# 2.0 PROPOSED PLAN AND DRAFT ALTERNATIVES

This chapter presents the Proposed Plan which was crafted from the four alternatives in the Draft RMP/EIS. The Proposed Plan primarily mirrors the Preferred Alternative (Alternative C) from the Draft RMP, but has been modified through public comment, internal review, and cooperating agency coordination to reflect specific decisions carried forward from the other alternatives in the Draft RMP. The Moab field office (MFO) formulated this Proposed Plan from the reasonable range of alternatives presented in the Draft RMP/EIS for managing resources within the planning areas that considered issues and concerns raised during the scoping period (see Chapter 1, Section 1.3.2), planning criteria, and the guidance applicable to the resource uses. The Proposed Plan and the draft alternatives constitute a range of management actions that set forth different priorities and measures to emphasize certain uses or resource values over other uses or resource values under the multiple-use and sustained yield mandate so as to achieve certain goals or objectives.

BLM recognizes that social, economic, and environmental issues cross land ownership lines and that extensive cooperation is needed to actively address issues of mutual concern. To the extent possible, the Proposed Plan and the draft alternatives (Alternatives A, B, and D) were crafted utilizing input from public scoping comments, Grand and San Juan County representatives, and other cooperating agencies. There are two other alternatives that were considered for detailed analysis, but did not meet the purpose and need for this plan revision or were not technically feasible or economically practical to carry forward. They were eliminated from detailed consideration and are briefly discussed in the last section of this chapter.

Chapter 2 has been organized in the following manner:

- Section 2.1 provides a brief summary of the major components of the Proposed Plan and of each draft alternative, and Table 2.1 provides the detailed alternative management strategies proposed under all four alternatives.
- Section 2.2 provides a comparative summary of the environmental impacts associated with the Proposed Plan and with each draft alternative.
- Section 2.3 outlines those alternatives the BLM initially considered but later eliminated, and the justifications for their dismissal from further evaluations.

Evaluation of a reasonable range of alternatives is required by NEPA and by the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) (40 CFR Part 1502.14), as well as by BLM planning regulations. As is also required in the CEQ regulations, one alternative consists of "no action," which is the same as the continuation of management under the current Grand RMP (BLM 1985a) and subsequent plan amendments.

The range of alternatives has been developed to:

- meet the Purpose and Need outlined in Chapter 1;
- respond to environmental, operational, and economic concerns raised by the public, agencies, business and other special interest groups during the scoping process; and
- address potential environmental issues identified during review of the proposed management actions.

## 2.1 DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVES FROM THE PROPOSED RMP/EIS

The four alternatives presented in detail in Table 2.1 of this chapter are as follows:

- Alternative A is the No Action alternative and represents the continuation of existing management under the current Grand Resource Area RMP (1985a), as amended.
- Alternative B emphasizes the protection/preservation of natural resources and minimizes human activities, over commodity production and extraction and motorized recreation access.
- The Proposed Plan provides for a balanced approach of protection/preservation of natural resources while providing for commodity production and extraction.
- Alternative D emphasizes commodity production and extraction as well as motorized recreation access over the protection/preservation of natural resources.

Some of the decisions in this PRMP/FEIS are carried forward from the existing Grand RMP (BLM 1985a) because there are no impending issues associated with them, and they do not need to change. They are decisions that are common to all alternatives, thus, a range of alternative decisions are not necessary for these resources or uses. Other decisions are common to all action alternatives (Alternatives B, D and the Proposed Plan), but are different from the No Action Alternative due to a change in circumstances.

### *2.1.1 BRIEF SUMMARY AND HIGHLIGHTS OF THE PROPOSED PLAN AND DRAFT ALTERNATIVES IN TABLE 2.1*

The major resources/uses where issues were identified during scoping were: travel management, recreation, oil and gas leasing and development, special designations (ACECs and Wild and Scenic Rivers), special status species, wildlife, and non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics. These resources/uses, among others, are displayed under a range of management alternatives that set forth different priorities and measures to emphasize uses or resource values over other uses or resource values to achieve specific goals or objectives outlined in detail in Table 2.1. Below is a brief summary of the range of alternatives for those major resources/uses brought forward during scoping. Much more detail for each of these resources and uses, among others, and their proposed management is in Table 2.1.

#### 2.1.1.1 TRAVEL MANAGEMENT

All public lands are required to have off-highway vehicle (OHV) area designations. Areas must be classified as open, limited, or closed to motorized travel activities. OHV designation areas, or categories, are listed by alternative. Within the "Limited" category, routes would be limited to "designated roads and trails" (43 CFR Part 8340.0-5(g)). Specific routes are being designated as open to motorized use by alternative as part of implementation level planning. Summary Table A portrays how travel and access management would be designated under each alternative.

**Summary Table A. OHV Categories (acres), by Alternative**

| Category | Alternative A No Action | Alternative B | PROPOSED PLAN | Alternative D |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Closed | 5,062 | 437,424 | 339,298 | 57,351 |
| Limited | 1,196,920 | 1,475,074 | 1,481,334 | 1,762,083 |

**Summary Table A. OHV Categories (acres), by Alternative**

| Category | Alternative A No Action | Alternative B | PROPOSED PLAN | Alternative D |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Miles of D Routes Designated[1] | 4,673 | 2,144 | 2,519 | 2,671 |
| Open | 620,212 | 0 | 1,866 | 3,064 |

[1] At time of publication

### 2.1.1.2 Recreation

Special Recreation Management Areas (SRMAs) are proposed to manage intensively used recreation areas, and do not restrict other uses. Focus Areas are Recreation Management Zones and are proposed in order to emphasize and provide particular types of recreation opportunities. In Alternative B, non-motorized recreation in emphasized; in Alternative D, motorized recreation is emphasized. The Proposed Plan provides opportunities for both non-motorized and motorized recreation, as depicted in Summary Table B.

**Summary Table B. SRMAs (quantity and acres) and Focus Areas (quantity), by Alternative**

| Category | Alternative A No Action | Alternative B | PROPOSED PLAN | Alternative D |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| SRMAs | 3 (141,252 acres) | 11 (976,173 acres) | 10 (658,642 acres) | 6 (277,471 acres) |
| Focus Areas | 0 | 22 | 30 | 10 |

### 2.1.1.3 Oil and Gas Leasing and Development

One of the major decisions in a land-use plan is to determine which areas should be: 1) open to leasing subject to the terms and conditions of the standard lease form stipulations, 2) areas open to leasing subject to moderate constraints such as timing limitations (TL) or controlled surface use (CSU) restrictions, 3) areas open to leasing subject to major constraints such as no surface occupancy (NSO) stipulations, or 4) areas unavailable to leasing. All of these proposed decisions must be consistent with the goals and objectives of other resources and uses for each alternative. Summary Table C depicts how oil and gas leasing would be managed under each alterative.

**Summary Table C. Oil and Gas Leasing Stipulations (acres), by Alternative**

| Stipulation | Alternative A No Action | Alternative B | PROPOSED PLAN | Alternative D |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Standard | 1,038,344 | 264,344 | 427,273 | 797,031 |
| TL/CSU | 389,605 | 543,751 | 806,994 | 590,442 |
| NSO | 38,912 | 342,931 | 217,480 | 84,772 |
| Closed | 353,293 | 671,444 | 370,250 | 350,219 |

In addition, this planning revision has applied the same oil and gas stipulations to all other surface-disturbing activities where they are not contrary to laws, regulations, or policy under all of the action alternatives. For example, if an area has a timing stipulation on it for oil and gas development, it would also apply that same timing stipulation on a right-of-way (ROW) construction proposal or an organized recreational event.

### 2.1.1.4 Special Designations

#### *2.1.1.4.1 Potential Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC)*

The *Federal Register* Notice of Intent (June 2003) for this plan revision requested ACEC nominations from the public for consideration in the planning effort. In order to be considered and carried forward into the range of alternatives for planning, an ACEC must meet the relevance and importance criteria in 43 CFR 1610.7-2(a), and must require special management. The MFO received and evaluated a total of 35 ACEC nominations of which 14 were determined to meet the relevance and importance criteria. The relevance and importance criteria encompass scenery, sensitive plant species, rare plants, cultural and historic resources, wildlife, fish, natural systems, and natural hazards. Summary Table D shows that all of the 14 potential ACECs were brought forward into Alternative B for designation consideration, and 5 potential ACECs were brought forward into the Proposed Plan for designation consideration. There are no existing designated ACECs in the Moab Planning Area (MPA); thus, there are none in the No Action Alternative (Alternative A). There were no ACECs brought forward for consideration in Alternative D. Where ACECs are designated, special management attention would be directed at the relevant and important values, resources, natural systems and/or natural hazards.

**Summary Table D. Potential ACECs (quantity and acres) Meeting the Relevance and Importance Criteria, by Alternative**

| Alternative A No Action | Alternative B | PROPOSED PLAN | Alternative D |
|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | 14 (613,077 acres) | 5 (63,232 acres) | 0 |

#### *2.1.1.4.2 Wild and Scenic Rivers (WSRs)*

During planning, the BLM must assess all eligible river segments and determine which are suitable or non-suitable per Section 5(d)(1) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1958, as amended. The MFO reviewed all river segments for wild and scenic river eligibility and suitability as part of the RMP process. Twenty-eight river segments were found to meet the eligibility criteria. BLM Manual 8351 directs BLM to provide tentative classifications of Wild, Scenic, or Recreational to the eligible river segments. Because the No Action Alternative (Alternative A) currently has no suitable river segments designated, the 29 river segments identified for eligibility would remain in eligibility status by BLM policy. Alternative B would propose all the segments, except Salt Wash, as suitable for Congressional designation into the Wild and Scenic River System, and the Proposed Plan would propose 10 river segments as suitable for Congressional designation into the system. This information is condensed in Summary Table E. Where rivers are determined to be suitable, protection of the outstandingly remarkable values, tentative classification, and free-flowing nature would be provided.

**Summary Table E. Eligible/Suitable WSR Segments (river miles) with Tentative Classifications, by Alternative**

| Alternative | # River Segments | River Miles | Suitable or Eligible? | Classifications |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| A | 29 | 287.5 | Eligible | 12 Wild, 9 Scenic, 8 Recreational |
| B | 28 | 287.2 | Suitable | 11 Wild, 9 Scenic, 8 Recreational |
| **PROPOSED PLAN** | 10 | 127.3 | Suitable | 1 Wild, 4 Scenic, 4 Recreational, 1 Scenic/Recreational |
| D | 0 | NA | NA | NA |

### 2.1.1.5 Special Status Species

Land-use plan decisions must be consistent with BLM's mandate to recover listed species and must be consistent with objectives and recommended actions in approved recovery plans, conservation agreements and strategies, MOUs, and applicable biological opinions for threatened and endangered species. The MFO has three listed bird species (and one candidate species), one listed mammal species, and one listed plant species. Species conservation measures (Appendix K) have been developed in coordination with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. They will be implemented under all alternatives.

In addition, there are 43 sensitive species, including the Greater and Gunnison Sage-grouse, White-tailed and Gunnison prairie dog, where there is some discretion in management.

Timing Limitations and Controlled Surface Use stipulations are applied to the habitat for these four species and are spread by alternative.

### 2.1.1.6 Wildlife

In planning, BLM should identify actions and area wide use restrictions needed to achieve desired population and habitat conditions while maintaining a thriving natural ecological balance and multiple-use relationships. The range of alternatives for wildlife actions and habitats includes:

- **Pronghorn antelope** – A Timing Limitation stipulation for surface-disturbing activities, including oil and gas development, of 45 days would be applied to pronghorn habitat. The size of habitat varies by alternative.
- **Desert bighorn sheep** – Alternatives B and the Proposed Plan: A no surface occupancy stipulation would be applied to lambing/rutting grounds and migration corridors. Alternative D: a Timing Limitation stipulation would be applied to lambing habitat.
- **Deer and elk** – A Timing Limitation stipulation for surface-disturbing activities, including oil and gas development. Timing limitation and acreage vary by alternative.
- **Rocky mountain bighorn sheep** – The objective is to manage and improve habitat. Habitat size varies by alternative.

### 2.1.1.7 Non-WSA Lands with Wilderness Characteristics

During planning, the MFO identified decisions to protect, preserve and maintain non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics (naturalness, outstanding opportunities for solitude, and

outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation). In Alternative B and the Proposed Plan, there are goals and objectives to protect the resource and there are management actions presented that are necessary to achieve those goals and objections. As portrayed in Summary Table F, there are 33 areas, totaling 266,485 acres that were found to have wilderness characteristics outside of existing WSAs; all of them would be protected, preserved and maintained to preserve their wilderness characteristics values in Alternatives B. In the Proposed Plan, three of the areas totaling 47,761 acres would have decisions carried forward to protect, preserve and maintain the wilderness characteristics values. In Alternatives A and D, management of other resources values and uses would take precedent over the protection of wilderness characteristics.

**Summary Table F. Non-WSA Lands Managed to Protect Wilderness Characteristics (quantity and total acres), by Alternative**

| Alternative A<br>No Action | Alternative B | PROPOSED PLAN | Alternative D |
|---|---|---|---|
| 0 areas | 33 areas<br>266,485 acres | 3 areas<br>47,761 acres | 0 areas |

Table 2.1 provides a comprehensive description of the alternatives carried forward for detailed environmental analysis.

**Table 2.1. MOAB PROPOSED PLAN and Draft RMP Alternatives**

## AIR QUALITY

**Goals and Objectives:**

Maintain existing air quality and air quality related values (e.g., visibility) by ensuring that all authorized uses on public lands comply with and support Federal, State, and local laws and regulations for protecting air quality.

**Management common to the PROPOSED PLAN and Draft RMP Alternatives A, B, and D:**

- As appropriate, quantitative analysis of potential AQ impacts would be conducted for project-specific developments.
- Prescribed burns would be consistent with the State of Utah Division of Environmental Quality (UDEQ) permitting process and timed so as to minimize smoke impacts.
- Comply with Utah Air Conservation (UAC) Regulation R446-1. The best air quality control technology, as per guidance from the Utah Division of Air Quality (UDAQ), would be applied to actions on public lands as needed to meet air quality standards.
- Comply with UAC Regulation R446-1-4.5.3, which prohibits the use, maintenance, or construction of roadways without taking appropriate dust abatement measures. Compliance would be obtained through special stipulations as a requirement on new projects and through the use of dust abatement control techniques in problem areas.
- Manage all BLM and BLM-authorized activities to maintain air quality within the thresholds established by the State of Utah Ambient Air Quality Standards and to ensure that those activities continue to keep the area as attainment, meet prevention of significant deterioration (PSD) Class II standards, and protect the Class I air shed of the National Parks (e.g., Arches and Canyonlands National Parks).
- Comply with the current Smoke Management Memorandum of Agreement (MOU) between BLM, USFS, and UDAQ. The MOU, in accordance with UAC regulation R446-1-2.4.4, requires reporting size, date of burn, fuel type, and estimated air emissions from each prescribed burn.
- 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 (UDEQ-DAQ), with 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.

## 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 (FLPMA, Section 103(c), 201(a) and (c); National Historic Preservation Act, Section 110(a); Archaeological Resources Protection Act, Section 14(a)).
- Seek to reduce imminent threats and resolve potential conflicts from natural or human-caused deterioration, or potential conflict with other resource uses (FLPMA, Section 103(c), National Historic Preservation Act, Sections 106, 110(a)(2)) by ensuring that all authorizations for land use and resource use will comply with the NHPA Section 106.

**Management common to the PROPOSED PLAN and Draft RMP Alternatives A, B, and D:**

- The BLM would comply with all pertinent statutes, regulations, formal agreements, Executive Orders, and policy as it applies to cultural resource management for all actions resulting from decisions in this land-use plan.
- Protect burial sites, associated burial goods, and sacred items in accordance with the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act and the Archaeological Resources Protection Act.
- Native American requests to practice traditional activities on public lands would be considered on a case-by-case basis and would be allowed where practical and appropriate. Reasonable access to specific sacred sites would be allowed under the American Indian Religious Freedom Act.
- All treaty and trust responsibilities as they apply to public lands within the resource area would be honored.

**Management common to the PROPOSED PLAN and Draft RMP Alternatives B and D:**

- All land-disturbing activities within Traditional Cultural Properties would be designed to avoid or minimize impacts, where reasonable. Proposed projects or actions would be modified to avoid the area or site, avoid time of use by Native American groups, or would be eliminated altogether. Cultural sites may be closed to visitation when it is determined that this visitation is endangering site integrity.
- Camping would be prohibited and posted within or on archaeological and historic sites eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places.
- Class III inventory is not required prior to designations that allow continued use of an existing route, impose new limitations on an existing route, close an open area or travel route, keep a closed area closed, or keep an open area open.
- Class III cultural resources inventory would be conducted on newly designated ATV, motorcycle and mountain bike routes (48" wide or less) based on potential resource conflicts. Routes identified for survey would be prioritized based on landscape level overviews, cultural resource predictive models, and available site location, environmental, and contextual information. If eligible archaeological sites along these routes are being adversely impacted by continued route use, impacts would be mitigated. "New routes" are defined as those designated in the Travel Plan accompanying this RMP.
- Where there is a reasonable expectation that a proposed route designation would shift, concentrate or expand travel into areas where historic properties are likely to be adversely affected, Class III inventory and compliance with Section 106, focused on areas where adverse effects are likely to occur, is required prior to designation.
- Proposed designations of new routes would require Class III inventory of the Area of Potential Effect (APE) and compliance with Section 106 prior to designation. Class III inventory of the APE and compliance with Section 106 would also be required prior to identifying new locations proposed as staging areas or similar areas of concentrated OHV use.
- Eligible cultural sites would *be* protected and impacts mitigated when it is determined that they are being impacted from grazing activities.
- New field inventories would be prioritized in areas of special cultural designation (e.g., ACECs, National Historic Trails, National Historic Landmarks) that have not been fully inventoried.
- Sego Rock Art Site and Wall Street/Colorado River Rock Art District, which have educational and recreational values, would be developed for public visitation and interpretation as long as such work does not contribute to the deterioration or destruction of the resources being interpreted. Work would be conducted in partnership with universities, museums, Tribes, and interested site stewards for the creation of interpretive materials on the archaeology of the Moab Planning Area (MPA).
- Specific management plans would be developed for up to seven culturally sensitive areas unless integrated into other activity plans. These plans would also include, but would not be limited to, developing a site monitoring system; identifying sites in need of stabilization, restoration, and protective measures (e.g., fences, surveillance equipment); developing research designs for selected sites/areas; and developing specific mitigation measures.
- Cooperate with counties to ensure county road and trail construction and maintenance activities avoid or minimize impacts to cultural resources.
- Cultural plants, once identified by interested tribes, would be managed to insure that ground-disturbing activities on the land do not contribute to the decline of cultural sensitive plant communities. Collection of plant resources would be considered on a case-by-case basis and would be allowed where practical and

**Table 2.1. MOAB PROPOSED PLAN and Draft RMP Alternatives**

appropriate.

- Cultural resource management priority for the Ten Mile Wash and Mill Creek Canyon would be scientific research of prehistoric sites and cultural landscapes. Manage the Mill Creek planning area in accordance with the Mill Creek Management Plan (2001b).
- Continue to allocate cultural sites, including ethnographic properties, to one of six management categories: a) scientific use; b) conservation for future use; c) traditional use; d) public use; e) experimental use; and f) discharged from management.
- Alternative management strategies for cultural resources are disclosed in the Special Designations sections. This section identifies areas with substantial cultural resources and alternative management prescriptions to protect these resources. These areas include the Behind the Rocks, Ten Mile Wash, and Mill Creek Canyon ACECs, and the Wall Street portion of Highway 279/Shafer Basin/Long Canyon proposed ACEC.
- Cultural use allocations would be made at the time of site documentation; allocations can be changed as new information or management direction becomes available, subject to consistency with the approved plan.
- Cultural management plans will be a component of the implementation plans for the Labyrinth Canyons, Colorado Riverway, and South Moab SRMAs. Heritage tourism may be considered in these cultural management plans.

| Alternative A (No Action) | Alternative B | PROPOSED PLAN | Alternative D |
|---|---|---|---|
| No priority for field inventory. | Priority for new field inventory would be a 1.00-mile vulnerability zone surrounding cities and towns.<br>Prioritize for Class II and Class III surveys: a total of 50,000 acres within the following areas: Bookcliffs, Dolores Triangle, Hidden Canyon/Bartlett Lisbon Valley, North Fork of Mill Creek , South Fork of Mill Creek, Seven Mile Canyon with adjacent uplands, and Ten Mile Wash and its tributaries. | Priority for new field inventory would be a 0.50-mile vulnerability zone surrounding cities and towns.<br>Prioritize for Class II and Class III surveys: a total of 30,000 acres within the following areas: Bookcliffs, Dolores Triangle, North Fork of Mill Creek, South Fork of Mill Creek, Seven Mile, and Ten Mile Wash and its tributaries. | Priority for new field inventory would be a 0.25-mile vulnerability zone surrounding cities and towns.<br>Prioritize for Class II and Class III surveys: a total of 20,000 acres within the following areas: North Fork of Mill Creek, South Fork of Mill Creek, and Ten Mile Wash and its tributaries. |
| No priority for restoration of damaged cultural resources. | To prevent further degradation from occurring, target the following areas for restoration of damaged cultural resources: Kane Springs Canyon from Highway 191 downstream to the Colorado River, Seven Mile Canyon, South and North Forks of Mill Creek, Bartlett/Hidden Canyon and Hell Roaring uplands, Ten Mile Wash and Wall Street Rock Art District. | To prevent further degradation from occurring, target the following areas for restoration of damaged cultural resources: South and North Forks of Mill Creek, Bartlett/Hidden Canyon, Hell Roaring uplands, Ten Mile Wash and Wall Street Rock Art District. | To prevent further degradation from occurring, target the following areas for restoration of damaged cultural resources: South and North Forks of Mill Creek, Ten Mile Wash and Wall Street Rock Art District. |
| No priority for public interpretation sites. | The following sites would be hardened and interpreted for public use: 3 sites in the Wall Street Rock Art District. | The following sites would be hardened and interpreted for public use: one site in Lower Kane Springs Canyon, and 3 sites in the Wall Street Rock Art District. | The following sites would be hardened and interpreted for public use: 3 sites in Lower Kane Springs Canyon, and 4 sites in the Wall Street Rock Art District. |

## FIRE MANAGEMENT

**Goals and Objectives:**

Fire management would adopt the comprehensive Utah Land-use Plan Amendment for Fire and Fuels Management, September 2005 (LUP Amendment; BLM 2005c). This document maybe found at www.ut.blm.gov/fireplanning/index/htm. Direction and guidance approved by the LUP Amendment is carried forward under all alternatives and incorporated by reference into this PRMP/FEIS. The content and purpose of the LUP Amendment is summarized as follows:

- Establishes landscape-level, fire management goals and objectives.
- Describes Desired Wildland Fire Conditions (DWFC) and the management strategies and actions to meet DWFC goals.
- Describes areas where fire may be restored to the ecosystem through wildland fire use for resource benefit and areas where wildland fire use is not appropriate.
- Identifies Resource Protection Measures (RPMs) for fire management practices to protect natural and cultural resource values.
- Identifies criteria used to establish fire management priorities.

**Management common to the PROPOSED PLAN and Draft RMP Alternatives A, B, and D:**

- The Moab Fire District Fire Management Plan (FMP) would be updated and amended to meet the direction and objectives of the RMP.
- Firefighter and public safety are the primary goals in all fire management decisions and actions.
- Wildland fire would be utilized to protect, maintain and enhance resources and, when possible, will be allowed to function in its natural ecological role.
- Hazardous fuels reduction treatments would be used 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 as well as benefits and values to be protected that are consistent with resource objectives.
- The BLM would implement a consistent, safe and cost-effective fire management program through appropriate planning, staffing, training, and equipment.
- Fire management objectives would be established for every area with burnable vegetation, based on sound science and consideration of other resource objectives.
- Emergency stabilization, rehabilitation, and restoration efforts would be implemented to protect and sustain resources, public health and safety, and community infrastructure.
- The BLM would work together with partners and other affected groups and individuals to reduce risks to communities and to restore ecosystems.
- The Reasonable and Prudent Measures and Terms and Conditions identified in consultation with the USFWS for the LUP Amendment would be implemented in fire-related actions.

## Table 2.1. MOAB PROPOSED PLAN and Draft RMP Alternatives

**Criteria for Establishing Fire Management Priorities:**

Protection of human life is the primary fire management priority. Establishing a priority among protecting human communities and community infrastructure, other property and improvements, and natural and cultural resources is based on human health and safety, the values to be protected, and the costs of protection. When firefighters and other personnel have been committed to an incident, these human resources become the highest values to be protected. Priorities for all aspects of fire management decisions and actions are based on the following:

- Protecting the Wildland-Urban Interface (WUI; including At-risk Communities and At-risk Watersheds).
- Maintaining existing healthy ecosystems.
- High priority sub-basins (HUC-4) or watersheds (HUC-5).
- Threatened, endangered, or special species.
- Cultural resources and/or cultural landscapes.

**Suppression:**

An "Appropriate Management Response" (AMR) procedure is required for every wildland fire that is not a prescribed fire. In all fire management decisions, strategies and actions, firefighter and public safety are the highest priority followed by consideration of benefits and values to be protected as well as suppression costs. The AMR can range from full suppression to managing fire for resource benefit (wildland fire use). Resource goals and objectives outlined in the RMP guide the development and implementation of AMR fire management activities in regard to the accomplishment of those objectives. The FMP establishes fire suppression objectives with minimum and maximum suppression targets for each Fire Management Unit (FMU) within the MPA. While firefighter and public safety are the first priority, considerations for suppression activities also include fire intensity, acreage, and spread potential, threats to life and property, potential to impact high-value resources such as critical habitat for threatened, endangered and sensitive species, crucial wildlife habitat, cultural resources and/or riparian areas, historic fire regimes, and other special considerations such as wilderness and/or adjacent agency lands.

**Wildland Fire Use for Resource Benefit:**

Wildland fire is authorized as a tool, when appropriate, to allow naturally ignited wildland fire to accomplish specific resource management objectives. Due to existing resource conditions and proximity to values at risk, fire cannot be allowed to resume its natural role on all BLM lands in the MPA. Consideration of ongoing management actions and other natural changes would direct periodical reassessment of DWFC and determination of potential areas for wildland fire use. Operational management of wildland fire use is described in the Wildland Fire Implementation Plan (WFIP).

The FMP identifies areas (FMUs) that may have the potential for wildland fire use. 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 attainment areas and PM-10 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.

**Fuels Treatment:**

Fuels management activities outlined in the FMP would be consistent with the resource goals and objectives contained in the RMP. To reduce hazards and to restore ecosystems, authorized fuels management actions include wildland fire use, prescribed fire, and mechanical, manual, chemical, biological, and seeding treatments. The FMP describes fuels management goals and objectives and the full range of fuels management strategies and actions authorized for fuels reduction. Fuels treatments are focused on the DWFC of restoring historic fire regimes to ecosystems when feasible, so that future wildland fire use actions can be more easily implemented.

- Fuels management actions may include but are not limited to the following activities:
  - Mechanical treatments such as mowing, chopping, or chipping/grinding (brush cutter), chaining, tilling, or cutting.
  - Manual treatments such as hand-cutting (chainsaw or handsaw) and hand-piling.
  - Prescribed fire including broadcast, underburn, and hand-pile burning.
  - Chemical spraying or biological treatments such as insects or goats/sheep.
  - Seeding including aerial or ground application (manual or mechanical).
- Targeted areas may be treated in phases over a period of several years and may involve multiple and varied treatments.
- Estimated fuels reduction treatments of 5,000 to 10,000 acres/year are targeted dependent on budgetary and time constraints. These treatments are in addition to those to be accomplished under the Utah Watershed Restoration Initiative and the National Healthy Lands Initiative.
- Implementation of fuels management actions would be prioritized using the following criteria:
  - WUI areas.
  - Areas with fuel loading that could potentially result in the loss of ecosystem components following wildland fire.
  - Resource management goals and objectives.

## Table 2.1. MOAB PROPOSED PLAN and Draft RMP Alternatives

**Prevention and Mitigation:**

- Prevention and mitigation goals target a reduction in unauthorized wildland fire ignitions. Goals include coordination with partners and affected groups and individuals, and a wide range of prevention and mitigation activities such as personal contacts, mass media, signing, and defensible space education.
- Implementation of fire prevention activities would be prioritized using the following criteria:
  - WUI areas.
  - Major travel corridors.
  - Recreation sites.
  - Public lands as a whole.

**Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation (ESR):**

A Normal Year Fire Stabilization and Rehabilitation Plan (NFRP) is in place to meet emergency stabilization and rehabilitation (ESR) needs and to comply with up-to-date ESR policy and guidance. The NFRP is a programmatic implementation plan authorizing treatment options specific to vegetative communities and dependent upon post-wildland fire conditions and other site-specific considerations. Treatment actions are designed according to the type and severity of wildfire impacts and priorities include, but are not limited to, areas where the following criteria apply:

- It is necessary to protect human life and safety as well as property.
- Unique or critical cultural and/or historical resources are at risk.
- It is determined soils are highly susceptible to accelerated erosion.
- Perennial grasses and forbs (fire-tolerant plants) are not expected to provide soil and watershed protection within two years.
- There is a need to establish a vegetative fuel break of less flammable species (greenstrips).
- Unacceptable vegetation, such as noxious weeds, may readily invade and become established.
- Shrubs and forbs are a crucial habitat component for wintering mule deer, pronghorn, sage-grouse, or other special status species.
- Stabilization and rehabilitation are necessary to meet RMP resource objectives, including rangeland seedings.
- It is necessary to protect water quality.
- It is necessary to quickly restore threatened, endangered, or special species habitat populations to prevent adverse impacts.

## HEALTH AND SAFETY

**Goals and Objectives:**

BLM would strive to ensure that human health and safety concerns on public lands remain a major priority.

**Management Common to the PROPOSED PLAN and Draft RMP Alternatives A, B, and D:**

Comply with all applicable Abandoned Mine Lands (AML) policies.

In conformance with 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. In order to achieve this goal, a State strategy has been written. National program criteria for determining site priorities were used to develop the work plan. This State strategy is entitled "Utah's Abandoned Mine Land Multi Year Work Plan."

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

- The AML physical safety program's highest priority would be the cleaning up of 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 presently listed or is eligible for listing in the Abandoned Mines Module of Protection and Response Information System.
- AML hazards should be, to the extent practicable, mitigated or remediated on the ground during site development.

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

- The State 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 managing agencies.
- The site is presently listed or is eligible for listing in the Abandoned Mines Site Cleanup Module of Protection and Response Information System.
- The project would be funded by contributions from collaborating agencies.

Identify and clean up unauthorized dumping sites and hazardous materials spills in the MPA as required to comply with applicable State, local, and Federal regulations.

The State Multi Year Work Plan will be maintained and updated as needed to reflect current policy for identifying program physical safety and water quality AML sites priorities for reclamation and remediation.

**Table 2.1. MOAB PROPOSED PLAN and Draft RMP Alternatives**

## LANDS AND REALTY

**Goals and Objectives:**

- Retain lands within its administration except where necessary to accomplish resource goals and objectives outlined in the Plan. BLM would transfer lands out of Federal ownership or acquire non-Federal lands where needed to accomplish resource goals and objectives, improve administration of public lands, or meet essential community needs.
- Meet public needs for use authorizations such as rights-of-way (ROWs), alternative energy sources, and permits while minimizing adverse impacts to resource values.
- Using the Visual Resource Management (VRM) system, maintain generally undeveloped landscapes in the backgrounds of popular filming locations.

**Management common to the PROPOSED PLAN and Draft RMP Alternatives A, B, and D:**

- Under IMP and Congressional action, Wilderness Study Areas and Wilderness Areas would be exclusion areas for any ROWs (Section 501(a) FLPMA).
- Continue the withdrawal of lands along the Colorado, Dolores and Green Rivers (totaling 65,037 acres within the MPA) from mineral entry (Three Rivers Withdrawal, October 6, 2004). In addition, continue the Westwater (8,096 acres) and Black Ridge Wilderness (5,200 acres) withdrawals (see Map 2-1).
- Give land exchanges with the State of Utah priority consideration to resolve inholding issues.

**Management common to the PROPOSED PLAN and Draft RMP Alternatives B and D:**

- Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACECs) would be avoidance areas for any new ROWs (including communication sites and wind and solar sites).
- Decisions on LTAs and withdrawals would be made in accordance with the criteria contained in Appendix A.
- Determinations on authorizing commercial filming in the MPA would be made in accordance with the criteria outlined in Appendix B.
- Right-of-way (ROW) avoidance and exclusion areas would be consistent with the stipulations identified in Appendix C for oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities. These stipulations have been developed to protect important resource values.
- As per the State of Utah v. Andrus, Oct. 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.
- To reduce surface use conflicts along the U.S. Highway 191 utility corridor within Moab Canyon, apply a no surface occupancy stipulation for oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities (see Appendix C), except those associated with utility ROWs.
- Authorization of any ROW for wind or solar energy development would incorporate best management practices including the USFWS's "Guidelines for Wind Power" and provisions contained in the Final Wind Energy Programmatic EIS (June 24, 2005; BLM 2005d).
- Both wind and solar energy development (renewable energy) can be considered wherever ROWs could be authorized.
- To be consistent with the existing withdrawals from mineral entry, apply a no surface occupancy stipulation for oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities within the area of the Three Rivers and Westwater Mineral Withdrawals. This action would further protect the riparian, wildlife, scenic, and recreation values addressed in these withdrawals. Applying a no surface occupancy stipulation for oil and gas leasing to lands within the Three Rivers Withdrawal, in combination with other areas where a no surface occupancy stipulation is applied, results in tracts of land that are physically inaccessible to oil and gas operations. For this reason, portions of the lands within the Three Rivers Withdrawal (e.g., along the Colorado River near the Richardson Amphitheater and along the Dolores River near Beaver Creek) would be closed to oil and gas leasing. These areas would be managed as no surface occupancy for other surface-disturbing activities (see Appendix C).
- Lands and/or interest in lands (such as minerals and conservation easements) acquired through future LTA would take on the management of the surrounding area. Land acquisitions would be pursued if they meet the criteria in Appendix A.

### Utility Corridors

| Alternative A (No Action) | Alternative B | PROPOSED PLAN | Alternative D |
|---|---|---|---|
| All utility corridors would be 1 mile wide, except the existing Moab Canyon utility corridor, which is constrained by the topography of Moab Canyon. This physical corridor is only 1/4 mile wide at its narrowest point. | Designate an I-70 utility corridor that includes all major existing ROWs as identified in the RMP with a 100-foot width on each side of the widest ROW corridor (Map 2-2-B). Designate the existing Moab Canyon utility corridor (Map 2-2-B).<br>Split the utility corridor south of Spanish Valley into two corridors, identical to existing corridors (Map 2-2-B). | Designate an I-70 utility corridor that includes all major existing ROWs as identified in the RMP with a 1/2-mile width on each side of the widest ROW corridor ( 2-2-C). Designate the existing Moab Canyon utility corridor (Map 2-2-C).<br>Combine the two corridors south of Spanish Valley into a single corridor (Map 2-2-C). The corridor would include the approximately 2 to 3 miles separating the two segments. | Designate an I-70 utility corridor that includes all major existing ROWs as identified in the RMP with a 1-mile width on each side of the widest ROW corridor (Map 2-2-D). Designate the existing Moab Canyon utility corridor (Map 2-2-D).<br>Combine the corridors south of Spanish Valley into a single corridor (Map 2-2-D). This corridor would include the approximately 2 to 3 miles separating the two segments. |

### Avoidance/Exclusion Areas for Rights-of-way (ROWs)

| Alternative A (No Action) | Alternative B | PROPOSED PLAN | Alternative D |
|---|---|---|---|
| About 354,015 acres would be exclusion areas for ROWs.<br>About 48,245 acres would be avoidance areas for ROWs. | About 672,724 acres would be exclusion areas for ROWs.<br>About 341,919 acres would be avoidance areas for ROWs. | About 370,250 acres would be exclusion areas for ROWs.<br>About 217,480 acres would be avoidance areas for ROWs. | About 355,146 acres would be exclusion areas for ROWs.<br>About 84,772 acres would be avoidance areas for ROWs. |

### Disposal Land List

| Alternative A (No Action) | Alternative B | PROPOSED PLAN | Alternative D |
|---|---|---|---|
| The list of parcels identified for disposal totals 12,415 acres. | Parcels identified for disposal total 14,961 acres and are shown on Map 2-3 and in Appendix D. | Parcels identified for disposal total 14,961 acres and are shown on Map 2-3 and in Appendix D. | Parcels identified for disposal total 14,961 acres and are shown on Map 2-3 and in Appendix D. |

**Table 2.1. MOAB PROPOSED PLAN and Draft RMP Alternatives**

## LIVESTOCK GRAZING

**Goals and Objectives:**

- Achieve the attainment of Standards for Rangeland Health and other desired resource conditions by maintaining appropriate utilization levels of the range through management prescriptions and administrative adjustments of grazing permits.
- Achieve healthy, sustainable rangeland ecosystems that support the livestock industry while providing for other resource values such as wildlife habitat, recreation opportunities, clean water, and functional watersheds.

**Management common to the PROPOSED PLAN and Draft RMP Alternatives A, B, and D:**

- Grazing would be managed according to the Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management to meet the Standards for Rangeland Health, including adjustment in seasons of use.
- On all allotments, allow allotment boundaries adjustments, joining and splitting, and modification of grazing season subject to appropriate NEPA review and analysis (see Map 2-4 for a map of grazing allotments).
- Continue to authorize grazing at the current preference levels (as per ten-year grazing permits) and adjust, if necessary to meet Standards for Rangeland Health.
- As amended in previous planning documents (the 1985 Grand RMP and a Plan Amendment analyzed in EA#068-94-047), grazing use would continue to not be authorized on the following allotments/areas (or portions of allotments/areas):
  - Between The Creeks with 3,960 acres and 221 AUMs, to protect municipal watersheds, improve mule deer winter range, improve riparian habitat, and reduce recreation conflict.
  - North Sand Flats with 18,246 acres and 798 AUMs, to reduce recreation conflict, improve mule deer winter range, and improve riparian habitat.
  - South Sand Flats with 10,209 acres and 592 AUMs, to reduce recreation conflict, improve mule deer winter range, and improve riparian habitat.
  - A portion of Arth's Pasture Allotment (Poison Spider area) with approximately 7,634 acres and 425 AUMs, to improve desert bighorn sheep habitat and reduce recreation conflict.
  - Castle Valley with 6,074 acres and 190 AUMs, to protect the Castle Valley sole source aquifer, to improve mule deer winter range, and to reduce recreation conflict.
  - Along Highway 128 from U.S. 191 to the Castle Valley Road, along U.S. 191 from Highway 313 to Moab, and along Highway 279 with 1,139 acres, to reduce recreation traffic conflict (no reduction in AUMs).
  - A portion of the Kane Spring Allotment (that portion in Kane Spring Canyon between the open valley and the river; 558 acres and no reduction in AUMs), to reduce recreation traffic conflict and to enhance riparian species' habitat.
  - An area along the Colorado River between Hittle and north of Dewey Bridge (400 acres and no reduction in AUMs), to reduce recreation traffic conflict and to enhance riparian species' habitat.
- Develop AMPs on seven allotments (Agate, Cisco, Cisco Mesa, Harley Dome, Highlands, Monument Wash, and San Arroyo) and on any additional allotments if resource issues are identified to benefit vegetation, wildlife, livestock grazing and soils.
- Identify appropriate utilization levels based on allotment or site-specific management practices, such as season-of-use, grazing intensity and duration, and utilization patterns, as well as vegetative conditions, the presence or absence of range improvements, and resource issues or concerns. Use utilization levels as an indicator to evaluate if current grazing use is appropriate to meet resource objectives for the area. Generally moderate utilization levels (40–60%) would be used to indicate if general management objectives can be met. Utilization levels above those identified as appropriate would be used to adjust livestock use on a yearly basis through pasture and possible early removal from allotments as needed. Utilization levels may be especially important during periods of drought. Long-term adjustments to livestock use (term permits adjustments) require the evaluation of monitoring data including climate, actual grazing use, current or historic impacts, utilization mapping, and long-term trend data, as well as utilization levels.
- Follow the recommendations of the National Sage-grouse Habitat Conservation Strategy (BLM 2004c) and the Strategic Management Plan for Sage-grouse (UDWR 2002) where applicable.
- Conversion of allotments from cattle to domestic sheep would not be considered in recognized bighorn sheep habitat (see Maps 2-25 and 2-28).
- Collect monitoring data, including trend, utilization, actual use, and climate data to determine if existing livestock management practices are meeting land-use planning and resource objectives.
- Change class of livestock from sheep to cattle on the Hatch Point Allotment (96,951 acres) to benefit wildlife.
- Rangelands that have been burned, reseeded, or otherwise treated to alter vegetative composition would have livestock grazing use temporarily suspended as follows: (1) burned rangelands, whether by wildfire or prescribed burning, would be ungrazed for a minimum of one complete growing season following the burn; (2) rangelands that have been reseeded, or otherwise mechanically treated would be ungrazed for a minimum of two complete growing seasons following treatment.

**Relinquishment of Preference:**

- Voluntary relinquishments of grazing permits and preference, in whole or in part, submitted by a permittee in writing to the BLM, would be handled on a case-by-case basis. BLM would not recognize as valid, relinquishments which are conditional on specific BLM actions and BLM would not be bound by them. Relinquished permits and the associated preference would remain available for application by qualified applicants after BLM considers if such action would meet rangeland health standards and is compatible with achieving land-use plan goals and objectives. Prior to re-issuance of the relinquished permit, the terms and conditions may be modified to meet RMP goals and objectives and/or site-specific resource objectives. However, upon relinquishment, BLM may determine through a site-specific evaluation and associated NEPA analysis that the public lands involved are better used for other purposes. 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 is not permanent and may be reconsidered and changed through future LUP Amendments and updates.

| Alternative A (No Action) | Alternative B | PROPOSED PLAN | Alternative D |
|---|---|---|---|
| AUMs allotted to livestock: 107,071 | AUMs allotted to livestock: 106,574 | AUMs allotted to livestock: 106,479 | AUMs allotted to livestock: 108,876 |
| Acres available for grazing: 1,695,621 | Acres available for grazing: 1,668,732 | Acres available for grazing: 1,690,481 | Acres available for grazing: 1,770,314 acres |
| Acres not available for grazing: 126,907 | Acres not available for grazing: 153,797 | Acres not available for grazing: 132,047 | Acres not available for grazing: 52,214 |
| Note: Please see Map 2-4-A for areas not available for livestock grazing under this alternative. | Note: Please see Map 2-4-B for areas not available for livestock grazing under this alternative. | Note: Please see Map 2-4-C for areas not available for livestock grazing under this alternative. | Note: Please see Map 2-4-D for areas not available for livestock grazing under this alternative. |
| **Allotments Not Available for Grazing:**<br>• Bogart with 14,744 acres and 209 AUMs (to benefit wildlife, especially mule deer and/or elk habitat, riparian habitat, watershed health and erosive soils).<br>• Cottonwood with 27,193 acres and 900 AUMs (to benefit wildlife, especially mule deer and/or elk habitat, riparian habitat, watershed health and erosive soils).<br>• Diamond with 18,620 acres and 588 AUMs (to benefit wildlife, especially mule deer and/or elk habitat, riparian habitat, watershed health | **Allotments Not Available for Grazing:**<br>• Bogart with 14,744 acres and 209 AUMs (to benefit wildlife especially mule deer and/or elk habitat, riparian habitat, watershed health and erosive soils).<br>• Cottonwood with 27,193 acres and 900 AUMs (to benefit wildlife especially mule deer and/or elk habitat, riparian habitat, watershed health and erosive soils).<br>• Diamond with 18,620 acres and 588 AUMs (to benefit wildlife especially mule deer and/or elk habitat, riparian habitat, watershed health and | **Allotments Not Available for Grazing:**<br>• Bogart with 14,744 acres and 209 AUMs (to benefit wildlife especially mule deer and/or elk habitat, riparian habitat, watershed health and erosive soils).<br>• Cottonwood with 27,193 acres and 900 AUMs (to benefit wildlife especially mule deer and/or elk habitat, riparian habitat, watershed health and erosive soils).<br>• Diamond with 18,620 acres and 588 AUMs (to benefit wildlife to benefit wildlife especially mule deer and/or elk habitat, riparian habitat, | **Allotments Not Available for Grazing:**<br>• Mill Creek with 3,921 acres and 137 AUMs (to reduce recreation and cultural conflict and to protect municipal watershed). |

**Table 2.1. MOAB PROPOSED PLAN and Draft RMP Alternatives**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| and erosive soils).<br>• Pear Park, with 14,201 acres and 200 AUMs (to benefit wildlife, especially mule deer and/or elk habitat, riparian habitat, watershed health and erosive soils).<br>• Spring Creek, with 1,550 acres and 45 AUMs (to benefit wildlife, especially mule deer and/or elk winter range).<br>• Beaver Creek with 2,304 acres and 0 AUMs (to benefit wildlife, especially riparian species and Colorado cutthroat trout). | erosive soils).<br>• Pear Park, with 14,201 acres and 200 AUMs (to benefit wildlife especially mule deer and/or elk habitat, riparian habitat, watershed health and erosive soils).<br>• Spring Creek-Buckhorn, approx. 600 acres and 45 AUMs (to benefit wildlife especially mule deer and/or elk winter range).<br>• Beaver Creek with 2,304 acres and 0 AUMs (to benefit wildlife especially riparian species and Colorado cutthroat trout).<br>• Professor Valley, with 18,966 acres and 378 AUMs (to reduce recreation conflict and enhance riparian habitat).<br>• Ida Gulch, with 3,612 acres and 112 AUMs (to reduce recreation conflict and enhance riparian habitat).<br>• River, with 386 acres and 7 AUMs (to reduce recreation conflict and enhance riparian habitat).<br>• Mill Creek, with 3,921 acres and 137 AUMs (to reduce recreation and cultural conflict and to protect municipal watershed). | watershed health and erosive soils).<br>• Pear Park, with 14,201 acres and 200 AUMs (to benefit wildlife especially mule deer and/or elk habitat, riparian habitat, watershed health and erosive soils).<br>• Ida Gulch, with 3,612 acres and 112 AUMs (to reduce recreation conflict and enhance riparian habitat).<br>• Portions of Professor Valley, Ida Gulch, and the River along Highway 128**, with 1,467 acres and 0 AUMs (to reduce recreation conflict and enhance riparian habitat).<br>• Mill Creek with 3,921 acres and 137 AUMs (to reduce recreation and cultural conflict and to protect municipal watershed).<br>**A fence would be constructed along the southeast side of Highway 128 (set back to protect the scenic resources of the National Scenic Highway). This would result in all BLM lands between the Colorado River and Highway 128 being unavailable for grazing. This would reduce acreage in the allotments, but it would not reduce the AUMs, because the quality of the forage is low due to heavy use by motorists and other recreationists. | |
| **Allotments Currently Not Available for Grazing that would be Available for Grazing:**<br>None<br>**Allotments Currently Not Available for Grazing that are to be Reconsidered for Allocation:**<br>None | **Allotments Currently Not Available for Grazing that would be Available for Grazing:**<br>None<br>**Allotments Currently Not Available for Grazing that are to be Reconsidered for Allocation:**<br>None | **Allotments Currently Not Available for Grazing that would be Available for Grazing:**<br>After allotment specific evaluation to assure resource objectives are met, the following areas would be available for livestock grazing:<br>Spring Creek.<br>**Allotments Currently Not Available for Grazing that are to be Reconsidered for Allocation:**<br>Beaver Creek with 1,351 acres and 0 AUMs. | **Allotments Currently Not Available for Grazing that would be Available for Grazing:**<br>After allotment specific evaluation to assure resource objectives are met, the following areas would be available for livestock grazing:<br>• Pear Park (no domestic sheep would be allowed).<br>• Spring Creek.<br>• Bogart (no domestic sheep would be allowed).<br>• Cottonwood (no domestic sheep would be allowed).<br>• Diamond Canyon (no domestic sheep would be allowed).<br>**Allotments Currently Not Available for Grazing that are to be Reconsidered for Allocation:**<br>Beaver Creek with 1,351 acres and 0 AUMs. |
| **Grazing in Saline Soils:**<br>Manage livestock grazing on portions of the following allotments to stabilize impacts on highly saline soils and reduce salinity in the Colorado River drainage. This includes the following allotments: Athena, Cisco, Cisco Mesa, Crescent Canyon, Highland, Monument Wash, and Thompson Canyon (1985 Grand RMP). | **Grazing in Saline Soils:**<br>Use grazing systems and develop AMPs to minimize impacts to saline soils and reduce salinity in the Colorado River drainage in the following allotments: Agate, Big Flat-Ten Mile, Cisco Mesa, Crescent Canyon, Floy Creek, Harley Dome, Highlands, and San Arroyo.<br>If Rangeland Health Standards indicate that soil compaction is an issue on the following allotments, assess all available data and determine if a change in the livestock season of use would correct the problem: Athena, Cisco, Coal Canyon, Horse Canyon, Little Grand, Lone Cone, and Monument. | **Grazing in Saline Soils:**<br>Use grazing systems and develop AMPs to minimize impacts to saline soils and reduce salinity in the Colorado River drainage in the following allotments: Agate, Athena, Big Flat-Ten Mile, Cisco, Cisco Mesa, Coal Canyon, Crescent Canyon, Floy Creek, Harley Dome, Highlands, Horse Canyon, Little Grand, Lone Cone, Monument, and San Arroyo. | **Grazing in Saline Soils:**<br>Same as Alternative A. |
| **Grazing in Riparian Areas:**<br>Continue no grazing in South Sand Flats, North Sand Flats, Between the Creeks, Cottonwood, and Diamond, to benefit riparian areas. | **Grazing in Riparian Areas:**<br>Evaluate non-functioning and functioning-at-risk riparian areas using Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management to determine if exclusion from grazing would improve riparian functioning condition.<br>The following riparian areas would be given priority for evaluation: Lower Gray Canyon of the Green River from Rattlesnake Canyon to Swasey's Beach, Ten Mile from Dripping Spring to the Green River, Day Canyon, Mill Creek, Seven Mile Canyon, East Coyote, Kane Springs, and Hatch Wash (totaling | **Grazing in Riparian Areas:**<br>Evaluate non-functioning and functioning-at-risk riparian areas using Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management to determine if restriction from grazing would improve riparian functioning condition.<br>The following riparian areas would be given priority for evaluation: Ten Mile from Dripping Spring to the Green River, Mill Creek, Day Canyon, Seven Mile Canyon, and East Coyote (totaling 1,169 acres). | **Grazing in Riparian Areas:**<br>Continue present grazing management. |

**Table 2.1. MOAB PROPOSED PLAN and Draft RMP Alternatives**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 4,422 acres). | | |
| **Vegetation Treatments:**<br>Areas treated prior to 1985 are considered existing treatments. Land treatments on 11 allotments would be implemented to increase available forage by 8,514 AUMs to allow for increased use by livestock and wildlife. The increase in AUMs would be split evenly between livestock and wildlife where both are present. Land treatments include plowing and seeding, chaining and seeding, drill seeding.<br>The following allotments are included in the land treatments: Bar X, Black Ridge, Buckhorn, Corral Wash, Hatch Point, Lisbon, Lower Lisbon, San Arroyo, Sand Flats, Taylor and Winter Camp.<br>Initiate prescribed fire and seeding on approximately 14,149 acres (in 10 allotments), as currently proposed in existing LUP Amendments, thereby increasing AUMs by approximately 1,700 for livestock and wildlife. The allotments include Showerbath Spring, Floy Canyon, Cottonwood, Diamond, Middle Canyon, Little Hole, Buckhorn, Adobe Mesa, Hatch Point, and Lisbon.<br>**Total Acres: 67,125.** | **Vegetation Treatments:**<br>Maintain the existing vegetation treatments (46,307 acres) to increase available forage within the following allotments. These areas have been treated over the past 50 years and consist primarily of pinyon-juniper woodlands. These areas would be treated by prescribed fire, chemical or mechanical or other means in accordance with BLM sagebrush conservation guidance and other applicable resource goals. The improved forage would benefit wildlife.<br>Allotments: Adobe Mesa, Big Triangle, Black Ridge, Buckhorn; Cisco;East Coyote, Fisher Valley, Granite Creek, Hatch Point, Lisbon, Lower Lisbon; Mountain Island, Rattlesnake South, Scharf Mesa, Spring Creek, Steamboat Mesa, Taylor, Windwhistle.<br>**Total Acres: 46,307.**<br>Conduct no new vegetation treatments except those beneficial to other resource values such as wildlife or watershed. | **Vegetation Treatments:**<br>Maintain the existing vegetation treatments (46,307 acres) to increase available forage within the following allotments. These areas have been treated over the past 50 years and consist primarily of pinyon-juniper woodlands. These areas would be treated by prescribed fire, chemical or mechanical or other means in accordance with BLM sagebrush conservation guidance and other applicable resource goals. The improved forage would benefit multiple use objectives including livestock and wildlife use.<br>Allotments: Adobe Mesa, Big Triangle, Black Ridge, Buckhorn, Cisco, East Coyote, Fisher Valley, Granite Creek, Hatch Point, Lisbon, Lower Lisbon, Mountain Island, Rattlesnake South, Scharf Mesa, Spring Creek, Steamboat Mesa, Taylor, Windwhistle.<br>**Total Acres: 46,307.**<br>Conduct new vegetation treatments (6,900 acres) for increased forage in the following allotments with prescribed fire, chemical, mechanical or other means: Floy Canyon, Hatch Point, Lisbon, and Showerbath. Other vegetation treatments would be considered to benefit other resource values such as wildlife or watershed. | **Vegetation Treatments:**<br>Same as the Proposed Plan, but other vegetation treatments would be considered specifically to benefit livestock. |
| **Implement Range Projects to meet or exceed Rangeland Health Standards:**<br>Implement livestock manipulation techniques (fences and water development) to benefit wildlife and livestock. | **Implement Range Projects to meet or exceed Rangeland Health Standards:**<br>Implement range projects that would benefit resource values such as habitat for wildlife, reducing soil compaction and erosion, and improving the health of riparian areas. | **Implement Range Projects to help maintain Rangeland Health Standards:**<br>Implement range projects that would equally benefit livestock grazing and other resource values. | **Implement Range Projects to help maintain Rangeland Health Standards:**<br>Implement range projects that would emphasize livestock production. |

## MINERALS

### Goals and Objectives:

- Provide opportunities for environmentally responsible exploration and development of mineral and energy resources subject to appropriate BLM policies, laws and regulations.
- Establish conditions of use through land-use planning to protect other resource values.

