

APPENDIX N. DRAFT TRAVEL PLAN BLM MONTICELLO FIELD OFFICE

N.1 INTRODUCTION

Travel management is the process of planning for and managing access and travel systems on the public lands. Comprehensive travel management planning should address all resource use aspects, such as recreational, traditional, casual, agricultural, commercial, and educational, and accompanying modes and conditions of travel on public lands, not just motorized or off-highway vehicle activities (BLM Land Use Planning Handbook 1601-1, Appendix C). This includes travel needs for all resource management programs administered by the BLM, including but not limited to the mineral industry, livestock grazing, and recreation.

Though historically focused on motor vehicle use, comprehensive travel management also encompasses all forms of transportation including travel by foot, horseback and other livestock, mechanized vehicles such as bicycles, as well as the numerous forms of motorized vehicles from two-wheeled (motorcycles) and four-wheeled such as all-terrain vehicles (ATVs) to cars, trucks, and boats motorized and non-motorized.

The term off-road vehicle (ORV) is an outdated term that has the same meaning as off-highway vehicle (OHV), which is currently in use. The term off-highway vehicle (OHV) refers to the latter group noted above – "any motorized vehicle capable of, or designated for, travel on or immediately over land, water, or other natural terrain," as defined in the National Management Strategy for Motorized Off-Highway Vehicle Use on Public Lands, finalized by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) in January 2001. The intent of the National Strategy was to update and revitalize management of off-highway motor vehicle use on BLM administered lands. The national strategy provides guidance and recommendations to accomplish that purpose.

The process of development and content of the preliminary draft Monticello travel plan are described in this document.

N.2 HOW TO READ/USE THIS DOCUMENT

This Travel Plan document addresses the process by which the BLM Monticello Field Office Interdisciplinary (ID) Team and the BLM cooperators have developed the Draft EIS alternatives for motorized and non-motorized use in the resource area. This document takes the reader through the current process of travel planning within the Monticello Field Office, and describes the route designations.

- The Land Use Planning portion of the travel plan defines the areas within the field office that are determined to be Open, Limited, or Closed, and the number of miles of designated routes under the Limited category.
- The Implementation portion of the travel plan describes the routes designated, seasonal closures and associated resource and/or user conflicts, mapping and travel information, signing, interagency coordination, use supervision, monitoring, enforcement, maintenance, and cost estimates for the implementation process.

Public scoping and input issues that were brought forward for this travel plan process are described in Section N.6.

The criteria and inventory processes by which the BLM and its cooperators arrived at the routes included in the draft environmental impact statement (DEIS) alternatives are outlined in Sections N.7 and N.8.

The travel plan development process is presented in Section N.9; lists of routes for non - motorized, equestrian/stock, and foot travel are also provided in Section N.9.4. Lists of preliminary motorized route closures can be viewed at the Monticello FO.

The analysis of impacts for the travel plan will be completed within the DEIS of the RMP process; the decisions made for the RMP will be in the Record of Decision (ROD).

Finally, implementation planning including mapping, signing, and public information is outlined in Section N.15 including general monitoring descriptions, proposals for educational programs, and the role of law enforcement in travel management for the Monticello Field Office. Cost estimates to accomplish the travel plan implementation are included in Section N.15.

Acronyms and Definitions commonly used in addressing off-road vehicle use are found in Attachment A and B, respectively. Lists of proposed route closures in the four draft alternatives, preliminary travel maps for the Monticello Field Office area (as of September 2005), and a summary and comparisons of BLM travel plan to two organizations' proposals can be viewed at the Monticello FO.

Note: Alternative E was developed subsequent to the Travel Plan. Alternative E under the Travel plan would be the same as Alternative B except non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be managed as closed to OHV use.

N.3 SUMMARY

Land Use Planning – The Code of Federal Regulations (43 CFR Part 8340) and Executive Order 12608 require BLM to designate all public lands as Open, Limited, or Closed for OHV use. These designations are made in the Resource Management Plans (RMPs) or in plan amendments. Additionally, the criteria for route designation are established in the RMP.

The following table represents the Open, Limited, and Closed acreages determined by the Monticello Field Office (FO) ID Team (as of September 2005).

OHV Designation Categories on BLM Lands (1,783,123 acres)	Number of Acres ¹			
	No Action [RMP 1991]	Alternative B Conservation	Alternative C Balanced	Alternative D Commodity
Open	611,310	0	2,311	2,311
Limited – to designated	218,780	1,352,053	1,354,784	1,780,807
Limited use-seasonal	540,260	NA	NA	NA
Limited – to existing	570,390	NA	NA	NA
Closed	276,430	431,065	426,025	0

* Numbers are subject to change depending on any changes made during the on-going alternative evaluation process.

¹ Acres may be additive because of overlap.

The BLM must distinguish between land use plan and implementation decisions in all proposed RMP documents and related decisions, and clearly describe for the public the administrative remedies for each type of decision (BLM H-1610-1, Appendix E, Page 1). The protest procedures in 43 CFR 1610.5-2 provide the public an administrative review of the State Director's proposed land use plan decisions. The BLM Director determines through this process whether the State Director followed established procedure, considered relevant information in reaching proposed decisions, and whether the proposed decisions are consistent with BLM policy, regulation, and stature (BLM H-1610-1, Appendix E, Page 1).

Implementation – Selection and identification of individual roads and trails within the travel plan system are implementation level decisions.

The following table represents a comparison of the number of miles of routes that were evaluated under the Total Resource Area (all ownership and all agency's lands) compared to the Monticello Field Office area (BLM and State lands), and the number of miles of Travel Plan routes spread across a range of alternatives [as of September, 2005].

Description of Mapped Area ¹	Alternative B ² Conservation	Alternative C ² Balanced	Alternative D ² Commodity
Highways, B, C and D roads, and trails within the Resource Area Boundary – including all ownership and all agencies (4,582,997 acres)	5,698 miles	6,171 miles	6,452 miles
Total number of GIS lines (segments)	4,918 GIS lines	5,440 GIS lines	5,814 GIS lines
Total length of closures in miles over the number of GIS lines (segments)	780 miles 1,083 GIS lines	320 miles 563 GIS lines	45 miles 119 GIS lines
**Highway, B, C and D roads, and trails within BLM and State lands (1,987,439 acres)	2,984 miles	3,433 miles	3,712 miles
Total number of GIS lines (segments)	2,337 GIS lines	2,859 GIS lines	3,233 GIS lines
Total length of closures in miles over the number of GIS lines (segments)	780 miles 1,083 GIS lines	320 miles 563 GIS lines	45 miles 119 GIS lines
***D roads and trails within BLM and State lands (1,987,439 acres)	1,778 miles	2,229 miles	2,508 miles
Total number of GIS lines (segments)	2,108 GIS lines	2,630 GIS lines	3,004 GIS lines
Total length of closures in miles over the number of GIS lines (segments)	780 miles 1,083 GIS lines	320 miles 563 GIS lines	45 miles 119 GIS lines

¹ B roads are regularly maintained; surfaces can be natural, paved, gravel; funded by State of Utah for maintenance; C roads are city (Monticello and Blanding) roads; D roads are all natural surface, and not on a maintenance schedule though they can be maintained, and not funded by the State.

² All mileages include a few segments at the northern field office boundary area that are on Monticello FO land but are managed by the Moab FO.

** This set of calculations represents the Monticello Field Office Travel Plan figures.

*** D roads and trails represent the portion of the travel plan that will be central to implementation signage.

Implementation decisions may be appealed to the Interior Board of Land Appeals, Office of the Secretary, in accordance with the regulations contained in 43 CFR 4, and Form 1842-1.

Management Common to All (MCA) alternatives include the following travel plan related action items as developed by the ID Team in preliminary alternative development meetings:

- In areas limited to designated routes, only designated routes are open to motorized use.
- There will be no cross-country travel for game retrieval or antler gathering in areas designated as limited or closed. This policy is consistent with the policies of all the National Forests in Utah, none of which allow this type of off-road use.
- Any fire, military, emergency or law enforcement vehicle when used for emergency purposes is exempted from OHV decisions.
- Wilderness Study Areas are to be either designated as limited or closed to OHV use, and must be managed and monitored to comply with the interim management policy non-impairment standard.

Management of the BLM Monticello Field Office Travel Plan will follow the decisions made in the signed Resource Management Plan (RMP) / Record of Decision (ROD).

N.4 AUTHORITY AND GUIDANCE

- Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA), 43 U.S.C 1701 – Land use plans and revision should be based on principles of multiple use and sustained yield.
- National Environmental Policy Act, (NEPA), 42 U.S.C. 4321.
- Executive Order No. 11644, Feb 8, 1972 - This order established criteria by which federal agencies were to develop regulations for the management of ORVs on lands under their management. Agencies are to "monitor the effects" of ORV use on their public lands and, "on the basis of the information gathered, they shall from time to time amend or rescind designation of areas for ORV use "as necessary to further" its policy.
- Executive Order No. 11989, May 25, 1977 – This order modified ED 11644 – This order authorized agencies to adopt a policy that particular lands can be considered closed to ORVs once it is determined that OHV use "will cause or is causing considerable adverse effects" to particular resources.
- Executive Order No. 12898, 1994 – Indicates that Federal planning efforts should give consideration to how plans will affect local economies.
- 43 C.F.R. Part 8340 – the ORV Regulations – Establish criteria for designating lands as open, limited, or closed to the use of ORVs.
- Archeological Resources Protection Act (ARPA), 1979, as amended. And other Cultural protection laws and regulations.
- Taylor Grazing Act, 43 U.S.C. 315a.
- Endangered Species Act, 16 U.S.C. 1531 – Federal agencies shall give consideration to ensure agency actions do not jeopardize the continued existence of any endangered species.
- Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, 16 U.S.C. 460 1-6a.
- National Historic Preservation Act, as amended, 1966.
- Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, 16 U.S.C. 1281c.
- National Trails System Act, 16 U.S.C. 1241.
- U.S. Department of the Interior, BLM, Interim Management Policy for Lands Under Wilderness Review, H-8559-1.

- Resource Management Plan, BLM San Juan Resource Area, March 1991.
- IB WO 99-181, OHV Use in WSAs.
- IM UT 2001-090, Implementation of Utah Recreation Guidelines.
- IM WO No. 2004 – Clarification of Cultural Resource Considerations for Off-Highway (OHV) Route Designation and Travel Management.
- IM WO 2004-005, Clarification of OHV Designations and Travel Management in the BLM Land Use Planning Process.
- IM UT 2004-008, Clarification of OHV Designations and Travel Management in the BLM Land Use Planning Process.
- IM UT 2004-061, Designating Off Highway Vehicle Routes in the Land Use Planning Process.
- OHV – National Management Strategy for Motorized Off-Highway Vehicle Use on Public Lands, USDI, BLM, January 2001.
- BLM, Indian Creek Recreation Corridor Environmental Assessment (draft), Monticello Field Office, Monticello, Utah, 2005.
- Standards for Rangeland Health of BLM Land in Utah, May 1997.

N.5 TRAVEL PLAN DESIGNATION PROCESS

A goal of the BLM Monticello Field Office planning process is to develop, with its cooperators, a travel plan that provides access to resources and resource areas. The goals and objectives of this travel plan apply to all areas of travel management including resources access, appropriate recreation opportunities that at the same time protect public land resources, ensuring public safety, minimizing conflicts among the various public land uses, and providing for support of the local economy (see also Section N.9.).

N.5.1 HISTORY OF OHV BLM GUIDANCE

The 1991 BLM San Juan Resource Area RMP included designations for Open, Closed, and Limited OHV areas. Under the Limited category there were two sub-categories: 1) limited to existing roads and trails, and 2) limited to designated roads and trails. Over the subsequent decade, due to lack of funding and staff, the actual on-the-ground implementation of designations either by mapping or signing of routes was never completed.

