

5.0 CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION

5.1 INTRODUCTION

During the planning and decision-making process for this Moab Proposed Resource Management Plan (PRMP)/Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS), the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) made formal and informal efforts to consult and coordinate with other Federal agencies, State and local governments, Indian tribes, and the interested public, in accordance with the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the Federal Land Policy Management Act (FLPMA), and all applicable Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) and Department of Interior regulations, policies and procedures. NEPA, FLPMA, and applicable regulations and policy require that all federal agencies involve the interested general public in their decision making, consider reasonable alternatives to the preferred alternative/proposed plan, and prepare environmental documents that disclose the potential impacts of the preferred alternative/proposed plan the reasonable alternatives.

Such public involvement, consultation, and coordination have been at the heart of the planning process leading to the Moab PRMP/FEIS to ensure that (1) the most appropriate data have been gathered and employed for the analyses and (2) agency and public sentiment and values are considered and incorporated into decision making. This was accomplished through *Federal Register* notices, formal public and informal meetings, individual contacts, news releases, planning bulletins, the planning website, and public comments and responses thereto on the Draft RMP/EIS.

The BLM initiated the planning process on June 4, 2003 by publishing in the *Federal Register* a Notice of Intent (NOI) to conduct land-use planning for the Moab Field Office. The NOI invited the participation of the affected and interested agencies, organizations, and members of the general public in determining the scope of and the significant issues to be addressed in the planning alternatives and analyzed in the EIS. Scoping remained open until January 2004. As part of the resource inventory, members of the interdisciplinary (ID) team formally and informally contacted various relevant agencies to request data to supplement BLM's existing resource database.

On August 27, 2007, the BLM published in the Federal Register a Notice of Availability of the Draft RMP/EIS to announce and solicit public comments on the alternatives and impacts and effects of those alternatives on the human environment. The BLM distributed to relevant agencies and the interested public the Draft RMP/EIS for review and comment. The comment period ended November 30, 2007. The comments and the BLM's responses thereto are addressed in this Proposed RMP/Final EIS (PRMP/FEIS or Proposed Plan).

The following sections of this chapter describe the public involvement, consultation, and coordination process including key consultation and coordination activities undertaken to prepare a comprehensive PRMP/FEIS for the Moab Field Office (Moab FO).

5.2 CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION WITH TRIBES, STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS, AND FEDERAL AGENCIES

In the development of this PRMP/FEIS, the BLM is required to consult and coordinate with other Federal agencies, State and local government agencies and officials, both elected and appointed, and federally recognized Indian tribes. More specifically, Federal law, including FLPMA, NEPA, the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA) (16 USC Sec. 470 et seq.), the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (16 USC Sec. 661 et seq.), the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (ESA) (16 USC Sec 1531 et seq.), and other applicable laws, regulations, policies, and executive orders, direct BLM to coordinate and consult with Native Americans, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) during the planning/NEPA decision-making process. This section documents the specific consultation and coordination efforts undertaken by BLM throughout the entire process of developing the PRMP/FEIS.

Coordination with other agencies and consistency, to the extent possible, with other plans were accomplished through frequent communications, meetings, and cooperative efforts among the BLM planning and interdisciplinary team and involved federal, state, and local agencies and organizations. The cooperating agencies that were formally involved assisted BLM throughout the planning process in the development of the PRMP/FEIS.

Cooperating agency status has been extended to state and local agencies with regard to the Moab RMP/EIS planning effort. Both San Juan and Grand Counties signed Memorandums of Agreement in 2003 to be cooperating agencies. The State of Utah signed a cooperating agency agreement in 2003. More than 60 meetings have been held with the cooperating agencies throughout the planning process, occurring between March 2003 and March 2007. RMP/EIS-related topics discussed in these meetings include socioeconomics, Wild and Scenic River suitability, ACEC relevance and determination, travel plans, and the development of alternatives for all resources.

In addition to the cooperating agencies, the Moab FO has held meetings with and sought the input of other agencies that have land management jurisdiction within or adjacent to the planning area. Agencies include the U.S Fish and Wildlife Service, the U.S. National Park Service, the U.S. Forest Service, and adjoining BLM field offices, including Grand Junction, Durango, Montrose, Price, Monticello, and Vernal.

5.2.1 NATIVE AMERICAN CONSULTATION

Protective measures for culturally sensitive Native American resources are established through consultation and coordination with the appropriate Native American tribes or entities. Pursuant to NEPA, the NHPA, FLPMA, the American Indian Religious Freedom Act (AIRFA), Executive Order 13007, and BLM Manuals 8160, *Native American Coordination and Consultation*, and H-8160-1, *General Procedural Guidance for Native American Consultation*, the BLM has engaged in consultation with Native American representatives throughout the planning process. The applicable laws and guidance require that the consultation record demonstrates, "that the responsible manager has made a reasonable and good faith effort to obtain and consider appropriate Native American input in decision making" (H8160-1, 2003:4). Recommended procedures for initiating the consultation process include project notification, preferably by certified mail, follow-up contact (i.e. telephone calls), and meetings when appropriate (H8160-1,

2003:15). Native American consultation is an ongoing process that will continue after the PRMP/FEIS is completed.

Native American organizations were invited to participate at all levels of the planning process for the RMP. The BLM State Director notified tribes of the BLM's intent to prepare the RMP and the Monticello and Moab Field Offices jointly invited tribes to consult regarding the entire range of cultural and natural resource issues.

As part of the RMP/EIS scoping process, by letter dated August 1, 2003, Utah State Director Sally Wisely initiated consultation for land-use planning with 34 tribal organizations (Table 5.1). In the letter, the BLM requested information regarding any concerns the organizations might have within the planning areas, specifically requested input concerning the identification and protection of culturally significant areas and resources located on lands managed by the Moab and Monticello Field Offices, and offered the opportunity for meetings. Between November 2003 and May 2004, all 34 tribal organizations were contacted by SWCA ethnographer Molly Molenaar, under contract with and on behalf of the BLM, to 1) ensure that the appropriate tribal contact had received the consultation letter and 2) determine the need for additional or future consultation for the study areas identified in the consultation letter. Meetings were arranged when requested.

In consulting with tribes or tribal entities under the NHPA, the BLM emphasized the importance of identifying historic properties having cultural significance to tribes (commonly referred to as Traditional Cultural Properties (TCPs)). The BLM held meetings with 12 tribal organizations between December 2003 and May 2004, but no TCPs were identified (Table 5.2). The BLM was represented at most of these meetings by the Field Office manager and archaeologist from both the Moab and Monticello Field Offices along with the representative from SWCA. During these meetings, tribal organizations were invited to be a cooperating agency in the development of the land-use plan; however, none of the tribal organizations the BLM came into contact with requested to be a cooperating agency.

Several tribal organizations requested that an additional meeting be held after the DRMP/EIS alternatives were prepared. The Moab FO mailed a draft copy of the range of alternatives to 12 tribal organizations in December 2005. In 2006 and 2007, the Moab FO manager and archaeologist, assisted by the SWCA ethnographer, participated in a second round of meetings with 5 tribes (Table 5.3). At these meetings, the draft RMP/EIS alternatives were discussed with special emphasis on cultural resource issues. A copy of the Moab Draft RMP/EIS was mailed in August 2007 to the tribal organizations listed in Table 5.2. Consultation with interested tribes is ongoing. In April 2008, the BLM extended an invitation to meet with tribal organizations regarding the PRMP/FEIS.

Table 5.1. Tribal Organizations Contacted by the BLM, Utah State Director

Navajo Nation	Hopi Tribe
Navajo Utah Commission	Navajo Nation, Aneth Chapter
Navajo Nation, Dennehotso Chapter	Navajo Nation, Mexican Water Chapter
Navajo Nation, Navajo Mountain Chapter	Navajo Nation, Oljato Chapter
Navajo Nation, Red Mesa Chapter	Navajo Nation, Teec Nos Pos Chapter
Ute Mountain Ute Tribe	White Mesa Ute Council

Table 5.1. Tribal Organizations Contacted by the BLM, Utah State Director

Southern Ute Tribe	Paiute Indian Tribe of Utah
Uintah and Ouray Ute Indian Tribe	Eastern Shoshone Tribe
San Juan Southern Paiute Council	Kaibab Paiute Tribe
Pueblo of Cochiti	Pueblo of Acoma
Pueblo of Jemez	Pueblo of Isleta
Pueblo of Nambe	Pueblo of Laguna
Pueblo of Pojoaque	Pueblo of Picuris
Pueblo of Santa Ana	Pueblo of Sandia
Pueblo of Santo Domingo	Pueblo of Santa Clara
Pueblo of Tesuque	Pueblo of Taos
Pueblo of Zuni	Pueblo of Zia

Table 5.2. Meetings with Tribal Organizations as part of Scoping for the Land-use Plan

Navajo Nation	Hopi Tribe
Navajo Utah Commission	Paiute Indian Tribe of Utah
Navajo Nation, Dennehotso Chapter	Pueblo of Santa Clara
Pueblo of Zia	Pueblo of Zuni
Pueblo of Laguna	Southern Ute Tribe
Uintah and Ouray Ute Indian Tribe	Ute Mountain Ute Tribe

Table 5.3. Meetings with Tribal Organizations to Discuss Draft Alternatives

Navajo Nation	Hopi Tribe
Paiute Indian Tribe of Utah	Ute Mountain Ute Tribe
Southern Ute Tribe	

5.2.2 COOPERATING AGENCY INVOLVEMENT

The Moab Field Office extended cooperating agency status to state and local agencies with regard to the Moab land-use planning effort. The State of Utah signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) to be a cooperating agency in January 2003. San Juan County signed a MOU in April 2003 to be a cooperating agency. Grand County signed a similar MOU in May 2003 to be a cooperating agency. Cooperating agencies that have participated in the development of the Moab land-use planning process include: State of Utah, San Juan County, and Grand County.

NEPA requires that the BLM work closely with cooperating and other responsible trustee state agencies in preparing an EIS. The cooperating agencies participated in more than 60 meetings to assist the Moab Field Office with travel plans and Off Highway Vehicle route designations, Wild and Scenic River eligibility and suitability determinations, ACEC relevance and importance determinations, mineral development, recreation, socioeconomic considerations, and

development of alternatives (Chapter 2) for the RMP. These meetings occurred between March 2003 and March 2006. A draft of the alternatives was sent to the cooperating agencies in March 2007 for review and comment before the release of the Draft RMP/EIS in August 2007.

The BLM has continued to involve the cooperating agencies in addressing comments raised during the public comment period for the Draft RMP/EIS and in developing the proposed alternative for the PRMP/FEIS.

5.2.3 STATE AGENCY COORDINATION

The NHPA and the regulations at 36 CFR Part 800 govern BLM's cultural resource management program. The regulations provide specific procedures for consultation between the BLM and the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO). A copy of the DRMP/EIS was sent to the SHPO for review and comment. The comments submitted by SHPO have been addressed in the comment and response section of this chapter. In May 2008, formal consultation was initiated with SHPO regarding the potential affects to cultural resources regarding the Proposed Alternative in the PRMP/FEIS. The BLM will finalize SHPO consultation before the Record of Decision is signed.

The BLM consulted with the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources regarding management of wildlife habitat and in developing the alternatives for the DRMP/EIS.

The Mineral Potential Report and the Reasonably Foreseeable Development scenario for oil and gas regarding the Moab planning area were prepared in cooperation with the Utah Geological Survey.

5.2.4 CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION WITH OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES

In developing the Proposed RMP/FEIS, the BLM coordinated with numerous other federal agencies. There are legal requirements for consultation with some federal agencies. The consultation and coordination efforts are described below.

5.2.4.1 U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

The BLM consulted with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) as required prior to initiation of any project by a federal agency that may affect Federally listed special status species or its habitat in accordance with Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act and with the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, 16 USC Sec 661 et seq.

In July 2004, the BLM requested assistance from the USFWS in identifying threatened, endangered, proposed, and candidate plant and animal species that may be located in the Moab planning area. A letter was sent by the BLM Utah State Office to the USFWS initiating informal consultation for the Moab planning effort. The USFWS responded with lists of species that may be present in or may be affected by projects in the project area. Table 3.45 of the PRMP/FEIS presents a comprehensive list of sensitive species that may be present in the planning area and indicates whether they could be affected by any of the land-use plan alternatives.

The Moab land-use plan is considered a major Federal project and the BLM initiated informal consultation with the USFWS in February 2008 by submitting the Biological Assessment (BA) for the Proposed Action in the PRMP/FEIS. In the BA, the BLM determined that the implementation of the Proposed Action in the PRMP/FEIS "may affect" or is "not likely to adversely affect" the species on which consultation occurred. The USFWS may concur with the

BLM's determination in the BA via memorandum, or prepare a Biological Opinion which advises the BLM on the actions that must be taken to protect Federally listed special status species. The BLM will finalize Section 7 consultation before the Record of Decision is signed.

5.2.4.2 ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

The BLM provided the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) with a copy of the DRMP/EIS and the EPA has submitted comments on this document. The EPA rated the document as Environmental Concerns-Insufficient Information, "EC-2". The EPA expressed concern about the lack of information associated with BLM's analysis of air quality impacts within the Moab planning area. Additional analysis and information regarding air quality has been included in Chapter 4 of the PRMP/FEIS based on EPA comments.

5.2.4.3 NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

The Moab planning area includes Arches National Park and shares a boundary with Canyonlands National Park. Coordination with Park Service representatives was held early in the land-use planning process and during the development of alternatives to the RMP in order to identify issues of concern. The Park Service was provided copies of the DRMP/EIS and it submitted comments.

5.2.4.4 U.S. FOREST SERVICE

The Moab planning area includes the Manti La Sal National Forest. The Forest Service is also engaged in revising its land-use plan. Coordination with representatives of the Forest Service was held to identify common issues. The major common issue is Wild and Scenic River eligibility and suitability. The Manti La Sal National Forest was provided a copy of the DRMP/FEIS.

5.3 CONSISTENCY WITH OTHER PLANS

The BLM's planning regulations require that resource management plans be consistent with officially approved or adopted resource-related plans of other federal agencies, state and local governments, and Indian tribes, so long as the guidance and resource management plans are also consistent with the purposes, policies, and programs of federal law and regulations applicable to public lands.

43 U.S.C. §1712(c) (9) states that the Secretary of the Interior (through the land-use plans of the federal agencies under it) shall "coordinate the land-use inventory, planning, and management activities of or for such lands with the land-use planning and management programs of other Federal departments and agencies and of the States and local governments within which the lands are located." It further states that "the Secretary shall assure that consideration is given to those State, local, and tribal plans that are germane in the development of land-use plans for public lands [and] assist in resolving, to the extent practical, inconsistencies between Federal and non-federal government plans..." This language does not require the BLM to adhere to or adopt the plans of other agencies or jurisdictional entities, but rather to give consideration to these plans and make an effort to resolve inconsistencies to the extent practical.

The BLM is aware that there are specific County and State plan decisions relevant to aspects of public land management that are discrete from, and independent of, Federal law. However, the

BLM is bound by Federal law. The FLPMA requires that the development of an RMP for public lands must be coordinated and consistent with County plans, to the maximum extent possible by law, and inconsistencies between federal and non-federal government plans be resolved to the extent practical (FLPMA, Title II Sec. 202 (c)(9)). Where State and local plans conflict with Federal law, there will be an inconsistency that cannot be resolved or reconciled.

Thus, while County and Federal planning processes, under FLPMA, are required to be as integrated and consistent as practical, the Federal agency planning process is not bound by or subject to County plans, planning processes, or planning stipulations. The BLM will identify these conflicts in the FEIS/PRMP, so that the State and local governments have a complete understanding of the impacts of the PRMP on State and local management options. A consistency review of the PRMP with the State and County Master Plans is included in Chapter 5. In addition, the relevant goals, objectives or policies of a County are often equivalent to an activity or implementation level decision and not a land-use plan decision. The very specific County goals would be addressed in any subsequent BLM activity or implementation level decision.

Table 5.4 outlines the planning consistency of the Proposed Plan with the approved management plans, land-use plans, and controls of other agencies with jurisdiction in or adjacent to the planning area. With a few exceptions, the Proposed RMP/FEIS is consistent with the Grand and San Juan County Plans. The authorized officer will continue to collaborate with federal agencies, state and local governments, and Indian tribes on implementation of the RMP and on pursuing consistency with other plans and will move toward integration of such plans to the extent that they are consistent with federal laws, regulations, and policy directives.

Table 5.4. Plan Consistency Review

Moab RMP				
Category	Grand County General Plan Update (2003)	Consistent	Partially Consistent	Not Consistent
Strong Economy	Supports multiple use of public lands including continued recreation uses and oil and gas exploration and development.	X		
Watersheds	Supports multiple use of public lands including continued recreation uses and oil and gas exploration and development.	X		
Land Tenure Adjustments	County will work to protect watersheds from activities and uses that are injurious to them and adopt policies that enhance and restore them.	X		

Table 5.4. Plan Consistency Review

Moab RMP				
Travel Management	Recognizes that allowing open, cross-country travel by mechanized vehicles is no longer an appropriate management practice. Supports more restrictive travel designations limiting mechanized travel to designated roads and trails and a "no new tracks" policy.	X		
ACECs	Encourages identification and conservation of areas with unaltered plant communities and soils through ACEC designations.	X		
Wilderness	Supports recommendation for Beaver Creek designation adopted by the Grand County Council in 1995. The plan is partially inconsistent in the addition of the Mary Jane Canyon and Fisher Towers areas. Will follow State of Utah's recommendation concerning wilderness designation where consistent with the interests of the people of Grand County.		X	
Wild and Scenic Rivers	Will participate and promote cooperation in planning and administration of Wild & Scenic River designations.	X		
Reintroduction of Animal Species	Grand County would participate in evaluation of feasibility and advisability of reintroductions.	X		
Category	Grand County River Road (SR-128) Corridor Plan (12/1998)	Consistent	Partially Consistent	Not Consistent
Land-use	Promotes protection of agriculture and ranching activities along with aesthetics of agricultural fields and open spaces.	X		
Canyon Character	States that preservation of the area's canyon character and spaciousness is the most important purpose of the plan.	X		
Economic Development	Supports creating economic assets and diversity for the county without creating adverse fiscal impacts.	X		

Table 5.4. Plan Consistency Review

Moab RMP				
Recreation	Supports limitation of recreation in the river corridor to rafting, climbing, hiking, horseback riding, camping, and similar activities. Opposes use of vehicles off established roads and trails.	X		
Transportation	Supports multi-purpose pathway or trail connection from US-191 to improve safety as long as canyon character is not adversely affected.	X		
Sensitive Areas	Supports protection of sensitive areas and resources, including steep slopes, roadless areas, wildlife habitats and water quality.	X		
Category	Crescent Junction to Thompson Springs Future Land-use Plan Amendment to the Grand County General Plan (3/2003)	Consistent	Partially Consistent	Not Consistent
General Uses	This area is intended to accommodate a wide variety of commercial activities meeting the needs of local business and residents, to make Thompson Springs a more attractive and energetic place to live, work and shop and to enhance the economic development.	X		
	All development in the designated Industrial category area will protect the environment, minimize visibility and excessive site disruption, and take into consideration the health and welfare of area residents. Development in the area should be asked to demonstrate reasonable mitigation of environmental impacts; and, demonstrate best efforts with respect to the utilization of color, shape, contrast, land-sculpting and site design to avoid drawing undue attention to its presence on the landscape. <u>BLM response</u> : The restrictions would require a VRM II designation which is not proposed for this area.		X	

Table 5.4. Plan Consistency Review

Moab RMP				
Category	Grand County Master Plan for Non-Motorized Trails (3/2005)	Consistent	Partially Consistent	Not Consistent
Guiding Principles	Trails are vital to the responsible use of natural resources; important to livable neighborhoods and a vibrant business community; must be viewed as part of a total, integrated trail system; must be properly designed to achieve a successful trail system and the entire system must be properly maintained to keep it viable.	X		
Recommendations	The County recommends involving local government; growing and maintaining partnerships; active coordination; seeking easements, and updating plans.	X		
Category	Moab/Grand County North Corridor Gateway A General Plan Amendment (4/2001)	Consistent	Partially Consistent	Not Consistent
Visual Resources	The plan focuses on the areas north and south of the Colorado River Bridge with particular emphasis on the visual impression it gives to visitors.	X		
County Goals	Create a positive first impression and economic opportunity. Make the north corridor gateway a people place – welcoming and accommodating. Provide adequate and affordable public facilities and services that are compatible with city infrastructure. Achieve the goals and objectives of this Plan through communication, coordination and cooperation.	X		
Category	The Wilderness Plan an Amendment to the Grand County General Plan (9/1999)	Consistent	Partially Consistent	Not Consistent
Recommended Wilderness 7 Designation	Beaver Creek Unit (UWC proposal) (5-2). The entire 28,200-acre UWC unit <u>excluding</u> the roaded top of Seven Mile Mesa and that portion traversed by the annual Jeep Safari Trail (See attached map entitled "Grand County Wilderness Proposal").	X		

Table 5.4. Plan Consistency Review

Moab RMP				
Category	The Wilderness Plan an Amendment to the Grand County General Plan (9/1999)	Consistent	Partially Consistent	Not Consistent
	<p>Labyrinth Canyon Unit (UWC proposal) (4-3). Wilderness designation is recommended for the lower reaches of Ten Mile Canyon and the east side of the Green River Canyon downstream to Hey Joe Canyon. Wilderness is also recommended for the east side of the Green River Canyon downstream from Spring Canyon to the mouth of Hell Roaring Canyon (See attached map entitled "Grand County Wilderness Proposal"). This latter area could continue on the west side of the Green River all the way to the Canyonlands National Park boundary. These areas are considered contiguous with the Upper Horseshoe Canyon Unit in Emery County.</p> <p><u>BLM response:</u> The unit was not recommended for management as non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics due to other proposed management that protects wilderness values. These include a recommendation for Wild & Scenic River designation along the Green River, an ACEC in Ten Mile Canyon, and surface use restrictions along the entire Green River corridor.</p>			X
Areas Not Recommended	<p>Fisher Towers Unit (UWC proposal) (consensus). It was recommended that the three State Trust Land sections in the unit be prioritized for exchange in order to protect the integrity of the area for filming and recreation.</p> <p><u>BLM response:</u> The proposal to manage areas for non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics protects the visual resources of concern to Grand County.</p>		X	
	<p>Mary Jane Canyon Unit (UWC proposal) (consensus). Again, the Trust Land Sections should be prioritized for exchange to protect</p>		X	

Table 5.4. Plan Consistency Review

Moab RMP				
	filming and recreation in the area. <u>BLM response:</u> The proposal to manage areas for non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics protects the visual resources of concern to Grand County.			
Areas Not Recommended For Wilderness, But Recommended For Alternative Protective Management	Granite Creek Unit (UWC proposal) (consensus). It is recommended that the entire unit be studied by BLM for designation as an Area of Critical Environmental Concern because of the unique riparian habitat and high wildlife values there. <u>BLM response:</u> Granite Creek was studied for ACEC designation but was found to not contain the relevant and important values.	X		
	Goldbar Canyon Unit (UWC proposal) (consensus). It is recommended that the unit be designated a Recreation Special Management Area to enhance opportunities for managing heavy recreational use	X		
Category	Town of Castle Valley General Plan (9/2007)	Consistent	Partially Consistent	Not Consistent
Land-use	The County's goal is to remain a peaceful, quiet rural residential/ agricultural community characterized by a sense of open space and the ability to enjoy landscape and sky.	X		
Transportation	The County's goal is to improve and actively maintain our road and storm drainage infrastructure.	X		
Water Quality and Quantity	The County's goal is to maintain or enhance water quality and quantity in the Castle Valley watershed by improving our knowledge, developing policies, and taking action as needed.	X		
Fire Protection	The County's goal is to improve fire prevention and to take steps that will help assure that fire-fighting can be effective.	X		

Table 5.4. Plan Consistency Review

Moab RMP				
Category	San Juan County Master Plan (1996)	Consistent	Partially Consistent	Not Consistent
Fire Protection	The County's goal is to protect and enhance the local environment and, where possible, respond to national and global environmental issues including, watershed, hazardous/solid wastes, weed control, dust, wildlife, energy, and the viewshed.	X		
Public Access	San Juan County has strong opinions regarding public access and its impact on economic stability in the county. The county claims all roads and trails over public land constructed prior to Oct. 21, 1976. Supports working with BLM to develop off-road trails for ATV use and bikes.	X		
Recreation and Tourism	Support for increased recreational activity on public lands, however, agency needs to acknowledge and aggressively address the impact that recreation has on the county's essential services (i.e. law enforcement, emergency services, water and waste management, and search & rescue).	X		
Wilderness	County does not support designation of large wilderness areas but will accept areas that meet the criteria of wilderness in the 1964 Wilderness Act. The County plan (Appendix E) includes the County's preferred alternative for wilderness designation.	X		
Wild and Scenic Rivers	Statement that any special land-use classifications or designations should include analysis of adverse economic impact on local economy and stability of communities and commitment to adequate mitigation.	X		
Threatened and Endangered Species	Statement that any special land-use classifications or designations should include analysis of adverse economic impact on local economy and stability of communities and commitment to adequate mitigation.	X		

Table 5.4. Plan Consistency Review

Moab RMP				
Areas of Critical Environmental Concern	Statement that any special land-use classifications or designations should include analysis of adverse economic impact on local economy and stability of communities and commitment to adequate mitigation.	X		
Socioeconomics	States that social and economic environment (of the communities most impacted by public land-use decisions) needs to be included in environmental review.	X		
Category	San Juan County Master Plan (1996)	Consistent	Partially Consistent	Not Consistent
Wildlife	States that forage allocations between livestock and wildlife should be balanced and based upon fair and equitable assumptions. San Juan County is not in favor of and will generally oppose introduction of exotics or species not native to the area.	X		
Land Tenure Adjustments	States that public land acreage currently owned and managed by Federal and State agencies is sufficient for the public interest. Supports a "no net loss of private" and no expansion of National parks position relative to federal-state property exchanges and transfers. (No net loss refers to both acreage and value.) Also, no net increase of public lands within San Juan County.	X		
Water Resources	Supports protection of limited water resources by promoting efficient use and management.	X		
Category	San Juan County Amendment to Master Plan (8/2002)	Consistent	Partially Consistent	Not Consistent
All-terrain Vehicle Plan	Establishes an all-terrain transportation plan, on developed trails within the county, as an opportunity for increased recreational use and economic benefit to the county.	X		

Table 5.4. Plan Consistency Review

Moab RMP				
Category	Dead Horse Point State Park Resource Management Plan April 2007	Consistent	Partially Consistent	Not Consistent
	The State Park planning team included the Moab BLM Recreation Branch Chief. The MFO Proposed Plan incorporates the Park's goal to protect the Park's viewshed.	X		
Water Resources	Utah Division of Water Resources Utah State Water Plan (May 2001)	X		
Water Resources	Utah Division of Water Resources Southeast Colorado River Basin (October 2000) Utah State Water Plan	X		
Wildlife and Fisheries	Utah Division of Wildlife Resources Northern River Otter Management Plan January (January 2005)	X		
Wildlife and Fisheries	Utah Division of Wildlife Resources Conservation Agreement and Strategy for Colorado River cutthroat Trout (March 1997)	X		
Wildlife and Fisheries	Utah Division of Wildlife Resources Range-Wide Conservation Agreement for Roundtail Chub, Bluehead Sucker and Flannelmouth Sucker (January 2004)	X		
Wildlife and Fisheries	Utah Division of Wildlife Resources Statewide Management Plan for Mule Deer (November 2003)	X		
Wildlife and Fisheries	Utah Division of Wildlife Resources Statewide Management Plan for Elk (March 2005)	X		
Wildlife and Fisheries	Utah Division of Wildlife Resources Statewide Management Plan for Bighorn Sheep (September 1999)	X		

Table 5.4. Plan Consistency Review

Moab RMP				
Wildlife and Fisheries	Utah Division of Wildlife Resources Utah Black Bear Management Plan (June 2000)	X		
Wildlife and Fisheries	Utah Division of Wildlife Resources Utah Cougar Management Plan (January 1999)	X		
Wildlife and Fisheries	Utah Division of Wildlife Resources Utah Gunnison's Prairie Dog and White-tailed Prairie Dog Conservation Plan (November 2007)	X		
Wildlife and Fisheries	Utah Division of Wildlife Resources Strategic management Plan for Sage-grouse (June 2002)	X		
Consistency with State of Utah Code 63j-4-401:				
ACECs	<p>State of Utah</p> <p>It is the policy of the State of Utah to withhold support for ACEC designation unless or until relevant and important values or significant natural hazards are clearly identified and the area requires special management protections not afforded by normal multiple-use management. ACECs should be no larger than necessary and management should be no more restrictive than necessary to prevent irreparable damage to relevant and important values or protect human safety. To the extent allowed by federal law, management prescriptions should comport with the plans and policies of the State and of the county where the proposed designation is located. These prescriptions should not result in management equivalent to that afforded congressionally designated wilderness areas.</p>	<p>BLM</p> <p>The potential ACECs brought forward for designation into the Proposed Plan have gone through a rigorous and stringent process in accordance with FLPMA, the planning regulations at 43 CFR 1600, Land-use Planning Handbook (H- 1601-1), and in accordance with BLM Manual 1613 and ACEC Policy and Procedures Guidelines (45 FR 57318). Appendix I outlines the process the interdisciplinary team underwent to determine whether a nominated ACEC had relevance and/or importance values. The size of the proposed ACECs is limited only to the area(s) of geography where the relevance and importance values are manageable to protect and prevent irreparable damage. In the Proposed Plan, the potential ACECs generally do not have redundant special designations and/or other existing protections applied. The potential ACECs carried forward into the Proposed Plan necessitate an ACEC designation because special management protection is necessary (outside of normal multiple-use management) to specifically protect</p>		

Table 5.4. Plan Consistency Review

Moab RMP		
		<p>the relevance and importance values within the areas identified. The special management prescriptions that have been proposed are narrowly tailored to protect the identified relevant and important values; none of which are recognized as wilderness resources. For these reasons, the potential ACEC decisions carried forward into the Proposed Plan are considered by BLM to be consistent with Utah Code 63j-4-401.</p>
<p>Wild and Scenic Rivers</p>	<p>State of Utah: It is the policy of the State of Utah that federal land managers should refrain from applying a non-impairment management standard to river segments inventoried as "eligible" for inclusions in the national Wild and Scenic Rivers and all eligible segments should promptly be evaluated for suitability. The State of Utah will work with federal land managers to identify suitable segments and work towards a recommendation to congress for designation where careful analysis: (1) identifies and evaluates regionally significant segments, (2) addresses the impact designation will have on physical, biological, and economic resources, (3) demonstrates that suitable segments have water present and flowing at all times, and (4) not interfere with water resources development. Interim management of suitable segments should not interfere with development of valid existing water rights, including development of waters apportioned to the State under all interstate compacts or agreements, including the Bear River Compact and the Upper Colorado River Compact. To the extent allowable by federal law and where not in conflict with state law or policy, interim management of suitable segments and congressional recommendations for designation should be consistent with plans and policies of the county or counties where the river segment is located.</p>	<p>BLM: The State of Utah has worked as a Cooperating Agency throughout this planning process and has been intimately involved with the BLM's wild and scenic river planning process. The State has assisted Field Office specialists to help determine eligibility findings for each of the river segments, and has provided social and economic expertise and advice as the BLM determined which eligible segments to carry forward as suitable into the Proposed Plan. BLM has committed to working cooperatively among Federal, State, and local governments and communities during the post-planning wild and scenic river study phase when statewide recommendations for inclusion of river segments into the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System would go forward to Congress. Prior to this post-planning phase, BLM would work with affected partners to help identify in-stream flows necessary to protect the outstandingly remarkable values for which the subject river segments were found suitable via this planning process. Thus, because there are no effects of this planning decision on valid existing rights, and because suitability findings in this planning process do not create new water rights for the BLM, the land-use planning wild and scenic river suitability determinations are found by BLM to be consistent with the Utah Code 63j-4-401.</p>

Table 5.4. Plan Consistency Review

Moab RMP		
Livestock Grazing	<p>State of Utah:</p> <p>It is the policy of the State of Utah that the citizens of the state are best served by applying multiple-use and sustained-yield principles in public land-use planning and management. Public lands should continue to produce food and fiber, and the rural character and landscape should be preserved through a healthy and active agricultural and grazing industry. Land management plans should maximize forage availability for domestic livestock and wildlife use. The State favors active management to restore and maintain rangeland health, increase forage, and improve watershed for the mutual benefit of local communities, domestic livestock, and wildlife.</p> <p>Adjustments in AUM levels may occur as required by range and watershed conditions, based on scientific, on-the-ground analysis. Grazing AUMs should be placed in suspension where range conditions will not sustain the current level of AUMs or where necessary to protect range and watershed health. Any suspended AUMs should be returned to active use when range conditions improve. The State generally opposes forced relinquishment or forced retirement of grazing AUMs but will continue to recognize voluntary relinquishments and retirements agreed to prior to RMP revisions.</p>	<p>BLM:</p> <p>Grazing decisions carried forward into the Proposed Plan are considered by BLM to be consistent with Utah Code 63j-4-401. Proposed Plan decisions on public lands would continue to promote a healthy active grazing industry. Forage allocations for livestock and wildlife are fully allocated on public lands. Numerous RMP decisions under other identified resources allow for the restoration and maintenance of rangeland and watershed health. For example, the Proposed Plan provides the umbrella to allow implementation-level actions for hazardous fuel reductions, fire rehabilitation, vegetation treatments, riparian improvements, range and wildlife habitat improvements, UPCD projects – including Healthy Lands Initiative projects, seed collection, etc. Minor, if any, adjustments to current permitted livestock AUMs are made in the Proposed Plan. Prior voluntary relinquishments and/or retirements have been recognized.</p>
Non-WSA Lands with Wilderness Characteristics	<p>State of Utah:</p> <p>It is the policy of the State of Utah to oppose management of public lands as wilderness except where congress designates lands as wilderness. Under State policy and FLPMA's multiple-use mandate, BLM ascribed management prescriptions for non-WSA lands inventoried as possessing wilderness characteristics should take into account the long-term needs of future generations for renewable and non-renewable resources, including, but not limited to, recreation, range, timber, minerals, watershed, wildlife, and fish.</p>	<p>BLM:</p> <p>The Proposed Plan identifies certain "non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics" in order to protect, preserve, and maintain their wilderness characteristics. BLM recognizes that it cannot, through the planning process, designate these lands as WSAs nor is it possible to manage them in accordance with IMP. For example, there is no provision to meet the "non-impairment criteria" mandated in IMP for WSA management. However, in following Section 201 of FLPMA, BLM has maintained its wilderness inventory</p>

Table 5.4. Plan Consistency Review

Moab RMP	
	<p>Designation as VRM Class I, closure to oil and gas leasing, withdrawal from mineral entry, and closure to motorized and mechanized use affords protections comparable to those associated with formal wilderness designation and should be avoided for non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics. Non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics should be managed in a manner consistent with the multiple-use, sustained yield standard that applies to BLM lands other than congressionally designated wilderness or WSAs.</p>
	<p>and has determined that lands previously found not to possess wilderness characteristics during the FLPMA Section 603 inventory process in the late 1970's and early 1980's, now have been determined to possess them. The focus of management in the areas carried forward in the Proposed Plan is to primarily provide for an experience of solitude and primitive recreation. This is enhanced by maintaining the naturalness of the geographic areas. However, management prescriptions do not mirror those for WSAs or designated wilderness since these two management objectives are sufficiently dissimilar that imposing similar prescriptions would not allow BLM to meet the planning objectives outlined in the Draft RMP/Draft EIS. WSAs and designated wilderness are rights-of-way exclusion areas, closed to fluid mineral leasing by law, and do not allow for surface-disturbing activities. In comparison, lands with wilderness characteristics have no set management by either law, rule, regulation, or policy. The Proposed Plan would allow for surface-disturbing activities where and when they are compatible with enhancing management objectives identified in the Proposed Plan.</p> <p>In order to ensure that BLM's planning decisions regarding the management of wilderness characteristics are consistent with Utah law, potential adjustments may be made in the Record of Decision to nomenclature. This editorial change would not affect management or goals and objectives.</p>

Table 5.4. Plan Consistency Review

Moab RMP		
RS-2477 Assertions	State of Utah: The State of Utah will defend its interest, and that of its political subdivisions, in rights-of-way accepted under the self-effectuating grant process set forth in Revised Statute 2477 (repealed by the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976) and <i>SUWA v. BLM</i> , 425 F.3d 735 (10 th Cir. 2005). The State of Utah expects and requests the BLM to fully consider all information concerning individual rights-of-way submitted to BLM. Further, the State of Utah expects and requests BLM's consideration of this information as part of the preparation and implementation of Resource Management or Management Framework Plans, and preparation or implementation of Transportation Plans as part of the ongoing inventory of resources on the public lands.	BLM: The Proposed Plan makes no commitments with respect to any valid existing rights, particularly those concerning RS-2477. Chapter 1 of this land-use plan states that resolution of this issue is outside the purview and scope of public lands planning efforts and must be adjudicated by a court of law or other legal means. Therefore, nothing in this plan extinguishes any valid rights-of-way or alters, in any way, the legal rights of the State of Utah to assert RS-2477 rights or to challenge any use restrictions imposed by the RMP that they believe are inconsistent with their rights.