### Management common to the PROPOSED PLAN and Draft RMP Alternatives A, B, and D:

- Continue the withdrawal of lands along the Colorado, Dolores, and Green Rivers, totaling 65,037 acres within the MPA, from mineral entry (Three Rivers Withdrawal, October 6, 2004). In addition, continue the Westwater (8,096 acres) withdrawal. Black Ridge Wilderness (5,200 acres) will remain closed, by law, to entry under the mining law.
- Wilderness Study Areas and designated Wilderness (358,806 acres) would remain closed, by law, to mineral leasing and development.
- Where public lands are sold or exchanged under 43 U.S.C. 682(B)(Small Tracts Act), 43 U.S.C. 869 (Recreation and Public Purposes Act), 43 U.S. C. 1718 (Sales) or 43 U.S. C. 1716 (Exchanges), the minerals reserved to the United States would continue to be removed from the operation of the mining laws unless a subsequent land-use planning decision expressly recommends restoring the land to mineral entry.

### Leasable Minerals:

Split-estate lands (private surface/Federal minerals) and lands administered by other Federal agencies are not managed by the BLM. The lands include about 29,678 acres of split-estate lands and the lands administered by the Manti-LaSal National Forest (141,241 acres). The surface owner or surface management agency (SMA) manages the surface. BLM administers the operational aspects of mineral leases. On lands administered by other Federal agencies, lease stipulations would include those required by the SMA. On 20,061 acres of split-estate lands, the BLM would apply the same lease stipulations as those applied to surrounding lands with Federal surface. BLM would close or impose a no surface occupancy stipulation on 9,617 acres of split-estate lands (see Appendix C). Mitigation measures to protect other resource values would be developed during the appropriate site-specific environmental analysis and would be attached as conditions of approval to permits in consultation with the surface owner or SMA.

*Coal:*

The coal resources within the MPA include the Sego and the La Sal coal fields. Approximately 80% of the Sego coal field is within Wilderness Study Areas and is not available for development. For the remaining coal resources, no interest has been expressed for coal leasing and the potential for development of coal resources is low (see Mineral Potential Report). At such time as interest is expressed in coal leasing, the RMP would be amended as appropriate and mining unsuitability criteria (43 CFR 3461) would be applied by the MFO before any coal leases are issued. If coal leases are issued, they would be subject to special conditions developed in the RMP and the unsuitability assessment. This may restrict all or certain types of mining techniques. Before any coal could be removed, MFO would have to approve the mining permit application package, incorporating stipulations developed in the RMP.

### Locatable Minerals:

Existing operations would continue to be subject to the stipulations developed for the notice or the plan of operations. The BLM would evaluate all operations authorized by the mining laws in the context of its requirement to prevent unnecessary and undue degradation of Federal lands and resources. Consistent with the rights afforded claimants under the mining laws, operations conducted after this RMP would be required to conform to the surface disturbing stipulations developed in this RMP.

Operations on BLM-administered lands open to mineral entry must be conducted in compliance with BLM's surface management regulations (43 CFR 3715, 3802, 3809, and 3814). BLM surface management regulations do not apply to operations on other Federal lands but do apply to split-estate lands.

## Table 2.1. MOAB PROPOSED PLAN and Draft RMP Alternatives

**Management Common to the PROPOSED PLAN and Draft RMPAlternatives B and D:**

- To be consistent with the existing withdrawals from mineral entry, apply a no surface occupancy stipulation for oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities (see Appendix C) within the area of the Three Rivers and Westwater Mineral Withdrawals. This action would further protect the riparian, wildlife, scenic, and recreation values addressed in these withdrawals.
- To the extent possible, the stipulations developed for oil and gas leasing are applicable to all mineral activities (leasable, locatable, and salable). These stipulations are found in Appendix C. Leasable minerals include oil and gas, coal, and potash. Locatable minerals include gold, copper, and uranium. Salable minerals include sand and gravel, clay, and building stone.
- In areas where mineral activities would be incompatible with existing surface use, apply a no surface occupancy stipulation for oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities (see Appendix C). These areas are as follows: Moab and Spanish Valley, Castle Valley (including Mayberry Orchard), Thompson Springs, Moab Landfill, Moab Airport, and Dead Horse Point State Park.
- The Federal minerals within the incorporated city of Moab and town of Castle Valley are closed to oil and gas leasing by Federal regulation at 43 CFR 3100.0-3 (a)(2)(iii).

**Leasable Minerals:**

*Oil and Gas:*

The plan would recognize and be consistent with the National Energy Policy Act and related BLM policy by adopting the following objectives:

- Recognizing the need for diversity in obtaining energy supplies.
- Encouraging conservation of sensitive resource values.
- Improving energy distribution opportunities.

In accordance with an UDEQ-DAQ letter dated June 6, 2008, (see Appendix V) 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 NOx 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 NOx per horsepower-hour.

Lease stipulations would be developed to mitigate the impacts of oil and gas activity (see Appendix C and Maps 2-5-A through 2-5-D). The stipulations would adhere to the Uniform Format prepared by the Rocky Mountain Regional Coordinating Committee in March 1989. Stipulations reflect the minimum requirements necessary to accomplish the desired resource protection and would contain provisions/criteria to allow for exception, waiver and modification if warranted. Stipulations would be determined unnecessary if duplicative of Section 6 of the Standard Lease Terms. The BLM has identified Land-use Plan leasing allocations for all lands within the Moab Field Office. In addition, the Proposed RMP describes specific lease stipulations and program-related Best Management Practices (both found in Appendix C: Stipulations and Environmental Best Practices Applicable to Oil and Gas Leasing and Other Surface Disturbing Activities) that apply to a variety of different resources.

Oil and gas leases issued prior to the RMP would continue to be managed under the stipulations in effect when issued. Those issued subsequent to the plan would be subject to the stipulations developed in the plan. Environmental best management practices would be incorporated into subsequent permits and authorizations to mitigate impacts and conflicts with other uses and resource values (see Appendix C).

*Potash and Salt (Non-energy Leasable):*

Within the MPA, three areas fall within known potash leasing areas (KPLAs). KPLA designations, based on known geologic data, would remain in place until potash resources are depleted. In KPLAs, potash leases are acquired through competitive bidding. In areas where potash values are not known, MFO could issue prospecting permits, which could lead to issuance of a preference right lease. There are currently 8 leases and 13 pending prospecting permit applications within the MPA (Map 2-6). Additional KPLAs could be designated, based on geologic data, if interest warranted. Potash leasing and prospecting permits issued prior to the RMP would continue to be managed under the stipulations in effect when issued. Those leases issued subsequent to the RMP would be consistent with the oil and gas leasing stipulations developed in the RMP (see Appendix C).

**Locatable Minerals:**

A no surface occupancy stipulation cannot be applied to locatable minerals without a withdrawal. All public lands overlying Federal minerals are open to mining claim location unless specifically withdrawn from mineral entry by Secretarial order or by a public land law. Therefore, other than the existing withdrawals (Three Rivers, Westwater, and Black Ridge Wilderness), all public lands with the MPA remain open under the mining laws. Future withdrawals may be recommended in areas identified as closed or with a no surface occupancy stipulation if it becomes necessary to prevent unacceptable resource impacts.

**Salable Minerals:**

There are currently 12 community pits totaling about 2,693 acres designated in the MPA (Map 2-7). Existing mineral material sale contracts, free use permits, and material sites, including community pits, would continue to be subject to the permit stipulation conditions. Sales, permits, community pits or common use areas issued or designated after the RMP would be subject to permit stipulations developed in the RMP. These stipulations would be the same as those stipulations for oil and gas leasing except that areas with a no surface occupancy stipulation and closed would be closed to the disposal of salable minerals.

| Alternative A (No Action) | Alternative B | PROPOSED PLAN | Alternative D |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Oil and Gas Leasing (see Map 2-5-A):**<br>• Approximately 1,038,344 acres would be open to oil and gas leasing, subject to standard lease terms (Category 1).<br>• Approximately 389,605 acres would be open to oil and gas leasing subject to special conditions (controlled surface use/timing limitation stipulations [CSU/TL], or Category 2).<br>• Approximately 38,912 acres would be open to oil and gas leasing with no surface occupancy (NSO; Category 3).<br>• Approximately 353,293 acres would be closed to oil and gas leasing. (Category 4). | **Oil and Gas Leasing (see Map 2-5-B):**<br>• Approximately 264,344 acres would be open to oil and gas leasing, subject to standard terms and conditions.<br>• Approximately 543,751 acres would be open to oil and gas leasing subject to CSU and TL stipulations.<br>• Approximately 342,931 acres would be open to oil and gas leasing subject to an NSO stipulation.<br>• Approximately 671,444 acres would be closed to oil and gas leasing, of which 318,709 acres are outside Wilderness or Wilderness Study Areas. Of these 318,709 acres, 20,288 acres are within the Castle Valley and Moab-Spanish Valley watersheds, and 266,455 are within lands with wilderness characteristics. The remaining 31,966 acres are closed to oil and gas leasing because it is not reasonable to apply an NSO stipulation. This includes areas where the oil and gas resources are physically inaccessible by current directional drilling technology from outside the boundaries of the NSO areas. (These lands closed to oil and gas leasing | **Oil and Gas Leasing (see Map 2-5-C):**<br>• Approximately 427,273 acres would be open to oil and gas leasing, subject to standard terms and conditions.<br>• Approximately 806,994 acres would be open to oil and gas leasing subject to CSU and TL stipulations.<br>• Approximately 217,480 acres would be open to oil and gas leasing subject to an NSO stipulation.<br>• Approximately 370,250 acres would be closed to oil and gas leasing, of which 25,306 acres are outside Wilderness or Wilderness Study Areas. About 25,306 acres are closed to oil and gas leasing because it is not reasonable to apply an NSO stipulation. This includes areas where the oil and gas resources are physically inaccessible by current directional drilling technology from outside the boundaries of the NSO areas. (These lands closed to oil and gas leasing would be managed to preclude all other surface-disturbing activities.) Should technology change, a Plan Amendment would be initiated to place these 25,306 acres under an NSO | **Oil and Gas Leasing (see Map 2-5-D):**<br>• Approximately 797,031 acres would be open to oil and gas leasing, subject to standard terms and conditions.<br>• Approximately 590,442 acres would be open to oil and gas leasing subject to CSU and TL stipulations.<br>• Approximately 84,772 acres would be open to oil and gas leasing subject to an NSO stipulation.<br>• Approximately 350,219 acres would be closed to oil and gas leasing.<br>In addition, 8,078 acres of Federal minerals (split-estate lands) would be managed as open to oil and gas leasing with an NSO stipulation, and 1,539 acres of Federal minerals (split-estate lands) would be closed to oil and gas leasing (see Appendix C). |

**Table 2.1. MOAB PROPOSED PLAN and Draft RMP Alternatives**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | would be managed to preclude all other surface-disturbing activities.) Should technology change, a Plan Amendment would be initiated to place these 31,966 acres under an NSO stipulation for oil and gas leasing.<br>In addition, 7,259 acres of Federal minerals (split-estate lands) would be managed as open to oil and gas leasing with an NSO stipulation, and 2,358 acres of Federal minerals (split-estate lands) would be closed to oil and gas leasing (see Appendix C). | stipulation for oil and gas leasing.<br>In addition, 8,078 acres of Federal minerals (split-estate lands) would be managed as open to oil and gas leasing with an NSO stipulation, and 1,539 acres of Federal minerals (split-estate lands) would be closed to oil and gas leasing (see Appendix C). | |
| **Salable Minerals:**<br>Allow the disposal of salable minerals on 1,466,861 acres. | **Salable Minerals (see Map 2-5-B):**<br>• Approximately 264,344 acres would be open to the disposal of salable minerals subject to standard terms and conditions.<br>• Approximately 543,751 acres would be open to the disposal of salable minerals subject to CSU and TL stipulations.<br>• Approximately 342,931 acres would not be open to the disposal of salable minerals (in those areas subject to an NSO stipulation for oil and gas leasing).<br>• Approximately 671,444 acres would be closed to the disposal of salable minerals.<br>In addition, 7,259 acres of Federal minerals (split-estate lands) would not be open to the disposal of salable minerals in those lands subject to an NSO stipulation for oil and gas, and 2,358 acres of Federal minerals (split-estate lands) would be closed to the disposal of salable minerals (see Appendix C). | **Salable Minerals (see Map 2-5-C):**<br>• Approximately 427,273 acres would be open to the disposal of salable minerals subject to standard terms and conditions.<br>• Approximately 806,994 acres would be open to the disposal of salable minerals subject to CSU and TL stipulations.<br>• Approximately 217,480 acres would not be open to the disposal of salable minerals (in those areas subject to an NSO stipulation for oil and gas leasing).<br>• Approximately 370,250 acres would be closed to the disposal of salable minerals.<br>In addition, 8,078 acres of Federal minerals (split-estate lands) would not be open to the disposal of salable minerals in those lands subject to an NSO stipulation for oil and gas, and 1,539 acres of Federal minerals (split-estate lands) would be closed to the disposal of salable minerals (see Appendix C). | **Salable Minerals (see Map 2-5-D):**<br>• Approximately 797,031 acres would be open to the disposal of salable minerals subject to standard terms and conditions.<br>• Approximately 590,442 acres would be open to the disposal of salable minerals subject to CSU and TL stipulations.<br>• Approximately 84,772 acres would not be open to the disposal of salable minerals (in those areas subject to an NSO stipulation for oil and gas leasing).<br>• Approximately 350,219 acres would be closed to the disposal of salable minerals.<br>In addition, 8,078 acres of Federal minerals (split-estate lands) would not be open to the disposal of salable minerals in those lands subject to an NSO stipulation for oil and gas, and 1,539 acres of Federal minerals (split-estate lands) would be closed to the disposal of salable minerals (see Appendix C). |
| **Locatable Minerals:**<br>• Approximately 1,389,531 acres are open to operations for locatable minerals.<br>• Approximately 78,333 acres are withdrawn from operations to locatable minerals.<br>• Approximately 353,510 acres within WSAs are open to operations for locatable minerals subject to the *Interim Management Policy for Lands Under Wilderness Review* (IMP; 1650-1). | **Locatable Minerals:**<br>• Approximately 268,873 acres are open to operations for locatable minerals subject to standard terms and conditions.<br>• Approximately 1,120,658 acres are open to operations for locatable minerals subject to CSU and TL stipulations.<br>• Approximately 78,333 acres are withdrawn from operations to locatable minerals.<br>• Approximately 353,510 acres within WSAs are open to operations for locatable minerals subject to the IMP (1650-1). | **Locatable Minerals:**<br>• Approximately 427,273 acres are open to operations for locatable minerals subject to standard terms and conditions.<br>• Approximately 962,258 acres are open to operations for locatable minerals subject to CSU and TL stipulations.<br>• Approximately 78,333 acres are withdrawn from operations to locatable minerals.<br>• Approximately 353,510 acres within WSAs are open to operations for locatable minerals subject to the IMP (1650-1). | **Locatable Minerals:**<br>• Approximately 797,031 acres are open to operations for locatable minerals subject to standard terms and conditions.<br>• Approximately 592,500 acres are open to operations for locatable minerals subject to CSU and TL stipulations.<br>• Approximately 78,333 acres are withdrawn from operations to locatable minerals.<br>• Approximately 353,510 acres are open to operations for locatable minerals subject to the IMP (1650-1). |

## NON-WSA LANDS WITH WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS

BLM has identified non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics for management consideration in this planning effort. Wilderness characteristics include the appearance of naturalness and outstanding opportunities for solitude or primitive and unconfined recreation (see Appendix P for more information).

### Goals and Objectives:

- Protect, preserve and maintain wilderness characteristics (appearance of naturalness, outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation or solitude) of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics as appropriate, considering manageability and the context of competing resource demands. Manage these primitive lands and backcountry landscapes for their undeveloped character, and to provide opportunities for primitive recreational activities and experiences of solitude, as appropriate.

| Alternative A (No Action) | Alternative B | PROPOSED PLAN | Alternative D |
|---|---|---|---|
| Non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics were not addressed in the 1985 Grand RMP, as amended. These lands are managed according to the 1985 RMP prescriptions. | Manage 266,485 acres of non-WSA lands (see Map 2-24-B) to protect, preserve and maintain wilderness characteristics by applying the following prescriptions:<br>• Closed to oil and gas leasing (see Appendix C).<br>• Preclude other surface-disturbing activities, including mineral material sales (see Appendix C).<br>• Retain public lands in Federal ownership.<br>• Prohibit woodland harvest.<br>• Manage vehicle use as limited to designated roads.<br>• Designate as VRM Class II.<br>• Manage as exclusion areas for ROWs.<br>**Non-WSA lands to be managed for wilderness characteristics:** Arches Adjacent (6,396 acres) Beaver Creek (25,722 acres), Behind the Rocks (3,643 acres), Big Triangle (5,200 acres), Coal Canyon (22,135 acres), Dead Horse | Manage 47,761 acres of non-WSA lands (see Map 2-24-C) to protect, preserve and maintain wilderness characteristics by applying the following prescriptions:<br>• Apply a no surface occupancy stipulation for oil and gas leasing and preclude other surface-disturbing activities (see Appendix C). Applying a no surface occupancy stipulation for oil and gas leasing to non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics, in combination with the no surface occupancy applied because of the Three Rivers Withdrawal, results in tracts of land which are physically inaccessible to oil and gas operations within the Fisher Towers, Mary Jane, and Beaver Creek areas. For this reason, portions of non-WSA lands in these areas with wilderness characteristics would be closed to oil and gas leasing.<br>• These areas would be managed to preclude other surface-disturbing activities (see Appendix C) including mineral material sales (see Appendix C). | No non-WSA lands would be managed to maintain wilderness characteristics. |

**Table 2.1. MOAB PROPOSED PLAN and Draft RMP Alternatives**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Cliffs (797 acres), Desolation Canyon (10,498 acres), Dome Plateau (14,207 acres), Fisher Towers (17,235 acres), Floy Canyon (9,983 acres), Flume Canyon (3,520 acres), Goldbar (6,437 acres), Gooseneck (843 acres). Granite Creek (4,528 acres), Harts Point (1,465 acres), Hatch Wash (10,983 acres), Hatch/Lockhart (2,670) acres), Hells Hole (2,538 acres), Hideout Canyon (11,607 acres), Horsethief Point (8,382 acres), Hunter Canyon (4,465 acres), Labyrinth Canyon (25,361 acres), Lost Spring Canyon (11,456 acres), Mary Jane Canyon (24,779 acres), Mexico Point (12,837 acres), Mill Creek Canyon (3,388 acres), Negro Bill Canyon (2,333 acres), Shafer Canyon (1,842 acres), Spruce Canyon (1,131 acres), Westwater Canyon (3,086 acres), Westwater Creek (7,188 acres), and Yellow Bird (357 acres). | • Retain public lands in Federal ownership.<br>• Prohibit woodland harvest.<br>• Manage vehicle use as limited to designated roads.<br>• Designate as VRM Class II.<br>• Manage as avoidance areas for ROWs.<br>**Non-WSA lands to be managed for wilderness characteristics:** Beaver Creek (25,722 acres), Fisher Towers (5,540 acres within the Richardson Amphitheater), and Mary Jane Canyon (16,499 acres within the Richardson Amphitheater). | |
| **PALEONTOLOGY** | | | |
| **Goals and Objectives:**<br>• Protect paleontological resources from surface-disturbing activities. Promote the scientific, educational, and recreational uses of fossils.<br>• Foster public awareness and appreciation of the MPA's paleontological heritage.<br>• Promote and facilitate scientific investigation of fossil resources.<br>**Management common to the PROPOSED PLAN and Draft RMP Alternatives A, B, and D:**<br>• Vertebrate fossils may be collected only by qualified individuals under a permit issued by the BLM Utah State Office. Vertebrate fossils include bones, teeth, eggs, and other body parts of animals with backbones such as dinosaurs, fish, turtles, and mammals. Vertebrate fossils also include trace fossils, such as footprints, burrows, gizzard stones, and dung.<br>• Fossils collected under a permit remain the property of the Federal government and must be placed in an approved repository (such as a museum or university) identified at the time of permit issuance.<br>**Management common to the PROPOSED PLAN and Draft RMP Alternatives B and D:**<br>• Locate, evaluate, and protect significant paleontological resources. Provide for public visitation and education opportunities while simultaneously protecting and supporting the scientific and research value of paleontological resources in the MPA.<br>• Recreational collectors may collect and retain reasonable amounts of common invertebrate and plant fossils for personal, non-commercial use. Surface disturbance must be negligible, and collectors may only use non-power hand tools.<br>• Casting of vertebrate fossils, including dinosaur tracks, is prohibited unless allowed under a scientific/research permit issued by the BLM Utah State Office.<br>• Lands identified for disposal would be evaluated to determine whether such actions would remove significant fossils (see Appendix D) from Federal ownership.<br>• Recognize and protect paleontological resources identified as part of the Dinosaur Diamond National Prehistoric Byway.<br>• Prohibit petrified wood gathering within the Colorado Riverway Special Recreation Management Area (SRMA) to protect these paleontological resources for future public enjoyment. Prohibit private petrified wood collection only near high visitation sites within the Labyrinth Rims/Gemini Bridges SRMA. Manage petrified wood gathering outside these two SRMAs to allow for private collection of petrified wood (43 CFR 3620).<br>• Prohibit commercial sales of petrified wood products due to limited availability of such resources.<br>• Attach lease notices, stipulations, and other requirements to permitted activities to prevent damage to paleontological resources.<br>• Manage Mill Canyon Dinosaur Trail, Copper Ridge Sauropod Trackway, and Poison Spider Track Site as important scientific and public education resources as guided by future SRMA activity-level plans.<br>• Personal collection of a reasonable amount of invertebrate and plant fossils would be allowed throughout the MPA. Where areas with rare and significant invertebrate and plant fossils are identified, these areas would be closed to personal collection. | | | |
| **RECREATION** | | | |
| **Goals and Objectives:**<br>To provide for multiple recreational uses of the public lands and sustain a wide-range of recreation opportunities and potential experiences for visitors and residents, while supporting local economic stability and sustaining the recreation resource base and sensitive resource values.<br>**Management common to the PROPOSED PLAN and Draft RMP Alternatives A, B, and D:**<br>Management of recreation would be generally guided by the Utah Standards for Public Land Health and Guidelines for Recreation Management. The guidelines describe in a broad sense the conditions to be maintained or achieved for rangeland health within the recreation program.<br>**Management common to the PROPOSED PLAN and Draft RMP Alternatives B and D:**<br>• Where unacceptable damage to natural or cultural resources by recreational use is anticipated or observed, BLM would seek to limit or control activities by managing the nature and extent of the activity or by providing site improvements that make the activity more sustainable or by a combination of management controls and facility development. Such management actions would seek to reduce or eliminate the adverse impact while maintaining the economic benefits associated with a wide range of recreation uses.<br>• BLM would consider and, where appropriate, implement management methods to protect riparian resources, special status species, and wildlife habitat while enhancing recreation opportunities. Management methods may include limitation of visitor numbers, camping and travel controls, implementation of fees, alteration of when use takes place, and other similar actions to be approved through normal BLM procedures.<br>• BLM would coordinate management of recreation use with other agencies, State and local government and tribal units to provide public benefits.<br>• Recreational off-highway vehicle (OHV) and mechanized travel would be consistent with area and route designations described in the travel management plan. BLM would work with agency and government officials and permit holders to develop procedures, protocols, permits or other types of authorization, as appropriate, to provide reasonable access for non-recreational use of OHVs for military, search and rescue, emergency, administrative, and permitted uses.<br>• Dispersed camping is allowed where not specifically restricted. Dispersed camping may be closed seasonally or as impacts or environmental conditions warrant. All vehicle use associated with dispersed camping activities is required to stay on designated routes.<br>• Management actions limiting camping, wood gathering, firewood cutting, and requiring use of fire pans and portable toilets implemented through published closures limitations, restrictions, or special rules applicable to specific land areas within the MPA are carried forward in all alternatives (see Consolidation of | | | |

**Table 2.1. MOAB PROPOSED PLAN and Draft RMP Alternatives**

Moab Field Office Rules, Closures, and Restrictions in Appendix E).

- Lands acquired within a management area through future land tenure adjustment would take on the management of the surrounding area.
- Provide visitor information and outreach programs that emphasize the value of public land resources and low impact recreation techniques while also providing information about recreation activities, experiences and benefits.
- Provide public information concerning the prevention of the spread of invasive and exotic weeds, and about wildlife species and their habitat especially in riparian areas.
- Continue to manage the Slickrock Bike Trail and Fisher Towers Trail as a National Recreation Trails consistent with their current secretarial designation. National Trails designation would be consistent with this plan.
- Continue supporting public use and enjoyment of the Prehistoric Highway National Scenic Byway. Assist with the development and implementation of a management plan.
- Support Grand County's efforts to obtain approval of corridor management plans for Utah Scenic Byways (Utah Highways 128, 313 and 279) and provide assistance, where feasible, in the development of byway facilities consistent with other decisions of the RMP.
- Continue to manage Kane Creek Road to Hurrah Pass and the roads to Needles, Anticline, and Minor overlooks as Utah Scenic Backways.
- BLM Back Country Byways and National Recreation Trails may be designated in the future as deemed appropriate with site-specific environmental analysis.
- Continue managing Kokopelli's Trail to facilitate its use as a potential segment of the American Discovery Trail. Seek to acquire public access along the entire route to facilitate potential designation as a National Recreation Trail.

## Special Recreation Management Areas (SRMAs)

**Management Common to the PROPOSED PLAN and Draft RMP Alternatives A, B, and D (see SRMA Maps 2-8-A through 2-8-D; see Appendix F for details on SRMAs):**

- Criteria for establishment of SRMAs, or adding or revising SRMA boundaries (using the Plan Amendment process, where appropriate) include:
  - Recreation use requires intensive management strategies to provide recreation opportunities or maintain resource values.
  - A recreation area management plan or interdisciplinary plan with intensive and specific recreation management actions is approved.
  - BLM announces the management plan and plan approval through media.
- Generally, where SRMA boundaries are revised, management actions applicable to the original SRMA would also apply to the revised area.
- Manage all public lands within SRMAs for retention in Federal ownership consistent with the MFO exchange criteria and acquire high value non-Federal lands from willing sellers where such acquisition would further the purposes of each SRMA.
- Apply a no surface occupancy stipulation for oil and gas leasing and preclude other surface-disturbing activities (see Appendix C) within 0.5 miles of developed recreation sites (current and planned as Potential Future Facilities; see each SRMA).
- Manage all SRMAs for sustainable camping opportunities. Camping may be restricted to designated sites if use and conditions warrant.
- Manage all SRMAs according to Visual Resource Management Class for each respective alternative to protect scenic values and settings important to recreation.
- Approved recreation facilities supporting recreation area management objectives would be planned and designed to reduce visual impacts where feasible (see Visual Resource Management).
- Replace The Colorado River SRMA (24,124 acres) with the Two Rivers, Colorado Riverway and Dolores River Canyons SRMAs (Maps 2-8-A through 2-8-D) to provide for more focused management.
- Provide general recreation management guidance and subsequent implementation of management actions for activity plan level actions for SRMAs through continuation and modification of approved recreation area management plans (RAMPs) and development of new RAMPs for all SRMAs.
- A River Management Plan for the Colorado River from the Colorado State Line to Castle Creek, and for the Dolores River, would be completed.
- Designate SRMAs as either Destination SRMAs (majority of visitation from outside the area), Community SRMAs (the majority of visitation is from the local community), or Undeveloped SRMAs (the focus of the SRMA is to maintain the backcountry setting.)

**Facilities:**

- Build and maintain additional recreation facilities consistent with the guidance provided in RAMPs and in the various focus areas as established in the RMP. In the absence of a RAMP, facilities may be considered through the NEPA process where they support the objectives of the SRMA.
- Campground facilities may be constructed; however, they would be located to avoid wetland, riparian, cultural resources, floodplains, and special status plant and animal species habitats. If avoidance is not possible, mitigation would be implemented to augment the values affected by the construction (MCA and Executive Orders).
- Continue to manage and maintain for recreation use all existing developed recreation sites. Follow site management guidance contained in RAMPs.
- Continue existing ROWs issued to BLM for all existing developed recreation sites and facilities. Issue similar protective ROWs for all new recreation facilities.
- Manage developed sites as necessary under the authority of 43 CFR Part 8360, inclusive of published closures, restrictions, and supplemental rules developed for the public lands within the MPA (see above), to protect visitor health and safety, reduce visitor conflicts, and provide for the protection of government property and resources.

**Focus Areas or Recreation Management Zones (see Maps 2-9-A through 2-9-D; see Appendix F for more detail on SRMAs)**

- Focus areas are Recreation Management Zones (RMZ) for emphasizing particular types of recreation activities while still allowing for other uses in accordance with the Travel Plan. As RMZs, Focus Areas are established as a mechanism for enhancing specific recreation opportunities through facilities and education such as route marking, parking, camping, and information. Where a single focus SRMA or a specific RMZ (Focus Area) is not identified, the default focus of that area is motorized, backcountry touring on designated roads. The roads are those identified in the Travel Plan accompanying this RMP.
- The following types of Focus Areas are considered under the alternatives: Non-mechanized Recreation, Mountain Bike Backcountry Touring, Motorized Backcountry Touring, Scenic Driving Corridors, Specialized Sport Venue Non-motorized, Specialized Sport Venue Motorized, and Managed Open OHV Area.

## Bookcliffs SRMA

| Alternative A (No Action) | Alternative B | PROPOSED PLAN | Alternative D |
|---|---|---|---|
| Continue to manage the Bookcliffs for general recreation use. | The Bookcliffs SRMA (Map 2-8) would be established as an Undeveloped SRMA at 348,140 acres for non-mechanized recreation, especially equestrian use, hiking, backpacking, and big game hunting. It would be managed for low frequency of visitor interaction by not establishing new motorized, mechanized routes; no commercial motorized permits would be issued and competitive events would not be allowed. | The Bookcliffs SRMA would not be established. | The Bookcliffs SRMA would not be established. |

**Table 2.1. MOAB PROPOSED PLAN and Draft RMP Alternatives**

| Cameo Cliffs SRMA | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Alternative A (No Action)** | **Alternative B** | **PROPOSED PLAN** | **Alternative D** |
| BLM authorization of the ROW to San Juan County for the Hook and Ladder OHV trailhead and several sections of connector route would continue.<br>In June 2005, the Cameo Cliffs Special Recreation Area (Map 2-8) was designated under a Plan Amendment to the Grand RMP. OHV designation for the area is Limited to Designated Routes. The focus activity in the Cameo Cliffs SRMA is motorized route use. | Same as the Proposed Plan. | Manage the Cameo Cliffs area as a Destination SRMA (15,597 acres) under the Cameo Cliffs Recreation Area Management Plan. The Cameo Cliffs SRMA would provide sustainable opportunities for road-related motorized and mechanized outdoor recreation on a marked route system, and provide a non-mechanized hiking and equestrian area in Hook and Ladder Gulch and along the route of the Old Spanish Trail, while protecting and maintaining resource values including range, wildlife habitat, scenic, cultural, historical, recreational, and riparian values in current or improved condition. To facilitate use of the area for touring purposes, no motorized competitive events would be authorized.<br>Work with San Juan County to further implement the Cameo Cliffs portion of the San Juan County All-terrain Vehicle Plan, and to protect and manage wildlife, vegetation, and cultural resources.<br>Implement camping management rules as use levels and resource impacts warrant.<br>**Potential Future Facilities:**<br>Install Cameo Cliffs OHV Trailhead toilet. | Same as the Proposed Plan. |
| **Canyon Rims SRMA** | | | |
| **Alternative A (No Action)** | **Alternative B** | **PROPOSED PLAN** | **Alternative D** |
| Manage the Canyon Rims SRMA (101,531 acres) (Map 2-8) to protect, manage and improve the natural resources of the area while allowing for recreation activities such as developed camping, visiting scenic overlooks, auto touring on the primary road system, touring the secondary road system by motorized vehicle and mountain bike, and hiking and backpacking the canyons (in accordance with the ROS classes) utilizing interpretive and educational opportunities to realize the potential of the area.<br>Major management actions include:<br>1. Manage the area as open to mineral leasing with controlled surface occupancy except for developed recreation sites, which would be managed as open to leasing with no surface occupancy.<br>2. Manage the area to maintain ROS classes as inventoried.<br>3. Acquire or exchange private and State lands from willing landowners.<br>4. Manage the entire area as OHV travel limited to existing roads (mapped as part of the planning process).<br>5. Manage the western rim land areas of Hatch Point as VRM Class II and the remainder of the area as VRM Class III.<br>6. Maintain and/or improve all existing developed recreation sites as specified in the Canyon Rims Recreation Area Management Plan.<br>7. Restrict camping near developed recreation sites.<br>8. Close the entire recreation area to wood cutting and gathering.<br>9. Manage Hatch Wash and the lower section of West Coyote Creek for primitive, non-motorized recreation.<br>10. Restrict backcountry motorized events to commercial and non-race special events on the Flat Iron Mesa Jeep Safari route only.<br>11. Consider development of additional trails and recreation facilities only as necessary. | Same as the Proposed Plan. | Same as Alternative A except:<br>• Manage the Canyon Rims SRMA as a Destination SRMA (101,531 acres).<br>• Motorized travel would be limited to designated roads and trails.<br>• Manage the Windwhistle Nature Trail, Anticline Overlook Trail, Needles Overlook Trail, and Trough Spring Canyon Trail for hiking use only. | Same as the Proposed Plan. |

**Table 2.1. MOAB PROPOSED PLAN and Draft RMP Alternatives**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Focus Area: Non-mechanized Recreation:**<br>N/A<br><br>**Focus Area: Scenic Driving Corridors:**<br>N/A | **Focus Area: Non-mechanized Recreation:**<br>Same as the Proposed Plan.<br><br>**Focus Area: Scenic Driving Corridors:**<br>Needles and Anticline Roads – Utah Scenic Backways. Manage for scenic driving enjoyment. The corridor is defined as having a width of 1 mile from centerline (or to border of adjoining focus area). | **Focus Area: Non-mechanized Recreation (3,642 acres):**<br>Hatch Wash Hiking and Backpacking Focus Area inclusive of the area from Goodman Canyon to the confluence of Hatch Wash with Kane Creek Canyon including the lower section of West Coyote Creek (from private land west to confluence with Hatch Wash) and the lower section of Troutwater Canyon.<br>New motorized routes would not be considered.<br><br>**Focus Area: Scenic Driving Corridors:**<br>Needles and Anticline Roads – Utah Scenic Backways. Manage for scenic driving enjoyment. The corridor is defined as having a width of 1/2 mile from centerline (or to border of adjoining focus area). | **Focus Area: Non-mechanized Recreation:**<br>The focus area would not be established.<br><br>**Focus Area: Scenic Driving Corridors:**<br>Needles and Anticline Roads – Utah Scenic Backways. Manage for scenic driving enjoyment. The corridor is defined as having a width of 1/4 mile from centerline (or to border of adjoining focus area). |
| **Colorado Riverway SRMA** | | | |
| **Alternative A (No Action)** | **Alternative B** | **PROPOSED PLAN** | **Alternative D** |
| The Colorado Riverway (Map 2-8) was established as a recreation management area in 1992 and extended in 2001. Management has focused upon providing improvements to sites to facilitate recreation use and protection of scenic and other resource values. Subsequent recreation plan amendments have addressed camping in the Onion Creek area, the construction of a bike lane along SR 128 from the Porcupine Rim Trail to Lion's Park, the construction of a non-motorized bridge on non-Federal land at Lion's Park, and the establishment of a non-mechanized route system in the area between Onion and Professor Creeks.<br>Major management actions include:<br>1. Acquiring specific tracts of State land.<br>2. Acquiring private lands or scenic easements from willing sellers.<br>3. Restricting motorized and mechanized travel to designated routes.<br>4. Developing and managing recreation facilities and uses.<br>5. Limiting camping and camp fires to designated sites.<br>6. Closing the area to firewood cutting and limiting firewood gathering to riverside driftwood.<br>7. Recommending withdrawal of the area from mineral entry.<br>8. Limiting use of the Fisher Towers, Negro Bill Canyon, Hunter Canyon, and Corona Arch trails to foot travel.*<br>Lands along the Colorado River within the riverway are withdrawn from mineral entry through the Three Rivers Withdrawal. | Same as the Proposed Plan, except:<br>• Expand boundary to include the entire Top of the World area and lands along the Entrada Bluffs Road up to the boundary of the Colorado River SRMA (103,467 acres).<br>• Prohibit camping on the north side of the river along Highway 128.<br>• Prohibit camping at the Kane Creek Crossing Area. | Colorado Riverway SRMA would be established as a Destination SRMA at 89,936 acres. Management would be the same as Alternative A with the following exceptions and additions:<br>• Expand the boundary of the Colorado Riverway to include the lands north of the Entrada Bluffs Road to the boundary of the Two Rivers SRMA, as well as lands south of the Entrada Bluffs Road (one mile corridor).<br>• Manage the Colorado Riverway as a Destination SRMA to manage camping, boating, river access, trail, and interpretive facilities in popular areas along or near the Colorado River and to protect the outstanding resource values of the area. Guidance for management is included in the Colorado Riverway Recreation Area Management Plan.<br>• Manage the Dewey Bridge to Castle Creek portion of the Colorado River to provide opportunities for high use boating in a scenic setting (see Boating Management below).<br>• Manage south shore recreation sites (from Dewey Bridge to Lion's Park) under the Colorado Riverway RAMP.<br>• Manage the north shore to provide quality undeveloped designated camping and hiking opportunities while assuring protection of high quality habitat for bighorn sheep as well as for other resource values.<br>• Manage the Kane Creek Crossing area to emphasize responsible designated camping and scenic touring.<br>• Manage the Entrada Bluffs Road area to emphasize designated camping opportunities, and scenic touring.<br>• Manage the Shafer Basin addition to emphasize scenic backcountry driving opportunities (no camping allowed in this area).<br>• Manage the Amphitheater Loop, Fisher Towers, Negro Bill Canyon, Hunter Canyon, and Corona Arch trails and Professor Creek to provide high quality hiking-only opportunities while preserving ecological resources.<br>• Provide for parking and manage the Kings Bench route (above the Kane Creek Road near the Kings Bottom camping area) as a hiking route. Obtain public access from a willing seller across the short section of private land that is located along the route.<br>• Manage the seldom-used 1.5-mile long route (that spurs left from the Poison Spider Mesa Road) on the intermediate bench between the Colorado River and Poison Spider Mesa for hiking use. If future use levels warrant, develop a return hiking trail loop on the river side of the road bed.<br>• Manage the Kane Creek Road to Amasa Back Jeep Road section of the Historic Jackson's Ladder trail as hiking and biking only. | Colorado Riverway SRMA would be established at 79,126 acres (this acreage excludes the Entrada Bluffs area). Management prescriptions would be the same as the Proposed Plan. |

**Table 2.1. MOAB PROPOSED PLAN and Draft RMP Alternatives**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | • Establish the proposed Pothole Arch and Rockstacker trails on Amasa Back (Kane Creek) as mountain bike routes. Work with Monticello Field Office to designate the Jackson's Ladder historic horse trail as a mountain bike trail from Jackson's Hole to the Amasa Back Jeep Road. Work with private land owners to secure non-motorized access to the bottom of this route.<br>• Manage the Portal Trail to provide both hiking and mountain bike opportunities. | |
| **Potential Future Facilities:**<br>N/A | **Potential Future Facilities:**<br>• Entrada Bluffs Camping Area; camping in this area would be limited to this campground.<br>• Hittle Bottom Group Campsites; camping in this area would be limited to this campground.<br>• Kane Creek Crossing Camping Area; camping in this area would be limited to this campground.<br>• Kane Creek Road Riverway Information Area.<br>• Utah Highway 279 Riverway Information Area.<br>• Wall Street climbing area toilet.<br>• Lower Castle Creek Trail head and parking area.<br>• Utah Highway 128 Bike Lane. | **Potential Future Facilities (in addition to those already in the Colorado Riverway Plan):**<br>• Castle Valley Interpretive Site.<br>• Entrada Bluffs Camping Area; camping in this area would be limited to this campground.<br>• Hittle Bottom Group Campsites.<br>• Kane Creek Crossing Camping Area. Work with SITLA to implement joint camping management in this area.<br>• Kane Creek Road Riverway Information Area.<br>• Lower Castle Creek Trail Access.<br>• Poison Spider Dinosaur Track Trail.<br>• Utah Highway 128 Bike Lane.<br>• Utah Highway 279 Riverway Information Area.<br>• Wall Street climbing area toilet. | **Potential Future Facilities:**<br>Same as the Proposed Plan except:<br>• Do not designate Entrada Bluffs Camping Area or limit camping.<br>• Do not designate Hittle Bottom Group Campsites or limit camping.<br>• Do not designate Kane Creek Crossing Camping Area or limit camping.<br>• Do not construct Wall Street climbing area toilet. |
| **Focus Areas: Non-mechanized Recreation:**<br>N/A | **Focus Areas: Non-mechanized Recreation:**<br>Negro Bill Hiking and Ecological Study Focus Area (12,510 acres) inclusive of Negro Bill Canyon from the Sand Flats Recreation Area boundary to the eastern rim of Mat Martin Point with allowance for recreational mechanized use of the Porcupine Rim Trail from the junction approximately 1.55 miles east of Little Spring (upper exit to Sand Flats Road) to Highway 128.<br>• Negro Bill Canyon would be restricted to day use only. Equestrian use of Negro Bill Canyon would be prohibited.<br>• Manage the Porcupine Rim Trail to provide only hiking and mountain biking opportunities. Management of this trail may change pending resolution of wilderness designation for the Negro Bill Canyon WSA.<br>• No new motorized routes would be considered.<br>• Temporal zoning, permitting and vehicle type restrictions would be used to mitigate user conflicts on the Porcupine Rim Jeep Safari Route.<br>Richardson Amphitheater/Castle Rock, Hiking, Climbing and Equestrian Focus Area:<br>• Same as the Proposed Plan.<br>• Up to 15 miles of equestrian trails would be marked within this focus area. | **Focus Areas: Non-mechanized Recreation:**<br>Negro Bill Hiking and Ecological Study Focus Area (8,684 acres) inclusive of Negro Bill Canyon between the Sand Flats Recreation Area and the Porcupine Rim Trail. Manage for recreational mechanized use on the main portion of the Porcupine Rim Trail from the junction approximately 1.55 miles east of Little Spring (upper exit to Sand Flats Road) to Highway 128 (with the exception of the Porcupine Rim Trail to Coffeepot Rock which would be managed for motorized use.)<br>• Manage the Negro Bill Canyon Trail for hiking use only. Equestrian use of Negro Bill Canon would be prohibited.<br>• Manage the Porcupine Rim Trail to provide only hiking and mountain biking opportunities. Management of this trail may change pending resolution of wilderness designation for the Negro Bill Canyon WSA.<br>• No new motorized routes would be considered.<br>Richardson Amphitheater/Castle Rock, Hiking, Climbing and Equestrian Focus Area (24,767 acres) bounded by Fisher Valley, the rim of "Top of the World" escarpment, Highway 128, and non-Federal lands along the east side of the Castle Valley Road. Motorized use allowed on the Fisher Towers Road, the Onion Creek Road, roads serving private ranches and water developments in the Professor Valley area, and the motorized access route to the viewpoint of Professor Valley (the saddle between Adobe Mesa and Castle Rock) and the road to designated undeveloped campsites below Castle Rock. Work with Utah Open Lands (a private land conservation organization) to establish a semi-developed camping area to serve rock climbers.<br>• The Onion Creek Benches equestrian trail system between Onion and Professor Creeks would be managed to provide opportunities for equestrian trail riding. An equestrian-oriented reservable camping area would be managed in Onion Creek upstream from Highway 128. Up to 30 miles of equestrian trails would be marked within this focus area.<br>• Manage the Amphitheater Loop and Fisher Tower Trails for hiking only.<br>• Consider connecting hiking trails between Onion Creek and the | **Focus Areas: Non-mechanized Recreation:**<br>Negro Bill Hiking and Ecological Study Focus Area (1,287 acres) inclusive of the core of Negro Bill Canyon as identified in the 1985 RMP as the Negro Bill Canyon Outstanding Natural Area.<br>• Equestrian use of Negro Bill Canyon would be prohibited.<br>Richardson Amphitheater/Castle Rock, Hiking, Climbing and Equestrian Focus Area:<br>• The Richardson Amphitheater/Castle Rock, Hiking, Climbing and Equestrian focus area would not be established. |

**Table 2.1. MOAB PROPOSED PLAN and Draft RMP Alternatives**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | Amphitheater Loop Trail. | |
| **Focus Area: Scenic Driving Corridors:**<br>N/A | **Focus Area: Scenic Driving Corridors:**<br>Same as the Proposed Plan, except increase scenic corridor average width to 1 mile from centerline or line of sight (whichever is shorter) or to border of adjoining focus area (see VRM for management prescriptions). | **Focus Areas: Scenic Driving Corridors:**<br>These corridors include Highways 128 and 279 (which are both designated Utah Scenic Byways), as well as the Kane Creek/Hurrah Pass portion of the Lockhart Basin Scenic Backway and the BLM portion of the LaSal Mountain Loop Road Scenic Backway. Manage for scenic driving enjoyment. The corridor is defined as having a width of 1/2 mile from centerline, or line of sight or to border of adjoining focus area (whichever is shorter; see VRM for management prescriptions). | **Focus Area: Scenic Driving Corridors:**<br>Same as the Proposed Plan, except reduce scenic corridor average width to 1/4 mile from centerline (or to border of adjoining focus area; see VRM for management prescriptions). |
| **Focus Areas: Specialized Sport Venue, Non-motorized:**<br>N/A | **Focus Areas: Specialized Sport Venue, Non-motorized:**<br>• No specialized sport venue-non motorized would be established.<br>• BASE jumping would not be allowed in developed recreation sites. | **Focus Areas: Specialized Sport Venue, Non-motorized:**<br>• Tombstone Competitive BASE Jumping Focus Area (42 acres):<br>Manage Tombstone area to provide BASE jumping opportunities along the Kane Creek Road.<br>BASE jumping would not be allowed in developed recreation sites.<br>• Wall Street Sport Climbing Focus Area (44 acres) (with special protective measures taken for rock art):<br>Manage Wall Street area to provide rock climbing opportunities along the Potash Road. | **Focus Areas: Specialized Sport Venue, Non-motorized:**<br>Same as the Proposed Plan, except BASE-jumping would be allowed in all areas. |
| **Boating Management:**<br>Dewey to Castle Creek: Continue the existing river management program on the Colorado and Dolores Rivers (24,000 passenger days per year: 30 commercial outfitters) to provide for the safe and enjoyable long-term use of the rivers. | **Boating Management:**<br>Same as the Proposed Plan, except:<br>• Dewey to Castle Creek: No restrictions on amount of private use would be established unless unacceptable resource impacts occur. Permit 20 unallocated and 2 allocated (100 user days each) commercial permits. Establish additional restrictions on amount of commercial use if conditions warrant based on desired resources objectives.<br>• Camping would be restricted to existing campgrounds along the Colorado River from Dewey to Castle Creek. There would be no camping along the north side of the Colorado River. | **Boating Management:**<br>• Dewey to Castle Creek: Manage to provide an opportunity for scenic, mild whitewater boating. No restrictions on amount of private use would be established unless unacceptable resource impacts occur. Permit 22 unallocated commercial permits. No further restrictions on amount of commercial use would be established.<br>• Camping would be restricted to designated campsites along the north side of the Colorado River and existing campgrounds on the south side of the Colorado River. | **Boating Management:**<br>Same as the Proposed Plan, except:<br>• Dewey to Castle Creek: Permit 25 unallocated commercial permits.<br>• River access camping by boaters would be allowed on the north side of the Colorado River and limited to existing campgrounds on the south side of the Colorado River.<br>• Camping on the south side of the river: same as the Proposed Plan. |
| **Dolores River Canyons SRMA** | | | |
| **Alternative A (No Action)** | **Alternative B** | **PROPOSED PLAN** | **Alternative D** |
| Continue to manage the Dolores River Canyons area for general recreation use. BLM presently has no recreation management plan in place for the area except for private and commercial boating management.<br>The Dolores River and its floodplain is an existing SRMA (Colorado River SRMA). | Same as the Proposed Plan. | Manage the Dolores River Canyons (Map 2-8) as an Undeveloped SRMA (31,661 acres).<br>• Maintain high quality opportunities for non-motorized boating and day hiking or backpacking in a remote setting supported by basic trailheads, trails, and car camping facilities that support primitive, non-motorized use of the canyon system.<br>• Major management actions would include prohibition of motorized and mechanized recreation use within the Dolores River's tributary canyons consistent with the Travel Plan.<br>• No new motorized routes would be considered. | Dolores River Canyons SRMA would not be established. |
| **Boating Management:**<br>Colorado State Line to Bridge Canyon: Continue the existing river management program on the Colorado and Dolores Rivers (24,000 passenger days per year: 30 commercial outfitters) to provide for the safe and enjoyable long-term use of the rivers. | **Boating Management:**<br>Same as the Proposed Plan, except:<br>• Colorado State Line to Bridge Canyon: establish maximum group size of 16 (including guides on commercial trips). | **Boating Management:**<br>Colorado State Line to Bridge Canyon: Manage to provide opportunities for scenic whitewater boating trips. Permits required for private and commercial use. Establish maximum group size of 25 (excluding guides on commercial trips). Do not establish daily launch limits. Permit 14 unallocated commercial outfitters. | **Boating Management:**<br>Dolores River Canyons SRMA would not be established. |
| **Labyrinth Rims/Gemini Bridges SRMA** | | | |
| **Alternative A (No Action)** | **Alternative B** | **PROPOSED PLAN** | **Alternative D** |
| No specific recreation decisions were made under the Grand RMP for this area. | Same as the Proposed Plan, except: | Manage the Labyrinth Rims/Gemini Bridges area (Map 2-8) as a Destination | Establish Dee Pass SRMA (60,939 acres), consisting of the Dee Pass |

