other alternatives. While management</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</p> |

| Alternative A | Proposed RMP | Alternative C | Alternative D |
|--|--|--|---|
| <p>decision area would be open to oil and gas leasing subject to standard terms and conditions and 15 percent would have an NSO stipulation or be closed to leasing.</p> | <p>costs associated with exploration and development and could require the installation of facilities in less desirable locations. Approximately 17 percent of the decision area would be open to oil and gas leasing subject to standard terms and conditions and 29 percent would have an NSO stipulation or be closed to leasing.</p> | <p>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 an NSO stipulation or be closed to leasing.</p> | <p>open to oil and gas leasing subject to standard terms and conditions and 18 percent would have an NSO stipulation or be closed to leasing.</p> |
| <p>Approximately 24,591 acres (4 percent) 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 would minimally affect the ability to meet the demand for locatable minerals.</p> | <p>In addition to the existing withdrawals (24,591 acres), an additional 9,500 acres would be recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry, but this would not further affect exploration and development activities.</p> | <p>Same as Alternative A, but 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 recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry would not affect exploration and development activities.</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 entry would not affect exploration and development activities.</p> |
| <p>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.</p> | <p>The majority of the 105,000 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.</p> | <p>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.</p> | <p>The 21,200 acres closed to mineral material sales do not include areas of high development potential for sand, gravel, and stone.</p> |
| <p>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, Kaiparowits, and Johns Valley coal</p> | <p>Coal management actions would allow for the leasing and development of coal resources on lands identified as suitable (Appendix 6). Based on the coal unsuitability criteria, approximately 113,629 acres would be suitable for</p> | <p>Same as the Proposed RMP.</p> | <p>Same as the Proposed RMP.</p> |

| Alternative A | Proposed RMP | Alternative C | Alternative D |
|---|---|---|---|
| <p>fields would be suitable for further leasing consideration.</p> <p>Management associated with the existing ACEC would protect the associated relevant and important values.</p> <p>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.</p> | <p>further leasing consideration.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Management from other decisions in this alternative would provide protection to the relevant and important values associated with the other four potential ACECs.</p> | <p>All relevant and important values would be protected through special management associated with the designation of the ACECs.</p> | <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> |
| Impacts on Wild and Scenic Rivers | | | |
| <p>Impacts on WSR tentative 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 on 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>Impacts on WSRs would be similar to 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>Impacts on WSRs would be similar to those described in the Proposed RMP; 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>No eligible river segments would be considered as suitable for inclusion in the NWSRS, 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</p> | <p>Implementation of the Wilderness Management Plan allows for periodic adjustments to site-specific management to ensure wilderness</p> | <p>Same as the Proposed RMP, except using only natural and prescribed fire to restore ecological functions would reduce short-term impacts from</p> | <p>Same as the Proposed RMP.</p> |

| Alternative A | Proposed RMP | Alternative C | Alternative D |
|--|---|--|---|
| <p>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>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>vegetation treatments, but also could increase impacts on natural character and functions of the wilderness area over the long term.</p> | |
| Impacts on Wilderness Study Areas | | | |
| <p>Wilderness characteristics within WSAs would be protected under this alternative.</p> <p>Motorized use along 32.6 miles of designated routes in the Parunuweap Canyon, Moquith Mountain and Orderville Canyon WSAs would result in short-term loss of 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>Same as Alternative A, except impacts from OHV use would decrease because 7.6 miles of 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 primitive unconfined recreation.</p> <p>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>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.</p> <p>Limiting group size associated with SRPs within WSAs to 12 would 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.</p> <p>However, further reductions in group sizes due to MSO habitat could also result in fewer opportunities for recreationists to access these areas.</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> |
| 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</p> | <p>Management of the Old Spanish Trail would provide for consideration of the historic values present along the corridor and the subsequent developments that have occurred. In addition, coordination and</p> | <p>Same as the Proposed RMP.</p> | <p>Same as the Proposed RMP.</p> |

| Alternative A | Proposed RMP | Alternative C | Alternative D |
|--|--|---|---|
| <p>character and historic setting of the Old Spanish National Historic Trail.</p> | <p>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>Impacts on Social and Economic Conditions</p> | | | |
| <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 approximately 12 direct and indirect jobs and approximately \$859,000 in direct and \$15,446,000 in indirect income. Oil and gas drilling would provide approximately 1 and 7 direct and indirect jobs and \$1,000 and \$21,000 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 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 are likely to have economic impacts, but quantification of impacts was <i>not</i> possible: locatable minerals (specifically, sepiarian concretions and gypsum); salable minerals (specifically, sand and gravel, stone, and 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</p> | <p>The Proposed RMP would provide improved management approaches to use of resources that would address many potential resource use conflicts. The Proposed RMP's closure of almost all land to cross-country OHV use would produce some impacts on local custom and culture, such as some motorized</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 that favor resource development over preservation.</p> <p>Alternative C would somewhat favor</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 that favor preservation over resource development.</p> <p>Alternative D would be most</p> |

| Alternative A | Proposed RMP | Alternative C | Alternative D |
|--|--|---|--|
| <p>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 466,000 acres (82 percent) 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>recreation users of BLM lands could be restricted. At the same time, managing 95 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. The Proposed RMP would include land treatments to increase livestock forage availability that would be welcomed by livestock grazing interests. Preservation interests would welcome the Proposed RMP'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 under the Proposed RMP.</p> | <p>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>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> |
| 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. 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</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</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 the Proposed RMP.</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</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</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</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</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 the Proposed RMP.</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</p> |

| Alternative A | Proposed RMP | Alternative C | Alternative D |
|--|--|---|--|
| <p>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. 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>vegetation conditions would move toward a pre-European settlement state, improving the condition of traditionally used species. 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>are restored compared to the Proposed RMP and Alternative D. 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>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> | | | |

This page intentionally left blank