In the current RMP process, state and national guidance for OHV use and travel planning in the sub-categories under the Limited designation has changed. Designating Open, Closed, and Limited areas for OHV use continues to be mandated, but under the Limited category only the 'limited to designated roads and trails' sub-category is recommended. The designation of the sub-category called 'existing roads and trails' is no longer an option. Eliminating the 'existing roads and trails' sub-category prevents confusion and enforcement problems concerning new unauthorized routes being created, and then used by the public because they are then 'existing'.

Designation of routes under the Limited category provides a purposefully designed and clearly delineated travel network, reduces route proliferation, and facilitates travel management and law enforcement.

By policy (IM No. 2004-005) BLM also recommends that as many roads as possible be designated under the Limited category within the RMP planning process. However, the following guidance applies if all routes cannot be designated within the plan:

If complexity, controversy, or incomplete data make it impossible to complete the selection of a road and trail network for any area designated-as-limited within reasonable time frames or budget availability, the BLM will perform the selection process for all limited areas that can be completed. For any limited areas or sub-area that cannot be completed in the RMP, the BLM will, to the extent possible:

- Incorporate a map of a preliminary road and trail network, including known roads or trails that are expected to be included in the final network;
- Define short-term management guidance for road and trail access and activities, including interim management guidelines for proper identification of the preliminary road and trail network, including signing and maintenance of open roads and trails;
- Outline additional data needs and a strategy to collect needed information;
- Establish a clear planning sequence, including public collaboration, criteria and constraints for subsequent road and trail selection and identification;
- Produce a schedule to complete the limited area or sub-area road and trail selection process. Normally, this process should not exceed five years, and
- Install signs, and in some cases, construct barriers or perform restoration on closed roads and trails. (IM No. 2004-005).

Plan maintenance and changes to the route designation plan are addressed in this document in Section N.13.

N.5.2 INTERDISCIPLINARY (ID) TEAM PROCESS

Guidance for developing a Travel Plan includes utilizing the ID Team approach (8342.21A and 43 CFR 1601.1-3). The following individuals participated in the completion of this plan.

Monticello FO Interdisciplinary (ID) Team Members and Cooperators

Name	Resource /Organization
Andy Boone	Co-lead, GIS, Mapping
Maxine Deeter	Co-lead, Lands & Realty, Visual Resource Management
Mark Lambert	Co-lead, Planning, WO
Todd Berkenfield	Co-lead, Planning, WSRs, ACECs
Sandra Meyers	Field Office Manager
Nick Sandberg	Range, Assistant Field Manager
Gary Torres	Planning Project Manager, NEPA Coordinator
Paul Curtis	Range, Riparian/Wetlands, Water
Summer Schulz	Vegetation, Weeds, Range, Woodlands
Tammy Wallace	Wildlife, Air Quality
Brenda Dale	Fire and Fuels Management

Monticello FO Interdisciplinary (ID) Team Members and Cooperators

Name	Resource /Organization
Marie Tuxhorn	Law Enforcement
Jim Ragsdale	Law Enforcement
Ted McDougall	Minerals, Geology
Jeff Brown	Minerals, Hazardous Materials
Scott Berkenfield	Recreation Supervisor, Wilderness
Brad Colin	Recreation
Linda Richmond	San Juan River Ranger, Recreation
Mark Meloy	San Juan River Ranger, Recreation
Laura Lantz	Kane Gulch Ranger, Recreation
Scott Edwards	Kane Gulch Ranger, Recreation
Marilyn Low	Permits, Recreation
Nancy Shearin	Cultural, Paleontology
Jim Carter	Cultural - BLM
Ed Scherick	San Juan County - Planner
Evan Lowry	San Juan County, Planner
Ben Nielson	San Juan County, Assistant Planner

Between October of 2003 and August of 2005, the ID Team held 31 meetings specifically concerning the travel plan, and 13 coordination meetings with cooperators, other agencies, and with groups that had presented travel routes proposals [meeting minutes are in the RMP Administrative Record].

N.6 IDENTIFICATION OF ISSUES**N.6.1 SCOPING, ISSUES, AND PUBLIC INPUT**

OHV/Travel issues were identified by BLM resource specialists in the pre-plan, through the Public Scoping process for the Monticello/Moab Field Offices RMP, by input from the public in response to Planning Bulletin #3 -- Request for Route Data, and through proposals for travel routes presented to BLM from organizations.

The BLM staff identified the following issues concerning travel in the field office:

- Use designations in the current RMP are outdated and do not address the current level of use.
- Need to incorporate BLM OHV National Strategy and Utah OHV Strategy in planning efforts.
- OHV designations need to be reviewed and revised as necessary to protect other resources.
- Maps need to be developed to identify uses of competing resources, and to show the public where OHV use is allowed.
- Implement designated routes on-the-ground through signing and maps.
- Make certain that OHV designations are consistent with Wilderness Study Areas (WSAs).

- Coordinate with adjacent field offices to match OHV designations.
- Dependence of local industry on public lands.
- Increased recreation use and demand.
- Conflicts between OHV use and other resources including riparian, wildlife, grazing and cultural.
- Conflicts between user groups such as, non-motorized and motorized users, and river runners and OHV users, commercial and private users, OHV use and unregulated camping.

Comments received from public scoping were placed in one of three categories:

- Issues to be addressed in the resource management plan (RMP) – Specific to this travel plan, these are the OHV/Travel issues considered in the Monticello Field Office;
- Issues that can be addressed through policy or administrative actions; or
- Issues beyond the scope of the plan: The RS 2477 issue is beyond the scope of this plan (see Section N.7).

Comments from the six public scoping meetings included 440 comments on recreation and OHV/Travel or 35% of the total 1,250 comments. Comments received in letters concerning the Monticello Field Office OHV and Travel program totaled 3,454 or 39% of the total comments, with the remaining 61% of the comments addressing the 14 remaining resource or planning categories (Moab and Monticello RMP Revisions, Scoping Summary, BLM, July 2004).

There is a high level of interest and concern about travel and OHV use in the Monticello Field Office planning area. The increase in recreational vehicle (OHV) use is indicated by the increase in vehicle registrations in San Juan County from 295 vehicles in 1998 to 1,039 vehicles in 2004, a 350% increase (Utah OHV Transactions by County and Fiscal Year, 2005).

Input from Public Scoping both through the public meetings (June 4, 2003 through December 31, 2004), and through input responses to Planning Bulletin # 3, identified the following issues, many of which are similar to those noted above:

- How can increased recreation use, especially motorized vehicle use, be managed while protecting natural resource values?
- Which areas should be designated as open, limited or closed to OHV use, and which routes should be designated within the limited category?
- What types of recreation travel should be available on designated routes and under what limitations?
- Where could adaptive management be applied in response to unacceptable resource impacts?
- How should recreational uses be managed to limit conflicts with other recreational users?
- How should camping, human waste, fires, and wood collection be managed? [in terms of OHVs]
- How should conflicts with other resource uses be reduced?
- What management actions should be implemented to mitigate damage caused by recreational uses, including vehicles, on other resources and sensitive areas, especially riparian areas?
- How should recreation in the planning areas be managed to ensure public health and safety?
- Where and under what circumstances should permitted recreation uses be available?

- What types of recreational facilities and uses should be available, and what limitation should be required?
- Where can the recreation opportunity spectrum (ROS) be applied?

N.7 DEVELOPING PLANNING CRITERIA

Considerations of both social and physical elements help to define the criteria for a travel plan. The social aspects include public demands, historical uses, existing rights-of-way, permitted uses, public access, resource development, law enforcement and safety, conflicts between existing or potential uses, recreation opportunities, local uses, cultural and economic issues. Physical aspects include the terrain, soils, water and watersheds, connectedness of routes, special designations [ACECs, WSAs], demands for specific types of vehicle use, and manageability considerations.

General planning criteria for the Resource Management Plan (RMP) process includes:

- Decisions - All decisions made in the RMP will only apply to public lands managed by the BLM.
- Existing Rights – The plan recognizes current, valid existing rights.

Specific to the travel plan, the criteria include:

- National OHV Policy - Decisions regarding OHV travel will be consistent with the BLM's National OHV Strategy.
- R.S. 2477 - No regulations to either assert or recognize R.S. 2477 rights-of-way currently exist. While R.S. 2477 claims have been asserted by San Juan County, it is beyond the scope of this document to recognize or reject R.S. 2477 assertions, and this issue is not addressed further in this Travel Plan. Nothing in this document is intended to provide evidence bearing on or addressing the validity of any R.S. 2477 assertions. At such time as a decision is made of R.S. 2477 assertions, BLM will adjust travel routes accordingly, where necessary.
- Access to Utah School and Institutional Trust Lands Administration (SITLA) State Sections - BLM is required to provide access to State lands.

N.7.1 OHV DESIGNATION CRITERIA

Policy guidance in BLM Manual 8343.1 lists the following protection criteria that must be met by BLM in the travel planning process:

1. Cultural and Natural Resources – Designations must minimize damage to all cultural and natural resources. Examples of these include, but are not limited to, the following: historical and archeological sites, soil, water, air, vegetation, and scenic values.
2. Wildlife – Designations must minimize harassment of wildlife and/or significant disruption of wildlife habitat.
3. Endangered Species – Special attention must be given to protect endangered or threatened species and their habitat.
4. Wilderness – Designations must not impair the wilderness suitability of lands under consideration for inclusion in the wilderness system.

User Access Requirements – the following criteria are used to assure adequate consideration for the requirements for each resource activity (i.e., minerals, range, forestry, recreation, etc) as they relate to access needs:

1. Operational needs – designations must consider user access requirements for inventory, exploration, use supervision, maintenance, development, and extraction of public land resources as well as maintenance of facilities on public lands.
2. State and Private Land – designations must consider the access and use needs for areas and trails located within intermingled State and private land.

Public Safety – The designation of areas and trails for ORV use must be completed so as to promote public safety, recognizing that challenge and risk are desirable factors for some uses.

1. Hazards – Designations must minimize or eliminate ORV use in areas of extreme natural or man-made hazards unless such hazards can be mitigated.
2. Safety Factors – Designations must separate uses in situations where public safety factors present unacceptable risks (e.g., rifle ranges, children's play areas, mines, etc.).

Conflict Resolution – The designation of areas and trails for ORV use must assure full consideration of the multiple-use values of public lands consistent with the following criteria:

1. Balanced Approach – Designations must provide as wide and as balanced an approach to public land access as possible to protect public land resource values while at the same time meeting user access needs.
2. Other Uses – Designations must minimize conflicts between ORV use and other existing or proposed uses of the public lands.
3. Compatibility – Designations must ensure the compatibility of ORV uses with existing conditions in populated and other sensitive areas by taking into account noise, air pollution, and other factors of the human environment.

N.7.2 MONTICELLO FIELD OFFICE CRITERIA FOR TRAVEL PLAN

Criteria for travel planning include Standards for Rangeland Health; establishing purpose and need (P/N) for routes per above mentioned guidance; defining conflicts between resources; defining conflicts among users; evaluation and consideration of routes in terms of WSAs; administration and emergency uses; and access to SITLA lands.

Standards for Rangeland Health of BLM land in Utah relate to all uses of public land, including recreation, and describe natural resource conditions that are needed to sustain public land health. The Standards encompass upland soils; riparian systems; plant and animal communities; special, threatened, and endangered species; and water quality. The Rangeland Health Standards provide guidance for management of resources.