**Table 2.1. MOAB PROPOSED PLAN and Draft RMP Alternatives**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| BLM manages private boating use in Labyrinth Canyon in conjunction with the Utah Divisions of State Parks and Recreation and Fire, Forestry and State Lands under the terms of a cooperative agreement. The agreement establishes an interagency river permit system and coordinates implementation of common river protection rules including group size and use of fire pans and portable toilets. BLM also issues permits for shoreline use related commercial river trips.<br>Lands along the Green River in Labyrinth Canyon were withdrawn from new entry under the mining laws through the Three Rivers Withdrawal.<br>Front country type use takes place along SR 313 and the Island in the Sky Road. This highway was designated the Dead Horse Mesa Scenic Byway by the State of Utah in the early 2000s. To manage dispersed camping and protect scenic values, BLM established a 1-mile-wide corridor along SR 313 and the Island in the Sky Entrance Road where camping is limited to designated sites, wood cutting and firewood gathering are prohibited, and portable toilets are required. BLM currently limits camping in the corridor to the Horsethief Campground, the Big Mesa, and Cowboy Camp camping areas. BLM also limits camping and prohibits woodcutting and firewood gathering in a one-mile-wide corridor along the Gemini Bridges Road. Manage the small Cowboy Camp for tent camping and manage the Big Mesa area for group use.<br>OHV and mountain bike travel are limited to existing roads and trails in the portion of the area south of the Ten mile Point Road (except for the Bartlett/ Tusher Slickrock area which was left open for 2 wheel riding).<br>The area around the White Wash Sand Dunes is Open to OHV travel.<br>In addition to the Mineral Bottom Takeout, BLM manages several additional facilities in the area including the Mill Canyon Dinosaur Interpretive Trail, the Halfway Stage Station Interpretive Site, and the Copper Ridge Sauropod Trackway Interpretive site. BLM also manages and maintains route markings (with user group assistance) on the Monitor and Merrimac, Seven Mile Rim, Poison Spider Mesa, Golden Spike, Goldbar Rim, Gemini Bridges, Lower Monitor and Merrimac, Bar M, and Klondike Bluffs routes which are used by both motorized and non-motorized visitors. The 3-D, Crystal Geyser, Hellroaring Rim, Secret Spire, and Wipeout Hill routes are authorized for Jeep Safari and other uses. | • The White Wash Sand Dunes and surrounding uplands would be managed to restore their ecological and scenic values and provide an opportunity for ecological interpretation and study. Emphasis would be placed upon protection of the cottonwood trees found in the open dune fields, water source protection, stream bank stabilization, and bighorn sheep habitat protection. Motorized travel in the White Wash area (like the rest of the SRMA) would be limited to designated routes.<br>• Close the Bartlett/Tusher/Courthouse/Ten Mile area to camping. | SRMA (300,650 acres). General management guidance includes building upon current management as outlined in Alternative A with the following additions:<br>• Continue issuing permits, for both private and commercial users, with common river protection rules for Labyrinth Rims/Gemini Bridges SRMA and consider extending the BLM/State cooperative agreement for management of non-commercial use to include management of commercial river use. If future use levels warrant, relocate the Mineral Bottom Takeout to a more suitable location and initiate cooperative site operations with the National Park Service.<br>• Limit camping to designated sites in high-use areas including the Scenic Driving Corridors and all areas east of the Dubinky Well Road as well as along Ten Mile Wash.<br>• Manage backcountry areas to facilitate scenic motorized touring on designated routes with special emphasis upon establishment of low-development, end of route parking areas and route signing.<br>• Improve road to the Mill Canyon Dinosaur Trailhead to accommodate passenger car traffic.<br>• Consider development of an alternative single-track mountain bike route on Poison Spider Mesa across the mesa top to the top of the Portal Trail. | motorized route system and the White Wash open OHV area. This area constitutes a subset of the Labyrinth Rims/Gemini Bridges area. |
| **Potential Future Facilities:**<br>N/A | **Potential Future Facilities:**<br>Same as the Proposed Plan, except:<br>• There would be no campground constructed in Bartlett Wash. Camping would not be allowed in Bartlett Wash.<br>• There would be no campground constructed at Courthouse Rock. Camping would not be allowed in the Courthouse Rock area. | **Potential Future Facilities:**<br>• Bartlett Campground: camping in this area would be restricted to this campground.<br>• Big Mesa Campground: camping in this area would be restricted to this campground.<br>• Blue Hills Road OHV Trailhead.<br>• Courthouse Rock Campground, camping in this area would be restricted to this campground.<br>• Cowboy Camp Campground, camping in this area would be restricted to this campground.<br>• Monitor and Merrimac Bicycle and OHV Trailhead relocation.<br>• White Wash Sand Dunes OHV Parking and Camping Area.<br>• Gemini Bridges Parking Area and Trailhead. | **Potential Future Facilities:**<br>Same as the Proposed Plan, except:<br>• Bartlett Campground would not be built; dispersed camping would be allowed in Bartlett.<br>• Expand White Wash Sand Dunes OHV Base Area, including campground. |
| **Focus Areas: Scenic Driving Corridors:**<br>N/A | **Focus Areas: Scenic Driving Corridors:**<br>Highway 313 and the Island in the Sky Road (Dead Horse Mesa Utah Scenic Byway): Manage for scenic driving enjoyment. The corridor is defined as having a width of 1 mile from centerline (or to border of adjoining focus area; see Appendix C). | **Focus Areas: Scenic Driving Corridors:**<br>Highway 313 and the Island in the Sky Road (Utah Scenic Byway): Manage for scenic driving enjoyment. The corridor is defined as having a width of 1/2 mile from centerline (or to border of adjoining focus area; see Appendix C). | **Focus Areas: Scenic Driving Corridors:**<br>No scenic driving focus areas would be established. |
| **Focus Areas: Non-mechanized Recreation:** | **Focus Areas: Non-mechanized Recreation:** | **Focus Areas: Non-mechanized Recreation:** | **Focus Areas: Non-mechanized Recreation:** |

**Table 2.1. MOAB PROPOSED PLAN and Draft RMP Alternatives**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| N/A | • Goldbar/Corona Arch Hiking Focus Area (4,787 acres) covers the lands below the Golden Spike OHV route inclusive of the Culvert Canyon drainage to the southern rim of Long Canyon. Manage the Corona Arch Trail for hiking only. Develop a hiking loop route in Culvert Canyon from the canyon bottom up to Jeep Arch and back on the western bench of Culvert Canyon. Apply a no surface occupancy stipulation for oil and gas leasing and preclude other surface-disturbing activities (see Appendix C) to protect primitive hiking opportunities and scenic values.<br>• White Wash Sand Dunes Ecological Study and Hiking Focus Area (9,708 acres) would be established.<br>• Ten Mile Canyon Hiking and Equestrian Focus Area (1,871 acres) inclusive of Ten Mile Wash from Dripping Spring to the Green Riverwith equestrian use limited to the main canyon.<br>• Spring Canyon Hiking Focus Area (457 acres) would be established upstream from the Spring Canyon Bottom Road. No new motorized routes would be considered.<br>• Labyrinth Canyon Canoe Focus Area (8,182 acres) inclusive of the rims along the east side of Labyrinth Canyon from Placer Bottom to Canyonlands National Park excluding the Hey Joe Mine OHV and mountain bike route and the route downstream from Spring Canyon. Temporal zoning, permitting and vehicle type restrictions would be used to mitigate user conflicts on the Hey Joe Mine Route.<br>• Seven Mile Canyons Equestrian Focus Area same as the Proposed Plan. | • Goldbar/Corona Arch Hiking Focus Area (4,191 acres) covers the lands below the Golden Spike OHV route inclusive of the Culvert Canyon drainage to the northern rim of Long Canyon exclusive of the main stem of the Day Point Road. Manage the Corona Arch Trail for hiking only. Develop a hiking loop route in Culvert Canyon from the canyon bottom up to Jeep Arch and back on the western bench of Culvert Canyon to the canyon to just up canyon from the railroad spur. Apply a no surface occupancy stipulation for oil and gas leasing and preclude other surface-disturbing activities (see Appendix C) to protect primitive hiking opportunities and scenic values. No new motorized routes would be considered.<br>• White Wash Sand Dunes Ecological Study and Hiking Focus Area would not be established.<br>• Ten Mile Canyon Hiking and Equestrian Focus area would not be established.<br>• Spring Canyon Hiking Focus Area (457 acres) would be established upstream from the Spring Canyon Bottom Road. No new motorized routes would be considered.<br>• Labyrinth Canyon Canoe Focus Area (7,709 acres) inclusive of the rims along the east side of Labyrinth Canyon from Placer Bottom to Mineral Bottom exclusive of the Hey Joe Mine OHV and mountain bike route. No new motorized routes would be considered.<br>• Seven Mile Canyons Equestrian Focus Area (1,026 acres) inclusive of the north and south forks of Seven Mile Canyon westward from the junction of the two canyons. Equestrian use in this area would be restricted to private (non-commercial) horse use. No new motorized routes would be considered.. | No non-mechanized focus areas would be established. |
| **Focus Areas: Mountain Bike Backcountry Touring:**<br>N/A | **Focus Areas: Mountain Bike Backcountry Touring:**<br>• Klondike Bluffs Mountain Biking Focus Area (14,626 acres) between Arches National Park and U.S. 191. Roads would be restricted to non-motorized access with the exception of Class B roads and the Copper Ridge Jeep Safari Route. Management same as the Proposed Plan (42 miles of road designated for motorized travel; 40 miles of route managed for mechanized use only).<br>• Bar M Mountain Biking Focus Area (2,904 acres) between Arches National Park, U.S. Highway 191 and the Bar M area state lands, exclusive of motorized access for the Copper Ridge Jeep Safari Route and the 191 rock quarry access road. Convert selected existing routes to mechanized routes. Recommend that the old highway route in Moab Canyon be managed for non-motorized use to facilitate use of the route as part of the 191 bike lane (12 miles of road designated for motorized travel; 10 miles of route managed for mechanized use only).<br>• Tusher Slickrock Mountain Biking Focus Area would not be established and would not available for slick rock mountain biking (there are no designated routes in this area).<br>• Mill Canyon/Upper Courthouse Mountain Biking Focus Area would not be established. Manage the Mill Canyon Dinosaur Trail for hiking only. | **Focus Areas: Mountain Bike Backcountry Touring:**<br>• Klondike Bluffs Mountain Biking Focus Area (14,626 acres) between Arches National Park and U.S. 191. Work with Grand County and SITLA to establish mountain-bike only opportunities in the Klondike area. Manage the Copper Ridge Sauropod Trackway Interpretive Trail for hiking only.<br>• Bar M Mountain Biking Focus Area (2,904 acres) between Arches National Park, U.S. Highway 191, and the Bar M area state lands, exclusive of motorized access for the Copper Ridge Jeep Safari Route and the 191 rock quarry access road. Convert existing routes to mechanized use and provide for a limited number of new and connecting routes to support use of area as the destination for the 191 bike lane. Recommend that the old highway route in Moab Canyon be managed for non-motorized use to facilitate use of the route as part of the 191 bike lane.<br>• Tusher Slickrock Mountain Biking Focus Area (428 acres) on slickrock between Bartlett and Tusher Washes with main access from Bartlett Wash to reduce traffic in Tusher Canyon. Manage the Tusher Canyon slickrock and Bartlett slickrock areas for mountain bike and hiking use only. Cross-country mountain biking across slick rock would be allowed throughout this area. | **Focus Areas: Mountain Bike Backcountry Touring:**<br>No mountain bike backcountry touring focus areas would be established. |
| **Focus Area: Motorized Backcountry Touring:** | **Focus Area: Motorized Backcountry Touring:** | • Mill Canyon/Upper Courthouse Mountain Biking Focus Area (5,744 acres) inclusive of areas within the Mill Canyon and upper Courthouse drainages with continued use of the Seven Mile Rim Jeep Safari route for motorized use, with non-motorized trailheads near the Mill Canyon Dinosaur Trail and the Halfway Stage Station. Manage the Mill Canyon Dinosaur Trail for hiking only (35 miles of road designated for motorized travel; 23 miles of route managed for mechanized use only).<br>**Focus Area: Motorized Backcountry Touring:** | **Focus Area: Motorized Backcountry Touring:** |

**Table 2.1. MOAB PROPOSED PLAN and Draft RMP Alternatives**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| N/A | Gemini Bridges/Poison Spider Mesa Focus Area would not be established. | Gemini Bridges/Poison Spider Mesa Focus Area (16,299 acres) for multiple use, including full-size OHV, ATV, and motorcycle use with consideration given to managing routes suitable for each vehicle type. Travel would be intensively managed on designated routes only. Close the spur route to Gemini Bridges to facilitate public use and help restore damaged lands along the spur route. Construct a parking area near the bridges. | • No motorized backcountry touring focus areas would be established. |
| **Focus Areas: Specialized Sport Venues (Non-motorized):**<br>N/A | **Focus Areas: Specialized Sport Venues (Non-motorized):**<br>• Mineral Canyon/Horsethief Point Competitive BASE Jumping Focus Area would not be established.<br>• Bartlett Slickrock Freeride Focus Area would not be established. | **Focus Areas: Specialized Sport Venues (Non-motorized):**<br>• Mineral Canyon/Horsethief Point Competitive BASE Jumping Focus Area (762 acres) would be established.<br>• Bartlett Slickrock Freeride Focus Area (166 acres) would be established. No man-made structures would be added to facilitate "stunt riding." | **Focus Areas: Specialized Sport Venues (Non-motorized):**<br>• No specialized sport venues (non-motorized) would be established. |
| **Focus Areas: Specialized Sport Venue (Motorized):**<br>N/A | **Focus Areas: Specialized Sport Venue (Motorized):**<br>• Dee Pass Motorized Trail Focus Area would not be established.<br>• Airport Hills Motocross Focus Area would not be established. | **Focus Areas: Specialized Sport Venue (Motorized):**<br>• Dee Pass Motorized Trail Focus Area (35,290 acres) for motorcycle and ATV use: This is the area for competitive motorized events. Competitive routes within this area would be identified based on site-specific NEPA analysis. All routes designated for motorized use in the accompanying Travel Plan would remain open while Section 106 cultural resource inventories are conducted. If these inventories indicate the presence of eligible sites within the travel corridor, the route would be altered or closed. All new routes would require Section 106 cultural resource inventory prior to designation. Establish a managed OHV route system with provision for ongoing management of existing single-track routes to maintain their single-track character.<br>• Airport Hills Motocross Focus Area (285 acres): Manage the focus area for motocross use in partnership with local government under the Recreation and Public Purposes Act. A patent would be issued to local government. | **Focus Areas: Specialized Sport Venue (Motorized):**<br>• Dee Pass Motorized Trail Focus Area (57,875 acres) for motorcycle and ATV use: This is the area for competitive motorized events. Competitive routes within this area would be identified based on site-specific NEPA analysis. All routes designated for motorized use in the accompanying Travel Plan would remain open while Section 106 cultural resource inventories are conducted. If these inventories indicate the present of eligible sites, the route would be altered or closed. All new routes would require Section 106 cultural resource inventory prior to designation. Establish a managed OHV route system with provision for on-going management of existing single-track routes to maintain their single-track character. |
| **Focus Areas: Managed Open OHV Areas (cross country travel allowed):**<br>N/A | **Focus Areas: Managed Open OHV Areas (cross country travel allowed):**<br>• No open areas for OHV use would be designated on public lands in the MPA.<br>• Open OHV use areas would not be considered for lease or patent under the Recreation and Public Purposes Act. | **Focus Areas: Managed Open OHV area (cross country travel allowed):**<br>• White Wash Sand Dunes Open OHV Focus Area, (1,866 acres) encompassing the area round the dunes themselves. Manage the central portion of the White Wash Sand Dunes for motorized sand play with exception of the dune field cottonwood trees and White Wash water sources which would be closed to motorized travel and fenced.<br>• Limit camping use in the White Wash Sand Dunes area to designated sites and establish basic camping facilities on the bench on the north side of White Wash.<br>• Implement a fee system, under the guidelines of the Federal Land Recreation Enhancement Act, to help fund cost of intensive management of the White Wash Sand Dunes area. | **Focus Areas: Managed Open OHV Areas (cross country travel allowed):**<br>• Greater White Wash Sand Dunes Open OHV Focus Area (3,064 acres) bounded by the Duma Point Road, the Red Wash/Ruby Ranch Road, and portion of the Crystal Geyser Jeep route between the Ruby Ranch Road and the Duma Point Road. Manage the entire Greater White Wash Sand Dune area as Open to OHV use for motorized sand play except for the dune field cottonwood trees and White Wash water sources which would be closed to motorized travel and fenced.<br>• Limit camping use in the White Wash Sand Dunes area to designated sites and establish basic camping facilities on the bench on the north side of White Wash.<br>• Implement a fee system to help fund cost of intensive management of the White Wash Sand Dunes area. |
| **Lower Gray Canyon SRMA** | | | |
| **Alternative A (No Action)** | **Alternative B** | **PROPOSED PLAN** | **Alternative D** |
| Continue existing management as described in the 1979 Desolation-Gray Canyons Management Plan prepared by the BLM Price Field Office. | Same as the Proposed Plan. | • Manage the Lower Gray Canyon SRMA (3,759 acres within the MPA; see Map 2-8) as a Destination SRMA in coordination with the Price Field Office.<br>• Manage river recreation in accordance with the Desolation-Gray Canyons Management Plan.<br>• Manage the existing riverside and the parallel bench route loop trails from Nefertiti Rapid to Rattlesnake Canyon for hiking and equestrian use.<br>• Vehicle camping limited to designated sites. | Lower Gray Canyon SRMA would not be established. |

**Table 2.1. MOAB PROPOSED PLAN and Draft RMP Alternatives**

| Sand Flats SRMA | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Alternative A (No Action)** | **Alternative B** | **PROPOSED PLAN** | **Alternative D** |
| The Sand Flats RAMP was approved in August of 1994. Management of the Sand Flats Recreation Area is also supported by the June 1994 Cooperative Agreement with Grand County, which authorizes the county to collect fees for the benefit of the recreation area and participate in the operational management of the area to help implement the recreation area management plan.<br>The plan includes:<br>1. Acquisition of State lands through exchange.<br>2. OHV travel limited to designated roads and trails.<br>3. Provision for entrance and use fees.<br>4. Development of campgrounds.<br>5. Potential development of a drinking water source.<br>6. Provision for parking lots at the Slickrock and Little Spring trailheads.<br>7. Installation of toilets.<br>8. Development of an entrance station.<br>9. Provision for visitor protection.<br>10. Information and various services.<br>11. Limit camping to designated sites.<br>12. Limit OHV and mountain bike travel to designated routes.<br>13. Prohibit wood collecting and gathering. | Same as the Proposed Plan, except:<br>• Close the Moab Slickrock Bike Trail to all motorized vehicles. | Same as Alternative A, plus:<br>• Manage the Sand Flats Area (Map 2-8) as a Destination SRMA (6,246 acres). Guidance for management is included in the Sand Flats RAMP.<br>• Close the Moab Slickrock Bike Trail to four-wheeled vehicles and ATV use for safety purposes.<br>• The Slickrock Bike Trail would be open to motorcycles and mountain bikes only.<br>• Apply a no surface occupancy stipulation for oil and gas leasing and preclude other surface-disturbing activities (see Appendix C) to protect recreation and scenic values. | Same as the Proposed Plan, except:<br>• Establish a Slickrock mountain bike free-ride area.<br>• Apply a controlled surface use stipulation for oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities (see Appendix C) to protect scenic values (VRM Class II). |
| **South Moab SRMA** | | | |
| **Alternative A (No Action)** | **Alternative B** | **PROPOSED PLAN** | **Alternative D** |
| Continue to manage the Mill Creek Power Dam hiking trailhead, the Ken's Lake Recreation Site, the Hidden Valley hiking trailhead and the Blue Hill multi-use trailhead and undeveloped camping area as recreation sites. Continue to manage the Mill Creek Canyon hiking trails, the Ken's Lake hiking trail system, the Hidden Valley Hiking trail, the Steelbender/Flat Pass OHV/ mountain bike route, the Behind the Rocks OHV route, the Strike Ravine OHV route, and the Kane Creek Canyon Rim OHV/mountain bike route as recreation routes.<br>Continue to limit camping to designated sites and prohibit wood gathering and cutting along the Black Ridge Road, the Pack Creek Road, the LaSal Mountain Loop Road and the Kane Creek Canyon Rim Road out to the Picture Frame Arch area. Prohibit camping on the west side of Spanish Valley, and in Mill Creek. | Same as the Proposed Plan. | Manage the South Moab SRMA (Map 2-8) as a Destination SRMA (63,999 acres).<br>• Same as Alternative A, except provide additional emphasis upon development of non-motorized trails through agreements with neighboring land owners through preparation of management guidance covering the Ken's Lake area.<br>• Work with Grand and San Juan counties to establish the New Spanish Trail Bicycle Lane to provide safe bicycle access from Canyonlands Field to the Pack Creek Picnic Area.<br>• Work with Moab City and Grand County to extend the Mill Creek Parkway to the Power Dam trailhead to provide safe access for cyclists and hikers.<br>• Formalize and continue the existing partnership with the water district to share management expenses at Ken's Lake. | South Moab would not be established as an SRMA. |
| Continue to manage Ken's Lake as a developed recreation site in partnership with the holders of the ROW for Ken's Lake (Spanish Valley Water and Sewer District).<br>Continue to manage the Mill Creek Canyon planning area in accordance with the approved interdisciplinary Mill Creek Canyon Management Plan. | | • Manage the Mill Creek Canyon planning area in accordance with the approved interdisciplinary management plan (as in Alternative A).<br>• Work with Grand County, SITLA, and private land owners to establish the "Power line" trail along the west side of Moab and Spanish Valleys from Kane Creek Road near the river portal south via the Hidden Valley Trailhead to the southern end of the Behind the Rocks area.<br>• Work with San Juan and Grand Counties, SITLA, and private land owners to establish the Red Rock Horse Trail along the east side of Spanish Valley via Ken's Lake from the Johnson's Up-on-Top Road to the Loop Road/Pack Creek junction area.<br>• Work with the Backcountry Horsemen, SITLA and San Juan County to establish *equestrian riding loop routes south from the Ken's Lake Trailhead.* | |

**Table 2.1. MOAB PROPOSED PLAN and Draft RMP Alternatives**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Focus Areas: Scenic Driving Corridors:**<br>N/A | **Focus Areas: Scenic Driving Corridors:**<br>LaSal Mountain Loop Road Scenic Backway: Manage for scenic driving enjoyment. The corridor is defined as: having a width of 1 mile from centerline (or to border of adjoining focus area; see Appendix C). | **Focus Areas: Scenic Driving Corridors:**<br>LaSal Mountain Loop Road Scenic Backway. Manage for scenic driving enjoyment. The corridor is defined as: having a width of 1/2 mile from centerline (or to border of adjoining focus area) (see Appendix C). | **Focus Areas: Scenic Driving Corridors:**<br>South Moab would not be established as an SRMA. |
| **Focus Areas: Non-mechanized Recreation:**<br>N/A | **Focus Areas: Non-mechanized Recreation:**<br>• Mill Creek Canyon Hiking Focus Area: Same as the Proposed Plan, except include motorized routes identified in the Travel Plan for this alternative. Temporal zoning, permitting and vehicle type restrictions would be used to mitigate user conflicts on the Steel Bender Routes.<br>• Behind the Rocks Hiking Focus Area: Same as the Proposed Plan. Temporal zoning, permitting, and vehicle type restrictions would be used to mitigate user conflicts on the Pritchett Canyon and Moab Rims. Hunter Canyon Rim Road at the end of the Jeep Safari route is available for mountain bike travel.<br>• Manage Hidden Valley Trail as non-mechanized only. | **Focus Areas: Non-mechanized Recreation:**<br>• Mill Creek Canyon Hiking Focus Area (16,950 acres) inclusive of the north and south forks of Mill Creek, Rill Creek, and Burkholder Draw south to the LaSal Mountain Loop Road with motorized use limited to the Steelbender OHV route and routes identified in the Travel Plan for this alternative. Emphasize management of the core area of Mill Creek to provide primitive hiking opportunities. Commercial equestrian use of Mill Creek Canyon and its tributaries would be prohibited except for use along the Steelbender/Flat Pass OHV/mountain bike route. No new motorized routes would be considered.<br>• Behind the Rocks Hiking Focus Area (17,536 acres) inclusive of the area currently closed to motorized use in the 1985 RMP and the Hunter Canyon area between Pritchett Canyon and the eastern rim of Kane Creek Canyon exclusive of the Pritchett Canyon and Behind the Rocks OHV route. Manage the Hunter Canyon trail for hiking only. Emphasize the management the core area of Behind the Rocks to provide primitive hiking opportunities. No new motorized routes would be considered. | **Focus Areas: Non-mechanized Recreation:**<br>South Moab would not be established as an SRMA. |
| **Focus Area: Mountain Bike Backcountry Touring:**<br>N/A | **Focus Area: Mountain Bike Backcountry Touring:**<br>Same as the Proposed Plan. | **Focus Area: Mountain Bike Backcountry Touring:**<br>Upper Spanish Valley Mountain Biking Focus Area (2,255 acres; Mud Spring Area) for development of a beginner to intermediate skill level mountain bike trail system through conversion of existing routes and development of new routes. Work with SITLA to expand route system on adjacent state lands. | **Focus Area: Mountain Bike Backcountry Touring:**<br>South Moab would not be established as an SRMA. |
| **Focus Area: Specialized Sport Venue (Non-motorized):**<br>N/A | **Focus Area: Specialized Sport Venue (Non-motorized):**<br>Same as the Proposed Plan. | **Focus Area: Specialized Sport Venue (Non-motorized):**<br>24 Hours of Moab Focus Area (2,905 acres) would be established to facilitate mountain bike speed-related events. | **Focus Area: Specialized Sport Venue (Non-motorized):**<br>South Moab would not be established as an SRMA. |
| **Focus Area: Specialized Sport Venue (Motorized):**<br>N/A | **Focus Area: Specialized Sport Venue (Motorized):**<br>Potato Salad Hill spur route would be closed to motorized travel. | **Focus Area: Specialized Sport Venue (Motorized):**<br>Potato Salad Hill Climbing Focus Area (41 acres) would be established within the boundary of the fenced areas emphasizing hill climbing events. Parking limitations would be established to limit vehicle group size.* | **Focus Area: Specialized Sport Venue (Motorized):**<br>South Moab would not be established as an SRMA. |
| **Two Rivers SRMA** | | | |
| **Alternative A (No Action)** | **Alternative B** | **PROPOSED PLAN** | **Alternative D** |
| The 1985 RMP provided for continuation of the river management program, which was initiated in early 1970s in response to increased demand for recreational boating. Existing management of the Colorado River focuses upon providing facilities and management to support and regulate commercial and private river use of the Colorado and Lower Dolores Rivers. Management activities are described in the annual Colorado and Dolores Rivers operating plan. | Same as the Proposed Plan. | Manage the Two Rivers SRMA (29,839 acres) as a Destination SRMA (Map 2-8) with the objective of continuing to provide distinct, high quality opportunities for recreational boating and camping, and to protect the outstanding resource values. Use launch systems and campsite assignments to reduce inter-party contacts. | Manage the Two Rivers SRMA (14,056 acres) as a Destination SRMA with the objective of continuing to provide distinct, high quality opportunities for recreational boating and camping. Use launch systems and campsite assignments to reduce inter-party contacts. |
| **Boating Management:**<br>Continue the existing river management programs on the Colorado and Dolores Rivers (24,000 passenger days per year; 30 commercial outfitters) to provide for the safe and enjoyable long-term use of the rivers. | **Boating Management:**<br>Same as the Proposed Plan except:<br>• State Line to Westwater Ranger Station: Seek to manage for moderate use flat water boating in conjunction with the Ruby/Horsethief Canyons section in Colorado.<br>• Westwater Canyon: Manage to provide an opportunity for whitewater boating in a highly primitive and very remote setting. Establish maximum group size of 16 (including guides on commercial trips). Establish daily launch limit of 48 people for each sector. | **Boating Management:**<br>• State Line to Westwater Ranger Station: Manage for relatively high use flat water boating in conjunction with the Ruby/Horsethief Canyons section in Colorado. Co-administer a private boating or parking permit system and user limitations and fees in conjunction with Colorado BLM as a means of providing for adequate take-out.<br>• Westwater Canyon: Manage to provide an opportunity for whitewater boating in a primitive and remote setting. Permits required for private and commercial use. Distribute potential use levels equally from May 1 to | **Boating Management:**<br>Same as the Proposed Plan, except:<br>• State Line to Westwater Ranger Station: Seek to manage for of high use flat water boating in conjunction with the Ruby/Horsethief Canyons section in Colorado.<br>• Westwater Canyon: Manage to provide an opportunity for whitewater boating in a semi-primitive (social only) and remote setting. Establish maximum group size of 32 (including guides on commercial trips). Establish daily launch limit of 128 people for each sector. |

**Table 2.1. MOAB PROPOSED PLAN and Draft RMP Alternatives**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | • Cisco Landing to Dewey Bridge: For private use, no restrictions on amount of private use would be established unless warranted by future use levels. Permit 20 unallocated and 2 allocated (100 user days each) commercial permits. Establish additional restrictions on amount of commercial use if conditions warrant based on desired resource objectives.<br>• Dolores River from Bridge Canyon to its confluence with the Colorado River: Establish maximum group size of 16 (including guides on commercial trips). | September 30 (allocation season) between private and commercial sectors (including guides). Establish maximum private group size of 25 people and a daily launch limit of 75 people. For commercial use, establish a maximum trip size of 25 passengers, plus one crew member per passenger carrying craft, plus two additional crew. Establish a commercial daily launch limit of 75 passengers. Permit 18 commercial outfitters.<br>• Cisco Landing to Dewey Bridge: Manage to provide an opportunity for scenic flat water boating or as an extension of Westwater Canyon trips. For private use, no restrictions on amount of use would be established. Permit 22 unallocated commercial permits. No further restrictions on amount of commercial use would be established. Manage the Dewey Bridge Recreation Site under the Colorado Riverway RAMP.<br>• Dolores River from Bridge Canyon to its confluence with the Colorado River: Manage to provide opportunity for scenic whitewater boating trips. Permits required for private and commercial use. Establish maximum group size of 25 (excluding guides on commercial trips). Do not establish daily launch limits. Permit 14 unallocated commercial outfitters. | • Cisco Landing to Dewey Bridge: Permit 25 unallocated commercial permits.<br>• Dolores River from Colorado State Line to its confluence with the Colorado River: Establish maximum group size of 32 (excluding guides on commercial trips. |
| **Potential Future Facilities:**<br>N/A | **Potential Future Facilities:**<br>Same as the Proposed Plan, except do not seek to develop a take-out facility separate from the Westwater Ranger Station launch ramp. | **Potential Future Facilities:**<br>Acquire additional lands at the Westwater Ranger Station to include additional camping, parking and launch facilities. Seek to develop a take-out facility separate from the Westwater Ranger Station launch ramp to reduce congestion at the ranger station. Seek opportunities to expand legal and physical access to facilitate camping at the Ranger Station. | **Potential Future Facilities:**<br>Same as the Proposed Plan. |
| **Focus Area: Non-mechanized Recreation:**<br>N/A | **Focus Area: Non-mechanized Recreation:**<br>Same as the Proposed Plan. | **Focus Area: Non-mechanized Recreation:**<br>• Establish the Westwater Canyon River Use and Hiking Focus Area (23,479 acres) inclusive of Westwater Canyon along the Colorado River between Westwater Ranch and Rose Ranch and the surrounding uplands.<br>• New motorized routes would not be considered. | **Focus Area: Non-mechanized Recreation:**<br>The focus areas would not be established. |
| **Utah Rims SRMA** | | | |
| **Alternative A (No Action)** | **Alternative B** | **PROPOSED PLAN** | **Alternative D** |
| Continue to manage the Utah Rims area for general recreation use. BLM presently has a limited management program in place for the area included in the proposed Utah Rims SRMA.<br>Manage the Kokopelli's Trail for recreation use.<br>Manage Bitter Creek Campsite for camping.<br>Continue limiting travel to existing routes. | Same as the Proposed Plan, except:<br>• No new recreational routes would be established. | Manage the Utah Rims area (Map 2-8) as a Community SRMA (15,424 acres) to provide sustainable opportunities for motorized, mechanized and non-motorized route related recreation while protecting and maintaining resource values including range, wildlife habitat, scenic, cultural, recreational, and riparian values in current or improved condition. Work with Colorado BLM to coordinate management of the Utah Rims and Rabbit Valley Colorado areas.<br>Management actions would include:<br>1. Limiting motorized and mechanized travel to a designated road and route system, including where feasible, the establishment and management of a network of single-track routes.<br>2. Acquisition of public access across non-Federal lands for the route system.<br>3. Development of a staging area.<br>4. Potential separation of types of single-track route use by time period.<br>5. Limited provision of camping facilities.<br>6. Prohibition of competitive, motorized events on the single-track route system to maintain its single-track nature.<br>Add single-track routes to the route system on a case-by-case basis pending resolution of resource concerns. | Utah Rims SRMA would not be established. |

**Table 2.1. MOAB PROPOSED PLAN and Draft RMP Alternatives**

## Moab Extensive Recreation Management Area (ERMA) Establishment

**Management common to the PROPOSED PLAN and Draft RMP Alternatives B and D:**

- Manage all lands within the MPA not within an SRMA as the Moab Extensive Recreation Management Area (ERMA; see Maps 2-8-A through 2-8-D and Appendix F).
- ERMA lands may be designated as SRMAs in the future based on intensity of use and would be analyzed through the plan amendment process.
- Minimal facilities may be constructed in the ERMA as needed to insure visitor health and safety, reduce user conflict, and protect resources.
- Provide general recreation management guidance and subsequent implementation of management actions for activity plan level actions for the Moab ERMA through development of a Recreation Area Management Plan (RAMP). Address both site-related issues (development and management in response to user demand and changing conditions) and backcountry management issues (the retention of backcountry characteristics, e.g., low level of development, relative lack of crowding, and feeling of remoteness).
- Amend the RMP, as necessary, for RMP level recreation and non-recreation actions proposed through the RAMP developed subsequent to RMP approval.
- Manage OHV travel as limited to designated routes or closed, depending on the specific area (see Travel Management section, beginning on page 2-47).
- Monitor recreation activity in the Moab ERMA to maintain recreation opportunities and protect resource values.

## Moab ERMA Management Guidance

| Alternative A (No Action) | Alternative B | PROPOSED PLAN | Alternative D |
|---|---|---|---|
| Continue making improvements to sites and areas as necessary and supported by activity and project level planning to balance demand for recreation opportunities and protection of the recreation resource base.<br>Continue to manage the Utah portion of the Kokopelli's Trail as a multi-day mountain bike and vehicle route (in part) with associated camping areas. | Same as the Proposed Plan, except:<br>• Upper Fisher Mesa would not be managed to emphasize mountain biking use. | • Continue making improvements to sites and areas as necessary and supported by activity and project level planning to balance demand for recreation opportunities and protection of the recreation resource base.<br>• Continue to manage the Utah portion of the Kokopelli's Trail as a multi-day mountain bike and vehicle route (in part) with associated camping areas.<br>• Develop basic camping and trailhead facilities to serve the Lost Spring Canyon area should use levels and impacts warrant.<br>• Construct information boards at the main exits along I-70 to inform visitors about recreation opportunities, travel management, low impact recreation techniques, and visitor safety issues.<br>• Upper Fisher Mesa (1,365 acres) would be managed to emphasize mountain biking. BLM would convert existing roads and provide new connecting routes for bicycle use in conjunction with the existing bike route within the Manti-LaSal National Forest. Motorized access would be retained along the main existing Fisher Mesa access road.<br>• Manage the Bookcliffs area (335,457 acres) for non-mechanized recreation, especially equestrian use, hiking, backpacking and big game hunting. It would be managed for low frequency of visitor interaction by not establishing new motorized or mechanized recreation routes, no commercial motorized permits would be issued, and competitive events would not be allowed.<br>• Manage the Sego Canyon Rock Art Site as a day use recreation area. Consider acquisition of the adjacent private rock art area north of the interpretive site to expand interpretive opportunities. | Same as the Proposed Plan, except:<br>• Manage the Bookcliffs area (141,679 acres) for non-mechanized recreation, especially equestrian use, hiking, backpacking and big game hunting. It would be managed for low frequency of visitor interaction by not establishing new motorized or mechanized recreation routes, no commercial motorized permits would be issued, and competitive events would not be allowed. |

## General Policy for Issuance and Management of Special Recreation Permits (SRPs)

**Management Common to the PROPOSED PLAN and Draft RMP Alternatives A, B, and D:**

- SRPs would be issued as a discretionary action as a means to: help meet management objectives, provide opportunities for economic activity, facilitate recreational use of the public lands, control visitor use, protect recreational and natural resources, and provide for the health and safety of visitors. Cost recovery procedures for issuing SRPs would be applied where appropriate.
- Priority for authorization of new SRPs for events would be given to applicants proposing uses that: do not duplicate existing events; take place outside of March, April, May, and October; make use of less-crowded weekdays; utilize facilities off public lands for overnight accommodation of guests; display and communicate the Canyon Country Minimum Impact Practices; and focus visitation on sites and areas capable of withstanding repeated use.
- All SRPs would contain standard stipulations appropriate for the type of activity and may include additional stipulations necessary to protect lands or resources, reduce user conflicts, or minimize health and safety concerns.
- There would be no competitive mechanized or motorized events in Wilderness Study Areas while these areas are managed under the IMP.

| Alternative A (No Action) | Alternative B | PROPOSED PLAN | Alternative D |
|---|---|---|---|
| Continue to issue and manage special recreation permits (e.g., four-wheel drive vehicle tours, horseback trips, bear hunting camps, survival school) to enhance outdoor recreational opportunities and provide business opportunities for | Same as the Proposed Plan, except:<br>• Increased emphasis would be placed upon mitigating the impacts of new | • Issue and manage special recreation permits for a wide variety of uses to enhance outdoor recreational opportunities, provide opportunities for private enterprise, manage user-group interaction, and limit the impacts of | • Same as the Proposed Plan, except that increased emphasis would be placed upon realizing positive economic and community benefits through SRP management. |

**Table 2.1. MOAB PROPOSED PLAN and Draft RMP Alternatives**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| private enterprise.<br>Continue to permit competitive and noncompetitive OHV events. | uses in support of conservation of natural and cultural resource values.<br>• Organized group permits required for groups with 15 or more vehicles (one driver/vehicle.) | such uses upon natural and cultural resources.<br>• Organized group permits required for groups with 25 or more vehicles (one driver/vehicle.) | • Organized group permits required for groups with 50 or more vehicles (one driver/vehicle.) |
| **RIPARIAN** | | | |
| **Goals and Objectives:**<br>• Manage riparian areas for properly functioning condition (PFC) and ensure stream channel morphology and functions are appropriate for local soil type, climate, and landform.<br>• Avoid or minimize the disturbance, loss, or degradation of riparian, wetland, and associated floodplains; preserve and enhance natural and beneficial values; and provide for fish, wildlife and special status species habitats.<br>**Management common to the PROPOSED PLAN and Draft RMP Alternatives A, B, and D:**<br>• Manage riparian resources for PFC, which is described as the presence of adequate vegetation, landforms, or large woody debris, in accordance with the Utah Standards for Public Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Recreation Management for BLM Lands in Utah and with the Grazing Guidelines for Grazing Management.<br>• Retain the Between the Creeks, North Sand Flats, and South Sand Flats Allotments as not available for grazing to benefit riparian resources. These allotments include the following streams: Negro Bill Canyon, portions of Mill Creek, and Rill Creek.<br>• Mitigation to reduce impacts to floodplains and riparian areas include (from Standards for Public Land Health and Guidelines for Recreation Management for BLM Lands in Utah and BLM Riparian Manual 1737):<br>1. Where feasible and consistent with user safety, developed travel routes would be located/relocated away from sensitive riparian/wetland areas.<br>2. Camping in riparian areas would be avoided and must be managed, monitored, and modified as conditions dictate to reduce vegetation disturbance and sedimentation.<br>3. Stream crossings would be limited in number dictated by the topography, geology, and soil type. Design any necessary stream crossings to minimize sedimentation, soil erosion and compaction (minimize longitudinal routes along stream banks, design crossings perpendicular to the stream).<br>4. Where necessary, control recreational use by changing location or kind of activity, season, intensity, distribution and/or duration.<br>5. Grazing actions to meet riparian objectives include vegetation use limits, fencing, herding, change of livestock class, temporary closures, change of season, and/or alternate development or relocation of water sources.<br>6. Any water diversions from riparian areas by BLM or non-BLM entities would be designed and constructed to protect ecological processes and functions.<br>7. Implement weed management stipulations and education to reduce spread of noxious weeds along stream corridors.<br>8. To the extent possible, mineral removal and lease development (including placer mining) must be located away from water's edge and outside of riparian/wetland zones.<br>**Management common to the PROPOSED PLAN and Draft RMP Alternatives B and D:**<br>• Limit activities in riparian areas, as necessary, to achieve and maintain PFC.<br>• Grazing actions to meet riparian objectives can include fencing, herding, change of livestock class, temporary closures, and/or change of livestock season of use.<br>• Preclude surface-disturbing activities within 100-year floodplains, 100 m of riparian areas, public water reserves, and 100 m of springs.<br>• Prioritize restoration activities in riparian systems that are Functioning at Risk or Non-functioning.<br>• Continue to apply integrated species management to accomplish riparian restoration through biological, chemical, mechanical, and manual methods (e.g., tamarisk control, willow plantings).<br>• Acquire riparian lands and water resources (from willing sellers) to preserve and maintain riparian habitat and instream flow.<br>• Do not dispose of riparian or wetland resources unless resource loss is mitigated.<br>• Develop watershed management plans for impaired systems as identified in current TMDL reports (e.g., Onion Creek, Mill Creek, and Castle Creek).<br>• Close riparian areas to woodcutting, except where permitted for traditional cultural practices identified for Native Americans or for restoration to benefit riparian values.<br>• Establish Lower South Fork of Seven Mile Canyon as a Riparian/Wetland Demonstration Area for the improvement and restoration of riparian, wetland and wildlife resources.<br>• Grazing would not be authorized on portions of the following streams (listed with affected allotments): the Colorado River from Dewey Bridge to Hittle Bottom (Professor Valley), and Lower Kane Creek (Kane Creek Springs).<br>• Management strategies would be implemented to restore degraded riparian communities, protect natural flow requirements, protect water quality, and manage for year-round flow. | | | |
| **Alternative A (No Action)** | **Alternative B** | **PROPOSED PLAN** | **Alternative D** |
| **Grazing Actions:**<br>• Retain the Between the Creeks, North Sand Flats, South Sand Flats, Spring Creek, Castle Valley, Pear Park, Bogart, Cottonwood and Diamond Allotments as not available to grazing to benefit riparian resources.<br>• Maintain the reduction of AUMs in the Cisco Allotment (1,819 AUMs allocated to livestock). | **Grazing Actions:**<br>• Evaluate non-functioning and functioning at risk riparian areas using Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management to determine if exclusion from grazing would improve riparian functioning condition.<br>• The following riparian areas would be given priority for evaluation: Lower Gray Canyon of the Green River from Rattlesnake Canyon to Swasey's Beach, Ten Mile from Dripping Spring to the Green River, Mill Creek, Seven Mile Canyon, East Coyote, Kane Springs, and Hatch Wash (totaling 4,673 acres).<br>• BLM would be required to build and maintain fences and provide access to water in Seven Mile Wash, and East Coyote wetland areas.<br>• Cottonwood, Bogart and Diamond Allotments (which include Cottonwood and Diamond Canyons) would continue to not be available | **Grazing Actions:**<br>• Evaluate non-functioning and functioning at risk riparian areas using Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management to determine if restriction from grazing would improve riparian functioning condition. The following riparian areas would be given priority for evaluation: Ten Mile from Dripping Spring to the Green River, Mill Creek, Seven Mile Canyon, and East Coyote (totaling 1,420 acres).<br>• Cottonwood, Bogart, Pear Park and Diamond Allotments (which include Cottonwood and Diamond Canyons) would continue to be not available to grazing to benefit riparian resources. Castle Valley would also not be available for grazing. Spring Creek would be available for grazing. | **Grazing Actions:**<br>• Grazing management in riparian areas would be identical as described in Alternative A, except that Spring Creek, Pear Park, Castle Valley, Cottonwood, Diamond and Bogart Allotments would be available for grazing. |

**Table 2.1. MOAB PROPOSED PLAN and Draft RMP Alternatives**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | to grazing to benefit riparian resources. Castle Valley, Spring Creek and Pear Park would also be not available for grazing. | | |
| **Season-of-Use:**<br>N/A | **Season-of-Use:**<br>Season of use adjustments would be made on a case-by-case basis to achieve PFC. | **Season-of-Use:**<br>Season of use adjustments would be made on a case-by-case basis to achieve PFC. | **Season-of-Use:**<br>Season of use adjustments would be made on a case-by-case basis to achieve PFC. |
| **Watershed Management Plans:**<br>Not specified. | **Watershed Management Plans:**<br>Prioritize development and implementation of the Watershed Management Plans and riparian studies for the following areas: Mill Creek (including North Fork, Rill, and Burkholder), Ten Mile Wash, Kane Springs, White Wash, Bartlett Wash, Tusher Wash, Mill Canyon, Courthouse Wash, Professor Creek, Negro Bill Canyon, Cottonwood/Diamond, Spring Canyon, Red Wash, Green River, Colorado River, Onion Creek and Westwater Creek. | **Watershed Management Plans:**<br>Prioritize development and implementation of the Watershed Management Plans and riparian studies for the following areas: Ten Mile Wash, Kane Springs, Bartlett Wash, Tusher Wash, Mill Canyon, Courthouse Wash, Cottonwood-Diamond, and Onion Creek. | **Watershed Management Plans:**<br>Do not prioritize Watershed Management Plans. |

## SOIL AND WATER

### Goals and Objectives:

- Manage watersheds to enhance ecosystem health and provide for public uses.
- Maintain and improve existing water quality by ensuring that all authorized uses on public lands comply with State water quality standards and with the Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Act.
- Manage watersheds to maintain or improve soil quality and long-term productivity.

### Management common to the PROPOSED PLAN and Draft RMP Alternatives A, B, and D:

- Comply with all State, Federal and local laws to protect municipal watersheds (Thompson, Moab, and Castle Valley), and watersheds of any public or private water supply such as Windwhistle Campground, Westwater Ranger Station, La Sal Creek, and Browns Hole.
- Coordinate with Utah Division of Oil, Gas, and Mining to remediate existing Abandoned Mine Lands sites.
- Comply with Floodplain Executive Order 11988.
- BLM would work with partners to implement Best Management Practices (BMPs) and continue BLM's cooperative work with the Utah Divisions of Water Rights and Water Quality in accordance with the administrative memorandum of understanding (MOU) and the cooperative agreement addressing water quality monitoring.

### Management Common to the PROPOSED PLAN and Draft RMP Alternatives A, B, and D:

- Allow no surface occupancy and preclude surface-disturbing activities (see Appendix C) within 100-year floodplains, within 100 m of a natural spring, or within public water reserves.
- In cooperation with Grand and San Juan Counties, develop BMPs for road maintenance and construction in high risk areas (e.g., floodplains, riparian zones, and areas with sensitive soils).
- Continue management of the Mill Creek planning area in accordance with the Mill Creek Management Plan (2001).
- Develop watershed management plans for municipal watersheds to ensure water sources are protected adequately. Monitor municipal water quality/watershed conditions.
- To protect sensitive soils on slopes, apply a timing limitation stipulation for oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities (see Appendix C) prohibiting surface-disturbing activities on slopes in the Bookcliffs (see Map 2-12) greater than 30% from November 1 to April 30. This restriction includes road construction and traffic on existing roads associated with initial drilling operations. In addition, apply a controlled surface use stipulation for oil and gas and other surface-disturbing activities (see Appendix C) on slopes greater than 30% throughout the MPA.
- Follow Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) recommendations on 303(d) listed streams, currently Mill, Castle, and Onion Creeks.
- Minimize surface disturbance in areas identified as having "sensitive soils" (see Chapter 3, Soil and Water) unless long-term impacts can be mitigated.
- Maintain vegetation based on desired future condition to provide adequate ground cover to prevent accelerated erosion in wind erodible soils.
- Apply environmental BMPs to all oil and gas authorizations in accordance to WO IM 2007-021 and the most current version of the "Goldbook."
- Develop BMPs to address health and safety concerns associated with blowing dust along U.S. 191 and I-70.
- Maintain or improve soil quality and long-term soil productivity through the implementation of Standards for Rangeland Health and other soil protection measures.
- Manage uses to minimize and mitigate damage to soils.
- Maintain and/or restore overall watershed health and reduce erosion, stream sedimentation, and salinization of water.
- Coordinate with Grand Water and Sewer Service Agency to ensure required minimum instream flow of 3.0 cfs in Mill Creek below the Sheley diversion.
- Implement portions of Greater Sagers Wash Watershed Management Plan that pertain to surface disturbance.
- No additional OHV routes would be allowed in saline soils other than those already designated in the Travel Plan accompanying this RMP (see Appendix G). An exception would be considered on a case-by-case basis for proposed routes in the Dee Pass Motorized Focus Area and in the Utah Rim SRMA. Exceptions could also be considered on a case-by-case basis outside these two areas if potential impacts could be mitigated and if the action would benefit other natural and cultural resources.
- Develop BMPs for activities on saline and other sensitive soils.
- Specific recommendations regarding surface and subsurface pipeline crossings found in Guidance for Pipeline Crossings (see Appendix H) would be implemented to prevent breakage and subsequent contamination.
- Implement guidelines from Technical Reference 1730-2, where feasible, to protect or restore the functions of biological soil crusts.
- Manage public lands in a manner consistent with the Colorado River Salinity Control Program, implementing BMPs and watershed restoration projects to reduce salinity contributions to the Colorado River system.

**Table 2.1. MOAB PROPOSED PLAN and Draft RMP Alternatives**

| Alternative A (No Action) | Alternative B | PROPOSED PLAN | Alternative D |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Aquifers/Watersheds:**<br>The Castle Valley aquifer was not addressed.<br>The Mill Creek-Spanish Valley aquifer was not addressed. | **Aquifers/Watersheds:**<br>Close the Castle Valley watershed to oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities to protect the Castle Valley sole source, unconfined, surficial aquifer.<br>Close the Mill Creek-Spanish Valley watershed to oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities to protect the aquifer for the Moab area. | **Aquifers/Watersheds:**<br>Apply a no surface occupancy stipulation to oil and gas leasing and preclude other surface-disturbing activities in the Castle Valley watershed in order to protect the sole source, unconfined, surficial aquifer.<br>Apply a no surface occupancy stipulation to oil and gas leasing and preclude other surface-disturbing activities in the Mill Creek-Spanish Valley watershed in order to protect the aquifer for the Moab area. | **Aquifers/Watersheds:**<br>Do not apply a stipulation to protect the Castle Valley aquifer.<br>Do not apply a stipulation to protect the Mill Creek-Spanish Valley aquifer. |
| **Saline Soils in Mancos Shale:**<br>Apply a timing limitation on 313,800 acres of Mancos Shale prohibiting surface-disturbing activities from November 1 to April 30. | **Saline Soils in Mancos Shale:**<br>To minimize watershed damage on saline soils in the Mancos Shale, apply a timing limitation stipulation for oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities (see Appendix C) prohibiting surface-disturbing activities on 330,142 acres of moderately to highly saline soils in the Mancos Shale (see Map 2-13) from December 1 to May 31. This restriction includes road construction and traffic on existing roads associated with drilling operations. | **Saline Soils in Mancos Shale:**<br>Same as Alternative B. | **Saline Soils in Mancos Shale:**<br>Do not apply a timing limitation to saline soils in the Mancos Shale. |
| **Grazing:**<br>Manipulate livestock grazing on portions of ten allotments to lessen impacts on saline soils and reduce salinity in the Colorado River Drainage. | **Grazing:**<br>Use Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Grazing Management to consider adjusting season of use on allotments with saline soils to minimize soils compaction. | **Grazing:**<br>Use grazing systems and develop AMPs to minimize impacts to saline soils. | **Grazing:**<br>Same as Alternative A. |
| **Watershed Management Plans:**<br>Not specified. | **Watershed Management Plans:**<br>Prioritize development and implementation of the Watershed Management Plans for the following areas: Mill Creek (including North Fork, Rill, and Burkholder), Ten Mile Wash, Kane Springs, White Wash, Bartlett Wash, Tusher Wash, Mill Canyon, Courthouse Wash, Professor Creek, Negro Bill Canyon, Cottonwood/Diamond, Spring Canyon, Red Wash, Green River, Colorado River, Onion Creek and Westwater Creek. | **Watershed Management Plans:**<br>Prioritize development and implementation of the Watershed Management Plans for the following areas: Ten Mile Wash, Kane Springs, Bartlett Wash, Tusher Wash, Mill Canyon, Courthouse Wash, Cottonwood-Diamond, and Onion Creek. | **Watershed Management Plans:**<br>Do not prioritize Watershed Management Plans. |

## SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS – AREAS OF CRITICAL ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERN (ACECs)

The term "Area of Critical Environmental Concern" means areas within the public lands where special management attention is required (when such areas are developed or used or where no development is required) to protect and prevent irreparable damage to important historic, cultural, or scenic values, fish and wildlife resources, or other natural systems or processes, or to protect life and safety from natural hazards (FLPMA, 43 U.S.C. 1702(a)).