In addition, the Moab Field Office RMP is consistent with the following agency plans: Manti-LaSal National Forest Management Plan, Arches National Park Management Plan, Canyonlands National Park Management Plan, Uintah-Ouray Indian Reservation Plan, and Management Plans being prepared for State of Utah and SITLA lands. **No comments were received to indicate inconsistency of these plans with the Proposed RMP.**

5.4 PUBLIC OUTREACH AND PARTICIPATION

Public outreach and participation in the land-use planning process began with the publication of the Notice of Intent (NOI) to plan in the Federal Register and will be ongoing up until the Record of Decision for the Moab RMP. Public outreach and participation has included public meetings, development of a mailing list, planning bulletins, newspaper articles, a RMP website, and workshops. It has also included informal meetings with individuals, groups, and organizations.

5.4.1 NOTICE OF INTENT (NOI) TO PLAN AND SCOPING

This planning process began on June 4, 2003 with the publication in the Federal Register of a Notice of Intent (NOI) to plan. The NOI announced the BLM's intent to conduct land-use planning for the public lands administered by the Moab Field Office by preparing an RMP and associated EIS. The NOI began what is known as the scoping process and invited the general public as well as Federal, State, and local government agencies and Indian tribes to identify potential issues and submit concerns regarding the intended planning effort. In addition to the NOI, the BLM provided the public with planning bulletins, and newspaper articles. Through all this outreach, the public was notified of public meetings and the BLM requested information regarding planning criteria, resources, nominations for Areas of Critical Environmental Concern,

nominations for Wild and Scenic Rivers, and proposals for route designations. Public service announcements on the radio were also utilized to inform the public about open house public meetings. The BLM distributed planning bulletins to all interested agencies, organizations, and individuals along with any other entity that requested to be included on the mailing list.

The scoping period began June 4, 2003 and ended January 31, 2004. The BLM relied on various public outreach methods for the scoping process, including 6 open houses in different communities (see Table 5.5), a mobile "comment cruiser" that visited 12 locations, a website with provision for e-mailing comments, and an invitation for the public to provide written comments via letters. In its Scoping Report, completed in July 2004, the Moab FO provided an analysis of the information received. The Scoping Report is available at the Moab FO, or online at the Moab RMP website. The BLM received 6,138 comment letters with 19,437 comments identified in these letters and emails. Comments from the 6 open houses totaled 1,250, and the "comment cruiser" gathered 200 comments, resulting in a grand total of 20,887 comments. It should be noted that the Scoping Report covers both the Moab and Monticello Field Offices. The information received during the scoping period was utilized to establish the scope of the RMP/EIS.

Table 5.5. Open House Locations and Attendance

Location	Date	Attendance
Green River, UT	October 14, 2003	15
Grand Junction, CO	October 15, 2003	14
Moab, UT	October 16, 2003	53
Monticello, UT	October 21, 2003	54
Blanding, UT	October 22, 2003	87
Salt Lake City, UT	November 13, 2003	96
Total		321

5.4.2. MAILING LIST

As directed by 43 CFR 1610.2(d), the BLM has established and maintained a list of "individuals and groups known to be interested in or affected by a resource management plan." This list was initially developed from the Moab Field Office mailing list and supplemented/updated throughout the planning process. Scoping meeting participants were given the option to be added to the mailing list. In addition, individuals were able to add themselves to the project mailing list by registering on the project website, as well as through requests to be placed on the mailing list by contacting the BLM.

The mailing list was used during the distribution of planning bulletins and postcards throughout the planning process. Postcards were mailed to the entire list, announcing the availability of the Draft RMP/EIS and the Proposed RMP/Final EIS. There are currently over 1500 individuals, organizations, and agencies included on the mailing list.

5.4.3 PLANNING BULLETINS

Planning bulletins were developed to keep the public informed about the Moab land-use planning process. They were provided to the public included on the mailing list for the Moab RMP. The planning bulletins were also posted on the website for the Moab RMP.

The **first planning bulletin** (6/30/03) announced the intention of the BLM Moab Field Office to prepare a Resource Management Plan. It also included preliminary planning issues, a request for nominations of Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) and Wild and Scenic Rivers, an announcement of public scoping meeting, and information on how to participate in the land-use plan process.

The **second planning bulletin** (11/1/03) provided information regarding the preliminary review of river segments found eligible for consideration as Wild and Scenic Rivers. The public was invited to provide comments on the findings.

The **third planning bulletin** (11/17/03) requested route data from the public to be considered in the alternatives for route designation in the Travel Plan.

The **fourth planning bulletin** (5/7/04) provided the preliminary planning criteria for public comment and review.

The **fifth planning bulletin** (7/9/04) provided the results of the public scoping process and included the issues to be addressed in the plan.

The **sixth planning bulletin** (2/21/06) provided the results of the ACEC review process.

5.4.4 WEBSITE

Information regarding the Moab land-use plan was made available to the public on the Moab RMP website. This website is currently found at <http://www.blm.gov/ut/st/en/fo/moab/planning.html>. The website serves as a virtual repository for documents related to development of the Moab RMP including news releases and bulletins, background documents, schedule, the land-use planning process, preliminary issues, maps, photos, and the draft and final RMP/EIS. The documents are available in pdf format to ensure that they are available to the widest range of users. During the scoping period, the website allowed members of the public to add themselves to the project mailing list or to submit comments/concerns to be considered in the scoping process. In addition, during the public comment period on the DRMP/EIS, the website served as one of the ways in which the public could submit comments.

5.4.5 NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY (NOA) OF THE DRAFT RMP/EIS

On August 24, 2007, the BLM and EPA published a Notice of Availability in the *Federal Register* which marked the beginning of the formal 90-day public comment period. The DRMP/EIS states that BLM is revising its current land-use plan and proposes several alternative ways of managing public lands within the Moab planning area. The DRMP/EIS was designed to provide a comprehensive look at the impacts to natural and cultural resources from various planning alternatives. The formal 90-day public comment period ended on November 30, 2007. The BLM provided hard copies of the DRMP/EIS directly to cooperating agencies, other federal, state, and local agencies, tribal representatives, the Utah BLM Resource Advisory Committee

members, public libraries, and elected officials. Also, hard copies and CDs were made available to the public upon request, and the DRMP/EIS was placed on the Moab RMP website and in its public room at the BLM Utah State Office. Additionally, the BLM widely distributed newspaper and radio press releases regarding the availability of the DRMP/EIS.

5.4.6 PUBLIC MEETINGS

Five open houses were held during the 90-day comment period for the Draft RMP/EIS. The open house locations, dates, and attendance are provided in Table 5.6. The locations, dates, and times of the open houses were announced to over 1,500 people included on the mailing list via a postcard. Press releases in local and regional newspapers and radio spots supplemented the mailing. In addition, the locations, dates, and times of the open houses were posted on the Moab RMP website.

Table 5.6 Open House Locations, Dates, and Attendance

Location	Date	Attendance
Moab, Utah	September 25, 2007	10
Monticello, Utah	September 26, 2007	88
Grand Junction, Colorado	September 27, 2007	109
Salt Lake City, Utah	October 3, 2007	158
Total		365

The open houses were geared to provide information to the public on the content of the Draft RMP/EIS as well as to provide guidance on commenting on the document and answer questions. Each open house included a PowerPoint presentation which provided an overview of the planning process and a comparison of major elements contained in the alternatives. Attendees were then encouraged to visit with BLM representatives and managers regarding questions or concerns about the Draft RMP/EIS. The public was provided with the opportunity to submit written comments at the open houses.

5.5 PUBLIC COMMENTS ON THE MOAB DRMP/EIS

5.5.1 PROCESS AND METHODOLOGY

According to National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the BLM is required to identify and formally respond to all substantive public comments received during the comment period for the DRMP/EIS. The BLM developed a systematic process for responding to comments to ensure all substantive comments were tracked and the content seriously considered. A description of this process follows.

First, the BLM developed a **coding structure** to help sort comments into logical groups by topics and issues. Codes were derived from resources covered in the DEIS or by common issues. Submissions (letters, emails, faxes, etc) were given a unique identifier for tracking purposes and then each submission was carefully reviewed to capture all comments, if substantive (more description of this process is set forth below). All comments received can be tracked to the original submission.

Second, the BLM created a **Comment Database**. For each comment in a unique submission, the BLM captured the name and address of the Commenter, assigned a code to the comment, and captured the text of all substantive comments.

The coding and comment database processes aimed at assisting the ID-team in determining if the substantive issues raised by the public warranted modification of one or more of the alternatives or further analysis of issues and impacts. With the information provided through the public review process, the BLM reconsidered the draft alternatives, made changes as appropriate, and developed the Proposed Resource Management Plan and Final EIS (PRMP/FEIS). Factual or grammatical errors which led to a change in text are not summarized but were incorporated into the PRMP/FEIS.

Finally, the BLM used the comment database to prepare a narrative summary of the substantive comments. Opinions, feelings, and preferences for one element or one alternative over another, and comments of a personal and/or philosophical nature were all read, analyzed, and considered, but because such comments are not substantive in nature, the BLM did not respond to them.

5.5.2 COMMENT ANALYSIS

During the 90-day public comment period for the Moab DRMP/EIS, the Moab Field Office received written comments by mail (1,248), fax, e-mail (31,853), website (483), and submitted directly at the public meetings or to the Moab Field Office. All comments submitted by fax were also e-mailed. This amounted to over 33,000 comment submissions. Many of the submissions were form letters (letters containing identical or nearly identical text submitted by a number of individuals) in which there were 13 different types. Outside the form letters, there were 1,027 unique submissions of which 391 submissions contained substantive comments. These submissions amounted to about 2,600 comments. Additional submissions were received after the close of the comment period on November 30, 2007. However, none of the late submissions raised substantially new issues or concerns not already addressed by comments received before the deadline.

Where warranted, the BLM responded to substantive comments by making revisions to the PRMP/FEIS (text changes). If no change was warranted, the BLM responded to the substantive comment in writing. The BLM responded to all substantive comments. In many cases the BLM chose to respond to non-substantive comments in order to clarify a point or position.

The comments received from cooperating agencies and the BLM responses are provided in Tables 5.9a, 5.9b, and 5.9c. Tables 5.10a through 5.10t provide the comments and responses by resource category that resulted in a change to the PRMP/FEIS. All comments and the BLM responses are provided in the compact disc (CD) attached to the PRMP/FEIS.

The BLM considered every comment in the analysis process, whether it came repeatedly from many people with the same message(s) or from a single person raising a technical or personal point. In analyzing comments, the BLM emphasized the content of the comment rather than the number of times a comment was received.

Respondents invested considerable time and effort to submit comments on the DRMP/EIS. Comments covered a wide spectrum of thoughts, opinions, ideas, and concerns. The commonly addressed themes include: travel, recreation, special designations (ACECs, Wild and Scenic Rivers), wilderness values, wildlife, and minerals/energy development.

While each person's viewpoint was diligently considered, the comment analysis involved determining whether a comment was substantive or non-substantive in nature. According to NEPA, the BLM is required to identify and formally respond to all substantive public comments. On the basis of the Council on Environmental Quality's (CEQ) regulations, a substantive comment does one or more of the following:

- Questions, with a reasonable basis, the accuracy of the information and/or analysis in the EIS.
- Questions, with a reasonable basis, the adequacy of the information and/or analysis in the EIS.
- Presents reasonable alternatives other than those presented in the DEIS that meet the purpose and need of the proposed action and addresses significant issues.
- Questions, with a reasonable basis, the merits of an alternative or alternatives.
- Causes changes in or revisions to the proposed action.
- Questions, with a reasonable basis, the adequacy of the planning process itself.

The NEPA handbook identifies the following types of substantive comments:

- **Comments on the Adequacy of the Analysis:** Comments that express a professional disagreement with the conclusions of the analysis or assert that the analysis is inadequate are substantive in nature but may or may not lead to changes in the PRMP/FEIS. Interpretations of analyses should be based on professional expertise. Where there is disagreement within a professional discipline, a careful review of the various interpretations is warranted. In some cases, public comments may necessitate a reevaluation of analytical conclusions. If, after reevaluation, the BLM does not think that a change is warranted, the response should provide the rationale for that conclusion.
- **Comments Which Identify New Impacts, Alternatives, or Mitigation Measures:** Public comments on a draft EIS that identify impacts, alternatives, or mitigation measures that were not addressed in the draft are substantive. This type of comment requires the BLM to determine if it warrants further consideration. If it does, the BLM must determine whether the new impacts, new alternatives, or new mitigation measures should be analyzed in either the FEIS; a supplement to the draft EIS; or a completely revised and recirculated draft EIS.
- **Significance Determinations:** Comments that directly or indirectly question, with a reasonable basis, determinations regarding the significance or severity of impacts are substantive. A reevaluation of these determinations may be warranted and may lead to changes in the FEIS. If, after reevaluation, the BLM does not think that a change is warranted, the response should provide the rationale for that conclusion.

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

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

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

The results of the comment analysis were important to the development of the PRMP/FEIS. From the nearly 33,000 total comment submissions that BLM received on the DRMP/EIS, it extracted about 2,600 individual substantive comments. The BLM has presented these comments and the BLM responses in the CD attached to the PRMP/FEIS. A list of the organizations and individuals that submitted substantive comments are provided below in Table 5.7. and Table 5.8.

Table 5.7. List of Organizations and Individuals that Submitted Substantive Comments

Commenter Type	Organization	Individual(s)
B	Bill Barrett Corporation	--
B	Cabot Oil and Gas Corporation	--
B	Delta Petroleum Corporation	--
B	Delta Petroleum Corporation	Harris, C.E.
B	Dolar Energy	Dolar, Mark
B	EnCana Oil and Gas (USA) Inc.	--
B	Fidelity Exploration and Production Co.	Green, Rachel
B	Green River Ranches	Stark, Nancy
B	Holiday Expeditions	Holladay, Dee
B	International Adventure Tours	Key, Kathy
B	Intrepid Potash	York, Eric
B	Lisbon Valley Mining Co	Indergard, Lantz M.
B	PacificCorp	--
B	Questar Exploration and Production Company	--
B	Red River Canoe Company	Butler, Theresa M.

Table 5.7. List of Organizations and Individuals that Submitted Substantive Comments

Commenter Type	Organization	Individual(s)
B	Ruby Ranch	Rozman, Curtis and Kerry
B	Samson	--
B	Slate River Resources	Johnston, Bruce E.
B	Tag a Long	--
B	Union Telephone Company	Fujimoto, Shirley
G	Arches National Park	--
G	BLM - Grand Junction Field Office	--
G	Colorado Division of Wildlife	--
G	Environmental Protection Agency	--
G	Grand County Council	Lewis, Jim
G	Green River City	Harris, Dan
G	San Juan County	--
G	State of Utah - Public Lands Policy Coordination	--
G	The Hopi Tribe	Kuwanwisiwma, Leigh Mogart, Terry
G	Town of Castle Valley	Bollermann, Damian
G	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	Romin, Laura

Table 5.7. List of Organizations and Individuals that Submitted Substantive Comments

Commenter Type	Organization	Individual(s)
G	US Geological Survey	Devine, James
G	Utah State Office of Education	Shumway, Larry
G	Ute Mountain Ute Tribe	House Sr, Ernest
I	Great Old Broads for Wilderness	Egan, Veronica
I	Van Loan Ranches	Van Loan, Jay
O	--	Boucher, Carla
O	American Motorcyclist Association	Harris, Nicholas
O	American Rivers	McKew, Quinn (Director, River Heritage)
O	Back Country Horsemen of Utah	Allen, Craig
O	Blueribbon Coalition, Inc.	--
O	Bookcliff Rattlers Motorcycle Club	--
O	Businesses/Organizations in Support of the Green River	--
O	Californians For Western Wilderness	Painter, Michael

Table 5.7. List of Organizations and Individuals that Submitted Substantive Comments

Commenter Type	Organization	Individual(s)
O	Canyonlands Field Institute	--
O	Capital Trail Vehicle Association	--
O	Center for Native Ecosystems	Robertson, Erin (Senior Staff Biologist)
O	Center for Water Advocacy	Shepherd, Harold (Staff Attorney)
O	Coconino Trail Riders	Greenwalt, Keith Hall, James
O	Colorado 500	Riggle, Don
O	Colorado Off-Highway Vehicle Coalition (COHVCO)	--
O	Colorado Plateau Archaeological Alliance	--
O	ECOS Consulting	--
O	Environment Preservation Foundation	--
O	Florida 4x4	McRory, Andrew
O	Foundation for North American Wild Sheep	--
O	Glen Canyon Group	Binyon, Jean
O	Grand County Backcountry Council	Bodner, Dave

Table 5.7. List of Organizations and Individuals that Submitted Substantive Comments

Commenter Type	Organization	Individual(s)
O	Howard County Bird Club	Schwarz, Kurt
O	Independent Petroleum Assoc. of Mountain States	Sgamma, Kathleen
O	International Mountain Bicycling Association	--
O	Moab Area Climbers Association	Lightner Jr, Sam
O	Moab Friends-for Wheelin'	Stevens, Jeff Jensen, Holly
O	Moab Solutions	Melnicoff, Sara
O	Moab Trails Alliance	--
O	Moab Trails Alliance	Schappert, Kimberly
O	National Parks Conservation Association	Nimkin, David
O	National Trust for Historic Preservation	Hays, Ti
O	New Mexico OHV Alliance	Spivack, Joanne
O	NOLS/ Outdoor Industry Association	Cukjati, Gary Kleiner-Roberts, Amy
O	Outward Bound Wilderness	--
O	Outward Bound Wilderness	DeHoff, Mike

Table 5.7. List of Organizations and Individuals that Submitted Substantive Comments

Commenter Type	Organization	Individual(s)
O	Pack Creek Water Company	Sleight, Jane
O	Public Lands Advocacy	Moseley, Claire M. (Executive Director)
O	Public Lands Equal Access Alliance	--
O	Red Rock 4-Wheelers, Inc.	Bandle, Bob
O	Ride with Respect	--
O	Rising Sun 4x4 Club	Morgan, Jr, Williams H.
O	Sage Riders Motorcycle Club	--
O	San Juan Public Entry and Access Rights	Qurri, Bob
O	San Juan Trail Riders	--
O	Sierra Club Utah Chapter	Hoskisson, Wayne
O	Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance (SUWA)	--
O	Sportsmen for Fish and Wildlife	--
O	The Nature Conservancy	Tuhy, Joel

Table 5.7. List of Organizations and Individuals that Submitted Substantive Comments

Commenter Type	Organization	Individual(s)
O	Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Partnership	Webster, Joel A.
O	Utah 4 Wheel Drive Association	Edmunds, Steve
O	Utah Farm Bureau Federation	--
O	Utah Four Wheel Drive Association	Jackson, Steve
O	Utah Rivers Council	Danenhauer, Mark
O	Utah Rock Art Research Association	Scotter, Troy
O	Western Watersheds Project	Carter, John
O	Western Wildlife Conservancy	Robinson, Kirk C.

Notes: B=Business, G=Government, I=Individual, and O=Organization

Table 5.8. List of Individuals that Submitted Substantive Comments

Last Name	First Name
Abernathy	Leroy P.
Ahearn	John J.
Alderson	George and Frances
Allender	William
Allender	Jen
Amrase	Gwenn
Andersen	Brandon
Anderson	Lisa
Anderson	Rachel
Anderson	Justin
Apicella	Peter
Armitage	Kevin
Artley	Dick
Askew	Ed
Avalos	Marty
Bailey	Bryan
Baird	Janelle
Baker	Shawn
Bassett	Mike
Bates	Harley
Bauer	Kincade
Benson	Chris
Berger	Bruce
Berhrmann	Rick
Biaswell	Kelly
Bigelow	Kerry
Bodner	David W
Bowers	Seth
Brown	Josh
Browning	Gay
Brunner	Christian
Bruno	Pete
Brunvand	Amy
Bulkeley	Jim
Bullard and Family	Larry

Table 5.8. List of Individuals that Submitted Substantive Comments

Last Name	First Name
Burch	David Paul Xavier
Burns	Alton
Burns	Allen
Burton	Jan Ellen
Butter	Jane
Butts	Raymond
Cameron	Laura (with Michael Peck)
Carlson	Ginny
Chalmers	D'ahna
Christie	Richard Lance
Ciscell	Michael
Clark	Robert L.
Clark	Robert
Clinard	Gary and Sallie
Connely	Arlene
Coronella	Mike
Crandall	Dell
Creighton	Katie
Croates	Jason
Crockett	Geoff
Crockett	Roger
D	Mike
Dallolio	Nate
Davidson Jr.	John
Davis	Keith and Rachael
Davis	Dan
Davis	Steven
De Sonne	Marcia
Deschamps	Justin
Deschamps	Michael
Dinkins	Dawna
Dozier	Steven
Edwards	Scott
Edwards	Lori
Edwards	Michael

Table 5.8. List of Individuals that Submitted Substantive Comments

Last Name	First Name
Elson	Eric S.
Engholm	Greta
Evans	Bud and Patty
Faleck	Adam
Farley	Bill
Farnsworth	David
Farnsworth	Tracey
Feantz	Nona Kay
Fitzgerald	Kathryn
Flasro	Robby
Foisy	Roger
Foster	Scott
Foster	Tom and Jane
Freethey	Sandra
Frisbie	Steve
Fryer	Colin
Gartlan	Naill
Gartlan	Alison
Gilliam	Charles E.
Glatz	Kathy
Gouer	Will
Gough	Joan
Grange	Dale
Granquist	Cindy
Greenberg	Bob
Greenberg	Bob
Griffin	Richard
Hackley	Pam
Halterman	George
Hansen	Bruce
Harris	Tracy
Harris	Dan
Hauer	John and Sena
Hawkins	Edwin D.
Himes	Alex

Table 5.8. List of Individuals that Submitted Substantive Comments

Last Name	First Name
Hoff	Wendy
Hogan	Sharon
Hopkins	Larry
Huber	Zachary
Hughes	William
Iannelli	Gina
Illingworth	Garth
Israels	Monica
Jarrett	Brad
Jenkins	Nick
Jenkins	Jolene
Johnson	Steve
Johnson	Tom
Johnson	Tom
Johnstun	Burke
Judd	Michael
Judge	Glen
Karnopp	Jerry
Kauffman	Christopher
Kemp	Kevin and Nan
Kennedy	John
Kilthau	Olaf
Kis	Jon
Klaus	Marion
Knight	Ber
Kobak	Steve
Koedoot	Joel
Kokjohn	Tyler
Kokjohn	Tyler
Krefting	Adam
Kyle	Tom L.
LaRoque	Fred and Susan
Lee	David
Leman	Doug
Lindley	Laura

Table 5.8. List of Individuals that Submitted Substantive Comments

Last Name	First Name
Linton	Ronald
Lippman	Robert
Lish	Christopher
Lively	Sean
Lowe	Zachary
Lund	Adrea
Lynch	James P.
Mair	Amanda
Malapanes	James
Malonado	Claire
Mandera	Tom
Manley	Michael and Judith
Marshall	Greg
Martin	Dirk
Martin	Steve
Maxey	Jim
McCollum	Ferris
McCracken	Nick and Bronwyen
McElhaney	Carma
McElhaney	Doug
McGill	J
McPhail	Michael
McVey	Stan
Messenger	Thomas J
Messenger	Tom
Mock Family	Bobby
Mohler	Wayne
Moore	Chad
Morgan	Meade
Muller	Joseph P.
Murrell	Mark
Narris	Shuanee
Neff	John
Nemitz	Robert W. (with Christine M. Warren)

Table 5.8. List of Individuals that Submitted Substantive Comments

Last Name	First Name
Newcomb	Richard
Newman	Stacy
Newren	Josh and Tamara
Nichols	Jason T.
Niederhauser	Mark G
Noble	Ruxton
Norton	Joey
Norton	Robert L.
Nosack	Kurt and Carissa
Nuckas	V.
Obert	Paul
Okubo	Byron
Orr	Diane
Panos	Nick
Parish	Ian
Parmelee	Steve
Parsons	Randall
Peavler	Terry J
Peay	Don
Pederson	Dusty
Pendergast	Jim
Peters	Wayne
Petti	Caroline
Phillips	Sue
Phillips	Sara Ann
Phillips	Ann
Phillips	Greg
Pincock	Kara
Pistorius	Shelley
Powell	Barry
Price	Jeff
Reddy	Shilpa
Reece	Justin
Reingold	Benjamin L.
Renwick	Kiel

Table 5.8. List of Individuals that Submitted Substantive Comments

Last Name	First Name
Ress	Frank
Reynolds	Marc
Riches	Randy
Robertson	Cris
Robinson	W.W.
Rodgers	David
Rogers	David
Rohde	David
Rose	Meredith
Rossiter	Paul
Royse	Cindy
Rue	Judy
Ruffin	Larry and Kris
Rust	Terry
Rzeczycki	John
Salbaum	J. Michael
Salmana	Stacy
Sanchez	Carlo
Schiller	Penny
Schmidt	Jason
Schoen	Erika
Schwartz	Alex
Sennett	Michael
Sevenhoff	Mark
Sharp	Marlin and Julia
Sheets	Lee
Silliman	Rodney
Silver	Duncan Wanda
Smith	Cynthia
Sorensen	LaDawn and Darwin
Speidel	Steve
Spengler	Diane
Stembridge	Charles
Stoy	Daniel
Stroud	David

Table 5.8. List of Individuals that Submitted Substantive Comments

Last Name	First Name
Stroud	David
Sudar	Jonathon
Swank	Gary
Swanke	Denice
Swanson	Fred and Bessann
Sweeten	Shannon
Tangren	Shane
Taylor	Molly
Taylor	Alan
Taylor	Tammy
Taylor	Gary C.
Taylor	Zane
Teisl	Philip
Telepak	Robert J
Tennyson	Raven
Thurston	Mike
Tipps	B
Tisovec	Phil
Tocher	Ross
Tolman	Roland
Tomka	Peter
Triolo	Phil
Trow Jr.	Richard
Turner	Jeff
Underwood	Teri
VanDuyn	David
Veranth	John M.
Vetere Jr.	John and John Cory Jr.
Vidiella	Patricia
Wade	R. Lance
Wade	Doug
Wakeman	TeriAnn
Washburn	Mary
Weaver	Mark
Weilmuenster	Mike, Becky, and Mason

Table 5.8. List of Individuals that Submitted Substantive Comments

Last Name	First Name
Werkmeister	Mark R.
West	Jaclyn
Westwood	Ryan
Whitaker	John M
Whiteman	David
Widdison	James
Williams	Candace
Williams	Gabriel
Wilson	Maggie

5.5.3 SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS

During the public comment period for the DRMP/EIS, comments were received from government agencies, organizations, businesses, and individuals. The greatest number of comments concerned travel management, recreation, non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics, and minerals, in this order. Commenters focused on their own definitions of "multiple use" and "balance among resource uses and natural resource values". Comments ranged from those urging the BLM to impose maximum restrictions on resource uses to those expressing dissatisfaction with the restrictions imposed in the Preferred Alternative of the DRMP/EIS.

Travel management comments ranged from those expressing a desire for more open to cross country travel areas and for the maximum number of routes being designated, to those expressing a desire for no open to cross country travel areas and to a minimum number of routes being designated. Recreation comments ranged from those favoring larger Special Recreation Management Areas with an emphasis on motorized recreation to those who wanted a de-emphasis on motorized recreation throughout the planning area. Comments involving non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics showed both support for and opposition to this resource value. Minerals comments included those favoring fewer restrictions to those who wanted stricter stipulations on the recovery of mineral resources.

Many Commenters addressed the impact analyses on various resources. Those Commenters who alleged deficiencies in the impact analysis often were comparing the preferred alternative not to the No Action alternative (as required by the Council on Environmental Quality), but rather to the Commenter's version of an ideal environment. For example, those who favored fewer designated routes and more lands to be managed to protect their wilderness characteristics often compared the Preferred Alternative with a landscape devoid of all existing routes; those who favored more routes compared the Preferred Alternative to their entire "wish list" of future motorized recreation opportunities.

The interest of the public in the management of BLM lands in the Moab planning area was manifest in the number and complexity of the submissions received.

5.5.4 PUBLIC COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

The following tables present a subset of the comments received by the Moab BLM during the comment period. The first set of tables (Tables 5.9a, 5.9b, and 5.9c) provides all the comments submitted by the three Cooperating Agencies – the State of Utah, Grand County, and San Juan County. These tables are organized by the commenter, comment number, whether the comment resulted in a change to the document, the resource category being addressed, the comment, and the BLM's response. The second set of tables (Tables 5.10a through 5.10t) provides the comments that resulted in a change to the document. These tables include similar information to that provided in the first set of tables except they are grouped by resource category.

All comments received during the public comment period are available on a CD accompanying this document. This CD contains two tables in Adobe Portable Document Format (PDF). Both tables have the following columns: **Commenter Name or Organization, Resource, Comment, Response**. The first table is sorted and grouped by Commenter Name or Organization and the second table is sorted and grouped by resource.

Table 5.9.a. Public Comments and Responses: State of Utah

Record ID	Commenter	Comment Number	Requires Change	Comment Text	Response to Comment
			Resource		
120	State of Utah	1	No	The BLM should consider the potentially large economic effects the oil and gas industry might have on Grand and San Juan Counties as shown in the Economic and Business Research Study (Phase I) for oil and gas in the Uintah Basin.	The BLM acknowledges the oil and gas study referenced for the Uintah Basin. However, the applicability to Moab is limited. The Moab Field Office prepared a Reasonably Foreseeable Development (RFD) scenario for oil and gas development over the next 15 years. The development predicted in the RFD was utilized to generate the economic impacts in the Draft RMP/EIS as detailed on pg. 4-259 through 4-264.
			Minerals: Oil and Gas		
120	State of Utah	2	No	Utah State law indicates that river segments proposed for Wild and Scenic designation should contain water at all times.	According to the "Wild and Scenic River Review in the State of Utah Process and Criteria for Interagency Use" (July 1996), "there are no specific requirements concerning minimum flow for an eligible segment". The BLM is aware that there are specific State laws relevant to aspects of public land management that are discrete from, and independent of, Federal law. However, BLM is bound by Federal law. As a consequence, there may be inconsistencies that cannot be reconciled. The FLPMA requires that BLM's land-use plans be consistent with State and local plans "to the extent practical" where State and local plans conflict with Federal law there will be an inconsistency that cannot be resolved. The BLM will identify these conflicts in the FEIS/PRMP so that the State and local governments have a complete understanding of the impacts of the PRMP on State and local management options.
			Wild and Scenic Rivers		

Table 5.9.a. Public Comments and Responses: State of Utah

120	State of Utah	3	No	The state is concerned about suitability findings for those streams where there are significant water diversions upstream.	According the "Wild and Scenic River Review in the State of Utah Process and Criteria for Interagency Use" (July 1996), Congress has allowed for the existence of some human modification of a riverway, the presence of impoundments or major dams above or below a segment under review (including those that may regulate the flow regime through the segment). The existence of minor dams, diversion structures, and riprap within the segment shall not by themselves render a reach ineligible.
			Wild and Scenic Rivers		
120	State of Utah	4	No	The state contends that while federal reserve water rights are not asserted prior to designation, those stream reaches found suitable are managed as if they were designated .	Barring congressional action, there is no effect on water rights or instream flows related to suitability findings made in a land-use plan decision. Even if Congress were to designate rivers into the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, any such designation would have no effect on existing water rights. Section 13(b) of the Wild and Scenic River Act states that jurisdiction over waters is determined by established principles of law. In Utah, the State has jurisdiction over water. Although the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act implies a federal reserved water right for designated rivers, it does not require or specify any amount, and as noted above, confirms that Utah has jurisdiction over water rights. The BLM would be required to adjudicate the water right, in the same manner as any other entity, by application through state processes. Thus, for congressionally designated rivers, BLM may assert a federal reserved water right for appurtenant and unappropriated water with a priority date as of the date of designation (junior to all existing rights), but only in the minimum amount necessary to fulfill the primary purpose of the reservation. The Draft RMP/EIS states (pg. 2-39) that the BLM would not seek water rights as part of a suitability determination made in the Record of Decision for the RMP.
			Wild and Scenic Rivers		

Table 5.9.a. Public Comments and Responses: State of Utah

120	State of Utah	5	No Livestock Grazing	<p>State policy discourages permanent closure of grazing allotments for improving watershed health, wildlife habitat, and the economic benefits of livestock production. The state strongly suggests that BLM support flexibility within the management provisions for livestock grazing time (duration) and timing (season of use) in the final plan.</p>	<p>Allotments proposed for closure on page 2-12 are not permanent and the decision to close these allotments or areas may be revisited in the development of subsequent RMPs or the revision of this one. However, certain allotments may not be available for grazing over the life of the plan. The allotments considered, as not available are spread by alternative. Subsequent revisions of the land-use plan may consider opening these areas to livestock grazing.</p> <p>The vast majority (over 95%) of the Moab Planning Area is available for livestock grazing. For those limited number of allotments shown on page 2-12 of the DRMP/EIS, the BLM is proposing that other uses of the BLM land are the highest and best use of these areas. Both FLPMA and BLM's Land-use Planning Handbook authorizes BLM to close specific areas to livestock grazing to place an emphasis on these areas for other purposes or values, such as wildlife use, watershed protection, and recreation. As indicated by the variable uses of the BLM lands, as shown in the proposed action, it is BLM's intention to emphasize "multiple use" of the public lands within the planning area.</p> <p>s stated in the DRMP/EIS (pg. 2-12), for those areas open to livestock grazing, grazing would be managed on an allotment basis according to the Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management to meet the Standards for Rangeland Health (see Appendix Q), including duration and adjustment in season of use. This will provide the manager flexibility to adjust the permitted numbers of livestock, and the season and duration of use on specific allotments after the careful evaluation of monitoring and inventory data in full compliance with appropriate rules and regulations and BLM policy.</p>
-----	---------------	---	-----------------------------	--	---

Table 5.9.a. Public Comments and Responses: State of Utah

120	State of Utah	6	Yes	The State supports the conversion of livestock AUMs to wildlife AUMs for the Diamond, Cottonwood, Bogart, and Pear Park allotments.	The BLM has recognized (Alts A, B, & C) the wildlife value of the Cottonwood, Diamond, and Bogart allotments as acknowledged in the 1994 Memorandum of Agreement among the BLM, UDWR, and the Nature Conservancy. The Pear Park allotment, which is unavailable in Alts A & B, has been made part of the PRMP/FEIS.
			Livestock Grazing		
120	State of Utah	7	Yes	The State believes the BLM should only employ the term "critical habitat" when referring to the legal habitat designations for endangered and threatened species under the Endangered Species Act. The State requests that the BLM use the "crucial habitat" designations mapped by the UDWR.	The term critical has been reserved to Threatened and Endangered (T &E) species. Corrections in the text have been made in the PRMP/FEIS. For non-T&E species the BLM relied on the UDWR crucial habitat designations.
			Wildlife		
120	State of Utah	8	No	The State asks BLM to provide a detailed explanation of the rationale and authority for management of lands solely because of wilderness characteristics, and why such management does not circumvent the provisions of the statutorily required wilderness review process.	The BLM's authority for managing lands to protect or enhance wilderness characteristics comes directly from FLPMA Section 202 (43 U.S.C. §1712). This section of BLM's organic statute gives the Secretary of the Interior authority to manage public lands for multiple use and sustained yield. Nothing in this section constrains the Secretary's authority to manage lands as necessary to "achieve integrated consideration of physical, biological, economic, and other sciences." (FLPMA, Section 202(c)(2) (43 U.S.C. §1712(c)(2)).) Further, FLPMA makes it clear that the term "multiple use" means that not every use is appropriate for every acre of public land and that the Secretary can "make the most judicious use of the land for some or all of these resources or related services over areas large enough to provide sufficient latitude for periodic adjustments in use. . . ." (FLPMA, section 103(c) (43 U.S.C. §1702(c).)
			Wilderness Characteristics		

Table 5.9.a. Public Comments and Responses: State of Utah

					<p>The FLPMA intended for the Secretary of the Interior to use land-use planning as a mechanism for allocating resource use, including wilderness character management, amongst the various resources in a way that provides uses for current and future generations.</p> <p>In addition, the BLM's Land-use Planning Handbook (H-1601-1) directs BLM to "identify decisions to protect or preserve wilderness characteristics (naturalness, outstanding opportunities for solitude, and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation). Include goals and objectives to protect the resource and management actions necessary to achieve these goals and objectives. For authorized activities, include conditions of use that would avoid or minimize impacts to wilderness characteristics."</p>
120	State of Utah	9	<p>No</p> <hr/> <p>Wilderness Characteristics</p>	<p>The BLM should give strong consideration to recommendations submitted by local government and not manage lands to protect wilderness character where such management would, in the opinion of local governments, be contrary to the interests of local residents.</p>	<p>Sections 103, 201, and 202 of FLPMA direct the BLM to take into account the national interest, as well as the local interest. In accordance with FLPMA and BLM rules, regulations, and policies, the BLM must provide for the balanced management of all resources and resource uses on public lands.</p> <p>The BLM gave strong consideration to the concerns of local governments throughout the planning process. In particular, Grand and San Juan Counties are cooperating agencies and have been active cooperators, including during the development of alternatives where Non-WSA areas with wilderness characteristics were considered.</p> <p>See also response to comment 121-70.</p>

Table 5.9.a. Public Comments and Responses: State of Utah

120		10	Yes	<p>The State strongly disagrees with the BLM's analytical assumption at page 4-3 of the Draft RMP/EIS that non-BLM lands would suffer minimally direct impacts from RMP decisions. SITLA lands may have reduced revenue potential or management objectives that differ from the BLM. The BLM planning decisions on rights-of-way, withdrawals from mineral leasing, special designations, and other determinations impact state trust lands.</p>	<p>Non-BLM lands could be indirectly impacted by RMP decisions both positively and negatively. The analysis in Chapter 4 of the PRMP/FEIS has been modified accordingly. For specifics regarding the impacts on mineral revenue see comment 120-101.</p> <p>The BLM does provide for reasonable access to all SITLA lands under all alternatives (pg. 4-3). A sentence will be added to Chapter 2, Lands and Realty.</p> <p>Non-BLM lands could be indirectly impacted by RMP decisions both positively and negatively. The analysis in Chapter 4 of the PRMP/FEIS has been modified accordingly.</p> <p>For specifics regarding the impacts on mineral revenue see comment 120-101.</p> <p>The BLM does provide for reasonable access to all SITLA lands under all alternatives (pg. 4-3). Information will be added to Chapter 2, Lands and Realty, Management Common to all action alternatives, that states that reasonable access to State land would be provided including across BLM lands within avoidance and exclusion areas for rights-of-way as specified by the Cotter decision (Utah v. Andrus, 10/1/79). In addition, the Moab DRMP/DEIS travel management plan recognizes the requirement to provide access to SITLA lands per the Cotter decision. Also, please see the revised analysis under Socioeconomics in Chapter 4 of the PRMP/FEIS.</p>
			Adequacy of Analysis		
120	State of Utah	11	No	<p>The need for BLM to give priority to state-federal land exchanges has been recognized. The disposal land list is inadequate and lands should be added to this list including the following:</p>	<p>The Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA) Section 203 requires the BLM to use the land-use planning process to identify lands for disposal through sales. Identifying lands for Section 203 sale requires the BLM to meet certain criteria set out specifically in the Statute.</p>
			Lands and Realty		

Table 5.9.a. Public Comments and Responses: State of Utah

				1) all lands proposed for BLM disposal in the pending Utah Recreation Land Exchange Act; 2) the block of BLM lands west of the Canyonlands airport that are currently subject to Potash preference right leases, and 3) all lands in Lisbon Valley.	FLPMA allows the BLM to identify lands that would be available for exchange (both disposal and acquisition) more generally. The DRMP/EIS has identified lands generally available for exchange, including identifying State lands that are currently available for acquisition. The DRMP/EIS does not contain a schedule or prioritize these lands, but the BLM understands that State in-lieu and other exchanges are a high priority for the State and for the BLM.
120	State of Utah	12	No	The BLM should commit to utilizing the State's expedited energy permitting process.	Federal laws, rules, regulations, and policies govern the procedures for processing all Federal projects.
			Process and Procedures		
120	State of Utah	13	No	The State encourages the BLM to impose air emission standards as lease conditions and conditions of approval for Applications for Permit to Drill.	The BLM does not have the responsibility to set air emission standards. That responsibility lies with EPA and the State of Utah. The BLM can only approve actions that meet the National Ambient Air Quality Standards as set by EPA or the State. Site specific mitigation or conditions of approval may be applied at the APD or implementation phase but not during land-use planning and leasing.
			Air Quality		
120	State of Utah	14	No	Future air quality analysis should include modeling with the following factors: 1) oil and gas proponents should assume that leasing and exploration will result in full field development, 2) air quality analyses should be cumulative and include not only planned development but existing omission sources, 3) air quality analyses should be based on	The BLM may consider the Commenter's recommendation for future air quality modeling and analyses.
			Air Quality		

Table 5.9.a. Public Comments and Responses: State of Utah

				<p>anticipated worst-case meteorological conditions for each dispersion scenario, 4) air quality analyses should address compliance/attainment with all applicable air quality-related requirements and standards, and 5) air quality analysis should specifically address impacts to sensitive visual resources and other air quality-related values.</p>	
120	State of Utah	15	<p>No</p> <hr/> <p>Travel Management</p>	<p>Under the preferred alternative (Alt C), certain existing routes that provide the only physical access to trust lands would be terminated. The Draft RMP does not address the impact of these closures on the economic value of the affected trust lands in either this section or its section on socioeconomic impacts.</p>	<p>The travel plan provides restrictions to the public for recreational purposes, but does not restrict uses permitted or authorized by the BLM. State inholdings may or may not currently have access, depending upon whether or not existing vehicle routes lead to them. Under different alternative scenarios, existing routes may be proposed to closure. BLM policy, as required by the Cotter decision (State of Utah v. Andrus, 10/1/79), is that "the state must be allowed access to the state school trust lands so that those lands can be developed in a manner that will provide funds for the common school..." This decision confined the issue of access to situations directly involving economic revenues generated for the school trust. The recreation restrictions do not prohibit the State from reasonable access to its lands for economic purposes through separate permit authorization as specified by the Cotter decision. Routes to State sections may not have been identified for recreation purposes due to resource conflicts or actual route conditions.</p>

Table 5.9.a. Public Comments and Responses: State of Utah

120	State of Utah	16	No	The State asks the BLM to explain its intention to designate D roads, and explain why different D roads may be designated across alternatives. Please clarify the authority under which BLM would designate county roads, and what happens to a D road if BLM chooses not to designate it... pursuant to RS 2477.	<p>A "D" route does not equate to a County road assertion. The routes identified as "D" routes in the land-use plan are routes located on public lands and managed by the BLM until properly adjudicated. The DRMP/EIS proposes four different alternatives for which to manage these routes</p> <p>As specified in the Draft RMP/EIS (pg. 1–12), addressing RS 2477 assertions is beyond the scope of this planning effort. However, nothing extinguishes any right-of-way or alters in any way the legal rights the State and counties have to assert and protect RS 2477 rights.</p> <p>The Proposed RMP/Final EIS will not address RS 2477 assertions. Such assertions will be settled administratively on a case-by-case basis or as confirmed through other legal means.</p>
			Travel Management		
120	State of Utah	17	No	The use of vehicles along the course of the Green River impacts natural resources and other recreational users of the corridor far beyond the traveled path due to noise.	The BLM assessed the impacts on natural resources and recreation conflict between motorized access and river based recreation. The BLM determined that the purpose and need associated with the route outweighed the specified conflict.
			Travel Management		
120	State of Utah	18	Yes	No mention is made of water rights. The State Engineer recommends that the BLM consider the impact its actions may have on water rights in general and non-BLM water rights in particular.	<p>On pg. 1–13 of the Moab DRMP/EIS under Planning Criteria, it is noted 1) the planning process recognizes the existence of valid existing rights, and 2) the BLM would adhere to all applicable laws (including State water laws). The text was clarified to ensure that valid water rights are recognized as valid existing rights. On page 1–13 of the DRMP/EIS under Planning Criteria, the BLM states 1) the planning process would recognize the existence of valid existing rights, and 2) the BLM would adhere to all applicable laws (including state and local laws). The text has been edited to ensure that water rights are recognized as valid existing rights. See also response to comment 120-4.</p>
			Water Resources		

Table 5.9.a. Public Comments and Responses: State of Utah

120	State of Utah	19	Yes	The proper description of deer and elk crucial winter habitats and Rocky Mountain bighorn habitat should occur regardless of the alternative.	<p>As required by NEPA, the BLM considered a range of alternatives. For non-special status species the alternatives varied by the size of the habitat and the timing restrictions. The management of habitat is consistent with the goals and objectives of each alternative.</p> <p>In the Draft RMP/EIS, Alt B has a timing limitation for what is referred to as "winter habitat." This habitat actually includes both crucial and high value winter habitats (635,774 acres). These habitats, although not separated in the draft, have been properly described in the PRMP/FEIS.</p> <p>Alts C and D provide timing limitations for crucial winter habitat only (349,955 acres), not for both crucial and high value habitats. The text has been changed to correct the error of confusing crucial and high value winter habitats.</p>
			Wildlife		
120	State of Utah	20	No	None of the alternatives address the fact that desert bighorn sheep wander between Crystal Geyser, Duma Point, and the Blue Hills. This migration corridor should be recognized in the final RMP.	Duma Point and Blue Hills habitat and migration corridors are recognized in the Draft RMP/EIS. Crystal Geyser is a small satellite population of recognized habitat located more than 10 miles across flat terrain from Duma Point. Defining a migration corridor across this flat terrain is unknown at this time. No known habitat exists between Duma Point and Crystal Geyser. Current studies are underway that may identify a migration corridor.
			Wildlife		

Table 5.9.a. Public Comments and Responses: State of Utah

120	State of Utah	21	Yes	The estimate of disturbed acreage to white-tailed prairie dogs as identified on page 4-315 is under estimated. Increased volume and speed of traffic, frequent road upgrades, and construction of utility poles and storage tanks, noise from wells and compressors, and increased recreational use will negatively impact prairie dogs.	Table 4.91 (pg. 4-315) has been changed to clarify that the acreage of disturbance from oil and gas development includes ancillary facilities such as roads, pipelines, and power lines. The BLM acknowledges in the impact analysis that there may be additional loss of individuals due to increased volume and speed of traffic.
			Special Status Species		
120	State of Utah	22	No	It is unclear how State comments will be sought for new rights-of-way for pipelines or service-access roads.	Where applicable, coordination with other Federal, State, and local entities will be sought as mandated under FLPMA, NEPA, and individual program requirements. All current NEPA documents prepared by the Utah BLM are posted on the Environmental Notification Bulletin Board via the BLM internet site. Access to this database is available to the State and the public.
			Lands and Realty		
120	State of Utah	23	Yes	Surveys for wildlife are not considered to be a valid form of compensatory mitigation.	The language on pg. 4-315 has been clarified to state: "The results of these surveys will be used for avoidance and other mitigating measures."
			Wildlife		
120	State of Utah	24	Yes	The BLM should recognize that prairie dogs create important habitat for many other wildlife species. There is room to enhance the discussion in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS.	The Proposed RMP/Final EIS (pg. 4-314) includes discussion about the benefits provided by prairie dog habitat to other important habitat.
			Special Status Species		
120	State of Utah	25	No	The BLM should only allow the use of utility poles in areas where underground conduits are not practical. Raptor excluders should be placed on utility poles where needed.	Upon receipt for proposed development, the BLM will analyze the impacts to prairie dogs and other wildlife as part of the NEPA process and would apply the appropriate mitigation measures as necessary. This may include underground conduits and raptor excluders.
			Wildlife		

Table 5.9.a. Public Comments and Responses: State of Utah

120	State of Utah	26	No	The BLM should work with the U.S. Department of Agriculture Wildlife Services to reduce nesting by ravens on storage tanks and other oil and gas infrastructure (i.e. design structures to be less suitable for nests).	Refer to comment 120-25.
			Wildlife		
120	State of Utah	27	No	Enforce a 45 mile-per-hour speed limit on secondary roads in oil and gas development areas from July through September to prevent deaths of young hawks and owls due to vehicle impact.	The speed limit on secondary roads is 25 mph unless otherwise posted.
			Wildlife		
120	State of Utah	28	No	When existing roads in raptor areas where they are likely to experience greatly increased traffic due to oil and gas well development, roads should be relocated as far as practical from the raptor nests regardless of whether or not the wells themselves are within a nest buffer.	Refer to comment 120-25.
			Wildlife		
120	State of Utah	29	Yes	On pg. 3-143, the RMP states "the planning area is not considered a suitable reintroduction area for black-footed ferrets due to dramatic declines in prairie dog populations". DWR considers the Cisco Desert the number 2 priority for black-footed ferret reintroduction in Utah and request that this language be removed from the RMP/EIS	The language in the text (pg. 3-143) of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS that states "the planning area is not considered a suitable reintroduction area for black footed ferrets" has been deleted .
			Special Status Species		

Table 5.9.a. Public Comments and Responses: State of Utah

120	State of Utah	30	No	The BLM should consider including the parcel surrounding the Gunnison's prairie dog habitat northwest of Bridger Jack Mesa as part of the Behind the Rocks ACEC.	When the BLM developed alternatives, the Commenter did not identify this area as Gunnison's prairie dog habitat. Furthermore, most of the area referred to is State land.
			Special Status Species		
120	State of Utah	31	Yes	Parcel R-11 which is identified for disposal under all alternatives contains Gunnison's prairie dog habitat. The State urges caution regarding the disposal of this land because the Gunnison's prairie dog may become petitioned for listing under ESA.	Parcel R-11 has been dropped from the disposal list (Appendix D, pg. D-3).
			Special Status Species		
120	State of Utah	32	No	Map 2-25 does not delineate pronghorn fawning habitat south of I-70 in the Cisco Desert.	Although pronghorn habitat is identified south of I-70, the BLM and UDWR agreed that the majority of fawning occurs north of I-70 due high population densities. UDWR habitat data from 2003 does not identify any pronghorn habitat south of I-70. Pronghorn habitat south of I-70 was added by BLM due to known and potential occupancy.
			Wildlife		
120	State of Utah	33	No	Fragmentation of crucial big game winter habitat due to oil and gas development should be mitigated through restoration at 4 acres for every 1 acre disturbed.	According to Washington Office Instruction Memorandum 2005-069, the BLM may identify off-site mitigation opportunities to address impacts of the project proposal, but is not to carry them forward for detailed analysis unless volunteered by the applicant.
			Wildlife		
120	State of Utah	34	Yes	Reference the Utah Comprehensive Wildlife Strategy as the Utah Wildlife Action Plan.	This reference has been changed on pg. 2-44.
			Wildlife		

Table 5.9.a. Public Comments and Responses: State of Utah

120	State of Utah	35	No	The State recommends listing the following nine species of concern: Allen's big-eared bat, American three-toed woodpecker, big free-tailed bat, cornsnake, ferruginous hawk, spotted bat, and Townsend's big-eared bat.	These species are listed on pg. 3-146 to 3-148.
			Special Status Species		
120	State of Utah	36	Yes	The State recommends a 2 mile buffer within active sage-grouse leks. The habitat reclamation ratio should be 4:1. There are currently no alternatives or reparations known to suitably replace a sage-grouse lek.	<p>There are currently no active Gunnison or greater sage-grouse leks in the Moab Field Office.</p> <p>In 2005, the BLM and UDWR signed the Gunnison Sage-grouse Rangewide Conversation Plan. One of the conservation measures identified in the plan to minimize impacts from mineral development was "apply a lease stipulation of No Surface Occupancy within 0.5 miles of occupied lek sites year round". Since the Moab Field Office currently has no active leks a Controlled Surface Use/Timing Limitation stipulation of 2.0 miles was applied so that any leks discovered in the future could be protected. This stipulation also precludes permanent surface occupancy within 2.0 mile of an active lek and no surface-disturbing activities allowed within 0.5 miles year round.</p> <p>To be consistent with the Utah State Sage-grouse strategy, the controlled surface use/timing limitation lek buffer for greater sage-grouse has been changed from 0.5 mile to 2.0 mile in the Preferred Alternative (Alt C). The BLM agrees that sage-grouse leks are irreplaceable, and Alts B and C offer the greatest degree of protection for them (2 mile lek buffer). Alt B, if selected in the final decision document, would provide the greatest level of protection for any leks identified, while Alt D would provide the least amount of protection.</p> <p>See the response to comment 120-33.</p>
			Special Status Species		

Table 5.9.a. Public Comments and Responses: State of Utah

120	State of Utah	37	Yes	It is stated on pg. 4-453 that interim and final reclamation will use native seeds. The State believes there are situations and circumstances where non-native plants may be the only tool to manage non-native weeds.	On pg. 2-50 it is stated that "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." The reference on pg. 4-453 has been changed to reflect this.
			Wildlife		
120	State of Utah	38	No	Seasonal restrictions and spatial buffers should be required of energy development. Use the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's Raptor Protection Guidelines.	<p>On pg. 2-53 it is specified that raptors are to be managed in accordance with the Best Management Practices (BMPs) included in Appendix O. These BM's implement the Utah Field Office Guidelines For Raptor Protection From Human and Land-use Disturbances (F&WS, 2002) and provide for modifications of spatial or temporal raptor nest buffers, if an established set of criteria can be met.</p> <p>The document specifies that the BMPs, or specific elements of the BMPs, which pertain to the proposal, should be attached as Conditions of Approval to all BLM use authorizations that have the potential to adversely affect nesting raptors, or would cause occupied nest sites to become unsuitable for nesting in subsequent years. Therefore, the raptor BMPs can be applied to any surface-disturbing action, including energy development activities, where raptor nesting may be affected.</p> <p>As specified in the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service "Guidelines" document, modifications of spatial and seasonal buffers for BLM-authorized actions would be permitted, so long as protection of nesting raptors is ensured. State and/or federally listed, proposed, and candidate raptor species, as well as BLM State-sensitive raptor species, should be afforded the highest level of protection through this BMP process; however, all raptor species would continue to receive protection under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. Modification of the buffers for threatened or endangered species would be considered pending results of Section 7 Consultation with USFWS.</p>
			Wildlife		

Table 5.9.a. Public Comments and Responses: State of Utah

120	State of Utah	39	Yes	The economic impacts summary Table 2.2 (pg. 2-78) for minerals is incomplete. It only mentions lease rental royalty payments for oil and gas. Severance tax and property tax should be addressed as economic benefits. The same table discusses the economic impacts of recreation through sales tax and employment (2,000 jobs), but fails to indicate whether or not those are low or high paying, seasonal or permanent jobs.	The economic benefits of severance taxes to the State of Utah as a whole are referenced on pg. 4-262. Information on the economic benefits of severance tax has been added to Table 2.2. Property taxes levied on natural resources can be broken by commodity and county and this has been added to Table 2.2 (pg. 2-79). The economic benefits of property taxes (ad valorem) are also discussed on pg. 4-262. Information on wage distribution for recreation jobs has been added to Chapter 3 (pg. 3-104).
			Socioeconomics		
120	State of Utah	40	No	The summary of impacts section should be expanded to discuss constraints upon mineral development when all requirements proposed under each alternative are considered concurrently. This should include the acreage available under each alternative, but the viability of development in light of restrictive but not prohibitive requirements such as Class II Visual Quality.	The summary of impacts section is a summary and does not provide a detailed discussion. The acreage provided under each alternative is provided in the summary. A discussion of the impacts to minerals from visual resource restrictions is provided on pg. 4-107.
			Minerals: Oil and Gas		
120	State of Utah	41	No	The discussion of locatable minerals notes that the anticipated effect of uranium development would be the same under all alternatives because the acres open to extraction would be the same across all alternatives (see pg. 4-259).	On pg. 4-106 to 4-108, it is acknowledged that special stipulations (timing and visual restrictions) impose additional constraints and costs to locatable mineral operations. The actual costs depend on many factors and cannot be quantified on a landscape level document.
			Locatable Minerals		

Table 5.9.a. Public Comments and Responses: State of Utah

120	State of Utah	42	No	None of the alternatives adequately analyze the loss of revenue from formally or effectively from eliminating mineral development in many of the lands subject to Special Designations and restrictive viewshed.	On pg. 4-264 the royalty revenues generated under each alternative are provided for oil and gas. The Moab Field Office has only one producing locatable mineral mine (Lisbon copper mine) and revenues (severance and property taxes) from this do not vary across alternatives.
			Socioeconomics		
120	State of Utah	43	No	The air quality analysis assumed all new compressors would operate at a NOx emission rate of 0.7 g/hp-hr (pg. 4-17). How will the BLM ensure this projection for newly permitted compressors.	This figure (0.7 g/hp-hr) was used as an analysis assumption and is based on the best available control technology. Air quality impacts will be analyzed for specific proposed oil and gas development on a case by case basis during the NEPA process. Air quality emission restrictions can be imposed at that time.
			Air Quality		
120	State of Utah	44	No	The air quality analysis assumed well spacing of 40 acres and 40 kilometers. Please confirm this analysis spacing.	The analysis assumption was based on 40 acre well spacing as stated on pg. 4-20. This spacing was utilized because it represents a conservative estimate for the oil and gas operations conducted within the Moab Field Office. The spacing varies by area.
			Air Quality		
120	State of Utah	45	Yes	Assumptions regarding the number of compressors and dehydrators listed on page 4-20 are inconsistent with those shown in Table 4.7. If the numbers in Table 4.7 are correct and the analysis was based on the numbers discussed in the text, the analysis could significantly understate air quality impacts.	The BLM recognizes this discrepancy and has made appropriate changes to both the table and the text (pg. 4-20) in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS.
			Air Quality		

Table 5.9.a. Public Comments and Responses: State of Utah

120	State of Utah	46	No	The State recommends the BLM undertake a final check to ensure that other potential areas of high cultural resource densities or values are examined for potential conflicts. The MFO should use techniques such as GIS, existing site databases.	In accordance with the BLM Land-use Planning Handbook (1601.1), a Class I cultural survey was conducted. For site specific actions the BLM conducts a Class III cultural survey as appropriate. On pg. 4-30 a model of cultural resource site density is described that was used to predict potential impacts to cultural resources. This model identified high, medium, and low site densities and this information was used to quantify the impacts. The model was tested by intersecting 4,259 known cultural sites with the probability coverage in GIS.
			Cultural Resources		
120	State of Utah	47	No	The State suggests that the BLM develop a specific ongoing program to identify and target identification efforts under Section 110 of the National Historic Preservation Act.	These type of actions are administrative and do not require land-use planning decisions to accomplish. However, on pg. 2-8, cultural resource inventory areas under Section 110 are prioritized.
			Cultural Resources		
120	State of Utah	48	Yes	The State suggests enhancing and strengthening the density analyses utilized in the Draft RMP/EIS. These techniques could be significantly enhanced and strengthened in implementation of the Final Plan for high cultural resource value areas which include Segoe Rock Art, Wall Street/Colorado River Rock Art, Behind the Rocks, Ten mile Wash, Mill Creek Canyon/South and North Forks of Mill Creek, the Wall Street portion of the Highway 279/Shafer Basin/Long Canyon proposed ACEC, Westwater Canyon, Kane Springs Canyon, Seven mile Canyon, Bartlett/Hidden Canyon, Hell Roaring Uplands, and the Dolores River Canyon.	The BLM will continue to enhance the inventory and density techniques for high cultural value areas identified in the final plan. Each of the cultural high value areas mentioned by the Commenter has been included in the Proposed Plan for inventory in the Final EIS including Seven mile Canyon (refer to pg. 2-8).
			Cultural Resources		

Table 5.9.a. Public Comments and Responses: State of Utah

120	State of Utah	49	Yes	The State requests that a cultural resource management plan be developed for Special Recreation Management Areas.	In Management Common to All Action Alternatives for Cultural Resources (pg. 2-7), several specific areas are mentioned for cultural resource management priority; Ten Mile Wash, Mill Creek Canyon, Behind the Rocks, and Wall Street. These 4 areas coincide with high visitation areas managed as SRMAs. The text has been changed to state that Cultural Resource Management Plans will be a component of the implementation plans for the SRMAs that include the 4 cultural areas.
			Cultural Resources		
120	State of Utah	50	Yes	The State suggests that BLM specify in the RMP the subsequent development of specific cultural resource management plans, especially in areas with potential resource conflicts between cultural and recreation/travel. These plans could provide for potential heritage tourism development where warranted.	See response to comment 120-49. In addition, potential heritage tourism development would be a component of the aforementioned Cultural Resource Management Plans (pg. 2-7).
			Cultural Resources		
120	State of Utah	51	No	The BLM should clarify the criteria utilized to determine which areas with wilderness characteristics (WC) were included in the preferred alternative.	Four alternatives for managing public lands, including lands with wilderness characteristics, are present in the Draft RMP/EIS. The range of alternatives considered issues and concerns raised during the scoping period, planning criteria, and the guidance applicable to resource uses. The 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 of FLPMA to achieve certain goals and objectives. The preferred alternative, Alternative C was crafted by an interdisciplinary team and cooperating agencies to provide a balance between commodity production and resource uses while providing protection to a wide spectrum of resource values.
			Wilderness Characteristics		

Table 5.9.a. Public Comments and Responses: State of Utah

					These resource values include those associated with wilderness characteristics, ACECs, Wild and Scenic Rivers, sensitive soils, watersheds, visual resources, wildlife values, and floodplain/riparian areas.
120	State of Utah	52	No	The BLM needs to consider the new information on roads (2007) to reevaluate the findings of the 1999/2003 wilderness inventory.	The 2003 Revision Document for the Moab Field Office made adjustments to Wilderness Inventory Areas based on county road data, none of which differs from the current county inventory. BLM stands by its 1999/2003 data.
			Wilderness Characteristics		
120	State of Utah	53	No	The BLM inconsistently applied road data between the 1999 inventory and the 2007 WC review.	<p>The BLM did not inconsistently apply the road data, but used the policies and procedures applicable at the time of review. The Wilderness Study Area Interim Management Policy (IMP, H-8550-1; BLM 1995). The "IMP" or "WSA Handbook" was used during the inventory process conducted prior to 2004. The WSA IMP emphasized the difference between "roads" and "ways". Under that policy, the presence of a "road" was considered to negatively affect the wilderness characteristics of an inventory unit, therefore, the road and affected area needed to be excluded. The presence of a "way" however, was not considered, in and of itself, to have a sufficient negative affect on naturalness of an area to disqualify all or part of an inventory unit.</p> <p>In 2004, the BLM settled the ongoing litigation with the State of Utah (Utah v. Norton Settlement Agreement). It was acknowledged that the BLM may continue to inventory public lands for resources or other values, including wilderness characteristics, as a part of managing the public lands and land-use planning. Inventories conducted post-2004 applied current policy, which is based on Washington Office Instruction Memorandum 2003-275, Change 1, which emphasizes naturalness and does not distinguish "roads" from "ways".</p>
			Wilderness Characteristics		

Table 5.9.a. Public Comments and Responses: State of Utah

					The BLM has evaluated wilderness characteristics since 2004 on the basis of affects to the naturalness of an area, which could either be from roads or ways.
120	State of Utah	54	No	On page 4-157, the DEIS states that under Alt B, all 266,485 acres of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be managed as VRM class II. Table 4.55 indicates some WC lands that would be managed as VRM class I; please clarify.	The VRM I acreage within WC areas in Alt B results from other decisions made under Alt B. For example, Beaver Creek, Fisher Towers, Mary Jane Canyon, and Mill Creek Canyon contain rivers found suitable as "wild" for Wild and Scenic River status. Wild Rivers are managed as VRM I. Portions of the other areas are managed as scenic ACECs under Alt B resulting in VRM I management in that alternative. WC management alone does not result in VRM I management under any alternative.
			Wilderness Characteristics		
120	State of Utah	55	No	On pages 4-158 and 159, the DEIS states that under Alternative B, new water development facilities for wildlife would likely be precluded within non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics. Please discuss the extent to which Alt C would preclude development of water facilities.	New water developments would be precluded under Alt B since non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics (WC) are closed to surface-disturbing activities. However, in Alt C WC lands are managed as No Surface Occupancy which provides an exception if the use is consistent and compatible with protection or enhancement of the resource values (see Appendix C). Under Alt C, a new wildlife water development could potentially be considered an enhancement of the natural values based on future NEPA analysis for such a proposal.
			Wilderness Characteristics		
120	State of Utah	56	No	Many of the WC areas were divided into sub-units based on "substantially noticeable routes". Is this division appropriate?	In Appendix P (pg. P-2), the BLM discusses the size criteria for areas with WC. The size criterion of 5,000 acres was applied only to stand alone units. Units contiguous with other federal lands with WC were evaluated for naturalness alone.
			Wilderness Characteristics		

Table 5.9.a. Public Comments and Responses: State of Utah

120	State of Utah	57	Yes	Portions of Arches Adjacent WC subunits 4-6 are not identified on the map. The text discussing unit five identifies wilderness characteristics for 625 acres, but the map does not show contiguity with the Park.	Placement of the labels on the WC supplemental maps have been refined for clarity.
			Wilderness Characteristics		
120	State of Utah	58	Yes	The text for the Diamond Canyon WC indicates that unit six does not meet wilderness characteristic requirements but the map appears to indicate otherwise.	The WC supplemental map for the Diamond Canyon WC shows a small portion of unit 6 as possessing WC. This is a mapping error which has been corrected; the text is correct.
			Wilderness Characteristics		
120	State of Utah	59	Yes	The map for the Goldbar WC show two exclusions from the analysis area (blue circles) that are not discussed in the text. What are these areas? Area six is discussed in the text but not identified on the map.	These exclusions are "doughnuts" in the data provided by the proponent and are meant to be exclusions due to impacts on naturalness. Unit six is shown on the map but the label has been improved.
			Wilderness Characteristics		
120	State of Utah	60	No	Portions of the Labyrinth Canyon and Lost Spring WC area determined to possess wilderness characteristics in the 1999–2003 review appear to have high route density. Please explain why these routes do not compromise either naturalness or the outstanding opportunities for solitude or a primitive and unconfined type of recreation.	Refer to response to comments for 120-52 & 53 for an explanation of roads vs. ways and the withdrawal of the Wilderness Handbook. The 2003 Revision Document removed from the original Wilderness Inventory Area those portions with "way" density so high as to preclude such opportunities. The routes in the remaining Wilderness Inventory Area are sufficiently unnoticeable and unused that their inclusion does not substantially detract from the wilderness characteristics.
			Wilderness Characteristics		
120	State of Utah	61	Yes	Area four of the Labyrinth Canyon WC is mapped as having WC but the text is contradictory.	The label for Area 4 has been repositioned to be more clear.
			Wilderness Characteristics		

Table 5.9.a. Public Comments and Responses: State of Utah

120	State of Utah	62	No	The Mary Jane Canyon WC area appears to have high route density. Please explain why these routes do not compromise either naturalness of the outstanding opportunities for solitude or a primitive and unconfined type of recreation.	See response to comments G-120-52,53, & 60 on route density. Most of the routes depicted in the Mary Jane Canyon area are substantially unnoticeable oil and gas seismic lines which are not being designated for travel under any of the Action Alternatives (B, C, & D). Alt C removes from WC management virtually all of the lands in the Mary Jane Canyon WC area in which these routes are located.
			Wilderness Characteristics		
120	State of Utah	63	No	The text and map for the Mill Creek WC area conclude that the analysis area lacks wilderness characteristics, but the wilderness characteristics review form shows that "some or all of the area has wilderness characteristics as shown on the attached map".	The 1999/2003 review found 3,388 acres of the Mill Creek WC area to possess wilderness characteristics. Subsequent review in 2007 found no additional areas to possess WC. The supplemental WC files on the BLM website state this in the text and on the map.
			Wilderness Characteristics		
120	State of Utah	64	No	The State is opposed to the establishment of ACECs overlapping Wilderness Study Areas (WSAs). The State also does not favor creation of ACECs that exceed the scope of the resources they are designed to protect.	The BLM has separate policies and guidelines, as well as criteria, for establishing ACECs and WSAs. These differing criteria make it possible that the same lands will qualify as both an ACEC and a WSA but for different reasons. The BLM is required to consider these different policies. The values protected by WSA management prescriptions do not necessarily protect those values found relevant and important in ACEC evaluation, and vice versa. The relevant and important values of ACECs within or adjacent to WSAs were noted in the ACEC Evaluation (Appendix I). The ACECs are evaluated and ranked based on the presence or absence of the stated relevant and important values. None of these values includes wilderness characteristics.
			Areas of Critical Environmental Concern		

Table 5.9.a. Public Comments and Responses: State of Utah

					Additionally, the management prescriptions for the ACECs is limited in scope to protect the relevant and important values, and the BLM maintains that the size of the ACEC areas is appropriate for protection of the relevant and important values identified.
120	State of Utah	65	No	State Parks currently has an R&PP lease for land along the east side of Dead Horse Point State Park that is within both the Colorado River SRMA and the Highway 279 Corridor/Shafer Basin/Long Canyon ACEC. The State would like to request an exception for the land currently under R&PP lease that would eventually allow this land to be patented to the Division.	The R&PP lease is a valid existing right and therefore the State of Utah has the right to go to patent upon completion of its plan of development.
			Lands and Realty		
120	State of Utah	66	No	The State seeks information on developing and approving Recreation Area Management Plans (RAMP) and River Management Plans.	After completion of the RMP, those SRMAs that do not currently have RAMPs will be subject to the development of a site specific RAMP, subject to NEPA. The process is identical for River Management Plans.
			Recreation		
120	State of Utah	67	Yes	The Draft RMP/EIS states that where a specific focus area is not identified with a Special Recreation Management Area, the focus of that area is motorized, backcountry touring on designated roads. This statement appears to indicate that those portions of SRMAs that are not subject to a more specific focus area will be managed to emphasize motorized recreation.	The BLM acknowledges that there are entire SRMAs that are focused on a particular type of recreation. The decision on pg. 2-18 has been changed to reflect this; "where a specific type of SRMA or focus area is not identified, the focus of that area is motorized backcountry touring on designated routes". Focus areas particularly for backcountry motorized touring would be managed more intensively than the default management. For example, focus areas for motorized backcountry touring could be considered for new route creation.
			Recreation		

Table 5.9.a. Public Comments and Responses: State of Utah

				This appears inconsistent with designating SRMAs to emphasize non-motorized recreation and mountain bike backcountry touring. Please also explain how management of focus areas specifically designated for "motorized backcountry touring" would differ from the default management of SRMA for motorized backcountry touring.	
120	State of Utah	68	Yes	The Draft RMP/EIS makes repeated reference to "destination SRMAs" (pg. 2-19). Please explain what a "destination SRMA" is and how such areas would be managed.	Destination SRMAs are those where the majority of visitation is from without the local area. A destination SRMA definition has been added to pg. 2-18.
			Recreation		
120	State of Utah	69	Yes	The Cottonwood-Diamond Watershed Potential ACEC notes that the proposed designation would remain in force, "until the watershed is restored to a healthy and functioning condition". Please clarify what management conditions would apply once the desired future condition is attained and the mechanism used to change prescriptions.	The Draft RMP/EIS states on pg. 4-320 that the ACEC would be designated until "the watershed is restored to a healthy functioning condition". The text has been changed to state that the ACEC would be designated until a determination is made by an interdisciplinary team that the Cottonwood and Diamond Watersheds are in properly functioning condition (PFC).
			Areas of Critical Environmental Concern		
120	State of Utah	70	Yes	Clarify launch limits in Westwater Canyon.	Table 4.69 (on pg. 4-207) states that the daily launch limit for Westwater Canyon is 75 people. This has been changed to state "75 people for the commercial sector and 75 people for the private sector". This equals the 150 person launch limit shown on the BLM website.
			Recreation		

Table 5.9.a. Public Comments and Responses: State of Utah

120	State of Utah	71	<p>No</p> <hr/> <p>Wild and Scenic Rivers</p>	<p>The State is concerned that Wild and Scenic River designations may limit water development by communities for future growth, limit industrial and agricultural growth, and reduce funding for the Colorado River Salinity Control program.</p>	<p>The Wild and Scenic Rivers Act implies a federal reserved water right; however, it must be the minimal amount necessary for purposes of the Act, it must be adjudicated through State processes, and it would be junior to existing water rights. The amount of federal water right will vary from river to river, depending on the river's flows, the un-appropriated quantities in the river, and the values for which the river is being protected. There is no effect whatsoever on water rights on in-stream flows related to suitability findings made in a land-use plan decision, barring Congressional action. Even if Congress were to designate rivers in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, any such designation would have no affect on existing, valid water rights. Section 13 (b) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act states that jurisdiction over waters is determined by established principles of law. In Utah, the State has jurisdiction over water. Although the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act implies a federal reserved water right for designated rivers, it does not require or specify any amount, and instead establishes that only the minimum amount for purpose of the Act can be acquired. Because the State of Utah has jurisdiction over water, BLM would be required to adjudicate the right as would any other entity, by application through State processes. Thus, for Congressionally designated rivers, BLM may assert a federal reserved water right to appurtenant and unappropriated water with a priority date as of the date of designation (junior to all existing rights), but only in the minimum amount necessary to fulfill the primary purpose of the reservation.</p> <p>During the suitability phase of the Wild and Scenic River process, both Grand and San Juan Counties, as well as the State of Utah and SITLA, were asked to supply information on uses, "including reasonably foreseeable potential uses of the area and related</p>
-----	---------------	----	---	---	--

Table 5.9.a. Public Comments and Responses: State of Utah

					<p>waters, which would be enhanced, foreclosed, or curtailed if the area were included in the national system of rivers, and the values which could be foreclosed or diminished if the area is not protected as part of the national system." (Appendix J-12). Attachment 4 of Appendix J summarizes suitability input by the public as well as local communities. Suitability decisions were made considering the results of this input. For example, the agricultural, residential, commercial and municipal development in and around the town of Green River was cited as a reason that segments 3 and 4 of the Green River were not suitable for consideration.</p> <p>In 1994, Public Law 98-569 amended the Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Act and directed the Secretary to develop a comprehensive program for minimizing salt contributions from lands administered by BLM and to provide a report on this program to the Congress and the Advisory Council. The BLM's Colorado River Basin Salinity Control program is designed to provide the best management practices (BMP) of the basic resource base. Successes with the resource base will translate to improved vegetation cover, better use of onsite precipitation, and stronger plant root systems. In turn, a more stable runoff regime and reduced soil loss should result, thus benefiting water quality of the streams in the Colorado River Basin including the Green River and San Rafael River. In Section 1(b) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, Congress states that one of the objectives of the Act is to protect the water quality of designated rivers. Congress further specified that the river-administering agencies cooperate with the EPA and State water pollution control agencies to eliminate or diminish water pollution (Section 2(c)).</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

Table 5.9.a. Public Comments and Responses: State of Utah

					<p>Comparing the two, it is clear that the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act and the Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Act are not only complementary of one another, but share the same objective with regard to water quality. The Wild and Scenic Rivers Act directs the Secretary of the Interior or any government agency to prohibit any loan, grant, license, or otherwise construction of any water resources project that would have a direct effect on the values for which such river designation was established. The law also states that it cannot preclude licensing of, or assistance to, developments below or above a wild, scenic, or recreational river area or on any stream tributary thereto that will not invade the area or unreasonably diminish the scenic, recreational, and fish and wildlife values present in the area on the date of designation of a river as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. However, projects intended to comply with the Colorado River Salinity Control Act are those that would generally benefit stream segments instead of affecting or unreasonably diminishing its values including water quality.</p>
120	State of Utah	72	No	<p>The State believes that the BLM should disclose the reasons and rationale for determinations of eligibility and suitability for proposed additions to the National Wild and Scenic River System, and to fully meet the requirements of state and federal law in doing so.</p>	<p>Appendix J of the DRMP/DEIS details the steps undertaken in the eligibility review process including the identification of outstandingly remarkable values as well as the Suitability Considerations by eligible river segments. The BLM complied with all applicable Federal laws, regulations, and policies in the Wild and Scenic Rivers Study Process.</p> <p>The BLM is aware that there are specific State laws relevant to aspects of public land management that</p>

Table 5.9.a. Public Comments and Responses: State of Utah

			Wild and Scenic Rivers		<p>are discrete from, and independent of, Federal law. However, BLM is bound by Federal law.</p> <p>As a consequence, there may be inconsistencies that cannot be reconciled. The FLPMA requires that BLM's land-use plans be consistent with State and local plans "to the extent practical" where State and local plans conflict with Federal law there will be an inconsistency that cannot be resolved. The BLM will identify these conflicts in the FEIS/PRMP so that the State and local governments have a complete understanding of the impacts of the PRMP on State and local management options.</p>
120	State of Utah	73	<p>No</p> <hr/> <p>Wild and Scenic Rivers</p>	<p>The State is concerned that the Draft RMP/EIS does not state the authority for protection of river segments while studies are underway.</p>	<p>Section 5(d) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act requires that federal land management agencies make wild and scenic river considerations during land-use planning. Two stages of review are involved. Eligibility is an inventory, solely involving river values. Suitability involves consideration of manageability and resource conflicts.</p> <p>As per BLM Manual 8351-Wild and Scenic Rivers-Policy and Program, Section .32C, all eligible rivers are considered in the EIS for the planning effort as to their suitability for congressional designation into the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. With any suitability determination made in the ROD for the PRMP/FEIS, the free-flowing, outstandingly remarkable values, and tentative classification of rivers would continue to be protected until Congress makes a decision on designation.</p> <p>Appendix J describes the process and authority for the Wild and Scenic Rivers Study.</p> <p>The FLPMA gives the BLM broad authority to manage the public lands, including management of eligible and suitable river segments.</p>

Table 5.9.a. Public Comments and Responses: State of Utah

					<p>For eligible rivers, it is BLM's policy to protect certain values identified in the eligibility determination process to ensure that a decision on suitability can be made. To accomplish this objective, the BLM's management prescriptions must protect the free-flowing character, tentative classifications, and identify outstandingly remarkable values of eligible rivers according to the prescriptions and directions of the current, applicable land-use plan per BLM Manual Section 8351.32C. The BLM Manual further states that should a determination on suitability not be made during the planning process, "the RMP must prescribe protective management measures to ensure protection shall be afforded the river and adjacent public land area pending the suitability determination" (Section 8351.33A).</p> <p>The NEPA specifies that while work on the EIS is in progress, BLM cannot undertake or authorize any actions in the interim that would prejudice the RMP decision or, in this case, the suitability determination (40 CFR 1505.1 (c)(3)). A case-by-case evaluation of potential impacts resulting from a proposed action must be made to ensure that all eligible rivers are not limited from being considered for suitability among the range of RMP alternatives, thus eliminating the opportunity to prejudice the decision. Implementation of the interim management to protect eligible rivers, therefore, is applied through site-specific NEPA analysis of environmental impacts on a case-by-case basis. The NEPA compliance, required for all federal actions that could significantly affect the environment, ensures that BLM consider alternatives to the proposed action and provides BLM an opportunity to apply mitigation measures that will reduce impacts on a given resource such as an eligible stream.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

Table 5.9.a. Public Comments and Responses: State of Utah

					<p>This mechanism of applying management must be in conformance with the current land-use plan. Protective prescriptions would be applied to rivers determined suitable in the ROD for the Field Office RMP. Resource allocations (such as those for visual resources, OHV use, and mineral leasing) compatible with protecting river values would be prescribed for suitable river corridors as part of the decision. In addition, no special management objectives would be applied to eligible rivers determined not to be suitable in the ROD. Instead, they would be managed without additional consideration according to the provisions of the plan.</p>
120	State of Utah	74	<p>Yes</p> <hr/> <p>Wild and Scenic Rivers</p>	<p>The BLM has not sufficiently divulged the proposed management prescriptions for river segments identified in the Draft RMP/EIS.</p>	<p>Table 4.102, Management Proposed for River Segments Considered for WSR Designation by Alternative, details these management prescriptions. The Oil and Gas Leasing Stipulations detailed in Table 4.102 by river segment are applicable to all surface-disturbing activities authorized in the plan as explained in Appendix C. These prescriptions have been moved to the Wild and Scenic River section of Chapter 2.</p>
120	State of Utah	75	<p>Yes</p> <hr/> <p>Wild and Scenic Rivers</p>	<p>Reference is made to 29 eligible segments that will be further reviewed for suitability; however, at several places, including pages 2-4, ES-5 and ES-6, 28 eligible segments are indicated. The Draft RMP/EIS identifies the number of eligible rivers as 13 at several places and 12 at many other locations.</p>	<p>There are 29 eligible river segments. On Salt Wash, which adjoins Arches National Park, the suitability determination has been delayed pending Park Service action. Therefore, 28 river segments were found suitable in one or more of the alternatives. This has resulted in some inconsistencies in the text which have been corrected. The same reasoning applies to the number of rivers which has also been corrected.</p>

Table 5.9.a. Public Comments and Responses: State of Utah

120	State of Utah	76	Yes	The term "designation" in place of "classification" on pgs 2-4 and 2-91, is inappropriate.	The term "designation" has been changed to "determine" in accordance with the BLM Land-use Planning Handbook (H 1601-1).
			Wild and Scenic Rivers		
120	State of Utah	77	Yes	The cumulative effects analysis would be enhanced by developing a map depicting the cumulative effect of all use restrictions imposed under each alternative. Such a map could resemble maps 4-1 through 44 in the Kanab Field Office Draft RMP/EIS.	The maps referred to for the Kanab Draft RMP/EIS depict oil and gas restrictions by alternative. The same maps are contained in the Moab Draft RMP/EIS and are referred as Maps 2-5A-D. The oil and gas restrictions shown on these maps apply to all surface-disturbing activities (see Appendix C). These maps have been referred to in the cumulative impact section for minerals (pg. 4-504) and other applicable resources.
			Adequacy and Analysis		
120	State of Utah	78	Yes	The BLM should clearly identify all reasonably foreseeable non-BLM actions within the planning area. As written, it is unclear what -- if any -- non-BLM actions were considered.	The BLM has added the following reasonably foreseeable non-BLM actions to the cumulative impact analysis: minerals extraction on private and SITLA lands; on-going residential growth and business development throughout the planning area; and expansion of U.S. Highway 191.
			Adequacy and Analysis		
120	State of Utah	79	No	Please clarify the identification of alternatives. For example, pgs 2-2 through 2-5 identify Alternative A as the No Action Alternative, Alternative B as the Preferred Alternative, Alternative C as the Alternative emphasizing Resource Protection and Alternative D as the Alternative emphasizing Development. Page 4-1 identifies Alternative B as the Alternative emphasizing Resource Protection, Alternative C as the Preferred Alternative, and Alternative D as the Alternative emphasizing Development.	Our review of these sections shows that the terminology for the alternatives is consistent and is summarized as follows: Alternative A is No Action. Alternative B emphasizes protection/preservation of natural resources. Alternative C is the Preferred Alternative, as it provides for a balanced approach of protection/preservation of natural resources while providing for commodity production. Alternative D emphasizes commodity production.
			Adequacy and Analysis		

Table 5.9.a. Public Comments and Responses: State of Utah

120	State of Utah	80	No	Pages 2-2 through 2-5 indicates that under Alternative C, 31 percent of the MPA would be closed to oil and gas development and only five percent of the MPA would be open under standard lease terms and conditions. In comparison, Alternative B would close only 14 percent of the MPA and leave 48 percent of the planning area open under standard terms and conditions. However, Table 4.3 indicates that despite the less stringent stipulations applied under Alternative B, 2,652 fewer oil and gas wells are anticipated compared to the more restrictive Alternative C. Please clarify this discrepancy.	The only reference to oil and gas restrictions is Summary Table C which shows 370,250 acres closed to oil and gas development in Alt C. This amounts to 20 percent of the BLM lands within the planning area. It should be noted that 19% of the BLM lands within the planning area are closed to oil and gas leasing by BLM policy. Also, as shown on this table, 427,273 acres are open with standard lease terms and conditions for Alt C. This amounts to 23% of the BLM lands within the planning area. On the same table, Alt B closes 36% of the BLM lands and leaves 14% of the BLM lands open with standard terms and conditions. Table 4.3 shows the total predicted surface disturbance for mineral development in acres by alternative. The more restrictive Alt B results in 3,321 fewer acres (not wells) of surface disturbance than Alt C for oil and gas development.
			Adequacy and Analysis		
120	State of Utah	81	No	The BLM should designate OHV "training trails" near dispersed camp sites to reduce OHV damage in those areas.	As stated in the Draft RMP/EIS (pg. 2-48) routes may be modified through subsequent implementation planning on a case by case basis. No specific trails or suggestions for "training trails" were submitted during the scoping period. After the RMP is completed and on a site specific basis, the BLM could consider training trails near dispersed camp sites in areas designated in the limited or open to OHV category.
			Travel Management		
120	State of Utah	82	No	To avoid having routes closed in the future which cross properties owned by SITLA, rights-of-ways should be placed in public ownership for OHV access.	The BLM recognizes that under <i>Utah v. Andrus</i> the State is entitled to reasonable access across public lands to school trust lands, including those located within WSAs and other areas where management prescriptions would restrict general public access. Any restrictions such as route closures within these management areas pertain to general public access. Public access to OHV routes on public lands is accomplished through travel management planning.
			Travel Management		

Table 5.9.a. Public Comments and Responses: State of Utah

					<p>We make a distinction between closures to the public, and State access entitlements and access needs of others that can be addressed as specific needs arise. Land tenure adjustment efforts including pending and anticipated land exchanges between the BLM and the State should properly focus on SITLA lands located within WSAs and other special management areas identified in RMPs. Therefore, the BLM does not believe it is necessary or prudent to globally grant rights-of-way or designated routes to school trust lands for public use. The BLM is happy to work with the State to process any FLPMA Title V ROW application the State feels is necessary to protect ingress and egress to State property.</p> <p>The concern about DRMP/EIS access restrictions other than those for general public access, such as the designation of right-of-way avoidance or exclusion areas, can be clarified with specific mention in the PRMP/FEIS that these designations are subject to State access entitlements under Utah v. Andrus, as described above.</p>
120	State of Utah	83	<p>Yes</p> <hr/> <p>Travel Management</p>	<p>The White Wash sand dunes OHV open area should be larger than proposed under Alternative C. There should be a larger mix of sand and slick rock with a logical boundary.</p>	<p>A larger OHV open area for the White Wash area is proposed in Alt D. A portion of this larger open area has been added to the PRMP/Final EIS which consists of the popular camping area to the west of the sand dunes and just east of the Ruby Ranch Road.</p>

Table 5.9.a. Public Comments and Responses: State of Utah

120	State of Utah	84	No	The State asks the BLM to explain its intention to designate D roads, and explain why different D roads may be designated across alternatives. Please clarify the authority under which BLM would designate county roads, and what happens to a D road if BLM chooses not to designate it pursuant to RS 2477.	See response to comment 120-16.
			Travel Management		
120	State of Utah	85	Yes	Table 4.54 on page 4-147 indicates that, under Alternative C and D, no portion of Lost Canyon would be either "open" or subject to "limited" OHV use.	The limited acreage is identical in Alternatives B, C, & D. Table 4.54 has been corrected.
			Travel Management		
120	State of Utah	86	No	Driving off designated routes to access dispersed camp sites would be in violation of the proposed travel plan. This plan should address this issue so that legitimate camp spots can be accessed from a legal route.	<p>Driving off designated routes to access dispersed campsites would be a violation. Access to dispersed campsites is addressed on pg. 2-48 of the Moab DRMP/DEIS; "designated routes and spurs were identified specifically for dispersed camping" under all action alternatives. Many of the designated routes lead to or access dispersed campsites.</p> <p>Dispersed camping was considered in designating routes in all of the action alternatives. So that the public is aware of these sites, the dispersed campsites would be signed. Additional routes to dispersed campsites can be considered after the RMP process is completed on a case-by-case basis in areas designated as limited or open to OHV use.</p>
			Travel Management		

Table 5.9.a. Public Comments and Responses: State of Utah

120	State of Utah	87	No	Duplicate routes may provide beneficial recreation experiences to OHV users of varying skills and interests.	No information was provided during the scoping phase identifying specific duplicate routes for consideration in this planning effort. During the development of the travel plan with Grand and San Juan Counties, consideration of these types of needs was discussed. However, most duplicate routes not designated were routes receiving little or no use and thus presumably not providing the experience suggested in the comment. After the RMP process is completed, additional routes can be considered on a case-by-case basis in areas designated as limited or open to OHV use.
			Travel Management		
120	State of Utah	88	No	The BLM is encouraged to coordinate route alignments with other jurisdictions including the border with Colorado in the Rabbit Valley/Bitter Creek area.	During development of the travel plan, the Moab BLM coordinated with Grand and San Juan Counties, the National Park Service, the Forest Service, SITLA, and all adjoining BLM offices, including the Grand Junction Office concerning the Rabbit Valley area.
			Travel Management		
120	State of Utah	89	No	There are a few additional connecting routes needed in the travel plan for Alt C to create loops for ATVs and full-sized vehicles	All route data received during scoping was considered in the alternatives for the travel plan. No specific information is provided about these "additional connecting routes". Any new routes can be considered for addition to the travel plan after the RMP is completed on a case by case basis in areas designated as limited to OHV use.
			Travel Management		
120	State of Utah	90	Yes	There are no ATV/motorcycle only routes proposed in the preferred alternative. This is a useful designation to complete the array of OHV alternatives. The initial inventory and subsequent designation of motorcycle routes was incomplete.	During the scoping period, the BLM received data on routes proposed for motorcycle use. The majority of these routes are included in the Travel Plan for Alt C or Alt D. During the comment period for the DRMP/EIS, some of the motorcycle route proposals were modified by their proponents to indicate that a few of these motorcycle routes were also suitable for ATVs.
			Travel Management		

Table 5.9.a. Public Comments and Responses: State of Utah

					The map has been corrected in the PRMP/FEIS to delineate these ATV/motorcycle routes where they are identified in the Travel Plan for Alt C and Alt D. The BLM incorporated all route data received during scoping into formulation of travel plan alternatives.
120	State of Utah	91	No	There are no designated routes in the Duma Point area under any of the alternatives and there is no explanation as to why these routes were omitted.	The BLM received several route submissions in the Duma Point area during the scoping period. Several of these routes were not identified in any of the action alternatives due to resource conflicts, particularly with big horn sheep and sensitive soils. The BLM received a comment from UDWR regarding the bighorn sheep herd in this area with respect to human disturbance. The BLM Manual 8342.1 requires that OHV designations must "minimize harassment of wildlife and/or significant disruption of wildlife habitat".
			Travel Management		
120	State of Utah	92	No	The State requests that the OHV riding area just north of the Airport on the Blue Hills Road remain open. The area is well-suited to the existing use (shale soils with no vegetation) and provides an authorized area for hill climbing.	The area described is actually west of the airport. This area was limited to existing roads and trails in the 1985 RMP due to concerns with sensitive soils. There are no identified routes within any of the alternatives for the travel plan. However, in Alt C, provisions are made for the Airport Hills Motocross Focus Area (285 acres) to be established upon application by local government under the Recreation and Public Purposes Act.
			Travel Management		
120	State of Utah	93	No	Please clarify whether page G-11's reference to wildlife habitat includes habitat for all species or is it intended to apply to habitat for more significant species or groups of species.	Page G-11 refers to the guidance found in BLM Manual 8342.1 which states that OHV designations "must minimize harassment of wildlife and/or significant disruption of wildlife habitat". On pg. G-25 BLM lists the relevant species considered in formulation of the alternatives for the travel plan.
			Travel Management		

Table 5.9.a. Public Comments and Responses: State of Utah

120	State of Utah	94	No	Page G-11, uses the term "extreme". Explain what constitutes an "extreme" hazard which can be considered an element of subjectivity.	This language is verbatim from BLM Manual 8342.1 which states "designations must minimize or eliminate OHV use in areas of extreme natural or man-made hazards".
			Travel Management		
120	State of Utah	95	No	Page G-15, Emergency Limitation or Closure: Perhaps "immediately closed" should read, "immediately mitigated or closed" or some similar wording.	The federal regulations at 8341.2(a) state "the authorized officer shall immediately close the areas affected to the types of vehicle causing the adverse affect". The wording on page G-15 is derived directly from the referenced regulations.
			Travel Management		
120	State of Utah	96	No	The implementation process section on page G-29 should stress the need for maps and signing as both are needed.	On pg. G-30, the Draft RMP/EIS states "in the final RMP decisions, designated OHV routes will be portrayed by a map. This map will be the basis for signing and enforcement. The implementation goals include completing signage, maps, public information, kiosks, and working with partners".
			Travel Management		
120	State of Utah	97	No	SITLA requests a detailed reference under Issue 8 of the Issues Identified for Consideration in the Moab RMP concerning inheld state lands within special areas such as WSAs, ACECs, and lands managed for wilderness characteristics.	See response to comments 120-101, 103, and 106. It is not necessary to have this specific language stated in the description of the issue.
			Lands and Realty		
120	State of Utah	98	No	Section 1.3.3-Development of Planning Criteria (pg. 1-13). The BLM states that the RMP will "apply only to public lands and, where appropriate, split estate lands where the subsurface mineral estate is managed by the BLM".	Information regarding leasing and development on split estate lands is found at the following Washington Office website: www.blm.gov/bmp/Split_Estate.htm . Instruction Memorandum No. 2003-202 outlines the policy, procedures and conditions for approving oil and gas operations on split-estate lands.
			Minerals Oil and Gas		

Table 5.9.a. Public Comments and Responses: State of Utah

				<p>The BLM should reconsider whether it can impose its standard on split estate lands where it does not own the surface as mentioned in the Planning Criteria on pg. 1-13.</p>	<p>In particular, the BLM will not consider an Application for Permit to Drill or a Sundry Notice administratively or technically complete until the federal lessee or its operator certifies that an agreement with the surface owner exists, or until the lessee or its operator complies with Onshore Oil and Gas Order No. 1. Compliance with Onshore Oil and Gas Order No. 1 requires the federal mineral lessee or its operator to enter into good-faith negotiations with the private surface owner to reach an agreement for the protection of surface resources and reclamation of the disturbed areas, or payment in lieu thereof, to compensate the surface owner for loss of crops and damages to tangible improvements, if any. In addition, the BLM will invite the surface owner to participate in the onsite inspection and will take into consideration the needs of the surface owner when reviewing the Application for Permit to Drill. The BLM will offer the surface owner the same level of surface protection BLM provides on federal surface (Instruction Memorandum No. 89-201).</p>
120	State of Utah	99	<p>No</p> <hr/> <p>Lands and Realty</p>	<p>Paragraph 3.6.2.1 - Land Tenure Adjustments (Pg. 3-28). This paragraph should specifically reference the need for federal acquisition of State school trust lands that are captured by federal reservations and withdrawals such as wilderness study areas will be a priority, in accordance with applicable BLM policy guidance. In addition State selection should be mentioned as an equally preferred method of land disposition as land exchanges.</p>	<p>See response to comments 120-106 and 120-11.</p> <p>The FLPMA Section 203 requires the BLM to use the land-use planning process to identify lands for disposal through sales. Identifying lands for Section 203 sale requires BLM to meet certain criteria set out specifically in the statute.</p> <p>The FLPMA authorizes BLM to identify lands that would be available for exchange (both disposal and acquisition) more generally. The Moab DRMP/DEIS has identified lands generally available for exchange, including identifying State lands that are currently available for acquisition.</p>

Table 5.9.a. Public Comments and Responses: State of Utah

					The DRMP/DEIS does not contain a schedule or prioritize these lands, but BLM understands that State in-lieu and other exchanges are a high priority for the State and for BLM.
120	State of Utah	100	Yes	Section 3.6.2.1.2-Exchanges and Acquisitions (pg. 3-29). The State encourages the BLM to add a new paragraph after the first paragraph, as follows: Facilitating acquisition of state trust lands inholdings in wilderness study areas and other sensitive areas through land exchange is considered an important public objective, and will be given priority.	See response to comments 120-106 and 120-11.
			Lands and Realty		
120	State of Utah	101	Yes	Paragraph 4.1.2 - Analytical Assumptions (pg. 4-2/3). The BLM's second to last analytical assumption, that non-BLM lands would be minimally directly impacted by RMP decisions, since BLM does not make land decisions on non-BLM lands, is incorrect with respect to state trust lands. The largest source of revenue for the Utah school trust is from oil and gas bonuses and royalties. In much of Utah, in order to establish an economic oil and gas resource play, the exploration company needs a large areal footprint. It is likely that multiple sections would have to be leased and developed in order to develop the necessary reserves to make the play economic.	<p>The BLM acknowledges that the closure of adjoining public lands to oil and gas leasing may have a potentially negative impact on SITLA's mineral revenue. The assumption on pg. 4-3 has been changed to reflect this fact. In Alternative C, the closure of the 354,015 acres managed as WSA or Wilderness Areas is nondiscretionary and beyond the scope of this plan.</p> <p>In Alternatives A, C, and D there are no SITLA lands affected by discretionary closure. Chapter 4 of the PRMP/FEIS has been revised to reflect the impacts in Alternative B on SITLA inholdings of the discretionary closures of 266,485 acres of public land. It should be noted that under any Alternative, the proposed ACECs are not managed as closed to mineral leasing. Areas with wilderness characteristics are recommended as closed under Alternative B and No Surface Occupancy in Alternative C.</p>
			Minerals Oil and Gas		

Table 5.9.a. Public Comments and Responses: State of Utah

				BLM decisions from mineral lands from leasing in WSAs, areas with wilderness characteristics, ACECs, and other areas directly affect the economic viability of state trust lands inholdings.	
120	State of Utah	102	No	BLM's last analytical assumption, that reasonable access to state lands , across BLM lands, would be provided under all alternatives, needs to be specifically repeated in Table 2.1 under the heading "Management Common to All Alternatives" with a notation that access to state trust lands will be granted even if an area is otherwise an avoidance or exclusion area for ROWs.	See response to comment 120-10.
			Lands and Realty		
120	State of Utah	103	Yes	Section 4.1.3.1/Table 4.2-Oil and Gas. The BLM withdrawals and special designations directly affect development of oil and gas on SITLA lands. The BLM should assume that, in addition to the loss of oil and gas wells on BLM lands, there would be an additional loss of wells on SITLA lands in proportion to the amount of SITLA land within the proposed special designations under each alternative.	As explained in comment 120-101, the only discretionary oil and gas closures imposed by this plan that negatively impact SITLA inholdings are in Alt B where 266,485 acres are closed to protect wilderness characteristics. An estimate of oil and gas wells foregone on SITLA lands as a result of the BLM closure has been added to the text on pg. 4-94.
			Minerals Oil and Gas		

Table 5.9.a. Public Comments and Responses: State of Utah

120	State of Utah	104	Yes	Section 4.3.5-Lands and Realty (pgs. 4-63/69). The second paragraph of section 4.3.5.1 (Impacts Common to All Alternatives) incorrectly states that 354,015 acres within WSAs and the Black Ridge Wilderness Area are closed to surface-disturbing activities and thus excluded to new ROWs.	Narrative has been added to the text on these pages to clarify that the BLM has an obligation to grant reasonable access to inheld State lands in WSAs subject to Utah v. Andrus and the Interim Management Policy. There are no State lands within the Black Ridge Wilderness Area.
			Lands and Realty		
120	State of Utah	105	No	Section 4.3.12-Socioeconomic Resource (pgs 4-252/277). BLM decisions to withdraw mineral lands from leasing (WSAs, etc.) directly affect the economic viability of state trust lands inholdings. This should be acknowledged appropriately in the discussion of socioeconomic impacts. In particular, the BLM should assume that in addition to the decline in the number of wells drilled on BLM lands, there will be a proportionate decrease in the number of wells drilled on trust lands if Alternative B is adopted.	See comments 120-101 & 120-103 for an explanation of closed acreage by alternative. In Alt B, the loss of revenue from SITLA wells foregone has been calculated and added to the analysis on page 4-264.
			Socioeconomics		
120	State of Utah	106	Yes	Appendix A.1.1. Land Tenure Adjustment Criteria. Add a new numbered paragraph stating that facilitating acquisition of state trust lands inholdings in wilderness study areas and other sensitive areas through land exchange is considered an important public objective, and will be given priority in accordance with existing BLM policy direction.	Current BLM Utah State Policy is to give priority to State of Utah exchanges and such exchanges do not require a land-use planning decision.
			Lands and Realty		

Table 5.9.a. Public Comments and Responses: State of Utah

120	State of Utah	107	No	Delete numbered paragraph 9 in A.1.1. It is inconsistent with county plans and may hinder necessary exchanges to acquire state inholdings.	This paragraph refers to retaining 1,806,413 acres in public ownership including all lands in WSAs, ACECs, SRMAs, and other designated areas. This paragraph has been restated as follows: "Retain all public lands within WSAs, ACECs, SRMAs, and other designated areas".
			Lands and Realty		
120	State of Utah	108	No	Please consider adding a new section, A.1.5, State Selections, which should read as follows: "State selections under the Utah Enabling Act and other applicable law will also be given priority pursuant to BLM Manual 2621.06A-C. All lands not encumbered by a withdrawal or other special designation will be available for state selection."	See the response to comment 120-106.
			Lands and Realty		
120	State of Utah	109	No	Under the Mill Creek Canyon Potential ACEC, Alternatives B and C propose to "maintain 3 cfs in the South Fork of Mill Creek below the Shelly diversion" (pg. 2-37). Please explain whether BLM possess a water right applicable to this area, how BLM would maintain this level of flow at the Shelly diversion, how it would prevent appropriation of instream flows below this point, and who would hold instream flow rights.	The BLM does not have instream flow rights on Mill Creek. The BLM would maintain 3 cfs through a stipulation in the right-of-way grant to the Grand County Water Conservancy District. The BLM does not control appropriation of water rights. Water rights are appropriated by the State of Utah. In Utah, the only agencies that can hold instream flow rights are the UDWR and the Utah State Parks.
			Water Resources		
120	State of Utah	110	No	The enhancement of riparian and wetland areas will increase the depletion of water within the Moab FO.	Restoration of riparian vegetation will not result in water depletion. In fact, this activity should increase the amount of available water. Enhancing riparian vegetation results in a decrease in stream temperature, a decrease in evaporation, and the storage of water in the bank for low flow seasons (summer).
			Water Resources		

Table 5.9.a. Public Comments and Responses: State of Utah

				<p>The State requests the BLM modify its goal to require mitigation of any increased water depletion that may result from its activities. Such mitigation may require the acquisition and change of a valid existing water right. As part of a mitigation effort, it is suggested the BLM consider the institution of a program to eradicate tamarisk and other highly water consumptive, non-native species and their replacement with native species. Water required for any enhancement effort will need to be obtained in accordance with State law.</p>	<p>In addition, the replacement of tamarisk and Russian olive by native vegetation results in reduced water use and higher stream flow. If any additional water should become necessary, the BLM will obtain this water in accordance with Utah State law.</p> <p>On pg. 2-50 under Management Common to All for Vegetation, it states "Reduce tamarisk and Russian olive where appropriate using allowable vegetation treatments. Restore riparian habitat to native willow and cottonwood communities".</p>
120	State of Utah	111	<p>No</p> <hr/> <p>Water Resources</p>	<p>The UDWQ suggests the following practices identified in the TMDL that would reduce Mill Creek water temperatures to bring conditions into compliance with standard for Class 3A waters. These practices include: 1) provide higher stream flows during summer by maintaining 3 cfs flow below the Ken's Lake diversion, 2) increase water depth by narrowing the stream channel with restoration techniques involving use of heavy equipment, and 3) plant and protect riparian vegetation to increase shading a minimum of 11 percent to attain water quality standard.</p>	<p>The Draft RMP/EIS on pg. 2-31 states under Management Common to All Alternatives for Soil and 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". Through ongoing restoration and management actions stream channel dimensions are improving without the use of heavy equipment. The use of heavy equipment is not appropriate due to inaccessibility, the size of the stream system, and other sensitive resources. On pg. 2-50 under Management Common to All for Vegetation, the Draft RMP/EIS states "Reduce tamarisk and Russian olive where appropriate using allowable vegetation treatments. Restore riparian habitat to native willow and cottonwood communities". Mill Creek has been and will continue to be a high priority for such restoration efforts due to its TMDL status.</p>

Table 5.9.a. Public Comments and Responses: State of Utah

120	State of Utah	112	No	Onion Creek is impaired for temperature. To attain a temperature reduction in Onion Creek, the TMDL recommends restricted access to the stream channel by off road vehicles and riparian restoration to facilitate canopy cover. To restore the beneficial use in the creek, a more protective alternative than those described by the BLM/Moab RMP may be required.	Under all alternatives, travel within the Onion Creek stream corridor is restricted to the "B" road. Riparian restoration in this area has been ongoing; as a TMDL, Onion Creek is a priority for restoration efforts. In addition, the BLM has worked with the Grand County Road Department to improve the stability of the "B" road, thus improving riparian and water quality conditions in Onion Creek.
			Water Resources		
120	State of Utah	113	No	Ken's Lake should be protected for cold water species of game fish and other cold water aquatic life. It is impaired for temperature. The protection of riparian vegetation may improve conditions around the lake.	The Ken's Lake TMDL concludes that stream temperatures are appropriate for the beneficial uses. The impairments are due to natural conditions and not management actions. Ongoing recreation management efforts for Ken's Lake have involved promoting native vegetation.
			Water Resources		
120	State of Utah	114	No	Best Management Practices should be included in the plan for impaired water bodies.	The BLM is adopting the State's TMDL recommendations for impaired waterbodies. These constitute the best management practices for those streams.
			Water Resources		
120	State of Utah	115	Yes	Monitoring should be defined for the plan, including water quality and biological parameters. Monitoring of recreation events should also be conducted to help provide data of the impacts.	The federal regulations at 43 CFR 1610.4-9 require that land-use plans establish intervals and standards and evaluations based on the sensitivity of the resource decisions involved. The Record of Decision (ROD) for the RMP will commit to a monitoring plan the specifics of which will be developed subsequent to the signing of the ROD.
			Water Resources		

Table 5.9.a. Public Comments and Responses: State of Utah

120	State of Utah	116	<p>Yes</p> <hr/> <p>Socioeconomics</p>	<p>A statewide social survey was conducted by Utah State University in 2007. The State provides the key survey results for Grand County (146 responses) and for San Juan County (124 responses).</p>	<p>The Commenter provides an additional source of data not considered in the Draft RMP/EIS, due to the unavailability at the date of publication. The Commenter has identified this data as preliminary and no conclusions are provided. This is a study done by Utah State University for the State of Utah (USU). The USU study surveyed residents of all Utah counties on an equal (equal sample size per county) basis. The Commenter has not provided BLM with the raw data, but has compiled summary statistics by county. The survey is described as a social survey, and it "attempts to assess the ways in which Utah residents use and value public land resources, and their views about public land management". Because it is a survey of a sample of the population, the results are not directly comparable to most of the state government agency-generated data used in the Draft RMP/EIS. Portions of the study do not distinguish among types of public lands; in the study, this label includes all state and federal lands, and not just BLM lands. This makes some of the results more difficult to use in BLM planning and analysis since both counties in the MPA contain significant amounts of state, NPS and USFS lands. Nonetheless, the study provides interesting results not available elsewhere, and the summaries for Grand and San Juan counties incorporated in Attachment B may be useful in future implementation actions. None of the results provided affect either the formulation of alternatives in Chapter 2, nor the analysis of impacts in Chapter 4. Where appropriate, pertinent results are incorporated in Chapter 3 of the PRMP/FEIS.</p>
-----	---------------	-----	--	--	---

Table 5.9.b. Public Comments and Responses: Grand County

Record ID	Commenter	Comment Number	Requires Change	Comment Text	Response To Comment
			Resource		
982	Grand County	1	No	We would like to thank you for including the Grand County Council in the RMP process. It has been a pleasure working with you over the years. Although many challenges were presented, the final product came out extremely well. Thank you for your cooperation and time devoted to this project. We look forward to working closely with you on the future phases of the RMP process.	Thank you.

Table 5.9.c. Public Comments and Responses: San Juan County

Record ID	Commenter	Comment Number	Requires Change	Comment Text	Response to Comment
			Resource		
121	San Juan County	1	No	The BLM's interpretation of the Multiple Use mandate where all uses occur someplace but not together is flawed. Landscapes can be managed so that a broad spectrum of resource uses can create social, economic and ecological wealth simultaneously. Multiple use management results in benefits to various resources. For example, grazing can be a tool to benefit wildlife and their habitats.	In developing land-use plans, the BLM is mandated by FLPMA to observe the principles of multiple use and sustained yield. FLPMA defines multiple use as "the management of the public lands and their various resource values so that they are utilized in the combination that will best meet the present and future needs of the American people...the use of some land for less than all of the resources, a combination of balanced and diverse resource uses that takes into account the long term needs of future generations for renewable and nonrenewable resources...with consideration given to the relative values of the resources and not necessarily to the combination of uses that will give the greatest economic return or the greatest unit output". The final land-use plan for the Moab Field Office will define multiple use for this area.
			Process and Procedures		

Table 5.9.c. Public Comments and Responses: San Juan County

121	San Juan County	2	No	More emphasis should be placed on monitoring the plan decisions both to measure the results of the plan and to insure that actions are taken to incorporate any changes needed. Watershed function, livestock use, recreation, OHV use and wildlife populations are uses that should be monitored more closely. The plan should have greater flexibility to adapt to changing conditions.	The federal regulations at 43 CFR 1610.4-9 require that land-use plans establish intervals and standards and evaluations based on the sensitivity of the resource decisions involved. The Record of Decision (ROD) for the RMP will commit to a monitoring plan the specifics of which will be developed subsequent to the signing of the ROD.
			Process and Procedures		
121	San Juan County	3	No	San Juan County asks for more cooperation and collaboration with local, state, and federal agencies (as well as interest groups) in actions and decisions within the Field Office. Misunderstandings could then be worked out in advance -- in the field rather than the courtroom. Within the framework of this RMP, the BLM should provide more opportunities to facilitate cooperative relationships and foster better collaboration efforts.	The State of Utah, Grand County, and San Juan County are cooperating agencies involved in the preparation of the RMP. The BLM has involved the cooperating agencies in all aspects of the land-use planning process including participation in the interdisciplinary team meetings. Cooperation and collaboration will continue on site specific projects after the RMP is completed and this does not require a plan decision to accomplish.
			Process and Procedures		
121	San Juan County	4	No	San Juan County feels more emphasis should be placed on sustaining and developing healthy watersheds. The functionality of watersheds underlies all resources values. The best way to improve the functionality of watersheds is by increasing the ground cover. Well managed grazing is one of the best, most economical, large scale tools for increasing ground cover.	The BLM actively supports efforts to improve watersheds and is a partner in the Healthy Lands Initiative for Utah. The RMP, under all action alternatives, specifies that restoration efforts be undertaken in cooperation with the Utah Partners for Conservation and Development (pg. 2-50). The RMP, under all alternatives, also specifies that grazing would be managed according to the Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management to meet the Standards for Rangeland Health. Implementation of these standards would improve watershed health and functioning.
			Water Resources		

Table 5.9.c. Public Comments and Responses: San Juan County

121	San Juan County	5	No	San Juan County supports livestock grazing in a prescriptive manner to accelerate progress toward improved rangeland health and reduction of catastrophic fire. The BLM should reassess timing and season of use for grazing.	The BLM Land-use Planning Handbook (H-1601-1) requires the BLM to identify lands available or not available for livestock grazing. This is the only planning decision within the RMP. Decisions concerning timing and season of use are made on an allotment basis using the Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Grazing Management.
			Livestock Grazing		
121	San Juan County	6	No	San Juan County feels that social/economic analysis for livestock grazing is inadequate, as many allotments have been reduced or closed. The county urges BLM to look at grazing on a watershed basis vs. an allotment basis so that livestock operations would have opportunities to be more profitable but also to benefit wildlife and other resources.	Only one livestock allotment is proposed under any alternative for non-availability in San Juan County (Mill Creek: 3,921 acres). Of those proposed for non-availability (including those in Grand County) under Alt C, only Mill Creek is available for grazing now. Most of the other allotments have been unavailable for grazing since 1994, and some since the 1985 Grand RMP. The socioeconomic impacts of lost grazing opportunities is analyzed on pg. 4-258. Decisions concerning numbers of livestock and seasons of use are made on a allotment basis using Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Grazing Management during the permit renewal process.
			Livestock Grazing		
121	San Juan County	7	No	San Juan County supports Alt C for travel management. The county wants the BLM to highlight specific prescriptions to promote responsible use, such as areas that would be highlighted for OHV use, maps, signing, kiosks etc. In addition, BLM does not mention impacts from hikers or mountain bikers.	The RMP proposes many areas to be focus areas or SRMAs emphasizing responsible motorized use. These include Cameo Cliffs SRMA, Gemini Bridges/Poison Spider Mesa Motorized Touring Area, Utah Rims SRMA, Dee Pass Motorized Trail Area, and the Airport Hills Moto Cross Area. These areas are proposed for specialized management emphasizing that activity.
			Travel Management		

Table 5.9.c. Public Comments and Responses: San Juan County

					<p>The RMP would designate these areas but a Recreation Area Management Plan will follow the RMP, where specific prescriptions suggested by the county would be detailed. The Travel Plan (Appendix G, pg. 30) details mapping, signing, and construction of kiosks as actions that would be part of implementation of this Plan.</p> <p>Mountain bikes are restricted to the designated route system under all action alternatives. Impacts of mountain bikes vs. motorized travel were not separated out in the discussion. All impacts of off-route travel were combined for all types of wheeled vehicles. The impacts of hikers were not considered because no decision in this plan requires hikers to stay on trail.</p>
121	San Juan County	8	Yes	<p>BLM erroneously uses the term critical habitat (defined as applicable only to threatened and endangered species). This error occurs on Maps 2-27 B and C/D, on pages 3-169 and 3-171 and on page N-6. The term crucial habitat is used too loosely; UDWR uses crucial habitat as descriptive designations. They are not intended to mislabel resource concerns and result in a limitation of compatible uses. San Juan County disputes the acreage identified for crucial elk and deer winter range in San Juan County and submits information from Dr. Charles Kay in that regard.</p>	<p>Maps 2-27B and C/D refer to the term crucial winter range and the term critical is not used. The term critical is used erroneously on pgs. 3-32, 3-38, 3-39, 3-40, 3-125, 3-127, 3-169, 3-171, 3-174, 3-177, and N-6. This term will be changed to crucial in the final RMP/EIS.</p> <p>The UDWR is the jurisdictional agency for wildlife management within the State. The BLM relied on the expertise of this agency for delineating wildlife habitats, estimating population numbers, and recommending wildlife restrictions.</p> <p>Also, refer to comment response 121-39.</p>
			Wildlife		

Table 5.9.c. Public Comments and Responses: San Juan County

121	San Juan County	9	No	San Juan County is opposed to "layering" or the establishment of ACECs or SRMAs over WSAs or Wild and Scenic Rivers.	<p>"Layering" is planning. Under FLPMA's multiple use mandate, BLM manages many different resource values and uses on public lands. Through land-use planning BLM sets goals and objectives for each of those values and uses, and prescribes actions to accomplish those objectives. Under the multiple use concept, the BLM doesn't necessarily manage every value and use on every acre, but routinely manages many different values and uses on the same areas of public lands. The process of applying many individual program goals, objectives, and actions to the same area of public lands may be perceived as "layering".</p> <p>The BLM strives to ensure that the goals and objectives of each program (representing resource values and uses) are consistent and compatible for a particular land area. Inconsistent goals and objectives can lead to resource conflicts, failure to achieve the desired outcomes of a land-use plan, and litigation. Whether or not a particular form of management is restrictive depends upon a personal interest or desire to see that public lands are managed in a particular manner. All uses and values cannot be provided for on every acre. That is why land-use plans are developed through a public and interdisciplinary process. The interdisciplinary process helps ensure that all resource values and uses can be considered together to determine what mix of values and uses is responsive to the issues identified for resolution in the land-use plan.</p>
			Process and Procedures		

Table 5.9.c. Public Comments and Responses: San Juan County

					<p>Layering of program decisions is not optional for BLM, but is required by the FLPMA and National BLM planning and program specific regulations.</p> <p>FLPMA directs BLM to manage public lands for multiple use and sustained yield (Section 102(a)(7)). As a multiple-use agency, the BLM is required to implement laws, regulations, and policies for many different and often competing land-uses and to resolve conflicts and prescribe land-uses through its land-use plans. BLM's Land-use Planning Handbook requires that specific decisions be made for each resource and use (See, Appendix C, Planning Handbook "H-1601-1"). Specific decisions must be included in each of the alternatives analyzed during development of the land-use plan. As each alternative is formulated, each program decision is overlaid with other program decisions and inconsistent decisions are identified and modified so that ultimately a compatible mix of uses and management prescriptions result.</p> <p>For example, the BLM has separate policies and guidelines as well as criteria for establishing Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACECs) as when the Wilderness Study Areas (WSAs) were established. These differing criteria make it possible that the same lands will qualify for both an ACEC and a WSA but for different reasons. The BLM is required to consider these different policies.</p> <p>The values protected by WSA management prescription do not necessarily protect those values found relevant and important in ACEC evaluation, and vice versa.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

Table 5.9.c. Public Comments and Responses: San Juan County

					<p>The relevant and important values of ACECs within or adjacent to WSAs were noted in the ACEC evaluation (Appendix I). The ACECs are evaluated and ranked based on the presence or absence of the stated relevant and important values. None of these values include wilderness characteristics. Additionally, the management prescriptions for the ACEC are limited in scope to protect the relevant and important values and the BLM maintains that the size of the ACEC areas is appropriate to the relevant and important values identified.</p> <p>SRMAs are not restrictive of resource uses but rather are utilized to control recreation use. The South Moab SRMA does overlay the Mill Creek and the Behind the Rocks ACECs, but the management proposed in each is for differing purposes.</p> <p>Please see Response 120-64</p>
121	San Juan County	10	No	<p>Managing Non-WSA Lands for so-called wilderness characteristics violates FLPMA, Utah Code 63-38d-401(6)(b), the San Juan County master plan, the Norton-Leavitt Agreement and other agreements.</p>	<p>The BLM's authority for managing lands to protect or enhance wilderness characteristics is derived directly from FLPMA Section 202 (43 U.S.C. §1712).</p> <p>This section of BLM's organic statute gives the Secretary of the Interior authority to manage public lands for multiple use and sustained yield.</p> <p>Nothing in this section constrains the Secretary's authority to manage lands as necessary to "achieve integrated consideration of physical, biological, economic, and other sciences." (FLPMA, Section 202(c)(2) (43 U.S.C. §1712(c)(2)))</p> <p>Further, FLPMA makes it clear that the term</p>

Table 5.9.c. Public Comments and Responses: San Juan County

			<p>Non-WSA lands and Wilderness Characteristics</p>	<p>"multiple use" means that not every use is appropriate for every acre of public land, and that the Secretary can "make the most judicious use of the land for some or all of these resources or related services over areas large enough to provide sufficient latitude for periodic adjustments in use. . . ." (FLPMA, Section 103(c) (43 U.S.C. §1702(c))) The FLPMA intended for the Secretary of the Interior to use land-use planning as a mechanism for allocating resource use, including wilderness character management, amongst the various resources in a way that provides uses for current and future generations.</p> <p>The BLM has long acknowledged that FLPMA Section 603 (43 U.S.C. §1782) requiring a one-time wilderness review has expired. All current inventory of public lands is authorized by FLPMA Section 201 (43 U.S.C. §1711). In September 2006, the Utah District Court affirmed that the BLM retained authority to protect lands it determined to have wilderness characteristics in a manner substantially similar to the manner in which such lands are protected as WSAs.</p> <p>The BLM is aware that there are specific State laws relevant to aspects of public land management that are discrete from, and independent of, Federal law.</p> <p>However, BLM is bound by Federal law. As a consequence, there may be inconsistencies that cannot be reconciled. The FLPMA requires that BLM's land-use plans be consistent with State and local plans "to the extent practical" where State and local plans conflict with Federal law there will be an inconsistency that cannot be resolved. The</p>
--	--	--	---	--

Table 5.9.c. Public Comments and Responses: San Juan County

					<p>BLM will identify these conflicts in the FEIS/PRMP so that the State and local governments have a complete understanding of the impacts of the PRMP on State and local management options.</p> <p>Finally, the Utah v. Norton Settlement Agreement does not affect BLM's authority to manage public lands. This Agreement merely remedied confusion by distinguishing between wilderness study areas established under FLPMA §603 and those lands required to be managed under §603's non-impairment standard, and other lands that fall within the discretionary FLMPA §202 land management process.</p>
121	San Juan County	11	No Adequacy and Analysis	<p>In the analysis of the impacts for the Draft RMP/EIS, almost all the impacts are attributable to OHV use, oil and gas use, and, to some extent, grazing. The underlying theme is that these 3 things are the cause of all negative impacts and if they are eliminated or controlled then everything else is take care of. The BLM should consider cheat grass and juniper encroachment, invasive weed problems, and catastrophic fires. The BLM should utilize livestock to control invasive plants.</p>	<p>In the Draft RMP/EIS surface-disturbing activities are considered potential negative impacts to natural and cultural resources. On page C-1, surface-disturbing activities are defined. Surface-disturbing activities include, among many other things, oil and gas development and cross country OHV use. Neither grazing nor vehicle travel on vehicular routes are defined as surface-disturbing activities.</p> <p>On pg. 2-50 in decisions common to all action alternatives, the BLM specifies controlling and reducing invasive and noxious weed species. Vegetation treatments areas for piñon-juniper area are identified on pg. 2-14.</p> <p>On an allotment basis, Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Grazing Management could be utilized to control invasive species.</p>
121	San Juan	12	Yes	San Juan County commends the BLM for the	The BLM has reviewed the Utah State

Table 5.9.c. Public Comments and Responses: San Juan County

	County		Socioeconomics	<p>effort that has been expended to better understand and portray socioeconomic impacts in this DRMP. This has been a weakness in previous plans. San Juan County encourages BLM to use studies done by Utah's universities to enhance this information such as the social survey undertaken by USU and the economic studies done by the U of U. Every NEPA action in the RMP should include a discussion on socioeconomic conditions and fully disclose all impacts.</p>	<p>University survey of rural counties conducted by the State of Utah. The BLM has received preliminary data from this study received after completion of the Draft RMP/FEIS. The BLM has incorporated findings in the PRMP/FEIS as appropriate.</p> <p>The BLM has incorporated findings from recent research completed by the University of Utah's Bureau of Economic and Business Research into the PRMP/FEIS.</p> <p>On a broad land-use planning level, the BLM has disclosed the socioeconomic impacts from various resource actions as discussed in Chapter 4 of the DRMP/FEIS. It is not practical to separate out the socioeconomic impacts of the many resource decisions specified in the plan.</p>
121	San Juan County	13	<p>No</p> <hr/> <p>Livestock Grazing</p>	<p>San Juan County is opposed to relinquishment of preference or retirement of grazing rights in favor of conservation (p. 2-12). BLM should clarify goals in encouraging relinquishment and what would happen to voluntarily relinquished AUMs if BLM proposes to retire AUMs. What mechanism would be used to retire grazing rights?</p>	<p>The BLM does not encourage or discourage relinquishment of grazing preference. The BLM policy concerning the voluntary relinquishment of grazing preference is included on pg. 2-12 of the DRMP/FEIS. As stated in this policy, relinquished permits and the associated preference would remain available for application by qualified applicants</p> <p>after the BLM considers if such action would meet rangeland health standards and is compatible with achieving land-use plan goals and objectives. Upon voluntary relinquishment, the BLM may determine through site specific evaluation and associated NEPA analysis that the public lands involved</p> <p>are better used for other purposes... any decision issued concerning discontinuous of</p>

Table 5.9.c. Public Comments and Responses: San Juan County

					livestock grazing is not permanent and may be reconsidered and changed through future land-use plan amendments.
121	San Juan County	14	No Livestock Grazing	Alternatives B and C should not favor a single use regarding vegetation treatments, but should benefit multiple use objectives (p. 2-14).	In the Draft RMP/EIS (pg. 2-14), Alt D specifically favors livestock grazing in conducting vegetation treatments. Alt C specifies vegetation treatments that would benefit multiple use objectives including livestock grazing and wildlife as well as watershed health. Alt B specifies vegetation treatments to benefit wildlife, watershed, soils, and riparian health. Multiple use is defined by FLPMA as 1) the use of some land for less than all of the resources, and 2) a combination of balanced and diverse resource uses that takes into account the long term needs of future generations for renewable and nonrenewable resources.
121	San Juan County	15	No Minerals Oil and Gas	BLM should give due consideration to the most efficient program for the development of oil and gas resources in favor of exclusionary management for other uses. BLM is using exclusionary management for non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics, ACECs and wildlife areas.	Alt B of the Draft RMP/EIS favors the protection of resources over the extraction of mineral development. Alt D favors mineral development over protection of resources. Alt C is designed to be a balance between mineral development and protection of resources. There are no "exclusionary areas" proposed in the Draft RMP/EIS for Alt C within San Juan County for oil and gas. There are no ACECs or non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics proposed for Alt C within San Juan County. Only timing restrictions for wildlife are proposed in Alt C within San Juan County.

Table 5.9.c. Public Comments and Responses: San Juan County

121	San Juan County	16	Yes	The socioeconomic analysis for oil and gas is inadequate. A study in Uintah County found that oil and gas account for 60% of total wages, with the average wage of an oil worker at \$84,795.	On pg. 4-264 of the Draft RMP/EIS it is stated that employment related to oil and gas development would be less under Alt B. The effects on employment and wages have been added to Chapter 4 of the PRMP/EIS.
			Socioeconomics		
121	San Juan County	17	Yes	Please explain how the extremely restrictive Alt. B would have only slightly lower economic benefits. Many of the new restrictions on oil and gas proposed in this RMP are not warranted. BLM should make reasonable adjustments in the preferred alternative.	The fiscal impacts have been described in Table 2.2 on pg. 2-78 (DRMP/EIS) in terms of royalty revenue. This table shows that royalty revenues will be reduced by 50% in Alt B. In addition property tax revenue, and severance tax data have been added to the table for the PRMP/FEIS and likewise show a 50% reduction in revenues in Alt B as compared to Alt C.
			Socioeconomics		
121	San Juan County	18	No	BLM should not manage lands for wilderness characteristics, taking into account the Utah v. Norton settlement, the opinions of local governments and residents, the existence of inholdings and valid existing rights, and the existence of SITLA lands. BLM has ignored county travel route and intrusion information in the 1999 wilderness inventory. BLM should clarify the difference between "natural", "largely natural", and "generally natural", and define "allotment files" and "master title plat data".	Refer to response to comment 121-10. No non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics are proposed for management in Alt C for San Juan County. County travel route information was utilized in the Travel Plan and in the selection of non-WSA lands for the preferred alternative. For impacts to SITLA lands refer to response to comments 120-101 and 120-103. The terms specified for clarification are taken from the 1999 Wilderness Inventory and cannot be changed at this time.
			Wilderness Characteristics		
121	San Juan County	19	No	Will future "recreation area management plans" and "river management plans" be subject to NEPA. What is the process for developing and approving these plans?	After completion of the RMP process, those SRMAs that do not currently have RAMPs will need to develop a site specific RAMP, subject to full compliance with the NEPA. The process is identical for River Management Plans.
			Recreation		

Table 5.9.c. Public Comments and Responses: San Juan County

121	San Juan County	20	Yes	The Draft RMP/EIS states that where a specific focus area is not identified with a Special Recreation Management Area, the focus of that area is motorized, backcountry touring on designated roads. This statement appears to indicate that those portions of SRMAs that are not subject to a more specific focus area will be managed to emphasize motorize recreation. This appears inconsistent with designating SRMAs to emphasize non-motorized recreation and mountain bike backcountry touring. Please also explain how management of focus areas specifically designated for "motorized backcountry touring" would differ from the default management of SRMA for motorized backcountry touring.	See response to the State of Utah's comment 120-67.
			Recreation		
121	San Juan County	21	Yes	The Draft RMP/EIS makes repeated reference to "destination SRMAs" (pg. 2-19). Please explain what a "destination SRMA" is and how such areas would be managed.	See response to the State of Utah's comment 120-68.
			Recreation		
121	San Juan County	22	No	The Mill Creek Canyon Potential ACEC. San Juan County is opposed to protecting wilderness characteristics and layering. Alt. D best describes this unit.	Alt C proposes no management to protect wilderness or wilderness characteristics within the Mill Creek Potential ACEC. Of the 3,721 acres in this ACEC in Alt C, 1,474 acres are within San Juan County. Alt. B contains 295 acres of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics within San Juan County. Of these acres, all are within the Mill Creek Potential ACEC as outlined in Alt. B.
			Areas of Critical Environmental Concern		

Table 5.9.c. Public Comments and Responses: San Juan County

121	San Juan County	23	No	Alternatives B and C propose to "maintain 3cfs in the South Fork of Mill Creek below the Shelly diversion" (pg. 2-37). Please explain whether BLM possess a water right applicable to this area, how BLM would maintain this level of flow at the Shelly diversion, how it would prevent appropriation of instream flows below this point, and who would hold instream flow rights.	See response to comment 120-109.
			Water Resources		
121	San Juan County	24	No	Wilson Arch Potential ACEC. This should be dropped in all alternatives because of surrounding private land. The area should be VRM Class III in all alternatives. The arch should be protected with a hiking trail up to it.	The Wilson Arch Potential ACEC is proposed only in Alt. B. The potential ACEC meets the relevance criteria and must be included in 1 alternative. The area is managed as VRM II in Alt C, providing protection to the arch, and managed as VRM III in Alt. D, providing virtually no protection to the arch.
			Areas of Critical Environmental Concern		
121	San Juan County	25	No	Southwestern Willow Flycatcher. What is their habitat? There is no map provided.	The Southwestern Willow Flycatcher is an endangered species; the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service has not mapped their critical habitat within the Moab Field Office boundaries. The USFWS defines their breeding habitat as dense riparian tree and shrub communities associated with rivers, swamps, and other wetlands (USFWS Recovery Plan, Southwestern Willow Flycatcher).
			Special Status Species		
121	San Juan County	26	No	Are there any Gunnison sage-grouse leks within the MPA? Will the restrictions be imposed whether or not the grouse are present?	There are currently no Gunnison sage-grouse leks or occupancy within the MPA. On page 2-47, the Draft RMP/EIS states: "If sage-grouse occupancy is identified, the stipulations would be imposed as follows:" Thus, stipulations would only be imposed if the grouse are present.
			Special Status Species		

Table 5.9.c. Public Comments and Responses: San Juan County

121	San Juan County	27	No	VRM Management appears to be the same for Alts C and D within San Juan County. San Juan County would like Shafer Basin managed as VRM I, Mill Creek managed as VRM II and the rest of San Juan County managed the same as Alt. A. BLM should adjust Alt. C.	Alts C and D are not identical within San Juan County, with 15,326 acres managed as VRM I, 65,273 acres of VRM II, 116,101 acres of VRM III, and 96,471 acres of VRM IV within the county in Alt C and 6,316 acres of VRM I, 42,887 acres of VRM II, 147,496 acres of VRM III and 96,471 acres of VRM IV within the county in Alt D. In Alt C, Shafer Basin is managed as VRM I, and the areas around Mill Creek are managed as VRM II. The 1985 Grand RMP did not manage for VRM. However, in 2002, a plan amendment was completed for the Canyon Rim Recreation Area, which is managed as VRM II and III. All WSAs, including Behind the Rocks WSA within San Juan County, are managed as VRM I. However, in Alt A, the remainder of San Juan County has no VRM management. This is not an option for the revised RMP.
			Visual Resource Management		
121	San Juan County	28	No	San Juan County disputes the acreage identified for crucial elk and deer winter range in San Juan County. San Juan County asks that Alt. A coverage be used for deer and elk winter range. Prescriptions should be added to the alternatives to allow for collaborative monitoring and studies conducted that will allow for habitat designations to be biologically and scientifically based.	The BLM relied on UDWR, the agency with jurisdictional expertise regarding deer and elk. In the 1985 Grand RMP, the BLM did not impose restrictions on the entire deer and/or elk habitat (approximately 110,000 acres) delineated by UDWR within San Juan County. Restrictions were only imposed on about 4,000 acres of this habitat. A prescription in the alternatives is not necessary in order to allow for collaborative monitoring and studies.
			Wildlife		
121	San Juan County	29	Yes	The term "critical" is used inappropriately for wildlife habitats on the following pages: p. 3-38, 3-39, 3-169 (in Table 3.52), 3-171. Critical is used only for 'sensitive species' habitat.	These terms have been corrected in Chapter 3 of the PRMP/FEIS.
			Wildlife		

Table 5.9.c. Public Comments and Responses: San Juan County

121	San Juan County	30	No	"Competition between deer and livestock" (pg. 3-38) is used inappropriately because both livestock and deer should be managed under an allocation system for both.	This statement is only intended to clarify the uses occurring on the Between the Creeks allotment.
			Wildlife		
121	San Juan County	31	No	With over 300,000 vehicles per year, are there conflicts between people and habitat for desert bighorn, bald eagle, SWWF, T and E fish, peregrine falcon and other sensitive raptors; since the RMP states that there are conflicts between people and livestock on the Professor Valley, River and Ida Gulch allotments (pg-3-39).	The conflicts between the vehicles and the livestock are in the form of vehicle collisions with cattle. Utah State Highway 128 does not cross desert bighorn habitat, and there have been no collisions between vehicles and the other species listed.
			Livestock Grazing		
121	San Juan County	32	Yes	There is a discrepancy between Tables 3.56 and 3.57 on DWR population objectives for elk. BLM should clarify or correct this. San Juan County questions the accuracy of DWR's elk counts.	Tables 3.56 and 3.57 have been changed to correct the discrepancies.
			Wildlife		
121	San Juan County	33	Yes	BLM should remove the crucial winter range for elk in San Juan County, including all prescriptions, impacts, environmental consequences, etc. from the DRMP (pg. 3-173).	Throughout the DRMP/EIS, the reference to "deer and elk habitat" has been replaced with "deer and/or elk" habitat. Since the prescriptions and environmental consequences for the two animals are very similar, the habitats were considered together.
			Wildlife		
121	San Juan County	34	Yes	Pronghorn do not use piñon-juniper habitat. Correct this inconsistency in Table 4.138 on page 4-442.	Pronghorn do utilize piñon juniper habitat occasionally but their primary habitat is sagebrush/perennial grass. This has been corrected in Table 4.138.
			Wildlife		

Table 5.9.c. Public Comments and Responses: San Juan County

121	San Juan County	35	No	BLM has presented no data that would justify range extensions for mule deer, elk, bighorn sheep or antelope. BLM assumes that habitat is the most important factor limiting ungulate populations, but data from studies indicate that numbers are limited by predation.	UDWR is the agency with jurisdictional authority for mule deer, bighorn sheep, elk, and antelope. The BLM relies on the UDWR for their expertise regarding habitats. The BLM does not have any authority to regulate predation.
			Wildlife		
121	San Juan County	36	No	Much of the area listed as antelope/kidding habitat on Map 2-25 is seldom actually used by antelope. The failure of antelope to increase in numbers are due to factors other than habitat, such as low fences in the southern end of the area and predation. Unless BLM can produce data showing that the area is heavily used by antelope, multiple use activities should not be restricted.	The BLM has not restricted multiple use activities due to the existence of antelope habitat in San Juan County. A minor timing restriction (45 days) for surface-disturbing activities is imposed on antelope habitat during kidding periods. This timing restriction is within the standard operating procedures for oil and gas activities. UDWR is the agency with jurisdictional authority for predator control. The DRMP/EIS states on pg. 2-53 "Construct fences that allow for pronghorn passage and dismantle unneeded fences" in pronghorn habitat.
			Wildlife		
121	San Juan County	37	No	BLM proposes an increase in bighorn sheep habitat over that proposed in the 1985 RMP. Much of the area proposed is seldom visited by bighorns, as they are never far from escape terrain. Studies have shown that hikers have a greater negative impact on desert bighorns than do motorized users. Predation is the key limiting factor on bighorn, an issue not addressed in the DEIS.	Only the Shafer Basin (within San Juan County) was proposed as bighorn habitat in 1985. The addition of bighorn habitat delineated by UDWR within San Juan County is along the rims of Canyon Rims, and in the Hatch Wash area. The majority of the bighorn habitat is within 0.5 to 1 mile from escape terrain. The BLM is aware of the studies that document the impact of hikers on bighorn sheep. Permitted hiking is restricted on a case by case basis within bighorn habitat under the issuance of Special Recreation Permits as stated on pg. 2-30 of the DRMP/EIS. UDWR is the agency with jurisdictional authority for predator control.
			Wildlife		

Table 5.9.c. Public Comments and Responses: San Juan County

121	San Juan County	38	Yes	BLM has combined deer and elk habitat throughout the analysis. This should be corrected for the following reasons: habitat manipulations that favor elk do not benefit mule deer; elk are above herd objective and need to be reduced; combining habitats is a way to increase elk numbers; BLM ignores the fact that elk will displace mule deer; elk and deer respond differently to development and human use, with elk being more easily displaced than deer; Monticello BLM maps deer and elk habitat separately; there is no elk use on BLM land that BLM wants to classify as "crucial habitat" in San Juan County	<p>The BLM combined deer and elk habitat for the purposes of analysis. On pg. 4-442, the DRMP/EIS states "Mule deer and elk habitat have been combined in an attempt to simplify the management of their closely overlapping ranges...Further discussions and analyses will consider the two species together". The BLM chose to map deer and/or elk habitat on the same map to simplify readability. In the PRMP/FEIS the habitats will be delineated separately on a map.</p> <p>However, throughout the PRMP/EIS the wording has been changed from "deer and elk" to "deer and/or elk". The BLM acknowledges that elk are not found on every acre of deer habitat. The land-use plan provides for broad landscape level planning prescriptions. These habitats will be separated for analyses on a site specific project level. UDWR has the jurisdictional authority for population objectives of big game species.</p>
			Wildlife		
121	San Juan County	39	No	The 1985 Grand RMP designated only a small area near the LaSal Mountains as habitat for mule deer. The BLM wants to propose an increase with no justification. San Juan County's study (undertaken in the Spring of 2006) found little mule deer use south of East Coyote Wash. BLM ignored these data. Additionally, there is virtually no elk use, except at Lackey Fan and on Three Step Hill. Calling the area deer and elk winter range is without merit. BLM should produce data south of East Coyote Wash to show that this is crucial deer or elk winter range.	UDWR has the jurisdictional authority for the identification of deer and elk habitat. The BLM relied on this expertise. As stated in response to comment 121-38, the BLM has corrected the wording of the habitats to read "deer and/or elk habitats".
			Wildlife		

Table 5.9.c. Public Comments and Responses: San Juan County

121	San Juan County	40	No	BLM should not use the phrase "a thriving natural ecological balance" because it does not know what "natural" is (p. 2-5). On Map 2-20, "historic habitat" for sage-grouse is identified as "pre-settlement" habitat. San Juan county has been settled for 10,000 years.	<p>The statement on pg. 2-5 is a simple statement directed to the general public that the BLM attempts to develop management prescriptions on a landscape level which will support and protect wildlife habitats while allowing for multiple use.</p> <p>Pre-settlement habitat of sage-grouse is defined on pg. 34 of the Gunnison Sage-grouse Range Wide Conservation Plan. The term pre-settlement in this document refers to the early 19th century.</p>
			Wildlife		
121	San Juan County	41	No	Page 2-50: BLM says it will "work in coordination with UDWR to reduce wildlife numbers as necessary to restore sagebrush habitat." BLM does not do this. The factor most responsible for the decline of sagebrush is browsing by mule deer, not drought.	UDWR is the agency with jurisdictional authority for wildlife population numbers. The DRMP/EIS states that BLM will work with UDWR to achieve the UDWR goals.
			Wildlife		
121	San Juan County	42	No	Page 3-168. The species name for elk is <i>Cervus elaphus</i> , not <i>Cervus canadensis</i> .	UDWR lists elk as <i>Cervus canadensis</i> and this nomenclature was adopted by the BLM in the DRMP/EIS.
			Wildlife		
121	San Juan County	43	Yes	Page 3-169 - 171. Mule deer do not eat dry and dead grass during the winter. Predation, not drought, is the reason for reduced mule deer numbers. ATV's, oil and gas development, mining, livestock grazing do not have the impact that predators have had on mule deer populations. Predation must be discussed in the Draft RMP/EIS.	<p>The BLM stands by the statement on pg. 3-169 that mule deer will eat dead grass during the winter.</p> <p>Predation, although not within the BLM's jurisdiction, can also contribute to mule deer population declines. This has been added to Chapter 3 of the PRMP/FEIS.</p>
			Wildlife		

Table 5.9.c. Public Comments and Responses: San Juan County

121	San Juan County	44	No	Page 3-171. BLM states that 90% of the local deer and elk population is located on BLM during an average of five winters out of ten. These data must be produced. On p. 3-172, DWR herd objectives and population estimates for elk are listed. These are imaginary numbers. DWR's elk population estimates are consistently 30-40% low because the agency ignores scientific studies. BLM should acknowledge the error of DWR's estimates.	The BLM has relied on information provided by the UDWR for elk and deer populations and habitat in the DRMP/EIS. UDWR is the agency with jurisdictional authority on these matters.
			Wildlife		
121	San Juan County	45	Yes	Page 3-173. BLM states that "livestock competition for forage is increasing as the elk herd numbers continue to grow." Forage was allocated to livestock when the allotments were adjudicated; thus, the problem is the increasing elk herd.	The BLM has reworded the sentence on pg. 3-173 to state that forage competition between livestock, other wildlife, and elk is increasing in the Cisco desert.
			Wildlife		
121	San Juan County	46	Yes	Page 3-173. Elk use in Hatch Point is zero, in Lisbon Valley and on most of Black Ridge it is near zero. The agency has no data to support its assertions.	Deer and elk habitats were combined for mapping purposes. As stated in response to comment 121-38, these habitats have been delineated separately on a map.
			Wildlife		
121	San Juan County	47	No	Table 3.58. BLM's age objectives for antelope make no sense. Antelope do not normally live to 14, and an age objective of 2 means the herd is under extreme harvest pressure, which is not the case.	This information was provided by the UDWR which is the agency with jurisdictional authority.
			Wildlife		
121	San Juan County	48	No	What evidence is there that desert bighorns actually use the Redd Sheep Trail?	Pellets from bighorn have been gathered from the Redd Sheep Trail; tracks have also been seen on it, as well as extensively along the rims accessed by this trail.
			Wildlife		

Table 5.9.c. Public Comments and Responses: San Juan County

121	San Juan County	49	No	Mule deer, elk and pronghorn do not utilize piñon-juniper habitat, as is asserted in the DEIS. There is no need to protect piñon or juniper; there is the need to clear them to restore natural conditions. Maintenance of chainings must specifically be addressed in the RMP.	See response to comment 121-34. Pronghorn use has been noted in areas where piñon-juniper interfaces with shrub-steppe/grasslands. These piñon-juniper areas are utilized for thermal protection. The DRMP/EIS (pg. 2-14) recognizes the need for maintaining vegetation treatments to increase the availability of forage. Many of these treatments involved the removal of piñon-juniper.
			Wildlife		
121	San Juan County	50	No	Page 4-449. Cattle do not eat sagebrush; cattle grazing at the proper time of year can improve sagebrush habitat for mule deer. Livestock do not compete for escape terrain or thermal cover with deer and elk.	Although cattle prefer grass, they will eat sagebrush when necessary. For example, during severe winters cattle may not be able to access grass and as a result they are forced to eat sage brush. During summer months cattle will seek the shade along the edge of piñon-juniper interfaces with sagebrush/grassland. These are areas that deer typically occupy for thermal protection and escape terrain.
			Wildlife		

Table 5.9.c. Public Comments and Responses: San Juan County

121	San Juan County	51	No	Page 4-452. BLM mentions that elk are intolerant of cattle, which is true, but the BLM fails to mention that mule deer are intolerant of elk. The DEIS needs to discuss elk-deer competition. BLM needs to discuss the negative impact deer browsing has on sagebrush.	UDWR is the agency with jurisdictional authority for big game populations. Elk and deer competition must be addressed by UDWR population objectives. Sagebrush communities across the west have been in decline from a myriad of reasons. The BLM Sagebrush Conservation Guidance is prescribed as management common to all action alternatives on pg. 2-50 of the DRMP/EIS. UDWR has not identified overpopulation issues among local deer herds utilizing sagebrush communities.
			Wildlife		
121	San Juan County	52	No	Pages 4-483 and 4-484. Sections 4.3.19.18.2.1 and 4.3.19.18.2.2 erroneously assess the impact of habitat fragmentation on mule deer and elk. BLM's analyses are flawed and should be corrected or removed. Sawyer's 2006 study is not applicable to San Juan County. DWR's study plots are near roads and DWR would not locate its plots close to roads if mule deer and elk use was reduced near roads as claimed by BLM.	The fragmentation analyses in the referenced sections are not an attempt to quantify specific impacts from site specific projects but are presented to analyze the degree of habitat fragmentation under each alternative. GIS models were based on the BLM's best available data. These models address fragmentation differences between alternatives on a landscape level. Habitat fragmentation is one of many factors that play an important role in land management decisions.
			Wildlife		
121	San Juan County	53	No	Pages 4-484 to 4-485. BLM's analysis of bighorn sheep fragmentation is flawed (p. 4-484- 4-485). BLM fails to mention that hikers disturb sheep more than do vehicles. Predation should also be mentioned, as should the dense growth of non-native woody riparian vegetation found along the Colorado River.	As stated in response to comment 121-52, the analysis of habitat fragmentation for bighorn sheep is a tool to understand the differences in fragmentation among alternatives. See response to comment 121-37 for a discussion of hikers on bighorn sheep. Predation is under the jurisdiction of UDWR. Tamarisk encroachment along the Colorado River was not raised as an issue in the Draft RMP/EIS.
			Wildlife		

Table 5.9.c. Public Comments and Responses: San Juan County

					However, the BLM recognizes the need for bighorn watering catchments, and has an active program of wildlife watering projects.
121	San Juan County	54	No Wildlife	Page G-25 (last paragraph). What reduces the survival rate of fawns and calves is predation.	BLM does not manage predation efforts; UDWR is the agency with jurisdictional authority over predation.
121	San Juan County	55	No Wildlife	Page N-5. BLM's 1989 RMP amendment gave 1,440 as the "prior stable number" of desert bighorn sheep. On p. 3-176, it states that the DWR's population objective for the Moab area is 450 desert bighorn sheep. Why are these numbers different?	The number of 1,440 was used in the 1989 RMP amendment. The number 450 is an updated number utilized in the DRMP/EIS (2007). The difference is a reflection of the number of years between the two documents (18 years).
121	San Juan County	56	Yes Special Status Species	Bald Eagles are not on the Federal Endangered Species List. The animal was removed last June.	The delisting of the Bald Eagle had not occurred prior to the printing of the DRMP/EIS. This change has been made to the PRMP/FEIS.
121	San Juan County	57	No Process and Procedures	BLM has not coordinated with local Native American governments regarding wilderness planning, as is required in Section 202 of FLPMA. Anything less than the opportunity for full participation will be considered a violation of law subject to legal action.	During the development of the DRMP, the BLM invited the affected tribal governments to fully participate in the RMP process, to consult on any aspect of the RMP's management prescriptions or actions, and to provide comments or issues of tribal concern. As outlined in Chapter 5 of the Moab DRMP/EIS, the BLM held several meetings with tribal governments concerning the development of the RMP, including holding additional meeting after the DRMP/EIS alternatives were prepared, as requested by the tribal governments. All consulted tribes were provided copies of the alternatives and draft documents.

Table 5.9.c. Public Comments and Responses: San Juan County

					<p>For example, the BLM held several meetings with the Navajo Nation. The BLM met with the Navajo Utah Commission on February 11, 2004, and with the Navajo Nation Historic Preservation Office on December 9, 2003, and on November 13, 2006. The BLM also met with the Southern Ute Tribe on March 30, 2004, and on October 11, 2006; meetings with the Ute Mountain Ute Tribe were held on August 26, 2004, and on February 9, 2007.</p> <p>A summary of tribal consultation, including all meetings with tribal governments and issues raised is contained in Chapter 5 of the DRMP/EIS. A complete record of the consultations is available in the Administrative Record for the DRMP/EIS.</p>
121	San Juan County	58	<p>No Wilderness Characteristics</p>	<p>For lands in question in the wilderness re-inventory, BLM has not adequately considered historical uses of the land, present and potential future uses of the land. Several court cases show that the wilderness planning process fails to adequately address several issues. Wilderness is a land classification and not a management modality. Wilderness is not within the scope of multiple use management. BLM is a rogue agency because it has a single-minded, headlong thrust to declare additional wilderness study areas within San Juan County. BLM has openly and brazenly defied the will of congress and the will of the people. BLM must coordinate with local plans, such as that of San Juan County</p>	<p>No lands are proposed to be managed as Wilderness or WSA in any alternative of the DRMP/EIS. However, the impacts of protecting Non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics is fully disclosed in Chapter 4 of the DRMP/EIS. The FLPMA makes it clear that the term "multiple use" means that not every use is appropriate for every acre of public land and that the Secretary can "make the most judicious use of the land for some or all of these resources or related services over areas large enough to provide sufficient latitude for periodic adjustments in use. . . ." (FLPMA, Section 103© (43 U.S.C. §1702©).) The FLPMA intended for the Secretary of the Interior to use land-use planning as a mechanism for allocating resource use, including wilderness character management, amongst the various resources in a way that provides uses for current and future generations.</p>

Table 5.9.c. Public Comments and Responses: San Juan County

121	San Juan County	59	No	BLM has refused to issue oil and gas leases because of the introduction of H.R. 1500, "America' Red Rock Wilderness"	Certain oil and gas parcels were deferred from leasing pending completion of the Moab RMP because of dated NEPA analysis. The BLM does not manage public land based on pending draft or proposed legislation.
			Wilderness Characteristics		
121	San Juan County	60	No	BLM must have public hearings, adequate notice and opportunity to comment upon, and participate in the formulation of plans and programs. There have only been two meetings to give the public an opportunity for clarification, and it was unclear whether the meetings held were "open houses" or "public hearings".	Public participation opportunities are detailed in Chapter 5 of the DRMP/EIS. To satisfy the public participation requirements of FLPMA, the BLM initiated the public scoping process on June 4, 2003 and the scoping period extended until January 31, 2004. Six open houses and a comment cruiser were utilized to gather public input as well as a website with provisions for emailing comments and an invitation to provide written comments via letters. A mailing list has been established of interested parties and a planning website has been maintained throughout the process. The public was invited to review and comment on the DRMP/EIS from August 27, 2007 to November 30, 2007. Four open houses were held to solicit comments from the public on the DRMP/EIS. The public was notified about the open houses through newspaper advertisements and articles, radio announcements, the RMP website, and postcards mailed to everyone on the mailing list. The open house format was utilized because it is more conducive to full public participation.
			Process and Procedures		
121	San Juan County	61	No	BLM must make a clear statement of whether it intends to designate WSAs for those areas that have wilderness character.	The BLM is not authorized to designate "Non-WSA Lands with Wilderness Characteristics" as WSAs or manage these lands under the WSA Interim Management Policy (IMP, H-8550-1; BLM 1995).
			Wilderness Characteristics		

Table 5.9.c. Public Comments and Responses: San Juan County

					<p>The BLM authority to establish new WSAs pursuant to Section 603 of FLPMA expired no later than October 21, 1993, therefore as stated on pg. 1-12 of the Moab DRMP/EIS designation of new wilderness areas or WSA proposals are decisions outside of the scope of the DRMP/EIS.</p>
121	San Juan County	62	No	<p>BLM should have a more generous road set-back. The BLM "standard" is indefensible. It provides no reasonable or rational opportunity for maintenance of roads. The BLM's boundaries are at man made barriers, which has resulted in capturing large chunks of State Trust land as well as some parcels of private land. This violates the County Comprehensive Plan which calls for no net loss of private land within the county.</p>	<p>The road set-back described by San Juan County only applies to roads within or adjacent to WSAs. The WSA setback is established by National BLM policy and is beyond the scope of the plan.</p> <p>Routes adjacent to or within Non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics have been accorded setbacks varying according to the classification of the road. These setbacks range from 3 to 91 meters. The acreage of Non-WSA areas with wilderness characteristics has been reduced to realize these setbacks. Information has been added to Chapter 3 of the PRMP/FEIS to clarify these setbacks.</p> <p>The BLM is aware that there are specific County and State plan decisions relevant to aspects of public land management that are discrete from, and independent of, Federal law. However, the BLM is bound by Federal law. As a consequence, where State and local plans conflict with Federal law there will be an inconsistency that cannot be resolved or reconciled. The FLPMA requires that BLM's land-use plans be consistent with State and local plans "to the extent practical" where State and local plans conflict with Federal law there</p>
			Wilderness Characteristics		

Table 5.9.c. Public Comments and Responses: San Juan County

					will be an inconsistency that cannot be resolved. The BLM will identify these conflicts in the FEIS/PRMP so that the State and local governments have a complete understanding of the impacts of the PRMP on State and local management options.
121	San Juan County	63	No Wilderness Characteristics	San Juan County objects to the 1996-99 Wilderness Character Re-inventory process. FLPMA does not provide for wilderness as a multiple use.	The BLM is required by FLPMA to maintain inventories of all resources and to use the inventory information during land-use planning (FLPMA Section 201 and 202 (43 U.S.C. §1711-1712)). The FLPMA makes it clear that the term "multiple use" means that not every use is appropriate for every acre of public land and that the Secretary can "make the most judicious use of the land for some or all of these resources or related services over areas large enough to provide sufficient latitude for periodic adjustments in use. . . ." (FLPMA, Section 103(c) (43 U.S.C. §1702(c))) The FLPMA intended for the Secretary of the Interior to use land-use planning as a mechanism for allocating resource use, including wilderness character management, amongst the various resources in a way that provides uses for current and future generations. See also responses to comments 120-8 and 121-10.
121	San Juan County	64	No Wilderness Characteristics	BLM did not make information public regarding the impact of additional WSA designations.	The DRMP/EIS proposes no lands for additional WSA designation. The document identifies non-WSA lands that are proposed to be managed to maintain their wilderness characteristics.

Table 5.9.c. Public Comments and Responses: San Juan County

					There are 26,162 acres of such lands within San Juan County in Alt B, and none in the Preferred Alternative, Alt C. All of the information that was utilized in making these determinations is publicly available, and any information which is not on the Moab RMP website will be provided to any interested party.
121	San Juan County	65	No Wilderness Characteristics	BLM must consider all grazing files, mineral files, lands cases, recreation use permits etc. in terms of the suitability of the land to be managed for wilderness designation.	<p>Considering lands for WSA or wilderness designation is beyond the scope of BLM's land-use planning effort, as identified on pg. 1-2 of the DRMP/DEIS.</p> <p>Chapter 4 of the DRMP/DEIS analyzes the impacts from management prescriptions which protect Non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics, and the impacts on other resources and uses because of that protection. In addition, during the inventory process, the majority of the existing land-uses were identified and taken into consideration when determining areas with wilderness characteristics. The source of the information was documented unit-by-unit during the wilderness review. An Interdisciplinary team of resource specialist, with on-the-ground knowledge of the units, was part of the review process. This inventory is available on the Moab RMP website, and is part of the Administrative Record. The information is also available upon request.</p> <p>Those non-WSA lands that are considered for management of wilderness characteristics in Alternative B were analyzed for their suitability for other uses.</p>

Table 5.9.c. Public Comments and Responses: San Juan County

					<p>These uses were the reasons why there are no non-WSA lands within the county that are managed for wilderness characteristics in the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>Those Non-WSA lands that are considered to be managed to maintain the wilderness characteristics in Alternative B were also analyzed for their suitability for other uses.</p> <p>See also response to comment 121-63.</p>
121	San Juan County	66	No	BLM must consider access, economic analyses, Native American issues and alternatives for management in terms of manageability for wilderness.	<p>No lands are considered for wilderness designation.</p> <p>Those non-WSA lands that are considered for management for wilderness characteristics in Alternative B were analyzed for access, economic uses, alternatives for management, and Native American concerns. These were among the reasons why there are no non-WSA lands within the San Juan County that are managed for wilderness characteristics in the Preferred Alternative (Alt C).</p>
			Wilderness Characteristics		
121	San Juan County	67	No	The mineral evaluations associated with the wilderness re-inventory are inadequate. The values of the foregone minerals must be calculated in areas under study for possible WSA designation. BLM violates its national minerals policy. BLM has failed to issue oil and gas leases because of planning. USGS is not involved in the wilderness process.	<p>Considering lands for WSA or wilderness designation is beyond the scope of BLM's land-use planning effort, as identified on pg. 1-2 of the DRMP/EIS.</p> <p>A comprehensive Mineral Report was prepared for the entire Moab planning area. This report was prepared by the Utah Geological Survey, in cooperation with the BLM. The report includes a comprehensive evaluation of the mineral potential of all mineral resources in the area. It also included an assessment of the development potential of all mineral resources in the area.</p>
			Wilderness Characteristics		

Table 5.9.c. Public Comments and Responses: San Juan County

					<p>In addition, a Reasonably Foreseeable Development scenario for oil and gas resources was prepared in cooperation with the Utah Geological Survey. The scenario provides projections of the potential oil and gas development in the entire area over the next 15 years.</p> <p>The mineral evaluations included all the Non-WSA lands found to have wilderness characteristics and were conducted in conformance with the BLM national minerals policy. The EPCA inventory of oil and gas resources prepared by the USGS was used in drafting the Mineral Report. Impacts to the affected mineral resources were analyzed and disclosed in Chapter 4 of the DRMP/EIS.</p>
121	San Juan County	68	<p>No</p> <hr/> <p>Wilderness Characteristics</p>	<p>The BLM should examine and discuss the potential economic losses to those areas associated with potential wilderness or WSA designation. It should also put forth alternatives where these adverse economic affects can be mitigated, such as larger PILT payments.</p>	<p>Considering lands for WSA or wilderness designation is beyond the scope of BLM's land-use planning effort, as identified on pg. 1-12 of the DRMP/DEIS.</p> <p>Those Non-WSA lands that are considered for management of wilderness characteristics were analyzed for the economic effects of that action. For example, on pg. 4-94 of the DRMP/DEIS, the number of oil and gas wells foregone in Alternative B is discussed.</p> <p>The PILT payments are outside the scope of the land-use planning process.</p>
121	San Juan County	69	<p>No</p> <hr/> <p>Wilderness Characteristics</p>	<p>San Juan County objects to using "cherry stemming" to create wilderness where none exists under the law. If BLM recognizes a road as a boundary, what is the setback?</p>	<p>Considering lands for WSA or wilderness designation is beyond the scope of BLM's land-use planning effort, as identified on pg. 1-2 of the DRMP/DEIS.</p>

Table 5.9.c. Public Comments and Responses: San Juan County

					<p>"Cherry stemming" is a land management technique that facilitates better land management by allowing ingress and egress without compromising a special designation. This technique is often applied to WSAs. However, the BLM is not proposing any WSAs under any alternative in the Moab DRMP/DEIS. Furthermore, no lands are proposed for management of wilderness characteristics in San Juan County for Alternative C of the DRMP/DEIS.</p> <p>Road setbacks are addressed in response to comment 121-62.</p>
121	San Juan County	70	<p>No Wilderness Characteristics</p>	<p>FLPMA requires a consistency review with local plans. The San Juan County Comprehensive Plan must be considered. Any diversions from the objectives of this plan by BLM must be accompanied by an explanation of why the BLM could not lawfully conform to the county plan.</p>	<p>The BLM is aware that there are specific County and State plan decisions relevant to aspects of public land management that are discrete from, and independent of, Federal law. However, the BLM is bound by Federal law. The FLPMA requires that the development of an RMP for public lands must be coordinated and consistent with County plans, to the maximum extent possible by law, and inconsistencies between federal and non-federal government plans be resolve to the extent practical (FLPMA, Title II Sec. 202 (c)(9)). As a consequence, where State and local plans conflict with Federal law there will be an inconsistency that cannot be resolved or reconciled.</p> <p>Thus, while County and Federal planning processes, under FLPMA, are required to be as integrated and consistent as practical, the Federal agency planning process is not bound by or subject to County plans, planning processes, or planning stipulations.</p>

Table 5.9.c. Public Comments and Responses: San Juan County

					<p>The BLM will identify these conflicts in the PRMP/FEIS, so that the State and local governments have a complete understanding of the impacts of the PRMP on State and local management options. A consistency review of the PRMP with the State and County Master Plans is included in Chapter 5.</p> <p>No lands are considered for wilderness designation in the DRMP/EIS. Also, no non-WSA areas with wilderness characteristics are proposed for management in Alt C.</p>
121	San Juan County	71	<p>No</p> <hr/> <p>Wilderness Characteristics</p>	<p>Solitude is a subjective concept. Area ranchers would express the view that recreationists have a negative influence on solitude. What do "outstanding" opportunities for solitude mean? What constitutes primitive or unconfined recreation. What is more important -- the economic viability of a county or solitude for an elite few?</p>	<p>Congress crafted the terms "outstanding opportunities for solitude" and "primitive or unconfined recreation" when it enacted the Wilderness Act of 1964. The BLM Washington Office Instruction Memorandum 2003-275 Change 1 defines these terms for the purposes of land-use planning. In general, when the sights, sounds, and evidence of other people are rare or infrequent, where visitors can be isolated, alone or secluded from others, where the use of the area is through non-motorized, non-mechanical means, and where no or minimal developed recreation facilities are encountered can provide visitors with the opportunity for solitude or primitive or unconfined recreation.</p> <p>The economic impacts of managing non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics were analyzed in Chapter 4 of the DRMP/EIS.</p>
121	San Juan County	72	<p>No</p> <hr/>	<p>Comment Analysis on the 1999 Wilderness Inventory found that those supporting wilderness were from out of state.</p>	<p>Considering lands for WSA or wilderness designation is beyond the scope of BLM's land-use planning effort, as identified on pg. 1-2 of the DRMP/DEIS.</p>

Table 5.9.c. Public Comments and Responses: San Juan County

			Wilderness Characteristics	Those supporting wilderness that were from Utah were from Salt Lake, Ogden and Logan. San Juan County residents were clearly opposed to any action by BLM to designate more land for WSAs. Native American comment letters were opposed to wilderness designation. Local comments are more impassioned, knowledgeable and we believe warrant more weight being placed on them. Unit specific comments follow. The 1999 inventory was not really field-truthed and there is a lack of consistency between field personnel. In this (1999) inventory, the BLM has developed their own set of rules and definitions as to what constitutes wilderness. BLM has not followed the direction of Congress in defining wilderness.	Under FLMPA, multiple use is defined as the management of public lands and their various resource values so they are used the combination that will best meet the present and future needs of all the American people. As part of BLM's wilderness characteristics inventory maintenance, BLM performed a combination of data and on-site reviews. This included specific field inspections, ID team review of data such as range files, County and BLM GIS data, and high-resolution 2006 aerial photographs. The BLM's findings are described in the 1999-2003 wilderness re-inventory documentation, as well as the 2007 wilderness characteristics review process (findings from this review are available on the Moab Field Office website, and in the Administrative Record). The BLM is confident of high-standard approach used to inventory the public lands and stands by its findings, particularly the findings which involved wilderness characteristics inventory maintenance.
121	San Juan County	73	No	Comment from 1999 Wilderness Inventory: Behind the Rocks: this area should not be considered for further wilderness activities. It is within the Paradox Fold and Fault Belt and has high potential for oil and gas. It has the potential for uranium and vanadium, as well as potash and copper. It does not qualify for wilderness because of past impacts. There are 13 roads within the unit, each of which is discussed specifically, with photos provided.	No lands are considered for wilderness designation in the DRMP/EIS. No non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics are proposed for management in Alternative C (Preferred) of the DRMP/EIS in the Behind the Rocks area.
			Wilderness Characteristics		
121	San Juan County	74	No	Comment from 1999 Wilderness Inventory: Gooseneck: San Juan County has no information that would refute BLM's finding	No lands are considered for wilderness designation in the DRMP/EIS.
			Wilderness		

Table 5.9.c. Public Comments and Responses: San Juan County

			Characteristics	in this area. It contains about 5,000 acres of public land, and to our knowledge has few intrusions. It should be pointed out, however, that this area does have the potential for minerals including potash, uranium and oil and gas. The economic potential of these minerals should be done if the area is designated wilderness. The minerals values outweigh the wilderness values. The BLM did miss four roads within or adjacent to the unit (photos and write-ups provided).	No non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics are proposed for management in Alternative C (Preferred) of the DRMP/EIS in the Gooseneck area.
121	San Juan County	75	No Wilderness Characteristics	Comment from 1999 Wilderness Inventory: Hatch Wash: this unit is particularly disturbing to San Jan County. BLM is creating wilderness where wilderness does not exist. There are roads, seismograph lines, fences and other intrusions covering the landscape. The Hatch Wash area has high potential for oil and gas, uranium, vanadium, copper and potash. San Juan County requests that the area be dropped from further wilderness consideration. Specific roads in the area are identified by San Juan County.	No lands are considered for wilderness designation in the DRMP/EIS. No non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics are proposed for management in Alternative C (Preferred) of the DRMP/EIS in the Hatch Wash area.
121	San Juan County	76	No Wilderness Characteristics	Comment from 1999 Wilderness Inventory: Hunter Canyon: Mineral values will be foregone if wilderness is designated for this area. It has oil and gas, uranium, vanadium, copper, barite and potash. Specific roads are discussed within the comment.	No lands are considered for wilderness designation in the DRMP/EIS. No non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics are proposed for management in Alternative C (Preferred) of the DRMP/EIS in the Hunter Canyon area.
121	San Juan County	77	No Wilderness Characteristics	Comment from 1999 Wilderness Inventory: Shafer Canyon: This unit is not suitable or manageable as wilderness, and it violates the 5,000 acre requirement. It has oil and	No lands are considered for wilderness designation in the DRMP/EIS. No non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics are proposed for management

Table 5.9.c. Public Comments and Responses: San Juan County

				<p>gas, uranium, vanadium, copper and potash resources. Individual roads are also discussed. San Juan County suggests that it could easily be managed as an area of critical environmental concern to protect the scenic qualities and vistas from Dead Horse Point.</p>	<p>in Alternative C (Preferred) of the DRMP/EIS in the Shafer Canyon area.</p> <p>The area does constitute a portion of the Highway 279/Long Canyon/Shafer Basin ACEC that is proposed in Alt C (Preferred) to protect scenic resources, particularly the vista from Dead Horse Point State Park.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

Table 5.10.a. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: Air Quality

Record ID	Commenter	Comment Number	Requires Change	Comment Text	Response to Comment
8	Arches National Park	1	Yes	In Section 3.2, Table 3.2 of the draft RMP/EIS, there are only ozone concentrations for La Plata County and Mesa Verde National Park in Colorado included, though ozone has been monitored at Canyonlands National Park for a number of years and is considerably nearer the area of interest. Those data should be included in the EIS, as well. NPS data shows a deteriorating trend for ozone, which may reflect more current data than that used for the RMP. Data for 2005 are available at www2.nature.nps.gov/air/monitoring/ads/ADSReport.cfm .	This data has been added to applicable table in Chapter 3 of the PRMP/FEIS.
124	SUWA	115	Yes	The Draft RMP fails to analyze the impacts of climate change to MFO resources. Soil disturbing activities such as recreation, grazing, and energy exploitation reduce or remove the natural components that stabilize desert soil, increasing soil loss through wind and water erosion. The BLM should design alternatives that minimize soil disturbance. BLM should designate an alternative with far fewer than the 2600 miles of back country ORV routes that Alternative C contains. The cumulative effects of various uses like ORV recreation and grazing should be considered in the context of climate change. The BLM is urged to develop and adopt an alternative that minimizes the extent of soil disturbance and reduces the Field Office's vulnerability to the effects of climate change.	<p>The assessment of so-called "greenhouse gas" emissions and climate change is in its formative phase; therefore, it is not yet possible to know with confidence the net impact to climate. However, the intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC 2007) recently concluded that "warming of the climate system is unequivocal" and "most of the observed increase in globally average temperatures since the mid-20th century is very likely due to the observed increase in anthropogenic (man-made) greenhouse gas concentrations."</p> <p>The last of scientific tools designed to predict climate change on regional or local scales limits the ability to quantify potential future impacts. However, potential impacts to air quality due to</p>

Table 5.10.a. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: Air Quality

					<p>climate change are likely to be varied. For example, if global climate change results in a warmer and drier climate, increased particulate matter impacts could occur due to increased wind blown dust from drier and less stable soils. Cool season plant species' spatial ranges are predicted to move north and to higher elevations, and extinction of endemic threatened/endangered plants may be accelerated. Due to loss of habitat, or due to competition from other species whose ranges may shift northward, the population of some animal species may be reduced. Less snow at lower elevations would be likely to impact the timing and quantity of snowmelt, which, in turn, could impact aquatic species.</p> <p>Information regarding global climate change has been added to Chapters 3 and 4 of the PRMP/FEIS.</p> <p>The BLM will not, in the foreseeable future, have tools to predict the effects of oil and gas development on climate change. This type of analysis can only be done at the research level, and then only on large (near-continental size areas) of wide spread emissions. It will be a long time before the BLM can say anything about specific projects on climate change or the impact of climate change on our resources.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

Table 5.10.a. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: Air Quality

215	EnCana Oil	15	Yes	The assumption on page 4-18 that a control efficiency of 37% would be obtained by watering of all exposed disturbance areas is inconsistent with the assumption on page 4-16 that 50% control of particulate emissions would be obtained by watering. The DRM should be corrected to consistently reflect the assumptions actually used in the quantification of impacts	The PRMP/FEIS has been corrected in Chapter 4 on air quality to reflect consistent assumptions.
479	Environmental Protection Agency	1	Yes	The BLM (in Table 4-8 of the DRMP/EIS) indicates that projected concentrations (of air pollutants) would be below National Ambient Air Quality Standards for criteria pollutants and hydrogen sulfide, but does not show the concentrations. The DRMP/EIS does not describe the methods used to calculate the projected concentrations. EPA recommends that the BLM disclose this information in the Final RMP/EIS.	The methods used to calculate the projected concentrations of pollutants and hydrogen sulfide are included in the PRMP/FEIS. Analyses of impacts on ozone, visibility, and deposition are included in Chapter 4 of the PRMP/FEIS. No comparisons are made to NAAQS in the PRMP/FEIS.
479	Environmental Protection Agency	2	Yes	The air quality analysis omits potential impacts to ozone, visibility or deposition. The planning area encompasses class I National Park Service airsheds. Ozone is of particular concern because of the potential emissions of volatile organic compounds and oxides of nitrogen from oil and gas development.	Analysis of impacts to ozone, visibility, and deposition require air dispersion modeling.
479	Environmental Protection Agency	3	Yes	The Final RMP/EIS should include information on the effects of oil and gas development on climate change (from CO ₂ emission). EPA recommends that the BLM encourage oil and gas lessees to participate in EPA's Natural Gas STAR program.	See response to comment 124-115.
479	Environmental Protection Agency	4	Yes	Because a semi-quantitative approach to air quality analysis was taken in the Moab RMP, it is not possible to determine potential impacts to air quality from specific oil and gas development (see Section 4.3.1.3 of the DRMP/EIS). Nevertheless, it is important to assign	A statement has been added to Chapter 2 of the PRMP/EIS, under Management Common to All, which states the following: "As appropriate, quantitative analysis of potential air

Table 5.10.a. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: Air Quality

				responsibility for project-specific air quality analyses for the future. EPA recommends that the Final RMP/EIS contain this wording from the Rawlins BLM DRMP/EIS, which also used a comparative, emissions-based approach: "As project-specific developments are proposed, quantitative air quality analysis would be conducted for project-specific assessments performed pursuant to NEPA."	quality impacts would be conducted for project specific developments.
479	Environmental Protection Agency	19	Yes	On pg. 4-17 of the DRMP/EIS, the BLM discusses rates of emissions from compressor engines in grams per horsepower-hour. Table 4.6 shows emission rates in grams per second, but the text does not explain whether BLM made this calculation in order to estimate impacts using the semi-quantitative method or for some other reason. An explanation is needed in the Final RMP/EIS as to why different units appear in this section, or convert emission rates to the same units.	The text and tables in Chapter 4 of the PRMP/EIS have been modified to provide an explanation regarding the units of analyses. Conversions were made from AP-42 emission factors using assumptions typical for compressors used in oil/gas in Utah.
826	James Lynch	1	Yes	I did not find a discussion of air or water pollution in the alternative discussion.	A statement has been added to Chapter 2 under "Management Common to All," which states: "As appropriate, quantitative analyses of potential air quality impacts would be conducted for project specific developments."

Table 5.10.b. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: Areas Of Critical Environmental Concern

Record ID	Commenter	Comment Number	Requires Change	Comment Text	Response to Comment
124	SUWA	86	Yes	Upper Labyrinth ACEC nomination - SUWA nominates the area south of the town of Green River and north of the Ruby Ranch. The nominated ACEC that the Price BLM has on the west side of the	The BLM considered this ACEC nomination which was submitted during the comment period for the DRMP/EIS. The values mentioned by the Commenter in the Upper

Table 5.10.b. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: Areas Of Critical Environmental Concern

			<p>Green River.</p> <p>This ACEC meets that relevant criteria due for scenic, historical, fish, and natural processes associated with the river and its surrounding landscape; historic values ranging from Crystal Geyser to the Powell expedition; and fish and wildlife habitat. The scenery and landscape of this are is outstanding and offers visitors and outstanding experience either by hiking or by canoeing.</p> <p>The nomination meets the importance criteria for scenery and for historical values. In addition, the Green River is habitat to Threatened and Endangered fish and Labyrinth Canyon is an internationally acclaimed canoe trip through BLM lands. This area faces heightened threats from oil and gas development or with the state of Utah leasing portions of the riverbed.</p>	<p>Labyrinth area are scenic, historical, fish, and natural processes. The BLM convened an interdisciplinary team to consider this nomination. The team found the historical, fish, and natural processes to be relevant. Scenery was not found to be relevant. While the canoe trip along the Green River is a highly sought after recreational experience, this portion of the Green River is only a portal to the scenery in the lower part of the canyon below Ruby Ranch.</p> <p>The relevant values of historical, fish, and natural processes were not found to be important. While John Wesley Powell did float this portion of the river, there were no significant events occurred in this portion from a historical perspective. The threatened and endangered fish that may inhabit this portion of the river are found throughout the Colorado and Green River system. This particular reach of the river provides no special habitat for these fish.</p> <p>The natural processes along this portion of the Green River are neither fragile, sensitive, rare, irreplaceable, exemplary, or unique.</p> <p>Because the nomination does not meet the importance criteria, it will not be carried forward as a potential ACEC in the PRMP/FEIS.</p> <p>The analysis supporting this conclusion has been incorporated into Appendix I of the PRMP/FEIS.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

Table 5.10.b. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: Areas Of Critical Environmental Concern

203	Independent Petroleum Assn. of Mountain States	13	Yes	<p>The DRMP/EIS fails to demonstrate that the proposed ACEC decisions meet the regulatory criteria of importance and relevance. 43 CFR § 1610-7-2. Secondly, many of the identified resource values already receive adequate protection through other management prescriptions. 43 USC § 1702 (a) (ACECs may be designated "where special management attention is required...to prevent irreparable damage"); BLM Manual 1613.51-53 (ACECs unnecessary when other designations are adequate to protect a resource or value.)</p>	<p>A rationale for designating or not designating ACECs in the Preferred Alternative of the DRMP/EIS is found in the Administrative Record referred to as the ACEC Final Report. The List of Threats and the Rationale for Designating or Not Designating ACECs in the Proposed Alternative is available to the public upon request. Relevant text has been added to Appendix I of the PRMP/FEIS.</p>
-----	--	----	-----	--	---

Table 5.10.c. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: Cultural Resources/Native American Consultation

Record ID	Commenter	Comment Number	Requires Change	Comment Text	Response to Comment
1	Colorado Plateau Archaeological Alliance	26	Yes	<p>The tiered approach reflected in the three action alternatives (more under Alternative B, less under Alternative C and even less under Alternative D) is problematic and would appear to reflect a common misperception that National Register designations are accompanied by greater levels of protection for listed resources.</p>	<p>All cultural resources are protected by law regardless if they are listed on the National Register or not. The priority for nominating cultural sites to the National Register has been removed.</p>

Table 5.10.c. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: Cultural Resources/Native American Consultation

123	COHVCO/Blue Ribbon	48	Yes	<p>"Inadvertent impacts" is undefined and is not discussed in the EIS. Inadvertent impacts are therefore an unfounded assumption which cannot be attributable to OHV or mechanized use. BRC believes a plan of mitigation, rather than prohibition, is possible and beneficial. This particularly so because numerous recreators use OHVs to access important historical sites.</p>	<p>Information has been added to Chapter 3 of the PRMP/FEIS that cultural resources are being, or have been, negatively impacted by the presence of humans engaging in looting or vandalism. Basically that increased access results in increased inadvertent impacts, looting, and vandalism. References will be cited.</p>
430	Ute Mountain Ute Tribe	1	Yes	<p>Upon review of your draft it seems some of the Utah Mountain Ute Tribe's important cultural issues have not been addressed.</p> <p>The women of White Mesa Ute Community, located south of Blanding, Utah, have traditionally made baskets from squawbush. One of the most critical areas where they gather this plant is off Highway 128, adjacent to the Arches National Park boundary and the river. These baskets play an important role in the culture and traditions of the White Mesa Community. The Tribe would therefore formally request that gathering of squawbush be allowed to continue in this area, and that it be made clear that the proposed restrictions in this area do not apply to gathering of plants for both medicinal and traditional practices such as basket making.</p> <p>Allowing these traditional gathering practices to continue would result in minor environmental impacts, while simultaneously allowing the White Mesa community to practice and preserve their cultural heritage.</p>	<p>On page 2-56 of the DRMP/EIS, under management common to all alternatives, it states: "Permit sustainable harvest (including cutting of green willows and cottonwoods) for Native American traditional ceremonial use". Squawbush has been added to this list of plants to specifically accommodate the Utah Mountain Ute Tribe's request.</p>
489	National Trust for Historic Preservation	2	Yes	<p>The Draft RMP may exempt hundreds, if not thousands, of route miles from the requirements of Section 106 by labeling them "existing" routes.</p>	<p>A sentence has been added on pg. 2-7 of the DRMP/EIS defining "new route": New routes are defined as those not designated in the Travel Plan accompanying this RMP".</p>

Table 5.10.c. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: Cultural Resources/Native American Consultation

				Under the preferred alternative, BLM would not perform Class III inventories prior to designating an "existing" OHV route for continued use. Draft RMP at 2-7. This management prescription comes from a BLM Instruction Memorandum (1M) issued in December 2006, which generally requires Class III inventories for the designation of "new" routes but not for the designation of continued use on "existing" routes. IM No. 2007-030. However, neither the DRMP nor the IM define the term "existing route." BLM must define the term "existing" route to mean only those routes previously designated through the land-use planning process and for which BLM completed the Section 106 process.	
868	The Hopi Tribe	1	Yes	Regarding B, C, and D, we do not support the 2/3 of sites allocated for scientific use, and less than 1/3 for conservation for further use. Avoidance of Hopi sacred sites and traditional use areas is the only real means of preventing impairment of these resources.	The BLM concurs with the Hopi Tribe that archaeological resources cannot be allocated to various uses prior to the study of these resources. The decision allocating archaeological resources has been removed from the PRMP/FEIS.
492	Diane Orr	1	Yes	The National Historic Preservation Act directs the BLM to do inventories, actively manage and nominate sites for historic registration.	National Register nomination is done on a site-specific basis and does not require a land-use plan decision. The prioritization of National Register nominations has been removed from the PRMP/DEIS.
492	Diane Orr	2	Yes	There are two different totals given as to the number of cultural sites on BLM lands within the Moab Field Office.	The number of identified cultural sites has been corrected on p. 4-253.

Table 5.10.d. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: Cumulative Impacts

Record ID	Commenter	Comment Number	Requires Change	Comment Text	Response to Comment
658	Richard Griffin	1	Yes	The cumulative impact analysis for the RMP is inadequate. It does not support the conclusions reached and does not provide sufficient information to evaluate the impact.	The BLM has added reasonably foreseeable non-BLM actions to the cumulative impact analysis.

Table 5.10.e. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: Hazardous Materials

Record ID	Commenter	Comment Number	Requires Change	Comment Text	Response to Comment
9	ECOS Consulting	21	Yes	Page 4-241,3rd Paragraph, 4.3.11: "AML" is not defined and is not listed in the "Acronyms and Glossary" section. It is highly probable that the protection of sites from "hazardous materials spills and spill site cleanup" will involve some amount of soil disturbance and drainage re-direction and/or storage.	The acronym AML is defined on pg. 2-10 of the DRMP/EIS as Abandoned Mine Lands. This acronym will be added to the glossary. AML projects are implementation actions in which the potential environmental impacts would be analyzed on a case by case site specific basis following completion of the land-use plan.

Table 5.10.f. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: Lands and Realty

Record ID	Commenter	Comment Number	Requires Change	Comment Text	Response to Comment
12	Pacificorp	12	Yes	PacifiCorp does not support the BLM's proposal in the RMP to eliminate the existing utility corridor from Cisco to US Highway 191.	Under Alternatives C and D, the Interstate Highway 70 utility corridor has been widened to include all major existing utilities. The wider corridor merges two corridors designated in the 1985 Grand RMP. Currently, there are no rights-of-way for electrical lines within the corridor south of I-70. This language has been corrected to state that "the existing utility corridor from Cisco to Highway 191 north of Arches National Park would be merged with the I-70 corridor under all action alternatives" (pg. 4-65 of the DRMP/EIS). In addition, the statement on page 2-11 of the DRMP/EIS that the "utility corridor from Cisco to Highway 191 north of Arches has been eliminated" has been deleted from the text of the PRMP/FEIS.
215	EnCana Oil and Gas	19	Yes	There is a typographical error on page 4-68 in the last line of the second full paragraph. The line should read, "Alternative D, and would have corresponding impacts on the construction of future ROWs"	This is a typographical error, and it has been fixed.
586	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	5	Yes	page 2-11, table 2.1 We recommend that BLM identify and incorporate the FWS Interim Guidelines for Wind Power (2003) in the "Management Common to All Action Alternatives" for the Lands and Realty section. Implementation of these recommendations will help to minimize impacts from wind power development projects to wildlife, particularly birds and bats, and their habitat.	The text on pg. 2-11 of the DRMP/EIS has been changed to read "Authorization of any ROW for wind or solar energy development would incorporate best management practices (including the United States Fish and Wildlife Service's "Guidelines for Wind Power"..."

Table 5.10.g. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: Livestock Grazing

Record ID	Commenter	Comment Number	Requires Change	Comment Text	Response to Comment
9	ECOS Consulting	26	Yes	Page 4-242, Table 4.71: Percentages are wrong. Actually they are: 32.9% (Alternative B), 8.7% (Alternative C), or 7.4% (Alternative A), or 3.7% (Alternative D).	The BLM agrees that the percentages on Table 4.71 and in the text are wrong and that the percentages provided by the Commenter are correct. The corrections to the table and text have been made in the PRMP/FEIS.
204	The Nature Conservancy	21	Yes	We notice that the next-to-last item under Management Common to All Action Alternatives refers to grazing not being authorized on portions of Beaver Creek – which we support, but which appears to be inconsistent with the treatment of Beaver Creek in Alternatives C and D on Page 2-13. Further, this list contains reference to "Bogart," and in this context it is not clear if it refers to grazing not being authorized on the entire Bogart Allotment (which we support), or just along portions of streams within that allotment.	The reference to Beaver Creek and Bogart being unavailable for grazing in Riparian: Management Common to All Action Alternatives is incorrect and this error has been corrected.)
416	John and Sena Hauer	2	Yes	Suggestions regarding Alternative C: Build a livestock fence only on the southeast side of the highway, and do not permit grazing between the highway and the river. Build the fence only 1,900 feet from the highway on the southeast side instead of 2,000 feet, in order to compensate the permittee for lost grazing between the highway and the river. Advantages: Only one fence would have to be constructed. Livestock would not be permitted in the campground areas and raft put-ins at Onion Creek. The campground and put-ins at Hittle Bottom are already fenced.	The text in Chapter 2 of the PRMP/FEIS for Alt C has been changed to read: "A fence would be constructed along the southeast side of Highway 128 (set back to protect the scenic resources of the National Scenic Highway)".

Table 5.10.g. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: Livestock Grazing

				Since the grazing between the river and the highway would be fragmented into such small areas, it would appear to be more convenient for the permittee to have an equal amount of grazing added to the northeast side than to attempt to utilize the small parcels of the northwest side of the highway.	
586	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	6	Yes	page 2-12, table 2-1 It is unclear why Alternative C (Preferred) would make available for grazing 12,673 more acres than Alternative A (No Action). We recognize that this may be to allow for greater flexibility in grazing management, such as rest rotation techniques, which can benefit range and habitat. This is unclear, however, and we recommend that the purpose of increasing grazing acreage NOT be to increase AUMs within the MPA.	Pear Park and Ida Gulch have been added to the list of allotments that are unavailable for grazing in the preferred alternative. Pear Park was unavailable for grazing in the 1985 Grand RMP (for wildlife forage). Ida Gulch is in habitat for Jones cycladenia. Other allotments that are unavailable in Alt A but available in Alt C would be subject to range studies prior to determining suitable grazing allocations. If there were suitable permittees interested in applying for these permits, an Environmental Assessment would be conducted. One consideration that may be identified would involve nearby permittees utilizing these newly available allotments without an increases in total AUMs. Additionally, all newly available allotments would require Section 7 consultation which will insure that the concerns and recommendations of the USFWS are considered.
195	Van Loan Ranches	2	Yes	There are two different Utah grazing allotments named Spring Creek in the Dolores Triangle. One is the spring Creek-Colorado allotment, managed by Colorado BLM as part of our Colorado allotment. The other allotment is Spring Creek-Utah, which has been unavailable for livestock grazing for a number of years. These are two separate, non-contiguous allotments.	The confusion regarding the two Spring Creek allotments has been corrected in the PRMP/FEIS. The map of grazing allotments has also been corrected.

Table 5.10.h. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: Minerals–Oil and Gas

	Commenter	Comment Number	Requires Change	Comment Text	Response to Comment
124	SUWA	98	Yes	The BLM must consider a no leasing alternative. The current draft of the RMP fails to consider such an alternative. Federal courts have made clear that a no leasing alternative should be a vital component in ensuring that agencies have all possible approaches before them (See, e.g., <i>Bob Marshall Alliance v. Hodel</i> , 852 F.2d 1223, 1228 [9 th Cir. 1988]).	The BLM's consideration of the no leasing alternative has been added to Chapter 2 of the PRMP/FEIS under the section on Alternatives Considered but Eliminated from Analysis.
201	Samson Resources	6	Yes	Section 1.4.7 -Memorandum of Understanding with Forest Service: The BLM improperly references a 1991 Memorandum of Understanding between the BLM and the United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service (Forest Service) establishing joint BLM and Forest Service procedures for managing oil and gas leasing and operational activities in the Moab DRMP/EIS. The BLM and the Forest Service issued the Memorandum of Understanding required by Section 363 of the Energy Policy Act in April of 2006.	The reference to the Memorandum of Understanding between the BLM and the Forest Service regarding oil and gas leasing has been changed in the PRMP/FEIS from 1991 to 2006.
202	Cabot Oil & Gas	7	Yes		
214	Bill Barrett Corp.	27	Yes	On page 3-113 of the Moab DRMP/EIS, the analysis of the contribution of mineral resources, which as mentioned above does not provide an overall economic contribution of oil and gas, notes that production peaked in 1994 and has declined since. However, the data stops at 2000, just about the time that oil and gas commodity prices started to rise and, coupled with advances in the technology to recover unconventional resources, production throughout Utah and the Intermountain West started to soar.	Chapter 3 of the PRMP/FEIS has been updated to reflect the current trend in oil and gas production.

Table 5.10.h. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: Minerals–Oil and Gas

215	EnCana Oil	14	Yes	The reference to the release of saline groundwater during drilling has been deleted from the text of the PRMP/FEIS.	The number of wells by alternative utilized in the air quality analysis in Chapter 4 of the DRMP/EIS. In the PRMP/FEIS the wording has been changed from proposed wells to projected wells.
306	Delta Petroleum	6	Yes	The economic analysis presented in the DEIS is based on old and outdated information with respect to oil and gas development. It relies on data from 2003 and older. The economic picture, development activities and approaches to resource extraction have undergone a major shift . . . That information is readily available from both state and federal sources, including some information in 2007, yet none of this recent information has been included in the DEIS. This is a major flaw under NEPA, since readily available information should be used for decision-making. This affects economic impacts and projections within all of the alternatives. Since this information is readily available, the BLM should amend the DEIS to reflect that information	Additional recent data has been added to Chapter 4 of the PRMP/FEIS pertaining to oil and gas employment, potential impacts to State revenues from oil and gas restrictions, information on property taxes and information on severance taxes.
491	Public Lands Advocacy	5	Yes	Offsite Mitigation – Under management Common to All Alternatives in Chapter 2, BLM indicates it will seek to "Fully mitigate all unavoidable habitat losses for special status species at a minimum 1:1 ratio." While we recognize that many companies have offered to perform off-site mitigation, several concerns must be raised. According to IM 2005-69, compensation or off-site mitigation must be entirely voluntary. While BLM may identify offsite mitigation opportunities, it stated they will not be carried forward unless volunteered by the applicant. We oppose any program that would impose off-site or compensation mitigation as a BLM requirement.	Chapter 2 of the PRMP/FEIS has been changed. The statement has been changed to "Mitigate all unavoidable habitat losses for special status species at a minimum 1:1 ratio, where required by policy or law".

Table 5.10.i. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: Non-WSA Lands With Wilderness Characteristics

Record ID	Commenter	Comment Number	Requires Change	Comment Text	Response to Comment
124	SUWA	233	Yes	The BLM arbitrarily excludes an area in Coal Canyon possessing wilderness characteristics by using legal lines as boundaries.	This appears to be a mapping error and has been corrected. About 338 acres has been added to the non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics in Alt B.
124	SUWA	234	Yes	The BLM arbitrarily excludes an area in Coal Canyon possessing wilderness and fails to provide justification.	This appears to be a mapping error and has been corrected. About 165 acres has been added to the non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics in Alt B.
124	SUWA	250	Yes	A small area of Horsethief Point adjoins the Park (Canyonlands National Park), with no physical impact or separation and has wilderness character.	This appears to be a mapping error and has been corrected. About 24 acres has been added to the non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics in Alt B.
209	Sierra Club Glen Canyon Group	46	Yes	There appear to be errors and/or muddled discussion in the first paragraph, sentences 3 and 4, of page 4-143 attributing to Alternative C comments which apparently refer to another alternative.)	The fourth sentence in paragraph 1 of page 4-143 has been changed to state: "...same as in Alternative B."
209	Sierra Club Glen Canyon Group	47	Yes	Summary Pages 4-162 thru 4-168 The VRM table (Table 4.58) is incorrect in showing 0% Class I in Alternative B, while Table 4.55 designates some Class I in Beaver Creek, Behind the Rocks, Dead Horse Cliffs, Dome Plateau, Goldbar, Gooseneck, Horsethief Point, Hunter Canyon, Labyrinth Canyon, Mary Jane Canyon, Mill Creek Canyon, Negro Bill Canyon, and Westwater.	The Commenter is correct. There are 45,048 acres of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics that are designated as VRM Class I in Alt B. The designation is for other reasons, usually the establishment of an ACEC. Table 4.58 has been corrected to show that 45,048 acres are VRM Class I (17%) in Alt. B, while 221,437 acres are VRM Class II (83%) in Class B.

Table 5.10.i. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: Non-WSA Lands With Wilderness Characteristics

215	EnCana Oil and Gas	20	Yes	The first sentence of this Section (p. 4-93) should be modified to say that no additional BLM lands would be closed to salable and leasable mineral resource development. Table 4.38 on page 4-85, shows that there are already 392,205 acres (2.1%) of closed BLM lands. This is an inaccurate sentence and needs to be modified to correctly identify that there are closed areas under Alternative A	The wording in this section has been changed to "Under Alternative A, no acres of lands with wilderness characteristics are to be managed to protect these characteristics, resulting in no additional closures of BLM lands to salable and leasable mineral resource development."
-----	--------------------	----	-----	---	---

Table 5.10.j. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: Paleontology

Record ID	Commenter	Comment Number	Requires Change	Comment Text	Response to Comment
123	COHVCCO/Blue Ribbon	49	Yes	The DEIS, however, lacks the nexus between OHV use and an increase in vandalism or unauthorized collection of paleontological resources. Additionally, although it is difficult to determine the extent to which existing routes in paleontologically sensitive areas will be eliminated, again, existing routes will have not been shown with any data in the DEIS to pose an unreasonable risk to those resources.	Information has been added to Chapter 3 of the PRMP/FEIS that paleontological resources are being, or have been, negatively impacted by the presence of humans engaging in looting or vandalism. Basically that increased access results in increased inadvertent impacts, looting, and vandalism. References will be cited.

Table 5.10.k. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: Recreation

Record ID	Commenter	Comment Number	Requires Change	Comment Text	Response to Comment
124	SUWA	102	Yes	The total acreage of SRMAs in the planning area, by alternative differs in two Tables. Table 2.1 does not match the acreage in Table 4.69. Table 4.21 does not match the acreage in Table 2.1.	The acreage in the tables has been corrected in the PRMP/FEIS.
199	Canyonlands Field Institute	1	Yes	Dolores River Canyons SRMA - Support Alternative C with exceptions: In the boating management section, we request a CHANGE in party number to match the other sections of river managed by BLM in SE Utah i.e. change the party size to be 25 PLUS guides. In order to serve school groups, the 25 maximum passengers is necessary in most cases. In addition, make this number consistent with other stretches will make it easier on the public and our office staff in comparing trip options.	The BLM agrees with the Commenter that it is important to have consistent river rules. The BLM also agrees that school groups have special needs because the guide-passenger ratio must often be increased. The text has been changed to read "25 people, excluding guides."
204	The Nature Conservancy	18	Yes	Reference is made on Page 2-21 to allowing motorized travel use on (among other routes) "the motorized access route to the viewpoint of Ida Gulch (the saddle between Adobe Mesa and Castle Rock)." This appears to be confusing, because (to our knowledge) the saddle between Adobe Mesa and Castle Rock does not look down northward into Ida Gulch, but into an unnamed side drainage of Professor Creek. Motorized access into this saddle from the south (Castle Valley side) via a single designated route is fine. The view down into Ida Gulch is obtained from the saddle between Castle Rock and Parriott Mesa – a saddle to which motorized travel must NOT be allowed from either direction, i.e. the foot path up from the Castle Valley side, or the road into Ida Gulch from Highway 128.	The Commenter is correct that the route looks downward into Professor Valley and not into Ida Gulch. The wording has been corrected. The route that ascends the ridge and looks down into Ida Gulch is and will remain non-motorized only.

Table 5.10.k. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: Recreation

209	Sierra Club Glen Canyon Group	27	Yes	Re: The Bookcliffs SRMA, There's an inconsistency in the RMP/EIS making the Bookcliffs SRMA a non-mechanized focus on page 2-18 (Alternative B) and non-motorized per page 4-135?	This is an error in Chapter 4 and has been changed to read "non-mechanized in both chapters.
209	Sierra Club Glen Canyon Group	30	Yes	Colorado Rivers SRMA: For boating management in the Colorado River, Two Rivers and Dolores River SRMAs, Alternative C should be the same as Alternative B in stating that no restrictions on private use would be established unless unacceptable resource impacts occur.	A sentence has been added to alternatives C and D for these SRMAs stating that no restrictions on private use would be established unless unacceptable resource impacts occur.

Table 5.10.l. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: Riparian

Record ID	Commenter	Comment Number	Requires Change	Comment Text	Response to Comment
1025	Western Watersheds Project	39	Yes	Significant discrepancies exist within the riparian sections and other sections referencing riparian resources within the DRMP/EIS.	The discrepancy in riparian data identified by the Commenter has been corrected in the PRMP/FEIS. The riparian analysis in Chapter 4 of the PRMP/EIS has been changed accordingly.

Table 5.10.m. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: Socioeconomics

Record ID	Commenter	Comment Number	Requires Change	Comment Text	Response to Comment
221	Fidelity Exploration	2	Yes	<p>BLM has a responsibility to include a comprehensive socioeconomic analysis that is lacking in this DRMP. The following should be giving more consideration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Oil and gas are vital sources of energy for the nation. BLM should discuss increasing energy demands, decreasing strategic necessity for development of mineral resources. Utah oil and natural gas resources need to be identified as crucial to help offset the deficit between supply and demand. -Federal lands contribute nearly one-third of the nation's natural gas supply; therefore, accounting for every resource rich area is crucial to producers and consumers. The DRMP should discuss the role of the planning area in the nation's natural gas supply. -The full, positive economic impact of mineral development in the planning area was not adequately analyzed, nor did the document analyze the negative impact associated with the severe restrictions called for in the Preferred Alternative C. Furthermore, the DRMP states that under Alternative b, the long-term economic benefits from oil and gas development would be slightly less than current circumstances or if Alternatives C or D were adopted (Table 2.2, p.2-78-2-79). This conclusion is counter-intuitive; it defies logic how the extremely restrictive Alternative B would have only slightly lower economic benefits from oil and gas when it would place so many more restrictions on development. Clearly, that analysis is flawed. 	<p>In 2007, Grand County provided 0.5% of Utah's total oil production and 1.8% of Utah's total gas production (DOGM, 2006). Utah ranks 12th nationally in oil production and 10th nationally in gas production (DOGM, 2008). These figures do not support the Commenter's assertion that this is crucial to the nation's energy supply.</p> <p>The impacts of minerals on social and economic conditions are detailed on pg. 4-259 through pg. 4-264. This analysis provides a reasonable assessment of the socioeconomic impacts.</p> <p>The restrictions imposed on oil and gas leasing in Alt B would result in fewer wells developed than in Alts, C, D, or A. These numbers are 264, 432, 448, 451, respectively. Therefore, Alt B would result in 168 fewer wells over the life of the plan. The well numbers were based on the Reasonably Foreseeable Development scenario for oil and gas and spread by alternative based on the restrictions imposed under each alternative. Impacts of minerals on socioeconomics are based on these wells numbers. Economic information on royalties, employment, severance taxes, and impacts to State revenues has been augmented in Chapter 4 of the PRMP/FEIS.</p>

Table 5.10.m. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: Socioeconomics

				<p>BLM would greatly benefit from a comprehensive economic analysis of the impact of oil and gas to the region such as is currently underway by the University of Utah's Bureau of Economic and business Research for the Utah Governor's Office of Public Land Policy Coordination Office (The Structure and Economic Impact of Utah's Oil and Gas Exploration and Production Industry Phase I- The Uinta Basin) (Draft, November 2007)</p> <p>-Each alternative contained in the DRMP includes some lands closed to energy resource development. Such closures are based on BLM's assessment of resource values on those lands. Closure also implications, however, in terms of national energy consumption and commodity prices, foregone employment opportunities, tax revenues, and support for state and local economies. Although BLM must necessarily base land-use decisions on consideration of all resources values, social and economic impacts of closure decisions should be estimated to fulfill the agency's mandate under FLPMA, and to comply with guidelines contained in BLM's Land-use Planning Handbook (H-1601-H) and Instruction Memorandum (IM) No. 2002-167</p>	<p>Information has been added to the PRMP/FEIS using the newly completed study by the University of Utah Bureau of Economic and Business Research (January 2008) "The Structure and Economic Impact of Utah's Oil and Gas Production and Industry, Phase III - Grand County". Therefore, use of the study in Uintah County suggested by the Commenter is not appropriate.</p>
299	Dan Harris	2	Yes	<p>The analysis states that Alternative B will have only slightly lower economic benefits than Alts C and D. This is not true, especially for Green River</p>	<p>Economic information on royalties, employment, severance taxes, and impacts to State revenues has been augmented in Chapter 4 of the PRMP/FEIS. Information has been added to the PRMP/FEIS using the newly completed study by the University of Utah Bureau of Economic and Business Research (January 2008) "The Structure and Economic Impact of Utah's Oil and Gas Production and Industry, Phase III - Grand County".</p>

Table 5.10.m. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: Socioeconomics

318	Mike D.	1	Yes	The town of Green River should be covered in the Moab RMP. By placing too many restrictions on this development, oil and gas companies may go elsewhere, including outside the country, for their operations. This will have severe negative economic impact on our local economy.	The text in Chapter 3 concerning socioeconomics has been altered to include the fact that economic effects include those on the neighboring communities of Green River and Grand Junction.
319	Bruce Hansen	1	Yes		

Table 5.10.n. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: Soils

Record ID	Commenter	Comment Number	Requires Change	Comment Text	Response to Comment
309	Pam Hackley	3	Yes	The analysis should reevaluate the amount of potential disturbance to soils, especially from OHV use.	Numbers have been added to Chapter 4 and to Appendix G that show the miles of route designated and not designated in erodible soils types. There are 167 miles of route that are closed in the preferred alternative because of soils conflicts.

Table 5.10.o. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: Special Status Species

Record ID	Commenter	Comment Number	Requires Change	Comment Text	Response to Comment
204	The Nature Conservancy	1	Yes	In addition to the species in the MPA with formal status as listed above, we urge that special attention be given to one additional plant: <i>Astragalus iselyi</i> (Isely's milkvetch). At present this plant has no special status. We had recommended that it be added to the Utah BLM list of Sensitive Plants when that list was being reviewed for revision in March 2007... the need for special status is heightened by a particular proposal for public-land disposal that	The Moab RMP does not add or subtract potential special status species to the Utah BLM list of Sensitive Plants. Parcel R-11, which contains habitat for the <i>Astragalus iselyi</i> , has been removed from the list of lands identified for disposal.

Table 5.10.o. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: Special Status Species

				appears within the three Action Alternatives of the DRMP. This action would, if implemented, remove from BLM control a major population center for this plant, probably increasing the need for BLM Sensitive designation of the remaining occurrences, and possibly creating a rationale for federal listing of the whole species.	
214	Bill Barrett Corp.	24	Yes	It would be inappropriate to require oil and gas leasees to "fully mitigate" impacts from oil and gas operations when oil and gas development is mandated and appropriate use of public lands.	The statement on pg. 2-44 of the DRMP/EIS which states "Fully mitigate all unavoidable habitat losses for special status species at a minimum of 1:1 ratio" has been changed from "fully mitigate" to "mitigate".
485	Center for Native Ecosystems	3	Yes	Alternative B applies a 1300' buffer for white-tailed and Gunnison's prairie dog habitat (C-22, 4-57). Alternative C applies a 660' buffer within white-tailed and Gunnison's prairie dog habitat (2-34, 2-47, 2-48, 4-57, 4-394). However, pages 2-84 and 4-316 refer to a 600' buffer for Alternative C. Page 4-395 seems to indicate that under Alternative D, white-tailed prairie dog habitat will be granted a 660' buffer while Gunnison's prairie dog habitat will not be conserved. This is confusing, and could easily be considered arbitrary and capricious.	The buffer was listed wrongly page 2-84 & 4-316 of the DRMP/EIS. The buffer is 660 feet, no 600; these errors have been corrected.
586	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	2	Yes	The bald eagle was removed from the Endangered Species list. It is, however, still protected under the MBTA and the BGEPA.	The wording in the plan has been corrected to correspond to this action. The two laws protecting bald eagles have been added to the text on pg. 3-143 of the DRMP/EIS.

Table 5.10.o. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: Special Status Species

586	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	3	Yes	Page 2-5, Section 2.1.1.5: 1st paragraph: The MFO has 3 listed bird species (and 1 candidate species), 1 listed mammal species, 1 listed plant species, and 4 listed fish species (see also Section 3.16). According to page 3-140, there are additionally 43 "Sensitive Species", not 4 as stated here.	The number of sensitive species has been corrected to 43. In addition, the enumeration of listed species has been changed to match USFWS's wording.
586	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	4	Yes	Page 2-5, Section 2.1.1.5 1st paragraph: The standard stipulations that have been developed in coordination between BLM and FWS (i.e., the Species Conservation Measures in the BO for Existing Utah BLM RMPs (2007)), should be included in the document. Appendix K is a close approximation in many respects, but there are inconsistencies and rearranged organization, and it is difficult to determine if items have been left out. The 2007 BO conservation measures were mutually developed and agreed to by FWS and BLM, and should be included in their entirety in the new RMP to ensure long-term species conservation as well as streamlined section 7 consultation.	This last sentence in the first paragraph on p. 2-5 of the DRMP/EIS has been changed to: "Species conservation measures (see Appendix K) have been developed in coordination with the United States Fish and Wildlife Service. They will be implemented under all alternatives." Appendix K has been updated with the 2007 "Species Conservation Measures for Utah BLM RMPs".
586	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	7	Yes	page 2-95, table 2.2, Special Status Species - Impacts from Riparian management: There must be typos in these descriptions (at the bottom of page 2-95), because they do not make sense. Alt. C cannot be the same as Alt. B, except with less riparian acres excluded than under Alt. C.	The wording has been corrected.
586	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	9	Yes	page 3-38, section 3.73. A number of the allotments identified in this section contain special status species and should be further discussed in Section 4.3.15.6 (page 4-367).	The following sentence has been added to Chapter 4: "Those allotments that remain unavailable for grazing are not subject to these impacts to special status species."

Table 5.10.o. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: Special Status Species

586	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	10	Yes	page 3-125, section 3.15.1.1.2.2 (Bookcliffs wildlife area) Is the clay reed mustard within the Moab Planning Area?	The USFWS is correct. This is an error. The clay reed mustard is not within the planning area; it is only within Uintah county.
586	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	11	Yes	page 3-125, section 3.15.1.1.2.2. (Bookcliffs wildlife area) typo-Jones cycladenia, with a small c.	The Jones cycladenia is not found in the Bookcliffs area. The text has been corrected.
586	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	12	Yes	page 3-127, section 3.15.1.2.5 (Colorado River Corridor ACEC) 4th paragraph mentions "two state sensitive rare plants" but the State of Utah has no sensitive plant list. Are these listed on the UNPS rare plant guide or NatureServe?	The sentence has been changed to "Two BLM sensitive plants, alcove rock daisy (<i>Perityle specuicola</i>) and alcove bog orchid (<i>Habenaria zothecina</i>) occur in Negro Bill Canyon."
586	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	14	Yes	page 3-128, section 3.15.1.2.5 The Colorado River Corridor ACEC "...contains about one quarter of all threatened Jones cycladenia plants." Does this mean within the MPA or across the range of the species? What is the source of this information (citation)?	The sentence has been changed to read: "The potential ACEC also contains threatened Jones cycladenia plants."
586	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	15	Yes	3-143, section 3.16.1.3 This bald eagle section should be moved to Section 3.16.2 (Sensitive Species).	This correction has been made.
586	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	16	Yes	3-143, section 3.16.1.4 The first sentence ("MSO habitat includes high canopy closure...") should be eliminated. The second sentence should read: "Steep slopes and canyons with rocky cliffs characterize much of the MSO habitat in Utah."	The sentence has been eliminated and the second sentence has been adjusted in accordance with the Commenter's request.
586	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	18	Yes	page 4-355, table 4.106 Place Latin names after common names for plant species.	The Latin names have been added to Table 4.106 for all plants.

Table 5.10.o. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: Special Status Species

586	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	20	Yes	4-363 section 4.3.15.3.5 What habitat types is this section referring to, and what special status species might be affected?	The title of the section has been changed.
586	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	21	Yes	4-365, section 4.3.15.5.3 Utility and communication infrastructure ROWs are also likely to fragment habitat, increase human access, and increase non-native invasive plants. These effects would have resulting impacts on various special status species, including prairie dogs and sage-grouse.	This sentence has been added to Section 4.3.15.5.3 of the DRMP/EIS.
586	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	22	Yes	page 4-370 section 4.3.15.7.1 Mineral exploration activities would also lead to greater road density, creating greater opportunity for OHV and other human disturbance.	This sentence has been added to Section 4.3.15.7.1 of the DRMP/EIS.
586	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	23	Yes	page 4-371, section 4.3.15.7.2.1 Potential direct adverse effects from oil and gas development would include: potential for spills, mortality from reserve pits, increased human access, OHV access, road mortality.	This sentence has been added to Section 4.3.15.7.2.1.
586	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	24	Yes	page 4-372, section 4.3.15.7.2.2 Explanation for greater detailed analysis on sage-grouse is reasonable, but you should still describe the impacts to other species as well.	Wording has been added to clarify that the habitat fragmentation analysis was performed for sage-grouse as an example of this type of action.
586	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	25	Yes	4-372, section 4.3.15.7.2.2. 5th paragraph: It's also possible that the analysis could be an underestimate of habitat degradation because more frequently used roads could cause disturbance greater than 400m.	The following sentence has been added to pg. 4-372 of the DRMP/EIS: "It is also possible that the analysis could underestimate habitat degradation because more frequently used roads could cause disturbance greater than 400 meters from the road."