N.7.2.1 PURPOSE AND NEED

The methodology used during the route designation ID Team meetings to develop a well-designed travel network was a combination of guidance received from the BLM State Office (SO) and Washington Office (WO):

- IM UT 2004-061, states that Field Offices should begin the route designation process with existing inventory and data, and then determine purpose and need (P/N) for the existing routes.
- IM WO 2004-005, recommends choosing individual roads and trails for designation, "rather than using inherited roads and trails," because most existing roads "were created by use over time, rather than planned and constructed for specific activities and needs."

The P/N for travel routes are examined in terms of the existing situation on-the-ground in terms of why the route is currently utilized. The Monticello Field Office considered the following criteria for routes in the travel plan:

- Desired future conditions
 - Potential for adverse or positive economic impacts
 - Resource and use conflicts
 - Standards for Public Land Health and Guidelines for Recreation
 - Management for BLM Lands in Utah
- Public health and safety
 - Abandoned Mine Lands
 - Hazardous Materials / locations
- Access
 - Routes identified in guide books
 - Scenic overlooks
 - Routes to SITLA lands
 - Elimination of route redundancy
 - Special Recreation Management Areas (SRMAs)
 - Special designation prescriptions including Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACECs), Wilderness Study Areas (WSAs), and Wild and Scenic Rivers (WSRs)
- Cultural and Paleontological resources
- Fire considerations
- Mineral resources / Energy development
- Rangeland standards
- Recreation Opportunities / Experiences including ROS
- Watershed resources
 - Erosive Soils
 - Saline Soils
 - At-risk watersheds
 - Municipal watersheds
- Vegetative resources
 - Relict vegetations
 - At-risk vegetative sites
- Wildlife resources
 - Special Status Species

- Crucial winter habitats
- Rutting, calving and fawning habitat
- Raptor nesting locations
- Migratory Bird Corridors
- Woodlands resources
- Visual / Scenic resources

N.7.2.2 MITIGATIONS

Mitigations that can be utilized to address conflicts could include:

1. The season and timing of use;
2. The types of vehicle use, motorized and non-motorized;
3. Re-routing of segments; and
4. Other methods of travel.

N.7.2.3 ROUTE NUMBERS

San Juan County has route numbers for each road in their inventory. B roads are identified with three-digits (BXXX), and D routes with four-digits (DXXXX). This system has been carried forward from the county baseline data by the BLM Monticello Field Office in developing their travel plan. Because many of the routes are already marked on the ground by the county, for consistency in developing maps and information for the public, and because BLM Monticello Field Office does not have any BLM-specific roads, the field office has chosen to use the same numbers as the county.

In collaboration with the Manti-LaSal National Forest, which has its own numbering system, BLM and San Juan County have suggested that the BLM provide their joint numbering system with the county as an adjunct to that of the National Forest for signing routes on-the-ground. It is possible that routes on the National Forest will bear two different numbered signs, one for the forest and one denoting the route number of the county route on a separate post. These two systems will be incorporated into the implementation plan in mapping and written public information.

N.7.2.4 ROUTE DESIGNATIONS IN WILDERNESS STUDY AREAS (WSAs)

Information Bulletin No. 99-181 BLM directs BLM to comply with the wilderness 'non-impairment' mandate (FLPMA, Section 603(c)). BLM must monitor and regulate the activities of off-highway vehicles in the Wilderness Study Areas (WSAs) to assure that their use does not compromise these areas by impairing their suitability for designation as wilderness.

The BLM's Off Road Vehicle Regulations (43 CFR 8342.1) require that BLM establish off-road vehicle designations of areas and trails that meet the non-impairment mandate. It is the BLM's policy that cross-country vehicle use in the WSAs does cause the impairment of wilderness suitability. Thus, the BLM should establish off-road vehicle designations in WSAs that limit vehicular access to boundary roads, or "ways" existing inside a WSA that were identified during the inventory phase of the wilderness review (in 1999 for the Monticello FO).

Travel routes within WSAs:

- "Ways" – a trace maintained solely by the passage of vehicles which has not been improved and/or maintained by mechanical means to ensure relatively regular and continuous use (IMP, Glossary, p. 5). Existing way – a "way" (see above) existing on the date of the initial wilderness inventory (IMP, Glossary, p. 1). "Ways" may be designated in a travel plan with rationale for their designation.
- Intrusions – are routes that illegally intrude into WSA boundaries, i.e., they are routes that have developed since [were not present at] the time of the wilderness inventory. There are three in Butler Wash WSA, one in Cheesebox WSA, and one in Indian Creek WSA. These intrusions are listed as closed in all alternatives.

The categories of routes on a large scale map that appear to be within a WSA but are not within the on-the-ground WSA boundary are:

- Cherry-stem route – is usually a dead-end that can form part of a WSA boundary. The narrow area within the cherry-stem is outside of the WSA due to the nature of the route detracting from the wilderness character of the WSA. There are eight cherry stemmed routes in the Monticello travel plan.
- Boundary, or as listed in the Monticello data, a dividing route. This refers to routes that lie at the boundary of WSAs but are not within that boundary. In the Monticello FO there is one such route; it runs between Fish and Road WSAs and is the boundary for each.

MFO received direction from the UTSO on September 17, 2004 (phone conversation with UT OHV Coordinator; Monticello GIS specialist was also present) to avoid designating "ways" in WSAs. A very reasonable and clear justification must be made for "ways" that BLM proposes to designate. This did not pose much of a conflict for Monticello FO, as the ID Team had earlier determined that the majority of WSAs in the resource area would be closed to motorized use. However, a limited number of "ways" were designated in Cedar Mesa WSAs to provide access to trailheads, and to stay in compliance with existing agreements with San Juan County (i.e., route to Moon House).

N.7.2.5 ADMINISTRATIVE ACCESS AND USE

Routes considered for Administrative Use Only were discussed by the ID Team. Several routes proposed in the travel plan including routes to ponds and other range improvements, guzzlers, BLM equipment, etc., were considered under the administrative category. MFO could reserve the right to allow travel on these routes to permittees, BLM employees, or whomever it deemed appropriate on a case-by-case basis.

The ID Team discussed whether these routes should either be designated for use or closed. Keeping routes open for administrative use means that the routes might need to be maintained for travel use even though use might be sporadic. In the current listing of routes, 33 routes covering approximately 36.8 miles are under the Administrative Closure category.

N.7.2.6 EMERGENCY USES

By regulation any fire, military, emergency or law enforcement vehicle when used for emergency purposes is exempted from OHV decisions. Emergency uses in WSAs are covered under the IMP, Section I.B.11 and 12.

N.7.2.7 EMERGENCY LIMITATION OR CLOSURE

Whenever the authorized officer determines that OHV use will cause or is causing considerable adverse effects on resources (soil, vegetation, wildlife, wildlife habitat, cultural, historic, scenic, recreation, or other resources), the area must be immediately closed to the type of use causing the adverse effects (43 CFR 8341.2). Such limitation or closures are not OHV designations.

N.8 INVENTORY - DATA AND INFORMATION COLLECTION

N.8.1 SAN JUAN COUNTY – ROUTE DATA

MFO began the process following the Utah BLM State Office (UTSO) approach. In the initial stages of the planning process, it was agreed that San Juan County's route inventory would serve as a baseline for route data since it was the most complete inventory for the field office area. Because of its expertise and local knowledge on this topic, San Juan County's participation in the route designation process is critical in order to develop a viable and well-designed travel network. Monticello Field Office used a sampling of the San Juan County route data to verify the validity of the

All of Monticello Field Office area lies within San Juan County. Field office staff has taken a systematic approach to verifying the county road data by relying on statistical sampling, [mapping,] and aerial photography wherever possible. The purpose of the road verification process is not to draw conclusions as to the condition, extent of use, or function of these road segments, but simply to verify that they exist." (San Juan County Road Verification Process).

BLM used internet statistics software (found at www.azplanit.com/samplesize.htm) to determine how many road segments would need to be verified in order to establish a 95% confidence interval and a maximum acceptable margin of error of 5 percentage points that the County road data was accurate. The software indicated that a minimum sample size would require a selection of 344 segments.

All road segments were selected randomly. To accomplish this, staff used a random selection tool extension in ArcView 3.3 GIS software to select 344 segments.

...Field Office staff could positively verify the existence of 343 of the 344 (or 99.7%) segment sample. One segment was not verifiable by DOQ (digital ortho quad [digital aerial photograph]) because it was located along the edge of the photograph. This segment was found on the 24k topographical map, however. Since the segments examined were a true random sample of the population of interests, BLM can be at least 95% confident that the September 27, 2001 inventory data provided by San Juan County is 99.7% accurate (Memorandum, MFO Travel Plan Development, October 8, 2004, by Bill Stevens, Moab BLM Office).

MFO also chose initially to utilize the County's purpose and need (P/N) determinations for the routes in the inventory. This decision was based on what MFO saw as the logistical problem of verifying P/N for every one of the thousands of segments in the County inventory. A number of

county P/N determinations, however, were based merely on the existence of a route on the ground. When it delivered its inventory to BLM, San Juan County asserted that "all roads go somewhere and serve a purpose. Otherwise, they would not be there".

From a BLM standpoint, this statement in itself is insufficient evidence for P/N, and can be construed as being inconsistent with Washington Office guidance. In order to develop a logical travel plan from existing routes, P/N must be determined from existing use (IM UT 004-061, pg. 3). Otherwise, routes that were redundant, created for one-time use such as old seismic lines, fire lines, and chaining routes, and which receive little to no current use, remain part of the travel system simply because there is a mark on the ground. Often these routes serve no current purpose. It is here that San Juan County and BLM differed on the basis for some determinations of P/N.

It is also important to consider the distinct purposes for which the County's inventory was developed, and for which the BLM is developing a travel plan for the Monticello resource area. Reviews of BLM P/N is tied to evaluation of routes based on access, resource uses, and use conflicts.

Coordination with the County has been on-going; county planners were present at meetings regarding OHV area designations and have been involved with the discussion of route designations under the Limited category listed in the range of alternatives.

In a letter dated February 9, 2005, San Juan County noted that in driving the county for their road inventory data gathering, they recognized numerous travel junctions [points] (2,965 including mining roads, routes to oil wells, scenic vistas, state lands, private lands, wildlife guzzlers, and other uses)), which did not currently have a purpose and need. The county identified these with GPS point data but did not drive them or collect any line data.

They further stated that as they drove the various routes in the county, they "became aware of the many activities occurring along the roads, and realized that only a portion of the purpose and need activities was captured." San Juan County notes that after working with the BLM ID Team, they concluded that the additional collected data would be useful not "only in your [BLM] planning efforts but the overall management of your field office", and provided BLM with the data. They also noted that they made no claim that their data represents all the activities occurring, but only a small portion.

N.8.2 ROUTE DATA INPUT FROM THE PUBLIC

On November 1, 2003, MFO requested from the public (Planning Bulletin #3, Request for Route Data) substantive and verifiable information on routes within the planning area beyond what was in the San Juan County inventory. BLM received additional route information from three individuals and two citizen groups.

N.8.2.1 DATA SUBMITTED BY BER KNIGHT

The data submitted by Mr. Knight included approximately 100 road segments covering approximately 104 miles of roads. The data submitted included GPS data of routes that were not a part of the County road data. These routes range from approximately 0.1 mile to 3 miles in length. The data has been examined by field office personnel and all of the routes in the data set

were confirmed to exist when compared with satellite imagery and USGS 1:24,000 scale topographic maps.

Knight's submittals were later determined to have no purpose and need. All of the "new" route information fell under one of the following categories, leading to the determination of no purpose and need:

- Route redundant to more established routes;
- Route leading to no significant location or feature and receiving very little to no current use; and/or
- Route developed due to one-time use, receiving very little to no current use (old seismic lines, fire line, chaining route, etc.).