**Goals and Objectives:**

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

**Management Common to the PROPOSED PLAN and Draft RMP Alternative B (see Maps 2-14-A through 2-14-D for ACECs by alternative; see Appendix I for the Relevance and Importance Evaluations of Area of Critical Environmental Concern Nominations)**

- In those areas where ACECs overlap with WSAs, the WSA management prescriptions, as stipulated in the Interim Management Policy for Lands Under Wilderness Review (IMP), would take precedence.
- ACECs would be avoidance areas for all ROWs, including wind, solar energy and communication sites.

## Behind the Rocks Potential ACEC

| Alternative A (No Action) | Alternative B | PROPOSED PLAN | Alternative D |
|---|---|---|---|
| The area is not designated as an ACEC.<br>Behind the Rocks WSA would be managed according to the IMP to protect wilderness values (12,635 acres).<br>Manage 694 acres as open to oil and gas leasing, 1,958 acres as no surface occupancy, and 15,196 acres as closed. | Behind the Rocks Potential ACEC (17,836 acres) would be designated as an ACEC. This area includes the Behind the Rocks WSA (12,635 acres) in its entirety.<br>**Special Management:** To protect the relevant and important values of natural systems (threatened, sensitive, and endangered plants), cultural resources and scenery, the following management prescriptions would apply:<br>• Designate as VRM Class I.<br>• No vegetation treatments except for noxious weeds and exotics.<br>• Cultural resources would be prioritized for Class III inventory.<br>• Vehicle-based camping only in campgrounds. No campfires outside of | Behind the Rocks Potential ACEC (5,201 acres) would be designated as an ACEC. This area excludes the Behind the Rocks WSA, which would be managed according to the IMP to protect wilderness values.<br>**Special Management:** To protect the relevant and important values of natural systems (threatened, sensitive and endangered plants), cultural resources and scenery, the following management prescriptions would apply:<br>• Designate as VRM Class II.<br>• No vegetation treatments (except for exotic/noxious weeds).<br>• Cultural resources in Behind the Rocks ACEC would be prioritized for Class III inventory. | The area would not be designated as an ACEC. Management of the acreage would default to prescriptions applicable to the general area, which include, but are not limited to:<br>• The Behind the Rocks WSA would be managed according to the IMP to protect wilderness values (12,635 acres).<br>• The remaining 5,201 acres will be managed as follows:<br>Designate as VRM Class III.<br>Allow vegetation treatments.<br>Open to oil and gas leasing with standard terms and conditions. |

**Table 2.1. MOAB PROPOSED PLAN and Draft RMP Alternatives**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | campgrounds.<br>• No new motorized or mechanized routes, motorized/mechanized travel limited to designated routes.<br>• Manage the WSA as closed to oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities (12,635 acres). Manage the non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics as closed to oil and gas leasing (4,231 acres). In the remaining 970 acres, apply a no surface occupancy stipulation for oil and gas leasing and preclude other surface-disturbing activities.<br>• No commercial or private use of woodland products. | • Vehicle-based camping only in campgrounds. No campfires outside of campgrounds.<br>• No new motorized or mechanized routes, motorized/mechanized travel limited to designated routes.<br>• Apply a no surface occupancy stipulation for oil and gas leasing and preclude other surface-disturbing activities (see Appendix C).<br>• No commercial or private use of woodland products.<br>• There are approximately 12,635 acres of this potential ACEC proposed for designation under another statutory authority (Wilderness Study Area) and no further management attention is required. | |
| **Bookcliffs Potential ACEC** | | | |
| **Alternative A (No Action)** | **Alternative B** | **PROPOSED PLAN** | **Alternative D** |
| This area is not designated as an ACEC.<br>Desolation, Flume, Floy, Coal and Spruce WSAs would be managed according to the IMP to protect wilderness values (250,207 acres).<br>Manage 15,757 acres as open to oil and gas leasing, 38,415 acres with timing limitations and controlled surface use, and 250,207 acres as closed.<br>OHV designations include open and limited to existing routes. | Bookcliffs Potential ACEC (304,252 acres) would be designated as an ACEC. This area includes Desolation, Flume, Floy, Coal, and Spruce WSAs (250,207 acres).<br>**Special Management:** To protect the relevant and important values of wildlife and cultural resources, the following management prescriptions would apply:<br>• All WSAs would be managed according to the IMP.<br>• Work with UDWR and other agencies to create and implement a Habitat Management Plan for the Bookcliffs.<br>• No new motorized or mechanized routes. Motorized and mechanized travel is limited to designated routes outside the WSA and closed in the WSA.<br>• Manage WSAs as closed to oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities (249,988 acres). Manage the non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics as closed to oil and gas leasing (19,901acres). In the remaining 34,363 acres, apply a no surface occupancy stipulation for oil and gas leasing and preclude other surface-disturbing activities (see Appendix C).<br>• No commercial or private use of woodland products.<br>• Prioritize Bookcliffs for Class III cultural inventory. | Proposed area would not be designated as an ACEC. Management of the acreage would default to prescriptions applicable to the general area, which include, but are not limited to:<br>• The WSAs (Desolation, Flume, Floy, Coal, and Spruce) would be managed according to the IMP.<br>• Areas outside of the WSAs (54,174 acres) would be managed according to the following prescriptions:<br>▪ Apply standard and controlled surface use and timing limitation stipulations for oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities (see Appendix C). | Same as the Proposed Plan. |
| **Canyon Rims Potential ACEC** | | | |
| **Alternative A (No Action)** | **Alternative B** | **PROPOSED PLAN** | **Alternative D** |
| Not designated as an ACEC.<br>Manage as part of the Canyon Rims SRMA (see SRMA prescriptions).<br>Designate as VRM Class II.<br>Manage with timing limitations and controlled surface use for oil and gas leasing. | Canyon Rims Potential ACEC (23,400 acres) would be designated as an ACEC. **Special Management:** To protect the relevant and important value of scenery, the following management prescriptions would apply:<br>• Designate as VRM Class II.<br>• No new motorized or mechanized routes. Motorized and mechanized travel limited to designated routes. Manage consistently with the Canyon Rims Recreation Area Plan.<br>• Manage the non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics as closed to oil and gas leasing (3,417 acres). Apply a no surface occupancy stipulation for oil and gas leasing, and preclude other surface-disturbing activities (see Appendix C) on the remaining 19,983 acres. | Proposed area would not be designated as an ACEC. Management of the acreage would default to prescriptions applicable to the general area, which include, but are not limited to:<br>• Manage as part of the Canyon Rims SRMA (see SRMA prescriptions).<br>• Designate as VRM Class II.<br>• Avoid permitting new ROWs.<br>• Apply controlled surface use and timing limitation stipulations for oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities on 15,422 acres. The Scenic Byway corridor (7,035 acres) would be managed as controlled surface use for oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities (see Appendix C). The remainder of the area (943 acres) would be managed as open with standard stipulations. | Proposed area would not be designated as an ACEC. Management of the acreage would default to prescriptions applicable to the general area, which include, but are not limited to:<br>• Manage as part of the Canyon Rims SRMA (see SRMA prescriptions).<br>• Designate as VRM Class II and III.<br>• Avoid permitting new ROWs.<br>• The area would be managed with the following stipulations for oil and gas: 2,226 acres are open to leasing subject to standard terms and conditions, and apply controlled surface use and timing limitation stipulations for oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities to 17,420 acres. The Scenic Byway corridor (3,754 acres) would be managed as controlled surface use for oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities (see Appendix C). |
| **Cisco White-tailed Prairie Dog Complex Potential ACEC** | | | |
| **Alternative A (No Action)** | **Alternative B** | **PROPOSED PLAN** | **Alternative D** |
| This area is not designated as an ACEC. | Cisco White-tailed Prairie Dog Complex Potential ACEC (117,481 acres) | Proposed area would not be designated as an ACEC. Management of the | The area would not be designated as an ACEC. Management of the acreage |

**Table 2.1. MOAB PROPOSED PLAN and Draft RMP Alternatives**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Currently implemented Seasons of Use for livestock grazing: Agate - 3/15, Cisco - 5/10, Cisco Mesa - 5/15, Corral Wash - 5/10, Harley - 5/12, Highlands - 5/15, Monument Wash - 5/15, Pipeline - 5/15, San Arroyo - 5/25, and Sulphur Canyon - 4/12.<br>Manage 97,089 acres as open to oil and gas leasing, 19,240 acres with timing limitations and controlled surface use, and 1,152 acres as no surface occupancy. | would be designated as an ACEC.<br>**Special Management:** To protect the relevant and important value of wildlife, the following management prescriptions would apply:<br>• Use grazing systems and develop AMPs to protect prairie dog habitat in the following allotments or portions of allotments: Agate, Cisco, Cisco Mesa, Harley Dome, Highlands, Monument Wash, Pipeline, San Arroyo. Establish rest-rotation system to allow adequate recovery for seed dispersal and establishment.<br>• Work with UDWR to prohibit shooting of prairie dogs year-round and ban prairie dog poisoning on public lands.<br>• Develop cooperative agreements with UDWR and USFWS to inventory prairie dog densities and to manage habitat for prairie dogs, ground squirrels and raptors.<br>• Apply a no surface occupancy stipulation for oil and gas leasing and preclude other surface-disturbing activities (see Appendix C).<br>• No new motorized or mechanized routes. Motorized and mechanized travel is limited to designated routes. | acreage would default to prescriptions applicable to the general area, which include, but are not limited to:<br>• Maintain current season of use, and manage grazing to allow for adequate seed production.<br>• Apply a controlled surface use stipulation for oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities (see Appendix C) within 660 feet of active prairie dog colonies. No permanent above-ground facilities would be allowed within the 660-foot buffer. | would default to prescriptions applicable to the general area. |
| **Colorado River Corridor Potential ACEC** | | | |
| **Alternative A (No Action)** | **Alternative B** | **PROPOSED PLAN** | **Alternative D** |
| Negro Bill Canyon would be designated as Outstanding Natural Area (1,375 acres).<br>Continue the Three Rivers Withdrawal for locatable minerals (18,519 acres).<br>Manage the river corridor as part of the Colorado River Recreation Area and the Colorado River SRMA.<br>Manage 34,342 acres as open to oil and gas leasing, 10,864 acres with timing limitations and controlled surface use, 1,189 acres as no surface occupancy, and 3,613 acres as closed. | Colorado River Corridor Potential ACEC (50,483 acres) would be designated as an ACEC.<br>• Negro Bill Canyon would no longer be designated as an Outstanding Natural Area, but would be included within the Colorado River Corridor ACEC. Negro Bill Canyon WSA would be managed according to the IMP to protect wilderness values.<br>• Manage recreation use according to the Colorado Riverway SRMA (see SRMA prescriptions) with the exception of the Dry Mesa/Cache Valley area north of the Colorado River.<br>• **Special Management:** To protect the relevant and important values of natural systems (threatened, sensitive and endangered plants), fish and wildlife, and scenery, the Colorado River Corridor would be designated as an ACEC with the following management prescriptions:<br>Designate as VRM Class I.<br>No permitted activities north of the Colorado River (excluding immediate river corridor) during crucial bighorn lambing and rutting periods, April 1 through June 15 and October 1 to December 15, respectively.<br>Motorized and mechanized travel limited to designated routes.<br>No competitive OHV events.<br>Vehicle-based camping only in designated campsites on south side of the Colorado River.<br>Campfires for vehicle-based camping would be allowed only within designated campsites on the south side of the Colorado River.<br>No Special Recreation Permits would be issued north of the river (except for immediate river corridor used by river runners).<br>No vegetation treatments except for noxious weeds and exotics.<br>Season of use adjustments for livestock grazing in crucial bighorn lambing and rearing habitat (see Wildlife).<br>Retain ACEC in public ownership except lands involved in the existing Professor Valley land exchange.<br>Prioritize acquisition of inholdings as opportunity presents itself.<br>Apply a no surface occupancy stipulation on 9,196 acres for oil and gas leasing and preclude other surface-disturbing activities (see Appendix C). Close | The area would not be designated as an ACEC. Management of the acreage would default to prescriptions applicable to the general area, which include, but are not limited to:<br>• Negro Bill Canyon would no longer be designated as an Outstanding Natural Area. The Negro Bill Canyon WSA would be managed according to the IMP to protect wilderness values.<br>• Designate as VRM Class II (see VRM section starting on page 2-50) except for Negro Bill WSA, which would be managed as VRM Class I.<br>• Manage recreation use according to the Colorado Riverway SRMA (see SRMA prescriptions) with the exception of the Dry Mesa/Cache Valley area north of the Colorado River, which would be managed according to the following prescriptions: No permitted activities north of the river (except in the immediate river corridor) during crucial bighorn lambing and at rutting seasons, April 1 through June 15 and October 1 to December 15, respectively.<br>• Apply a no surface occupancy stipulation for oil and gas leasing and preclude other surface-disturbing activities (see Appendix C) in VRM Class II areas, areas within the Three Rivers Withdrawal (see Map 2-1) and in crucial bighorn lambing and rearing areas. Within these areas, prohibit geophysical exploration for oil and gas, and close to minerals material disposal. Close areas unreachable by directional drilling to oil and gas leasing. | The area would not be designated as an ACEC. Management of the acreage would default to prescriptions applicable to the general area, which include, but are not limited to:<br>• Negro Bill Canyon would no longer be designated as an Outstanding Natural Area. The Negro Bill Canyon WSA would be managed according to the IMP to protect wilderness values.<br>• Manage recreation use according to the Colorado Riverway SRMA (see SRMA prescriptions).<br>• Area would be managed the same as the Proposed Plan, with the following exceptions:<br>Permitted activities would be allowed year-round.<br>Apply controlled surface use and timing limitation stipulations for oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities (see Appendix C).<br>Apply a no surface occupancy stipulation for oil and gas leasing and preclude other surface-disturbing activities (see Appendix C) within the Three Rivers Withdrawal (see Map 2-1).<br>Open to minerals material disposal.<br>Open to geophysical exploration for oil and gas.<br>No commercial or private collection of woodland products on the south side of the river. |

**Table 2.1. MOAB PROPOSED PLAN and Draft RMP Alternatives**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 33,548 acres of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics to oil and gas leasing. Close 8,008 acres, which are unreachable by directional drilling to oil and gas leasing.<br>No commercial or private collection of woodland products. | | |
| **Cottonwood-Diamond Watershed Potential ACEC** | | | |
| **Alternative A (No Action)** | **Alternative B** | **PROPOSED PLAN** | **Alternative D** |
| This area is not designated as an ACEC.<br>Manage the portions of the Cottonwood-Diamond Watershed Potential ACEC (34,004 acres) within the Flume, the Coal Canyon and the Spruce WSAs according to the IMP to protect the wilderness values.<br>Manage areas outside the WSAs with timing limitations and controlled surface use for oil and gas leasing (1,825 acres). | Cottonwood-Diamond Watershed Potential ACEC (35,830 acres) would be designated as an ACEC.<br>**Special Management: NOTE: ACEC would only be designated until hazard is no longer present. At that point, management would revert to the IMP.** To protect the relevant and important values of natural systems, and to mitigate the natural hazards due to fire, the following management prescriptions would apply:<br>• Continue to keep area not available to livestock grazing.<br>• Close to vehicle use at the end of the Class B-road system, except for administrative access.<br>• No new mechanized or motorized routes. Motorized and mechanized travel limited to designated routes outside the WSA, and closed in the WSA.<br>• No competitive events.<br>• Suspend commercial permits (guiding or special groups).<br>• Manage the acreage within the WSAs (34,027 acres) as closed to oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities. Manage the remaining acreage within non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics as closed to oil and gas leasing (1,690 acres). Apply a no surface occupancy stipulation for oil and gas leasing and preclude other surface-disturbing activities on the remaining acreage (113 acres; see Appendix C). | Cottonwood Diamond Watershed would be designated as an ACEC with the same prescriptions as in Alternative B, except that 34,027 acres within the WSA are closed to oil and gas leasing, and the remaining 1,804 acres would be managed as no surface occupancy for oil and gas leasing. Other surface-disturbing activities would be precluded (see Appendix C). | The area would not be designated as an ACEC. Management of the acreage would default to prescriptions applicable to the general area, which include, but are not limited to:<br>• Manage portions of the area that are in the Flume, Spruce or Coal WSA according to IMP. |
| **Highway 279/Shafer Basin/Long Canyon Potential ACEC** | | | |
| **Alternative A (No Action)** | **Alternative B** | **Proposed Plan** | **Alternative D** |
| This area is not designated as an ACEC.<br>Manage 6,425 acres as open to oil and gas leasing, 4,606 acres with timing limitations and controlled surface use, 2,094 acres as no surface occupancy, and 362 acres as closed.<br>Continue the Three Rivers Withdrawal for locatable minerals (2,034 acres).<br>Avoid permitting new ROWs. | Highway 279/Shafer Basin/Long Canyon Potential ACEC (13,500 acres) would be designated as an ACEC.<br>**Special Management:** To protect the relevant and important values of scenery, wildlife, natural systems (threatened, sensitive, and endangered plants), and cultural resources, the following management prescriptions would apply:<br>• Designate as VRM Class I.<br>• Permitted activities would be confined to main roads within crucial bighorn lambing habitat from April 1 through June 15. This restriction would not apply to filming if the filming meets the minimum impact criteria (see Appendix B).<br>• Wall Street rock art sites would be managed for public use with the emphasis on interpretation.<br>• Motorized and mechanized travel limited to designated routes.<br>• Vehicle-based camping only in designated campgrounds.<br>• No campfires except in campgrounds.<br>• Retain ACEC in public ownership except for the previously initiated Moab Salt Exchange Parcel (635 acres).<br>• Manage non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics as closed to oil and gas leasing (3,502 acres). Apply a no surface occupancy stipulation for oil and gas leasing and preclude other surface-disturbing activities (see Appendix C) to the remaining acreage (9,998 acres). | Highway 279/Shafer Basin/Long Canyon would be designated as an ACEC with the same prescriptions as in Alternative B, except:<br>• Designate Highway 279 and Long Canyon as VRM Class II; manage the remainder of the ACEC as VRM I.<br>• Manage the entire area as no surface occupancy for oil and gas leasing and preclude other surface-disturbing activities. | The area would not be designated as an ACEC. Management of the acreage would default to prescriptions applicable to the general area, which include, but are not limited to:<br>• Designate as VRM Class III.<br>• The area would be managed with the following stipulations for oil and gas: 5,741 acres would be open to leasing subject to standard terms and conditions, and apply a timing limitation stipulation for oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities on 5,370 acres. In addition, 2,389 acres along the Colorado River would be managed as no surface occupancy (see Appendix C). |

**Table 2.1. MOAB PROPOSED PLAN and Draft RMP Alternatives**

| Labyrinth Canyon Potential ACEC | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Alternative A (No Action)** | **Alternative B** | **PROPOSED PLAN** | **Alternative D** |
| This area is not designated as an ACEC.<br>Manage as open to oil and gas leasing subject to standard terms and conditions and as open with controlled surface use stipulations for oil and gas.<br>Continue the Three Rivers Withdrawal for locatable minerals.<br>No commercial or private use of woodland products. | Labyrinth Canyon Potential ACEC (8,528 acres) would be designated as an ACEC.<br>**Special Management:** To protect the relevant and important values of scenery and fish, the following management prescriptions would apply:<br>• Designate as VRM Class I.<br>• No new mechanized or motorized routes. Motorized and mechanized travel limited to designated routes.<br>• Manage non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics as closed to oil and gas leasing (5,492 acres). Apply a no surface occupancy stipulation for oil and gas leasing and preclude other surface-disturbing activities (see Appendix C) on the remaining lands (3,036 acres).<br>• No commercial or private use of woodland products. | The area would not be designated as an ACEC. Management of the acreage would default to prescriptions applicable to the general area, which include, but are not limited to:<br>• Designate as VRM Class II.<br>• No new mechanized or motorized routes. Motorized and mechanized travel limited to designated routes.<br>• Apply a no surface occupancy stipulation for oil and gas leasing and preclude other surface-disturbing activities (see Appendix C).<br>• No commercial or private use of woodland products. | Same as the Proposed Plan. |
| **Mill Creek Canyon Potential ACEC** | | | |
| **Alternative A (No Action)** | **Alternative B** | **PROPOSED PLAN** | **Alternative D** |
| This area is not designated as an ACEC.<br>Manage Mill Creek Canyon WSA (9,780 acres) according to the IMP to protect wilderness values.<br>Manage the WSA as closed to oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities. Manage remainder of the area as open with standard stipulations.<br>Livestock grazing would be available in the Mill Creek Allotment. | Mill Creek Canyon Potential ACEC (13,501 acres) would be designated as an ACEC. This area includes the Mill Creek Canyon WSA (9,780 acres) in its entirety.<br>**Special Management:** To protect the relevant and important values of cultural resources, scenery, and natural systems (cold water fishery/riparian/watershed and wildlife), the following management prescriptions would apply:<br>• Recreation activities would be managed according to the South Moab SRMA.<br>• Prioritize Mill Creek for Class III cultural inventory.<br>• Protect Native American traditional cultural places.<br>• Designate as VRM Class I.<br>• Livestock grazing would not be available.<br>• No vehicle-based camping.<br>• No campfires in riparian areas.<br>• Motorized competitive events would be prohibited.<br>• No new mechanized or motorized routes. Motorized and mechanized travel limited to designated routes.<br>• All recreational events would be confined to the designated roads in the ACEC.<br>• Limit recreation facility development to day-use only.<br>• Acquire state land within ACEC as the opportunity arises.<br>• Maintain 3 cfs in the South Fork of Mill Creek below the Sheley diversion.<br>• Manage the area as closed to oil and gas leasing. No recreational mining would be allowed.<br>• No fuel wood harvesting permits would be issued.<br>• Private wood gathering for backpacking campfires would be allowed in the uplands only. | Mill Creek Canyon Potential ACEC (3,721 acres) would be designated as an ACEC. This area excludes the Mill Creek Canyon WSA. The Mill Creek Canyon WSA (9,780 acres) would be managed according to the IMP to protect wilderness values.<br>**Special Management:** To protect the relevant and important values of cultural resources, scenery, natural systems: (cold water fishery/riparian/watershed and wildlife), the following management prescriptions would apply to 3,721 acres in the ACEC:<br>• Recreation activities would be managed according to the South Moab SRMA.<br>• Prioritize Mill Creek for Class III cultural inventory.<br>• Protect Native American traditional cultural places.<br>• Designate as VRM Class II.<br>• Livestock grazing would not be available.<br>• No vehicle-based camping.<br>• No campfires in riparian areas.<br>• Motorized competitive events would be prohibited.<br>• No new mechanized or motorized routes. Motorized and mechanized travel limited to designated routes.<br>• All recreational events would be confined to the designated roads in the ACEC.<br>• Limit recreation facility development to day-use only.<br>• Acquire state land within ACEC as the opportunity arises.<br>• Maintain 3 cfs in the South Fork of Mill Creek below the Sheley diversion.<br>• Apply a no surface occupancy stipulation for oil and gas leasing and preclude other surface-disturbing activities (see Appendix C).<br>• No recreational mining would be allowed.<br>• No fuel wood harvesting permits would be issued.<br>• Private wood gathering for backpacking campfires would be allowed in the uplands only. | The proposed area would not be designated as an ACEC. Management of the acreage would default to prescriptions applicable to the general area, which include, but are not limited to:<br>• The Mill Creek Canyon WSA would be managed according to the IMP to protect wilderness values (9,780 acres).<br>• The remaining 3,721 acres would be managed as follows:<br>Recreation activities would be managed according to the South Moab SRMA in that portion within the SRMA.<br>Designate as VRM Class II.<br>Livestock grazing would not be available.<br>Apply controlled surface use and timing limitation stipulations for oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities (see Appendix C). |

**Table 2.1. MOAB PROPOSED PLAN and Draft RMP Alternatives**

| Ten Mile Wash Potential ACEC | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Alternative A (No Action)** | **Alternative B** | **PROPOSED PLAN** | **Alternative D** |
| This area is not designated as an ACEC.<br>Manage as controlled surface use for oil and gas use.<br>Open to competitive motorized events. | Ten Mile Wash Potential ACEC (4,980 acres) would be designated as an ACEC.<br>**Special Management:** To protect the relevant and important values of natural systems (riparian/wetlands), wildlife, cultural resources and natural hazards, the following management prescriptions would apply:<br>• Prioritize Ten Mile for Class III cultural inventory.<br>• Prioritize Ten Mile as a scientific research area.<br>• No grazing in Ten Mile Canyon downstream from Dripping Springs.<br>• Prioritize area for riparian restoration.<br>• No vehicular travel in Ten Mile Wash from Dripping Springs to the Green River.<br>• Restrict camping and campfires to designated sites at Dripping Spring.<br>• Manage non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics as closed to oil and gas leasing (232 acres). Apply a no surface occupancy stipulation for oil and gas leasing and preclude other surface-disturbing activities (see Appendix C) to the remaining acreage (4,748 acres).<br>• No commercial or private collection of woodland products.<br>NOTE: In Alternative B, Ten Mile does not have a designated road in it; therefore, all the road-related prescriptions have been removed from Alternative B. | Ten Mile Wash Potential ACEC (4,980 acres) would be designated as an ACEC with the following management prescriptions:<br>• Prioritize Ten Mile for Class III cultural inventory.<br>• Prioritize Ten Mile as a scientific research area.<br>• No grazing in Ten Mile Canyon downstream from Dripping Springs.<br>• Prioritize area for riparian restoration.<br>• Restrict camping and campfires to designated sites at Dripping Spring.<br>• Motorized and mechanized travel limited to designated routes.<br>• No competitive events.<br>• Establish speed limits.<br>• Reroute designated road around the wetlands south of the cattle guard near Dripping Springs.<br>• Restrict vehicle access at the Green River; designate a parking area at the Green River.<br>• Permits for motorized recreational use may be required if monitoring indicates long-term damage.<br>• Require permits for groups greater than 25 vehicles.<br>• Apply a no surface occupancy stipulation for oil and gas leasing and preclude other surface-disturbing activities (see Appendix C).<br>• No commercial or private collection of woodland products. | The area would not be designated as an ACEC. Management of the acreage would default to prescriptions applicable to the general area, which include, but are not limited to:<br>• Continue present grazing management in Ten Mile Canyon.<br>• No campfires outside of designated sites.<br>• Motorized travel on designated routes only (see Map 2-11-D).<br>• Require permits for groups greater than 50 vehicles.<br>• Apply a timing limitation stipulation for oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities (see Appendix C) to 2,558 acres. |
| **Upper Courthouse Potential ACEC** | | | |
| **Alternative A (No Action)** | **Alternative B** | **PROPOSED PLAN** | **Alternative D** |
| This area is not designated as an ACEC.<br>Managed as open to oil and gas leasing with standard terms and conditions.<br>No commercial or private use of woodland products. | Upper Courthouse Potential ACEC (11,529 acres) would be designated as an ACEC.<br>• Recreation use would be managed in accordance with the Labyrinth Rims/Gemini Bridges SRMA.<br>• **Special Management:** To protect the relevant and important values of historic/cultural/paleontological resources and natural systems (threatened, sensitive, endangered, and relict plants), the following management prescriptions would apply:<br>Prioritize Upper Courthouse for a Class III cultural inventory.<br>No collection of petrified wood.<br>No new range improvements except for fencing.<br>No vegetation treatments except for noxious weeds and exotics, and to restore riparian environments.<br>Active protection of archeological sites from grazing.<br>Limit OHVs to designated routes (no sandhill climbing routes would be designated).<br>No new mechanized or motorized routes. Motorized and mechanized travel limited to designated routes.<br>Vehicle-based camping only in designated sites.<br>No campfires outside of campgrounds.<br>No competitive OHV events.<br>Apply a no surface occupancy stipulation for oil and gas leasing and preclude other surface-disturbing activities (see Appendix C).<br>No commercial or private use of woodland products. | The area would not be designated as an ACEC. Management of the acreage would default to prescriptions applicable to the general area, which include, but are not limited to:<br>• Recreation use would be managed in accordance with the Labyrinth Rims/ Gemini Bridges SRMA.<br>• Apply a no surface occupancy stipulation for oil and gas leasing and preclude other surface-disturbing activities (see Appendix C) to mesa-top relict plant communities.<br>• Avoid permitting new ROWs on the mesa-top relict plant communities.<br>• No commercial or private use of woodland products.<br>• Recommend the mesa-top relict plant communities for the withdrawal of locatable minerals. | The area would not be designated as an ACEC. Management of the acreage would default to prescriptions applicable to the general area, which include, but are not limited to:<br>• Manage as open for oil and gas leasing (see Map 2-5-D).<br>• Open to locatable mineral development.<br>• No commercial or private use of woodland products. |

**Table 2.1. MOAB PROPOSED PLAN and Draft RMP Alternatives**

| Westwater Canyon Potential ACEC | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Alternative A (No Action)** | **Alternative B** | **PROPOSED PLAN** | **Alternative D** |
| This area is not designated as an ACEC.<br>Manage the Westwater WSA according to the IMP to protect wilderness values.<br>Manage as closed to oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities.<br>Continue with the existing withdrawal for locatable minerals.<br>Avoid permitting new ROWs. | Westwater Canyon Potential ACEC (5,069 acres) would be designated as an ACEC. This area is within the Westwater Canyon WSA.<br>**Special Management:** To protect the relevant and important values of scenery and fish, the following management prescriptions would apply:<br>• Manage the Westwater Canyon WSA according to the IMP to protect wilderness values.<br>• Designate as VRM Class I.<br>• Closed to motorized and mechanized travel.<br>• Acquire inholdings within ACEC.<br>• Manage as closed for oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities.<br>• No commercial or private use of woodland products. | The area would not be designated as an ACEC. Management of the acreage would default to prescriptions applicable to the general area, which include, but are not limited to:<br>• Manage the Westwater Canyon WSA according to the IMP to protect wilderness values. | Same as the Proposed Plan. |
| **White Wash Potential ACEC** | | | |
| **Alternative A (No Action)** | **Alternative B** | **PROPOSED PLAN** | **Alternative D** |
| This area is not designated as an ACEC.<br>Competitive motorized events would be allowed.<br>Open to cross country OHV travel.<br>Manage as no surface occupancy for oil and gas leasing.<br>Open to locatable mineral development. | White Wash Potential ACEC (2,988 acres) would be designated as an ACEC.<br>**Special Management:** To protect the relevant and important value of natural systems (riparian dune systems), the following management prescriptions would apply:<br>• Limit OHVs to designated routes.<br>• Competitive motorized events would not be allowed.<br>• Vehicle-based camping in campgrounds only.<br>• No fires or wood gathering allowed.<br>• Apply a no surface occupancy stipulation for oil and gas leasing and preclude other surface-disturbing activities (see Appendix C).<br>• No commercial or private use of woodland products. | The area would not be designated as an ACEC. Management of the acreage would default to prescriptions applicable to the general area, which include, but are not limited to:<br>• Recreational use in this area would be managed according to the White Wash Sand Dunes Open OHV Focus Area (1,866 acres) within the Labyrinth Rims/ Gemini Bridges SRMA. The remaining 1,122 acres would be managed according to the Dee Pass Motorized Trail Focus Area in the same SRMA.<br>• About 1,866 acres are open to OHV, and 1,122 acres are limited to designated routes.<br>• Competitive motorized events would be allowed.<br>• Manage as open to oil and gas leasing (see Map 2-5-C).<br>• Open to locatable mineral development.<br>• No commercial or private use of woodland products. | The area would not be designated as an ACEC. Management of the acreage would default to prescriptions applicable to the general area, which include, but are not limited to:<br>• Recreational use in this area would be managed according to the White Wash Sand Dunes Open OHV Focus Area within the Dee Pass SRMA for this alternative.<br>• The entire area would be open to OHV use.<br>• Competitive motorized events would be allowed. |
| **Wilson Arch Potential ACEC** | | | |
| **Alternative A (No Action)** | **Alternative B** | **PROPOSED PLAN** | **Alternative D** |
| The area is not designated as an ACEC.<br>Managed as open to oil and gas leasing. | Wilson Arch Potential ACEC (3,700 acres) would be designated as an ACEC.<br>**Special Management:** To protect the relevant and important value of scenery, Wilson Arch would be designated as an ACEC with the following management prescriptions:<br>• Designate as VRM Class I.<br>• Build one trail up to Wilson Arch for hiking use only.<br>• Motorized and mechanized travel limited to designated routes.<br>• Apply a no surface occupancy stipulation for oil and gas leasing and preclude other surface-disturbing activities (see Appendix C).<br>• No commercial or private use of woodland products. | The area would not be designated as an ACEC. Management of the acreage would default to prescriptions applicable to the general area, which include, but are not limited to:<br>• Designate as VRM Class II.<br>• Apply a controlled surface use stipulation for oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities (see Appendix C). | Same as the Proposed Plan, except designate as VRM Class III. |
| **SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS – NATIONAL HISTORIC TRAIL – OLD SPANISH TRAIL** | | | |
| **Management common to the PROPOSED PLAN and Draft RMP Alternatives A, B, and D:**<br>• Segments of the Old Spanish Trail would be identified and classified for historic integrity and condition. These segments would then be designated for appropriate types of management and travel.<br>• Landmarks along the Old Spanish Trail would be identified for historic integrity and interpreted only if the action would not impact the values at the site. All interpretation projects would be done in consultation with Native Americans and other interested parties including the Old Spanish Trail Association and | | | |

**Table 2.1. MOAB PROPOSED PLAN and Draft RMP Alternatives**

National Park Service.

- Consider plan amendment, as necessary, to incorporate provisions of the forthcoming Old Spanish Trail Comprehensive Management Plan.
- Participate in the development of the management plan for the Old Spanish Trail and assist with its implementation as opportunities arise, consistent with other decisions of the RMP.
- Support protective management, interpretation, and public enjoyment and understanding of the National Historic Old Spanish Trail, consistent with the Old Spanish Trail Comprehensive Management Plan.
- Seek to acquire public access to the site of the Old Spanish Trail ford of the Green River, upstream from the town of Green River, Utah, for the purpose of developing an interpretive site.
- Consistent with the Cameo Cliffs and Canyon Rims Recreation Area Management Plans (RAMPs), consider developing and managing a section of the Old Spanish Trail for equestrian use.

## SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS – WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS (WSRs)

**Goals and Objectives:**

- Review all eligible rivers to determine suitability for Congressional designation into the National Wild and Scenic River System (NWSRS).
- To the extent of the BLM's authority (limited to BLM lands within the river corridor), maintain and enhance the free flowing character, preserve and enhance the outstandingly remarkable values, and allow no activities within the river corridor that would alter the tentative classification of those river segments determined suitable for congressional designation in the NWSRS until Congress acts.

**Management common to the PROPOSED PLAN and Draft RMP Alternatives B and D:**

- River segments found suitable and recommended for designation would be managed to protect their free-flowing condition and to protect the outstandingly remarkable values and maintain the tentative classification within line-of-sight up to 1/4 mile (1/3 miles on the Colorado and Dolores Rivers) from the high water mark on each bank of the river (not to exceed 320 acres per mile). Management that would apply should any rivers be designated by Congress is identified in BLM Manual 8351.51 (see Appendix J and Maps 2-15-B and 2-15-C for river segments found suitable for WSR designation, by alternative).
- BLM would not seek water rights as part of a suitability decision made in the Record of Decision for this RMP.
- WSR segments recommended as suitable for Wild would be designate as VRM Class I; Scenic and Recreational segments would be designated as VRM Class II.
- OHV travel would be limited to designated routes or closed, depending on the river segment.
- The stipulations that would be applied to oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities within suitable river segments have been developed based on other resource values such as scenery, wildlife and fisheries, riparian, and recreation. In all cases, these stipulations are sufficient to protect the outstandingly remarkable values. All suitable segments would be managed with a no surface occupancy stipulation for oil and gas leasing as well as all other surface-disturbing activities, or as closed to oil and gas leasing (see Appendix C and Maps 2-5-B and 2-5-C for the surface stipulations application to oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities, by alternative).
- 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 National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. Besides applying consistent criteria across agency jurisdictions, the joint study would avoid piece-mealing 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 Plan 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(s). 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 Wild and Scenic Rivers System does not create new water rights for the BLM. Federal reserved water rights for new components of the Wild and Scenic Rivers System are established at the discretion of Congress. If water is reserved by Congress when a river component is added to the Wild and Scenic Rivers System, 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.

### Beaver Creek (7.7 miles)

- Segment 1 – Forest Service boundary to one mile from Dolores River
- Segment 2 – One mile to Dolores River

| Alternative A (No Action) | Alternative B | PROPOSED PLAN | Alternative D |
|---|---|---|---|
| Suitability determination would not be made for either of the eligible river segments. They would remain eligible and would be managed to protect their outstandingly remarkable values, free-flowing nature, and tentative classification. | Segment 1 – Suitable–Wild<br>Oil and gas leasing: Closed<br>OHV category: Limited to designated routes<br>VRM designation: Class I<br>Segment 2 – Suitable–Scenic<br>Oil and gas leasing: Closed<br>OHV category: Limited to designated routes<br>VRM designation: Class II | Segment 1 – Not suitable<br>Segment 2 – Not suitable | Segment 1 – Not suitable<br>Segment 2 – Not suitable |

**Table 2.1. MOAB PROPOSED PLAN and Draft RMP Alternatives**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Colorado River (66.5 miles)**<br>• Segment 1 – Colorado-Utah state line to Westwater Canyon<br>• Segment 2 – Westwater Canyon (Mile 125) to River Mile 112<br>• Segment 3 – River Mile 112 to confluence with the Dolores River<br>• Segment 3(a) – River Mile 112 to Cisco Wash<br>• Segment 3(b) – Cisco Wash to confluence with the Dolores River<br>• Segment 4 – Confluence with the Dolores River to River Mile 49 near Potash<br>• Segment 4 (portion for Alternative D only) – Hittle Bottom to Take Out Beach<br>• Segment 5 – River Mile 44.5 to Mile 38.5 state land boundary<br>• Segment 6 – River Mile 37.5 below state land to Mile 34 Canyonlands National Park | | | |
| **Alternative A (No Action)** | **Alternative B** | **PROPOSED PLAN** | **Alternative D** |
| Suitability determination would not be made for any of the eligible river segments. They would remain eligible and would be managed to protect their outstandingly remarkable values, free-flowing nature, and tentative classification. | Segment 1 – Suitable–Scenic<br>Oil and gas leasing: NSO<br>OHV category: Limited to designated routes<br>VRM designation: Class II<br>Segment 2 – Suitable–Wild<br>Oil and gas leasing: Closed<br>OHV category: Closed<br>VRM designation: Class I<br>Segment 3 – Suitable–Scenic<br>Oil and gas leasing: NSO<br>OHV category: Limited to designated routes<br>VRM designation: Class II<br>Segment 4 – Suitable–Recreational<br>Oil and gas leasing: NSO<br>OHV category: Limited to designated routes<br>VRM designation: Class II<br>Segment 5 – Suitable–Scenic<br>Oil and gas leasing: NSO<br>OHV category: Limited to designated routes<br>VRM designation: Class II<br>Segment 6 – Suitable–Wild<br>Oil and gas leasing: NSO<br>OHV category: Limited to designated routes<br>VRM designation: Class II | Segment 1 – Not suitable<br>Segment 2 – Suitable–Wild<br>Oil and gas leasing: Closed<br>OHV category: Closed<br>VRM designation: Class I<br>Segment 3(a) – Suitable–Scenic<br>Oil and gas leasing: NSO<br>OHV category: Limited to designated routes<br>VRM designation: Class II<br>Segment 3(b) – Suitable–Recreational<br>Oil and gas leasing: NSO<br>OHV category: Limited to designated routes<br>VRM designation: Class II<br>Segment 4 – Suitable–Recreational<br>Oil and gas leasing: NSO<br>OHV category: Limited to designated routes<br>VRM designation: Class II<br>Segment 5 – Suitable–Scenic<br>Oil and gas leasing: NSO<br>OHV category: Limited to designated routes<br>VRM designation: Class II<br>Segment 6 – Suitable–Scenic<br>Oil and gas leasing: NSO<br>OHV category: Limited to designated routes<br>VRM designation: Class II | Segment 1 – Not suitable<br>Segment 2 – Not suitable<br>Segment 3 – Not suitable<br>Segment 4 – Not suitable<br>Segment 5 – Not suitable<br>Segment 6 – Not suitable |

**Table 2.1. MOAB PROPOSED PLAN and Draft RMP Alternatives**

| **Cottonwood Canyon (10.4 miles)**<br>• Source near Cottonwood Point to private land (includes the first 1/2 mile of Horse Canyon) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Alternative A (No Action)** | **Alternative B** | **PROPOSED PLAN** | **Alternative D** |
| Suitability determination would not be made for this eligible river segment. It would remain eligible and would be managed to protect its outstandingly remarkable values, free-flowing nature, and tentative classification. | Suitable–Scenic<br>Oil and gas leasing: Closed<br>OHV category: Closed<br>VRM designation: Class I | Not suitable | Not suitable |
| **Dolores River (22.0 miles)**<br>• Segment 1 – Colorado-Utah state line to Fisher Creek<br>• Segment 2 – Fisher Creek to Bridge Canyon<br>• Segment 3 – Bridge Canyon to Colorado River | | | |
| **Alternative A (No Action)** | **Alternative B** | **PROPOSED PLAN** | **Alternative D** |
| Suitability determination would not be made for any of the eligible river segments. They would remain eligible and would be managed to protect their outstandingly remarkable values, free-flowing nature, and tentative classification. | Segment 1 – Suitable–Scenic<br>Oil and gas leasing: NSO<br>OHV category: Limited to designated routes<br>VRM designation: Class II<br>Segment 2 – Suitable–Wild<br>Oil and gas leasing: Closed<br>OHV category: Limited to designated routes<br>VRM designation: Class I<br>Segment 3 – Suitable–Scenic<br>Oil and gas leasing: NSO<br>OHV category: Limited to designated routes<br>VRM designation: Class II | Segment 1 – Suitable–Recreational<br>Oil and gas leasing: NSO<br>OHV category: Limited to designated routes<br>VRM designation: Class II<br>Segment 2 – Suitable–Scenic<br>Oil and gas leasing: NSO<br>OHV category: Limited to designated routes<br>VRM designation: Class II<br>Segment 3 – Suitable–Recreational<br>Oil and gas leasing: NSO<br>OHV category: Limited to designated routes<br>VRM designation: Class II | Segment 1 – Not suitable<br>Segment 2 – Not suitable<br>Segment 3 – Not suitable |
| **Green River (99.0 miles)**<br>• Segment 1 – Coal Creek to Nefertiti Boat Ramp<br>• Segment 2 – Nefertiti Boat Ramp to Swasey's Boat Ramp<br>• Segment 3 – Swasey's Boat Ramp to I-70 Bridge<br>• Segment 3(a) – Swasey's Boat Ramp to River Mile 97 (confluence with the San Rafael River; combination of Segment 3 and part of Segment 4)<br>• Segment 4 – I-70 Bridge to River Mile 91 below Ruby Ranch<br>• Segment 4(a) – Mile 97 (confluence with the San Rafael River) to Canyonlands National Park boundary (part of Segment 4 and all of Segments 5 and 6)<br>• Segment 5 – Mile 91 below Ruby Ranch to Hey Joe Canyon<br>• Segment 6 – Hey Joe Canyon to Canyonlands National Park Boundary | | | |
| **Alternative A (No Action)** | **Alternative B** | **PROPOSED PLAN** | **Alternative D** |
| Suitability determination would not be made for any of the eligible river segments. They would remain eligible and would be managed to protect their outstandingly remarkable values, free-flowing nature, and tentative classification | Segment 1 – Suitable–Wild<br>Oil and gas leasing: Closed<br>OHV category: Closed | Segment 1 – Suitable – Wild<br>Oil and gas leasing: Closed<br>OHV category: Closed | Segment 1 – Not suitable<br>Segment 2 – Not suitable<br>Segment 3 – Not suitable |

**Table 2.1. MOAB PROPOSED PLAN and Draft RMP Alternatives**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | VRM designation: Class I<br>Segment 2 – Suitable–Recreational<br>Oil and gas leasing: NSO<br>OHV category: Limited to designated routes<br>VRM designation: Class II<br>Segment 3 – Suitable–Recreational<br>Oil and gas leasing: NSO<br>OHV category: Limited to designated routes<br>VRM designation: Class II<br>Segment 4 – Suitable–Scenic<br>Oil and gas leasing: NSO<br>OHV category: Limited to designated routes<br>VRM designation: Class II<br>Segment 5 – Suitable–Wild<br>Oil and gas leasing: NSO<br>OHV category: Limited to designated routes<br>VRM designation: Class I<br>Segment 6 – Suitable–Scenic<br>Oil and gas leasing: NSO<br>OHV category: Limited to designated routes<br>VRM designation: Class II | VRM designation: Class I<br>Segment 2 – Suitable – Recreational<br>Oil and gas leasing: NSO<br>OHV category: Limited to designated routes<br>VRM designation: Class II<br>Segment 3 – Not suitable<br>Segment 3(a) – Not suitable<br>Segment 4 – Not suitable<br>Segment 4(a) – Suitable–Scenic<br>Oil and gas leasing: NSO<br>OHV category: Limited to designated routes<br>VRM designation: Class II<br>Segment 5 – Not suitable<br>Segment 6 – Not suitable | Segment 4 – Not suitable<br>Segment 5 – Not suitable<br>Segment 6 – Not suitable |
| **Mill Creek (6.0 miles)**<br>• Segment 1 – National Forest boundary to private property below diversion<br>• Segment 2 – T26S, R23E, Section 19 to Power Dam | | | |
| **Alternative A (No Action)** | **Alternative B** | **PROPOSED PLAN** | **Alternative D** |
| Suitability determination would not be made for either of the eligible river segments. They would remain eligible and would be managed to protect their outstandingly remarkable values, free-flowing nature, and tentative classification. | Segment 1 – Suitable–Recreational<br>Oil and gas leasing: Closed<br>OHV category: Closed<br>VRM designation: Class I<br><br>Segment 2 – Suitable–Scenic<br>Oil and gas leasing: Closed<br>OHV category: Closed<br>VRM designation: Class I | Segment 1 – Not suitable<br>Segment 2 – Not suitable | Segment 1 – Not suitable<br>Segment 2 – Not suitable |

**Table 2.1. MOAB PROPOSED PLAN and Draft RMP Alternatives**

| **Negro Bill Canyon (7.4 miles)**<br>• Segment 1 – From state land below rim to 1/4 mile from Colorado River<br>• Segment 2 – Last 1/4 mile to Colorado River | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Alternative A (No Action)** | **Alternative B** | **PROPOSED PLAN** | **Alternative D** |
| Suitability determination would not be made for either of the eligible river segments. They would remain eligible and would be managed to protect their outstandingly remarkable values, free-flowing nature, and tentative classification. | Segment 1 – Suitable–Wild<br>Oil and gas leasing: Closed<br>OHV category: Closed<br>VRM designation: Class I<br>Segment 2 – Suitable–Recreational<br>Oil and gas leasing: NSO<br>OHV category: Limited to designated routes<br>VRM designation: Class II | Segment 1 – Not suitable<br>Segment 2 – Not suitable | Segment 1 – Not suitable<br>Segment 2 – Not suitable |
| **North Fork Mill Creek (11.2 miles)**<br>• National Forest boundary near Wilson Mesa to Mill Creek | | | |
| **Alternative A (No Action)** | **Alternative B** | **PROPOSED PLAN** | **Alternative D** |
| Suitability determination would not be made for this eligible river segment. It would remain eligible and would be managed to protect its outstandingly remarkable values, free-flowing nature, and tentative classification. | Suitable–Wild<br>Oil and gas leasing: Closed<br>OHV category: Closed<br>VRM designation: Class I | Not suitable | Not suitable |
| **Onion Creek (12.5 miles)**<br>• Segment 1 – Source to Onion Creek Road<br>• Segment 2 – Beginning of Onion Creek Road to Colorado River | | | |
| **Alternative A (No Action)** | **Alternative B** | **PROPOSED PLAN** | **Alternative D** |
| Suitability determination would not be made for either of the eligible river segments. They would remain eligible and would be managed to protect their outstandingly remarkable values, free-flowing nature, and tentative classification. | Segment 1 – Suitable–Wild<br>Oil and gas leasing: Closed<br>OHV category: Limited to designated routes<br>VRM designation: Class I<br>Segment 2 – Suitable–Recreational<br>Oil and gas leasing: Closed<br>OHV category: Limited to designated routes<br>VRM designation: Class II | Segment 1 – Not suitable<br>Segment 2 – Not suitable | Segment 1 – Not suitable<br>Segment 2 – Not suitable |
| **Professor Creek (7.4 miles)**<br>• National Forest and state land boundary to diversion near private land | | | |
| **Alternative A (No Action)** | **Alternative B** | **PROPOSED PLAN** | **Alternative D** |
| Suitability determination would not be made for this eligible river segment. It would remain eligible and would be managed to protect its outstandingly remarkable values, free-flowing nature, and tentative classification. | Suitable–Wild<br>Oil and gas leasing: Closed | Not suitable | Not suitable |

**Table 2.1. MOAB PROPOSED PLAN and Draft RMP Alternatives**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | OHV category: Limited to designated routes<br>VRM designation: Class I | | |
| **Rattlesnake Canyon (31.6 miles)**<br>• Source to Green River (including Flat Nose George Tributary) | | | |
| **Alternative A (No Action)** | **Alternative B** | **PROPOSED PLAN** | **Alternative D** |
| Suitability determination would not be made for this eligible river segment. It would remain eligible and would be managed to protect its outstandingly remarkable values, free-flowing nature, and tentative classification. | Suitable–Wild<br>Oil and gas leasing: Closed<br>OHV category: Closed<br>VRM designation: Class I | Not suitable | Not suitable |
| **Salt Wash (0.3 miles)**<br>• Arches National Park boundary to Colorado River | | | |
| **Alternative A (No Action)** | **Alternative B** | **PROPOSED PLAN** | **Alternative D** |
| Suitability determination would not be made for this eligible river segment. It would remain eligible and would be managed to protect its outstandingly remarkable values, free-flowing nature, and tentative classification. | Salt Wash to be deferred until NPS does suitability on portion within Arches National Park. It would remain eligible and would be managed to protect its outstandingly remarkable values, free-flowing nature, and tentative classification.<br>By default, the lower 0.25 miles of this 0.3-mile segment is within Segment 4 of the Colorado River. Consequently, it would be managed as suitable with a recreation classification. | Salt Wash to be deferred until NPS does suitability on portion within Arches National Park. It would remain eligible and would be managed to protect its outstandingly remarkable values, free-flowing nature, and tentative classification.<br>By default, the lower 0.25 miles of this 0.3-mile segment is within Segment 4 of the Colorado River. Consequently, it would be managed as suitable with a recreation classification. | Salt Wash to be deferred until NPS does suitability on portion within Arches National Park. It would remain eligible and would be managed to protect its outstandingly remarkable values, free-flowing nature, and tentative classification. |
| **Thompson Canyon (5.5 miles)**<br>• Source of Thompson to Fisher Creek (Cottonwood Canyon; tributary of Dolores River) | | | |
| **Alternative A (No Action)** | **Alternative B** | **PROPOSED PLAN** | **Alternative D** |
| Suitability determination would not be made for this eligible river segment. It would remain eligible and would be managed to protect its outstandingly remarkable values, free-flowing nature, and tentative classification. | Suitable–Wild<br>Oil and gas leasing: Closed<br>OHV category: Limited to designated routes<br>VRM designation: Class I | Not suitable | Not suitable |

**Table 2.1. MOAB PROPOSED PLAN and Draft RMP Alternatives**

## SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS – WILDERNESS AND WILDERNESS STUDY AREAS (WSAs)

**Goals and Objectives:**

- Preserve the wilderness character of Wilderness Study Areas (WSAs) until Congress designates them wilderness or releases them.
- Manage the Black Ridge Wilderness Area to provide for the protection of wilderness character and for the use and enjoyment of visitors in a manner that leaves it unimpaired for future use (43 CFR 8560).