Table 5.10.o. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: Special Status Species

586	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	26	Yes	page 4-375, section 4.3.15.7.4 MSO do occupy rocky slope/canyon habitat in the MPA (not just the "potential" to occupy this habitat type).	The sentence now reads: "MSO are known to occupy the rocky slope/canyon habitat in the MPA.
586	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	27	Yes	page 4-376, table 4.116. Why is there a difference of 37 acres between Alternative B and C for Jones cycladenia? Are these 37 acres in Jones cycladenia habitat? If so, we suggest these acres also be made NSO/Closed.	The 37 acres has been added to the Jones cycladenia habitat that is NSO or closed to leasing in Alt C.
586	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	29	Yes	4-390, table 4.119. The document states there are 24,370 acres of habitat for Jones cycladenia. Please clarify, is this the size of the amount of suitable habitat or habitat potential for the plant?	The habitat is suitable for Jones cycladenia. The word has been added to Table 4.119.
586	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	34	Yes	page C-35, table C-4. Golden eagles are not listed under ESA. They are protected under the MBTA and BGEPA.	The title has been changed in Appendix C to read "federally protected species"
586	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	37	Yes	Appendix K. The BLM Committed Conservation Measures identified in this appendix should be consistent with the Species Conservation Measures developed for the Biological Opinion for Existing Utah BLM RMPs (2007) (see attached document).	Appendix K will be replaced with the correct and updated document.
586	Moab Trails Alliance	11	Yes	p. I-8 Under Relevance Criteria, seventh line, ".....threatened plants do not occur....." Shouldn't "do not" be deleted or else the whole sentence be deleted?	The sentence has been corrected

Table 5.10.p. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: Travel Management

Record ID	Commenter	Comment Number	Requires Change	Comment Text	Response to Comment
6	Colorado 500	12	Yes	the MFO staff's choice to separate the citations from the body of the text makes it extremely cumbersome to review the use of the literature in this analysis. We have selected a citation that is pretty obviously aimed at roads, and because our comment is about roads, it seemed the most likely match. Please bear with us. From the Chapter in the DEIS called "References:" Forman, R.T.T. and L.E. Alexander. 1998. Roads and their major ecological effects. Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics '29:207-231. This does not have anything to do with undeveloped dirt roads and narrow trails, lightly trafficked, in a desert ecosystem. Just so you do not have to take our word for it, we have located and read the article, plus we have followed the citations in the article. None of the material we found is related to what this DEIS is analyzing. (multiple reference examples followed, text not included here)	<p>Placing all references at the back of the document is standard operating procedure when assembling Environmental Impact Statements.</p> <p>The reference to the article by Foreman and Alexander is found on pg. 4-485 of the DRMP/EIS in the section on wildlife habitat fragmentation. The reference to the article concerns vehicles killing birds that are attracted to road kills.</p> <p>The BLM has added an expanded discussion to Appendix G of the extensive research on the impacts of OHV use on a variety of natural resources, including soil and water, vegetation, wildlife and habitat, and water and water quality . The BLM has also added an expanded discussion of the impacts of OHV use on socioeconomics, including user conflict, to Appendix G. Where appropriate, references to this section of Appendix G will be added to the relevant resource sections of Chapter 4.</p>
6	Colorado 500	20	Yes	The placement of a "Mountain Bike Focus Area" (Map 2-9-C) exactly where the popular Copper Ridge motorcycle trail already is. This is an existing single-track loop, plus single-back connectors to the Sovereign Trails system (state land) and an existing single-track connector to Thompson Springs.	<p>1. As stated explicitly in the DRMP/EIS. Focus areas are not designed to exclude other uses, such as the single-track motorcycle trail cited by the Commenter. Klondike Bluffs is a mountain bike focus area because the predominant use of Klondike Bluffs is mountain bike use. The Copper Ridge motorcycle trail was submitted to the BLM during scoping; the route could not be</p>

Table 5.10.p. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: Travel Management

			<p>Requests that will resolve this comment:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We want BLM to provide the analysis that supports the statement "There are no routes solely dedicated to OHV use." Reprinting the same sentence from the AMS will not satisfy this request, as there is no analysis in the AMS that supports BLM's claim in 3.11.1.2.16. This additional analysis will obviously include maps of every existing road and trail. This analysis must detail who made each route, for what purpose, and when it was made. To accomplish this, interviews with residents of the Moab area, as well as residents of western Colorado and western Utah will be necessary, and interviews with motorcycle clubs and businesses, to gather the factual evidence that supports (or refutes) the claim that off-road motorcycles do not have their own dedicated system of routes in the MPA and in the MFO jurisdiction. 2. We want a third-party, non partisan review of this analysis. The reason that is necessary is that many private citizens donated hundreds of hours to help BLM map the single-track OHV routes in the run-up to this DEIS. Hundreds of miles of motorcycle trails were mapped. Since BLM has no compunctions about discarding that work, we have no reason to trust BLM in the conduct of any new route inventory or route development history. 3. Reprinting the same sentence from the AMS will not satisfy this request, because there is no analysis in that document that supports BLM's claim in 3.11.1.2.16. 4. If there is no such analysis, we want BLM to add this statement to 3.11.1.2.16: "MFO staff has 	<p>verified on the ground. This means that it was not popular enough to be evident on the ground. See also response to comment 122-36.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. The BLM acknowledges the comment cited by the Commenter, but fails to see its relevance to the issue at hand. 3. The sentence referred to by the Commenter from the 1985 Grand RMP is simply a statement by the BLM that there are no trails managed solely for OHV use, which is the case in the No Action alternative. No amount of research or interviews or third-party analysis will change this fact from the 1985 Grand RMP. The Commenter provides no evidence to suggest otherwise. The fact that user groups may have their own trail systems does not mean that the BLM manages these for that single use. Additionally, no user group has the self-appointed authority to manage trails on public lands for their exclusive use. 4. The BLM, as part of its scoping for the land-use planning process, requested route information from the public. A result of this request, the BLM received several hundred miles of routes from the public, including numerous motorcycle routes. Most, but not all, of these routes were verified on the ground by the BLM and were included in one or more action alternatives for analysis. This process is described in detail in Appendix G of the DRMP/EIS. These include many (perhaps most, but the BLM is not familiar
--	--	--	---	---

Table 5.10.p. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: Travel Management

			<p>elected to omit at least 200 miles of existing motorcycle single-track trails from the inventory and to eliminate from consideration the designation of a "system" of existing single-track OHV trails in Alternative C. Staff has chosen to remove this data in advance of the Deciding Offer's review and Decision. Staff realizes that this will prevent the Deciding Officer any opportunity to evaluate and designate single-track OHV systems. Based on the record supporting this DEIS and Plan, it will likely be perceived as a pre-emptive Decision by the ID Team. There is no analysis that supports this action. There is ample evidence that these routes do exist, as many members of the public assisted in locating and mapping them. However, MFO staff has elected to discard that data. Please refer to 3.11.1.2.16."</p> <p>Alternatively, and less contentious and less time consuming, and more likely to get this project to a Decision in a more timely way, we want the Moab BLM to restore the trails in the MFO database that were collected under the public perception that the trails would be called "motorcycle single-track" and included in the travel plan for consideration. We will not try to guess at the name BLM has assigned these trails. Restoring these trails to the database will simplify completion of the RMP, and it would fill several glaring voids in the "Travel Plan." Then, in the post-ROD implementation, site-specific monitoring would support the eventual site specific analysis of the impacts of these trails.</p> <p>We also request that BLM add the following section to Chapter 3:</p> <p>1. Beginning on page 3-79, part 3.11.1.2.16 must be changed to "Popular Motorcycle Routes." These will be the same as the "popular bicycle" trails, plus</p>	<p>with each group's route naming system) of the routes presented by the Commenter. Some of the routes mentioned by the Commenter were not presented to the BLM during scoping, and were therefore not included in the travel plan process. The BLM is not in a position to forego travel planning indefinitely to accommodate new route proposals. As the DRMP/EIS explicitly states, new routes can be considered for inclusion in the travel plan on a site-specific basis in the future. See also response to comments 122-15 and 122-30.</p> <p>It is worth noting that several of the routes proposed by the Commenter are located in an area limited to existing trails as of 1985. The Commenter needs to be aware that on pg. 2-32 of the DRMP/EIS, it is stated: "No additional OHV routes would be allowed in saline soils other than those already designated in the Travel Plan".</p> <p>The Slickrock Bike Trail has been added to the motorcycle trail route map (2-11-E). The following routes mentioned by the Commenter are open to all motorized vehicles, including motorcycles: Gemini Bridges, Amasa Back, Flat Pass, Klondike Bluffs, Kokopelli's Trail, Poison Spider, Bartlett Wash, Moab Rim, Kane Creek Canyon Rim, Hurrah Pass and Onion Creek.</p> <p>The Commenter should consult the motorcycle trail map (2-11-E) to see if the routes he names are available to motorcycles. The BLM is unfamiliar with some of the names used by the Commenter.</p>
--	--	--	---	---

Table 5.10.p. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: Travel Management

				<p>many more miles. The reason they are the same is, BLM changed the usage for this DEIS even though (because it is in the record) BLM cannot dispute the fact that motorcycles were using those trails when the 1985 RMP was written.</p> <p>2. We want BLM to include ... (many named trails).</p>	<p>The Mel's Loop route has been placed in the proposed alternative for the PRMP/FEIS.</p>
8	Arches National Park	5	Yes	<p>Several roads are shown within Arches NP that are not park roads. These are circled on the attached map; please delete them. Alternately, since the RMP does not apply to Arches, we would prefer that the park simply be shown as a "blank spot" on the map, with all roads removed.</p>	<p>All routes within Arches National Park have been deleted from the Travel Plan maps accompanying the PRMP/FEIS.</p>
970	National Parks and Conservation Association	7	Yes	<p>Section 3.11.2.6 (page 3-85&6&7) addresses use conflict and displacement, but not adequately so. It crudely lists a few circumstances the agency believes to exist. The lists are arbitrary, and should be removed.</p>	
122	Ride with Respect	5	Yes	<p>Section 3.11.2.6 (page 3-85&6&7) addresses use conflict and displacement, but not adequately so. It crudely lists a few circumstances the agency believes to exist. The lists are arbitrary, and should be removed.</p>	<p>The list of recreation conflicts in Section 3.11.2.6 of the DRMP/EIS is based upon professional judgment of Moab Field Office BLM staff. The areas listed are those that have come to the attention of BLM staff due to reports of conflicts by users themselves. The sentence on pg. 3-86 of the DRMP/EIS has been changed to read: "specific areas in which BLM staff have had reports of user conflict and displacement include..."</p>
122	Ride with Respect	15	No	<p>By any of these definitions, many OHV trails exist in the Moab field office beyond the data from BLM, RWR, or any other known source. RWR'S data is the best available information. All of the routes we submit currently exist, and new data of existing routes includes photographs to aid your staff in verification. RWR expects that you to contact us before determining that any of these routes are not legal, existing travel ways.</p>	<p>The routes considered in the alternatives for the Travel Plan accompanying the DRMP/EIS were those submitted by the public during the scoping period, including those submitted by Ride with Respect, and verified on the ground by BLM staff (see pgs. G-15 through G-21). On pg. 2-48 of the DRMP/EIS there is a provision for adding new routes. The provision states "identification of specific designated routes would be initially established through the</p>

Table 5.10.p. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: Travel Management

					chosen travel plan accompanying the RMP and may be modified through subsequent implementation planning and project planning on a case by case basis". New routes proposed by the Commenter will be considered after completion of the Record of Decision for the Moab RMP unless those routes are in a closed area to OHV use. However, at the completion of the RMP, all travel will be restricted to the routes designated in the plan.
122	Ride with Respect	21	Yes	Table 2.1 Wilderness & Travel Management (page 2-43 & 2-48) refer to WSA ways when stating that "If Congress designates the area as Wilderness, the routes will be closed." This sentence should be removed.	The sentence has been changed to read "If Congress designates the area as Wilderness, the routes could be closed." This sentence means that the will of Congress would override any route designation made in the DRMP/EIS. Congress does have the final authority, and close any route that it chooses.
122	Ride with Respect	22	Yes	Alternative C would require Special Recreation Permits for groups with "25 vehicles." The document ought to explicitly exclude counting more than one vehicle per person, since he/she can only use one vehicle at a time.	The 25 vehicle rule is intended to mean the primary vehicle driven by the participant. The phrase "one driver/vehicle" has been added to the Special Recreation Permit decisions in the PRMP/FEIS for clarification.
122	Ride with Respect	23	Yes	Table 2.1 Travel Management (2-48) also states "Only designated roads are available for motorized commercial and organized group use."	The words "and managed open areas" have been added to the appropriate section of the PRMP/EIS to clarify that permittees would be allowed in these areas.
122	Ride with Respect	24	Yes	Section 4.3.10.2.10.6 (page 4-220) should acknowledge that Labyrinth Rims in Alternative C would negatively impact motorcycling to the extent that it prohibits future use of Bartlett Slickrock by motorcycle.	The impacts of this restriction on motorcycling opportunities have been added to the text of the PRMP/FEIS.

Table 5.10.p. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: Travel Management

122	Ride with Respect	26	Yes	Likewise Section 4.3.10.2.12 (page 4-229) should state that soil decisions substantially reduce vehicular access to certain environments, including high-saline soils, and both riparian and non-riparian washes.	Text has been added to Chapter 4 of the PRMP/EIS acknowledging that soils and riparian decisions limit motorized users. The decision in soils has been changed so that soils are a limiting factor, rather than a factor that absolutely forbids new routes in saline soils.
122	Ride with Respect	42	Yes	For consistency, Slickrock Trail should appear on the map of designated motorcycle routes.	The Slickrock Trail has been added to the map of motorcycle routes in the PRMP/EIS for alternatives C and D.
123	COHVCO/Blue Ribbon	4	Yes	The BLM must disclose how the Recreational Settings may or may not affect future management decisions, allowable uses, including and especially travel management.	A sentence has been added to the PRMP/FEIS under Travel Management (Management Common to All Action Alternatives) for clarity that states "routes identified in the Travel Plan would be available regardless of other proposed management actions".
123	COHVCO/Blue Ribbon	5	Yes	The DEIS is far from a model of clarity in distinguishing between program-level and project-level decision-making and management prescriptions. We urge BLM to clarify this distinction, and to specifically identify program-level management guidance from project-level management prescriptions for all management decisions, especially travel management.	<p>The BLM followed the Land-use Planning Handbook (H-1601-1) to develop program level management guidance. In 2004, the Washington Office (WO) clarified the guidance in the handbook by issuing WO Instruction Memorandum 2004-005, which states specifically, "Selection of a network of roads and trails should be performed for all limited areas in each RMP. This requires establishment of a process that includes</p> <p>selecting specific roads and trails within the limited area or subarea and specifying limitations placed on use."</p> <p>The management decisions in Chapter 2 of the PRMP/FEIS will clearly show which</p>

Table 5.10.p. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: Travel Management

					decisions are planning decisions and which decisions are implementation (project-level) decisions.
123	COHVCO/Blue Ribbon	8	Yes	A map is provided of the White Wash area which displays an area where access to dispersed camping sites has been eliminated.	The open area to the west side of the White Wash Sand Dunes has been enlarged to accommodate the camping that occurs to the south of the oil well. See also response to comment 120-83.
123	COHVCO/Blue Ribbon	10	Yes	BRC strongly opposes the fee system proposed for White Wash Sand Dunes in Alts C and D. A fee system at White Wash will be difficult to implement because of the distance from the Moab Field Office and ease of access to the Dunes and nearby trails. A fee system with the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act. The BLM should remove the section requiring the Special Recreation Permit idea, and instead, insert guidance to pursue funding sources.	The possibility of a fee system for use of the open area in White Wash Sand Dunes is proposed in the DRMP/EIS as a means of funding the cost of the intensive management that this area would require to keep it open to cross country travel and provide services to visitors. Actual implementation of any new fee would follow the guidelines of the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act, and be considered by the Utah BLM Resource Advisory Council. This action does not preclude pursuing other funding sources to help manage the White Wash Sand Dunes. For clarity the statement on pg. 2-25 of the DRMP/EIS has been changed to read "Implement a fee system under the guidelines of the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act.

Table 5.10.p. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: Travel Management

124	SUWA	32	Yes	The plan says that all alternatives would ensure PFC, and that "the loss or degradation of riparian areas, wetlands and associated floodplains would be avoided or minimized; natural and beneficial values would be preserved and enhanced; and fish and wildlife and special status species would be provided for," 4-182, there is no explanation of how ORV use in these same streams affects that conclusion.	On page 4-245 of the DRMP/EIS, the impacts of travel on riparian resources are analyzed. The acres of riparian areas by OHV designation are specified. No cross-county travel is allowed in riparian areas under any of the action alternatives. To provide further analyses, a table has been added to Appendix G of the PRMP/FEIS detailing the number of miles of routes not designated due to resource conflicts including riparian areas. This data has been incorporated into the appropriate resource sections of Chapter 4. In Appendix G of the DRMP/EIS it is acknowledged that OHV use in riparian areas can result in loss of vegetation, degraded stream banks, and erosion.
196	Moab Trails Alliance	2	Yes	The amount of new trail ("C"= 150 miles, "B"= 75, etc) should be specifically stated as, "In addition to trails developed on existing roads as mapped on the Grand County Transportation Inventory map". The allotted new mileage will include only those routes mapped across previously undisturbed terrain.	Wording has been added to the DRMP/EIS on pg. 2-49 to clarify that the mileage is for new trails; converted existing routes are in addition to the specific mileage listed for each alternative.
196	Moab Trails Alliance	5	Yes	Typos: p. 4-464 second paragraph line 4 "carefully" should be careful.	The grammatical correction has been made in the PRMP/FEIS.
196	Moab Trails Alliance	6	Yes	Typos: p. 1-8 Under Relevance Criteria, seventh line, "...threatened plants do not occur..." Shouldn't "do not" be deleted or else the whole sentence be deleted?	The sentence has been deleted.

Table 5.10.p. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: Travel Management

204	The Nature Conservancy	11	Yes	See DRMP 2-48* Finally, within this area we would like to see the designation of motorized travel on the road up Ida Gulch from Hwy 128 proceed no farther up-valley than the northern boundary of our section of private land (Sec 32, T24S R23E, SLM) in Ida Gulch. In the DRMP under all Action Alternatives this route is shown as designated for motorized travel through our property and onto BLM-administered lands to the east.	The BLM does not designate routes on private land. The Nature Conservancy may restrict travel on this route. The route will be removed from the designated travel maps in Alts C and D. This would restrict all motorized travel past the Nature Conservancy's private land.
206	Red Rock 4-Wheelers	11	Yes	There are a number of permitted Jeep Safari routes not included in Alternative C, and these should be added to this Alternative. These include segments of the Copper Ridge, Strike Ravine, 3D, Dolores Triangle, and Flat Iron Mesa routes.	The short segments on BLM are mapping errors which have been corrected (route numbers 13637, 15331, 15332, 15334, 15336). Strike Ravine and Flat Iron Mesa routes will need to be hand digitized, since they are not part of current Travel Plan database. Several of the segments are exclusively on State lands, and beyond the scope of the Travel Plan formulation.
208	Bookcliff Rattlers Motorcycle Club	9	Yes	BLM should identify routes suitable for ATVs in its travel plan, rather than passively assuming that many of the OHV routes submitted in scoping are motorcycle-only.	The BLM has incorporated the Commenter's suggestion for a change in route use involving ATVs in the PRMP/EIS. See also response to State of Utah comment 120-90.
209	Sierra Club Glen Canyon Group	10	Yes	. . .confusing Table 4.126 OHV Designations by Alternative on page 4-409. The table which contains both acres and miles has four footnotes, of which the second is not referenced in the table itself. "These are the miles of designated routes at time of EIS publication. After the issuing of the ROD, minor adjustments may be made by the MFO to more accurately define the designated	Footnote 2 refers to the bottom two rows of Table 4.126; this has been fixed. The "minor adjustments" that the Commenter wishes defined relate to GIS data smoothing issues, which the BLM would expect (but cannot predict with certainty before the data smoothing is completed) to add up to well less than one per cent in either direction.

Table 5.10.p. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: Travel Management

				routes." BLM should let us know where the superscript belongs in the table, what the definition of "minor" is, and how the public will be involved.	The manner of public involvement is an implementation activity. The process is described on page 2-48 of the DRMP/EIS.
209	Sierra Club Glen Canyon Group	44	Yes	Re: 4.3.8.2.13.1 OHV Travel Management Pages 4-146 thru 4-152, Table 4.5, Page ES-6 The paragraph beginning at the bottom of page 4-149 also apparently contains an error. Clearly, it means that OHV use will be limited to designated, not existing, routes. The same error is found in the last paragraph on page 4-150. Under all of the action alternatives, vehicles must stay on designated routes.	The Commenter is correct, and the wording has been changed to "designated".
209	Sierra Club Glen Canyon Group	55	Yes	The Glossary is not comprehensive. For example, "way" is defined, but "route" are not. "Mechanized" and "non-mechanized travel" are not defined at all. Attachment A of Appendix G includes additional terms which should be justified with Glossary definitions and/or referenced in the Glossary. It is possible that there are definitions in other appendices or the text of the document itself which, if added to the Glossary, would make it more user friendly.	The BLM has added the referenced words (route, mechanized and non-mechanized) to the glossary. The BLM would need more specifics to address the other glossary changes which the Commenter recommends.
218	Colorado b Division of Wildlife	1	Yes	Closing many of the spur roads that have no destination will also be of great benefit to wildlife. There is one road that is identified to be closed under preferred Alternative C in the travel management plan that concerns us, as we would like to have this road remain open.	As this route provides the only public access to public lands in Colorado, it has been added to the preferred alternative. The route has been designated in Alternatives C and D.
195	Van Loan Ranches	1	Yes	In the Dolores River Triangle there is a road starting in Township 21S Range 26E Section 32 SW 1/4 (state school section) that heads south for approximately one mile before it braches; both	Two routes that start in the State Section (T. 21 S., R. 26 E., Sec. 32) on the Colorado state line, cross Utah BLM land, and entre the state of Colorado have been added to the Preferred Alternative

Table 5.10.p. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: Travel Management

				<p>branches head southeast up different forks of spring Canyon along Spring Creek before entering into Colorado. This road provides the only public access into BLM land on the Colorado side of the border.</p> <p>The proposed road closures will eliminate our historic access.</p>	
264	Curtis Rozman Ruby Ranch	2	Yes	<p>It is very clear that BLM intends to make a large area in White Wash "open" to motorized use. We request that any "open" areas do not directly border our private property and that there is an adequate buffer between our private property and any designated open area. Please include a .25 - .5 mile buffer to minimize the vandalism and destruction of property that has been occurring (fence vandalism-- wires cut, posts used for firewood, gates destroyed-- also property shot at, livestock harassment, etc). See attached map.</p>	<p>The BLM proposes an open area of fewer than 2,000 acres in White Wash. The open area is primarily the sand dunes themselves. Everywhere else, all travel would be limited to designated routes. The acreage of open area in the PRMP/FEIS has been greatly reduced from the acreage of open area in the No Action (current) alternative. The southwest boundary of the open area has been adjusted to provide a buffer between the open area and the private property to accommodate the Commenter.</p>
964	Moab Trails Alliance	7	Yes	<p>Whenever different user groups are listed in the RMP, road cycling should be included as a category just the same as "driving for pleasure". This is fast becoming a popular use on the spectacular scenic byways of Grand County.</p>	<p>Road cycling has been added to the list of recreation activities in the Moab Field Office on pg. 3-80 of the DRMP/EIS.</p>
310	Benjamin Reingold	2	Yes	<p>The difference between an RMP and the Travel Plan is not clearly described in the DEIS.</p>	<p>A sentence has been added to the PRMP/FEIS under Travel Management that clarifies this distinction.</p>

Table 5.10.p. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: Travel Management

941	Great Old Broads for Wilderness	4	Yes	Not enough has been done to determine the impact of the designated routes on cultural, riparian or wildlife resources.	Additional information on the impacts of travel on resources has been added to Chapter 4 of the PRMP/FEIS and to Appendix G (Travel).
995	Fred and Bessann Swanson	7	Yes		

Table 5.10.q. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: Water Resources

Record ID	Commenter	Comment Number	Requires Change	Comment Text	Response to Comment
215	EnCana Oil	7	Yes	Section 3.14.3.2.2 Salinity (p. 3-112) The second paragraph of this section states that the release of saline groundwater during drilling activities is a point source for salinity. This statement is inaccurate because groundwater is not released during drilling activities in natural gas drilling operations.	The reference to the release of saline groundwater during drilling has been deleted from the text of the PRMP/FEIS.

Table 5.10.r. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: Wild and Scenic Rivers

Record ID	Commenter	Comment Number	Requires Change	Comment Text	Response to Comment
124	SUWA	89	Yes	Segment 5 of the Colorado river should be scenic or wild.	The classification of Segment 5 was changed from scenic in Alt B to recreational in Alt C. Upon closer review, it was determined that the classification in Alt C should be changed to scenic in order to match the classification of scenic on the other side of the river in the Monticello Field Office. This change has been made in the PRMP/FEIS.
213	Utah Rivers Council	2	Yes	The preferred alternative in the Draft on page 2-41 changes the classification of one segment of the Green River, from Coal Creek to Nefertiti from its original classification of 'Wild' in the eligibility study to 'Scenic' under the preferred alternative. There is no basis for such a change due to a manageability issue. The Council urges the Moab F.O. to find the Coal Creek to Nefertiti segment of the Green River as a 'Wild' river in the preferred alternative, as it was in the eligibility study and in Alternative B.	The BLM has reevaluated the determination of the classification of the Green River from Coal Creek to Nefertiti. The classification of this segment in the proposed alternative for this river segment has been changed to "wild".

Table 5.10.r. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: Wild and Scenic Rivers

213	Utah Rivers Council	9	Yes	The list of eligible segments of the Green River and the segments that are analyzed for suitability are inconsistent. In Appendix J, seven suitability factors were considered for each of the different rivers, including the Green River. Attachment 2 in Appendix J, pages J-61 to J-64, shows that 6 segments of the Green River are eligible to become a Wild and Scenic River. However, attachment 4, pages J-81 and J-82, lists the suitability considerations for the, "Green River – Segments 1 through 5". Thus, the suitability analysis fails to even include all 6 eligible segments in the analysis. It is impossible to determine which of the 6 eligible river segments were not included in the analysis because they are not listed nor mentioned.	There are 6 river segments along the Green River and this error has been corrected in the PRMP/FEIS. The heading on pg. J-81 of the DRMP/EIS has been changed to "Green River segments 1 through 6".
213	Utah Rivers Council	10	Yes	The suitability analysis of the Green River includes segments 1 through 5 together. The response to each of the seven suitability factors does not make it clear which of the segments the response applies to. This completely muddles the entire suitability analysis as it is impossible to determine why some segments were found suitable and others were found not suitable.	There are 6 river segments along the Green River and this error has been corrected in the PRMP/FEIS. Attachment 4, Suitability Considerations by Eligible River Segment, has been augmented for the Green River and this augmentation makes the suitability determinations more clear.

Table 5.10.s. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: Wildlife

Record ID	Commenter	Comment Number	Requires Change	Comment Text	Response to Comment
9	ECOS Consulting	58	Yes	Page 4-442, Table 4.138, 4.3.19: This table is missing a number of very important wildlife associations that must be considered by the BLM in its analyses of impacts in this Moab RMP/EIS. Add the wildlife association "aquatic macro-invertebrates" with the Aquatic habitat type.	The tables referred to have been modified as suggested by the Commenter in the PRMP/FEIS.

Table 5.10.t. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: Woodlands (Forestry)

Record ID	Commenter	Comment Number	Requires Change	Comment Text	Response to Comment
204	The Nature Conservancy	29	Yes	Woodlands (Pg 2-55—2-56) As a more technical note, the language used in each of the four Alternatives on DRMP Page 2-56 appears to be confusing. Each one is a single run-on sentence that seems to combine the concepts of provide and prohibit. Although one can figure out which acreage value applies to which concept, it would be best for the Final RMP to use language such as separate sentences so that the distinction between "provide" and "prohibit" is clear and unambiguous.	The language on page 2-56 has been corrected to be more direct.

5.6 RECORD OF DECISION

Following publication by the EPA and BLM of a Notice of Availability of the PRMP/FEIS in the Federal Register, there is a 30-day protest period. In addition, a 60-day Governor's Consistency Review period runs concurrently with the first half of the protest period.

The State Director will approve the PRMP/FEIS by issuing a public Record of Decision (ROD), which is a concise document summarizing the findings and decisions brought forth from the PRMP. However, approval shall be withheld on any portion of a plan being protested until final action has been completed on such protest. Before such approval is given, there shall be public notice and opportunity for public comment on any significant change made to the proposed plan.

Management actions specified for the Proposed Alternative in Chapter 2 of the PRMP/FEIS are labeled as follows:

Land-use Plan Decisions (P): These broad-scale decisions guide future land management actions and subsequent site-specific implementation decisions. Land-use plan decisions fall into two categories: desired outcomes (goals; standards, including land health standards; and objectives) and allowable uses and actions to achieve outcomes. Proposed land-use plan decisions are protestable to the BLM Director.

Implementation Decisions (I): These decisions take action to implement land-use plan decisions on a site-specific basis. They may be incorporated into implementation plans or may exist as stand-alone decisions. When issued, implementation decisions are generally appealable to the Interior Board of Land Appeals as outlined in 43 CFR Part 4.

Administrative and Policy Decisions (A): These decisions are based on law, regulation, and/or policy and do not require a land-use plan decision or implementation decision. They are not protestable or appealable.

5.7 DISTRIBUTION LIST FOR THE PROPOSED RMP/FINAL EIS

A copy of the PRMP/FEIS has been sent to all the entities identified in the distribution list below (Table 5.11). The individuals, groups, organizations, and agencies included in the mailing list for the Moab RMP will be notified that the PRMP/FEIS is available and a hard copy or compact disc of the document can be provided upon request. In an effort to reduce printing costs, the PRMP/FEIS is also available on the Moab RMP website at <http://www.blm.gov/ut/st/en/fo/moab/planning.html>, the Moab Field Office, the public room in the BLM Utah State Office, and the public libraries listed on the distribution list.

Table 5.11. Distribution List Proposed RMP/Final EIS

Federal Agencies (Required)	Local Federal Agencies
Bureau of Reclamation Denver Federal Center Denver, CO	Arches National Park Moab, UT
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Division of Environmental Quality Arlington, VA	Canyonlands National Park Moab, UT
Office of Environmental Compliance Department of Energy Washington, DC	U.S. Geological Survey Moab, UT
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Office of Federal Activities Washington, DC	Manti-LaSal National Forest Price, UT
U.S. Geological Survey Environmental Affairs Program Reston, VA	Manti-LaSal National Forest Moab, UT
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 8 Denver, CO	Colorado Canyons NCA Grand Junction, CO
Minerals Management Service Environmental Division Herndon, VA	BLM Monticello Field Office Monticello, UT
U.S. Geological Survey Reston, VA	BLM Grand Junction Field Office Grand Junction, CO
National Park Service Washington, DC	BLM Price Field Office Price, UT
Bureau of Indian Affairs Reston, VA	BLM Montrose Field Office Montrose, CO
Office of Surface Mining Washington, DC	BLM Durango Field Office Durango, CO
U.S. Department of the Interior Office of Environmental Policy and Compliance Washington, DC	BLM Vernal Field Office Vernal, UT
U.S. Department of the Interior Natural Resources Library Washington, DC	

Table 5.11. Distribution List Proposed RMP/Final EIS

Other Federal Agencies	Utah BLM Resource Advisory Council
Mineral Management Service Denver, CO	Mr. Carl Albrecht Richfield, UT
Federal Highway Administration Utah Division Salt Lake City, UT	Mr. Norman Carroll Orderville, UT
U.S. Department of Energy Grand Junction Office Grand Junction, CO	Mr. Michael Jenkins Salt Lake City, UT
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service West Valley City, UT	Mr. Lowell Braxton Salt Lake City, UT
Bureau of Reclamation Provo, UT	Mr. Ray Bloxham Salt Lake City, UT
Natural Resources Conservation Service Provo Service Center Provo, UT	Ms. Ashley Korenblat Moab, UT
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Chief, Planning Division Sacramento, CA	Mr. Clair "Riley" Cutler Salt Lake City, UT
Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Air Force Environment, Safety, and Occupational Health Washington, DC	Mr. Jerry Spangler Ogden, UT
Federal Depository Library System Government Printing Office Washington, DC	Mr. Gordon Topham Monroe, UT
	Mr. Drew Sitterud Castle Dale, UT
	Mr. F.E. "Fee" Busby Logan, UT
	Mr. Tom Clawson Salt Lake City, UT
	Mr. Lynn Stevens Blanding, UT
	Mr. Manuel Morgan Aneth, UT

Table 5.11. Distribution List Proposed RMP/Final EIS

State Agencies	County Governments
Public Lands Policy Coordination Office Salt Lake City, UT	Grand County Council Moab, UT
Utah State Historic Preservation Office Salt Lake City, UT	Grand County Council Administrator Moab, UT
Utah School and Institutional Trust Lands Administration Moab, UT	Grand County Road Department Moab, UT
Utah School and Institutional Trust Lands Administration Salt Lake City, UT	San Juan County Commission Monticello, UT
Utah Governor's Office of Planning and Budget Salt Lake City, UT	San Juan County Planner Monticello, UT
Utah Department of Transportation Price, UT	
Utah State Parks Moab, UT	
Utah Governor's Office of Planning and Budget Salt Lake City, UT	
City Governments	Elected Officials
City of Moab Moab, UT	Senator Orrin Hatch Washington, DC
Town of Castle Valley Moab, UT	Senator Bob Bennett Washington, DC
City of Monticello Monticello, UT	Representative Jim Matheson Washington, DC
Town of Green River Green River, UT	Mike Dmitrich State Senator Price, UT
	Brad King State Representative Price, UT 84501
	John Mathis State Representative Vernal, UT
Tribal Governments	
Hopi Tribal Council Kykotsmovi, AZ	Governor Pueblo of Laguna Laguna, N.M.

Table 5.11. Distribution List Proposed RMP/Final EIS

Hopi Cultural Preservation Office Hopi Tribal Council Kykotsmovi, AZ	NAGPRA Coordinator Pueblo of Laguna Laguna, NM
President Navajo Nation Window Rock, AZ	Governor Pueblo of Santa Clara Española, NM
Cultural Specialist Navajo Nation Window Rock, AZ	Land Claims and Rights Protection Officer Pueblo of Santa Clara Española, NM
Director Navajo Utah Commission Montezuma Creek, UT	Governor Pueblo of Zia Zia Pueblo, NM
Chairman Southern Ute Tribe Ignacio, CO	Cultural Preservation Officer Pueblo of Zia Zia Pueblo, NM
NAGPRA Coordinator Southern Ute Tribe Ignacio, CO	Governor Pueblo of Zuni Zuni, NM
Chairman Ute Mountain Ute Tribe Towaoc, CO	Manager Zuni Cultural Resources Enterprise Zuni, NM
Tribal Cultural Representative Ute Mountain Ute Tribe Towaoc, CO	Manager Uintah & Ouray Agency Bureau of Indian Affairs Fort Duchesne, UT
Chairwoman Uintah and Ouray Tribal Business Committee Fort Duchesne, UT	Chairwoman Paiute Indian Tribe of Utah Cedar City, UT
Director Cultural Rights and Protection Fort Duchesne, UT	Cultural Resources Director Paiute Indian Tribe of Utah Cedar City, UT
Public Libraries	Adjoining State Agencies
Public Reading Room Salt Lake City Public Library 210 East 400 South Salt Lake City, UT 84111	Colorado Division of Wildlife Grand Junction, CO
Grand County Public Library 257 East Center Moab, UT 84532	

Table 5.11. Distribution List Proposed RMP/Final EIS

San Juan County Public Library P.O. Box 66 Monticello, UT 84535	
Public Reading Room Marriott Library University of Utah 295 S. 1500 East Salt Lake City, UT 84112-0860	
Mesa County Public Library Public Reading Room 530 Grand Avenue Grand Junction, CO 81502-5019	
Library of Congress 101 Independence Avenue SE Washington DC 20540	

5.8 LIST OF PREPARERS

The BLM Moab FO PRMP/FEIS was written and produced by a team composed of Moab FO interdisciplinary resource specialists and SWCA Inc., an independent, third-party consulting firm. In accordance with 40 CFR 1506.5(c), SWCA certified that it does not have any financial or other interest in the outcome of the decisions made pursuant to this RMP/FEIS. Under the guidance and direction of the BLM, and in collaboration with the cooperating agencies, the team developed alternatives, collected baseline data to be used in the analysis, assessed potential affects of the alternatives, and prepared all the necessary elements of an RMP/FEIS with additional participation, comments, and critique from the cooperating agencies and resource specialists with the BLM Utah State Office. Table 5.8 lists the name, position, and planning role of the team members associated with preparation of the PRMP/FEIS.

Table 5.12. List of Preparers

Name	Position	Education	Planning Role
BLM			
Ann Marie Aubry	Hydrologist	B.S.	Air Quality, Soils/Watershed
Dusty Carpenter	Ecology SCEP	B.S.	Livestock Grazing
Jean Carson	GIS Specialist		GIS Mapping
Kate Juenger	Planning Coordinator, Fire		
Brent Northrup	Resource Advisor	B.S.	RMP Project Manager, Minerals, Health and Safety
Marilyn Peterson	Outdoor Recreation Planner	B.S.	Wild and Scenic Rivers

Table 5.12. List of Preparers

Name	Position	Education	Planning Role
Pam Riddle	Wildlife Biologist	B.S.	Wildlife and Fisheries, Special Status Animal Species
Bill Stevens	Planning Specialist	Ph D.	Wilderness, Socioeconomics, Travel
Katie Stevens	Outdoor Recreation Planner	Ph D.	Areas of Critical Environmental Concern, Recreation
Rob Sweeten	Landscape Architect	B.S.	Visual Resource Management
Daryl Trotter	Environmental Protection Specialist	B.S.	NEPA Specialist, Riparian, Special Status Plant Species, Vegetation, Woodlands
Donna Turnipseed	Archaeologist	B.S.	Cultural, Paleontology, National Historic Trails
Mary von Koch	Realty Specialist	M.S.	Lands and Realty
Doug Wight	GIS Coordinator	M.S.	GIS Mapping
Dave Williams	Range Conservationist	B.S.	Livestock Grazing
Maggie Wyatt	Moab Field Office Manager	M.A.	Management
SWCA Inc.			
Laura Burch	Environmental Planner	M.P.A.	Socioeconomics, Hazardous Materials
Linda Burfitt	Technical Editor	B.A.	General
Karl Chalker	Technical Editor	M.A.	General
Tonya Dombrowski	Environmental Chemist	Ph D.	Air Quality
Sherri Ellis	Cultural Resources Lead	M.S.	Cultural Resources, Lands and Realty
Janet Guinn	Project Coordinator	B.A.	Project Coordination, Formatting
David Harris	NEPA Specialist	M.S.	Recreation, Travel, Visual Resource Management, Woodlands
Kristen Knippenberg	Resource Specialist, Technical Editor	M.F.A.	Minerals, editing
Greg Larson	Resource Specialist	M.S.	Fire, Lands, Soils
Cynthia Manseau	Technical Editor	B.A.	General
Susan Martin	Ecologist	M.S.	Special Status Plant Species, Vegetation
Eric McCulley	Geologist	B.S.	Riparian, Soils/Watershed
Molly Mollenaar	Cultural Anthropologist	M.A.	Native American Consultation

Table 5.12. List of Preparers

Name	Position	Education	Planning Role
Paul Murphey	Principal Investigator, Paleontology	Ph D.	Paleontology
Matt Peterson	Principal Ecologist	M.S.	NEPA Specialist/QA/QC
Deb Reber	Natural Resource Planner	B.S.	Project Manager/QA/QC
Jan Reed	Ecologist	B.A.	Livestock Grazing
Dave Reinhart	GIS Coordinator	B.A.	GIS Mapping
Tyson Schreiner	GIS Coordinator	B.S.	GIS Mapping
Thomas Sharp	Ecologist	M.S.	Special Status Animal Species, Wildlife
Sherri Wysong	Resource Specialist	B.S.	Special Designations, Wilderness Characteristics