N.8.2.2 DATA SUBMITTED BY ROBERT NORTON AND ROBERT TELEPAK, MD

Submittals from individuals Misters Robert Norton and Telepak were examined by field office personnel and determined not to be new. All routes identified were already part of the County's inventory; no further analysis for route verification was needed or conducted.

N.8.2.3 DATA SUBMITTED BY SAN JUAN PUBLIC ENTRY AND ACCESS RIGHTS, INC (SPEAR), [PREVIOUSLY SOUTHEAST UTAH LAND USERS ASSOCIATION (SULU)]

Data provided by SPEAR/SULU, under the name The Canyon Rims Trail System Basic Master Plan, includes approximately 535 miles of roads which form loop systems throughout San Juan and Grand Counties. Most of the roads in the proposal are included in the San Juan County road data. Loop systems are mainly along County roads with some parts of the loops including trails and potential new routes. The plan proposed new construction of connector routes on Forest Service, National Park, and BLM lands.

The question arose concerning the evaluation of the SPEAR Canyon Rim Trails Systems proposal as to whether the entire system would be considered as a whole including proposed constructed connections, and routes that were not included in the travel plan, or whether the SPEAR proposal would be compared to the routes designated in the Monticello Field Office travel plan for the portions that were coincidental. It was decided that the latter comparison would be completed.

BLM agrees that having a route system for ATV travel is a component of the travel plan. However, evaluating the potential construction of connector routes, and the evaluation of route proposals through some specific resource areas would require site-specific NEPA. Therefore, the BLM cannot evaluate the proposal in its entirety in the current planning process.

Maps presented at the February 2005 meeting by the SPEAR group were derivations of the map presented during scoping for the RMP. Also brought to that February meeting were 7 ½ quad maps with markings indicating additional routes and connector routes that SPEAR would like to see included in their planned system. These, as noted above, will be considered on a site-by-site basis activity-level planning.

BLM will complete their travel plan process and in so doing will compare the BLM designated routes with those proposed by SPEAR. In the planning process BLM will make note of the SPEAR routes that are coincidental to the BLM travel plan routes in the DEIS (a summary and

comparisons of BLM travel plan to the SPEAR routes can be viewed at the Monticello FO). The BLM will work with San Juan County for SPEAR proposals in the implementation phase of the travel plan to consider on a site-specific basis NEPA process which routes, connectors, and staging areas are consistent with the goals and objectives of the resource management plan. BLM would recognize infrastructure additions under the Title V process, and will compare the proposed network of routes based on resource evaluations through the NEPA process (see Section N.9.4.2.4).

N.8.2.4 DATA SUBMITTED BY THE REDROCK HERITAGE COALITION (RRHC)

Data submitted by the Redrock Heritage Coalition was in the form of a route designation plan, the "Red Rock Heritage Proposal for Sustainable Economies and Ecosystems". The Redrock Heritage proposal is related to the Red Rock Wilderness Proposal in that the route designation plan limits available routes in areas proposed as wilderness. Available routes are existing routes that are included in the San Juan County road data. When compared with the county's data, the RRHC proposal calls for approximately 1,796 fewer route miles, with approximately 42 fewer miles of Class B roads and 1,830 fewer miles of Class D roads.

This proposal basically limits travel to most existing County B Roads and 45% of existing County D Roads. The RRHC proposal is based on the reasoning that few places exist in the County where one can be more than 0.5 miles from a motorized route, thus, the RRHC proposal increases the opportunity for 'quiet users' to be further away from motorized routes.

BLM analyzed the specific route closures that RRHC proposed in their submittal of September 15, 2004, and made preliminary suggestions to the travel plan alternatives as appropriate (see Section N.9.4.2.5). RRHC noted that 'quiet [user] vs. motorized user opportunities are not currently balanced in this resource area', which is what RRHC attempts to correct in their proposal. This information has been taken into account in the conservation and balanced alternatives (see BLM's Comment Analysis on RRHC Proposal, April 2005, and RRHC's specific route recommendations analyzed by BLM, both in the Administrative Record).

A comparison of the RRHC proposal and the routes in Alternatives B and C will be made by the BLM staff. However, the data provided by RRHC included the entire resource area including Forest Service lands, National Park Service lands, and Navajo Nation lands. It took some time to re-digitize the data into the BLM shape system to reflect BLM lands, and then make the comparison between what RRHC proposes and the Monticello Field Office travel plan proposed alternatives. A summary and comparisons of BLM travel plan to two organizations' proposals can be viewed at the Monticello FO. This comparison was completed before the draft alternatives were completed, and will be analyzed in the DEIS (see Section N.9.4.2.5).

N.8.3 TRAVEL PLAN EVALUATION

A meeting with the San Juan County was held October 8, 2004 to review the process described in this document. It was planned that specific details regarding designated routes would be sent to the County at a later date but prior to any scheduled cooperators' meetings. As mentioned above, the field office's P/N determinations, while made by specialists familiar with the route or area in question, were not field checked, and needed the County's input to verify several of BLM's P/N determinations. Over the ensuing four months, BLM and county planning

representatives worked together to share this needed information and comments on the preliminary draft travel plan.

N.9 MONTICELLO FIELD OFFICE TRAVEL PLAN DEVELOPMENT

N.9.1 GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Goals are statements that describe a desired condition to be achieved some time in the future. Goals are normally expressed in broad, general terms, without any specific date for attainment. The Travel Plan goal is to provide opportunities for a range of motorized access and recreation experiences on public lands while protecting sensitive resources and minimizing conflicts among various users.

Objectives are concise time-specific statements of measurable planned results that move toward pre-established goals. Objectives help define the precise steps to be taken and the resources to be used in achieving identified goals. BLM policy and regulations state that:

- All BLM lands will be designated Open, Limited, or Closed. Limited designation includes designated routes, seasonal routes, and or type of vehicle routes.
- OHV designations for wilderness study areas (WSAs) must be Limited or Closed.
- Implementation planning will be completed for the Monticello Field Office Travel Plan.

N.9.2 POLICY: BLM OHV DESIGNATIONS

OHV Designation Categories – BLM National Strategy mandates that all public lands administered by the BLM must be designated as Open, Limited, or Closed.

- Open – The BLM designates areas as "open" for intensive ORV use where there are no compelling resource protection needs, user conflicts, or public safety issues to warrant limiting cross-country travel.

However, motor vehicles may not be operated in a manner causing or likely to cause significant, undue damage to or disturbance of the soil, wildlife, wildlife habitat improvements, cultural or vegetative resources or other authorized uses of the public lands (see 43 CFR 8341).

- Limited – The "limited" designation is used where ORV use must be restricted to meet specific resource management objectives. In the current guidance context, this means limited to designated roads and trails, i.e., a route network designated by the BLM in its RMP.
- These routes may also be limited to:
 1. A time or season of use depending on the resources in the area (i.e., Threatened and Endangered Species' habitat or nesting areas, crucial winter ranges, etc.); and/or
 2. Types of vehicle use (ATV, Motorcycle, four-wheel vehicle, etc.).
- Closed – The BLM designates areas as "closed" if closure to all vehicular use is necessary to protect resources, ensure visitor safety, or reduce resource or use conflicts. Access by means other than motor vehicle access is generally allowed. The Field Manager may allow motor vehicle access on a case-by-case basis or for emergencies.

Monticello Field Office –Draft Open, Limited and Closed Areas (Acreages as of September 2005)

OHV Designation Categories on BLM Lands (1,783,123 acres)	Number of Acres ¹			
	No Action [RMP 1991]	Alternative B Conservation	Alternative C Balanced	Alternative D Commodity
Open	611,310	0	2,311	2,311
Limited – to designated	218,780	1,352,053	1,354,784	1,780,807
Limited use-seasonal	540,260	NA	NA	NA
Limited – to existing	570,390	NA	NA	NA
Closed	276,430	431,065	426,025	0

* Numbers are subject to change depending on any changes made during the on-going alternative evaluation process.

¹ Acres may be additive because of overlap.

N.9.3 ROUTE DESIGNATION ID TEAM MEETINGS

Six ID Team meetings to address route/resource conflicts and route designation were held August 26, 27, and September 15, 21, 22, 24, 2004. On-going meetings (20 additional ID Team and 11 coordination meetings) were also held during the fall of 2004 and in 2005 concerning route selection for the range of alternatives. The purpose of the route designation ID Team meetings was two-fold:

- Gather input from ID Team on conflicts identified and mitigation proposed by each resource specialist. If there are conflicts with resources (e.g., popular overlook on route proposed to be closed for protection of wildlife habitat), these conflicts are discussed and resolved during the meeting, and a final proposal for the balanced alternative is established.
- Develop a thoughtfully, purposefully designed system of designated routes that fulfills the management goals and objectives for the resource area.

N.9.4 ROUTE DESIGNATIONS FOR LIMITED AREAS

A majority of the resource area was proposed to be designated as "limited" to OHV use in the four action alternatives. By policy BLM is required to designate individual routes within the "limited" areas as part of the RMP process. This is the implementation portion of the Travel Plan process and includes identifying roads and trails that will be available for access and public use, and specifying the limitations, if any, placed on use (see Monticello Field Office Draft Alternative Matrix, September 19, 2005).

N.9.4.1 POTENTIAL CONFLICT IDENTIFICATION BY AREA

The Monticello Field Office ID Team agreed to utilize the map and boundaries of the Field Office Law Enforcement Patrol Sectors as the baseline polygons for discussing and defining areas for designations, and potential conflicts, both resource and user conflicts.

Three ID Team meetings to address OHV area designations were held July 1, 6 and 7, 2004. San Juan County Planners participated in these meetings, during which areas were identified that could be open, limited, and closed to OHV travel. Notes were made on a large format map, and

minutes were recorded of the discussions. On August 19 and 25, 2004, a subcommittee of the ID Team met to correlate the various notes with the purpose of producing three alternative maps of area (Open, Limited, and Closed) designations. These maps were completed on September, 2004. The seven Law Enforcement Patrol sectors and pertinent travel discussions are described below. A map of these sectors can be viewed at the Monticello FO.

1. Indian Creek is located at the northern boundary of the field office from Hurrah Pass south to the Manti-LaSal National Forest. The west boundary of this sector is Canyonlands National Park and the eastern boundary is along the Canyon Rims Moab Field Office boundary to the Manti-LaSal NF boundary.

Use and resource conflicts noted by ID Team:

- Off-road use / play-riding
- ACECs: Shay Canyon, Lavender Mesa, Bridger Jack Mesa, Butler Wash North,
- Indian Creek; WSA: Indian Creek
- Vegetation and livestock
- Desert Bighorn Sheep area year-round
- Cultural in some areas
- Wood gathering
- Antler gathering
- Camping and Indian Creek emergency closure (1999)
- Dead-end roads in Lockhart Basin
- Match with Moab FO
- Some redundant routes
- Hart's Draw and motorcycle use – potential MSO habitat, riparian bottom, scenic
- Trend: popular place for public and OHV use

2. Dry Valley Summit – is located east of the southern portion of Indian Creek sector (above) and extends eastward to the Colorado state line; it is bounded on the north by the Moab Field Office boundary and on the south by State Highway 491.

Use and resource conflicts noted by ID Team:

- Wildlife – Gunnison sage grouse leks, MSO, antelope, burrowing owls, prairie dogs, and deer and antelope winter range
- Antler hunting/gathering
- O/G – pipeline goes through the area
- Leaving gates open
- Seasonal closure – not clear in current RMP
- Wood cutting and post cutting – may be creating routes
- Hunting in area (private owners posting closed)
- Cultural – typically project a high density in areas
- Mineral development on private lands (copper) in area
- Trend: lots of local and visitor use, antler gathering

3. Montezuma Recapture Drainages – located south of State Highway 491 and bounded at its southern boundary by the Navajo Nation; on the east by the Colorado state line, and on the west by State Highway 191.