**Management Common to PROPOSED PLAN and Draft RMP Alternatives A, B. and D:**

- Manage WSAs under the Interim Management Policy for Lands Under Wilderness Review (IMP; USDI-BLM 1995; see Map 2-16). Manage for the continued preservation of each WSA's wilderness character.
- Manage Black Ridge Wilderness Area (5,200 acres; part of the McInnis Canyon National Conservation Area) in accordance with applicable law, regulation, policy, and management for the area (see Maps 2-16-A through 2-16-D).
- For WSAs, no surface disturbance, permanent new development, or ROWs are allowed, and the lands are closed to oil and gas leasing (see Appendix C).
- For designated Wilderness, any new development or surface disturbance is for wilderness purposes, and the lands are closed to mineral leasing and location. These are non-discretionary, non-planning decisions.
- Only Congress can release a WSA from wilderness consideration. Should any WSA, in part or in whole, be released from wilderness consideration, proposals in the released area would be examined on a case-by-case basis. All proposals inconsistent with Interim Management Policy (IMP) would be deferred until completion of requisite plan amendments. Because a plan amendment would be required, there is no separate analysis in this Land-use Plan to address resource impacts if any WSAs are released.
- Fire activities and projects in WSAs would follow the IMP.
- Designate WSAs and Wilderness as VRM Class I.
- Under the Proposed Plan and under Alternatives A and D, 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 – see Glossary) could continue as long as use of these routes does not impair wilderness suitability, as provided by the Interim Management Policy for Lands Under Wilderness Review (BLM 7/5/95). The miles of motorized routes in WSAs (see below for miles of route per WSA) are only conditionally open to vehicle use. 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.

### Behind the Rocks WSA (12,635 acres)

| Alternative A (No Action) | Alternative B | PROPOSED PLAN | Alternative D |
|---|---|---|---|
| Designate the majority of the Behind the Rocks WSA as closed to OHV use.<br>About 3.55 miles of inventoried way are designated. | Designate the Behind the Rocks WSA as closed to OHV use.<br>No miles of route are designated. | Designate a portion of the Behind the Rocks WSA as closed to OHV use (11,822 acres). Designate OHV use in the remainder of the WSA as limited to designated routes (813 acres, with 0.9 miles of designated route). | Designate the Behind the Rocks WSA as limited to designated routes (with 0.9 miles of designated routes). |

### Black Ridge (52 acres) and Lost Spring Canyon (1,624 acres) WSAs

**Note: Most of the original Black Ridge WSA was designated Wilderness with the creation of the McInnis Canyon NCA. Most of the original Lost Spring Canyon WSA has been incorporated into Arches National Park.**

| Alternative A (No Action) | Alternative B | PROPOSED PLAN | Alternative D |
|---|---|---|---|
| Designate Black Ridge and Lost Spring Canyon WSAs as limited to inventoried routes, with 0.25 miles of route designated in Lost Spring Canyon WSA and 0 miles of route designated in Black Ridge WSA. | Designate Black Ridge and Lost Spring Canyon WSAs as closed to OHV use, with 0 miles of route designated in Lost Spring Canyon WSA and 0 miles of route designated in Black Ridge WSA. | Designate Black Ridge and Lost Spring Canyon WSAs as limited to designated routes, with 0.25 miles of route designated in Lost Spring Canyon WSA and 0 miles of route designated in Black Ridge WSA. | Same as the Proposed Plan. |

### Desolation Canyon (81,603 acres), Floy Canyon (72,605 acres), Flume Canyon (50,800 acres), Coal Canyon (60,755 acres), Mill Creek Canyon (9,780 acres), Negro Bill Canyon (7,820 acres), and Spruce Canyon (20,990 acres) WSAs

**Note: Acreage of Desolation Canyon WSA is for the MPA portion only. Remainder of this WSA is managed by the Price Field Office. Acreage of Flume Canyon WSA includes 2,750 acres in areas administered by the Vernal Field Office.**

| Alternative A (No Action) | Alternative B | PROPOSED PLAN | Alternative D |
|---|---|---|---|
| Designate these WSAs as limited to inventoried routes, with:<br>• 8.2 miles of inventoried way designated in Desolation Canyon WSA.<br>• 23.5 miles of inventoried way designated in Floy Canyon WSA.<br>• 10.1 miles of inventoried way designated in Flume Canyon WSA.<br>• 8.0 miles of inventoried way designated in Coal Canyon WSA.<br>• 1.8 miles of inventoried way designated in Mill Creek Canyon WSA.<br>• 3.5 miles of inventoried way designated in Negro Bill Canyon WSA.<br>• 1.0 mile of inventoried way designated in Spruce Canyon WSA. | Designate these WSAs as closed to OHV. No miles of route would be designated. | Same as Alternative B. | Designate these WSAs as limited to designated routes, with<br>• 1.5 miles of inventoried way designated in Floy Canyon WSA.<br>• 1.5 miles of inventoried way designated in Coal Canyon WSA.<br>• 1.4 miles of inventoried way designated in Mill Creek Canyon WSA.<br>• 1.1 miles of inventoried way designated in Negro Bill Canyon WSA. |

### Westwater Canyon WSA (31,160 acres)

| Alternative A (No Action) | Alternative B | PROPOSED PLAN | Alternative D |
|---|---|---|---|
| Designate the Westwater Canyon WSA as limited to inventoried routes, with 22.5 miles of inventoried way designated. | Designate the Westwater Canyon WSA as closed to OHV, with no miles of route designated. | Designate a portion of the Westwater Canyon WSA as closed to OHV (23,690 acres). Designate the remainder of the WSA as limited to designated routes, | Designate the Westwater Canyon WSA as limited to designated routes, with 8.4 miles of route designated. |

**Table 2.1. MOAB PROPOSED PLAN and Draft RMP Alternatives**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | with zero miles designated (7,470 acres). | |
| **SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES** | | | |

**Goals and Objectives:**

- Maintain, protect, and enhance habitats (including but not limited to designated critical habitat) of Federally listed threatened, endangered, or candidate plant or animal species to actively promote recovery to the point that they no longer need protection under the Endangered Species Act.
- Maintain, protect, and enhance habitats of BLM (State) Sensitive plant and animal species to prevent the listing of these species under the Endangered Species Act.
- Implement management strategies that restore degraded riparian communities; protect natural flow requirements; protect water quality; manage for stable, non-eroding banks; and manage for year-round flows where applicable.
- Allow or participate in research of threatened and endangered (T&E) and Sensitive species and their habitats.
- Avoid practices that permanently convert sagebrush shrubland to invasive species.

**Management common to the PROPOSED PLAN and Draft RMP Alternatives A, B, and D:**

As required by the Endangered Species Act:

- Implement recovery actions identified in Recovery Plans and in Conservation Agreements, Plans and Strategies in coordination with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), Utah Division of Wildlife Resources (UDWR), and other interested entities. The BLM would be an active participant in all recovery implementation teams.
- The protection of habitat for listed and non-listed plant and animal species would be considered prior to authorizing any actions that could alter or disturb such habitat.
- No management action would be permitted on public lands that would jeopardize the continued existence of plant or animal species that are listed or are officially proposed or are candidates for listing as T&E.
- Surveys of habitat or potential habitat for special status species (including any sensitive species under consideration for formal designation as T&E) would be made prior to taking any action that could affect these species. Surveys would be conducted using protocols established for potentially affected species.
- BLM would conduct or cooperate in surveys to determine the extent of listed and non-listed plant and animal species and their habitat or potential habitat. Any listed or non-listed special status species survey must be conducted by qualified biologists, botanists, or ecologists that have been approved by the BLM.
- Monitoring, using approved protocol, would be required on listed and non-listed special status species habitat that may be affected by BLM authorization of any activities within that habitat.
- Follow current and future recovery plans and manage habitat for T&E and BLM Sensitive species:
  - Colorado Squawfish Recovery Plan.
  - Colorado Pikeminnow Recovery Goals: amendment and supplement to the Colorado Squawfish Recovery Plan.
  - Humpback Recovery Plan.
  - Humpback Chub Recovery Goals: amendment and supplement to the Humpback Recovery Plan.
  - Bonytail Recovery Plan.
  - Bonytail Recovery Goals: amendment and supplement to the Bonytail Recovery Plan.
  - Razorback Sucker Recovery Plan.
  - Razorback Recovery Goals: amendment and supplement to the Razorback Sucker Recovery Plan.
  - Black-footed Ferret Recovery Plan.
  - Northern States Bald Eagle Recovery Plan.
  - Recovery Plan for the Mexican Spotted Owl.
  - Recovery Plan Southwestern Willow Flycatcher.
- Support and implement special status plant and animal Species Management Plans. Coordinate actions with UDWR and other involved entities. Support population and habitat monitoring.
- Support and implement current and future special status plant and animal species Conservation Plans, Strategies, and Agreements. Coordinate actions with USFWS and other involved entities. Support population and habitat monitoring. As of 2005, Conservation Plans Strategies and Agreements include:
  - Colorado River Cutthroat Trout Conservation Agreement and Strategy Conservation Agreement for the Roundtail Chub, Bluehead Sucker and Flannelmouth Sucker (see Map 2-17).
  - Follow current and future Conservation Measures and Best Management Practices (BMP) for Federally Listed Species (see Appendix K). Species include but are not limited to: Jones Cycladenia, Mexican Spotted Owl, Southwestern Willow Flycatcher, Bald Eagle, and the Endangered Fish of the Colorado River.
- Work with UDWR to implement the Utah Wildlife Action Plan (UDWR 2005a) to coordinate management actions that will conserve native species and prevent the need for additional listings.
- Mitigate all unavoidable habitat losses for special status species as required by policy or law.
- Avoid construction of new roads within listed and non-listed special status plant and animal species habitats.
- Apply lease notices for listed plant and animal species as determined by Section 7 consultation between BLM and USFWS. Apply appropriate lease notices for any non-listed special status plant and animal species that occur or could potential occur applicable proposed lease areas.
- Develop cooperative agreements with other agencies or entities to inventory and/or monitor existing or potential habitat for listed and non-listed special status plant and animal species.
- Plan and implement assessment and monitoring plans for T&E and BLM Sensitive species.
- Participate in the Colorado River Fishes Recovery and Implementation Program.
- Coordinate with USFWS and UDWR to allow for the reintroduction of T&E and BLM Sensitive species into historic or suitable range. These reintroductions would be analyzed with site-specific NEPA.
- Allow translocations and population augmentation of special status species to aid in conservation and recovery efforts. Implement necessary habitat manipulations and monitoring to ensure successful translocation efforts.
- Apply environmental best management practices (BMPs) to all oil and gas operations in accordance with WO IM 2007-021 and the latest version of the "Goldbook" (see Appendix C).

**Mexican Spotted Owl (MSO):**

- If BLM determines that a proposed action may affect MSO or its habitat, consultation with the USFWS would be initiated (see Map 2-18).

**Table 2.1. MOAB PROPOSED PLAN and Draft RMP Alternatives**

- Monitor and protect known Protected Activity Center (PAC) sites according to USFWS recommendations and MSO Recovery Plan.
- Manage habitat for MSO according to USFWS and UDWR recommendations and recovery plans.
- Develop cooperative agreements with other agencies and entities to inventory and monitor existing potential habitat and annually schedule assessment plans of MSO habitat to determine quality of habitat and presence of species.
- Protect occupied and potential habitat, including designated critical habitat for the MSO, by applying the standard terms and conditions developed in consultation with the USFWS for oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities (see Standard Terms and Conditions [Lease Notices] which are Required to Protect Special Status Species and to Comply with the Endangered Species Act, Appendix C). These stipulations would preclude temporary activities within designated critical habitat from March 1 through August 31. Permanent actions are prohibited year-round within 0.5 miles of a PAC.

**Southwestern Willow Flycatcher (SWFL):**

- If BLM determines that a proposed action may affect SWFL or its habitat, consultation with the USFWS would be initiated.
- Monitor and protect known nesting sites according to USFWS recommendations and SWFL Recovery Plan.
- Manage habitat for SWFL according to USFWS and UDWR recommendations and recovery plans; avoid loss or disturbance of suitable riparian habitat.
- Develop cooperative agreements with other agencies and entities to inventory and monitor existing potential habitat and annually schedule assessment plans of SWFL habitat to determine quality of habitat and presence of species.
- Protect SWFL and their habitat by applying the standard terms and conditions developed in consultation with the USFWS for oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities (see Standard Terms and Conditions [Lease Notices] which are Required to Protect Special Status Species and to Comply with the Endangered Species Act, Appendix C) within suitable habitat. These stipulations would preclude activities within a 100-m buffer of suitable habitat year long. Activities within 0.25 miles of occupied breeding habitat would not occur during the breeding season, May 1 through August 15.

**Bald Eagle:**

- If BLM determines that a proposed action may affect bald eagles or its habitat, consultation with the USFWS would be initiated.
- Acquire lands with roost and nest sites through land exchange, purchase or donation.
- Conduct assessments of wintering bald eagle habitat to delineate essential winter habitat and to develop necessary protective measures.
- Monitor nesting territories annually during breeding season (generally January 1 through August 31).
- Protect bald eagle nest sites by applying the standard terms and conditions developed in consultation with the USFWS for oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities (see Standard Terms and Conditions [Lease Notices] which are Required to Protect Special Status Species and to Comply with the Endangered Species Act, Appendix C) within 1.0 mile of documented nest sites (2,439 acres). These stipulations would preclude surface-disturbing activities within a 1.0 mile radius of nest sites from January 1 through August 31 (see Map 2-19). No permanent structures would be allowed within 0.5 miles of known bald eagle nest sites year-round. Deviations may be allowed only after appropriate levels of consultation and coordination with the USFWS.
- Protect bald eagle winter habitat by applying the standard terms and conditions developed in consultation with the USFWS for oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities (see Standard Terms and Conditions [Lease Notices] which are Required to Protect Special Status Species and to Comply with the Endangered Species Act, Appendix C) within 0.5 mile of winter roost areas. These stipulations would preclude activities and permanent structures within a 0.5 mile radius of winter roost sites from November 1through March 31 (see Map 2-19). No permanent structures would be allowed within 0.5 mile of winter roost sites, if the structure would result in the habitat becoming unsuitable for future winter roosting by bald eagles.

**Sage-grouse:**

- Advance the conservation of Greater sage-grouse as well its habitat in accordance with the BLM National Sage-grouse Habitat Conservation Strategy to avoid contributing to its listing under the Endangered Species Act (see Map 2-20).
- Consistent with RMP goals and objectives, utilize and apply, as needed, the following plans as part of implementing the BLM's National Sage-grouse Habitat Conservation Strategy, Strategic Management Plan for Sage-grouse (UDWR 2002), Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies, Conservation Assessment of Greater Sage-grouse and Sagebrush Habitats (Connelly et al. 2004), Greater Sage-grouse Comprehensive Conservation Strategy (WAFWA 2006), and the Gunnison Sage-grouse Range-wide Conservation Plan. Follow The Gunnison Sage-grouse Range-wide Conservation Plan (GSRSC 2005) for suggested management practices within 4 miles of active Gunnison sage-grouse leks.
- Work cooperatively with UDWR; universities; State, county, and local agencies; and private organizations to develop expanded data; assist with analysis; identify important habitat and potential restoration areas and treatments; and form cooperative agreements with other agencies and organizations to inventory sage-grouse densities and identify suitable habitat for expansion.
- Develop and implement suitable sage-grouse habitat restoration projects.
- Allow for translocation of sage-grouse in suitable unoccupied habitat.

**White-tailed and Gunnison Prairie Dogs:**

- The White-tailed prairie dog and the Gunnison prairie dog are BLM and State sensitive species; translocations of these species would be considered in suitable unoccupied habitats (see Map 2-21).
- Manage both prairie dog species and their habitats in coordination with the UDWR. Apply habitat management guidance and population monitoring strategies as recommended in the newly developed multi-agency White-tailed and Gunnison's Prairie Dog Management Plan.
- Develop cooperative agreements with other agencies to inventory prairie dog densities and identify suitable habitat for expansion.

**Colorado River Endangered Fish:**

- No surface-disturbing activities within the 100-year floodplain of the Colorado River, Green River, and at the confluence of the Dolores and Colorado Rivers would be allowed. Any exceptions to this requirement would require consultation with the USFWS. Restrictions on surface disturbance within this critical habitat would be developed through this consultation process (see Map 2-17).

**Golden Eagle:**

- Known golden eagle nest sites would be protected according to the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act amended in 1978.
- Acquire lands with nest and roost sites through land exchange or acquisition.
- Conduct assessments of wintering golden eagle habitat.
- Protect golden eagle nest sites and habitat (12,902 acres) by applying the standard terms and conditions developed in consultation with the USFWS for oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities (see Standard Terms and Conditions [Lease Notices] which are Required to Protect Special Status Species and to Comply with the Endangered Species Act, Appendix C). These stipulations would preclude surface-disturbing activities within 0.5 miles of documented nest sites from February 1 to July 15 (see Map 2-19).

**Burrowing Owl:**

- Protect burrowing owls by applying the standard terms and conditions developed in consultation with the USFWS (see Appendix O) for oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities (see Standard Terms and Conditions [Lease Notices] which are Required to Protect Special Status Species and to Comply with the Endangered Species Act, Appendix C) by precluding surface-disturbing activities within 0.25 miles of known nests from March 1 through August 31 (see Map 2-22).
- Domestic sheep camps, temporary watering sites, and salt and mineral blocks would not be located within 0.25 miles of occupied burrowing owl nests from March 1 through August 31.

**Table 2.1. MOAB PROPOSED PLAN and Draft RMP Alternatives**

- Maintain ground squirrel and prairie dog colonies to provide habitat and nesting burrows for burrowing owls.
- The species would be managed under the guidance provided by the Raptor Best Management Practices (BMPs; see Appendix O), which includes implementation of spatial and seasonal buffers to protect nesting raptors and their habitats.

**Kit Fox:**

- Protect kit fox by precluding surface-disturbing activities within 200 m of a kit fox den.

**Ferruginous Hawk:**

- Manage ferruginous hawk nesting and foraging habitat by applying the standard terms and conditions developed in consultation with the USFWS (see Appendix O) for oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities (see Standard Terms and Conditions [Lease Notices] which are Required to Protect Special Status Species and to Comply with the Endangered Species Act, Appendix C) precluding surface-disturbing activities within 0.5 miles of active nests from March 1 through August 1 (see Map 2-22).
- Domestic sheep camps, temporary watering sites, and salt and mineral blocks would not be located within 0.5 miles of occupied ferruginous hawk nests from March 1 through August 1.
- The species would be managed under the guidance provided by the Raptor BMPs (see Appendix O), which includes implementation of spatial and seasonal buffers to protect nesting raptors and their habitats.

**Yellow-billed Cuckoo:**

- Avoid loss or disturbance of yellow-billed cuckoo habitat and manage yellow-billed cuckoo nesting and foraging habitat by applying the standard terms and conditions developed in consultation with the USFWS for oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities (see Standard Terms and Conditions [Lease Notices] which are Required to Protect Special Status Species and to Comply with the Endangered Species Act, Appendix C). These stipulations preclude surface-disturbing activities within 100 m of yellow-billed cuckoo habitat within riparian areas from May 15 through July 20.
- Compliance with BLM Riparian Policy would restrict surface disturbance within 100 m of riparian habitat and would therefore protect nesting habitat for yellow-billed cuckoo.

**Jones *Cycladenia (Cycladenia humilis* var. *jonesii*):**

- Require specific site inventories for all surface disturbing projects in areas with suitable *Cycladenia humilis* var. *jonesii* habitat.
- BLM would restrict activities, in suitable *Cycladenia humilis* var. *jonesii* habitat. Restrictions include limiting motorized travel to designated routes, precluding surface disturbing activities within 300 feet of plants and suitable habitat, and precluding construction activities from May 15th through June 30th within occupied habitat (see Standard Terms and conditions [Lease Notices] which are Required to Protect Special Status Species and to Comply with the Endangered Species Act, Appendix C). Other restrictions include avoiding road construction, land disposal, and utilities in this habitat, as well as avoiding grazing activities such as trailing, salting, watering and herding.

**California Condor**

- Within potential habitat for the California Condor, surveys will be required prior to operations unless species occupancy and distribution information is complete and available.
- Surface disturbing activities will not occur within 1.0 mile of nest sites during the breeding season of August 1 to November 30 or within 0.5 mile of established roosting sites (see Standard Terms and Conditions [Lease Notices] which are Required to Protect Special Status Species and to Comply with the Endangered Species Act, Appendix C).
- No permanent infrastructure will be placed within 1.0 mile of nest sites and within 0.5 miles of established roosting sites.

| Greater Sage-grouse Habitats | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Alternative A (No Action)** | **Alternative B** | **PROPOSED PLAN** | **Alternative D** |
| Not specified. | About 12,850 acres of pre-settlement habitat (see Map 2-20) would be subject to controlled surface use and timing limitation stipulations (if sage-grouse occupation is identified by BLM in cooperation with UDWR) as follows:<br>• **Leks (within 2 miles of active strutting grounds):** apply controlled surface use and timing limitation stipulations for oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities (see Appendix C). These stipulations would preclude surface-disturbing activities from March 1 to May 15. Allow no permanent above-ground facilities within the 2 mile buffer year-round.<br>• **Nesting and Brood-rearing Habitat:** apply a timing limitation stipulation for oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities (see Appendix C). This stipulation would preclude activities from March 15 to July 15.<br>• **Winter Habitat:** apply a timing limitation stipulation to oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities (see Appendix C). This stipulation would preclude surface-disturbing activities from November 15 to March 14 on 12,850 acres.<br><br>Any surface occupancy that would require or result in loss or fragmentation of 12,850 acres of habitat would be avoided or minimized. If surface occupancy cannot be avoided, BLM would recommend that sagebrush habitat be reclaimed. BLM would require onsite mitigation measures that prevent unnecessary or undue degradation to protect surface resources in accordance | About 3,068 acres of potential habitat would be subject to controlled surface use and timing limitation stipulations (if sage-grouse occupation is identified by BLM in cooperation with UDWR) as follows:<br>• **Leks (within 2 miles of active strutting grounds):** apply controlled surface use and timing limitation stipulations for oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities (see Appendix C). These stipulations would preclude surface-disturbing activities from March 1 to May 15. Allow no surface-disturbing activities year-round within 0.5 mile buffer of active leks. Allow no permanent above-ground facilities within the two mile buffer.<br>• **Nesting and Brood-Rearing Habitat:** apply a timing limitation stipulation for oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities (see Appendix C). This stipulation would preclude activities from March 15 to July 15.<br>• **Winter Habitat:** apply a timing limitation stipulation to oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities (see Appendix C). This stipulation would preclude surface-disturbing activities from November 15 to March 14 on 3,068 acres.<br><br>Any surface occupancy that would require or result in loss or fragmentation of 3,068 acres of habitat would be avoided or minimized. If surface occupancy cannot be avoided, BLM would recommend that sagebrush habitat be reclaimed. BLM would require onsite mitigation measures that prevent unnecessary or undue degradation to protect surface resources in accordance | About 1,986 acres of potential brooding habitat would be subject to controlled surface use and timing limitations stipulations (if sage-grouse occupation is identified by BLM in cooperation with UDWR) as follows:<br>• **Leks (within 0.25 miles of active strutting grounds):** apply controlled surface use and timing limitation stipulations for oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities (see Appendix C). These stipulations would preclude surface-disturbing activities from March 1 to May 15. Allow no permanent above-ground facilities within the 0.25 mile buffer year-round.<br>• **Nesting and Brood-Rearing Habitat:** apply a timing limitation stipulation for oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities (see Appendix C). This stipulation would preclude activities from March 15 to July 15.<br>• **Winter Habitat:** apply a timing limitation stipulation to oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities (see Appendix C). This stipulation would preclude surface-disturbing activities from November 15 to March 14 on 1,986 acres.<br><br>Any surface occupancy that would require or result in loss or fragmentation of 1,986 acres of habitat would be avoided or minimized. If surface occupancy cannot be avoided, BLM would recommend that sagebrush habitat be reclaimed. BLM would require onsite mitigation measures that prevent unnecessary or undue degradation to protect surface resources in accordance |

**Table 2.1. MOAB PROPOSED PLAN and Draft RMP Alternatives**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | with 40 CFR 1508.20. | with 40 CFR 1508.20. | with 40 CFR 1508.20. |
| **Gunnison Sage-grouse Habitat** | | | |
| **Alternative A (No Action)** | **Alternative B** | **PROPOSED PLAN** | **Alternative D** |
| Not specified. | About 246,107 acres of pre-settlement habitat (See Map 2-20) would be subject to controlled surface use and timing limitation stipulations (if sage-grouse occupation is identified by BLM in cooperation with UDWR) as follows:<br>• **Lek habitat (within 2.0 miles of active strutting ground):**<br>Apply controlled surface use and timing limitation stipulation for oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities (see Appendix C). This stipulation would preclude permanent surface occupancy within 2.0 miles of an active lek. No surface-disturbing activities would be allowed from March 20 to May 15.<br>Allow no permanent above-ground facilities within the buffer.<br>Prohibit or limit year-round construction of fences. Where opportunity exists, remove existing fences.<br>Prohibit construction of power lines or other structures.<br>Avoid issuing ROWs that would result in permanent above-ground facilities within 2.0 miles of a lek.<br>Human caused disturbances would be avoided from March 20 to May 15.<br>• **In year-round habitat (within 6.0 miles of active lek):** avoid construction of fences, power lines, and tall structures. | About 175,727 acres of current potential habitat would be subject to controlled surface use and timing limitation stipulations (if sage-grouse occupation is identified by BLM in cooperation with UDWR) as follows:<br>• **Leks (within 2 miles of active strutting grounds):** apply controlled surface use and timing limitation stipulations for oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities (see Appendix C). These stipulations would preclude surface-disturbing activities from March 20 to May 15. Allow no surface disturbing activities year-round within 0.5 mile buffer of active leks.<br>Allow no permanent above-ground facilities within the two mile buffer.<br>Prohibit or limit year-round construction of fences. Where opportunity exists, remove existing fences.<br>Prohibit construction of power lines or other structures.<br>Avoid issuing ROWs that would result in permanent above-ground facilities within 0.5 miles of a lek.<br>Human caused disturbances would be avoided from March 20 to May 15.<br>• **In year-round habitat (within 4.0 miles of active lek):** minimize fence construction and avoid overhead power line construction where it would provide new raptor hunting perches and the possibility of collision for sage-grouse. Fences deemed necessary to construct should be built with materials that maximize visibility for sage-grouse to avoid collision. | About 41,620 acres of potential brooding habitat would be subject to controlled surface use and timing limitation stipulations (if sage-grouse occupation is identified by BLM in cooperation with UDWR) as follows:<br>• **Lek habitat (within 0.25 miles of active strutting ground):**<br>Apply controlled surface use and timing limitation stipulation for oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities (see Appendix C). These stipulations would preclude permanent surface occupancy within 0.25 miles of an active lek. No surface-disturbing activities would be allowed from March 20 to May 15.<br>Allow no permanent above-ground facilities within the buffer.<br>Prohibit or limit year-round construction of fences. Where opportunity exists, remove existing fences.<br>Prohibit construction of power lines or other structures.<br>Avoid issuing ROWs that would result in permanent above-ground facilities within 0.25 miles of a lek.<br>Human caused disturbances would be avoided from March 20 to May 15. |
| Not specified. | Any surface occupancy that would require or result in loss or fragmentation of 246,107 acres of habitat would be avoided or minimized. If surface occupancy cannot be avoided sagebrush habitat would be reclaimed. BLM would require onsite mitigation measures that prevent unnecessary or undue degradation to protect surface resources in accordance with 40 CFR 1508.20. | Any surface occupancy that would require or result in loss or fragmentation of any of the 175,727 acres of identified Gunnison sage-grouse habitat would be avoided or minimized. If surface occupancy cannot be avoided sagebrush habitat would be reclaimed. BLM would require onsite mitigation measures that prevent unnecessary or undue degradation to protect surface resources in accordance with 40 CFR 1508.20. | Any surface occupancy that would require or result in loss or fragmentation of 41,620 acres of habitat would be avoided or minimized. If surface occupancy cannot be avoided sagebrush habitat would be reclaimed. BLM would require onsite mitigation measures that prevent unnecessary or undue degradation to protect surface resources in accordance with 40 CFR 1508.20. |
| **White-tailed Prairie Dog Habitat** | | | |
| **Alternative A (No Action)** | **Alternative B** | **PROPOSED PLAN** | **Alternative D** |
| Not specified. | Manage 199,505 acres of historic habitat (see Map 2-21) designated by UDWR. Manage 117,481 acres of this habitat as the Cisco White-tailed Prairie Dog Complex ACEC; apply no surface occupancy stipulation for oil and gas leasing and preclude other surface-disturbing activities (see Appendix C) within the ACEC.<br>Manage the remaining 82,024 acres of habitat to protect active prairie dog colonies by applying a controlled surface use stipulation for oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities (see Appendix C). This stipulation would preclude surface-disturbing activities within 1,300 feet of these colonies. No permanent above-ground facilities would be allowed within the 1,300-foot buffer. | Manage the contiguous 117,481 acres of historic habitat designated by UDWR. Apply a controlled surface use stipulation for oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities (see Appendix C) within 660 feet of active prairie dog colonies. This stipulation would preclude surface-disturbing activities within 660 feet of these colonies. No permanent above-ground facilities would be allowed within the 660-foot buffer. | Manage 31,186 acres of occupied habitat designated by UDWR. Apply a controlled surface use stipulation for oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities (see Appendix C) within 660 feet of active prairie dog colonies. This stipulation would preclude surface-disturbing activities within 660 feet of these colonies. No permanent above-ground facilities would be allowed within the 660-foot buffer. |
| **Gunnison Prairie Dog Habitat** | | | |
| **Alternative A (No Action)** | **Alternative B** | **PROPOSED PLAN** | **Alternative D** |
| Not specified. | Manage 10,700 acres of habitat designated by UDWR for Gunnison prairie dogs (see Map 2-21). Apply a controlled surface use stipulation for oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities (see Appendix C) within 1,300 feet of active prairie dog colonies. This stipulation would preclude surface- | Manage 10,700 acres of habitat designated by UDWR for Gunnison prairie dogs. Apply a controlled surface use stipulation for oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities (see Appendix C) within 660 feet of active prairie dog colonies. This stipulation would preclude surface-disturbing | Manage Gunnison prairie dog habitat using standards terms and conditions. |

**Table 2.1. MOAB PROPOSED PLAN and Draft RMP Alternatives**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | disturbing activities within 1,300 feet of these colonies.<br>No permanent above-ground facilities would be allowed within 1,300 feet of prairie dog colonies.<br>Construction of new power lines would be prohibited within 1,300 feet of prairie dog colonies. | activities within 660 feet of these colonies.<br>No permanent above-ground facilities would be allowed within 660 feet of prairie dog colonies.<br>Power lines would be avoided within prairie dog colonies; however in the event that power lines are required within colonies, raptor anti-perch devices would be required. | |

## TRAVEL MANAGEMENT

### Motorized Travel

**Management common to the PROPOSED PLAN and Draft RMP Alternatives A, B, and D:**

Under the Proposed Plan and under Alternatives A and D, 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 – see Glossary) could continue as long as use of these routes does not impair wilderness suitability, as provided by the Interim Management Policy for Lands Under Wilderness Review (BLM 7/5/95). The miles of motorized routes in WSAs (see page 2-42 and 2-43 for miles of route per WSA) are only conditionally open to vehicle use. 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.*

**Management common to the PROPOSED PLAN and Draft RMP Alternatives B and D:**

- BLM, in preparing its RMP designations and its implementation-level travel management plans, is following policy and regulation authority found at: 43 C.F.R. Part 8340; 43 C.F.R. Subpart 8364; and 43 C.F.R. Subpart 9268.
- *Provide opportunities for a range of motorized recreation experiences on public lands while protecting sensitive resources and minimizing conflicts among various users. Identification of specific designated routes would be initially established through the chosen Travel Plan accompanying this RMP (see Appendix G) and may be modified through subsequent implementation planning and project planning on a case-by-case basis. These identified routes would be available regardless of other management actions. These adjustments would occur only in areas with limited route designations and would be analyzed at the implementation planning level. These adjustments would be done through a collaborative process with local government and which would include public review of proposed route changes. Site-specific NEPA documentation would be required for changes to the route designation system.* †
- All areas would be limited, open, or closed to motorized travel. Limit travel by motorized vehicle on all lands administered by the MFO to designated routes, except for Managed Open Areas, and for areas that are closed to motorized travel (see Maps 2-10-A through 2-10-D; see Appendix G for Travel Plan development).
- BLM could impose limitations on types of vehicle allowed on specific designated routes if monitoring indicates that a particular type of vehicle is causing disturbance to the soil, wildlife, wildlife habitat, cultural or vegetative resources, especially by off-road travel in an area that is limited to designated roads.
- OHV access for game retrieval, antler collection and dispersed camping would only be allowed on designated routes (designated routes/spurs have been identified specifically for dispersed camping). Adherence to the Travel Plan is required for all activities, except where otherwise explicitly permitted.
- Only designated roads and managed open areas are available for motorized commercial and organized group use (see Maps 2-11-B through 2-11-D for route designations by alternatives).
- Where the authorized officer determines that off-road vehicles are causing or would cause considerable adverse impacts, the authorized officer shall close or restrict such areas. The public would be notified as to these closures and restrictions.
- Any routes that are not baseline routes would be signed "Closed" on the ground. Such routes would be considered as impacts to the area's natural character, and use of such routes would be considered cross country use and not allowed. Non-inventoried routes should be rehabilitated.
- Under the Proposed Plan and under Alternatives A and D, 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 – see Glossary) could continue as long as use of these routes does not impair wilderness suitability, as provided by the Interim Management Policy for Lands Under Wilderness Review (BLM 7/5/95). The miles of motorized routes in WSAs (see below for miles of route per WSA) are only conditionally open to vehicle use. 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.

| ♦ Alternative A (No Action) | Alternative B | PROPOSED PLAN | Alternative D |
|---|---|---|---|
| Continue to manage motorized vehicle travel under the travel designations established in the 1985 Grand RMP as modified by subsequent Federal Register notices published under the authority of 43 CFR 8340 (see Map 2-10-A).<br>Manage 620,212 acres as open to off-road vehicle travel, 1,196,920 acres as OHV travel limited to existing roads and trails (of which 48,169 acres would be OHV travel limited to designated roads and trails and 309,749 acres within WSAs would be limited to inventoried routes) and 5,062 acres as closed to OHV travel. | ♦ 437,424 acres would be closed to OHV travel.<br>♦ 1,475,074 acres would be limited to designated routes.<br>♦ 0 acres would be open to cross country travel (see Map 2-10-B). | ♦ 339,298 acres would be closed to OHV travel.<br>♦ 1,481,334 acres would be limited to designated routes.<br>♦ Approx. 2,000 acres (White Wash Sand Dunes) would be open to cross country travel (see Map 2-10-C). | ♦ 57,351 acres would be closed to OHV travel.<br>♦ 1,762,083 acres would be limited to designated routes and/or inventoried routes within WSAs.<br>♦ 3,064 acres (White Wash Sand Dunes and the Airport Hills) would be open to cross country travel (see Map 2-10-D). |
| **Miles of Route:** | **Designated Routes:** | **Designated Routes:** | **Designated Routes:** |
| 6,199 miles motorized routes. | 3,328 miles motorized routes. | *3,693 miles motorized routes.*† | 3,855 miles motorized routes. |
| 199 miles inventoried verified motorized single-track. | 122 miles of full-sized motorized routes converted to motorcycle-only use. | *313 miles for motorcycles (163 miles on inventoried routes and 150 miles on inventoried single-track).* † | 347 miles for motorcycles (151 miles on inventoried routes and 196 miles on inventoried single-track). |

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

## Table 2.1. MOAB PROPOSED PLAN and Draft RMP Alternatives

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Dirt Bike Trail/Route:**<br>Dirt bike route from Colorado State Line to Thompson not designated. | **Dirt Bike Trail/Route:**<br>Do not designate dirt bike routes from the Colorado State Line to Thompson, Utah. | **Dirt Bike Trail/Route:**<br>*Designate dirt bike route from Colorado State Line to Thompson (see Map 2-11), utilizing 9 miles of single-track and 22 miles of inventoried Grand County roads. These totals are reflected in the mileage under "designated routes."* † | **Dirt Bike Trail/Route:**<br>Designate 58.3 miles of dirt bike route from the Colorado State Line to Thompson. Portions of this route (48 miles) are considered new and will require site-specific NEPA analysis prior to possible designation and use. The remaining 10 miles of the route may be used immediately. These totals are reflected in the mileage under "designated routes." |
| **Mechanized Recreational Travel (e.g., mountain bikes)** | | | |
| **Management common to the PROPOSED PLAN and Draft RMP Alternatives B and D:**<br>• Provide opportunities for mechanized travel on all routes open to motorized use.<br>• Prohibit new bike routes within non-WSA lands managed for wilderness characteristics or within hiking focus areas.<br>• Limit mechanized travel to designated trails and managed routes for resource protection purposes. Routes that are no longer available for motorized travel may be converted to bike routes upon application of site-specific NEPA analysis.<br>• Manage approximately 11.2 miles of routes on the following trails for non-motorized use only: Jackson Trail, "Baby Steps," Hunter Canyon Rim, Portal Trail, Hidden Valley, and Porcupine Rim single-track section. (Hidden Valley and Porcupine Rim Trails are subject to IMP.)<br>• Identification of specific designated routes would be initially established through the RMP process and may be modified through subsequent planning at the activity plan and project plan levels on a case-*by-case basis. These modifications would be analyzed through site-specific NEPA.* | | | |
| **Alternative A (No Action)** | **Alternative B** | **PROPOSED PLAN** | **Alternative D** |
| Continue to manage mechanized travel under closure and restriction notices published in the Federal Register under the authority of 43 CFR 8364.<br>Manage 4 miles of route on the following trails for mechanized use:<br>• Jackson Trail.<br>• Portal Trail. | Design and implement up to 75 additional miles of managed mechanized trails. Implement these new system routes solely by converting inventoried routes not designated for motorized travel to non-motorized use, where appropriate, and installing support facilities such as trailheads and route signage. No new single track trails would be considered (see Map 2-11-F(B)). | *Design and implement up to 150 new miles of managed mechanized trails. In addition, convert existing inventoried routes not designated for motorized travel to non-motorized use, where appropriate, and install appropriate support facilities such as trailheads and route signage*†<br>*Initially designate the following existing trails for mechanized use (totaling 11.3 miles; see Map 2-11-F(C):*†<br>• *Fisher Mesa (in conjunction with USFS; 5.8 miles).*<br>• *Pothole (on Amasa Back; 1.2 miles).*<br>• *Rockstacker (on Amasa Back; 0.9 miles).*<br>• *Lower Porcupine Singletrack (LPS; 1.4 miles).*<br>• *"Power line" Trail (0.07 miles on public land).*<br>• *Mill Creek Parkway Extension (0.16 miles on public land).* | Design and implement up to 300 new miles of managed mechanized trails. In addition, convert inventoried routes not designated for motorized travel to non-motorized use, where appropriate, and install appropriate support facilities such as trailheads and route signage.<br>Same as the Proposed Plan, except also initially designate the following additional trails for mechanized use (totaling 15.5 miles; see Map 2-11-F(D)):<br>• Goldbar Singletrack (4.4 miles)<br>This new proposed trail would be analyzed with site-specific NEPA before implementation. |
| **Non-mechanized Recreational Travel (e.g., hiking, backpacking, and equestrian)** | | | |
| **Management common to the PROPOSED PLAN and Draft RMP Alternatives B and D:**<br>• Non-mechanized travel is not restricted on public lands except where limited or prohibited to protect specific resource values, provide for public safety or maintain an identified opportunity.<br>• Provide opportunities for non-mechanized travel on all routes open to mechanized use and manage routes identified in each alternative to exclude motorized and mechanized use and provide opportunities for non-mechanized travel independent of motorized and mechanized routes.<br>• Limit non-mechanized travel on specific lands to designated trails and managed routes for resource protection purposes.<br>• Manage 17 miles of routes on the following trails for non-mechanized use: Amphitheater Loop, Fisher Towers, Negro Bill, Corona Arch, Trough Spring Canyon, Anticline Overlook, Needles Overlook, Windwhistle Nature Trail, Mill Canyon Dinosaur Interpretive Trail, Copper Ridge Sauropod Interpretive Trail, and Sego Canyon Interpretive Trail.<br>• Identify specific routes through the RMP process. These routes may be modified through subsequent planning at the RMP, activity plan, and project plan levels on a case-by-case basis.<br>• Work with equestrian groups to identify additional trails for equestrian and hiker use only. These trails would be designated based on site-specific NEPA analysis. | | | |
| **Alternative A (No Action)** | **Alternative B** | **PROPOSED PLAN** | **Alternative D** |
| Not addressed. | • Design and implement up to 25 additional miles of managed non-mechanized trail system consistent with the Travel Plan. Implement these new system routes largely by converting roads to non-mechanized use and installing appropriate support facilities such as trailheads and route signage.<br>• Manage the Hidden Valley Trail as non-mechanized only.<br>• Mark the following existing trails: Castleton, Culvert-Goldbar Loop. Mark a new trail from Onion Creek to Amphitheater Loop. | • Design and implement up to 50 miles of managed non-mechanized trail system consistent with the Travel Plan. Implement these new system routes largely by converting existing, low utilization roads to non-mechanized use and installing appropriate support facilities such as trailheads and route signage.<br>• Mark the following existing trails: Castleton, Culvert-Goldbar Loop. Mark a new trail from Onion Creek to Amphitheater Loop. | • Design and implement up to 100 additional miles of managed non-mechanized trail system consistent with the Travel Plan. Implement these new system routes largely by converting existing, low utilization roads to non-mechanized use and the installation of appropriate support facilities such as trailheads and route signage.<br>• In addition to the trails proposed in the Proposed Plan, work to gain public access to the Heavenly Stairway Trail. |
| **Equestrian Use:** | **Equestrian Use:** | **Equestrian Use:** | **Equestrian Use:** |

**Table 2.1. MOAB PROPOSED PLAN and Draft RMP Alternatives**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| All public lands within the field office are presently available for equestrian use. Equestrian use in Negro Bill Canyon has been discouraged because the sandy hiking trail is easily damaged by equestrian use.<br>The Mill Creek Canyon Plan specifies that commercial equestrian use would not be renewed. | Same as the Proposed Plan, except the following additional equestrian trails would be developed. Hikers would also be allowed on this trail, but there would be no motorized or mechanized vehicles allowed:<br>• Ten Mile from Dripping Springs to Green River. | The following trails would be managed for equestrian use. Hikers would also be allowed on these trails, but there would be no motorized or mechanized vehicles allowed:<br>• Onion Creek Benches (Colorado Riverway SRMA).<br>• Ida/Stearns Gulch Equestrian Trail System.<br>• Castle Creek Equestrian Trail.<br>• Rattlesnake Trail above Nefertiti Boat Launch.<br>• Seven Mile Canyons.<br>• Red Rock Horse Trail (Ken's Lake to Johnson's Up-on-Top). | Same as the Proposed Plan. |
| **VEGETATION** | | | |
| **Goals and Objectives:**<br>• Manage vegetation resources for desired future conditions (DFC) ensuring ecological diversity, stability, and sustainability, including the desired mix of vegetation types, structural stages, and landscape/riparian function and provide for livestock grazing and for native plant, fish, and wildlife habitats (see Appendix L for Desired Future Conditions for Vegetation).<br>• Maintain existing vegetation treatment areas as appropriate.<br>• Control invasive and non-native weed species and prevent the introduction of new invasive species by implementing a comprehensive weed program (as per national guidance and local weed management plans in cooperation with state, federal, and affected counties), including: coordination with partners; prevention and early detection; education; inventory and monitoring; and using principles of integrated weed management.<br>• Manage for vegetation restoration, including control of weed infestations and control of invasive and undesirable nonnative species.<br>• Maintain, protect and enhance special status plant and animal habitats in such manner that the potential need to consider any of these species for listing as threatened or endangered under the Endangered Species Act does not arise.<br>• Develop management prescriptions for all surface-disturbing resource uses during times of extended drought (see description of Adaptive Drought Management, below).<br>• Maintain or enhance the integrity of current sagebrush and sage steppe communities and identify areas in need of restoration. Initiate restoration and/or rehabilitation efforts to ensure sustainable populations of sage-grouse, mule deer and other sagebrush obligate species. | | | |
| **Management common to the PROPOSED PLAN and Draft RMP Alternatives A, B, and D:**<br>• Utilize the BLM National Sage-grouse Conservation Strategy – Guidance for Management of Sagebrush Plant Communities for Sage-Grouse Conservation, when applicable, in the development and implementation of vegetation and land treatments, livestock manipulation techniques, fire projects, energy exploration and development and any surface-disturbing activity within sagebrush and sage steppe communities.<br>• Sagebrush/steppe communities would be a high priority for wildfire suppression, emergency stabilization and fuel reduction to avoid catastrophic fires in these communities.<br>• Reclaim and restore up to 257,809 acres of sagebrush habitat and shrub-steppe ecosystems where appropriate in accordance with the BLM sagebrush conservation guidance. Reclamation/restoration would be undertaken in cooperation with the Utah Partners for Conservation and Development (UPCD) and may include removing surface material, re-contouring, spreading topsoil, seeding or planting seedlings, and/or changing livestock grazing strategies, such as, changing season of use, type of use, removing or reducing spring grazing, reducing livestock numbers, reducing grazing intensity, improving distribution, requiring rest rotation practices, or exclusion. Work in coordination with UDWR to reduce wildlife numbers, as necessary, to restore sagebrush habitat.<br>• Provide opportunities for seed gathering of various vegetation types while protecting other resources.<br>• Restoration and rehabilitation would use native seed-mixes wherever possible. Non-native species may be used as necessary for stabilization or to prevent invasion of noxious or invasive weed species.<br>• Gather necessary vegetation information and continue monitoring to assess if planning objectives are being met.<br>• Utilize the techniques and methods for vegetation treatments identified in the Utah ROD for Vegetation Treatments using Herbicides on Bureau of Land Management Lands in Seventeen Western States (2007).<br>• Control noxious weed species and prevent the infestation and spread of invasive species. Develop cooperating agreements with other Federal, State, local and private organizations to control invasive and noxious weed species.<br>• Reduce tamarisk and Russian olive where appropriate using allowable vegetation treatments. Restore riparian habitat to native willow and cottonwood communities.<br>• Where appropriate, replant cottonwoods and willow subsequent to wildland fire or other disturbance in riparian areas.<br>• Promote science and research opportunities in the San Arroyo Area/Exclosures, Sagers Watershed Area/Exclosures and Big Flat Area/Exclosures (approximately 300 acres each).<br>• Establish Lower South Fork of Seven Mile Canyon as a Riparian/Wetland Demonstration Area for the improvement and restoration of the riparian area.<br>• Insect pests would be treated in coordination with the State of Utah, other Federal agencies, affected counties, adjoining private land owners and other directly affected interests.<br>• See Livestock Grazing for other vegetation treatments. | | | |
| **Adaptive Drought Management:**<br>Establish criteria for restricting activities during drought (see Appendix M for Drought Classification System) based on the following measures/parameters:<br>*Severe (D2):*<br>• Send drought letters.<br>• UDWR coordination for big game herd control.<br>• Prepare local seasonal precipitation graphs.<br>• Suspend or limit seed collecting activities. | | | |

**Table 2.1. MOAB PROPOSED PLAN and Draft RMP Alternatives**

*Extreme (D3):*

- No new surface-disturbing activities in areas with sensitive soils (subject to valid existing rights or actions associated with other valid permitted activities; see oil and gas Appendix C for definition of surface-disturbing activities).
- Changes in livestock use would be based on site-specific data on those allotments that are affected by drought.
- OHV use and competitive motorized events would be confined to designated roads and routes within the open OHV area.
- Require additional erosion-control techniques/BMPs for surface-disturbing activities (e.g., hydromulching).
- Limit prescribed burns and vegetation treatments.

*Exceptional (D4):*

- Changes in livestock use will be based on site-specific data on those allotments that are affected by drought.
- No new surface-disturbing activities (subject to valid existing rights or actions associated with other valid permitted activities).
- Consider closing areas to public entry.

| Alternative A (No Action) | Alternative B | PROPOSED PLAN | Alternative D |
|---|---|---|---|
| Not specified. | Avoid or minimize to the extent possible the loss of sagebrush/steppe habitat from BLM-initiated or authorized actions. The BLM recommends that loss of sagebrush/steppe habitat essential to wildlife (e.g., sage-grouse, mule deer, and sagebrush obligate species) be reclaimed or mitigated off-site. | Avoid or minimize to the extent possible the loss of sagebrush/steppe habitat from BLM-initiated or authorized actions. The BLM recommends that loss of sagebrush/steppe habitat essential to wildlife (e.g., sage-grouse, mule deer, and sagebrush obligate species) be reclaimed or mitigated off-site. | Same as the Proposed Plan. |

## VISUAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT (VRM)

**Goals and Objectives:**

- Manage public lands in a manner that protects the quality of scenic values.
- Recognize and manage visual resources for overall multiple use, filming, and recreational opportunities for visitors to public lands.
- Manage BLM actions to preserve those scenic vistas that are most important.

**Management common to the PROPOSED PLAN and Draft RMP Alternatives A, B, and D:**

WSAs and designated wilderness would be designated as VRM Class I.

**Management common to the PROPOSED PLAN and Draft RMP Alternatives B and D:**

- Wild and Scenic River (WSR) segments recommended as suitable for Wild would be designated as VRM Class I, Scenic would be designated as VRM Class II, and Recreational would be managed the same as the underlying VRM management class.
- For all VRM classes, all resource uses and management activities would be required to meet VRM objectives. However, recreation developments in the immediate foreground of Key Observation Points (KOPs) in VRM Class I and II areas would require special consideration to meet both recreational and VRM objectives. These facilities often create more contrast than would be acceptable; however this contrast would be allowed if the facilities are part of the expected image of the public being served. The contrast should be allowed only to the extent needed for the function of the facility, which should reflect design excellence and be a positive element of the built environment. Structures should blend into the landscape while retaining functionality.
- Apply a no surface occupancy stipulation for oil and gas leasing and preclude other surface-disturbing activities (see Appendix C) to all areas designated as VRM Class I.
- Apply a controlled surface use stipulation for oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities (see Appendix C) to all areas designated as VRM Class II. This would require surface-disturbing activities to meet the objectives of VRM Class II.
- Designated utility corridors within VRM Class II areas would be designated as VRM Class III only for utility projects.
- Necessary road maintenance could occur regardless of VRM class.
- Public lands within the viewshed of Arches National Park would be designated as VRM Class II.
- See Maps 2-23-A through 2-23-D for VRM Management Classes, by alternative.

| Alternative A (No Action) | Alternative B | PROPOSED PLAN | Alternative D |
|---|---|---|---|
| VRM management classes identified only for Canyon Rims (33,037 acres designated as VRM Class II; 67,236 acres designated as VRM Class III). Interim management classes would be assigned through site-specific analysis based on the current VRM inventory. | Areas with high potential for oil and gas development (Big Flat/Hatch Point/Lisbon Valley and Eastern Bookcliffs/Greater Cisco) would be designated according to the underlying VRM inventory (VRM Classes II and III). | Areas with high potential for development of oil and gas (Big Flat/Hatch Point/Lisbon Valley, and Eastern Bookcliffs/Greater Cisco) would be designated as VRM Class III with the exception of those portions of SRMAs and ACECS that have more stringent VRM classifications. | Areas with high potential for oil and gas (Big Flat/Hatch Point/Lisbon Valley, and Eastern Bookcliffs/Greater Cisco) development would be designated as VRM Class III or IV with the exception of the more stringent VRM classification established for the rims of the Canyon Rims Recreation Area. |
| Wilderness, WSAs, and Negro Bill Outstanding Natural Area would be designated as VRM Class I. | The following ACECs would be designated as VRM Class I: Behind the Rocks, Canyon Rims, Colorado River, Highway 279/Shafer Basin/Long Canyon, Mill Creek Canyon, Upper Courthouse, Westwater and Wilson Arch. Manage the remaining ACECs according to the underlying VRM inventory class.<br>Scenic driving corridors would be designated as VRM Class II within a specified viewshed not to exceed 1 mile from centerline. Apply a no surface occupancy stipulation for oil and gas leasing and preclude other surface-disturbing activities (see Appendix C) within 1 mile of scenic driving corridors. | Manage the Shafer Basin portion of the Highway 279/Shafer Basin/Long Canyon ACEC as VRM Class I.<br>Scenic driving corridors would be designated as VRM Class II within a specified viewshed not to exceed 0.5 mile from centerline. Apply a controlled surface use stipulation for oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities (see Appendix C) within 0.5 mile of scenic driving corridors.<br>Manage the following areas with high-quality visual resources as VRM Class II: Sand Flats, Gemini Bridges/Monitor and Merrimac/Poison Spider/Goldbar/ Corona Arch area, the Colorado, Dolores and Green River corridors, Tusher | Scenic driving corridors would be designated as VRM Class II within a specified viewshed not to exceed 0.25 mile from centerline. Apply a controlled surface use stipulation for oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities (see Appendix C) within 0.25 mile of scenic driving corridors.<br>Manage the following areas with high quality visual resources as VRM Class II: Sand Flats, the Colorado, Dolores and Green River corridors, Tusher Canyon (Bookcliffs), the Colorado Riverway, Matt Martin Point, areas bordering Arches National Park, Hatch Wash, the rims of Canyon Rims, the Mill Creek area, and Beaver Creek (see Map 2-23-D). |

**Table 2.1. MOAB PROPOSED PLAN and Draft RMP Alternatives**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Manage the following areas with high quality visual resources as VRM Class II: Sand Flats, Gemini Bridges/Monitor and Merrimac/Poison Spider/Goldbar/ Corona Arch area, the Colorado, Dolores and Green River corridors, Tusher Canyon (Bookcliffs), areas of the Colorado Riverway not within the Colorado River ACEC, Matt Martin Point, areas bordering Arches National Park, Kane Creek, Hatch Wash, the rims of Canyon Rims, Beaver Creek and the eastern Book Cliffs (see Map 2-23-B). | Canyon (Bookcliffs), the Colorado Riverway, Matt Martin Point, areas bordering Arches National Park, Kane Creek, Hatch Wash, the rims of Canyon Rims, the Mill Creek and Behind the Rocks ACECs, Beaver Creek, and Long Canyon (see Map 2-23-C). | |
| 349,110 acres would be designated as VRM Class I. | 453,462 acres would be designated as VRM Class I. | 358,911 acres would be designated as VRM Class I. | 349,617 acres would be designated as VRM Class I. |
| 401,015 acres inventoried as VRM Class II, of which 33,037 acres would be designated as VRM II. | 373,647 acres would be designated as VRM Class II. | 365,566 acres would be designated as VRM Class II. | 245,773 acres would be designated as VRM Class II. |
| 800,782 acres inventoried as VRM Class III, of which 67,236 would be designated as VRM III. | 784,246 acres would be designated as VRM Class III. | 829,158 acres would be designated as VRM Class III. | 956,724 acres would be designated as VRM Class III. |
| 271,356 acres inventoried as VRM Class IV. | 210,532 acres would be designated as VRM Class IV. | 268,133 acres would be designated as VRM Class IV. | 269,641 acres would be designated as VRM Class IV. |

## WILDLIFE AND FISHERIES

**Goals and Objectives:**

- Maintain, protect, and enhance habitats to support natural wildlife diversity, reproductive capability, and a healthy, self-sustaining population of wildlife and fish species.
- Manage crucial, high-value, and unfragmented habitats as management priorities.

**Management common to the PROPOSED PLAN and Draft RMP Alternatives A, B, and D:**

- Continue to implement and modify three Habitat Management Plans (HMPs) summarized in Appendix N: Hatch Point HMP, Dolores Triangle HMP, and the Potash-Confluence HMP.
  - The Hatch Point HMP: Manage to benefit pronghorn and improve sagebrush habitat for sage-grouse and other wildlife species. Emphasize habitat management, change in livestock class from sheep to cattle, and maintenance of land treatments.
  - Potash-Confluence HMP: Manage to benefit desert bighorn sheep, but also include guidance for chukar partridge, bald eagle, and peregrine falcon. Water developments to benefit desert bighorn are to be maintained; under this HMP, 278,000 acres of land administered by the BLM are to be maintained in good condition and habitat is to be improved where needed. Eight specific management objectives were established (see Appendix N for details).
  - The Dolores Triangle HMP: Manage to benefit deer, elk, and bighorn sheep. Improve bald eagle, riparian and native and naturalized fish habitat through the installation of fencing and enclosures in Granite, Coates, Ryan, and Renegade Creeks by installing six in-stream structures (see Appendix N for details).
- Livestock grazing would not be authorized on the following allotments/areas (or portions of allotments/areas) in order to benefit wildlife resources:
  - A portion of the Kane Spring Allotment (that portion in Kane Spring Canyon between the open valley and the river; 558 acres and 0 AUMs).
  - An area along the Colorado River between Hittle and north of Dewey Bridge (400 acres, AUMs would remain the same).
  - Between The Creeks with 3,960 acres and 221 AUMs.
  - North Sand Flats with 5,860 acres and 798 AUMs.
  - South Sand Flats with 10,209 acres and 592 AUMs.
  - A portion of Arth's Pasture Allotment (Poison Spider area; approximately 6,200 acres and 425 AUMs).
- Support and implement current and future animal species Conservation Plans, Strategies and Agreements. Coordinate actions with UDWR and other involved entities. Support population and habitat monitoring.

**Migratory Birds:**

- Executive Order 13186, "Responsibilities of Federal Agencies to Protect Migratory Birds," would be integrated into all activities with potential adverse impacts, wildlife management programs, and other resources including but not limited to riparian-wetland habitat, rangeland health standards and guidelines raptor protection, fire, special status species, off-site mitigation and habitat enhancement. Management actions would emphasize birds listed on the current USFWS "Birds of Conservation Concern" (2002f or as updated) and Utah Partners-in-Flight priority species. Habitats that would be emphasized are the Cisco Desert Bird Habitat Conservation Area, Colorado and Dolores River Bird Habitat Conservation Area, Green River Bird Habitat Conservation Area, and the Cottonwood and Willow Creek Bird Habitat Conservation Area (see Appendix N). As a supplement to complying with Executive Order 13186, the Bird Habitat Conservation Areas identified in the Coordinated Implementation Plan for Bird Conservation in Utah (Martinsen et al. 2005 or as updated), would receive priority for conducting bird habitat conservation projects, through cooperative funding initiatives such as the Intermountain West Joint Venture.
- Implement Executive Order 13186, "Responsibilities of Federal Agencies to Protect Migratory Birds" during all activities to protect habitat for migratory birds. Management would emphasize birds listed on the current USFWS "Birds of Conservation Concern" (2002 or as updated) and Partners-in-Flight priority species (as updated).
- As specific habitat needs and population distribution to "Birds of Conservation Concern" and Partners-in-Flight priority species are identified, BLM would use adaptive management strategies to further conserve habitat and avoid impacts to these species.
- Prioritize the maintenance and/or improvement of lowland riparian, wetlands, and low and high desert scrub communities which are the four most important and used habitat types by migratory birds in MPA.
- Prevent the spread of invasive and non-native plants, especially cheatgrass, tamarisk, and Russian olive. Strive for a dense under story of native species in riparian areas with a reduction in tamarisk and improvement of cottonwood and willow regeneration.
- During nesting season for migratory birds (May 1 – July 31), avoid surface-disturbing activities and vegetative-altering projects and broad-scale use of pesticides in identified occupied migratory bird habitat.

**Management common to the PROPOSED PLAN and Draft RMP Alternatives B and D:**

- Coordinate with UDWR and other partners to help accomplish the population and habitat goals and objectives of big game Herd Management Plans that are consistent with and meet the goals and objectives of this land-use plan.
- The BLM will approach compensatory mitigation on an "as appropriate" basis where it can be performed onsite, and on a voluntary basis where it is performed offsite, or, in accordance with current guidance.
- Restrict dispersed camping in riparian areas to protect riparian wildlife habitat. Restrictions could include limiting camping to designated sites or prohibiting camping.
- Implement a limited fire suppression policy and initiate prescribed fires where treatment by fire would increase vegetation productivity and increase forage for wildlife.
- Modify the grazing season of use or change class of livestock for individual allotments as necessary to accommodate forage needs for wildlife.

## Table 2.1. MOAB PROPOSED PLAN and Draft RMP Alternatives

- Predator management would continue to be coordinated with Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS)-Wildlife Services and UDWR and would be conducted utilizing the guidance provided by the existing MOU with APHIS-Wildlife Services.
- BLM would continue to coordinate with, and provide support to UDWR for introduction/reintroduction of native or naturalized fish or wildlife species into historic or suitable habitats as determined appropriate.
- Introduction, transplantation, augmentation and re-establishment of both naturalized and native species would be considered and would include, but may not be limited to, pronghorn, desert bighorn sheep, wild turkey, bison, beaver, chukar, otter, and Colorado River cutthroat trout and other native and naturalized fish species, pursuant to guidance and direction provided in BLM's 1745 Manual.
- Raptors would be managed under the auspices of Best Management Practices (BMPs; see Appendix O), which would include implementation of spatial and seasonal buffers. These BMPs implement the USFWS's Guidelines for Raptor Protection From Human and Land-use Disturbances, with modifications allowed as long as protection of nests is ensured. Seasonal and spatial buffers are also listed in Appendix O. Cooperate with utility companies to prevent electrocution of raptors. Temporarily close areas (amount of time depends on the species) near raptor nest to rock climbers or other activities if the activity could result in nest abandonment.
- Support and implement where possible the Northern River Otter Management Plan; coordinate with UDWR to determine potential release sites; support population monitoring.
- Manage riparian areas to ensure a multi-aged, multi-layered structure, allowing for retention of snags and diseased trees. Provide multiple layers of vegetation (vertical structure) within 10 feet of the ground.
- Minor adjustments to crucial wildlife habitat boundaries periodically made by the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources (UDWR) would be accommodated through plan maintenance.

**Pronghorn Habitat:**

- Manage 78,476 acres of current pronghorn habitat that UDWR has designated in the La Sal (Hatch Point Herd) Wildlife Management Unit. Implement the Hatch Point HMP. Manage 743,524 acres of pronghorn habitat that UDWR has designated in the Cisco Desert and on the following allotments: Cisco, Cisco Mesa, Harley Dome, San Arroyo, Horse Canyon, Pipeline, Floy Creek, Athena, Little Grand, Corral Wash Canyon, Agate, Little Hole, Monument Wash, Highlands, 10-Mile Point, Big Flat, Ruby Ranch, Bar-X, Crescent Canyon, Squaw Park, and San Arroyo (see Map 2-24).
- Management of pronghorn habitat (see Map 2-25) would be done in coordination with UDWR and may include (but would not be limited to) the following actions:
  - Installing and improving year-round water resources within the La Sal Management Unit and the Cisco Desert Herd unit.
  - Supporting a change in class of livestock from sheep to cattle on the Hatch Point area. Changing class of livestock from cattle to sheep would not be allowed within pronghorn habitat.
  - Installing water developments every 2 square miles on summer and fawning areas.
  - Constructing fences that allow for pronghorn passage.
  - Dismantling un-needed fences.
  - Installing restrictive fencing to stop pronghorn passage onto highways.
  - Increasing forage through vegetation treatments on approximately 4,400 acres.

**Bighorn Sheep Habitat:**

- Film permits would comply with minimum impact criteria (see Appendix B) from April 1 through June 15 and from October 15 through December 15 within 123,490 acres of crucial bighorn sheep habitat (see Maps 2-25-B through 2-25-D).
- No change in class of livestock from cattle to sheep conversions would be considered in recognized bighorn habitat. (see Maps 2-26 and 2-28).
- Follow the recommendations found in the BLM Bighorn Sheep Rangeland Management Plan, as revised (1993b); the Utah BLM Statewide Desert Bighorn Sheep Management Plan, as revised (1986a); and the Revised Guidelines for the Management of Domestic Sheep and Goats in Native Wild Sheep Habitats (BLM 1998a).
- Support the current bighorn sheep population and manage to increase desert bighorn population (prior stable numbers) on 330,892 acres. Population goals would be reached by releases, by reestablishment, and through change of livestock class and installation of new water facilities (see Appendix N for details).
- Management of bighorn sheep habitat in coordination with UDWR would include: installing water developments every 5 square miles in or within 2 miles of escape terrain, precluding exotic ungulate, wild horses or burros within 10 miles of habitat, and constructing fences that allow for bighorn sheep passage (3 strands with bottom wire smooth) and dismantling un-needed fences.
- Manage 9,278 acres along the rim of Hatch Point as part of the Lockhart Bighorn Sheep habitat areas. Apply a timing limitation stipulation to oil and gas leases and other permitted uses, which would restrict surface-disturbing activities from April 1 through June 15 for lambing and from October 15 through December 15 for rutting (see Appendix C).
- Manage 317,523 acres of total desert bighorn sheep habitat on the following grazing allotments: Buckhorn, North River, Little Grand, Taylor, Ten Mile Point, Arth's Pasture, Spring Canyon Bottom, Big Flat, Kane Springs, Potash, Horsethief, Behind the Rocks, and Ruby Ranch.
- Support conversion of sheep AUMs to cattle on Hatch Point Allotment.*
- Improve desert bighorn habitat by installing and improving year-round water resources within all desert bighorn habitat and provide additional water sources at a minimum spacing of one water development in each 2 square mile area on lambing grounds.

**Deer and/or elk:**

- Manage UDWR current deer habitat of 534,329 acres in the Bookcliffs and 313,551 acres on the La Sal Mountains as mule deer habitat by improving or maintaining vegetative conditions to benefit both livestock and wildlife and by maintaining or improving the ecological condition of rangelands.
- Increase elk forage through vegetation treatments such as chemical, mechanical, and prescribed fire on approximately 40,000 acres of elk winter range (see Livestock Grazing).
- Manage crucial and high value deer and/or elk summer range (105,636 acres) within the Bookcliffs and La Sal Wildlife Management Unit by applying a timing limitation stipulation that would preclude surface-disturbing activities from May 15 to June 30 (see Appendix C; see Maps 2-27-B and Map 2-27-C/D.
- All forage on acquired state lands in upper Castle Valley within crucial deer winter range would be allocated to deer.

### Pronghorn Habitat

| Alternative A (No Action) | Alternative B | PROPOSED PLAN | Alternative D |
|---|---|---|---|
| For pronghorn fawning habitat, exploration, drilling, and other development is prohibited from May 15 through June 15. | Protect current pronghorn habitat (822,001 acres) within Cisco Desert (743,524 acres) and Hatch Point (78,477 acres; the La Sal Wildlife Management Units: see Map 2-24) by applying a timing limitation stipulation that would preclude surface-disturbing activities from May 1 to June 15 (see Appendix C). | Protect pronghorn fawning habitat (293,741 acres) within Cisco Desert and on Hatch Point (the La Sal Wildlife Management Units) by applying a timing limitation stipulation that would preclude surface-disturbing activities from May 1 to June 15 (see Appendix C). | Protect pronghorn fawning habitat on Hatch Point (78,477 acres) by applying a timing limitation stipulation that would preclude surface-disturbing activities from May 1 to June 15 (see Appendix C). |
| **Cisco Desert HMP:** Improve pronghorn habitat by excluding livestock grazing activities from May 15 through June 20 or during extreme snow conditions. Change season of use on fawning grounds to reduce disturbance.<br>**Hatch Point HMP:** Pronghorn fawning areas would exclude livestock grazing | Spring grazing would be adjusted on 188,975 acres on allotments within crucial pronghorn habitat in the Cisco Desert to encourage forb production. These allotments include: Athena, Cisco, Cisco Mesa, Crescent, Harley Dome, San Arroyo, Pipeline, and Bar X. | Spring grazing would be adjusted on a case-by-case basis on 188,975 acres on allotments within crucial pronghorn habitat in the Cisco Desert to encourage forb production. These allotments include Athena, Cisco, Cisco Mesa, Harley Dome, and San Arroyo. | No adjustments to season of use would be made. |

**Table 2.1. MOAB PROPOSED PLAN and Draft RMP Alternatives**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| from May 1 till June 30. Changes in season of use (November 1 through June 1) number of livestock (27% reduction), change in livestock class from sheep to cattle, fencing, seeding, and rest/rotation to improve habitat are recommended.<br>**Cisco Desert HMP:** Increase the percent browse and forb species on 6,375 acres of grass vegetation from less the 5% to 30% browse and forb.<br>**Hatch Point HMP:** Implement rest/rotation on three pastures developed on the Hatch Point Allotment. One pasture to be grazed from November 1 to March 1, the second from March 1 to June 1, and the third to receive a year-long rest from grazing. A total of 69 acres were to be seeded to attain a combination of succulent forbs, grasses, and shrubs that would provide spring forage. Fencing would be utilized as a management tool to accomplish this. | Pronghorn fawning areas would not be grazed from May 1 till June 30 on Hatch Point. These allotments include: Hatch Point, Lisbon, and Windwhistle. | Develop, where applicable, a rest/rotation of pasture or other grazing management systems within allotments that have crucial pronghorn habitat to encourage forb production prior to fawning. Change in livestock class from sheep to cattle, fencing, seeding and rest/rotation to improve habitat would be encouraged. | |
| **Desert Bighorn Sheep Habitat** | | | |
| **Alternative A (No Action)** | **Alternative B** | **PROPOSED PLAN** | **Alternative D** |
| Avoid situating major ROWs within 48,245 acres in the Mineral Bottom, Potash and Westwater areas to protect crucial bighorn sheep habitat. Apply a Category 2 mineral leasing stipulation in order to protect 25,431 acres of bighorn sheep. | To protect lambing, rutting, and migration habitat (130,419 acres), apply a no surface occupancy stipulation for oil and gas leasing and preclude other surface-disturbing activities (see Appendix C). | To protect lambing, rutting, and migration habitat (101,897 acres), apply a no surface occupancy stipulation for oil and gas leasing and preclude other surface-disturbing activities (see Appendix C). Within migration corridors pipeline construction and geophysical exploration for oil and gas development would be allowed outside lambing and rutting periods from June 16 through October 14 and from December 15 through March 31, respectively. | To minimize disturbance within bighorn lambing and rutting areas (46,319 acres) apply a timing limitation stipulation for oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities (see Appendix C). This limitation would preclude surface-disturbing activities from April 1 through June 15, and from October 15 through December 15. |
| **Potash-Confluence HMP:** Improve 42,500 acres of crucial bighorn sheep habitat by preventing surface disturbance during lambing and breeding seasons.<br>Assist in the development of livestock manipulation techniques on Horsethief Point, Spring Canyon Bottom, and Ten-Mile Point Allotments to improve or maintain bighorn sheep habitat.<br>Change season of use on the Potash Allotment to reduce competition on lambing and breeding grounds. | Manage 46,319 acres of lambing habitat (see Map 2-26-B) with the following prescriptions:<br>• Camping would be allowed in designated campsites only.<br>• No camping in Shafer Basin and Long Canyon.<br>• Livestock use would be adjusted on North River and, Taylor Allotments (Dry Mesa Pasture). | Manage lambing areas and manage 46,319 acres (see Map 2-26-C) with the following prescriptions:<br>• Camping would be allowed in designated campsites except for areas within the Green River riparian corridor, which remain open to unrestricted camping.<br>• No camping in Shafer Basin and Long Canyon.<br>• Livestock use would be adjusted on North River and, Taylor Allotments (Dry Mesa Pasture). | Same as the Proposed Plan with the exception that camping would not be restricted to designated campsites in lambing areas (see Map 2-26-D). |
| **Rocky Mountain Bighorn Sheep Habitat** | | | |
| **Alternative A (No Action)** | **Alternative B** | **PROPOSED PLAN** | **Alternative D** |
| The 1990 amendment to the 1985 RMP recognized 194,560 acres of Rocky Mountain bighorn sheep habitat. | Manage the entire 458,242 acres of habitat for Rocky Mountain bighorn sheep that UDWR has designated from the Green River to the Colorado border according to the stipulations described in management common to all. This management would include improving or maintaining habitat and vegetative conditions to benefit bighorn sheep while maintaining or improving the ecological condition of rangelands (see Map 2-28). | Manage 310,726 acres of currently occupied Rocky Mountain bighorn habitat from the Green River to Pipeline Canyon according to stipulations described in management common to all. This management would include improving or maintaining habitat and vegetative conditions to benefit bighorn sheep while maintaining or improving the ecological condition of rangelands (see Map 2-28). | Manage 194,560 acres of occupied habitat defined in the 1985 RMP. (Same as Alternative A) according to stipulations described in management common to all.<br>This management would include improving or maintaining habitat and vegetative conditions to benefit bighorn sheep while maintaining or improving the ecological condition of rangelands (see Map 2-28). |
| Any future proposal for a change in kind of livestock from cattle to sheep in Rocky Mountain bighorn habitat would be denied. | Support conversion of sheep to cattle on allotments that are within nine miles of the 458,242 acres of managed Rocky Mountain bighorn sheep habitat. Once conversion occurs, do not allow re-conversion (from cattle to sheep). Allotments include Agate, Bar-X, Cisco, Cisco Mesa, Corral Wash Canyon, Floy Creek, Harley Dome, Rattlesnake North, and San Arroyo. | Support conversion of sheep to cattle on allotments that are within nine miles of the 310,726 acres of managed Rocky Mountain bighorn habitat. Once conversion occurs, do not allow re-conversion (from cattle to sheep). This includes the Cisco and Cisco Mesa Allotments, San Arroyo, Winter Camp and Harley Dome. | Same as Alternative A. |
| **Deer and/or Elk Habitat** | | | |
| **Alternative A (No Action)** | **Alternative B** | **PROPOSED PLAN** | **Alternative D** |
| In order to protect deer and/or elk winter range, exploration, drilling, and other development activity would be allowed only from May 16 to October 31 on 260,769 acres of deer and/or elk winter range. | Protect deer and/or elk crucial and high value winter habitat (635,774 acres) by applying a timing limitation stipulation for oil and gas leasing as well as other surface-disturbing activities (see Appendix C). This stipulation would preclude surface-disturbing activities from November 1 through May 15. (This acreage includes 240,258 acres in WSAs, which are already closed to leasing.) | Protect deer and/or elk crucial winter habitat (349,955 acres) by applying a timing limitation stipulation for oil and gas leasing as well as other surface-disturbing activities (see Appendix C). (This includes 73,160 acres in WSAs, which are already closed to leasing.) This limitation would preclude surface-disturbing activities from November 15 through April 15. | Protect deer and/or elk crucial winter habitat (349,955 acres) by applying a timing limitation stipulation for oil and gas leasing as well as other surface-disturbing activities (see Appendix C). (This includes 73,160 acres in WSAs, which are already closed to leasing.) This limitation would preclude surface-disturbing activities from December 1 through April 15. |

**Table 2.1. MOAB PROPOSED PLAN and Draft RMP Alternatives**

| Livestock Grazing Allotment Decisions Affecting Wildlife | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Allotments Not Available for Grazing:**<br>• Bogart with 14,751 acres and 209 AUMs.<br>• Cottonwood with 27,193 acres and 900 AUMs.<br>• Diamond with 19,112 acres and 588 AUMs.<br>• Pear Park, with 14,202 acres.<br>• Spring Creek, with 924 acres.<br>• Beaver Creek with 1,351 acres and 0 AUMs. | **Allotments Not Available for Grazing:**<br>• Bogart with 14,751 acres and 209 AUMs.<br>• Cottonwood with 27,193 acres and 900 AUMs.<br>• Diamond with 19,112 acres and 588 AUMs.<br>• Pear Park, with 14,202 acres.<br>• Spring Creek, with 924 acres.<br>• Beaver Creek with 1,351 acres and 0 AUMs.<br>• Professor Valley with 20,424 acres and 378 AUMs.<br>• Ida Gulch with 3,624 acres and 112 AUMs.<br>• River, with 388 acres and 7 AUMs.<br>• Mill Creek, with 3,922 acres and 137 AUMs. | **Allotments Not Available for Grazing:**<br>• Bogart with 14,751 acres and 209 AUMs.<br>• Cottonwood with 27,193 acres and 900 AUMs.<br>• Diamond with 19,112 acres and 588 AUMs.<br>• Portions of Professor Valley along Highway 128.<br>• Ida Gulch with 3,624 acres and 112 AUMs.<br>• Portions of River along Highway 128.<br>• Mill Creek with 3,922 acres and 137 AUMs.<br>• Pear Park with 14,202 acres. | **Allotments Not Available for Grazing:**<br>Mill Creek with 3,922 acres and 137 AUMs. |
| **Allotments Currently Not Available for Grazing that are to be Reconsidered for Allocation:**<br>None. | **Allotments Currently Not Available for Grazing that are to be Reconsidered for Allocation:**<br>None. | **Allotments Currently Not Available for Grazing that are to be Reconsidered for Allocation:**<br>After performing rangeland health assessments, the resulting AUMs could be made available for grazing:<br>• Spring Creek. | **Allotments Currently Not Available for Grazing that are to be Reconsidered for Allocation:**<br>After performing rangeland health assessments, the resulting AUMs could be made available for grazing:<br>• Pear Park (no domestic sheep would be allowed).<br>• Spring Creek.<br>• Bogart (no domestic sheep would be allowed).<br>• Cottonwood (no domestic sheep would be allowed).<br>• Diamond Canyon (no domestic sheep would be allowed). |
| **Areas Currently Not Available for Grazing that are to be Reconsidered for Allocation:**<br>None. | **Areas Currently Not Available for Grazing that are to be Reconsidered for Allocation:**<br>None. | **Areas Currently Not Available for Grazing that are to be Reconsidered for Allocation:**<br>Beaver Creek. | **Areas Currently Not Available for Grazing that are to be Reconsidered for Allocation:**<br>Beaver Creek. |

## WOODLANDS

**Goals and Objectives:**

- Manage forests and woodlands for healthy conditions that contribute to healthy habitat for animal and plant species, proper watershed functioning conditions, and riparian restoration and enhancement.
- Provide woodland products on a sustainable basis consistent with maintaining ecosystem health and other resource management objectives to meet local needs where such use does not limit the accomplishment of goals for the management of other important resources.
- Encourage, where feasible, the harvest of forest products in areas of proposed or existing vegetation treatments to lessen the need for additional treatment or land disturbance, and in areas that need restoration for ecological benefits.
- Identify, maintain, and restore forests with late successional characteristics to a pre-fire suppression condition. The MFO would adopt the USFS old-growth definitions and identification standards as per the USFS document "Characteristics of Old-Growth Forests in the Intermountain Region (April 1993)." In instances where the area of application in the previous document does not apply (e.g., *Pinus edulis*), use the document "Recommended Old-Growth Definitions and Descriptions, USDA Forest Service Southwestern Region (Sept. 1992)."

**Management common to the PROPOSED PLAN and Draft RMP Alternatives A, B, and D:**

- Permits for harvest of woodland products would continue to be sold to the public, consistent with the availability of woodland products and the protection of sensitive resource values.
- As needed, designate private and commercial wood gathering areas for the following uses: firewood, fence posts, Christmas tree cutting, green wood cutting, and plant gathering for landscaping.
- Use woodland harvest to assist in managing woodlands to accomplish goals outlined in the Fire Management Plan.
- Prohibit public fuelwood gathering in riparian areas.
- Permit sustainable harvest (including cutting of green willows, squawbush, and cottonwoods) for Native American traditional ceremonial use.

**Management Common to the PROPOSED PLAN and Draft RMP Alternatives B and D:**

- Additional areas may be closed to wood gathering and wood harvest as needed to protect sensitive resources.
- Follow national BLM Forest Health and Forest Management Standards and Guidelines to assess conditions and guide management actions for the forest and woodland resource.
- Provide for salvage harvest of wood in beetle-kill areas, when compatible with other resource objectives.

**Table 2.1. MOAB PROPOSED PLAN and Draft RMP Alternatives**

| Areas Available for Woodland Harvest | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Alternative A (No Action)** | **Alternative B** | **PROPOSED PLAN** | **Alternative D** |
| Provide 1,243,734 acres for woodland harvest and wood gathering. See Map 2-29-A for areas in which woodland harvest and wood gathering is prohibited (609,385 acres) to protect resources values. | Provide 958,124 acres for woodland harvest and wood gathering. See Map 2-29-B for areas in which woodland harvest and wood gathering is prohibited (863,250 acres) to protect resource values. | Provide 1,168,988 acres for woodland harvest and wood gathering. See Map 2-29-C for areas in which woodland harvest and wood gathering is prohibited (652,386 acres) to protect resource values. | Provide 1,243,734 acres for woodland harvest and wood gathering. See Map 2-29-D for areas in which woodland harvest and wood gathering is prohibited (609,385 acres) to protect resource values. |

## 2.2 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS

Table 2.2 provides a comparative summary of the environmental impacts associated with the Proposed Plan and with each alternative.

## Table 2.2. Impacts Summary Table

| Management Action | Alternative A (No Action) | Alternative B | PROPOSED PLAN | Alternative D |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **AIR QUALITY** | | | | |
| Cultural Resources, Paleontological Resources, Visual Resources, Lands and Realty, Livestock Management, Riparian Resources, Soil and Water, Special Designations, Special Status Species, Vegetation, Wildlife, and Woodlands | Incremental benefits due to restrictions and/or reductions in surface disturbing activities, grazing, vegetation disturbance, and riparian disturbance. Alternative A is generally the least restrictive of these activities, and therefore has the lowest associated potential benefit but is not expected to result in a substantial decrease in air quality. | Generally the most restrictive of the proposed alternatives and therefore has the highest potential for incremental benefits to air quality. | The Proposed Plan is less restrictive than Alternative B, but more beneficial than Alternatives A and D. | Alternative D is less restrictive than Alternative B and the Proposed Plan, but more beneficial than Alternative A. |
| Fire Management | Reduce fuel loads and wildfire severity would reduce air quality impacts. Limited short-term impacts would result from controlled burns and prescribed fire. | Same as Alternative A | Same as Alternative A | Same as Alternative A |
| Hazard Management | Small to negligible adverse impacts due to surface disturbance and operation of heavy equipment during remediation. | Same as Alternative A | Same as Alternative A | Same as Alternative A |
| Mineral Resources | Adverse emissions of atmospheric pollutants on both short-term and long-term durations. Alternative A would have the most mineral development activities, but is not expected to result in a substantial decrease in air quality or exceedance of state or federal air quality criteria. | Same as Alternative A, except that the least oil and gas development would occur under this alternative. | Same as Alternative A, except that the second least oil and gas development would occur under this alternative. | Same as Alternative A, except that the third least (or second most) oil and gas development would occur under this alternative. |

## Table 2.2. Impacts Summary Table

| Management Action | Alternative A (No Action) | Alternative B | PROPOSED PLAN | Alternative D |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **CULTURAL RESOURCES** | | | | |
| Cultural Resources | NHPA and BLM policy to identify resources, and avoid, minimize, or mitigate adverse impacts would apply. | Livestock grazing restrictions in high site density areas provide long-term benefits to cultural resources in restricted areas. 50,000 acres targeted for priority site identification studies; more than any other alternative. Greater focus on restoration of damaged sites than any other alternative. There would be mixed, long-term, beneficial and adverse impacts from site interpretation. | Livestock grazing restrictions in high site density areas (fewer than Alternative B) provide long-term benefits to cultural resources in restricted areas. 30,000 acres targeted for priority site identification studies; the second most of all alternatives. Second greatest focus on restoration of damaged sites of all alternatives. There would be mixed, long-term, beneficial and adverse impacts from site interpretation; more sites developed for public use than under Alternative B. | Same as the Proposed Plan except livestock grazing would be restricted in fewer areas, and fewer sites would be targeted for restoration. More sites would be allocated for public use than under any other alternative. 20,000 acres would be targeted for resource identification studies; less than any other action alternative. |
| Fire Management | Negative impacts from fuels treatments over 5,860 acres and non-fire fuels treatments over 1,347 acres every 10 years in high site-density areas. | Same as Alternative A. | Same as Alternative A. | Same as Alternative A. |
| Lands and Realty | Mineral withdrawals on 13,296 acres reduce opportunities for adverse impacts to cultural resources. Adverse impacts over 3,776 acres of high site density lands encompassed by designated utility corridors. | Same as Alternative A except 6,309 acres of high site density lands encompassed by designated utility corridors, and reduced opportunities for adverse impacts in WSAs or Was (exclusion areas) and ACECs (considered avoidance areas for rights-of-way). | Same as Alternative B except 28,400 acres of high site density lands encompassed by designated utility corridors. | Same as Alternative B except 29,983 acres of high site density lands encompassed by designated utility corridors. |

## Table 2.2. Impacts Summary Table

| Management Action | Alternative A (No Action) | Alternative B | PROPOSED PLAN | Alternative D |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Livestock Grazing | Reduced opportunities for long-term adverse impacts over 126,907 acres of existing grazing closures and 24,329 acres of high site density lands also closed to grazing. Long-term adverse impacts from trampling and rubbing over 273,890 acres of high site density lands. | Reduced opportunities for long-term adverse impacts over 153,797 acres of grazing closures, 3,263 acres of wildlife closures, and 29,758 acres of high site density lands closed to grazing. Long-term adverse impacts from trampling and rubbing over 272,818 acres of high site density lands This alternative has slightly greater benefit and lesser impact to cultural resources than any other alternative. | Same as Alternative B except that 114,235 acres of grazing closures would occur, with 25,177 acres of high site density land closed to livestock grazing and 277,399 acres of high site density lands open to grazing.<br>This alternative has slightly higher overall potential for adverse impact than Alternative B but less than Alternatives A and D. | Same as Alternative B except that 52,214 acres of grazing closure would occur, with approximately 12,386 acres of high site density lands closed to livestock grazing and 290,190 acres of high site density lands would be open to grazing.<br>This alternative has slightly higher overall potential for adverse impact than Alternative B and the Proposed Plan but less than Alternative A. |
| Minerals | Reduced of opportunities for direct and inadvertent impacts from ground disturbance and increased human activity over 458,665 acres closed to mineral entry, leasing, and development.<br>Approximately 618 acres of disturbance could occur on high site density lands for oil and gas development.<br>Approximately 407 acres of disturbance could occur on high site density lands for geophysical work.<br>Adverse impacts possible over 1,467,758 acres of land available for salable minerals. | Same as Alternative A except:<br>• An additional 41,488 acres of high site density lands closed to mineral entry, leasing, and development,<br>• 401 acres of oil and gas disturbance on high site density lands,<br>• 239 acres of geophysical disturbance on high site density lands, and<br>• 836,137 acres of land available for salable minerals.<br>This alternative has the least potential adverse impact and greatest beneficial impact to cultural resources. | Same as Alternative B except:<br>• Approximately 527 acres of disturbance on high site density lands for oil and gas development.<br>• Approximately 352 acres of disturbance on high site density lands for geophysical work.<br>• 1,234,717 acres of land available for saleable minerals.<br>This alternative has the second least potential adverse impact and second greatest beneficial impact to cultural resources s. | Same as Alternative B except:<br>• Approximately 594 acres of disturbance on high site density lands for oil and gas development.<br>• Approximately 396 acres of disturbance on high site density lands for geophysical work.<br>• 1,387,473 acres of land available for saleable minerals.<br>This alternative has the third least (second most) potential adverse impact and greatest beneficial impact to cultural resources. |

## Table 2.2. Impacts Summary Table

| Management Action | Alternative A (No Action) | Alternative B | PROPOSED PLAN | Alternative D |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Paleontological Resources | Limited long-term adverse impacts from collection of fossil materials. Limited long-term beneficial impacts from raising awareness about fossil collecting and preservation goals. | Same as Alternative A. | Same as Alternative A. | Same as Alternative A. |
| Recreation—SRMAs | Reduced long-term, adverse impacts over 49,543 acres of high site density lands managed as SRMAs. | Reduced long-term, adverse impacts over 217,994 acres of high site density lands managed as SRMAs. | Same as Alternative A except 160,885 acres of high site density lands would be managed as SRMAs. This would result in less protection from long-term adverse impacts to cultural resources than under Alternative B and more than Alternatives A and D. | Same as Alternative A except 74,278 acres of high site density lands would be managed as SRMAs. |
| Special Designations | Long-term benefits due to reduced surface disturbance over 243 acres of high site density lands managed as Outstanding Natural Area (ONA). | Same as Alternative A except up to 109,809 acres of high site density lands would be managed as ACECs with restrictions on surface disturbance. | Same as Alternative A except up to 19,029 acres of high site density lands would be managed as ACECs with restrictions on surface disturbance. | NO ACECs or ONAs would be designated. |

## Table 2.2. Impacts Summary Table

| Management Action | Alternative A (No Action) | Alternative B | PROPOSED PLAN | Alternative D |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Travel Management | 1,049 acres of high site density lands closed to OHV use with long-term benefits to cultural resources.<br>208,757 acres of high site density lands where OHV use is limited to designated routes, with mixed long-term beneficial and adverse impacts to cultural resources.<br>92,628 acres of high site density lands open to cross country OHV use without designated routes, with long-term adverse impacts to cultural resources.<br>Existing levels of direct and indirect impacts, primarily adverse, to cultural resources along travel routes would be maintained.<br>This alternative has the least benefit and most potential for adverse impacts to cultural resources of all alternatives. | Same as Alternative A except the acreages are as follows:<br>• 72,415 acres closed<br>• 230,160 acres limited to designated routes<br>• 0 acres open to cross country OHV use<br>This alternative has the most long-term benefits for cultural resources and least potential for long-term adverse impacts of all alternatives.<br>327 linear miles of travel routes in high site density areas would be closed, providing long-term direct and indirect benefits to cultural resources.<br>This alternative has the most benefit to cultural resources of all alternatives. | Same as Alternative B except as follows:<br>• 69,215 acres closed<br>• 232,875 acres limited to designated routes<br>• 486 acres open to cross country OHV use 19 miles of designated motorcycle routes on high site density lands<br>This alternative has the second most long-term benefits for cultural resources and second least potential for long-term adverse impacts of all alternatives.<br>238 linear miles of travel routes in high site density areas would be closed, providing long-term direct and indirect benefits to cultural resources.<br>This alternative has the second most benefit to cultural resources of all alternatives. | Same as Alternative B except as follows:<br>• 17,981 acres closed<br>• 283,951 acres limited to designated routes<br>• 643 acres open to cross country OHV use<br>• 21 miles of designated motorcycle routes on high site density lands<br>This alternative has the second least long-term benefits for cultural resources and second most potential for long-term adverse impacts of all alternatives.<br>214 linear miles of travel routes in high site density areas would be closed, providing long-term direct and indirect benefits to cultural resources.<br>This alternative has the third most (second least) benefit to cultural resources of all alternatives. |
| Visual Resources | Long-term, indirect, benefits due to reduced surface disturbance over 349,101 acres of WSAs and WAs and 72,609 acres of high site density lands outside of WSAs and WAs managed as VRM Class I.<br>This alternative has the least long-term benefit to cultural resources of all alternatives. | Same as Alternative A except 106,105 acres of high site density lands outside of WSAs, WAs, and WSRs and an additional 18,301 acres of high site density lands in WSRs managed as VRM Class I.<br>This alternative has the most long-term benefit to cultural resources of all alternatives. | Same as Alternative B except 74,672 acres of high site density lands outside of WSAs, WAs, and WSRs and an additional 3,447 acres of high site density lands in WSRs managed as VRM Class I.<br>This alternative has the second most long-term benefit to cultural resources of all alternatives. | Same as Alternative A except 72,703 acres of high site density lands outside of WSAs, WAs, and WSRs managed as VRM Class I.<br>This alternative has the third most (second least) long-term benefit to cultural resources of all alternatives. |

## Table 2.2. Impacts Summary Table

| Management Action | Alternative A (No Action) | Alternative B | PROPOSED PLAN | Alternative D |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Non-WSA Lands with Wilderness Characteristics | There are no management actions for non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics under Alternative A. | Limited, long-term, benefits to cultural resources from restrictions on woodcutting in non-WSA areas managed for wilderness characteristics. Management of 47,784 acres of high site density lands with restrictions on surface disturbance provide long-term benefits for cultural resources in those areas.<br>This alternative has the most long-term benefit to cultural resources of all alternatives. | Same as Alternative B except:<br>• Management of 12,773 acres of high site density lands with restrictions on surface disturbance provide long-term benefits for cultural resources in those areas.<br>This alternative has the second most long-term benefit to cultural resources of all alternatives. | Same as Alternative A. |
| Woodlands | Reduced disturbance over 144,146 acres of high site density lands closed to use of woodland products. | Same as Alternative A except 183,677 acres of high site density lands closed to use of woodland products. | Same as Alternative A except 159,985 acres of high site density lands closed to use of woodland products. | Same as Alternative A except 144,146 acres of high site density lands closed to use of woodland products. |
| **FIRE MANAGEMENT** | | | | |
| Fire Management | Reduced fuel loads and wildfire severity over 5,000 to 10,000 acres per year of prescribed fire and non-fire treatment areas concentrated in pinyon-juniper woodland and wildland/urban interfaces. | Same as Alternative A. | Same as Alternative A. | Same as Alternative A. |
| Lands and Realty | Slightly decreased risk of inadvertent fire starts due to limits on the number of people and vehicles associated with filming, and on the use of pyrotechnics and explosives. | Same as Alternative A. | Same as Alternative A. | Same as Alternative A. |

## Table 2.2. Impacts Summary Table

| Management Action | Alternative A (No Action) | Alternative B | PROPOSED PLAN | Alternative D |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Minerals | Mineral development-related surface disturbance and activities would slightly increase the risk of human-caused fires surrounding 6,765 acres of projected disturbance. | Same as Alternative A except 3,975 acres of projected disturbance in the MPA. | Same as Alternative A except 6,480 acres of projected disturbance in the MPA. | Same as Alternative A except 6,720 acres of projected disturbance in the MPA. |
| Recreation and Travel | Increased risk of human- and vehicle-caused wildland fires over 678,250 acres open to cross-country OHV travel,. Slightly reduced risk of wildfire over 29,654 acres would be closed to all OHV travel.<br>Slightly reduced risk of human-caused fire over 151,252 acres closed to dispersed camping within SRMAs. | Slightly reduced risk of wildfire over entire MPA (closed to cross-country OHV travel), and 358,126 acres closed to all OHV travel.<br>The impacts of limiting camping would be the same as Alternative A, except within 976,173 acres. | Fire risk would be slightly higher than Alternative B, with 1,866 acres open to cross-country OHV travel and 349,843 acres closed to OHV travel.<br>The impacts of limiting camping would be the same as Alternative A, except within 658,642 acres. | Fire risks would be higher than Alternatives B and C (but lower than A), with 3,348 acres open to cross-country OHV travel and 29,654 acres closed to OHV travel.<br>The impacts of limiting camping would be the same as Alternative A, except within 277,471acres. |
| Special Designations, Woodlands, Wildlife, Special Status Species | Alternative A is generally the least restrictive of vegetation treatments and woodland harvest and, therefore, has the lowest risk of fuel loading and catastrophic wildfire. | Alternative B is generally the most restrictive of vegetation treatments and woodland harvest and, therefore, has the highest risk of fuel loading and catastrophic wildfire. | The Proposed Plan is generally the most second restrictive of vegetation treatments and woodland harvest and, therefore, has the second highest risk of fuel loading and catastrophic wildfire. | Alternative B is generally the second least restrictive of vegetation treatments and woodland harvest and, therefore, has the second lowest risk of fuel loading and catastrophic wildfire. |
| **HEALTH AND SAFETY** | | | | |
| Minerals | Hazardous materials risk from the use, generation, storage, transportation, and/or disposal of hazardous materials would be negligible given the small number of wells projected. Nevertheless, any mineral exploration and development would increase the potential for adverse and long-term hazardous materials risks in the planning area. | Same as Alternative A. | Same as Alternative A. | Same as Alternative A. |

## Table 2.2. Impacts Summary Table

| Management Action | Alternative A (No Action) | Alternative B | PROPOSED PLAN | Alternative D |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Abandoned Mine Land | Abandoned mine land site and area mitigation and reclamation priorities would assist in minimizing risks to health and safety. | Same as Alternative A. | Same as Alternative A. | Same as Alternative A. |
| **LANDS AND REALTY** | | | | |
| Lands and Realty | Alternative A would have the smallest impacts to the placement of future ROWs due to ROW exclusion and avoidance and restrictions on surface disturbance of any of the alternatives (353,293 acres closed to surface disturbing activities; 38,912 acres designated as NSO; and 389,605 acres with timing and controlled surface use limitations). | Alternative B would have the greatest impacts to the placement of future ROWs due to ROW exclusion and avoidance and restrictions on surface disturbance of any of the alternatives (672,724 acres closed to surface disturbing activities; 341,919 acres designated as NSO; and 544,412 acres with timing and controlled surface use limitation stipulations). | The Proposed Plan would have fewer impacts to the placement of future ROWs due to ROW exclusion and avoidance and restrictions on surface disturbance than Alternative B, but more so than Alternatives A or D (370,250 acres closed to surface disturbing activities; 217,480 acres designated as NSO; and 806,994 acres with timing and controlled surface use limitation stipulations). | Alternative D would have fewer impacts to the placement of future ROWs due to ROW exclusion and avoidance and restrictions on surface disturbance than Alternatives B and C, but greater impacts than Alternative A (355,146 acres closed to surface disturbing activities; 84,772 acres designated as NSO; and 590,442 acres with timing and controlled surface use limitation stipulations). |
| **LIVESTOCK GRAZING** | | | | |
| Fire Management | Short-term, adverse impacts on livestock grazing in treated areas. Long-term, beneficial impacts from reduced risk of fire and improved forage. | Same as Alternative A. | Same as Alternative A. | Same as Alternative A. |
| Livestock Grazing | Adverse impacts to grazing from making 126,907 acres unavailable for grazing. | Adverse impacts to grazing from making 153,797 acres unavailable for grazing. | Adverse impacts to grazing from making 114,234 acres unavailable for grazing. | Adverse impacts to grazing from making 52,214 acres unavailable for grazing. |
| Minerals | Surface disturbing activities on 679 total acres annually under this alternative could lead to losses of AUMs and acres available to livestock grazing. | Surface disturbing activities on 426 total acres annually under this alternative could lead to losses of AUMs and acres available to livestock grazing. | Surface disturbing activities on 721 total acres annually under this alternative could lead to losses of AUMs and acres available to livestock grazing. | Surface disturbing activities on 743 total acres annually under this alternative could lead to losses of AUMs and acres available to livestock grazing. |

## Table 2.2. Impacts Summary Table

| Management Action | Alternative A (No Action) | Alternative B | PROPOSED PLAN | Alternative D |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Recreation | Loss of AUMs from grazing restrictions at developed recreation sites. | Same as Alternative A. | Same as Alternative A. | Same as Alternative A. |
| Travel | Impacts resulting in potential loss of vegetation for livestock grazing from cross country OHV travel on 602,212 acres. | No impacts because cross country travel is not allowed. | Impacts resulting in potential loss of vegetation for livestock grazing from cross country OHV travel on 1,866 acres. | Impacts resulting in potential loss of vegetation for livestock grazing from cross country OHV travel on 3,064 acres. |
| Riparian | Short-tem negative impacts to livestock grazing when site closures are necessary; possible long-term beneficial impacts after a site is rehabilitated. | Same as Alternative A with eight additional sites excluded from livestock grazing. | Same as Alternative A with six additional sites excluded from livestock grazing. | Same as Alternative A. |
| Soils/Watershed | Temporary or permanent decreases in acres or AUMs available to livestock to mitigate damage to soils. | Same as Alternative A. | Same as Alternative A. | Same as Alternative A. |
| Vegetation | Short-term, adverse impacts on livestock grazing in areas that are closed following treatment. Long-term, beneficial impacts from improved forage. | Same as Alternative A. | Same as Alternative A. | Same as Alternative A. |
| Wildlife | Slight changes in grazing season of use in pronghorn and bighorn sheep habitat (using Rangeland Health Standards). | Same as Alternative A. | Same as Alternative A. | Same as Alternative A. |

## Table 2.2. Impacts Summary Table

| Management Action | Alternative A (No Action) | Alternative B | PROPOSED PLAN | Alternative D |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **MINERAL RESOURCES** | | | | |
| Mineral Resources | Most beneficial impacts to mineral development with 1,427,949 total leasable acres under standard lease terms and special stipulations, 451 oil and gas wells, 2,397 acres geophysical exploration, and 1,467,768 salable acres. | Most adverse impact to mineral development with 808,096 total leasable acres under standard lease terms and special stipulations, 264 oil and gas wells, 1,404 acres geophysical exploration, and 808,097 salable acres. 11,207 acres with limiting designations. | Second most adverse impacts with 1,234,267 total leasable acres under standard lease terms and special stipulations, 432 oil and gas wells, 2,072 acres geophysical exploration, and 1,234,267 salable acres. 10,437 acres with limiting designations. | Second most beneficial impacts to mineral development with 1,387,473 total leasable acres under standard lease terms and special stipulations, 448 oil and gas wells, 2,329 acres geophysical, and 1,387,473 salable acres. |
| Soil and Water | Adverse impacts to mineral development on 313,800 acres of saline soils and 823,094 acres of high-limitations soils closed to surface disturbance. | Adverse impacts to mineral development on 330,142 acres of saline soils and 487,917 acres of high-limitations soils closed to surface disturbance, and 2 watersheds closed to mineral development. | Adverse impacts to mineral development on 330,142 acres of saline soils and 710,129 acres of high-limitations soils closed to surface disturbance, and 2 watersheds NSO for mineral development. | Adverse impacts to mineral development 487,917 acres of high-limitations soils closed to surface disturbance. |
| Special Designations | Adverse impacts to mineral development over 1,287 acres in Negro Bill Outstanding Natural Area. | Adverse impacts to mineral development within 301,115 acres designated as ACECs and limiting development. | Adverse impacts to mineral development within 30,563 acres designated as ACECs and limiting development. | No impact. |
| Visual Resources | Second-least adverse impacts to minerals development on 349,110 acres (of WSAs) managed as VRM Class I and 401,015 acres designated VRM Class II. | Most-adverse impacts to minerals development on 453,462 acres managed as VRM Class I and 373,647 acres designated VRM Class II. | Second-most adverse impacts to minerals development on 358,911 acres managed as VRM Class I and 365,567 acres designated VRM Class II. | Least adverse impacts to minerals development on 349,617 acres managed as VRM Class I and 245,773 acres designated VRM Class II. |
| Non-WSA Lands with Wilderness Characteristics | No non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be managed. | Most adverse impacts to mineral development, with 266,485 acres managed to protect WC. These acres would be closed to oil and gas leasing. | Second-most adverse impacts, with 47,761 acres managed to protect WC.NSO for oil and gas leasing. | Same as Alternative A. |