Use and resource conflicts noted by ID Team:

- Wood cutting
- Critical DWR habitat in small area on west
- ACECs: Alkali Ridge and Hovenweep for Cultural; NH Landmark within Alkali Ridge ACEC; WSAs: Squaw and Papoose, and Cross Canyon
- Recreation impacting cultural

4. Butler Comb Lime – is located west of State Highway 191 and on the west at Comb Wash; the northern boundary is the Manti-LaSal National Forest and the southern boundary is the San Juan River.

Use and resource conflicts noted by ID Team:

- Travel is heavy on highways and between highways
- River House Ruins – cultural site on San Juan River – driving into area, and sleeping in ruins
- SRMA for San Juan River boaters
- Proposed OHV trail from Bluff to Butler Wash
- Off-road area currently open
- Trapping
- Hiking
- OHVs – see above, area currently open
- Motocycles
- Human waste
- Foot traffic between Sand Island and Bluff
- Wildlife, some elk, small amount of MSO
- Cultural – Tank Bench
- Whiskers Draw – OHVs vs. hikers
- Grazing (west of Blanding) and OHVs (West Water Area)
- Illegal building of new OHV routes

5. Cedar Mesa – is located south of State Highway 95 south to the boundary with Glen Canyon National Recreation Area; it is bounded on the east by Comb Wash, and the rim that runs west to Highway 261 on the northern boundary of Valley of the Gods. The area is bounded on the west by State Highway 276 and then south across the highway to the GCNRA boundary.

Use and resource conflicts noted by ID Team:

- SRMA at south end of area
- ACEC: Cedar Mesa
- Wood cutting and OHV use; Cultural sites and OHVs
- Proliferation of de-facto routes

- WSAs - wood cutting and dirt bike use west of Grand Gulch; impacts from OHV use in Cedar Mesa WSAs (8) / cutting wood
- Littering
- Motorized road claim along rim of Fish Creek was closed and not shown on map
- Antler hunting around Polly's Mesa
- Some MSO, fish, and elk around Arch Canyon
- Comb Wash Campground and OHVs and cultural issues
- Horses and pack animals and staging areas mouth of Mule Canyon

6. Southwest Canyons – is located in the southwestern portion of the field office and is bounded on the south and west by GCNRA; on the north by the Dark Canyon rims and on the northeast by Manti-LaSal National Forest.

Use and resource conflicts noted by ID Team:

- Wildlife, crucial habitat, bighorn sheep and OHVs
- Cultural
- Deer near Long Canyon – small area
- MSO
- Other recreation uses and OHVs
- WSA – Mancos Mesa and routes
- County/group wants to make loops
- Wilderness Characteristics and OHVs
- ROS and Primitive
- Grazing in Lake Canyon area, and cultural sites
- Hole in the Rock Trail – protection

7. Dark Canyon - Beef Basin –located west of Manti-LaSal NF, east of GCNRA, north of White Canyon area, and south of Canyonlands NP.

Use and resource conflicts noted by ID Team:

- ACEC (Dark Canyon and Butler Wash North)
- Wildlife – deer and elk, MSO
- National Forest – open to travel but policy doesn't allow commercial horn hunting and hunting retrieval – consistent with NF
- Fable Valley
- Beef Basin spur road and increased camping – cultural sites
- Car-camping is increasing
- Cultural site impacts
- Horse use – corrals, bring own feed
- Elk critical shape/mapped area, deer critical, critical MSO in entire area
- Commercial Special Recreation Permits (SRPs)-three agencies-NPS, FS, BLM
- Trend: increasing use of recreational use

N.9.4.2 MOTORIZED ROUTES - DESIGNATIONS

Open, Limited, and Closed area designations needed to be delineated before any route designations could be made. Once these area designations were established for the draft alternatives, each resource specialist was tasked with identifying resource conflicts with specific routes that could warrant some type of mitigation measures. Conflicts were addressed according to NEPA Critical Elements, as well as other elements associated with OHV use as advised in IM UT 2004-061.

Specialists were given a form to complete for each route/resource conflict. These forms were filled out by two Law Enforcement rangers, and a Range specialist. Several resources had too many route conflicts associated with their resource to warrant filling out a form for each route; this included Wildlife and Recreation. These were compiled by the Wildlife Biologist, and Recreation specialists in conjunction with the co-leads for the travel plan.

These resource conflicts were captured using GIS and recorded in tables, which can be viewed at the Monticello FO. Some resource specialists identified no conflicts. All conflict areas were mapped and used for further discussion at ID Team meetings.

As the ID Team began addressing wildlife conflicts at the first meeting, it became apparent that some routes on the baseline map had no P/N from a BLM standpoint. This is the point where MFO began to further address P/N for individual routes. This was primarily done only for routes that were identified as conflicts by the various resource specialists; a limited number of routes not previously identified by resource specialists were also determined to have no P/N based on the ID Team Meeting discussions. These determinations, while made by specialists familiar with the route or area in question, were not field checked, and BLM determined the need for the county's input to verify several of BLM's P/N determinations (see Section N.8.3 for discussion on San Juan County's inventory and participation in route designation process). This was accomplished in subsequent meetings with the county.

During the meetings, each specific conflict was examined, after which the ID Team either proposed management actions to address the conflict (usually in the form of a route or seasonal closure) or it was decided that other management resource programs required access even in light of the conflict. About half of all resource noted identified conflicts were dismissed at the meetings because the conflict was with resource uses that were dependant on the existence of the specific route.

Typically, if a route was determined to have no P/N and a substantive resource or user conflict, then the route was closed. Routes were more likely to be closed because they had multiple resource conflicts and little P/N. Except where specifically noted in a meeting and written minutes, the ID Team's proposed route designation closures applied to the conservation and/or balanced alternative (Alternatives B and/or C).

A record of the discussion and decisions made at each of the meetings were recorded in written minutes (see Administrative Record) and with GIS mapping. The GIS specialist developed data layers (shape files) for all noted conflict areas, and included notes in the closed-route tables by conflict code. These tables can be viewed at the Monticello FO.

N.9.4.2.1 CULTURAL CONFLICTS

Because of the extremely high density of cultural sites in the resource area, an alternative plan was worked out with the MFO cultural specialist to address cultural conflicts as they pertain to route designations. With the guidance and help of the BLM UTSO Archeologist and OHV coordinators, BLM decided to address cultural "priority" areas (cultural ACECs, National Historic Districts, etc.) only, and leave other potential cultural conflicts with routes for future consideration, if necessary (most likely post RMP). This is consistent with a widely-circulated draft IM 2004-005 from the Washington Office allowing for subsequent designation determination (Section N.5.1). The archeologist/cultural specialist was present at the majority of the ID Team meetings to also offer cultural perspective for areas of the field office other than specific cultural resource areas.

Route designation in the Butler Wash cultural priority area was addressed in a specific Butler Wash ID Team meeting between recreation and cultural management programs because of the large number of unresolved cultural conflicts with the recreation uses.

N.9.4.2.2 WILDLIFE CONFLICTS

Wildlife considerations by the ID Team for route designations included evaluations of Crucial Deer, Antelope, Bighorn Sheep, and Elk Habitats; and special status species habitat. Computer shape files / maps were developed with the Utah Department of Wildlife Resources (UDWR) for these habitat areas, as well as on-going consultations with US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) conducted through cooperators' meetings. The four alternatives developed for the planning process reflect the mapped areas and timing issues (rutting, lambing, nesting, etc.) for each of the species.

N.9.4.2.3 ROUTES WITHIN WILDERNESS STUDY AREAS (WSAs)

At a minimum, the travel management area designation for wilderness study areas (WSAs) must be limited to ways and trails existing at the time the area became a WSA (BLM H-1610-1, Appendix C, D (D)(2)).

MFO received direction from the BLM UTSO on September 17, 2004 (phone conversation with UT OHV Coordinator) to avoid designating "ways" in WSAs. A very reasonable and clear justification must be made for "ways" that BLM proposes to designate in WSAs. This did not pose much of a conflict for MFO, as the ID Team had earlier determined that the majority of WSAs in the resource area would be closed to motorized use. However, a limited number of "ways" were designated in all Cedar Mesa WSAs (8) to provide access to trailheads and to remain in compliance with existing agreements with San Juan County.

N.9.4.2.4 SPEAR PROPOSAL ANALYSIS

The SPEAR routes have been digitized onto a map using the rough hand-drawn map provided by the proponents. Proposed SPEAR routes are compared to the routes that are part of the Monticello travel plan. The majority of SPEAR routes (457 miles of the 519 SPEAR proposed miles) are coincidental with the BLM travel plan. The routes that SPEAR shows as connectors will be proposed by San Jan County for SPEAR on a site-by-site basis for NEPA review. These 'connectors' include 24 routes covering approximately 35 miles (SPEAR route information can be viewed at the Monticello FO; see also Section N.8.2.3).

N.9.4.2.5 RED ROCK HERITAGE COALITION PROPOSAL ANALYSIS

RRHP delivered a map, and transportation plan, and route analysis to BLM during the RMP scoping process. The BLM received the explanation of rationale behind proposed route closures on September 15, 2004 by email from Kevin Walker, one of RRHP's organizers. The BLM's analysis of each route mentioned in the RRHC Proposal and the comment analysis of their general proposals can be viewed at the Monticello FO (see Section N.8.2.4).

N.9.4.3 MOTORIZED SINGLE –TRACK

There is one route on BLM Monticello FO managed land that is open to foot traffic, mechanized, and motorized single-track riding. The route runs for approximately 0.8 miles from the National Forest boundary near Foy Lake (where it is a single-track on FS Land) to the Indian Creek area near Newspaper Rock where, after crossing the creek, it becomes a two-track county claimed route.

N.9.4.4 NON-MOTORIZED ROUTES

N.9.4.4.1 MECHANIZED ROUTES

Mechanized use includes mechanical devices such as bicycles that are not motorized. There is one route specifically for bicycles at the northern boundary of the Monticello Field Office area named Jackson Hole. This route is designated Bicycles-Only and was established out of the Moab Field Office; it occurs on both BLM Monticello and Moab managed lands.

N.9.4.4.2 CONSTRUCTED (FOOT) TRAILS

- Butler Wash Ruins Interpretive Trail: Trailhead – paved parking lot; pit toilet; bulletin board; register box; brochure box with description of an interpretive trail to a cultural site overlook. Trail – Hiking; approximately 0.5 miles, easy to moderate, dirt and slickrock trail.
- Mule Canyon Ruins Interpretive Trail: Trailhead – paved parking lot; pit toilet; register box; interpretive kiosk. Trail – Hiking; a 200 yard paved sidewalk to a reconstructed Ancient Puebloan Kiva and surface pueblo. Handicap accessible.
- Sand Island Petroglyphs: Trailhead – vehicle pullout on sand/dirt road access to Sand Island Campground. Trail – Hiking; easy; a 150 yard dirt/rocky trail along a fence barrier to view prehistoric rock art panels.
- Three Kiva Pueblo – Montezuma Creek: Trailhead – dirt pullout along maintained county road; register box; interpretive sign. Trail – Hiking; pueblo is in view from the parking area; short walk on dirt to view pueblo up close.
- Newspaper Rock Petroglyph Panel: Trailhead – paved parking lot; pit toilet; register box. Trail – Hiking; short walk on a paved and dirt trail to view prehistoric rock art panel. Handicap assessable.

N.9.4.4.3 HIKING (FOOT) AND EQUESTRIAN / STOCK USE

Current status of Non-Motorized / Non-Mechanized Trails

Trail Name	Foot	Stock Overnight Use ¹	StockDay Use ¹
Kane Gulch	X	X	
Todie Canyon	X		
Bullet Canyon	X	X	X From Grand Gulch to Jailhouse Ruin
Shieks Canyon	X		
Government Trail	X	X	
Collins Canyon	X	X	
Slickhorn Canyon	X		
Point Lookout Canyon	X		
Grand Gulch	X	X	
	From junction to San Juan River	From Kane Gulch to the junction of Collins – no stock below Collins	
Fish Canyon	X	X	X 2 miles above the confluence with Owl
		From Comb Wash to confluence with Owl	
Owl Canyon	X		X To Nevill's Arch
Road Canyon	X	X	X
Lime Creek Canyon	X	X	X
North Mule Canyon	X		
South Mule Canyon	X		
Lower Mule Canyon (from Comb Wash)	X	X	X
Mule Canyon or Cave (Canyon Towers)	X		
Arch Canyon	X	X	X
Johns Canyon	X	X	X
Honaker Trail	X		
McLoyd	X	X	X To the impassable pour-off
Moon House Trail	X		
Keeley Trail	X		
Sundance Trail	X		
Dark Canyon	X		
Fable Valley	X	X	
Salt Creek Mesa Trail	X	X	
Newspaper Rock Trail	X		
Salvation Knoll	X		

Current status of Non-Motorized / Non-Mechanized Trails

Trail Name	Foot	Stock Overnight Use ¹	StockDay Use ¹
Shay Canyon (Petroglyph Trail Area)	X		
Indian Creek Climbing Trails			
Bridger Jack Mesa	X		
Super Crack	X		
Cat Wall	X		
Way Rambo Wall	X		
Broken Tooth Wall	X		
Scarface	X		
Battle of the Bulge	X		
Butler Wash Trails			
Monarch Cave Trail	X		
Fish Mouth Trail	X		
Cold Springs Trail	X		
Wolf Man Panel Trail	X		
Ball Room Cave Trail	X		

¹ Stock users are required to take all feed (non-germinating and certified weed-free) necessary to sustain their animals while on the trip. Use is restricted to existing trails and routes in areas open to recreational stock use. Loose herding of pack and saddle stock is prohibited. All stock must be under physical control. Pack and saddle stock must be tethered at least 100 feet away from any water source, off o the trail, and well away from archaeological sites. Group size is limited to 12 people and 10 animals.

Equestrian use is currently available on all trails and D routes in the Field Office area. Coordination with user groups will be on-going to identify specific areas for potential corrals, and potentially restricted trail-use. Development of horse use areas are scheduled for the Comb Wash Campground.

N.9.4.4.4 NATIONAL TRAIL – AMERICAN DISCOVERY TRAIL (ADT)

The American Discovery Trail stretches across more than 6,800 miles and 15 states. The ADT is currently the only coast-to-coast, non-motorized recreational trail. The ADT links communities, cities, parks, and wilderness and allows people to hike, bicycle, or ride horses for an afternoon or a cross-county adventure. The trail in Utah consists of six segments totaling 593 miles, and includes rural, remote and rugged terrain. The Moab to Hite Crossing on the Colorado River covers 174 miles through portions of San Juan County and the Monticello Field Office area (see www.discoverytrail.org for information and Utah map)

N.9.4.5 OTHER TRAVEL MODES

N.9.4.5.1 AIRPORTS/AIRSTRIPS – WITH FLY-IN ACCESS

- Cal Black Airport, FAA regulated located on the road to Halls Crossing before reaching the Glen Canyon NRA boundary.

- Bluff Airport, Non-FAA, under Right-of-Way to San Juan County located 3-4 miles west of Bluff, UT south of SR-163.
- Fry Canyon Airstrip, no facility, under Right of Way to Back Country Pilots' Association located south off SR-95 and west of Natural Bridges National Monument.
- Numerous old airstrips located throughout the resource area on BLM, State and private lands. Available for causal use, not maintained (see Administrative Record for List from the Utah Back Country Pilots, 3.7).

N.9.4.5.2 BOATING

- San Juan River - permitted motorized and non-motorized travel is allowed on the San Juan River under the current RMP. No up-stream motorized traffic is allowed (against the flow) except in an emergency.
- Colorado River – permitted activities on the BLM portion of the Colorado River are managed through the National Park Service, Canyonlands National Park.

N.9.4.6 NATIONAL SCENIC BYWAYS AND NATIONAL SCENIC BACKWAYS

The following scenic byways and backways (see "Utah! Scenic Byways and Backways," Utah Scenic Byways Committee) are located within the Monticello Field Office area and described in promotional materials provided to the public by Utah Tourism:

N.9.4.6.1 SCENIC BYWAYS

Indian Creek Corridor Scenic Byway: SR-211 (Junction with US-191 fourteen miles north of Monticello) to its terminus at the Needles District of Canyonlands National Park.

Bicentennial – Trail of the Ancients Scenic Byway: SR-95 from south of Blanding goes west across the Colorado River at Glen Canyon National Park (with a loop through Natural Bridges National Monument). A section also travels south from Blanding to the town of Bluff and then east to Montezuma Creek, and eventually into Colorado.

Monument Valley to Bluff Scenic Byway: US-163 from the Utah / Arizona border to the town of Bluff.

N.9.4.6.2 SCENIC BACKWAYS

Lockhart Basin Road Scenic Backway: From Moab, on the Kane Creek Blvd at the intersection of US-191, to Hurrah Pass onto Monticello FO which becomes the Lockhart Basin Road and ends at SR-211 (this is a 57 mile trail which takes approximately 11 hours to traverse, and is an extremely challenging 4- wheel drive, high clearance trail).

Trail of the Ancients Scenic Backway: Follows SR-261 including the Moki Dugway, from SR-95 to SR-163; and intersects SR-316 to the Goosenecks State Park. The Valley of the Gods road intersects SR-261 below the dugway for a 17 mile dirt and gravel loop drive.

Elk Ridge Road Scenic Backway: Begins 25 miles west of Blanding at the junction of SR-25 and SR-275; it turns onto Forest Road 088 (through the Manti-LaSal National Forest) and ends 48 miles later at the junction of SR-211.

Abajo Loop Scenic Backway: West from Monticello on Forest Road (FR) 105 to the junction of FR 079, and ends 35 miles later in the town of Blanding.

N.10 ALTERNATIVES DEVELOPMENT

After evaluating routes using the Field Office designation criteria, the ID Team began preliminary discussions to develop a range of alternatives for the Monticello Field Office travel plan. With very few exceptions, decisions made at route designation ID Team meetings pertained only to the balanced alternative. For the most part, the preliminary draft conservation and commodity alternatives are defined by general groups of conflicts.

The conservation alternative generally reflects the following:

- All routes initially identified as conflicts by resource specialists are closed;
- All routes identified as designation conflicts are closed (ways in WSAs, routes in closed areas, etc.).

The commodity alternative is essentially the San Juan County inventory minus WSA intrusions since BLM cannot legally designate intrusions (see Interim Management Policy for WSAs, H-8550-1, I.B.11).

The following table represents the Open, Limited, and Closed acreages determined by the Monticello Field Office ID Team, and the number of miles under the Limited category of designated roads and trails as of September 2005. Route closures and the key for conflict codes for each alternative can be viewed at the Monticello FO.

OHV Designation Categories on BLM Lands (1,783,123 acres)	Number of Acres ¹			
	No Action [RMP 1991]	Alternative B Conservation	Alternative C Balanced	Alternative D Commodity
Open	611,310	0	2,311	2,311
Limited – to designated	218,780	1,352,053	1,354,784	1,780,807
Limited use-seasonal	540,260	NA	NA	NA
Limited – to existing	570,390	NA	NA	NA
Closed	276,430	431,065	426,025	0

* Numbers are subject to change depending on any changes made during the on-going alternative evaluation process.

¹ Acres may be additive because of overlap.

Areas Limited to Designated Roads and Trails on BLM Lands	Miles*			
	No Action [RMP 1991]	Alternative B Conservation	Alternative C Balanced	Alternative D Commodity
B roads		992	992	992
D Roads		1,767	2,217	2,475

* Numbers are subject to change depending on any changes made during the on-going alternative evaluation process.

N.11 ANALYSIS OF EFFECTS – DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT (DEIS)

Analysis of the potential impacts to resources and uses by alternative will be completed in the DEIS.

N.12 RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN (RMP) DECISIONS – RECORD OF DECISION (ROD)

Management decisions for resources and uses in the Monticello Field Office will be made through the Resource Management Plan (RMP) and (ROD), expected to be completed and signed in June of 2008.

N.13 PLAN MAINTENANCE AND CHANGES TO ROUTE DESIGNATIONS

The RMP must include indicators to guide future plan maintenance, amendments or revisions related to OHV area designations or the approved road and trail system within limited areas or sub-areas. Indicators for such changes could include results of monitoring data, new information, or changed circumstances (IM 04-005, Attachment 2).

Actual route designations can be modified without completing a plan amendment, although NEPA compliance is still required. 43 CFR 8342.3 states:

The authorized officer shall monitor effect of the use of off-road vehicles. On the basis of information so obtained, and whenever the authorized officer deems it necessary to carry out the objectives of this part, designations may be amended, revised, revoked, or other action taken pursuant to the regulation in this part.

Within the RMP, a Field Office must establish procedures for making modifications to their designated route network. Because future conditions may require the designation or construction of new routes or closure of routes in order to better address resources and resource use conflicts, a Field office will expressly state how modification would be evaluated. As noted in IM 2004-061, plan maintenance can be accomplished through additional analysis and land use planning, e.g., activity level planning. BLM will collaborate with affected and interested parties in evaluating the designated road and trail network for suitability for active OHV management and envisioning potential changes in the existing system or adding new trails that would help meet current and future demands. In conducting such evaluations, the following factors would be considered:

- Trails suitable for different categories of OHVs including dirt bikes, ATVs, dune buggies, and 4-wheel drive touring vehicles, as well as opportunities for joint trail use;
- Need for parking, trailheads, informational and directional signs, mapping and profiling, and development of brochures or other materials for public dissemination;
- Opportunities to tie into existing or planned trail networks;
- Measures needed to avoid onsite and offsite impacts to current and future land uses and important natural resources; among others, issues include noise and air pollution, erodible solids, stream sedimentation, non-point source water pollutions, listed and sensitive species' habitats, historic and archeological sites, wildlife, special management areas, grazing

operations, fence and gate security, needs of non-motorized recreationists, and recognition of property rights for adjacent landowners; and

- Public land roads or trails determined to cause considerable adverse effects or to constitute a nuisance or threat to public safety would be considered for relocation or closure and rehabilitation after appropriate coordination with applicable agencies and partners.

Regulations at 43 CFR 8342.2 require BLM to monitor the effects of OHV use. Changes should be made to the Travel Plan based on the information obtained through monitoring.

N.14 COOPERATORS AND CONSULTATION

N.14.1 COOPERATORS

Copies of meeting minutes are found in the BLM Monticello Field Office Land Use Plan Administrative Record.

N.14.1.1 STATE OF UTAH, INCLUDING STATE INSTITUTIONAL TRUST LAND ADMINISTRATION (SITLA)

A meeting with SITLA representatives was held February 16, 2005 at the Monticello Field Office. On-going consultations continue to address BLM and SITLA management concerns including a field meeting July 19, 2005 and a meeting with SITLA and San Juan County on August 2, 2005.

N.14.1.2 STATE OF UTAH, DEPARTMENT OF WILDLIFE RESOURCES (DWR)

DWR participated in the Cooperators' Meetings held May 10-12, 2005 for review and input to the draft alternatives matrix and at subsequent meetings.

N.14.1.3 U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE (USFWS)

Letters from the USFWS concerning on-going issues with Mexican spotted owl habitat in Arch Canyon, and discussions in coordination with BLM and UDWR, are the basis for choices made by the ID team in evaluating draft alternatives.

N.14.1.4 UTAH STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICE (USHPO)

The USHPO is consulted on cultural aspects through the RMP process and activity level, site-specific NEPA where cultural resources are concerned. A meeting was held with the Director of USHPO in the Monticello office on June 23, 2005 to review the alternatives matrix for cultural resources.

N.14.1.5 SAN JUAN COUNTY

As described in this document, San Juan County has been an integral part of the Monticello Field Office's travel plan development.

N.14.1.6 BLM MOAB FIELD OFFICE

Coordination with the Moab FO has been consistent from the outset of travel planning and the RMP process. Edge matching of boundaries has been accomplished.

N.14.2 OTHER COORDINATION

N.14.2.1 NATIVE AMERICAN TRIBES

Native American Tribes are consulted on all site-specific NEPA where there are cultural concerns and have been invited to participate in the planning process.

N.14.2.2 NATIONAL PARK SERVICE (NPS)

Canyonlands National Park - Canyonlands NP allows only street legal and licensed vehicles to travel on park roads; no ATVs are permitted on park service lands. Coordination with routes that traverse both BLM and Canyonlands areas has been initiated and will be on-going.

There are routes on BLM lands that carry-over onto Canyonlands NP. One route (B122) in the Indian Creek ACEC area shows on the Canyonlands General Management Plan as open to street licensed vehicles. Route (D0497) in the Davis Canyon area crosses from BLM lands to State lands and then to Canyonlands NP. Canyonlands will post that State land/NPS boundary as open to foot travel only on NPS.

Glen Canyon National Recreation Area NRA – Meetings concerning planning issues have been held between the BLM and GCNRA staff. Travel on the NRA lands is limited at this time (Spring 2005) to vehicles that are licensed and street legal; no ATVs are permitted to travel on NRA lands.

N.14.2.3 NATIONAL FOREST SERVICE

Manti La Sal National Forest – Coordination between BLM and the Forest is on-going. At the implementation level, joint signing efforts are being worked on with the three agencies (BLM, National Forest, and NPS), the San Juan County planning staff, Utah Parks and Recreation, and ATV user group, SPEAR.

N.14.2.4 CANYONS OF THE ANCIENTS NATIONAL MONUMENT (COANM), COLORADO BLM

The COANM is presently in the development phase of their initial Management Plan. The monument was designated on June 9, 2000 by Presidential Proclamation to protect cultural and natural resources on a landscape scale. An initial meeting with the COANM personnel occurred in October, 2003 with follow-up phone calls concerning wild and scenic rivers determinations, and travel planning, and a meeting in Monticello held on September 6, 2005.

N.15 IMPLEMENTATION PROCESS

Implementation decisions are actions to implement land use plans and generally constitute BLM's final approval allowing on-the-ground actions to proceed. These types of decisions are based on site-specific planning and NEPA analyses and are subject to the administrative remedies set forth in the regulations that apply to each resource management program of the BLM. Implementation decisions are not subject to protest under the planning regulations.

The Monticello FO travel planning and implementation process includes the following:

- A map of roads and trails for all travel modes;
- Notations of any limitation for specific roads and trails;

- Criteria to select or reject roads and trails in the final travel management network, add new roads or trails, and to specify limitations;
- Guidelines for management, monitoring, and maintenance of the system; and
- Needed easements and rights-of-ways (to be issued to the BLM or others) to maintain the existing road and trail network providing public land access.

In addition, travel management networks should be reviewed periodically to ensure that current resource and travel management objectives are being met (43 CFR 8342.3).

In the final RMP, designated OHV routes will be portrayed by a map entitled "Field Office Travel Plan and Map". This map is then the basis for route signing and enforcement. The field office will prioritize actions, resources, and geographic areas for implementation. The implementation goals include completing signage, maps, public information, kiosks, and working with partners.

As part of implementing the route designation decision, each Field Office should input their route information into the FIMMS/MAXIMO systems so that Bureau maintenance funding can be allocated to the route system.

The Resource Advisory Council (RAC) works with the Utah BLM in an advisory capacity to support OHV management. RAC states in its Executive Summary Report on OHV Management that it "believes the explosive growth in off-highway vehicle (OHV) use on public lands in Utah requires that the BLM implement a high priority pro-active statewide OHV management plan."

The RAC has adopted recommendations in their report which include:

- Establish a Coordinated OHV Management Policy
- Designate and Inventory Trails
- Increase Enforcement
- Educate OHV Users
- Develop and Maintain Trails
- Monitor and Adapt the Management Plans

The RAC recommendations will guide the implementation plan for the Monticello Field Office. Included in their summary of key issues are signage and the lack thereof throughout the state; the lack of user-friendly, accurate maps for areas; the length of time it takes to complete planning; and the plan implementation which in many cases are never completed.

Developing an implementation plan to define and document a specific course of action needed to implement the OHV allocation decision is part of the OHV planning process. The Implementation Plan is an internal BLM document providing guidance to Managers on how to implement designation decisions.

N.15.1 BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Coordination meetings with San Juan County, Manti La Sal National Forest and the National Park Service have initially explored the feasibility of creating a multi-agency travel map of routes as they lie on each agency's lands, and which would be publicly distributed for the area encompassing southeastern Utah. This joint effort is supported by the participating agencies and

will be pursued between the BLM, San Juan County, NPS units, and the Manti La Sal National Forest not only in the mapping / signing portion of implementation but also with the educational aspect of access and OHV use.

N.15.2 PRE-DESIGNATION ACTIONS

The National Management Strategy for Motorized Off-Highway Vehicle Use on Public Lands is the primary guidance document for implementation of designated routes on BLM lands.

N.15.2.1 MAPPING AND TRAVEL INFORMATION

A coordinated group of BLM, San Juan County, NPS, Forest Service, and Utah State Parks and Recreation personnel will form a working-group to establish guidelines for maps and information that can be published in the form of brochures and route maps for the recreating public.

N.15.2.2 SIGNS

Signing will follow the State-wide OHV Trail Signing Standards as Prepared by the National Resource Coordinating Council (NRCC) Technical Team. To gain consistency throughout the state (Utah), these standards are recommended for all new signs installed to manage off-highway vehicle use after January 1, 2002. A coordinated effort has already begun to review signing on routes; this group includes Utah State Parks and Recreation, San Juan County, Manti La Sal National Forest, National Park Service units in the southeast area of Utah, and the BLM.

Monticello FO will plan the on-the-ground designation of routes process to coordinate with maps and needed signage. This includes working with the BLM Rawlins (WY) Sign Shop to design and produce the needed signage over a period of three to five years. Likewise, planning will include the recommendation to hire seasonal employees, and / or use partners, instruction for them in GIS systems, and providing a vehicle and the equipment needed to install an estimated 1,000 to 1,200 signs a year.

A system of volunteer help will be coordinated with the local OHV and other groups to elicit support in maintaining and repairing signage as necessary, as well as reporting to BLM what on-the-ground needs for signage they discover in their riding areas within the field office.

N.15.2.3 PHYSICAL CONSTRAINTS

In the case of routes that need closure from use, physical restraints such as fences, boulders, or other types of barriers may be put in place.

N.15.2.4 PUBLIC ANNOUNCEMENTS

Outreach efforts will be coordinated through the working group of county and federal agencies to reach user groups of the recreating public. This includes San Juan County, Moab and Monticello BLM, Utah State Parks and Recreation, Glen Canyon NRA, Canyonlands NP, Natural Bridges NM, Hovenweep NM, and the Canyons of the Ancients NM under the jurisdiction of Colorado BLM.

N.15.3 POST-DESIGNATION ACTIONS

N.15.3.1 INSTALLATION

BPS funding will be requested beginning in FY 2007 to start on-the-ground installation of signing (see 15.4 below for projected funding needs over the life of the new RMP).

N.15.3.2 USE SUPERVISION

The BLM Monticello and Moab Field Offices Recreation Programs will supervise the use of routes as outlined in the new RMPs. Law Enforcement and resource specialists will formally and informally monitor the travel plan routes as outlined in a Monitoring Plan.

N.15.3.3 ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING

A Monitoring Plan will be developed following the signing of the RMP Record of Decision and will address timing and criteria for resource monitoring. Of particular interest for the Monticello Field Office are cultural and wildlife resources management due to the large number of identified and recorded cultural sites and the continuing identification of yet unknown sites, and the areas of habitat for Threatened and Endangered and wildlife species.

Monitoring methodologies, procedures and techniques for OHV use and impacts in the resource area will meet existing resource health standards and guidelines. Monitoring plans will be developed sufficient to detect and evaluate motorized OHV-related impacts so that management changes can occur, if needed. (National Management Strategy for Motorized Off-Highway Vehicle Use on Public Lands, January 2001).

N.15.3.4 ENFORCEMENT

When OHV designation, which may include closures or restrictions, are developed through Resource Management Plans, publication of the Federal Register Notice for the RMP, Record of Decision, is required and is sufficient for legal enforcement (Draft Travel Management Guidelines for the Public Lands in Wyoming, September 21, 2004).

National strategy notes that "law enforcement needs to be a more visible and effective tool for motorized OHV management...Improvements in user education, WSA monitoring and observation, signing, route marking, and other Strategy outcomes will assist motorized OHV law enforcement efforts. But substantially more law enforcement rangers and support resources are needed to ensure compliance with motorized OHV regulations. Currently, each ranger patrols an average of 1.76 million acres of often remote public land" (National Management Strategy for Motorized Off-Highway Vehicle Use on Public Lands, January 2001).

N.15.3.5 MAINTENANCE

With thousands of miles of routes in the field office area, maintenance is an on-going need. The costs in money and personnel time have to be considered, and are included in the cost estimates shown below. It is anticipated that the use of volunteer help will provide an additional support system for the maintenance of the motorized trail systems, just as volunteer work is currently being utilized on the maintenance of non-motorized trails.

N.15.3.6 EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

These include continuing support and education of the "Leave No Trace" and "Tread Lightly" programs which the BLM helped establish; local interagency coordination with literature, maps and brochures for public distribution; consistent signing throughout the southeastern Utah area; and working with the rider ATV groups with cultural training, wildlife awareness, and safe rider education.

N.15.4 COST ESTIMATES

See Table 15.1 for listing of estimated costs for implementation scheduled over the potential life of the RMP of approximately 12 years.

N.15.4.1 DIRECT COSTS

Initial Phase – Installation, Years 1-3

- Each sign cost (4/05) is approximately \$37 each
- Each post estimated cost is approximately \$13 each
- Carsonite Sign Posts, 72" approximately \$12 each plus stickers
- Physical Restraints such as boulders, fences, etc.
- Labor estimated at GS 4-5: \$28,000 per year (for 10 months per year)
 - Two seasonal employees for 10 months each for three years to install
 - 1,200 signs per year (taking average of 1 hour each sign plus drive time)
- Vehicle – dedicated 4x4 pick up truck for 3-5 seasons, \$6,000/year
- Gas and Per Diem

Secondary Phase – Maintenance and Repair, Year 2-12

- Sign Cost is approximately \$37 each (plus 10% for cost increases)
- Post cost estimated at \$13 each (plus 10% for cost increases)
- Labor estimated GS 4-5: \$28,000 per year (for 3 months per year)
 - One seasonal employee for 3 months for years 3-12 to replace and maintain signage;
 - Averaging replacement of 60 signs per year, and maintenance on the rest.
- Vehicle – dedicated 4x4 pick up truck for 3-5 seasons, \$6,000/year

N.15.4.2 INDIRECT COSTS

- Law Enforcement – ¼ time of LE Officer, estimated at \$15,000 per year - from year 1-12.
- Maps for Distribution to the Public - first year set up, design, printing costs for approximately 5,000 maps. As time progresses, the sale of the maps should reimburse the costs. There is also the possibility of Utah Parks and Recreation helping with providing maps from their OHV registration budget.
- Brochures for Free Distribution to the Public - First year design and printing, then copying year 2-12.

Table 15.1. Cost Estimates for Travel Plan Implementation Monticello Field Office September 2005

Fiscal Year	Signs/ Posts	Replaces- ments	Labor/ Vehicle	Gas/ Per diem	Physical Restraints	Direct Costs	Law Enforce- ment	Maps/ Brochures	Indirect costs	Totals
Year 1: 2007	1,200 @ \$50 each	0	2 @ 10 mos each \$50,000 +\$6,000	\$5,000	\$40,000	\$161,000	\$15,000	\$8,500 /\$2,500 (for 5,000)	\$26,000	\$187,000
<u>Year 1 Total:</u>	<u>\$60,000</u>		<u>\$56,000</u>	<u>\$5,000</u>	<u>\$40,000</u>		<u>\$15,000</u>	<u>\$11,000</u>		
Year 2: 2008	1,200 @ \$50 each	60 @ \$50 each	2 @ 10 mos each \$50,000 +\$6,000	\$5,000	\$40,000	\$164,000	\$15,000	\$6,000 /\$1,500 (for 5,000)	\$22,500	\$186,500
<u>Year 2 Total</u>	<u>\$60,000</u>	<u>\$3,000</u>	<u>\$56,000</u>	<u>\$5,000</u>	<u>\$40,000</u>		<u>\$15,000</u>	<u>\$7,500</u>		
Year 3: 2009	1,200 @ \$50 each	60 @ \$50 each	2 @ 10 mos each \$50,000 +\$6,000	\$5,000	\$40,000	\$164,000	\$15,000	\$2,500 /\$1,500 (for 5,000)	\$19,000	\$183,000
<u>Year 3 Total</u>	<u>\$60,000</u>	<u>\$3,000</u>	<u>\$56,000</u>	<u>\$5,000</u>	<u>\$40,000</u>		<u>\$15,000</u>	<u>\$4,000</u>		
Initial Subtotal:	<u>\$180,000</u>	<u>\$6,000</u>	<u>\$168,000</u>	<u>\$15,000</u>	<u>\$120,000</u>	<u>\$489,000</u>	<u>\$45,000</u>	<u>\$22,500</u>	<u>\$67,500</u>	<u>\$556,500</u>
Year 4: 2010	1,200 @ \$50 each	60 @ \$50 each	2 @ 10 mos each \$50,000 +\$6,000	\$4,000	\$30,000	\$153,000	\$15,000	\$1,000 /\$1,500 (for 5,000)	\$17,500	\$170,500
<u>Year 4 Total</u>	<u>\$60,000</u>	<u>\$3,000</u>	<u>\$56,000</u>	<u>\$4,000</u>	<u>\$30,000</u>		<u>\$15,000</u>	<u>\$2,500</u>		
Years 5-12	0	60 @ \$50 each = \$3,000	1 @ 3 mos \$12,000 +\$6,000 (8x18K)	\$4,000 (8x4k)	\$10,000 (8x10k)	\$336,000	\$15,000	\$1,000 /\$1,500 (for 5,000)	\$140,000	\$476,000
Subtotal for years 5-12:		\$24,000	\$200,000	\$32,000	\$10,000		\$120,000	\$20,000		
Totals for 12 years:	\$240,000	\$33,000	\$424,000	\$51,000	\$160,000	\$978,000	\$180,000	\$45,000	\$225,000	1.203 m

N.16 DESIGNATION ORDERS AND RECORD

Each Field Office is required to input their route information in the FIMMS/MAXIMO systems so that Bureau maintenance funding can be allocated to the route system (IM UT 2004-061, p. 6).

N.17 REFERENCES

43 C.F.R. Part 8340

BLMs Comment Analysis on RRHC Proposal, April 2005

BLM Moab and Monticello Field Office, Planning Bulletin #3 – Request for Route Data, November 1, 2003

BLM Moab and Monticello RMP Revisions, Scoping Summary, July 2004

BLM Monticello Field Office, Analysis of Management Situation (AMS), January 2005

BLM Monticello Field Office, Draft Alternatives Matrix, April 15, 2005

BLM Land Use Planning Handbook 1601

Draft Travel Management Guidelines for the Public Lands in Wyoming, September 21, 2004

Memorandum, MFO Travel Plan Development, October 8, 2004

NRCC Technical Team, State-wide OHV Trail Signing Standards (from Utah BLM State Office, September 5, 2001

Natural Resource Coordinating Council (NRCC) Utah Interagency OHV Steering Committee, Final Report, April 1, 2004

Standards for Rangeland Health of BLM Land in Utah, May 1997

U.S. Department of the Interior, BLM, Interim Management Policy for Lands Under Wilderness Review, H-8559-1

U.S. Department of the Interior, BLM, National Management Strategy for Motorized Off-Highway Vehicle Use on Public Lands, January 2001

Utah OHV Transactions by County and Fiscal Year, 2005

Utah!, Scenic Byways and Backways, Utah Scenic Byway Committee, 2002

www.discoverytrail.org

ATTACHMENT A: ACRONYMS

ACEC – Area of Critical Environmental Concern
ATV – All Terrain Vehicle
BLM – Bureau of Land Management
DEIS – Draft Environmental Impact Statement
DWR – Department of Wildlife Resources
EA – Environmental Assessment
EIS – Environmental Impact Statement
MFO – Monticello Field Office
MSO – Mexican spotted owl
NEPA – National Environmental Policy Act
NRCC – Natural Resource Coordinating Council
OHV – Off-highway Vehicle [synonymous with ORV)
ORV – Off-road Vehicle
RAC – Resource Advisory Council
RMP – Resource Management Plan
ROD – Record of Decision
SHPO – State (Utah) Historic Preservation Office
SRMA – Special Recreation Management Area
USFWS – U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
SITLA – School Institutional Trust Land Administration
UTSO – Utah (BLM) State Office
WSA – Wilderness Study Area
WSR – Wild and Scenic River

ATTACHMENT B: DEFINITIONS

All-Terrain Vehicle (ATV) – A wheeled or tracked vehicle, other than a snowmobile or work vehicle, designed primarily for recreational use of the transportation of property or equipment exclusively on undeveloped road rights of way, marshland, open country or other unprepared surfaces (BLM, National Management Strategy for Motorized Off-Highway Vehicle Use on Public Lands, January 2001).

Closed Designations – Areas or trails are designated closed if closure to all vehicular use is necessary to protect resources, promote visitor safety, or reduce use conflicts (8342.06 E).

Considerable Adverse Impacts – Any ORV related adverse environmental impact that causes: (a) significant damage to cultural or natural resources, including but not limited to historic, archaeological, soil, water, air, vegetation and scenic values, or (b) significant harassment of wildlife and/or significant disruption of wildlife habitats; or (c) significant damage to endangered or threatened species or their habitat, or (d) impairment of wilderness suitability; *and* is irreparable due to the impossibility or impracticality of performing corrective or remedial actions. The significance of these damages is determined on a case-by-case basis by BLM's authorized officers in the field (normally District [Field Office] Managers) in the context of local conditions (BLM Manual 8342.05).

Designation – The formal identification of public land areas and trails where off-road vehicles use has been authorized, limited, or prohibited through publication in the *Federal Register*. The types of designation used by the BLM are open, limited, or closed to off-road vehicle use (BLM Manual 8342.05).

Emergency Limitations or Closures – Limiting use or closing areas and trails on public lands to ORV use under the authority of 43 CFR 8341.2. Such limitations or closures are not ORV designations (BLM Manual 8341.05).

Implementation Plan - A site-specific plan written to implement decisions made in the land use plan. An implementation plan usually selects and applies best management practices (BMP) to meet land use plan objectives. Implementation plans are synonymous with "activity" plans. Examples of implementation plans include interdisciplinary management plans, habitat management plans, and allotment management plans (BLM, National Management Strategy for Motorized Off-Highway Vehicle Use on Public Lands, January 2001).

Land Use Plan - A set of decisions that establish management direction for land within an administrative area, as prescribed under the planning provisions of FLPMA; and assimilation of land use plan-level; decisions developed through the planning process outlines in 43 CFR 1600, regardless of the scale at which the decisions were developed. (BLM, National Management Strategy for Motorized Off-Highway Vehicle Use on Public Lands, January 2001)

Limited Designations – The limited designation is used where ORV use must be restricted to meet specific resource management objectives. Examples of limitations include: number or types of vehicles; time or season of use; permitted or licensed use only; use limited to designated roads and trails; or other limitations if restrictions are necessary to meet resource management objectives including certain competitive or intensive use areas which have special limitations (BLM Manual 8342.06 F).

Mechanized Travel – Moving by a mechanical device such as a bicycle, not powered by a motor.

Minimize ORV Damage – To reduce ORV effects to the maximum extent feasible short of eliminating ORV use, consistent with established land management objectives as determined by economic, legal, environmental, and technological factors (BLM Manual 8342.05).

Motorized Travel – Moving by means of vehicles that are propelled by motors such as cars, trucks, OHVs, motorcycles, boats, etc.

Non-motorized Travel – Moving by foot, stock or pack animal, boat, or mechanized vehicle such as a bicycle.

Off-highway Vehicle (OHV) - OHV is synonymous with, and the more current term for, Off-Road Vehicles (ORV). ORV is defined in 43 CFR 8340.0-5(a): Off-road vehicle means any motorized vehicle capable of, or designed for, travel on or immediately over land, water, or other natural terrain, excluding: 1) Any non-amphibious registered motorboat; 2) Any military, fire, emergency, or law enforcement vehicle while being used for emergency purposes; 3) Any vehicle whose use is expressly authorized by the authorized officer, or otherwise officially approved; 4) Vehicles in official use; and 5) Any combat or combat support vehicle when used in times of national defense emergencies.

OHV area designations - Refers to the land use plan decisions that permit, establish conditions, or prohibit OHV designations (43 CFR 8342.1). The CFR requires all BLM-managed public lands to be designated as open, limited, or closed to off-road vehicles, and provides guidelines for designation. The definitions of open, limited, and closed are provided in 43 CFR 8340-5 (f), (g), and (h), respectively.

Open Designations – Open designations are used for intensive ORV use areas where there are no special restrictions or where there are no compelling resource protection needs, user conflicts, or public safety issues to warrant limiting cross-country travel (8342.06 D).

Preliminary Network - If a final road and trails network is not identified in the RMP process, the plan should include a preliminary network that will be identified for use until a final network is selected through a subsequent implementation plan (Attachment to IM 2004-005).

Resource Management Plan (RMP) Area - Most RMPs cover a large planning and management area. As a result, the planning area may be divided into smaller areas, each with differing values, issues, needs and opportunities that may warrant differing management prescriptions (Attachment to IM 2004-005).

Road and Trail Selection - For each limited area, the BLM should choose a network of roads and trails that are available for motorized use, and other access needs including non-motorized and non-mechanized use, consistent with the goals and objectives and other consideration described in the plan (Attachment to IM 2004-005).

Road and Trail Identification - For the purposes of this guidance, road and trail identification refers to the on-the-ground process (including signs, maps and other means of informing the public about requirements) of implementing the road and trail network selected in the land use plan or implementation plan. Guidance on the identification requirements is in 43 CFR 9342.2© (Attachment to IM 2004-005).

"Ways" - See p. N-14, Section N.7.2.4 – Route Designations in Wilderness Study Areas (WSAs).