## Table 2.2. Impacts Summary Table

| Management Action | Alternative A (No Action) | Alternative B | PROPOSED PLAN | Alternative D |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Wildlife and Fisheries | Least adverse impacts to mineral development over 503,574 acres of total habitat with restrictive stipulations over 227 days. | Most adverse impacts to mineral development with 1,553,233 acres total habitat with restrictive stipulations over 273 days. | Second most adverse impacts to mineral development with 1,379,134 acres total habitat with restrictive stipulations over 273 days. | Third most adverse impacts to mineral development (second least) with 590,442 acres total habitat with restrictive stipulations over 273 days. |
| **NON-WSA LANDS WITH WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS** | | | | |
| Non-WSA Lands with Wilderness Characteristics | Adverse impacts to 94% of the non-WSA areas inventoried with wilderness characteristics. Adverse impacts would include major surface disturbing activities and degradation of the wilderness characteristics of the entire area.<br>Approximately 81% would be open to mineral leasing with standard lease terms or with controlled surface use/timing limitation stipulations. In addition, 53% would be open to cross-country OHV use and 74% would be open to woodland harvest. Potential loss of wilderness characteristics on non-WSA lands across the entire area over the life of the plan. | Beneficial protection of naturalness and opportunities for solitude and primitive recreation across all non-WSA lands inventoried with wilderness characteristics.<br>Beneficial management including closed to oil and gas leasing, NSO for other surface disturbing activities, retained in federal ownership, vehicle use limited to designated roads, woodland harvest prohibited, VRM Class II, and exclusion areas for ROWs.<br>Therefore the entire inventory (266,485 acres) of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be preserved under this alternative. | Beneficial protection of naturalness and opportunities for solitude and primitive recreation across 18% of the non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics (47,761 acres).<br>Adverse impacts to naturalness and outstanding opportunities on 61% of the non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics open to mineral leasing, 53% managed under VRM Classes III and IV, and 61% open to woodlands harvest.<br>Potential degradation of the wilderness characteristics of those non-WSA lands not managed specifically to protect wilderness characteristics. | Adverse impacts to 87% (232,133 acres) of the non-WSA areas inventoried with wilderness characteristics (as described under Alternative A).<br>Approximately 87% would be open to mineral leasing with standard lease terms or with controlled surface use/timing limitation stipulations. In addition, 74 % would be open to woodland harvest. Potential loss of wilderness characteristics on non-WSA lands across the entire area over the life of the plan. |

## Table 2.2. Impacts Summary Table

| Management Action | Alternative A (No Action) | Alternative B | PROPOSED PLAN | Alternative D |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES** | | | | |
| Fire Management, Lands and Realty, Livestock Grazing, Minerals, Special Designations, Travel, Non-WSA Lands with Wilderness Characteristics, and Woodlands | Long term direct and indirect adverse impacts from construction of roads, fire lines, prescribed burns, 21,701 acres of utility corridors, 1,695,621 acres (total) open to livestock grazing, 838,412 acres open to oil and gas development, 391,133 acres open to unrestricted OHV travel, and 760,344 acres open to woodland harvest in paleontologically sensitive areas/geologic units. Beneficial impacts from fossils recovered as a result of mitigation and designation of ACECs, WSRs, WSAs, WA. Designates the fewest acres of land as ACECs, WSAs and WSRs. 0 acres as WSRs, and 1,287 acres as ACEC. No acres designated to be managed for wilderness characteristics on non-WSA lands<br>Has highest overall potential for adverse impacts. | Same as Alternative A, except: 38,633 acres of utility corridors, 1,668,732 acres (total) open to livestock grazing, 487,227 acres open to oil and gas development, no lands open to unrestricted OHV travel, and 614,848 acres open to woodland harvest in paleontologically sensitive areas/geologic units. 71,072 acres designated as WSRs, 610,703 acres as ACECs. 266,485 acres of non-WSA lands to be managed for wilderness characteristics.<br>Has lowest potential for adverse impacts. | Same as Alternative A except: 101,359 acres of utility corridors, 1,708,294 acres (total) open to livestock grazing, 730,458 acres open to oil and gas development, 7 acres open to unrestricted OHV travel, and 737,198 acres open to woodland harvest in paleontologically sensitive areas/geologic units. 41,495 acres designated as WSRs, 63,781 acres as ACECs. 47,761acres of non-WSA lands to be managed for wilderness characteristics.<br>Has second lowest potential for adverse impacts. | Same as Alternative A except: 123,132 acres of utility corridors, 1,770,314 acres (total) open to livestock grazing, 814,739 acres open to oil and gas development, 38 acres open to unrestricted OHV travel, and 760,198 acres open to woodland harvest in paleontologically sensitive areas/geologic units. 0 acres designated as WSRs, 35,042 acres as ACECs<br>Has second highest potential for adverse impacts. |
| Paleontology | Long- and short-term direct and indirect beneficial impacts from mitigation of surface disturbing actions in paleontologically sensitive areas/geologic units; designation of some paleontologically sensitive sites as SRMAs; and enhanced educational, interpretive and scientific opportunities. | Same as Alternative A. | Same as Alternative A. | Same as Alternative A. |

**Table 2.2. Impacts Summary Table**

| Management Action | Alternative A (No Action) | Alternative B | PROPOSED PLAN | Alternative D |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **RECREATION** | | | | |
| Air Quality | Long-term, beneficial impacts to scenic quality from interagency MOUs and BMPs controlling smoke, haze, and air pollutants. | Same as Alternative A. | Same as Alternative A. | Same as Alternative A. |
| Cultural | Long-term, adverse impacts on all users from least protection of cultural resources. | Protection-related actions applied to 50,000 acres of recreation/cultural resources would have long-term, beneficial impacts on recreation. | Impacts similar to Alternative B, but to a lesser degree, from protection of 30,000 acres of recreation/cultural resources. | Impacts similar to Alternative B, but to a lesser degree than the Proposed Plan. |
| Fire Management | Short-term, adverse impacts on recreation from surface disturbances, scenic quality degradation, and loss of vegetation. Long-term, beneficial impacts on recreation resources from reduced fire risks, enhanced wildlife habitat, and improved scenic quality. | Same as Alternative A. | Same as Alternative A. | Same as Alternative A. |
| Health and Human Safety | Negligible short-term impacts, with beneficial, long-term impacts from increased recreational opportunities for all users in remediated/reclaimed hazardous areas. | Same as Alternative A. | Same as Alternative A. | Same as Alternative A. |
| Lands and Realty | Long-term, beneficial impacts on all recreation user groups from protection of 70,237 acres of scenic and recreation resources in the Three Rivers and Westwater Mineral Withdrawal Areas. | Similar to Alternative A, but more beneficial impacts, from NSO leasing stipulations within the withdrawal areas. | Same as Alternative B. | Same as Alternative B. |

## Table 2.2. Impacts Summary Table

| Management Action | Alternative A (No Action) | Alternative B | PROPOSED PLAN | Alternative D |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Livestock Grazing | Direct and indirect, long-term, beneficial impacts on wildlife viewing and hunting from changes in allotment use and grazing exclusion in riparian areas. Grazing vegetation treatments on 67,125 acres would have short-term, adverse impacts on recreation, but long-term benefits from reduced fire risks, enhanced wildlife habitat, and improved scenic quality. | Beneficial, long-term, indirect impacts to wildlife viewing and hunting from forage treatments on 46,307 acres and exclusion of grazing in 4,673 acres of riparian areas. | Impacts slightly less beneficial than Alternative B, with riparian grazing exclusion on 1,497 acres. | Same beneficial impacts from forage treatments as Alternative B, but less beneficial riparian protection than Alternatives B or C. Slightly more beneficial than Alternative A. |
| Minerals | Indirect and direct, short-term and long-term, adverse impacts on recreational opportunities from surface-disturbing impacts to natural resources from noise, intrusive night lighting, soil erosion, and cross-country geophysical activities. | Impacts similar to Alternative A, except that fewer acres of RFD predicted development (56% of Alternative A) would reduce the adverse impacts to recreation. | Impacts similar to Alternative A, with slightly reduced adverse impacts from RFD predicted development (96% of Alternative A). | Impacts negligibly less adverse than Alternative A. |
| Recreation, Book Cliffs SRMA | Minor, adverse impacts to recreation resources and users from resource use conflicts. | Long-term, beneficial impacts to recreation resources and non-mechanized from reduced conflicts and preservation of resources in 348,140-acre Undeveloped SRMA. Mechanized users would be adversely restricted to 18 miles of routes. | SRMA would not be established, with impacts to the same as Alternative A. | SRMA would not be established, with impacts to the same as Alternative A. |
| Recreation, Cameo Cliffs SRMA | Minor impacts to resources from OHV surface disturbances along designated routes. Adverse impacts to non-motorized users from continued use of the 15,597-acre SRMA as a focus area for OHVs. | Beneficial, long-term impacts on resources and on motorized and non-motorized users from resource protection, expanded recreational opportunities, additional facilities, and reduced user conflicts within the 15,597-acre SRMA. | Same as Alternative B. | Same as Alternative B. |

## Table 2.2. Impacts Summary Table

| Management Action | Alternative A (No Action) | Alternative B | PROPOSED PLAN | Alternative D |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Recreation, Canyon Rims SRMA | Potential long-term, adverse impacts from minerals leasing, VRM III objectives, and user conflicts within the 101,531-acre SRMA. Long-term, beneficial resource protection impacts from travel route designation, camping restrictions. | Long-term, beneficial impacts from reduced user conflicts for motorized, mountain biking, and non-mechanized users within the SRMA from management of focus areas and increased recreational opportunities. | Same as Alternative B. | Impacts similar to Alternative A, but with more beneficial impacts to scenic drivers and hikers. |
| Recreation, Colorado Riverway SRMA | Long-term, beneficial impacts for all user groups from continued management for reduced user conflicts and restrictions on surface disturbances within the 17,983-acre SRMA. | Long-term, beneficial impacts from resource protection, reduced user conflicts from additional facilities, additional focus areas, and restricting camping to designated areas in the 103,467-acre SRMA. Long-term, adverse impacts to specialized, river floating groups. | Impacts similar to Alternative B, but with more beneficial impacts to all user groups. | Beneficial impacts to recreation from designated of a 79,126-acre SRMA, but long-term, adverse impacts from user conflicts because of management of fewer, and smaller, focus areas, and fewer facilities. |
| Recreation, Dolores River Canyons SRMA | Long-term, adverse impacts to resources from lack of management prescriptions for the area, creating the likelihood of user conflicts and resource degradation. | Long-term, adverse impacts on motorized and mountain biking users. Beneficial, long-term impacts to resources and users within the 31,661-acre SRMA from expanded recreational opportunities for boating and hiking, and a reduction in user conflicts. | Same as Alternative B. | Same as Alternative A. |

## Table 2.2. Impacts Summary Table

| Management Action | Alternative A (No Action) | Alternative B | PROPOSED PLAN | Alternative D |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Recreation, Labyrinth Rims/Gemini Bridges/Dee Pass SRMAs | Beneficial, short-term impacts to resources from maintained opportunities and facilities, and maintained protection of resources. Long-term, adverse impacts to resources and all user groups from lack of management prescriptions to protect resources from increased visitation, increased recreation demands. | Long-term, beneficial impacts on recreation through focus areas for non-motorized and motorized users within the 300,650-acre SRMA and the increased number of facilities that would reduce user conflicts and surface disturbances. Long-term, adverse impacts on motorized, specialized and mountain biking groups from user conflicts in SRMA areas without focus area management. | Impacts similar to Alternative B, but more beneficial, through focus areas for scenic driving, non-motorized, motorized, specialized, and mountain biking users within the 300,650-acre SRMA. | Impacts similar to Alternative A, except for increased long-term, beneficial motorized recreational opportunities within the 60,939-acre Dee Pass SRMA and the White Wash Open OHV area. |
| Recreation, Lower Gray Canyon SRMA | Long-term, beneficial impacts along Lower Gray Canyon from continued management under the Desolation-Gray Management Plan. | Long-term, beneficial impacts on resources from continued management under the current management plan and from increased opportunities within the 3,759-acre SRMA. | Same as Alternative B, with the same management prescriptions. | Same as Alternative A, as the SRMA would not be designated. |
| Recreation, Sand Flats SRMA | Short-term, beneficial impacts from adequate management of current levels of user needs and demands. Long-term, adverse impacts from lack of adequate management to address over-crowding, increasing user demands, and increasing user conflicts. | Long-term, beneficial protection of resource values within the 6,246-acre SRMA. Beneficial impacts on mountain bikers, but adverse impacts on OHV users from prohibitions on Slickrock Trail use. | Impacts similar to Alternative B, except for beneficial impacts to OHV motorcycle user from access to the Slickrock Trail and reduced beneficial impacts on mountain bikers. | Impacts similar to the Proposed Plan, except more beneficial, long-term recreational opportunities for mountain biking within the free-ride area. |

## Table 2.2. Impacts Summary Table

| Management Action | Alternative A (No Action) | Alternative B | PROPOSED PLAN | Alternative D |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Recreation, South Moab SRMA | Long-term, adverse impacts to motorized, mountain biking, and non-mechanized users from inadequate management to address user needs, demands, resource impacts, user displacement, and resource impacts. | Long-term, beneficial impacts on scenic driving, mountain biking, and non-mechanized users from reduced conflicts, reduced displacement, protection of resources, and expanded recreational opportunities within focus areas of the 63,399-acre SRMA. Long-term, adverse impacts on specialized (motorized) users from reduced opportunities. | Impacts similar to Alternative B, except for additional beneficial impacts to specialized users from opportunities on Potato Salad Hill. | Same as Alternative A. |
| Recreation, Two Rivers SRMA | Short-term, beneficial impacts on river recreation from continued management. Long-term, adverse impacts on river recreation from inadequate management to address increasing user demands, resource impacts, user conflicts. | Long-term, beneficial impacts on river and non-mechanized users from enhanced river and shoreline recreation opportunities, increased facilities, focus areas, and permit system modification within the 29,839-acre SRMA. Short-term, adverse impacts on river opportunities from permit limits. | Impacts similar to Alternative B, but more beneficial to recreation users from more river opportunities under less restrictive permit limits. | Impacts similar to the Proposed Plan, except for long-term, adverse impacts from lack of river focus area and potential degradation of river experiences by increasing permit numbers and group sizes within the 14,056-acre SRMA. |
| Recreation, Utah Rims SRMA | Long-term, adverse impacts from continued management allowing OHV noise, surface disturbances, and from intensifying user conflicts between mountain bikers, motorized OHV, and non-mechanized users. | Long-term, beneficial impacts from reduced OHV impacts, additional facilities, and reduced user conflicts within the 15,424-acre SRMA. | Impacts similar to Alternative B, except more benefits from increased opportunities from expanded 7 system and single-track (motorcycle) opportunities. | Same as Alternative A. |

## Table 2.2. Impacts Summary Table

| Management Action | Alternative A (No Action) | Alternative B | PROPOSED PLAN | Alternative D |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Recreation, Moab ERMA | Long-term, adverse impacts on recreation from inadequate management of intensifying user conflicts along Kokopelli's Trail. | Adverse impacts to users of Kokopelli's Trail similar to Alternative A. Long-term, beneficial impacts from additional facilities and opportunities to reduce user conflicts and meet user demands. | Impacts similar to Alternative B, except more beneficial impacts from additional mountain biking opportunities on 1,365-acre Upper Fisher Mesa. | Similar to the Proposed Plan, but to a lesser degree, from reduced acres managed for recreation. |
| Recreation, Special Recreation Permits | Long-term, beneficial impacts on recreation from current management by providing recreational opportunities for commercial and private groups, and protecting resources. | Similar to Alternative A, but to a greater degree, from emphasis on resource protection while managing for a wide range of opportunities. | Impacts similar to Alternative B, but to a greater degree, from more specific permit stipulations to protect resources. | Impacts similar to the Proposed Plan, but to a less beneficial degree, from reduced resource protection. Short-term, beneficial impacts from providing permits (and opportunities) to large groups, but long-term, adverse impacts from increased likelihood of resource degradation and loss of recreation values. |
| Riparian | Long-term, adverse impacts on recreation from continued degradation of riparian areas that would reduce opportunities to enjoy riparian areas. | Long-term, beneficial impacts to recreation experiences and opportunities from improved riparian areas through livestock grazing controls and limits on recreational use of these areas. Long-term, adverse impacts from reduced OHV opportunities from riparian area protection. | Same as Alternative B. | Same as Alternative B. |
| Soils/Watershed | Negligible impacts on recreation resources or resource users. | Long-term, beneficial impacts from maintained scenic quality in Castle Valley from reducing surface disturbances in the watershed, and from restrictions on steep slopes. | Same as Alternative B. | Impacts same as Alternative B, but to a lesser degree, because Castle Valley surface disturbance-restricting stipulations would not be applied. |

## Table 2.2. Impacts Summary Table

| Management Action | Alternative A (No Action) | Alternative B | PROPOSED PLAN | Alternative D |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Special Designations, ACECs | Long-term, adverse impacts from lack of prescriptions to protect recreation resource values in areas proposed as ACECs under other alternatives. Continued long-term, beneficial impacts on motorized OHV users within Ten Mile Wash and White Wash. | Long-term, beneficial impacts on recreation resources within 610,086 acres designated as ACECs from NSO protection from minerals development, and from restrictions on motorized use. Long-term, adverse impacts on specialized, motorized, and mountain biking users from reduced recreational opportunities in some areas. Long-term, beneficial impacts on scenic, mountain biking, and non-mechanized users from expanded opportunities in some areas. | Impacts similar to Alternative B in 63,232 acres proposed as ACECs (11% of Alternative B area) and areas not proposed as ACECs, except for long-term, adverse impacts to all recreation users within Canyon Rims, and long-term, beneficial impacts from expanded opportunities for motorized OHV users in White Wash. | Long-term, adverse impacts on all users and recreation resources from lack of protection to scenic resources because no ACECs would be designated. |
| Special Designations, Wild and Scenic Rivers | Negligible impacts to recreation along 46 miles of eligible river segments of the Colorado and Dolores Rivers. Impacts on recreation along the remaining MPA river segments would be adverse in the short-term and long-term from lack of protection from intensifying use, user conflicts, and potential surface disturbances. | Long-term, beneficial impacts on recreation resources and on all user groups along 287.5 miles of river corridor determined to be suitable for recommendation as Wild and Scenic. | Long-term beneficial impacts as compared to Alternative B, because 127.3 river miles would be suitable for recommendation. | Impacts similar to Alternative A, except no river segments would be suitable for recommendation, with adverse impacts on resources and river-related recreation. |
| Special Designations, WSAs | Beneficial, long-term impacts to recreation because WSAs have been and would continue to be managed to protect their wilderness values. Adverse impacts from managing OHV as limited to inventoried routes. | Same as Alternative A, except for adverse, minor impacts to motorized OHV users from use limited to designated routes. | Same as Alternative B. | Same as Alternative B. |

## Table 2.2. Impacts Summary Table

| Management Action | Alternative A (No Action) | Alternative B | PROPOSED PLAN | Alternative D |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Special Status Species | Long-term, beneficial impacts on opportunities from continued protection of wildlife and plants for recreational sightseeing and nature study. | Same as Alternative A. | Same as Alternative A. | Same as Alternative A. |
| Travel Management, OHV | Long-term, adverse impacts to recreation from intensifying user conflicts and displacement, noise, from surface disturbances, and destruction of recreation-related cultural resources. Long-term, beneficial impacts to motorized OHV opportunities from unrestricted cross-country travel on 620,212 acres. | Long-term, beneficial impacts to non-motorized users and resources from OHV route designation and elimination of all cross-country travel. Beneficial impacts from reduced user conflicts. Long-term, adverse impacts to motorized OHV users from travel opportunities limited to designated routes within 1,475,074 acres and 3,278 miles of B and D class routes. | Impacts on resources and user groups would be similar to Alternative B, except that the adverse impacts to motorized users would be reduced by limiting OHV travel to designated routes within 1,481,334 acres and along 3,653 miles of B and D class routes, 123 miles of single-track routes, with 1,866 acres open to cross-country travel. | Long-term, beneficial impacts on motorized OHV users from opportunities along designated routes. Impacts on resources similar to Alternative B, except that OHV travel limited to designated routes would be permitted on 1,762,083 acres, 3,805 miles of B and D class routes, 219 miles of single-track routes, with 3,064 acres open to cross-country travel. |
| Travel Management, Mountain Biking | Long-term, adverse impacts to mountain biking recreation from inadequate management to address increasing user conflicts, increasing user demand, and user displacement. | Long-term, beneficial impacts from 75 new miles of routes managed for mountain biking recreation, by increasing opportunities, and reducing conflicts and displacement. | Impacts similar to Alternative B, except 150 new miles would be designated for mountain biking recreation. | Impacts similar to Alternative B, except 300 new miles would be designated for mountain biking recreation. |
| Travel Management, Non-Mechanized | Long-term, adverse impacts to non-mechanized recreation from inadequate management to address increasing user conflicts, increasing user demand, and user displacement. | Long-term, beneficial impacts from 25 new miles of routes managed for non-mechanized recreation, by increasing opportunities, and reducing conflicts and displacement. | Impacts similar to Alternative B, except 50 new miles would be designated for non-mechanized recreation. | Impacts similar to Alternative B, except 100 new miles would be designated for non-mechanized recreation. |

## Table 2.2. Impacts Summary Table

| Management Action | Alternative A (No Action) | Alternative B | PROPOSED PLAN | Alternative D |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Vegetation | Short-term, adverse impacts on recreation from surface disturbances, scenic quality degradation, and loss of vegetation. Long-term, beneficial impacts on recreation resources from enhanced wildlife habitat and improved scenic quality. | Same as Alternative A, except that drought management would have short-term, adverse impacts on motorized and mountain biking opportunities. | Same as Alternative B. | Same as Alternative B. |
| Visual | Long-term, beneficial impacts on recreation resources and all user groups because Alternative A would attempt to manage recreation-related scenic quality as determined by the VRM inventory. | Long-term, beneficial impacts to all recreational users and resources from managing more acres than determined by the VRM inventory for VRM I. | Long-term, adverse impacts to recreational users and resources from fewer acres managed for high scenic quality than determined by the VRM inventory. | Adverse impacts similar to the Proposed Plan, but to a greater degree, from fewer acres managed for high scenic quality than determined by the VRM inventory. |
| Non-WSA Lands with Wilderness Characteristics | Long-term, adverse impacts to motorized and non-motorized users from lack of management to preserve non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics areas. | Long-term, beneficial impacts on resources and on motorized and non-motorized users from maintained opportunities within 266,485 acres of non-WSA areas with wilderness characteristics. | Impact similar to Alternative B, but to a lesser degree, from management of 47,761 acres of non-WSA lands for wilderness characteristics (20% of the area under Alternative B). | Same as Alternative A. |
| Wildlife and Fisheries | Short-term, adverse impacts on opportunities for motorized, mountain biking, and specialized users in the Potash-Confluence HMP (42,500 acres) from actions to protect wildlife. | Long-term, adverse impacts on dispersed camping opportunities in riparian areas to protect habitat, and in Shafer Basin and Long Canyon (13,500 acres) to protect bighorn sheep habitat. | Same as Alternative B. | Similar impacts as Alternative B, but to a lesser degree, from more opportunities for dispersed camping in bighorn sheep habitat. |
| **RIPARIAN RESOURCES** | | | | |
| Fire Management | Long-term, beneficial impacts due to reduction in catastrophic fire risk. | Same as Alternative A. | Same as Alternative A. | Same as Alternative A. |

## Table 2.2. Impacts Summary Table

| Management Action | Alternative A (No Action) | Alternative B | PROPOSED PLAN | Alternative D |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Lands and Realty | No impacts unless exceptions are granted in which case they would be mitigated. | Same as Alternative A. | Same as Alternative A. | Same as Alternative A. |
| Livestock Grazing | Beneficial impacts from excluding grazing on 9% of MPA's riparian areas. | Beneficial impacts from excluding grazing on 34% of MPA's riparian areas. | Beneficial impacts from excluding grazing on 12% of MPA's riparian areas. | Same as Alternative A. |
| Mineral Resources | No impacts unless exceptions are granted in which case they would be mitigated. | Same as Alternative A. | Same as Alternative A. | Same as Alternative A. |
| Recreation and Travel | Adverse impacts in the form of disturbance of vegetation and soils; introduction of weeds; and potential for fire due to 2,100 acres of riparian areas being open to OHVs.<br>Beneficial impact from managed recreation use on 141,234 acres of SRMA.<br>Adverse impacts (forms described above) due to high number of river users and few limitations on camping. | Beneficial impacts from reductions in vegetation and soil disturbance and introduction of weeds; reduced fire potential from closing all riparian areas to OHVs or limiting travel.<br>Beneficial impact from managed recreation use on 976,173 acres of SRMA.<br>Reduced disturbance by river users relative to Alternative A. | OHV impacts the same as Alternative B.<br>Beneficial impact from managed recreation use on 658,642 acres of SRMA.<br>Impacts from river users less than Alternative A and more than Alternative B. | OHV impacts the same as Alternative B.<br>Beneficial impact from managed recreation use on 277,471 acres of SRMA.<br>Impacts from river users less than Alternative A and more than Alternatives B and C. |
| Riparian Resources | Under all alternatives, beneficial impacts from maintenance of PFC; guidance on pipeline crossings; No Surface Occupancy stipulations in riparian and floodplain areas; prohibition of public wood gathering; and weed control measures. Beneficial impacts from excluding grazing on 9% of MPA's riparian areas. | Same as Alternative A, plus beneficial impacts from excluding grazing on 17% of MPA's riparian areas and prioritization of 17 watersheds for Watershed Management Plans (WMP). | Same as Alternative A, plus beneficial impacts from excluding grazing on 12% of MPA's riparian areas and prioritization of 8 watersheds for Watershed Management Plans (WMP). | Same as Alternative A. |

## Table 2.2. Impacts Summary Table

| Management Action | Alternative A (No Action) | Alternative B | PROPOSED PLAN | Alternative D |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Soil and Water | Beneficial impacts due to a controlled surface use stipulation restricting surface disturbing activities in 100-year floodplains, under all alternatives. No impacts from WMPs. | Same as Alternative A, plus beneficial impacts to riparian management from prioritizing 17 watersheds for WMPs. | Same as Alternative A, plus beneficial impacts to riparian management from prioritizing 8 watersheds for WMPs. | Same as Alternative A. |
| Special Designations | Beneficial protection from designation of Negro Bill ONA.<br>WSR eligible sections would be managed to protect ORVs which may offer indirect protections to riparian resources. | Greatest beneficial protection from designation of 12 ACECs.<br>Beneficial protection of riparian resources by declaring 71,300 acres suitable for some level of WSR designation. | Second greatest beneficial protection from designations of 5 ACECs.<br>Beneficial protection of riparian resources by declaring 41,236 acres suitable for some level of WSR designation. | No ACEC s designated, thus no riparian benefit.<br>Adverse impacts to riparian resources from listing all eligible river segments (except Salt Wash) as "not suitable" for WSR designation. |
| Special Status Species | Beneficial enhancement (or reduction of degradation) of riparian areas designated for recovery of Special Status Species. | Same as Alternative A. | Same as Alternative A. | Same as Alternative A. |
| Vegetation | Beneficial enhancement of riparian health through removal of invasive species and replacement with native species. | Same as Alternative A. | Same as Alternative A. | Same as Alternative A. |
| Non-WSA Lands with Wilderness Characteristics | No specific management of non-WSA lands with lands with wilderness characteristics is proposed; so no direct impacts to riparian resources would occur. | Beneficial protection from the prohibition of surface disturbance, off road travel, and new ROWs on 266,485 acres of non-WSA lands managed to maintain wilderness characteristics. | Beneficial protection from the prohibition of surface disturbance, off road travel, and new ROWs on 47,761 acres of non-WSA lands managed to maintain wilderness characteristics. | No non-WSA lands would be managed for wilderness characteristics, so adverse impacts to riparian resources would be possible. |

## Table 2.2. Impacts Summary Table

| Management Action | Alternative A (No Action) | Alternative B | PROPOSED PLAN | Alternative D |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Wildlife | Benefits from reduced livestock impacts due to exclosures under Dolores Triangle Habitat Management Plan (Appendix N). Beneficial reduction of vegetation and soil disturbance and reduced spread of weeds due to camping restrictions in riparian wildlife habitats. Beneficial improvement in riparian habitat for migratory bird management. | Same as Alternative A. | Same as Alternative A. | Same as Alternative A. |
| Woodlands | Beneficial reduction in disturbance due to prohibition on public fuelwood gathering under all alternatives. | Same as Alternative A. | Same as Alternative A. | Same as Alternative A. |
| **SOCIOECONOMIC RESOURCES** | | | | |
| Cultural | Socioeconomic impacts resulting from cultural resource management decisions would continue. | Long-term beneficial social and economic impacts related to cultural resource visitation and subsequent revenue generation would be greatest because the identification, preservation, and restoration of sites would be highest under this alternative. | Similar to Alternative B with slightly fewer prioritizations that would reduce adverse impacts to cultural sites. | With the fewest amount of prioritizations and greatest opportunity for surface disturbing activities, adverse impacts to social and economic conditions resulting from cultural resources would be greatest under this alternative. |
| Lands and Realty | Socioeconomic impacts would remain similar to current conditions. | About 318,709 acres (outside WSAs) would be rights-of-way exclusion areas, resulting in potential adverse economic impacts. | About 25,306 acres (outside WSAs) would be rights-of-way exclusion areas, resulting in potential adverse economic impacts. | Socioeconomic impacts would remain similar to current conditions. |
| Livestock Grazing | Socioeconomic impacts would remain similar to current conditions. | The additional 26,890 acres unavailable for grazing would not alter socioeconomic impacts compared to Alternative A. | The additional 12, 673 acres unavailable for grazing would not alter socioeconomic impacts compared to Alternative A. | Similar to Alternative A.<br>The additional 74,693 acres available for grazing would not alter socioeconomic impacts compared to Alternative A. |

## Table 2.2. Impacts Summary Table

| Management Action | Alternative A (No Action) | Alternative B | PROPOSED PLAN | Alternative D |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Minerals | Economic benefits (taxes, royalties, bonus payments and annual rent payments) from minerals development would be long-term and beneficial to local communities. Estimated annual royalty revenue: oil – $200, 980, gas – $1,624,244<br>Employment would remain similar to current conditions with minor beneficial impacts to the local economy. Long-term production jobs would likely continue at current rates.<br><br>Estimated annual property tax benefit from oil and gas production - $574,000<br><br>Estimated annual severance tax benefits to State from oil and gas production in the Moab Planning Area - $1,356,000, based on relative share of total State production (State of Utah data, February, 2008.) | Long-term economic benefits from minerals development would be slightly less under this Alternative, thus having a negligible to minor impact in comparison to the other Alternatives. Estimated annual royalty revenue: oil – $100,490, gas – $937,050.<br><br>Estimated annual property tax benefit from oil and gas production - $321,440<br><br>Estimated annual severance tax benefits to State from oil and gas production in the Moab Planning Area is likely to be about 45% less than A, due to decreased production opportunities. | Long-term beneficial socioeconomic impacts slightly less than Alternative A, but greater than Alternative B. Estimated annual royalty revenue: oil – $200,980, gas – $1,561,750<br><br>Estimated annual property tax benefit from oil and gas production - $551,000<br><br>Estimated annual severance tax benefits to State from oil and gas production in the Moab Planning Area would be similar to A, since estimated production would be only slightly less than A. | Long-term beneficial socioeconomic impacts same as Alternative A, but greater than Alternatives B and C. Estimated annual royalty revenue: oil – $200, 980, gas – $1,624,244<br><br>Estimated annual property tax benefit from oil and gas production - $574,000<br><br>Estimated annual severance tax benefits to State from oil and gas production in the Moab Planning Area would be similar to A, since estimate production would be similar to A. |

## Table 2.2. Impacts Summary Table

| Management Action | Alternative A (No Action) | Alternative B | PROPOSED PLAN | Alternative D |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Recreation and Travel Management | Long-term beneficial impacts from tourist-related spending (approx. $2 million in sales tax revenue annually) and employment (2000 jobs) would continue.<br>With no designation of focus areas and 3 SRMAs, user conflicts are likely to escalate and adversely impact visitor experience.<br><br>Economic contributions from OHV users would be similar to current conditions. There could be a potential decrease in social well-being and contribution to the local economy from recreationists seeking non-motorized opportunities. There could be possible degradation of other resources that could adversely impact recreation opportunities and visitation in the long term. | Slight decrease in revenue generation and tourist-related employment due to emphasis on non-motorized recreation.<br>With 11 SRMAs and 22 focus areas, user conflicts would likely decrease, having long-term beneficial impacts on visitor experience. Decreased OHV user satisfaction due to emphasis on non-motorized users.<br><br>Potential decrease in OHV visitation with corresponding potential increase in non-motorized recreation. Adverse economic impacts to businesses focusing on OHV use, but positive economic benefits to businesses focusing on non-motorized recreation.<br><br>Potential increase in second home and retirement relocation, with corresponding benefits to businesses involved in this market. Potential adverse impact to local residents from increases in housing costs and changes to local customs and culture. | Emphasis on a balance of recreational uses could lead to greatest opportunity for revenue generation and a range of employment opportunities in the region. Socioeconomic impacts would be long-term and beneficial.<br>With 10 SRMAs and 30 focus areas, the greatest opportunity for reduction in user conflicts and satisfactory visitor experiences for all recreation types is emphasized under this Alternative.<br><br>Greatest potential for social and economic benefits to the extent that user conflicts are reduced, and that sufficient opportunities exist for both motorized and non-motorized recreation. | Slight decrease in revenue generation and tourist-related employment due to emphasis on motorized recreation.<br>With 6 SRMAs and 10 focus areas, user conflicts may decrease, having long-term beneficial impacts on visitor experience. Decreased non-motorized user satisfaction due to emphasis on motorized users.<br><br>Social and economic benefits to OHV users and associated businesses higher than under the Proposed Plan, but less than under current conditions. Social and economic benefits to non-motorized recreationists less than under the Proposed Plan, but greater than under current conditions. |

## Table 2.2. Impacts Summary Table

| Management Action | Alternative A (No Action) | Alternative B | PROPOSED PLAN | Alternative D |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Special Designations | Opportunities for adverse socioeconomic impacts resulting from the designation of ACECs would be negligible as no ACECs are designated.<br>With 63 river miles designated as eligible for WSR status, socioeconomic impacts would be negligible. | Opportunities for adverse impacts to socioeconomics resulting from the designation of ACECs would be minor, as 92,056 acres would be excluded from oil and development.<br>WSR designation on 340 river miles could have long-term beneficial economic impacts related to tourism-related revenues. | Opportunities for adverse socioeconomic impacts resulting from the designation of ACECs are likely to be minor as 29,205 acres of ACECs would have major restrictions on oil and gas development. An additional 34,027 acres of ACECs are excluded from development due to their WSA status.<br><br>WSR designation would have most of the beneficial impacts of tourism-related revenue in comparison to Alternative B, as the major recreational rivers are included (Colorado, Dolores and Green). | Similar to Alternative A.<br>Potential adverse and/or beneficial impacts of WSR designation are negligible as no miles are designated. |
| Visual | Negligible to minor impacts due to VRM restrictions on minerals development. | Slightly greater VRM restrictions on minerals development than Alternative A. | Slightly less VRM restrictions on minerals development than Alternative A. | Slightly less VRM restrictions on minerals development than Alternative A, but greater than the Proposed Plan. |
| Non-WSA Lands with Wilderness Characteristics | No impacts, as no non-WSA lands would be managed for wilderness characteristics. | Adverse economic impacts from reduction in oil and gas development on 266,485 acres of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics. Possible increases in revenues from primitive recreation opportunities. | Negligible adverse economic impacts from reduction in oil and gas development on 47,761 acres of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics. Possible increases in revenues from primitive recreation. | No impacts, as no non-WSA lands would be managed for wilderness characteristics. |
| **SOIL AND WATER** | | | | |
| Cultural Resources | No new impacts on soil and water resources. | Beneficial removal of grazing from 42 miles of perennial stream. | Same as Alternative B. | Beneficial removal of grazing from 28 miles of perennial stream. |

## Table 2.2. Impacts Summary Table

| Management Action | Alternative A (No Action) | Alternative B | PROPOSED PLAN | Alternative D |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Fire Management | Short term adverse increased sedimentation and runoff. Long-term beneficial reduction of catastrophic fire risk, reduced frequency/number of high-intensity fires, fewer hydro-phobic soils, increased infiltration, decreased flood magnitude, less erosion and sedimentation. | Same as Alternative A. | Same as Alternative A. | Same as Alternative A. |
| Human Health and Safety | Beneficial long-term reduction of water quality-related threats to public health and/or the environment where Abandoned Mine Lands (AMLs) are rehabilitated. | Same as Alternative A. | Same as Alternative A. | Same as Alternative A. |
| Lands and Realty | Utility corridors have the potential to adversely impact soils on up to 32,502 acres. | Utility corridors have the potential to adversely impact soils on up to 65,865. | Utility corridors have the potential to adversely impact soils on up to 173,099 acres. | Utility corridors have the potential to adversely impact soils on up to 204,168 acres. |
| Livestock Grazing | Reduced saline soil erosion due to 84,949 acres of sensitive soils being unavailable for grazing. Alternative A would provide more protection for sensitive soils than Alternatives C and D but less than Alternative B. | Reduced saline soil erosion due to 106,752 acres of sensitive soils being unavailable for grazing. Alternative B represents the greatest, short- and long-term, beneficial impacts to soil and water resources. | Reduced saline soil erosion due to 80,178 acres of sensitive soils being unavailable for grazing. | Reduced saline soil erosion due to 43,999 acres of sensitive soils being unavailable for grazing. Least protective of sensitive soils of all the alternatives. |
| Minerals | Potential for adverse disturbance of up to 41% of sensitive soils by mineral resource development. | Potential for adverse disturbance of up to 26% of sensitive soils by mineral resource development. | Potential for adverse disturbance of up to 38% of sensitive soils by mineral resource development. | Potential for adverse disturbance of up to 40% of sensitive soils by mineral resource development. |

## Table 2.2. Impacts Summary Table

| Management Action | Alternative A (No Action) | Alternative B | PROPOSED PLAN | Alternative D |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Recreation | Adverse impacts to 620,212 acres of soils open to cross country OHV travel and associated surface disturbance. Greatest adverse impacts to soil and water resources due to lowest level of recreation management (141,234 acres of SRMA). | No soils open to cross-country OHV use. Beneficial impacts from the greatest level recreation management (976,173 acres of SRMA). | Adverse impacts to 1,866 acres of soils open to cross country OHV travel and associated surface disturbance. Management of recreation impacts would be less than Alternative B and more than Alternatives A and D (658,642 acres of SRMA). | Adverse impacts to 3,096 acres of soils open to cross country OHV travel and associated surface disturbance. Management of recreation impacts would be less than Alternatives B and C and more than Alternative A (277,471 acres of SRMA). |
| Riparian | Least beneficial impacts from least protective riparian management. | Greatest beneficial impacts from development and implementation of WMPs in the greatest number of watersheds, management of livestock grazing on most acres, and grazing exclusion on portions of nine allotments protecting 28 miles of perennial stream. | Fewer benefits from WMPs than under Alternative B, but more than Alternatives A and D. Fewer benefits from livestock grazing management than Alternative B, but more than Alternatives A and D. | Same as Alternative A. |
| Soils/Water Resources | Adverse impacts due to oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities in the Castle Valley or the Mill Creek watersheds. Beneficial impacts over 313,800 acres of saline soils and 823,094 acres of high-limitations soils closed to surface disturbance. | Beneficial impacts due to closure of Castle Valley and Mill Creek municipal watersheds for mineral resource development and other surface-disturbing activities. Beneficial impacts over 330,142 acres of saline soils and 487,917 acres of high-limitations soils closed to surface disturbance. | Same as Alternative B, except areas within the municipal watersheds would be no surface occupancy for surface disturbing activities, and 330,142 acres of saline soils and 710,129 acres of high-limitations soils would be closed to surface disturbance. | Impacts regarding the Castle Valley r and the Mill Creek municipal watersheds would be the same as under Alternative A.<br>Beneficial impacts over 487,917 acres of high-limitations soils closed to surface disturbance. |
| Special Designations | Minor beneficial impacts from protective management of 5,400 acres of sensitive soils are within 1/4 mile of two currently eligible WSR segments. | Greatest beneficial protection of soil and water with all 14 proposed areas managed as ACECs, limits on surface disturbance over at least 40,800 acres of sensitive soils due to WSR designation. | Moderate beneficial protection with 5 of the 14 proposed areas managed as ACECs, limits on surface disturbance over at least 25,900 acres of sensitive soils due to WSR designation. | No beneficial impacts to sensitive soils. |

**Table 2.2. Impacts Summary Table**

| Management Action | Alternative A (No Action) | Alternative B | PROPOSED PLAN | Alternative D |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS** | | | | |
| All Potential ACECs (613,077 acres) | None of the 14 Potential ACECs would be designated, with the exception of the existing 1,375 acre Negro Bill Outstanding Natural Area, which would continue to be protected.<br>Relevant and important values, resources, and natural systems in the 13 potential ACECs that would not be designated could be at risk of irreparable damage due to the potential for adverse impacts except for those portions of potential ACECs that are in existing WSAs (approximately 306,000 acres), which would continue to be protected. | All of the 14 Potential ACECs would be designated.<br>Special management provisions would be applied to 613,077 acres and relevant and important values, resources, and natural systems would be protected, and hazards addressed. | Five of the Potential ACECs would be designated. Special management provisions would be applied to 63,232 acres, and the relevant and important values, resources, and natural systems in these areas would be protected (and hazards addressed).<br>In most cases the relevant and important values in 9 potential ACECs would be protected from long-term adverse impacts by other proposed management actions. | None of the 14 Potential ACECs would be designated.<br>Some of the relevant and important values, resources and natural systems in the potential ACECs could be at risk of irreparable damage due to the potential for adverse impacts. |

## Table 2.2. Impacts Summary Table

| Management Action | Alternative A (No Action) | Alternative B | PROPOSED PLAN | Alternative D |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ACEC, Behind the Rocks | Not designated.<br>Relevant and important values within the Behind the Rocks WSA (12,635 acres) would be protected.<br>Of the 5,201 acres outside the WSA:<br>About 2,549 acres are closed to oil and gas leasing thereby providing protection to relevant and important values;<br>About 1,958 acres are NSO for oil and gas leasing thereby providing protection to relevant and important values; and<br>About 694 acres would be open to oil and gas leasing, resulting in about 7.3 acres of surface disturbance due to oil and gas development. These acres would also be open to cross country OHV use thereby impacting relevant and important values. | About 17,836 acres designated, including 12,635 acres within the WSA.<br>All relevant and important values would be protected by managing as either closed or NSO for oil and gas leasing and other surface disturbing activities.<br>In addition, 17,836 acres would be managed as closed to woodlands harvest and OHV travel limited to designated routes, which would have beneficial impacts to relevant and important values. | About 5,201 acres (outside the WSA) would be designated. The ACEC would be NSO for oil and gas leasing and other surface disturbing activities.<br>In addition, the 5,201acres would be managed as closed to woodlands harvest and OHV travel limited to designated routes, which would have beneficial impacts to relevant and important values. | Not designated. Relevant and important values within the Behind the Rocks WSA (12,635 acres) would be protected.<br>About 5,201 acres outside the WSA would be open to oil and gas leasing and other surface disturbing activities. This would result in about 7.0 acres of surface disturbance due to oil and gas development.<br>However, there would be beneficial impacts to relevant and important values from limiting OHV travel to designated routes. |

## Table 2.2. Impacts Summary Table

| Management Action | Alternative A (No Action) | Alternative B | PROPOSED PLAN | Alternative D |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ACEC, Book Cliffs | Not designated. Relevant and important values within Book Cliffs WSAs (250,207 acres) would be protected.<br>Of the 54,045 acres outside the WSAs:<br>All 54,045 acres are open to oil and gas leasing, with adverse impacts to relevant and important values possible from oil and gas development. There is a projected disturbance of 841 acres.<br>There would be additional adverse impacts on these 54,045 acres from woodland harvest, open OHV use, and ROWs. | About 304,252 acres designated, including 250,207 acres within the WSAs. All relevant and important values would be protected by managing as either closed or NSO for oil and gas leasing and other surface disturbing activities.<br>In addition, the entire 304,252 acres would be managed as closed to woodlands harvest, managed as an SRMA, and OHV travel limited to designated routes, which would have beneficial impacts to relevant and important values.<br>Greatest beneficial impacts to relevant and important values under this alternative. | Not designated. Relevant and important values within the WSAs (250,207 acres) would be protected.<br>About 54,045 acres outside the WSAs would be open to oil and gas leasing and other surface disturbing activities. This would result in about 806 acres of surface disturbance due to oil and gas development.<br>There would be a beneficial impact by limiting OHV use to designated routes. | Same as the Proposed Plan. |
| ACEC, Canyon Rims | Not designated. About 23,400 acres would be open to oil and gas leasing, which could result in adverse impacts to relevant and important values. There would be about 33 acres of surface disturbance due to oil and gas development. | About 23,400 acres designated. The area would be closed or NSO for oil and gas leasing and other surface disturbing activities. This would provide beneficial protections to relevant and important values. | Not designated. About 23,400 acres would be open to oil and gas leasing with a controlled surface use stipulation, which could result in adverse impacts to relevant and important values. There would be about 24 acres of surface disturbance due to oil and gas development. | Same as the Proposed Plan except mineral leasing disturbance would be 32 acres. |

## Table 2.2. Impacts Summary Table

| Management Action | Alternative A (No Action) | Alternative B | PROPOSED PLAN | Alternative D |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Additional adverse impacts from surface disturbance associated with ROWs could occur.<br>The 23,400 acres would also limit OHV travel to existing routes, benefiting relevant and important values, but to a lesser degree than would limit travel to designated routes.<br>Beneficial impacts would result from SRMA and VRM II management. Least protective of all the alternatives. | Additional adverse impacts from surface disturbance associated with ROWs could occur.<br>Beneficial impacts would result from limiting OHV travel to designated routes and from SRMA and VRM II management.<br>Greatest beneficial impacts to relevant and important values under this alternative. | Additional adverse impacts to view shed from VRM III management in portions of the area. Additional adverse impacts from surface disturbance associated with ROWs could occur.<br>Beneficial impacts from SRMA management and from limiting OHV travel to designated routes. | |
| ACEC, Cisco White-tailed Prairie Dog Complex | Not designated. About 117,481 acres would be open to oil and gas leasing, which could result in adverse impacts to relevant and important values. There would be about 1,249 acres of surface disturbance due to oil and gas development.<br>Least protective of all alternatives. | About 117,481acres designated. The area would be managed as NSO for oil and gas leasing and other surface disturbing activities. This would provide beneficial protections to relevant and important values.<br>Beneficial protections from management of livestock grazing to maximize seed production and from limiting OHV travel to designated routes.<br>Greatest beneficial impacts to relevant and important values under this alternative. | Same as Alternative A except there would be beneficial impacts from requirements for a 660- foot buffer around known active prairie dog colonies and changes in livestock use (except for seasons of use) to maximize seed production.<br>Additional beneficial impacts from limiting OHV travel to designated routes. | Same as the Proposed Plan except for adverse impacts from not managing livestock grazing to maximize seed production. |

## Table 2.2. Impacts Summary Table

| Management Action | Alternative A (No Action) | Alternative B | PROPOSED PLAN | Alternative D |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ACEC, Colorado River Corridor | Not designated. Relevant and important values within the Negro Bill WSA (7,280 acres) would be protected.<br>Of the 43,203 acres outside the WSA, about 31,276 acres would be open to oil and gas leasing, resulting in about 35 acres of surface disturbance due to oil and gas development. These acres would also be open to cross country OHV use thereby impacting relevant and important values.<br>The Three Rivers withdrawal for locatable minerals would have beneficial impacts to relevant and important values.<br>Least protection of relevant and important values under this alternative. | About 50,483 acres designated, including 7,280 acres within the WSA. All relevant and important values would be protected by managing as either closed or NSO for oil and gas leasing and other surface disturbing activities.<br>In addition, the 50,483 acres would be managed as closed to woodlands harvest, managed as an SRMA, and OHV travel limited to designated routes, which would have beneficial impacts to relevant and important values.<br>Additional beneficial impacts from VRM I and SRMA management and from the Three Rivers withdrawal for locatable minerals.<br>Greatest beneficial impacts to relevant and important values under this alternative. | Not designated. Relevant and important values within the Negro Bill WSA (7,280 acres) would be protected.<br>Of the acreage outside the WSA, the majority would be managed as closed or NSO for oil and gas leasing and other surface disturbing activities, providing beneficial impacts to relevant and important values. The northwest corner of the Potential ACEC would be open to oil and gas leasing and other surface disturbing activities. This would result in about 26 acres of surface disturbance due to oil and gas development.<br>Restrictions on river-based camping, limiting OHV travel to designated routes.<br>SRMA management, VRM II management, and the Three Rivers withdrawal for locatable minerals, would also have beneficial impacts. | Same as the Proposed Plan except that more of the acreage is open to oil and gas leasing and other surface disturbing activities, resulting in greater impacts to relevant and important values. |

## Table 2.2. Impacts Summary Table

| Management Action | Alternative A (No Action) | Alternative B | PROPOSED PLAN | Alternative D |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ACEC, Cottonwood-Diamond Watershed | Not designated. Relevant and important values within the Book Cliffs (Coal, Flume, and Spruce) WSAs (34,004 acres) would be protected.<br>The 1,825 acres outside the WSAs are open to oil and gas leasing, with adverse impacts to relevant and important values possible from oil and gas development projected at about 1 acre of surface disturbance. | About 35,830 acres designated, including 34,004 acres within the WSAs. All relevant and important values would be protected by managing as either closed or NSO for oil and gas leasing and other surface disturbing activities.<br>In addition, the 35,830 acres would be managed as closed to woodlands harvest, livestock grazing would be excluded, and SRPs would be withheld until the area is rehabilitated.<br>The area would be managed as an SRMA, and OHV travel limited to designated routes, which would have beneficial impacts to relevant and important values.<br>Greatest beneficial impacts to relevant and important values under this alternative. | Same as Alternative B. | Same as Alternative A except beneficial impacts from limiting OHV travel to designated routes. |

## Table 2.2. Impacts Summary Table

| Management Action | Alternative A (No Action) | Alternative B | PROPOSED PLAN | Alternative D |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ACEC, Highway 279/Shafer Basin/Long Canyon | Not designated. About 11,466 acres would be open to oil and gas leasing, which could result in adverse impacts to relevant and important values. There would be about 19 acres of surface disturbance due to oil and gas development.<br>There would be beneficial impacts from NSO management for oil and gas leasing on 2,034 acres.<br>Some beneficial impacts from limiting OHV travel to existing routes but not as protective as limiting OHV travel to designated routes. | About 13,500 acres designated. The area would be closed or NSO for oil and gas leasing and other surface disturbing activities. This would provide beneficial protections to relevant and important values.<br>Beneficial impacts would result from limiting OHV travel to designated routes, and from SRMA and VRM I management.<br>Greatest beneficial impacts to relevant and important values under this alternative. | Same as Alternative B except that area would be NSO for oil and gas leasing and other surface disturbing activities, and the area would be managed as VRM II. There would be virtually no difference in impacts as compared to Alternative B. | Same as Alternative A except the area would be managed as VRM III resulting in slightly greater protections than under Alternative A. |
| ACEC, Labyrinth Canyon | Not designated. About 8,528 acres would be open to oil and gas leasing, which could result in adverse impacts to relevant and important values. There would be about 12 acres of surface disturbance due to oil and gas development.<br>Some beneficial impacts from limiting OHV travel to existing routes but not as protective as limiting OHV travel to designated routes.<br>This alternative would offer the least beneficial protection to relevant and important values. | About 8,528 acres designated. The area would be closed or NSO for oil and gas leasing and other surface disturbing activities. This would provide beneficial protections to relevant and important values.<br>Beneficial impacts would result from limiting OHV travel to designated routes, and from SRMA and VRM I management.<br>Greatest beneficial impacts to relevant and important values under this alternative. | Same as Alternative A except the area would be managed as VRM II and OHV travel would be limited to designated routes rather than existing routes, thereby offering slight more beneficial protections. | Same as the Proposed Plan. |

## Table 2.2. Impacts Summary Table

| Management Action | Alternative A (No Action) | Alternative B | PROPOSED PLAN | Alternative D |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ACEC, Mill Creek Canyon | Not designated.<br>Relevant and important values within the Mill Creek WSA (9,780 acres) would be protected.<br>The 3,721 acres outside the WSA would be open to oil and gas leasing, resulting in about 3 acres of surface disturbance due to oil and gas development.<br>Some beneficial impacts from limiting OHV use to existing routes but not as protective as and limiting OHV travel to designated routes.<br>This alternative would offer the least beneficial protection to relevant and important values. | About 13,501 acres designated, including 9,780 acres within the WSA. All relevant and important values would be protected by managing as either closed or NSO for oil and gas leasing and other surface disturbing activities.<br>The 13,501 acres would be managed as VRM I, closed to woodlands harvest and OHV travel limited to designated routes, which would have beneficial impacts to relevant and important values. Additional beneficial impacts from limiting grazing, maintaining a 3 cfs flow in the South Fork of Mill Creek, and recreation restrictions such as closures to vehicle based camping.<br>Greatest beneficial impacts to relevant and important values under this alternative. | About 3,721 acres (outside the WSA) would be designated. The ACEC would be NSO for oil and gas leasing and other surface disturbing activities. In addition, the 3,721 acres would be managed as closed to woodlands harvest and OHV travel limited to designated routes, which would have beneficial impacts to relevant and important values.<br>Same impacts as Alternative B but for a lesser area and less beneficial impacts from VRM II management rather than VRM I. | Same as Alternative A with greater beneficial impacts from limiting OHV travel to designated routes, managing as VRM II, and only allowing grazing in Mill Canyon allotment. |
| ACEC, Negro Bill ONA | The 1,375-acre ONA was designated in the Grand RMP. | Not designated. | Not designated. | Not designated. |

## Table 2.2. Impacts Summary Table

| Management Action | Alternative A (No Action) | Alternative B | PROPOSED PLAN | Alternative D |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ACEC, Ten Mile Wash | Not designated. About 4,980 acres would be open to oil and gas leasing, which could result in adverse impacts to relevant and important values. There would be about 7 acres of surface disturbance due to oil and gas development.<br>Some beneficial impacts from limiting OHV travel to existing routes but not as protective as limiting OHV travel to designated routes.<br>This alternative would offer the least beneficial protection to relevant and important values. | About 4,980 acres designated. The area would be NSO for oil and gas leasing and other surface disturbing activities. This would provide beneficial protections to relevant and important values.<br>Beneficial impacts would result from eliminating motorized travel in the canyon, closing it to woodland harvest, and SRMA and VRM II management.<br>Greatest beneficial impacts to relevant and important values. | About 4,980 acres designated. Same as Alternative B except motorized travel in the canyon would be allowed on designated routes instead of being closed.<br>This would offer less beneficial protections than Alternative B. | Same as Alternative A except slightly greater beneficial impacts from limiting motorized travel to designated routes and not allowing campfires outside of designated sites. |
| ACEC, Upper Courthouse | Not designated. About 11,529 acres would be open to oil and gas leasing, which could result in adverse impacts to relevant and important values. There would be about 19 acres of surface disturbance due to oil and gas development.<br>Some beneficial impacts from limiting OHV travel to existing routes but not as protective as limiting OHV travel to designated routes.<br>This alternative would offer the least beneficial protection to relevant and important values. | About 11,529 acres designated. The area would be NSO for oil and gas leasing and other surface disturbing activities. This would provide beneficial protections to relevant and important values.<br>Beneficial impacts would result from limiting OHV travel to designated routes, closing it to woodland harvest, and SRMA and VRM II management.<br>Greatest beneficial impacts to relevant and important values. | Not designated.<br>The majority of the Potential ACEC would be open to oil and gas leasing and other surface disturbing activities. This would result in about 11 acres of surface disturbance due to oil and gas development. The relict plant mesa tops would be NSO for oil and gas leasing and other surface disturbing activities, protecting some relevant and important values.<br>Beneficial impacts from limiting motorized travel to designated routes, closures to woodland harvest, and SRMA management. | Same as the Proposed Plan except mesa tops would not be NSO for oil and gas leasing and other surface disturbing activities, and there would be no SRMA management. |

## Table 2.2. Impacts Summary Table

| Management Action | Alternative A (No Action) | Alternative B | PROPOSED PLAN | Alternative D |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ACEC, Westwater Canyon | Not designated. Relevant and important values within West-water WSA (5,069 acres) would be protected. The existing Westwater Withdrawal would protect relevant and important values. Some beneficial impacts from limiting OHV travel to existing routes but not as protective as limiting OHV travel to designated routes. | About 5,069 acres designated. Same beneficial impacts as Alternative A with additional benefits from limiting OHV use to designated routes.<br>Greatest beneficial impacts to the relevant and important values. | Same as Alternative A, but OHV travel limited to designated routes. | Same as Alternative A, but OHV travel limited to designated routes. |
| ACEC, White Wash | Not designated. About 2,988 acres would be open to oil and gas leasing, which could result in adverse impacts to relevant and important values. There would be about 11 acres of surface disturbance due to oil and gas development. Adverse impacts from open OHV travel.<br>Least beneficial protections of all the alternatives. | About 2,988 acres designated. The area would be NSO for oil and gas leasing and other surface disturbing activities. This would provide beneficial protections to relevant and important values.<br>Beneficial impacts would result from limiting OHV travel to designated routes, restrictions on vehicle based camping, and from SRMA management.<br>Greatest beneficial impacts to relevant and important values under this alternative. | Not designated. Same impacts as Alternative A except additional beneficial impacts from limiting OHV travel to designated routes in portions of the ACEC (1,122 acres), and closing the area to woodland product use. Adverse impacts from managing the area as VRM III and from about 1,866 acres open to cross country OHV use. | Not designated. Same impacts as Alternative A except additional adverse impacts from VRM III management. |

**Table 2.2. Impacts Summary Table**

| Management Action | Alternative A (No Action) | Alternative B | PROPOSED PLAN | Alternative D |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ACEC, Wilson Arch | Not designated. About 3,700 acres would be open to oil and gas leasing, which could result in adverse impacts to relevant and important values. There would be about 26 acres of surface disturbance due to oil and gas development.<br>Beneficial impacts from SRMA management and limiting OHV travel to designated routes.<br>Least beneficial protections of all the alternatives. | About 3,700 acres designated. The area would be NSO for oil and gas leasing and other surface disturbing activities. This would provide beneficial protections to relevant and important values.<br>Beneficial impacts would result from limiting OHV travel to designated routes, closing the area to woodland harvest, restrictions on vehicle based camping, and from SRMA and VRM I management.<br>Greatest beneficial impacts to relevant and important values under this alternative. | Not designated.<br>The majority of the Potential ACEC would be open to oil and gas leasing and other surface disturbing activities. This would result in about 26 acres of surface disturbance due to oil and gas development.<br>Beneficial impacts from limiting motorized travel to designated routes, closures to woodland harvest, and SRMA management. | Not designated. Same as the Proposed Plan. |

## Table 2.2. Impacts Summary Table

| Management Action | Alternative A (No Action) | Alternative B | PROPOSED PLAN | Alternative D |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| All eligible Wild and Scenic River (WSR) segments | Continued case-by-case protection of all 13 eligible rivers involving BLM lands would result in the sustaining of the free-flowing nature, outstandingly remarkable values (ORVs), and tentative classifications of these rivers until suitability determinations are made. | All of the 13 eligible rivers would be found suitable for inclusion into the Wild and Scenic River System. All segments on BLM lands would be directly and indirectly managed in such a manner the outstandingly remarkable values, free-flowing nature, and tentative classification of these rivers would be sustained and enhanced. | The Green, Dolores, and Colorado Rivers would be found suitable for inclusion into the Wild and Scenic River System. BLM lands along these rivers would be directly and indirectly managed in such a manner that the free- flowing nature, ORVs, and tentative classifications of these rivers would be sustained and enhanced.<br>Ten rivers would be found not suitable. No direct protections would be afforded any of these eligible rivers. Any protections to the ORVs or tentative classification would be indirect, resulting from management associated with other resource programs. Because no direct protections would be afforded, there is potential that to the free-flowing nature, ORVs and tentative classification of these rivers could be severe enough to preclude these rivers from any future opportunities for W&SR consideration.<br>However, the restrictions from other resource programs would afford greater protection to these rivers than does Alternative D. | None of the 13 eligible rivers would be found suitable for inclusion in the Wild and Scenic River System.<br>No direct protections would be afforded any eligible rivers. Any protections to the free-flowing nature, ORVs and tentative classifications of these rivers would be indirect, resulting from management associated with other resource programs. Because no direct protections would be afforded, there is a potential that impacts to the free-flowing nature, ORVs and tentative classification of these rivers could occur and be severe enough to preclude the rivers from any future opportunities for W&SR consideration. None of the 13 eligible rivers would be found suitable for inclusion in the Wild and Scenic River System.<br>No direct protections would be afforded any eligible rivers. Any protections to ORVs or tentative designations would be indirect resulting from management associated with other resource programs. Because no direct protections would be afforded, there is a potential that impacts could occur on ORVs and tentative designations that could be severe enough to preclude them from any future opportunities for WSR consideration. |

## Table 2.2. Impacts Summary Table

| Management Action | Alternative A (No Action) | Alternative B | PROPOSED PLAN | Alternative D |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| WSR, Beaver Creek | About 7.7 miles and 2,268 acres would be managed as eligible for WSR consideration. | About 7.7 miles and 2,268 acres would be managed to preserve Wild (Segment 1) and Scenic (Segment 2) qualities. | Although found not suitable, 7.7 miles and 2,268 acres would be managed as NSO for oil and gas leasing to preserve non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics. Therefore, impacts to ORVs, free flowing nature and tentative classification would be minimal. | Not suitable. Some areas of Beaver Creek could be impacted by surface disturbing activities.<br>Therefore, impacts to ORVs, free flowing nature and tentative classification could occur. |
| WSR, Colorado River | About 69.3 miles and 24,288 acres would be managed as eligible for WSR consideration. | About 69.3 miles and 24,288 acres would be managed to preserve Scenic (Segments 1, 3 and 5), Wild (Segments 2 and 6), and Recreational (Segment 4) qualities. | About 68.1 miles and 23,763 acres would be managed to preserve Scenic (Segments 3a and 6), Wild (Segment 2), and Recreational (Segments 3b, 4 and 5) qualities.<br>About 1.2 miles and 525 acres would be found not suitable. However, these lands would be managed as NSO for oil and gas leasing and withdrawn from locatable minerals, thereby protecting eligibility for WSR consideration. | Although found not suitable, 69.3 miles and 24,288 acres would be managed as NSO for oil and gas leasing and withdrawn from locatable minerals, thereby protecting eligibility for WSR consideration. |
| WSR, Cottonwood Canyon | About 10.4 miles and 2,938 acres would be managed as eligible for WSR consideration. | About 10.4 miles and 2,938 acres would be managed to preserve Scenic qualities. | Although found not suitable, 10.4 miles and 2,938 acres would be managed for protection of riparian resources and the WSA's on either side of the river would protect the ORVs, free flowing nature, and tentative designation. | Same as the Proposed Plan. |

## Table 2.2. Impacts Summary Table

| Management Action | Alternative A (No Action) | Alternative B | PROPOSED PLAN | Alternative D |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| WSR, Dolores River | About 22.1 miles and 6,823 acres would be managed as eligible for WSR consideration. | About 22.1 miles and 6,823 acres would be managed to preserve Scenic (Segments 1 and 3) and Wild (Segment 2) qualities. | About 22.1 miles and 6,823 acres would be managed preserve Recreational (Segments 1 and 3) and Scenic (Segment 2) qualities. | Although found not suitable, 22.1 miles and 6,823 acres would be managed as NSO for oil and gas leasing and withdrawn from locatable minerals, thereby protecting eligibility for WSR consideration. |
| WSR, Green River | About 75.3 miles and 13,393 acres would be managed as eligible for WSR consideration. | About 75.3 miles and 13,393 acres would be managed to preserve Scenic (Segment 4) Wild (Segments 1 and 5) and Recreational (Segments 2 and 3) qualities. | About 64.8 miles and 10,976 acres would be managed to preserve Wild (Segment 1), Recreation (Segment 2), and Scenic (Segment 4a) qualities. About 10.5 miles and 2,417 acres would be found not suitable. However, the lands along the river would be managed as NSO for oil and gas leasing and withdrawn from locatable minerals, thereby protecting eligibility for WSR consideration. | Although found not suitable, 75.3 miles and 13,393 acres would be managed as NSO for oil and gas leasing and withdrawn from locatable minerals, thereby protecting eligibility for WSR consideration. |
| WSR, Mill Creek | About 6.0 miles and 1,864 acres of would be managed as eligible for WSR consideration. | About 6.0 miles and 1,864 acres would be managed to preserve Recreational (Segment 1) and Scenic (Segment 2) qualities. | Although found not suitable, 4.6 miles and 1,292 acres are within the WSA, providing protection for eligibility for WSR consideration. An additional 1.4 miles and 572 acres not within the WSA would be managed as NSO for oil and gas leasing, thereby protecting eligibility for WSR consideration. | Same as the Proposed Plan. |

**Table 2.2. Impacts Summary Table**

| Management Action | Alternative A (No Action) | Alternative B | PROPOSED PLAN | Alternative D |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| WSR, Negro Bill Canyon | About 7.4 miles and 1,949 acres would be managed as eligible for WSR consideration. | About 7.4 miles and 1,949 acres would be managed to preserve Recreational (Segment 2) and Wild (Segment 1) qualities. | Although found not suitable, 7.2 miles and 1,687 acres are within the WSA, providing protection for eligibility for WSR consideration. An additional 0.2 miles and 262 acres not within the WSA would be managed as NSO for oil and gas leasing thereby protecting eligibility for WSR consideration. | Same as the Proposed Plan. |
| WSR, North Fork Mill Creek | About 11.2 miles and 3,027 acres would be managed as eligible for WSR consideration. | About 11.2 miles and 3,027 acres of the waterway on BLM lands would be managed to preserve Wild qualities. | Although found not suitable, 11.2 miles and 1,687 acres are within the WSA, thereby protecting eligibility for WSR consideration. | Same as the Proposed Plan. |
| WSR, Onion Creek | About 12.5 miles and 3,146 acres would be managed as eligible for WSR consideration. | About 12.5 miles and 3,146 acres would be managed to preserve Recreational (Segment 2) and Wild (Segment 1) qualities. | Although found not suitable, 12.5 miles and 3,146 acres would be managed as NSO for oil and gas leasing to preserve non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics. Therefore, impacts to ORVs, free flowing nature and tentative designation would be minimal. | Not suitable. Some areas of Onion Creek could be impacted by surface disturbing activities. Therefore, impacts to ORVs, free flowing nature and tentative designation could occur. |
| WSR, Professor Creek | About 7.3 miles and 1,936 acres would be managed as eligible for WSR consideration. | About 7.3 miles and 1,936 acres would be managed to preserve Wild qualities. | Although found not suitable, 7.3 miles and 1,936 acres would be managed as NSO for oil and gas leasing to preserve non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics. Therefore, impacts to ORVs, free flowing nature and tentative designation would be minimal. | Not suitable. Some areas of Professor Creek could be impacted by surface disturbing activities. Therefore, impacts to ORVs, free flowing nature and tentative designation could occur. |
| WSR, Rattlesnake Canyon | About 31.6 miles and 8,371 acres would be managed as eligible for WSR consideration. | About 31.6 miles and 8,371 acres would be managed to preserve Wild qualities. | Although found not suitable, 31.6 miles and 8,371 acres are within the WSA thereby protecting eligibility for WSR consideration. | Same as the Proposed Plan. |

## Table 2.2. Impacts Summary Table

| Management Action | Alternative A (No Action) | Alternative B | PROPOSED PLAN | Alternative D |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| WSR, Salt Wash | About 0.3 miles and 96 acres would be managed as eligible for WSR consideration. | About 0.3 miles and 96 acres would be managed as NSO for oil and gas leasing, protecting ORVs. The suitability decision would be deferred until the NPS makes a suitability determination on the portion in Arches National Park. | Same as Alternative B. | Same as Alternative B. |
| WSR, Thompson Canyon | About 5.5 miles and 1,620 acres of would be managed as eligible for WSR consideration. | About 5.5 miles and 1,620 acres would be managed to preserve Wild qualities. | Although found not suitable, 5.5 miles and 1,620 acres would be managed as NSO for oil and gas leasing to preserve non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics. Therefore, impacts to ORVs, free flowing nature and tentative designation would be minimal. | Not suitable. Some areas of Thompson Canyon could be impacted by surface disturbing activities. Therefore, impacts to ORVs, free flowing nature and tentative designation could occur. |
| WSAs | **There would be beneficial impacts to WSAs under all alternatives from management under the IMP.** There would be potential for adverse impacts in areas where there are valid existing rights. VRM Class I would apply to all WSAs under all alternatives. | See A. | See A. | See A. |
| WSAs, Miles of designated way/route | 82.5 | 0 | 3.1 | 16 |
| **SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES** | | | | |
| Fire Management | Long term beneficial impacts from reduced weedy and invasive species. Short term adverse effects from surface disturbance, trampling, and crushing. | Same as Alternative A. | Same as Alternative A. | Same as Alternative A. |

## Table 2.2. Impacts Summary Table

| Management Action | Alternative A (No Action) | Alternative B | PROPOSED PLAN | Alternative D |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Health and Safety Decisions | Potentially adverse loss of bat habitat. Benefits to fish species due to reduced threat of groundwater contamination. | Same as Alternative A. | Same as Alternative A. | Same as Alternative A. |
| Lands and Realty | Adverse removal of individual plants, surface disturbance, and habitat degradation due to construction within ROWs and utility corridors. | Same as Alternative A, but more adverse impacts from utility corridors, and less adverse impacts from other ROWs. | Same as Alternative B, but with more acreage available for utility corridors (and therefore greater impacts). | Same as Alternative B, but Alternative D would have the greatest impacts due to the greatest acreage available for utility corridors. |
| Livestock Grazing | Alternative A, would have the second largest total area excluded from grazing. This alternative would have the second most beneficial effects on Special Status species. | Alternative B provides the largest area (riparian and total) excluded from grazing, which would have long-term, beneficial effects on native vegetation in excluded areas. | The Proposed Plan provides the third largest area (riparian and total) excluded from grazing, which would have long-term, beneficial effects on native vegetation in excluded areas. | Alternative D would have the smallest area excluded from grazing among all alternatives. It would make Cottonwood and Diamond watersheds available for grazing. |
| Minerals | Possible adverse impacts include direct mortality, surface disturbance, habitat degradation, and habitat fragmentation due to mineral development and exploration. This alternative has the highest risk of adverse impacts. | Same as Alternative A, except that less mineral development and exploration would occur. This alternative would have the lowest risk of adverse impacts. | Same as Alternative A, except that less mineral development and exploration would occur. This alternative would have the second lowest risk of adverse impacts. | Same as Alternative A, except that less mineral development and exploration would occur. This alternative would have the second highest risk of adverse impacts. |
| Non-WSA Lands with Wilderness Characteristics | No acres managed as Non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics. | Beneficial impacts from managing 266,485 acres to maintain naturalness, providing habitat protection for Special Status species. | Beneficial impacts from managing 47,761 acres to maintain naturalness, providing habitat protection for Special Status species. | No acres managed as Non WSA lands with wilderness characteristics. |
| Recreation | Adverse impacts to habitat quantity and quality from the greatest amount of mechanized recreational use and the least restriction on recreational use. | Least adverse impacts to habitat due to greatest management of recreation and focus on non-motorized uses. | Slightly less adverse impacts than Alternative B due to slightly less focus on non-motorized recreation. | Less adverse effects on SS species that Alternative A, but more than Alternatives B and C due to management of recreation and motorized uses. |

## Table 2.2. Impacts Summary Table

| Management Action | Alternative A (No Action) | Alternative B | PROPOSED PLAN | Alternative D |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Riparian | Vegetation treatments would result in long-term beneficial reductions of weed populations and restoration of native vegetation, as well as Short-term adverse crushing and removal of native vegetation during the treatment process. Adverse impacts from OHV use and grazing in riparian areas. | Same as Alternative A, expect that riparian areas would be closed to livestock grazing or subject to seasonal restrictions, lessening adverse surface disturbance. This alternative would be more beneficial than Alternatives A and D. | Same as Alternative A, except the riparian acres excluded would be less than under Alternative B. | Same as Alternative A. |
| Soils/Watershed | Greatest potential for adverse effects on steep-slope vegetation located in disturbance areas. | Least potential for adverse effects due to restriction of surface-disturbing activities on slopes greater than 30% and closure of the Castle Valley watershed to oil and gas leasing. | Same as Alternative B except that the Castle Valley watershed would have an NSO stipulation applied to oil and gas leasing (instead of being closed). | Same as Alternative A. |
| Special Designations | No ACECs or WSRs would be designated, so no beneficial protection would occur. | Beneficial management of 85,825 acres of federally listed SS species habitat as ACECs, and 44,227 acres of federally listed Special Status species habitat as WSRs. | Beneficial management of 16,345 acres of federally listed SS species habitat within the designated ACECs, and 79,910 acres of federally listed Special Status species habitat within the WSRs. | Same as Alternative A. |
| Special Status Species | Alternative A would not manage for the Gunnison and greater sage-grouse or for the white-tailed and Gunnison prairie dog beyond what is required by law. This alternative would be the most detrimental for these species and other Special Status species utilizing these habitats. | Alternative B would provide the most acres of protected habitat for the Gunnison and greater sage-grouse and for the white-tailed and Gunnison prairie dog in the MPA. This would indirectly provide protection for other Special Status species utilizing similar habitats. | The Proposed Plan would provide the second least acres of protected habitat for Special Status species. | Alternative D would provide the fewest number of acres of surface disturbance restrictions in Special Status species habitat, which would result in a greater potential for adverse effects on other species utilizing these habitats. |

## Table 2.2. Impacts Summary Table

| Management Action | Alternative A (No Action) | Alternative B | PROPOSED PLAN | Alternative D |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Travel Management | Greatest adverse impact from surface disturbance and human-caused disturbance due to closure of the least (7,558 acres) federally listed SS species habitat to OHVs. | Least adverse impact from surface disturbance and human-caused disturbance due to closure of the most (22,946 acres) federally listed SS species habitat to OHVs. | Second least adverse impact from surface disturbance and human-caused disturbance due to closure of the second most (17,666 acres) federally listed SS species habitat to OHVs. | Second greatest adverse impact from surface disturbance and human-caused disturbance due to closure of the second least (10,627 acres) federally listed SS species habitat to OHVs. |
| Vegetation | Negligible adverse disturbance from seed gathering and plant collection. Beneficial wildlife habitat improvement from treatment of tamarisk and Russian olive. | Same as Alternative A except for additional long term beneficial effects from replacing lost sagebrush steppe habitat deemed essential to wildlife. | Same as Alternative A except for additional long term beneficial effects from replacing lost sagebrush steppe habitat deemed essential to wildlife. | Same as the Proposed Plan. |
| Visual Resources | Greatest adverse surface disturbance due to the smallest area subject to VRM Class I and II restrictions, and the second smallest area subject to VRM Class III and IV restrictions. | Least adverse surface disturbance due to the largest area subject to VRM Class I and II restrictions and the smallest area subject to VRM Class III and IV restrictions. | Second least adverse surface disturbance due to the second largest area subject to VRM Class I and II restrictions and the second largest area subject to VRM Class III and IV restrictions. | Second greatest adverse surface disturbance due to the second smallest area subject to VRM Class I and II restrictions and the largest area subject to VRM Class III and IV restrictions. |
| Wildlife | Least beneficial impacts from special conditions placed on 257,228 acres of wildlife habitat. (Note: some acreage may overlap). | Greatest beneficial impacts from special conditions placed on 2,004,942 acres of wildlife habitat (Note: some acreage may overlap). | Second greatest beneficial impacts from special conditions placed on 1,041,055 acres of wildlife habitat. (Note: some acreage may overlap). | Second least beneficial impacts from special conditions placed on 875,825 acres of wildlife habitat. (Note: some acreage may overlap). |
| Woodlands | Short-term, adverse disturbance and long-term habitat degradation over 1,243,743 acres of pinyon-juniper habitat open to woodland harvest. | Short-term, adverse disturbance and long-term habitat degradation over 1,071,335 acres of pinyon-juniper habitat open to woodland harvest. | Short-term, adverse disturbance and long-term habitat degradation over 1,212,886 acres of pinyon-juniper habitat open to woodland harvest. | Same as Alternative A. |
| **TRAVEL MANAGEMENT** | | | | |
| Air Quality | Short-term, adverse travel delays or detours during dust abatement or road maintenance. | Same as Alternative A. | Same as Alternative A. | Same as Alternative A. |

## Table 2.2. Impacts Summary Table

| Management Action | Alternative A (No Action) | Alternative B | PROPOSED PLAN | Alternative D |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Cultural | No prescriptions address travel opportunities under this alternative. | Short- and long-term adverse impacts from reduced or prohibited access to closed cultural sites. | Same as Alternative B. | Same as Alternative B. |
| Minerals | Minor long-term beneficial increase in travel opportunities along minerals access roads. | Same as Alternative A. | Same as Alternative A. | Same as Alternative A. |
| ACECs/Wild and Scenic Rivers | Negligible to minor reduction of travel opportunities in these areas. | Same as Alternative A. | Same as Alternative A. | Same as Alternative A. |
| WSAs/Wilderness Areas | Long-term adverse impacts from closure of 29,654 acres of WSAs to OHVs. | Long-term adverse impacts from closure of 354,015 acres of WSAs to OHVs. | Long-term adverse impacts from closure of 279,110 acres of WSAs to OHVs. | Long-term beneficial impacts from OHV access to all WSAs. |
| Travel Management and Recreation, Mountain Biking and Non-mechanized travel | Long-term, adverse impacts from inadequate management to address current conditions and trends. | Long-term, beneficial impacts from decreased conflicts between mountain bikers and motorized users, and from 75 miles of additional proposed routes bike routes and 25 miles of proposed non-mechanized routes. | Same as Alternative B, except that 150 additional miles of bike routes and 50 additional miles of non-mechanized routes would be proposed. | Same as Alternative B, except that 300 additional miles of bike routes and 100 additional miles of non-mechanized routes would be proposed. |
| Travel Management and Recreation, Motorized (OHV) | Negligible to minor impacts on motorized travel. | Long-term adverse impacts from 347,424 acres closed to OHV use. | Slightly less adverse impacts than Alternative B, with 339,298 acres closed to OHV use. | Less adverse impacts than Alternatives B or C, with 57,351 acres closed to OHV use. |
| Travel Management and Recreation, Road | Long-term, beneficial impacts from unimpeded travel along 4,673 miles of D-Class roads. | Long-term, adverse impacts from route closures, with travel designated along 2,144 miles of D-Class roads. | Impacts similar to Alternative B, except that 2,519 miles of routes would be designated along D-Class roads. | Impacts similar to C, except that 2,671 miles of routes would be designated along D-Class roads. |
| Vegetation | No impacts to travel from vegetation decisions. | Minor short-term adverse impacts from area closures under drought management plan. | Same as Alternative B. | Same as Alternative B. |

## Table 2.2. Impacts Summary Table

| Management Action | Alternative A (No Action) | Alternative B | PROPOSED PLAN | Alternative D |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **VEGETATION RESOURCES** | | | | |
| Fire Management | Long-term, beneficial reduction of invasive species. Short-term, adverse trampling and loss of vegetation from treatments. | Same as Alternative A. | Same as Alternative A. | Same as Alternative A. |
| Lands and Realty | Beneficial, long-term impacts from minerals withdrawals. Long-term, adverse impacts from energy facility development, 32,502 acres within utility corridors, and ROWs. | Same as Alternative A, except greater adverse impacts in ROWs and utility corridors (65,865 acres). | Same as Alternative A, except greater adverse impacts in ROWs and utility corridors (173,099 acres). | Same as Alternative A, except greater adverse impacts in ROWs and utility corridors (204,168 acres). |
| Livestock Grazing | Long-term, beneficial impacts from vegetation treatments to expand forage for livestock and wildlife. | Similar impacts to Alternative A. | Similar impacts to Alternative A. | Similar impacts to Alternative A. |
| Minerals | Direct, adverse, long-term impacts from minerals exploration and development. 10,184 acres of disturbance projected) which could eliminate vegetation on these acres. | Same as Alternative A, but with fewer acres of disturbance projected (6,382 acres) which could eliminate vegetation on these acres. | Same as Alternative A , but with fewer acres of disturbance projected (9,750 acres) which could eliminate vegetation on these acres. | Same as Alternative A , but with fewer acres of disturbance projected (10,083 acres) which could eliminate vegetation on these acres. |
| Non-WSA with Wilderness Characteristics | Long-term, adverse impacts to vegetation from permitted surface disturbances. | Long-term, beneficial impacts from reduced vegetation disturbance on 266,485 acres. | Same as Alternative B, except to a lesser degree, from protection on 47,761 acres. | Same as Alternative A. |
| Recreation | Minor short- and long-term, adverse impacts from motorized and non-motorized travel. Beneficial limitations on camping sites within 132,832 acres of SRMA. | Same as Alternative A, except additional beneficial restrictions on cross-country OHV impacts and dispersed camping impacts within 982,399 acres of SRMA. | Same as Alternative B, except reduced beneficial restrictions on cross-country OHV impacts, and reduced dispersed camping impacts within only 982,399 acres of SRMA. | Same as Alternative A except for increased acreage open to motorized travel and OHV cross-country use. Decreased impacts on 272,522 acres of SRMA |
| Riparian | Compliance with the BLM National Riparian Policy would result in long-term, beneficial impacts to riparian vegetation. | Same as Alternative A, but with greater benefits from the application of CSU stipulations within 100 meters of riparian areas. | Same as Alternative B. | Same as Alternative B. |

## Table 2.2. Impacts Summary Table

| Management Action | Alternative A (No Action) | Alternative B | PROPOSED PLAN | Alternative D |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Soils/Watershed | Indirect, beneficial impacts from reduced soil erosion and subsequent impacts to plant communities, and reduced invasive weed establishment. | Same as Alternative A. | Same as Alternative A. | Same as Alternative A, except greater impacts due to lack of timing restrictions. |
| Special Designations | Beneficial reduction of surface disturbance in 1,375-acre Negro Bill ONA. | Long-term beneficial reduction of surface disturbing activities in ACECs (613,077 acres). | Same as Alternative B except 63,232 acres would be designated as ACECs. | No acreage designated as ACEC, so no beneficial impacts. |
| Special Status Species | Long-term, beneficial impacts from sensitive species habitat protection, which would preserve vegetation. | Same as Alternative A. | Same as Alternative A. | Same as Alternative A. |
| Travel Management | Long-term adverse loss of vegetation and productivity, and spread of weeds. 620,212 acres open to cross country travel. | Greatly reduced impacts from OHV use compared to Alternative A, with zero acres open to cross country travel. | Same as Alternative B, except 1,086 acres open to cross country travel. | Same as Alternative B, except 3,045 acres open to cross country travel. |
| Vegetation | None specified. | Long-term, beneficial impacts to vegetation resources through conservation and reclamation measures. | Same as Alternative B except for fewer acres of sagebrush-steppe habitat that would be reclaimed. | Same as Alternative B except for fewer acres of sagebrush-steppe habitat that would be reclaimed. |
| Wildlife | Long-term, beneficial surface-disturbance activities and vegetation-altering projects. | Same as Alternative A. | Same as Alternative A. | Same as Alternative A. |
| Woodland | Short-term, adverse trampling of understory vegetation and long-term adverse introduction of weed species. | Same as Alternative A, except lesser impacts (107,321 fewer acres open to woodland harvest). | Same as Alternative A. | Same as Alternative B, expect slightly more acres open to woodland harvest. |
| **VISUAL RESOURCES** | | | | |
| Class I | 349,110 acres | 453,462 acres | 358,911 acres | 349,617 acres |
| Class II | 401,015 acres | 373,647 acres | 365,566 acres | 245,773 acres |
| Class III | 800,782 acres | 784,246 acres | 829,158 acres | 956,724 acres |
| Class IV | 271,356 acres | 210,532 acres | 268,133 acres | 269,641 acres |

## Table 2.2. Impacts Summary Table

| Management Action | Alternative A (No Action) | Alternative B | PROPOSED PLAN | Alternative D |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Scenic Quality/Viewshed, Canyon Rims | Short-term and long-term minerals-related degradation of scenic quality in VRM III areas. | Scenic quality protection from additional 6,867 acres of VRM II; Approximately 41% of area subject to minerals disturbance. | Impacts similar to Alternative B but to a lesser degree, because more area (68 more acres than Alternative A) would be subject to disturbance under VRM III than determined by the VRM inventory. Approximately 73% of area subject to minerals disturbance. | Impacts similar to Alternative A, as 95% of the area could be subject to minerals disturbances. |
| Scenic Quality/Viewshed, Onion Creek | No scenic quality degradation because of management under VRM II. | Same as Alternative A, except management under VRM I would provide more visual resource protection. | Same as Alternative A. | Same as Alternative A. |
| Scenic Quality/Viewshed, Richardson Amphitheater/Fisher Towers | Potentially adverse impacts to Arches NP viewshed from minerals activities. | Impacts similar to Alternative A, except greater visual resource protection from proposed VRM I objectives. | Impacts similar to Alternative B, but to a lesser degree, from no VRM I management. | Same as the Proposed Plan. |
| Scenic Quality/Viewshed, Colorado Riverway/Highway 128 | Potentially adverse impacts to Arches NP viewshed from minerals activities. Mitigation would reduce fugitive dust impacts to viewshed to minor levels. | Long-term, beneficial impacts to visual resources from increased protection under VRM I and VRM II Management Classes. | Same as Alternative B, but to a lesser degree, because fewer acres managed under VRM I and II. | Impacts similar to Alternative B but to a lesser degree because fewer acres managed under VRM I and II. |
| **WILDLIFE AND FISHERIES RESOURCES** | | | | |
| Fire Management | Short-term adverse impacts due to habitat disturbance and stream sedimentation. Long-term beneficial impacts due to reduced fuel loading, reduced fire risk, and diversified habitat. | Same as Alternative A. | Same as Alternative A. | Same as Alternative A. |
| Health and Safety | Adverse displacement and habitat reduction of bats. Reclamation would benefit aquatic species by improving water quality. | Same as Alternative A. | Same as Alternative A. | Same as Alternative A. |

## Table 2.2. Impacts Summary Table

| Management Action | Alternative A (No Action) | Alternative B | PROPOSED PLAN | Alternative D |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Lands and Realty | Under all alternatives, wildlife would benefit from continued mineral withdrawals on 78,333 acres.<br>Utility corridors would disturb up to 32,183 acres of desert shrub wildlife habitat. | Same as Alternative A.<br>Utility corridors would disturb up to 64,539 acres of desert shrub wildlife habitat. | Same as Alternative A.<br>Utility corridors would disturb up to 170,996 acres of desert shrub wildlife habitat. | Same as Alternative A.<br>Utility corridors would disturb up to 201,656 acres of desert shrub wildlife habitat. |
| Livestock Grazing | Management under Utah Standards for Rangeland Health would benefit wildlife, particularly in riparian and aquatic habitats. Grazing in riparian areas would increase salinity and sedimentation. | Same as Alternative A. | Same as Alternative A. | Same as Alternative A. |
| | Beneficial exclusion of livestock grazing and increased forage on 126,907 acres.<br>Cottonwood, Diamond and Bogart allotments not available for grazing, with beneficial impacts for deer and/or elk.<br>Short-term adverse and long-term beneficial impacts from vegetation treatments on 67,125 acres. | Same as Alternative A, but livestock exclusion from 153,797 acres.<br>Cottonwood, Diamond and Bogart allotments not available for grazing, with beneficial impacts for deer and/or elk.<br>Same as A, but vegetation treatments would occur on 46,307 acres. | Same as Alternative A, but livestock exclusion from 114,234 acres.<br>Cottonwood, Diamond and Bogart allotments not available for grazing with beneficial impacts for deer and/or elk.<br>Vegetation treatments would be the same as under Alternative B. | Same as Alternative A, but livestock exclusion from 52,214 acres.<br>Cottonwood, Diamond and Bogart allotments available for grazing with adverse impacts for deer and/or elk in crucial winter range. Could reduce herd sizes and viability.<br>Vegetation treatments would e are the same as under Alternative B. |
| Minerals | Adverse impacts include direct mortality, surface disturbance, habitat degradation, and habitat fragmentation due to mineral development and exploration. This alternative has the highest disturbance and adverse impacts. | Same as Alternative A, except that less mineral development and exploration would occur. This alternative would have the lowest adverse impacts. | Same as Alternative A, except that less mineral development and exploration would occur. This alternative would have the second lowest adverse impacts. | Same as Alternative A, except that less mineral development and exploration would occur. This alternative would have the second highest adverse impacts. |

## Table 2.2. Impacts Summary Table

| Management Action | Alternative A (No Action) | Alternative B | PROPOSED PLAN | Alternative D |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Non-WSA Lands with Wilderness Characteristics | Alternative A would not implement any specific non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics, so no beneficial impacts to wildlife would occur. | Beneficial closure to surface disturbing activities, and new ROWs over 266,485 acres to maintain wilderness characteristics on non-WSA lands. | Same as Alternative B, except over 47,761 acres and with an NSO stipulation for all surface disturbing activities. | No non-WSA lands would be managed to maintain wilderness characteristics, so no beneficial impacts to wildlife would occur. |
| Recreation | Adverse impacts including noise, vehicle traffic, trampling of vegetation, habitat fragmentation, and other human-related disturbances. Greatest impacts due to greatest amount of mechanized recreational use and the least restriction on recreational use. | Same as Alternative A.<br>Least adverse impacts to habitat due to greatest management of recreation and focus on non-motorized uses. | Same as Alternative A.<br>Slightly less adverse impacts than Alternative B due to slightly less focus on non-motorized recreation. | Same as Alternative A.<br>Less adverse effects on wildlife species than Alternative A, but more than Alternatives B and C due to management of recreation and motorized uses. |
| Riparian | Vegetation treatments would result in long-term beneficial reductions of weed populations and restoration of native vegetation, as well as Short-term adverse crushing and removal of native vegetation during the treatment process. Adverse impacts from OHV use and improper grazing in riparian areas. | Same as Alternative A, expect that some riparian areas would be unavailable for livestock grazing, lessening adverse surface disturbance. This alternative would be more beneficial than Alternatives A and D. | Same as Alternative B. | Same as Alternative A. |
| Soils/Watershed | Benefit impacts from compliance with Utah Standards for Rangeland Health and NSO stipulations applied within 100-year floodplains and within 100 feet of natural springs or public water reserves. | Same as Alternative A, except reduced impacts to aquatic by prohibiting surface-disturbing activities on slopes greater than 30 percent and closing the Castle Valley and Mill Creek watersheds to oil and gas leasing. | Same as Alternative B, except The Proposed Plan would apply an NSO stipulation to the Castle Valley and Mill Creek watersheds. More beneficial than Alternative A, but less beneficial than Alternative B. | Same as the Proposed Plan. |

## Table 2.2. Impacts Summary Table

| Management Action | Alternative A (No Action) | Alternative B | PROPOSED PLAN | Alternative D |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Special Designations | Beneficial habitat protection in 1,375 acres in Negro Bill ONA, and short-term protection along eligible WSR segments managed to preserve their wild and scenic qualities. | Beneficial habitat protections in 613,005 acres designated as ACECs and the most river segments found suitable as WSRs; most beneficial to wildlife. | Beneficial habitat protections in 63,232 acres designated as ACECs and the second most river segments found suitable as WSRs; second most beneficial to wildlife. | Alternative D would not designate any ACECs or find any WSRs suitable, and would therefore not benefit wildlife. |
| Special Status Species | No impacts beyond special status species decisions required by law that would affect wildlife. | Beneficial wildlife habitat protection over 469,162 acres managed as special status species habitat. | Beneficial wildlife habitat protection over 306,976 acres managed as special status species habitat. | Beneficial wildlife habitat protection over 74,792 acres managed as special status species habitat. |
| Travel Management | Beneficial closure of 5,060 acres to OHV use, which is more than Alternative D, but fewer than Alternatives B or C. | Beneficial closure of 346,812 acres to OHV use, which is the most of any alternative. | Beneficial closure of 338,847 acres to OHV use, which is more than Alternatives A and D, but fewer than Alternative B. | Beneficial closure of 56,970 acres to OHV use, which is more than Alternative A, but fewer than Alternatives B and C. |
| | Adverse disturbance on 620,212 acres open to cross-country OHV use, which is more than any other alternative. | No areas would be open to cross-country OHV use. | Wildlife would be adversely impacted on 1,866 acres open to cross-country OHV use. | Wildlife would be adversely impacted on 3,064 acres open to cross-country OHV use. |
| | About 6,199 miles of road would be utilized, potentially fragmenting the most wildlife habitat. | About 3,328 miles of road to be designated; 122 miles for motorcycle use; potentially fragmenting the least wildlife habitat | About 3,693 miles of road to be designated; 282 for motorcycle use, potentially fragmenting more habitat than Alternative B but less than Alternatives A and D. | About 3,855 miles of road to be designated; 340 for motorcycle use, potentially fragmenting more habitat than Alternatives B or C, but less than Alternative D. |
| Vegetation | Under all alternatives, seed gathering and plant collection could have short-term, direct, adverse impacts on wildlife species and habitat. Restoration of riparian areas would have short-term, adverse effects on wildlife, but would have long-term, beneficial impacts. | Same as Alternative A. | Same as Alternative A. | Same as Alternative A. |

## Table 2.2. Impacts Summary Table

| Management Action | Alternative A (No Action) | Alternative B | PROPOSED PLAN | Alternative D |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Not Applicable-wasn't addressed. | Beneficial maintenance of sagebrush wildlife habitat by reclaiming sagebrush. | Beneficial maintenance of sagebrush wildlife habitat by reclaiming sagebrush. | Same as the Proposed Plan. |
| Visual Resources | Reduction of habitat/surface disturbance over 750,125 acres designated as VRM Class I or II; second most beneficial. | Reduction of habitat/surface disturbance over 827,093 acres designated as VRM Class I or II; most beneficial. | Reduction of habitat/surface disturbance over 724,587 acres designated as VRM Class I or II; second least beneficial. | Reduction of habitat/surface disturbance over 595,390 acres designated as VRM Class I or II; least beneficial. |
| Wildlife | Wildlife would benefit from the removal of grazing from 124,512 acres.<br>Least acres managed with development restrictions to benefit wildlife, providing the least benefit to wildlife and fisheries resources. | Beneficial impacts from the removal of grazing from 134,491 acres. Beneficial impacts to pronghorn, bighorn sheep, deer, elk, and raptors from specific habitat and cooperative management.<br>Greatest number of acres managed with development restrictions to benefit wildlife, providing the greatest benefit to wildlife and fisheries. | Beneficial impacts from the removal of grazing from 109,903 acres. Second greatest number of acres managed with development restrictions to benefit wildlife, benefiting wildlife more than Alternatives A and D, but less than Alternative B. | Beneficial impacts from the removal of grazing from 51,179 acres. Adverse impacts could result from grazing Cottonwood, Diamond and Bogart allotments Second least number of acres managed with development restrictions to benefit wildlife, benefiting wildlife more than Alternative A, but less than Alternatives B and C. |
| Woodland | Beneficial reduction of human disturbance and habitat degradation over 601,146 acres closed to woodland harvest; least beneficial. | Beneficial reduction of human disturbance and habitat degradation over 863,227 acres closed to woodland harvest; most beneficial. | Beneficial reduction of human disturbance and habitat degradation over 646,694 acres closed to woodland harvest; second most beneficial. | Same as Alternative A. |
| **WOODLANDS RESOURCES** | | | | |
| Fire Management | Short-term and long-term, adverse impacts to woodland productivity from soil erosion, invasive species from surface disturbances. Long-term, beneficial impacts from reduced wildland fire risks. | Same as Alternative A. | Same as Alternative A. | Same as Alternative A. |

## Table 2.2. Impacts Summary Table

| Management Action | Alternative A (No Action) | Alternative B | PROPOSED PLAN | Alternative D |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Non-WSA Lands with Wilderness Characteristics | No impacts on woodland harvesting because non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics areas are unspecified. | Long-term, adverse impacts on woodland harvesting opportunities from closure of 224,125 acres to woodland harvest (not closed by other decisions). | Impacts similar to Alternative B, but greatly reduced, from closure of 15,478 acres. | Same as Alternative A. |
| Recreation | Long-term, adverse impacts to woodland harvesting from harvesting restrictions on 180,657acres in SRMAs. | Similar to Alternative A, from harvesting prohibitions on 234,590 acres in SRMAs. | Impacts similar to Alternative B from harvesting prohibitions on 255,555acres in SRMAs. | Impacts similar to Alternative B from harvesting prohibitions on 180,657acres in SRMAs. |
| Special Designations | WSAs – long-term, adverse impacts from harvesting prohibitions within WSAs and designated wilderness areas.<br>ACECs – negligible impacts on woodland harvesting. | WSAs – same impacts as Alternative A.<br>ACECs – long-term, adverse impacts from harvesting prohibitions on 55,050 acres within ACECs. | WSAs – same impacts as Alternative A.<br>ACECs – long-term, adverse, impacts from harvesting prohibitions on 15,478 acres within ACECs. | WSAs – same impacts as Alternative A.<br>ACECs – No designation of ACECs under this alternative. |
| Woodlands | Long-term, beneficial impacts from selective harvesting and salvage to reduce wildland fire risks, and improve woodland ecological conditions on 1,243,734 acres. | Impacts similar to Alternative A, but to a lesser degree, because fewer acres would be open to woodland harvesting and salvage 958,124 acres). Long-term adverse and beneficial impacts to harvesting from protection of riparian resources and other sensitive resources: adverse impacts from harvesting restrictions, but beneficial impacts to sustainable use of the resource. | Impacts similar to Alternative A, but to a lesser degree, because fewer acres would be open to woodland harvesting and salvage (1,168,988 acres). Impacts from harvesting restrictions within sensitive resource areas similar to Alternative B. | Impacts would be similar to Alternative A because impacted acreages would be the same. Impacts from harvesting restrictions within sensitive resource areas similar to Alternative B. |

## 2.3 Alternatives Considered but Eliminated from Analysis

### 2.3.1 Livestock Grazing Adjustments Alternative

During scoping and comment on the Draft EIS it was suggested that BLM consider adjustments to livestock numbers, livestock management practices, and the kind of livestock grazed on allotments within the Moab Field Office 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 assure that Rangeland Health Standards (RHS) 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 Moab 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 RHS, 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 43CFR 4160. These decisions determine the exact levels of use by livestock in conformance with the LUP and to meet resource objectives and maintain or enhancing land health. For these reasons this alternative has been dismissed from further consideration in this land-use plan revision.

### 2.3.2 No Grazing Alternative

An alternative that proposes to make the entire planning area unavailable for grazing would not meet the purpose and need of this RMP/Draft EIS. The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) 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 grazing within the planning area for their resolution. Where appropriate, removal of livestock and adjustments to livestock use have been incorporated into the alternatives on an allotment or area basis to address issues identified in this planning effort. Since 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 make the entire planning area unavailable for 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, to adequately safeguard grazing privileges, to provide for the orderly use, improvement, and development of the range, and to stabilize the livestock industry dependent upon the public range.

The Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA) requires that public lands be managed on a "multiple use and sustained yield basis" (FLPMA Sec. 302(a) and Sec. 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 planning 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 planning 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 planning area has been dismissed from further consideration in this RMP/EIS.

### 2.3.3 NO LEASING ALTERNATIVE

During scoping and/or the comment period for the DRMP/EIS, it was suggested that BLM should address a "No-Leasing Alternative" because the "No-Leasing Alternative" is the equivalent of 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 Moab 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 Rel. 1-1693), Appendix C. item H. requires that land-use plans identify areas as open or unavailable for leasing.

Given the potential range of decisions available in the DRMP/DEIS, the analyzed alternatives include no leasing for certain areas; but a field office-wide "No-Leasing Alternative" is 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 (USDI, 1973). 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 Environmental Assessments (then titled "Environmental Analysis Records or EARs") including the Grand Resource Area Oil and Gas Program Environmental Analysis Record (EAR), 1988 which addressed oil and gas leasing for the public lands in the Moab 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 1988 oil and gas leasing in the Moab Field Office Area has been an ongoing federal program under the established categories.

The Council on Environmental Quality (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 MFO DRMP/DEIS, the "No-Action Alternative" is to continue the *status quo* which is to lease under the oil and gas stipulations (formerly categories) established in the Grand Resource Area RMP.

### 2.3.4 THE RED ROCK HERITAGE TRAVEL PLAN ALTERNATIVE

An alternative that proposes to remove all travel routes from all areas proposed for wilderness by external groups from the Travel Plan that would accompany this RMP would not meet the purpose and need of this RMP/Draft EIS. NEPA 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.

On September 7, 2004, BLM received a Travel Plan alternative from Red Rock Heritage (RRH). The narrative explains the philosophy and objectives underlying its plan and offers rationale for not designating specific routes for motorized travel within the BLM Travel Plan. RRH emphasizes that the primary objective of its plan is a "fair allocation of recreational opportunities" between motorized and non-motorized uses. RRH specifically states that the best practical alternative for comparing travel plans on this dimension is by "measuring the

percentage of the field office area within various distances of the nearest motorized trail." RRH suggests that the appropriate percentage to achieve this goal is approximately 25%.

Near the end of their narrative, RRH provides data with such computations at varying distances from motorized routes, contrasting its plan with the BLM-verified Grand County inventory. It is important to note that the Grand County Travel Plan was approved unanimously by the Grand County Council. This plan recommends elimination of approximately 2,000 miles of inventoried "D" roads from motorized travel. BLM feels that the Grand County Travel Plan is a better basis of comparison to the RRH plan, and not the County inventory.

BLM agrees with RRH that an equitable allocation between non-motorized and motorized recreation is a desirable outcome of the BLM Travel Plan. BLM believes, however, that the RRH plan is not a viable alternative, for several reasons:

1. The RRH plan's roadless polygons match almost identically with wilderness proposals submitted by SUWA and/or other citizens' groups. To achieve this roadlessness, RRH has recommended for closure virtually all roads within these proposed wilderness polygons, without specific mention or regard for purpose and need.[1] This results in several hundred miles of County "B" roads being recommended for closure. BLM has determined that these roads, which are constructed, regularly maintained by mechanical means, and serve specific purposes and needs, need to be included in all alternatives of the BLM Travel Plan.
2. RRH includes SITLA lands in all its analyses. BLM cannot mange travel on SITLA lands, and BLM confines its analysis to public lands managed by the MFO.
3. RRH focuses their analyses on lands south of I-70, which leaves out those portions of the MPA where opportunities for non-motorized recreation are most available. BLM believes this division is arbitrary, and will focus its analyses on the entire MPA.
4. RRH analyses are done only in comparison to the Grand County route inventory. BLM's analyses will encompass the travel plans carried forward under the alternatives considered in the Draft EIS.
5. RRH states that any travel plan presented as an alternative to its plan should "achieve the same degree of balance (i.e., 25% of the MPA more than a mile from a road, 12% more than two miles, etc.)." BLM agrees that an equitable allocation between motorized and non-motorized use is a desirable outcome of the BLM travel plan. However, the BLM cannot justify using an unsubstantiated percentage to achieve this goal.
6. RRH uses only a portion of what is commonly referred to as the Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS). RRH limits its ROS analysis to physical separation, but ROS also looks at such facets as topography and social interactions (e.g., likelihood of meeting others) within the broader analysis. The MFO chose not to use ROS as a management tool for decision making in this RMP because the varied topography of the MPA results in ROS analysis, using physical separation only, misrepresenting opportunities for primitive, non-motorized recreation. The RRH Travel Plan mirrors the Red Rock Wilderness proposal, which encompasses over 46% of public lands in the MPA. RRH assumes that lands without access would be eligible to be considered for the protection of their wilderness characteristics. This is a false assumption; for instance, within close proximity to the city of Moab, primitive

[1] Per BLM Instruction Memorandum 275, Change 1 (9/29/03), BLM is prohibited from establishing new wilderness areas. BLM *may* choose to manage certain areas to protect wilderness characteristics, but is not required to do so.

recreation opportunities are available in 3 WSAs and within Arches and Canyonlands National Parks.

7. In its narrative, RRH discusses numerous specific routes, as well as areas, that it recommends that BLM not designate as available for motorized travel. Rather than discuss each route or area individually, several general comments are appropriate:
   - Almost all of these routes and areas lie within RRH wilderness proposals. In its comments, there is repeated emphasis on the need to set aside areas for non-motorized recreation and, if necessary, to "create a rare remote and wild area." Current BLM policy prohibits the creation of new wilderness study areas, although it does allow managing areas to protect wilderness characteristics. Several of the areas cited in RRH's proposal were found by BLM in 1999 to lack wilderness character. Many of the specific routes identified by RRH were either described as roads in the BLM 1999 inventory or described as roads at the time of the establishment of the original WSAs. Roads, by definition, are an impact on wilderness characteristics.
   - Other resource concerns are usually mentioned (e.g., wildlife, sensitive soils, riparian), but no specific data is presented to support the contention (unstated) that a particular existing route is causing the problem cited.
   - Several of the routes specified are county B roads, which are constructed and maintained and receive regular use.

For the reasons outlined above, the RRH Travel Plan in total is eliminated from further analysis.

**THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK**