

2.0 PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES

This chapter presents 5 alternative proposals for managing public lands in the Monticello Field Office (FO). In accordance with the federal guidelines implementing The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), a range of reasonable alternatives has been identified that could accomplish the objectives of the proposed actions. BLM considered issues and concerns raised during scoping, identified goals and objectives associated with the resources and allowable uses on the public lands, and developed a reasonable range of alternatives with varying management decisions that would allow BLM to prioritize and balance competing uses under the multiple use and sustained yield mandates of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (FLPMA). The alternatives were designed to achieve the goals and objectives. BLM recognizes that social, economic, and environmental issues cross land ownership lines, and that extensive cooperation is needed to actively address issues of mutual concern. To the extent possible, these alternatives were crafted utilizing input from public scoping comments, San Juan County representatives, and other cooperating agencies. Those alternatives that did not meet the Purpose and Need, or that are not technically feasible or economically practical, were eliminated from detailed consideration.

Chapter 2 has been organized in the following manner:

- Section 2.1 provides descriptions of the alternatives carried forward for detailed environmental analysis.
 - Table 2.1 provides a summary of the alternatives.
- Section 2.2 provides a comparative summary of the environmental impacts associated with each alternative.
 - Table 2.2 provides a summary of the impacts.
- Section 2.3 outlines those alternatives the BLM initially considered but later eliminated from detailed analysis, and the justifications for their dismissal from further evaluations.

Evaluation of the alternatives to the Proposed Action is required by NEPA and by the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) (40 CFR §1502.14). The reason for this statutory mandate is that some aspects of the proposed actions may impact the environment in a manner that could be minimized or even eliminated by using an Alternative Action. Alternatives to the proposed action have been developed to:

- meet project Purpose and Need;
- respond to environmental, operational, and economic concerns raised by the public, agencies, business and other special interest groups during the scoping process; and
- address potential environmental or engineering issues that have been identified during review of the proposed actions.

2.1 DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVES

There are 5 alternatives presented. Alternative A (the "No Action" Alternative, a continuation of the existing 1991 RMP) is presented for comparison to the action alternatives. There are four action alternatives; Alternatives B, C, D, and E represent variations in the existing management and are generally distinguished by the degree of resource protection use.

Alternative A (No Action) would be a continuation of existing management practices defined in the San Juan Resource Management Plan (BLM 1991a, as amended). The current plan maintained "multiple use management while providing protection or enhancement to unique and sensitive resources." Areas were designated as open, limited, and closed to OHV travel. ACECs were used extensively to manage cultural and recreation resource and use.

Alternative B would minimize human activities, offer more protection for wildlife and other natural resources, and favor natural systems over commodities development. Decisions include minimizing routes and enlarging critical habitat for wildlife. All proposed ACECs are considered in this alternative. All eligible wild and scenic rivers (WSRs) are considered for suitability in this alternative. Oil and gas leasing stipulations were determined and used to protect sensitive resources.

Alternative C (Preferred Alternative) would balance the protection of important environmental values and sensitive resources with commodities development. All areas were designated as open, limited, and closed to OHV travel and routes were designated to allow access and protect resources. A balanced use of ACECs and WSRs was used to protect important resource values.

Alternative D emphasizes commodities development over the protection of natural resources. No ACECs were considered in this alternative. No WSRs were brought forward in this alternative. Protection of wildlife habitat was minimized to that required by law, regulation, or policy. Access was maximized; as no acres were closed to OHV travel and almost the entire area was designated as limited to OHV travel.

Alternative E would be based on Alternative B, except it emphasizes protection of 582,360 acres of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics and allows for other activities consistent with that emphasis. Large areas on the west side of the Monticello FO would be difficult to access or do any kind of surface disturbing activities. Wilderness characteristics would be enhanced as would adjacent wilderness found in WSAs.

Table 2.1 provides a detailed description of the alternatives carried forward for detailed environmental analysis and is organized alphabetically by resource (i.e. air quality, cultural, fire management, etc.). There are twenty resources listed. Each section includes goals, management common to all alternatives, and then a comparative listing for each alternative of the proposed management decisions. If the proposed management for two different alternatives is the same then management prescriptions will not be repeated, merely indicated by a "same as Alternative..." Occasionally, the proposed management decisions are the same but the acreage or the time frames they are applicable to changes, this is indicated in the text.

2.1.1 BRIEF SUMMARY AND HIGHLIGHTS OF THE ALTERNATIVES IN TABLE 2.1

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

brought forward during scoping. Much more detail for each of these resources and uses, among others, and their proposed management is in Table 2.1.

2.1.1.1 TRAVEL MANAGEMENT

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

Summary Table A. OHV Acreage and Mileage Designations by Alternative

	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
Open	611,310	0	2,311	2,311	0
Limited – Seasonal Restrictions	540,260	N/A	3.8 ¹	N/A	N/A
Limited – Existing Roads and Trails	570,390	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Limited – Designated Roads and Trails	218,780	1,359,417	1,362,142	1,780,807	812,679
Closed	276,430	423,698	418,667	0	970,436
Total²	N/A³	1,783,115	1,780,809	1,780,807	1,783,115
Miles of Routes Designated	2,179 ⁴	1,521	1,947	2,205	1,342

¹This acreage applies to Arch Canyon.

²Acreage figures may vary by alternative due to the changes in GIS technology and variances in shapefiles.

³Acres are not additive under this alternative because of overlap between limited use categories.

⁴ Miles of existing routes; but undesignated in the 1991 San Juan RMP.

2.1.1.2 RECREATION

Special Recreation Management Areas (SRMAs) are proposed to manage intensively used recreation areas, and do not restrict other uses. In Alternative B, non-motorized recreation is emphasized; in Alternative D, motorized recreation is emphasized. Alternative C provides opportunities for both non-motorized and motorized recreation. Alternative E emphasizes non-motorized recreation and protection of naturalness, outstanding opportunities for solitude, and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation. These are depicted in Summary Table B.

Summary Table B. SRMAs by Alternative (acres)

Category	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
SRMAs	15,100	528,856	525,512	525,018	508,856

2.1.1.3 OIL AND GAS LEASING AND DEVELOPMENT

One of the major decisions in a land use plan is to determine which areas should be: 1) open to leasing subject to the terms and conditions of the standard lease form stipulations, 2) areas open to leasing subject to moderate constraints such as timing limitations (TL) or controlled surface use (CSU) restrictions, 3) areas open to leasing subject to major constraints such as NSO stipulations, or 4) areas unavailable to leasing. All of these proposed decisions must be consistent with the goals and objectives of other resources and uses for each alternative. Summary Table C depicts how oil and gas leasing would be managed under each alternative.

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

Stipulation	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
Standard	578,604	365,170	629,472	962,283	213,290
TL/CSU	659,626	876,740	719,501	421,000	545,641
NSO	161,224	125,105	39,323	14,175	53,915
Closed	385,316	416,612	395,329	386,853	974,463

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

2.1.1.4 SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS

2.1.1.4.1 POTENTIAL AREAS OF CRITICAL ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERN (ACEC)

The *Federal Register* Notice of Intent (June 2003) for this plan revision requested ACEC nominations from the public for consideration in the planning effort. In order to be considered and carried forward into the range of alternatives for planning, an ACEC must meet the relevance and importance criteria in 43 CFR 1610.7-2(a), and must require special management. The Monticello FO received and evaluated a total of 17 ACEC nominations of which 13 were determined to meet the relevance and importance criteria. The relevance and importance criteria encompass scenery, sensitive plant species, rare plants, cultural and historic resources, wildlife, fish, natural systems, and natural hazards. Summary Table D shows that all of the 13 potential ACECs were brought forward into Alternative B for designation consideration, and 7 potential ACECs were brought forward into Alternative C for designation consideration. There are 10 existing designated ACECs in the Monticello Planning Area (MPA); and therefore 10 in Alternative A. There were no ACECs brought forward for consideration in Alternative D. Where ACECs are designated, special management attention would be directed at the relevant and important values, resources, natural systems and/or natural hazards.

Summary Table D. Proposed total acreage of Potential ACECs by Alternative

Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
488,616	521,141	76,764	0	521,141

2.1.1.4.2 WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS (WSRs)

During planning, the BLM must assess all eligible river segments and determine which are suitable or non-suitable per Section 5(d)(1) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1958, as amended. The Monticello FO reviewed all river segments for wild and scenic river eligibility and suitability as part of the RMP process. Twelve river segments were found to meet the eligibility criteria. BLM Manual 8351 (BLM 1993b) directs the BLM to provide tentative classifications of Wild, Scenic, or Recreational to the eligible river segments. Under the No Action Alternative (Alternative A), six river segments were identified as eligible for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System. These six segment would be managed to protect their free-flowing nature and outstandingly remarkable values until their suitability for inclusion in the Wild and Scenic River System is determined. Alternative B would recommend and manage all of the segments as suitable for Congressional designation into the system, and Alternative C would recommend three river segments as suitable for Congressional designation into the system. The number of miles of rivers recommended suitable for designation are included in Table E below.

Summary Table E. Wild and Scenic Rivers Recommended Suitable by Alternative

Alternative	BLM River Miles	Total River Miles	Classifications
A ¹	56.8	59.2	Recreational, Scenic, Wild
B	92.4	115.3	Recreational, Scenic, Wild
C	18.4	26.9	Scenic, Wild
D	0	0	NA
E	92.4	115.3	Recreational, Scenic, Wild

¹ Miles of river determined eligible under the 1991 San Juan RMP; but suitability not determined.

2.1.1.4.3 WILDERNESS STUDY AREAS (WSAs)

The Monticello FO manages 13 wilderness study areas totaling approximately 386,027 acres. Please see the Special Designation section of Table 2.1 for details.

2.1.1.5 SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES

Land use plan decisions should be consistent with BLM's mandate to recover listed species, and should be consistent with objectives and recommended actions in approved recovery plans, conservation agreements and strategies, MOUs, and applicable biological opinions for threatened and endangered species. The Monticello PA has eleven threatened, endangered, and candidate wildlife, fish, and plant species. They are the Black-footed ferret, Bald eagle, California condor, Southwestern willow flycatcher, (Mexican) spotted owl, (Western) yellow-billed cuckoo, Bonytail, Colorado pikeminnow, Humpback Chub, Razorback sucker, and the Navajo sedge. Standard stipulations have been developed in coordination with the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) under all alternatives.

In addition, there are 58 Special Status Species (Please refer to Section 3.16.3.1 Special Status Species, Tables 3.54 and 3.55, pages 3-152-3-158 for a complete list) where there is some discretion in management.

Timing Limitations and Controlled Surface Use stipulations are applied to the habitat of some species and are spread by alternative.

2.1.1.6 WILDLIFE

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

- **Pronghorn antelope** – A Timing Limitation stipulation for surface-disturbing activities, including oil and gas development would be applied to pronghorn habitat. The size of habitat varies by alternative.
- **Desert bighorn sheep** – Recommendations from the BLM Bighorn Sheep Rangeland Management Plan (BLM 1993c) would be adhered to were practicable. Onsite mitigation to replace forage and browse species lost would be required in bighorn habitat. The size of the habitat varies by alternative.
- **Deer and elk** – A Timing Limitation stipulation for surface-disturbing activities, including oil and gas development. Timing limitation and acreage vary by alternative.

2.1.1.7 NON-WSA LANDS WITH WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS

During planning, the Monticello FO identified decisions to protect or preserve non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics (naturalness, outstanding opportunities for solitude, and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation). There are 582,360 acres that were found to have wilderness characteristics outside of existing WSAs; all of them would be protected and managed to preserve their wilderness characteristics values in Alternative E. There would not be specific prescriptions for wilderness characteristics under Alternatives A, B, C, and D. However, some of these areas would receive indirect beneficial protections from other resource prescriptions such as NSO, closed to leasing, VRM Class I and limited or closed to OHV use.

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

Table 2.1. Summary Table of Alternatives

MANAGEMENT COMMON TO ALL RESOURCES
<p>The goals and objectives described below apply only to Alternatives B, C, D, and E. Goals and objectives for Alternative A are described in the 1991 San Juan Resource Area Resource Management Plan (BLM 1991a). Acreage figures for Alternative A in this matrix may vary slightly from the acreages in the existing Resource Management Plan (RMP). This variance is due to the current GIS technology that was used to recalculate more accurate acreages for existing management areas and designations.</p> <p>For the purpose of this plan, off-highway vehicles (OHVs, also called off-road vehicles) are defined as any motorized vehicle capable of or designed for travel on or immediately over land, water, or other natural terrain, excluding the following: (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 an authorized officer, or otherwise officially approved; (4) any vehicle in official use; and (5) any combat or combat support vehicle when used in times of national defense emergencies. Designated routes can be categorized as mechanized only (bicycles), single track motorized (dirt bikes), two track motorized (4-wheelers, jeeps), available to all vehicles, or any combination of these categories.</p> <p>OHV use would be limited to designated roads and trails, except in areas designated as open or closed to OHV use.</p> <p>Lands within the Monticello PA would be available for oil and gas leasing subject to standard lease terms unless listed specifically in alternatives as NSO, Timing Limitations (TL), Controlled Surface Use (CSU), Controlled Surface Use and Timing Limitations (CST), or Closed.</p> <p>Management for disposal of mineral materials would be available unless it is specifically stated in the alternatives to be unavailable.</p> <p>Management for geophysical work would be available unless stated specifically in alternatives that it is unavailable.</p> <p>The Monticello PA would be open for mining entry unless proposed for withdrawal.</p> <p>Wilderness Study Areas (WSAs) would be managed according to the Interim Management Policy and Guidelines for Lands Under Wilderness Review (IMP). WSAs would be Visual Resource Management (VRM) Class I. If the WSA is released by Congress, site-specific NEPA would be completed to change the management prescriptions.</p> <p>All Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACECs) would be retained in public ownership, would be subject to appropriate fire management response, and would have travel limited to designated routes unless otherwise noted.</p> <p><u>Education and Interpretation</u></p> <p>BLM would work with its partners, including local school districts and universities, to develop a variety of opportunities to promote education, research, and interpretation on public lands.</p> <p><u>Fire, Drought, and Natural Disasters</u></p> <p>BLM would coordinate actions with affected parties where natural resources may be impacted by fire, drought, insects and diseases, or natural disasters.</p> <p><u>Monitoring</u></p> <p>BLM would conduct monitoring for all resources to determine the effectiveness of management prescriptions in achieving RMP objectives or making progress toward them.</p> <p><u>Utah Standards for Rangeland Health</u></p> <p>BLM lands would be managed and uses would be authorized in a manner consistent with meeting or moving toward meeting Utah's Standards for Rangeland Health (BLM 1997). The current Utah Standards for Rangeland Health (as revised), augmented with ecological condition and trend objectives, would be incorporated across all resource programs as a minimum management objective. Management prescriptions in the form of constraints to use, terms and conditions, and stipulations may be needed to meet resource objectives and/or to comply with current regulations. Management prescriptions may consider, but would not be limited to, the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surface-disturbing activities: These would be closely monitored to ensure compliance with authorizations/permits, conditions of approval, or terms and conditions. Actions minimizing new surface disturbance, as well as actions insuring successful reclamation, would be of paramount concern. During periods of drought, BLM could require additional actions such as changes to standard seed mix compositions, amounts of seed, and method of application. Methods to ensure successful revegetation following disturbance could include hydromulching, installation of drip irrigation, and/or temporary fencing to exclude ungulate grazing/browsing. • Livestock grazing: Active livestock use would be authorized in animal unit months (AUMs), season, and duration to meet static (no apparent trend) to upward trends towards achieving site-specific resource objectives. In the case of fire, drought, insects and diseases, or other natural disasters, BLM would work cooperatively to implement a grazing strategy on an individual grazing allotment basis and make changes to the annual grazing authorizations as appropriate within the limits of the existing permit and in accordance with the grazing regulations. BLM may temporarily close allotments or portions of allotments to grazing where it is determined that other, less drastic measures would not avoid degradation of vegetative resources. Temporary changes to active permitted use or grazing practices, or non-use may also be implemented voluntarily by the permittee with BLM consent. • Wildlife management: During periods of prolonged dryness or drought or other natural disaster, to the extent that wildlife grazing ungulate populations may not be sustainable and/or impacts to the resource habitats may occur due to competition for water and/or available forage and/or overall animal health is compromised, BLM may enter into discussions with the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources (UDWR) regarding temporary adjustments in herd numbers and overall management options to address the effects of drought. • Recreation: During periods of prolonged dryness or drought, BLM, in cooperation with local and state fire management agencies, may limit campfires to established fire rings or fully contained fires. The last resort would be to close the public lands to campfires of any kind. • OHV use: OHV use during period of prolonged dryness could be further restricted to designated routes. If site-specific conditions warrant, closure to OHVs could be implemented to minimize vehicle-induced injury or damage to rangeland and/or woodland resources, and to minimize the potential of spark caused fires. • SOPs would be implemented as described in Appendix I.
AIR QUALITY
<p>GOALS</p> <p>Ensure that authorized uses on public lands meet or comply with and support federal, state, and local laws and regulations.</p>
<p>MANAGEMENT COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES</p> <p>The best air quality control technology, recommended by the Utah Division of Air Quality (UDAQ), would be applied as needed to meet air quality standards.</p> <p>Prescribed burns would be consistent with the State of Utah Division of Environmental Quality (UDEQ) permitting process and timed in conjunction with meteorological conditions so as to minimize smoke impacts.</p> <p>BLM would comply with Utah Air Conservation (UAC) Regulation R307-205, which prohibits the use, maintenance, or construction of roadways without taking appropriate dust abatement measures.</p> <p>BLM would comply with the current Smoke Management Memorandum of Agreement (MOU) between BLM, the U.S. Forest Service (USFS), and UDAQ. The MOU, in accordance with UAC regulation R301-204, requires reporting size, date of burn, fuel type, and estimated air emissions from each prescribed burn.</p> <p>BLM would manage emissions to prevent deterioration to air quality in Class 1 Airsheds.</p>

Table 2.1. Summary Table of Alternatives

CULTURAL RESOURCES				
GOALS				
Identify, preserve, and protect important cultural resources and ensure that they are available for appropriate uses by present and future generations (FLPMA, Section 103(c), 201 (a) and (c); National Historic Preservation Act, Section 110 (a); Archaeological Resources Protection Act, Section 14 (a)).				
Seek to reduce imminent threats and resolve potential conflicts from natural- or human-caused deterioration, or potential conflict with other resource uses (FLPMA Sec. 103(c), NHPA 106, 110(a)(2) by ensuring that all authorizations for land use and resource use comply with the NHPA Section 106.				
MANAGEMENT COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES				
BLM would nominate appropriate cultural resource objects, sites, districts, and multiple listings to the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP).				
Priority geographic areas for new field inventory would be identified based upon a probability for unrecorded important resources.				
BLM would ensure that all authorizations for land and resource use would comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), consistent with and subject to the objectives established in the RMP for the proactive use of cultural properties in the public interest.				
Impacts to any NRHP-listed or eligible cultural resource sites, objects, or districts found during an inventory would be mitigated in accordance with 43 CFR 800, generally through avoidance. Should it be determined the cultural resources eligible or listed on the NRHP cannot be avoided, consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) would be initiated and the procedures identified in the National Programmatic Agreement and the Utah State BLM Protocol for meeting BLM's responsibilities under the NHPA would be followed.				
BLM would consult with Native American tribes to identify, protect, and maintain access for areas of traditional and religious use that includes but is not limited to burials, rock art, traditional use areas, religiously active areas, and sacred sites.				
Burial sites, associated burial goods, and sacred items would be protected in accordance with the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) and the Archaeological Resources Protection Act.				
Cultural resources would be evaluated according to National Register criteria (36 CFR Part 60.4) and assigned to appropriate use categories as the basis for management decisions.				
BLM would conduct a consultation process to identify both the resource management concerns and the strategies for addressing them through an interactive dialogue with appropriate Native American communities.				
BLM would work with tribes and other communities with traditional linkage to public lands to identify places of traditional cultural and religious importance. To the extent allowed by statute, regulation, and policy, such locations would be managed to minimize impacts to important values and to allow continued access for traditional purposes.				
BLM, in coordination with San Juan County, would continue to identify, evaluate, and nominate historic roads and trails for inclusion into the NRHP.				
When new sites are discovered, interim protection may be applied until Section 106 consultation and NAGPRA (CFR 10) processes are completed, if warranted.				
BLM would provide for legitimate field research by qualified scientists and institutions.				
BLM would work with local communities and other groups to foster heritage tourism throughout the Monticello PA area.				
Cultural sites, including ethnographic properties, would continue to be allocated to one of six management use categories: experimental, discharged from management, public, scientific, traditional, and conservation.				
Protective measures would be established and implemented for sites, structures, objects, and traditional use areas that are important to tribes with historical and cultural connections to the land, in order to maintain the view shed and intrinsic values, as well as the auditory, visual, and esthetic settings of the resources. Protection measures for undisturbed cultural resources and their natural settings would be developed in compliance with regulatory mandates and Native American consultation.				
For Cedar Mesa Cultural-Special Recreation Management Area, see Cedar Mesa C-SRMA, under Recreation.				
MANAGEMENT COMMON TO ALL ACTION ALTERNATIVES				
Specific plans, Cultural Resource Management Plans (CRMP), and Cultural Special Recreation Management Area for Cedar Mesa would be developed for culturally sensitive areas unless included in other integrated activity plans. The CRMP would not require an amendment to the Monticello RMP if it is consistent with the goals and objectives of this RMP. Such plans would include protective measures such as restrictions and limitations on recreation around cultural at-risk areas and sites, Native American consultation, and regulatory compliance. These plans would also include but not be limited to developing cultural monitoring systems; identifying sites and areas in need of stabilization and protective measures (e.g., fences, surveillance equipment); developing research designs for selected sites/areas; designating sites/areas for interpretive and educational development; identifying areas for cultural inventory where federal undertakings are expected to occur; and developing specific mitigation measures. The plan would designate sites, districts, landmarks, and landscapes that would be nominated for inclusion on the NRHP.				
BLM would proactively reduce hazardous fuels or mitigate the potential hazard around archaeological and cultural sites that are susceptible to destruction by fire from prescribed or wildland fire. Management response to fire would follow the guidelines in the Moab District Fire Management Plan.				
BLM would promote collaborative partnerships to assist in meeting management goals and objectives for cultural resources.				
Certain at-risk cultural properties may be posted as off-limits to visitors with pets.				
Ropes and other climbing aids would not be allowed for access to ruins/cultural sites, except for emergencies or administrative needs.				
Cultural sites may be closed to visitation when they are determined to be at risk or pose visitor safety hazards.				
Comb Ridge Cultural Special Management Area (CSMA)				
Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Preferred)	Alternative D	Alternative E
No CSMA was identified in the 1991 San Juan Resource Area RMP, as amended. These lands are managed according to the 1991 San Juan RMP prescriptions.	Comb Ridge (38,012 acres) would be managed as a Cultural Special Management Area (CSMA) with the following prescriptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Managed for heritage tourism and traditional cultural values. • Unavailable for geophysical work, disposal of mineral materials, and recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry. • Available for oil and gas leasing subject to NSO. • Open for campfires at designated sites. • Unavailable for private and/or commercial use of 	Comb Ridge (38,012 acres) would be managed as a Cultural Special Management Area (CSMA) as in Alternative B except for the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Available for private and/or commercial use of woodland products including on-site collection of dead wood for campfires. • Available for range, wildlife habitat, and watershed improvements, and vegetation treatments. • Available for surface-disturbing land treatments if consistent with current law, regulations, policy, and management plan objectives. 	Comb Ridge would not be managed as a Cultural Special management Area (CSMA). The area would be managed with the same management prescriptions as the adjacent areas which are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Available for private and/or commercial use of woodland products including on-site collection of dead wood for campfires. • Available for range, wildlife habitat, and watershed improvements, and vegetation treatments. • Available for livestock use but it may be limited if cultural resources are impacted. 	Comb Ridge (38,012 acres) would be managed as a Cultural Special Management Area (CSMA) with the following prescriptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Managed for heritage tourism and traditional cultural values. • Unavailable for geophysical work, disposal of mineral materials, and recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry. • Unavailable for oil and gas leasing. • Open for campfires at designated sites. • Unavailable for private and/or commercial use of

Table 2.1. Summary Table of Alternatives

	<p>woodland products, including on-site collection of dead wood for campfires.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Available for livestock use but it may be limited if cultural resources are impacted. • Available for range, wildlife habitat, and watershed improvements. • Available for non-surface disturbing vegetation treatments. • OHV use limited to designated routes. • The Comb Wash Campground would be developed (as proposed in 1991 Monticello RMP). • Closed to dispersed camping. Camping limited to designated camp areas and campgrounds with designated access routes and parking. • Establishment of a permit system for day and overnight use if necessary to protect cultural resources. • In camp areas without toilets, human waste must be packed out. • Designation and signing of trails from parking areas to cultural sites, which are included in the Cultural Management Plan. • Limited parking for day use to designated areas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Group size limited to 12 people. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Available for surface disturbing land treatments if consistent with management plan objectives. • OHV use limited to designated routes. 	<p>woodland products including on-site collection of dead wood for campfires.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Available for livestock use but it may be limited if cultural resources are impacted. • Maintenance of existing improvements allowed; no new improvements. • Available for non-surface disturbing vegetation treatments. • Limited OHV use to designated routes and closed in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics. • Development of the Comb Wash Campground (as proposed in 1991 Monticello RMP). • Closed to dispersed camping. Camping limited to designated camp areas and campgrounds with designated access routes and parking. • Establishment of a permit system for day and overnight use if necessary to protect cultural resources. • In camp areas without toilets, human waste must be packed out. • Hiking to cultural sites limited to designated trails that would be developed in the Cultural Resource Management Plan. Group size limited to 12 people. • Limited parking for day use to designated areas.
<p>Butler Wash East of Comb Ridge</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No allocation limit • No private group size limit • No commercial permit or group size limit • Open to camping • Open to OHV use • Dogs allowed • No fees • Grazing allowed • Fires allowed 	<p>Butler Wash East of Comb Ridge: Manage the same as Comb Ridge with the following exceptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Private group size limited to 6. • Commercial group size limited to 12. • Butler Wash canyons closed to domestic pets and pack animals. • Designated primitive campsites. • If necessary, managed as part of Cedar Mesa permits and regulations, including regulations and permit fees. Groups would view low-impact video at Kane Gulch Ranger Station or Sand Island. 	<p>Butler Wash East of Comb Ridge: Manage the same as Comb Ridge and the same as Alternative B with the following exceptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Private group size limited to 8. • Commercial group size limited to 12. 	<p>Butler Wash East of Comb Ridge-Manage the same as Comb Ridge with the following exceptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Private group size limited to 12. • Commercial group size limited to 12. 	<p>Butler Wash East of Comb Ridge: Manage the same as Comb Ridge with the following exceptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Private group size limited to 6. • Commercial group size limited to 12. • Butler Wash canyons closed to domestic pets and pack animals. • Designated primitive campsites. • Managed as if part of Cedar Mesa permits and regulations, including regulations and permit fees. Groups would view low-impact video at Kane Gulch Ranger Station or Sand Island.
Tank Bench Cultural Special Management Area (CSMA)				
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
<p>No CSMA was identified in the 1991 San Juan Resource Area RMP, as amended. These lands are managed according to the 1991 San Juan RMP prescriptions.</p>	<p>Tank Bench (2,646 acres) would be managed as a CSMA with the following prescriptions:</p> <p><u>Outlaw Canyon and South Cottonwood Wash</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hiking limited to designated trails. • Group size limited to 12 people. • Human waste must be packed out. • Closed to domestic pets and pack animals. • Closed to OHV use. • Available for livestock use but it may be limited if cultural resources are impacted. • Available for watershed, range, and wildlife habitat improvements. • Available for non-surface disturbing vegetation treatments. • Closed to campfires. • Closed to private and/or commercial use of 	<p>Tank Bench (2,646 acres) would be managed as a Cultural Special Management Area (CSMA) the same as Alternative B except for:</p> <p><u>Outlaw Canyon and South Cottonwood Wash</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hiking not limited to designated trails. • Available for watershed, range, wildlife habitat improvements and vegetation treatments. • Available for surface-disturbing land treatments if consistent with management plan objectives. • Available for locatable mineral entry, disposal of mineral materials, and geophysical work. • Available for oil and gas leasing, subject to standard lease terms. 	<p>Tank Bench would not be managed as a CSMA. The area would be managed the same as adjacent areas with the following prescriptions:</p> <p><u>Outlaw Canyon and South Cottonwood Wash</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Available for livestock use but may be limited if cultural resources are impacted. • Available for watershed, range, and wildlife habitat improvements. • Available for locatable mineral entry. • Available for disposal of mineral materials and geophysical work. • Available for oil and gas leasing, subject to standard lease terms. • Available for campfires. • Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland products, including the on-site collection of dead wood for campfires. 	<p>Tank Bench (2,646 acres) would be managed as a CSMA with the following prescriptions:</p> <p><u>Outlaw Canyon and South Cottonwood Wash</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hiking limited to designated trails. • Group size limited to 12 people. • Human waste must be packed out. • Closed to domestic pets and pack animals. • Closed to OHV use. • Available for livestock use but it may be limited if cultural resources are impacted. • Available for watershed, range, and wildlife habitat improvements. • Available for non-surface disturbing vegetation treatments. • Closed to campfires. • Unavailable for private and/or commercial use of

Table 2.1. Summary Table of Alternatives

	<p>woodland products (including on-site collection of dead wood for campfires) with the exception of traditional cultural uses, as long as they do not adversely impact other resource values.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry, and unavailable for disposal of mineral materials and geophysical work. Available for oil and gas leasing, subject to no surface occupancy. 			<p>woodland products (including on-site collection of dead wood for campfires) with the exception of traditional cultural uses, as long as they do not adversely impact other resource values.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry, and unavailable for disposal of mineral materials and geophysical work. Available for oil and gas leasing, subject to no surface occupancy.
Beef Basin Cultural Special Management Area (CSMA)				
MANAGEMENT COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES				
BLM would work with USFS and NPS to develop Interagency Recreation Commercial permits.				
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
No CSMA was identified in the 1991 San Juan Resource Area RMP, as amended. These lands are managed according to the 1991 San Juan RMP prescriptions.	<p>Beef Basin (20,302 acres) would be managed as a CSMA with the following prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Management focus for the CSMA would be heritage, tourism, traditional cultural values, and scientific research of prehistoric cultural landscapes. Unavailable for private and/or commercial use of woodland products (including on-site collection of dead wood for campfires). Available for livestock use, but may be limited if cultural resources are impacted. Available for watershed, range, wildlife habitat improvements, and vegetation treatments. OHV use limited to designated routes. Development of a car campground in Ruin Park for primitive camping. Designated primitive car camping areas in Middle Park, House Park, and along Beef Basin Loop Road, as well as other areas as necessary to control impacts to cultural resources. Closure of all campsites that impact archaeological sites. Cultural site visitation limited to designated trails. Unavailable for campfires. Group size limited to 12 people total. Removal of human waste required. Parking for day use limited to designated areas. Car camping limited to designated camp areas and campgrounds with designated access routes and parking. Climbing gear use allowed as an aid to hiking routes only. No fixed lines, bolts, chalk, etc. allowed in order to protect rock art. 	<p>Beef Basin (20,302 acres) would be managed as a CSMA the same as in Alternative B, except for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Designated primitive car camping areas in Middle Park, House Park, and along Beef Basin Loop Road, as well as other areas as necessary to control impacts to cultural resources Open for campfires; fire pan required. Groups larger than 20 people total required to camp in designated areas and remove their waste. 	<p>Beef Basin would not be managed as a CSMA. The area would be managed with the following prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unavailable for private and/or commercial use of woodland products, except for limited on-site collection of dead wood for campfires. Available for livestock use but may be limited if cultural resources are impacted. Available for watershed, range, and wildlife habitat improvements, and vegetation treatments. Designated primitive campsites outside of Ruin Park. Development of a (seasonal) commercial campground in Ruin Park area. Closure of all campsites that impact archaeological sites. No group size limits. Open for campfires; fire pan required. Climbing gear allowed as an aid to hiking routes only. No fixed lines, bolts, chalk, etc. allowed. 	<p>Beef Basin (20,302 acres) would be managed as a CSMA with the following prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Management focus for the CSMA would be heritage, tourism, traditional cultural values, and scientific research of prehistoric cultural landscapes. Unavailable for private and/or commercial use of woodland products (including on-site collection of dead wood for campfires). Available for livestock use but may be limited if cultural resources are impacted No new improvements, maintenance of existing improvements allowed. OHV use limited to designated routes and closed in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics. Development of a car campground in Ruin Park for primitive camping. Designated primitive car camping within the interior of the Beef Basin Loop Road. Closure of all campsites that impact archaeological sites or negatively impact wilderness characteristics. Cultural site visitation limited to designated trails. Closed to campfires. Group size limited to 12 people total. Removal of human waste required. Parking for day use limited to designated areas. Car camping limited to designated camp areas and campgrounds with designated access routes and parking. Climbing gear use allowed as an aid to hiking routes only. No fixed lines, bolts, chalk, etc. allowed in order to protect rock art.
McLoyd Canyon-Moon House Cultural Special Management Area (CSMA)				
McLoyd Canyon-Moon House is within a WSA; WSAs are managed under the IMP. The special management prescriptions below apply to Moon House for cultural protection through a range of alternatives for analysis.				
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
	<p>McLoyd Canyon-Moon House (1,607 acres) would be managed as a Cultural Special Management Area with the following prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A cultural resource management plan (CRMP) 	<p>Same as Alternative B except:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Access to interior corridor limited to 4 people at any one time. 	<p>Same as Alternative C except:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 24 people would be allowed to visit Moon House per day. Limitations on visitation may change based on-site monitoring of impacts of visitation. 	<p>McLoyd Canyon-Moon House (1,607 acres) would be managed as a CSMA with the following prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A CRMP would be written for Moon House and would not require a plan amendment to the RMP.

Table 2.1. Summary Table of Alternatives

	<p>would be written for Moon House and would not require a plan amendment to the RMP.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public access limited via a permit system for day visits. No more than 12 people allowed to visit Moon House per day. Limitations on visitation may change based on site monitoring of impacts of visitation. One commercial group per day. Access to interior corridor limited to 3 people at any one time. Visitors would not be allowed to enter the Moon Room and adjoining rooms. Human waste must be packed out. Designated primitive camp and park area west of the Snow Flat Road. Camping prohibited outside of this primitive camp area. Hiking to Moon House site limited to designated trail. Closed to pack animals and pets. Closed to campfires. Unavailable for private and/or commercial use of woodland products, including on-site collection of dead wood for campfires. McLloyd Canyon closed to overnight use from the head of the canyon to UTM: 607100E, 4143495N. Utah State Section Township 39S Range 19E, Section 2 to be acquired. Development of a site stewardship program to monitor site and possibly develop guided tours. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Two commercial groups per day allowed, but total number of visitors not to exceed more than 24 people per day. Travel allowed on Road D4798, limited to the designated route. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public access limited via a permit system for day visits. No more than 12 people would be allowed to visit Moon House/day. Limitations on visitation may change based on site monitoring of impacts of visitation. One commercial group per day. Access to interior corridor limited to 3 people at any one time. Visitors would not be allowed to enter the Moon Room and adjoining rooms. Human waste must be packed out. Designated primitive camp and park area west of the Snow Flat Road. Camping prohibited outside of this primitive camp area. Hiking to Moon House site limited to designated trail. Closed to pack animals and pets. Closed to campfires. Unavailable for private and/or commercial use of woodland products, including on-site collection of dead wood for campfires. McLloyd Canyon closed to overnight use from the head of the canyon to UTM: 607100E, 4143495N. Utah State Section Township 39S Range 19E, Section 2 to be acquired. Development of a site stewardship program to monitor site and possibly develop guided tours.
<p>Grand Gulch National Historic District</p>				
<p>Grand Gulch National Historic District is within a WSA; WSAs are managed under the IMP. The special management prescriptions below apply to Grand Gulch National Historic District for cultural protection through a range of alternatives for analysis.</p>				
<p>Alternative A</p>	<p>Alternative B</p>	<p>Alternative C</p>	<p>Alternative D</p>	<p>Alternative E</p>
<p>Grand Gulch Special Emphasis Area/Grand Gulch National Historic District (37,433 acres): Cultural and Recreational (natural values associated with primitive recreation/scenic). Unavailable for mineral leasing in Grand Gulch Special Emphasis area. Available for geophysical work except Grand Gulch Special Emphasis area. Closed to disposal of mineral materials. Retained in public ownership and classified as segregated from entry (a Secretarial withdrawal would be requested). Excluded from private ownership and commercial use of woodland products, except for limited on-site collection of dead wood for campfires. Available for livestock use, except Grand Gulch Canyon and associated tributaries, below Kane Gulch fence to the confluence with the San Juan River (approximately 16,599 acres). Closed to OHV use.</p>	<p>Grand Gulch National Historic District (37,388 acres) would be managed with the following prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unavailable for oil and gas leasing in Grand Gulch Special Emphasis area. Unavailable for geophysical activities. Unavailable for disposal of mineral materials. Recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry. Unavailable for private and/or commercial use of woodland products, except for limited on-site collection of dead wood for campfires. Campfires limited to mesa tops only (no campfires in the canyon). Available for livestock use, except Grand Gulch Canyon and associated tributaries, below Kane Gulch fence to the confluence with the San Juan River (approximately 16,316 acres). Closed to OHV use. Excluded from surface disturbance by mechanized or motorized equipment. Excluded from habitat improvements, watershed 	<p>Grand Gulch National Historic District (37,388 acres) would be managed the same as Alternative B except for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Non-motorized habitat improvements, watershed improvements, vegetation treatments, including aerial seeding, hand reseeding, planting seedlings, and control of invasive non-native species allowed as long as they do not impact cultural resources based on a site specific analysis, and are consistent with the IMP. Pack animals permitted but packers must camp in designated areas. Limitations on numbers of trips may be implemented if cultural resources are impacted. Recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry. 	<p>Grand Gulch National Historic District (37,388 acres) would be managed the same as Alternative C with the following exceptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Available for oil and gas leasing subject to NSO. Available for geophysical exploration that meets definition of "casual use" as defined 43 CFR 3150. Pets and pack animals allowed. 	<p>Grand Gulch National Historic District (37,388 acres) would be managed as prescribed by the IMP and with the following prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unavailable to oil and gas leasing in Grand Gulch Special Emphasis area. Unavailable for geophysical activities. Unavailable for disposal of mineral materials. Recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry. Unavailable for private and/or commercial use of woodland products, except for limited on-site collection of dead wood for campfires. Campfires limited to mesa tops only (no campfires in the canyon). Available for livestock use, except Grand Gulch Canyon and associated tributaries, below Kane Gulch fence to the confluence with the San Juan River (approximately 16,316 acres). Closed to OHV use. Excluded from surface disturbance by mechanized or motorized equipment.

Table 2.1. Summary Table of Alternatives

<p>Managed as VRM Class I. Excluded from surface disturbance by mechanized or motorized equipment. Managed for Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS) Primitive (P)-class to provide primitive recreation opportunities in the ROS areas. ROS P-class areas protected from surface disturbance to the maximum extent possible. Open to leasing with NSO in ROS P-class areas. Managed to limit recreation use if cultural resources or scenic values are being damaged. Subject to conditional fire suppression with motorized suppression methods used only if necessary to protect life or property.</p>	<p>improvements, and vegetation treatments. Exceptions are non-motorized weed control with no surface disturbance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designated trails and camping areas as necessary to protect cultural resources. • Closed to pack animals and pets. • Human waste must be packed out. 			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excluded from habitat improvements, watershed improvements, and vegetation treatments. Exceptions are non-motorized weed control with no surface disturbance. • Designated trails and camping areas as necessary to protect cultural resources. • Closed to pack animals and pets. • Human waste must be packed out.
Historic Trails				
<p>MANAGEMENT COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES</p> <p>The designated Old Spanish National Historic Trail would be managed to protect the resource values for which it was designated (Public Law 107-325). Hole in the Rock Trail would be managed for Heritage Tourism in consultation with Utah State Historic Preservation Office and Native American tribes, as well as interested stakeholder groups. BLM would coordinate with the National Park Service (NPS) and other managing agencies in management of the Old Spanish National Historic Trail. All interpretation projects would be done in consultation with Native Americans and other interested parties including the Old Spanish Trail Association and NPS.</p>				
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
<p>BLM and NPS are co-administrators of the Old Spanish National Historic Trail and currently involved in the development of a comprehensive management plan for the trail. The trail would be managed to protect the resource values for which it was designated (Public Law 107-325).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Segments (linear) of the Old Spanish National Historic Trail would be identified and classified for historic integrity and condition. These segments would then be designated for appropriate types of travel. • Special Recreation Permits (SRPs) on the Old Spanish National Historic Trail would be authorized only for heritage tours and reenactments. 	<p>Same as Alternative B except:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landmarks (structures) along the Old Spanish National Historic Trail would be identified for historic integrity and interpreted only if the action would not impact the values at the site. 	<p>Same as Alternative C.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Segments (linear) of the Old Spanish National Historic Trail would be identified and classified for historic integrity and condition. These segments would then be designated for appropriate types of travel. • SRPs on the Old Spanish National Historic Trail would be authorized only for heritage tours and reenactments.
FIRE MANAGEMENT				
<p>Fire management would adopt the comprehensive Utah Land Use Plan Amendment for Fire and Fuels Management, September 2005 (LUP Amendment; BLM 2005c). This document may be found at www.ut.blm.gov/fireplanning/index/htm. Direction and guidance approved by the LUP Amendment is incorporated by reference into this RMP. Specific decisions for other resources that could impact fire management are found throughout this table. However, the content and purpose of the LUP Amendment is adopted and is summarized as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishes landscape-level fire management goals and objectives. • Describes Desired Wildland Fire Conditions (DWFC) and the management strategies and actions to meet DWFC goals. • Describes areas where fire may be restored to the ecosystem through wildland fire use for resource benefit and areas where wildland fire use is not appropriate. • Identifies Resource Protection Measures (RPMs) for fire management practices to protect natural and cultural resource values. • Identifies criteria used to establish fire management priorities. <p>MANAGEMENT COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES</p> <p>Firefighter and public safety are the primary goals in all fire management decisions and actions. Appendix B, Desired Wildland Fire Condition and Condition Class, shows the different responses allowed for the planning area (PA). Wildland fire would be utilized to protect, maintain and enhance resources and, when possible, would be allowed to function in its natural ecological role. Hazardous fuels reduction treatments would be used to restore ecosystems; protect human, natural and cultural resources; and reduce the threat of wildfire to communities. Fires would be suppressed at minimum cost, taking into account firefighter and public safety as well as benefits and values to be protected that are consistent with resource objectives. The BLM would implement a consistent, safe, and cost-effective fire management program through appropriate planning, staffing, training, and equipment. Fire management objectives would be established for every area with burnable vegetation, based on sound science and consideration of other resource objectives. Emergency stabilization, rehabilitation, and restoration efforts would be implemented to protect and sustain resources, public health and safety, and community infrastructure. The BLM would work together with partners and other impacted groups and individuals to reduce risks to communities and to restore ecosystems. The Reasonable & Prudent Measures and Terms and Conditions identified in consultation with the USFWS for the LUP Amendment would be implemented in fire-related actions. BLM would work together with Native Americans to provide for their use of woodland products as associated with fire, fuels, and emergency stabilization and rehabilitation (ES&R) actions.</p>				

Table 2.1. Summary Table of Alternatives**Criteria for Establishing Fire Management Priorities**

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

- Protection of the Wildland-Urban Interface (WUI) (including At-Risk Communities and At-Risk Watersheds)
- Maintaining existing healthy ecosystems
- High priority sub-basins or watersheds
- Threatened, endangered, or special status species
- Cultural resources and/or cultural landscapes

Suppression

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

Wildland Fire Use for Resource Benefit

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

The FMP identifies FMUs that may have the potential for wildland fire use. Wildland fire use may be authorized for all areas, except when the following resources and values may be negatively impacted and there are no reasonable Resource Protection Measures to protect such resources and values:

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

Fuels Treatment

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

Fuels management decisions may include but are not limited to the following activities:

- Mechanical treatments such as mowing, chopping, or chipping/grinding (brush cutter), chaining, tilling, or cutting
- Manual treatments such as hand-cutting (chainsaw or handsaw) and hand-piling
- Prescribed fire, including broadcast, underburn, and hand-pile burning
- Chemical spraying or biological treatments such as insects or goats/sheep
- Seeding including aerial or ground application (manual or mechanical)

Targeted areas may be treated in phases over a period of several years and may involve multiple and varied treatments.

Estimated fuels reduction treatments of 5,000 to 10,000 acres/year are targeted dependent on budgetary and time constraints.

Implementation of fuels management decisions would be prioritized using the following criteria:

- WUI areas
- Areas with fuel loading that could potentially result in the loss of ecosystem components following wildland fire
- Resource management goals and objectives

Prevention and Mitigation

Prevention and mitigation goals target a reduction in unauthorized wildland fire ignitions. Goals include coordination with partners and affected groups and individuals, and a wide range of prevention and mitigation activities such as personal contacts, mass media, signing, and defensible space education.

Implementation of fire prevention activities would be prioritized using the following criteria:

Table 2.1. Summary Table of Alternatives

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WUI areas • Major travel corridors • Recreation sites • Public lands as a whole <p>Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation (ES&R)</p> <p>A Normal Year Fire Stabilization and Rehabilitation Plan (NFRP) is in place to meet ES&R needs and to comply with up-to-date ES&R policy and guidance. The NFRP is a programmatic implementation plan authorizing treatment options specific to vegetative communities and dependent upon post-wildland fire conditions and other site-specific considerations. Treatment actions that are designed according to the type and severity of wildfire impacts and priorities include but are not limited to areas where the following criteria apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is necessary to protect human life and safety as well as property. • Unique or critical cultural and/or historical resources are at risk. • It is determined soils are highly susceptible to accelerated erosion. • Perennial grasses and forbs (fire-tolerant plants) are not expected to provide soil and watershed protection within two years. • There is a need to establish a vegetative fuel break of less flammable species (greenstrips). • Unacceptable vegetation, such as noxious weeds, may readily invade and become established. • Shrubs and forbs are a crucial habitat component for wintering mule deer, antelope, sage-grouse, or other special status species. • Stabilization and rehabilitation are necessary to meet RMP resource objectives, including rangeland seedings. • It is necessary to protect water quality. • It is necessary to quickly restore threatened, endangered, or special status species habitat populations to prevent negative impacts. <p>MANAGEMENT COMMON TO ALL ACTION ALTERNATIVES</p> <p>The Moab Fire District Fire Management Plan (FMP) would be updated and amended to meet the direction and objectives of the RMP.</p>
<p>HEALTH AND SAFETY</p>
<p>GOALS</p> <p>Effectively manage hazardous risks on public lands to protect the health and safety of public land users and stewards; protect the natural and environmental resources; minimize future hazardous and related risks, costs, and liabilities; and mitigate physical hazards in compliance with all applicable laws, regulations, and policies.</p>
<p>MANAGEMENT COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES</p> <p>Abandoned Mine Lands</p> <p>In conformance with BLM's long-term strategies and National Policies regarding Abandoned Mine Lands (AMLs), this RMP recognizes the need to work with our partners toward identifying and addressing physical safety and environmental hazards at all AML sites on public lands. In order to achieve this goal, a state strategy has been written. National program criteria for determining site priorities were used to develop the work plan. This state strategy is entitled "Utah Abandoned Mine Land Multi-Year Work Plan." The following criteria would be established to assist in determining priorities for site and area mitigation and reclamation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AML physical safety program priorities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Highest priority would be cleaning up AML sites where (a) a death or injury has occurred, (b) the site is situated on or in immediate proximity to developed recreation sites and areas with high visitor use, or (c) upon formal risk assessment, a high or extremely high risk level is indicated; ▪ AML would be factored into future recreation management area designations, land use planning assessments, and all applicable use authorizations; ▪ The site is presently listed or is eligible for listing in the Abandoned Mines and Site Cleanup Module; ▪ AML hazards should be, to the extent practicable, mitigated or remediated on the ground during site development. • AML water-quality program priorities are ones where the state has identified the watershed as a priority based on 1) one or more water laws or regulations; 2) threat to public health or safety; 3) threat to the environment; 4) the project reflects a collaborative effort with other land managing agencies; 5) the site is presently listed or is eligible for listing in the Abandoned Mines and Site Cleanup Module; and 6) the project would be funded by contributions from collaborating agencies. <p>These priorities would be maintained and updated as needed in the state AML strategy.</p> <p>BLM would identify and clean up unauthorized dumping and shooting areas in the PA as required to comply with applicable state, local, and federal regulations. These would include areas such as the unauthorized shooting range west of Blanding, dumps near Hovenweep, the Monticello Airport, and Piute Knoll.</p> <p>Hazardous Waste</p> <p>BLM would respond to releases as appropriate.</p>
<p>LANDS AND REALTY</p>
<p>GOALS</p> <p>BLM would retain lands within its administration except where necessary to accomplish resource goals and objectives outlined in the plan. BLM would transfer lands out of federal ownership or acquire non-federal lands or conservation easements where needed to accomplish resource goals and objectives, improve administration of public lands, or to meet essential community needs.</p> <p>Make public land available for a variety of ROWs, alternative energy sources, and permits where consistent with resource, goals, objectives, and prescriptions. Where possible, BLM would encourage project sponsors to locate new major ROWs in existing or designated utility and transportation corridors and not in areas designated for avoidance to protect specific resources.</p>

Table 2.1. Summary Table of Alternatives**MANAGEMENT COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES**

BLM would not transfer out of federal ownership any habitat for listed threatened or endangered species or any habitat for non-listed special status species if it could be determined that such an action would lead to the need to list any species as threatened or endangered. Acquisition of potential/occupied special status species habitat would be high priority. These acquired/exchanged lands would be managed according to BLM land management prescriptions for special status species.

Under IMP and Congressional action, WSAs and Wilderness Areas would be exclusion areas for any ROWs (Section 501(a) FLPMA).

Land ownership changes would be considered on lands specifically identified in the RMP for sale or other disposal or acquisition if the changes are in accordance with resource management objectives and other RMP decisions, and would meet one or more of the following criteria as outlined by BLM Land Tenure Adjustment criteria as described in Section 203 of FLPMA:

- Such changes are determined to be in the public interest and would accommodate the needs of local and state governments, including needs for the economy, public purposes, and community growth.
- Such changes would result in a net gain of important and manageable resources on public lands such as crucial wildlife habitat, important cultural sites, quality riparian areas, live water, listed species habitat, or areas key to productive ecosystems.
- Such changes would ensure public access to lands in areas where access is needed and cannot otherwise be obtained.
- Such changes would promote effective management and meet essential resource objectives through land ownership consolidation.
- Such changes would result in acquisition of lands that serve regional or national priorities identified in applicable policy directives.
- Such changes have been identified in existing activity plans (i.e., habitat management plans, etc.).

BLM would recognize the mission, goals, and objectives of the State of Utah as they relate to the values and resources of state-owned lands. The Monticello FO would work cooperatively with the State of Utah in identifying opportunities for Land Tenure Agreements (LTAs) that may assist the state in furthering its mission. These agreements must comply with applicable law and policy; consider fair market values; consider LTA criteria; and comply with goals and objectives for resource management prescribed in the RMP. They would be processed on a case-by-case basis, with consideration given to the goals, objectives, and decisions of this RMP.

Applications for new ROW on public lands would be considered and analyzed on a case-by-case basis, taking into consideration areas identified for avoidance and exclusion. Proposals would be reviewed for consistency with planning decisions and evaluated under requirements of applicable laws for resource protection.

Filming Permits

Applications for filming permits in the Monticello PA would be limited to existing highways, roads, and pullouts throughout the Field Office (including Valley of the Gods, Moki Dugway, Highway 211, Newspaper Rock, and Highway 95) and would have to meet the following criteria of minimal impact to be approved. Filming projects that do not meet these criteria would be subject to site-specific NEPA analysis prior to permit approval (EA on BLM managed lands in Utah within WSAs and the GSENM, EA USO-06-004).

- Project would not impact sensitive habitat or species.
- Project would not impact cultural resources or Native American sacred sites.
- Project would not involve use of pyrotechnics.
- Project would not involve more than minimum impacts to land, air, or water. (Minimum is defined as temporary impact only; no permanent impacts; no surface disturbance allowed that can't be raked out or rehabbed so that there is no sign of activity at the end of the filming).
- Project would not involve use of explosives.
- Project would not involve use of exotic plant or animal species that could cause danger of introduction into the area.
- Project would not involve WSAs, non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics, WSR corridors, National Register Eligible Sites, and Native American Sacred Sites.
- Project would not involve adverse impacts to sensitive surface resource values including: historic, cultural or paleontological sites; sensitive soils; relict environments; wetlands or riparian areas; ACECs.
- Project does not involve substantial restriction of public access.
- Project does not involve substantial use of domestic livestock.
- Project does not involve 15 or more production vehicles within sensitive area.
- Project does not involve 75 or more people within sensitive area.
- The activity within the sensitive area would not continue in excess of 10 days.
- No refueling allowed within sensitive areas.
- Aircraft use in area with wildlife concerns is not proposed during critical wildlife period for more than 1 day and does not exceed frequency of 2 projects per 30-day period.
- Aircraft use in area with no wildlife concerns is proposed for no more than 2 days and does not exceed frequency of 3 projects per 30-day period.
- Use of aircraft is not proposed within 0.5 mile of a designated campground located within a sensitive area and the number of low-elevation passes would not exceed 4 passes per day.

Recreation and Public Purpose Act (R&PP) and Other Authorizations for Disposal

Lands conveyed to state or local governments or non-profit organizations under the R&PP Act may include those identified in LTAs. In addition, requests for lands other than those identified could be considered for disposal provided the proposed use would provide a greater public benefit than that which the current management provides, and that the action is otherwise consistent with this RMP. Examples may include but are not limited to local government or non-profit recreational and public purposes facilities such as public shooting ranges, landfills, motocross tracks, racetracks, etc. Other authorizations for disposal include the Airport and Airway Improvement Act, Color-of-Title Act, state selections under the Enabling Act, and other lesser-used authorities.

Trespass Resolution

Intentional trespass resolution would be limited to removal and/or restoration as appropriate. Unintentional trespass resolution may include authorization under ROW grant, commercial/agricultural lease, or permit; disposal of the impacted land through sale or exchange; or removal, depending on the nature of the trespass. In all such trespass cases, administrative costs incurred by the BLM for investigating and resolving trespasses would be collected. All trespass incidents resolved by issuance of ROW grants, leases, or permits would be subject to payment by the holder/lessee/permittee of rent based on market value. Trespass cases resolved by land sales would be based on fair market value, and land exchanges would be completed on an equal value basis.

Access

ROWs for state and private inholdings, in-field oil and gas leases, and pipelines for producing oil and gas wells would be approved subject to a determination of "reasonable" access for the "intended purpose" and they are processed and issued upon application.

Easements

Easements would be acquired from willing landowners and the State of Utah to gain access to public lands or placement of facilities on non-public lands, and acquire easements to accomplish resource objectives.

Table 2.1. Summary Table of Alternatives

<p>Land Tenure Adjustments Acquisitions would be managed in the same manner as adjoining lands unless they are acquired for a specific purpose (i.e., wildlife habitat, buffer zones near other federal lands, etc.).</p> <p>Disposal Criteria As described under Sections 203 (a) and 206 of FLPMA (43 USC 1713; 1716), public lands have potential for disposal when they are isolated and/or difficult to manage. Lands in the Monticello PA identified for disposal must meet public objectives (as outlined in Sections 203 (a) and 206 of FLPMA), such as community expansion and economic development. Sale or Other Disposals Approximately 6,440 acres of land would be identified for disposal. See Appendix C Lands and Realty, Tracks Identified for Disposal. These lands need to be screened to assure that they meet FLPMA 203 criteria.</p> <p>Withdrawal Processing and Review: General Management Guidance FLPMA requires BLM to review agency withdrawals and prior Classification and Multiple Use Act (C&MU) classifications according to schedules prepared by USO or upon special BLM or agency request. The Monticello FO would review other-agency withdrawals (24,140 acres); withdrawals found to be obsolete can be removed. New withdrawals are processed upon request from BLM or other federal agencies, but can be made only by the Secretary or by Congress.</p> <p>Support Support from Utah state office and Washington office would be needed for requests for withdrawal. Interdisciplinary staff support would be needed for coordination and development of site-specific mitigation. Coordination with surface owners, surface-administering agencies, or the State of Utah may also be required. Coordination with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service would be required where threatened or endangered species are involved.</p> <p>MANAGEMENT COMMON TO ALL ACTION ALTERNATIVES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Avoidance and Exclusion Areas for ROWs: ROW avoidance and exclusion areas would be consistent with the stipulations identified for oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities. Areas NSO or unavailable for leasing or VRM Class I are ROW-avoidance areas. These stipulations have been developed to protect important resource values. Avoidance: ACECs, Pearson Canyon hiking area, WSAs, WSRs. Exclusion: Grand Gulch Special Emphasis Area, Dark Canyon ACEC, developed recreation sites. <p>Transportation and Utility Corridors This RMP would adopt the existing designated ROW corridors including the Western Utility Group (WUG) updates to the Western Regional Corridor Study (Map 4 and Sec. 368 Energy Policy Act of 2005 West-Wide Energy Corridor), and would designate additional corridors subject to physical barriers and sensitive resource values. Designated transportation and utility corridors include existing groupings of ROWs for electric transmission facilities, pipelines 16 inches and larger, communication lines, federal and state highways, and major county road systems.</p>				
<p>Rights-of-Way (ROW) – Wind, Solar Energy, Communication Sites</p>				
<p>Decision Background Authorization of any ROW for wind or solar energy development would incorporate best management practices and provisions contained in the Wind Energy Programmatic EIS, once this document becomes final. Both wind and solar energy development are normally authorized by ROW grant. Interim policy would be replaced by upcoming internal memorandum (IM).</p>				
<p>Alternative A (No Action)</p>	<p>Alternative B</p>	<p>Alternative C (Preferred)</p>	<p>Alternative D</p>	<p>Alternative E</p>
<p>Lands available for ROWs are divided into four categories according to the 1991 San Juan RMP prescriptions (page 37). Lands to be excluded are 120,800 acres:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cedar Mesa ACEC Portion of Grand Gulch Dark Canyon ACEC ROS SPM area of San Juan River SRMA Developed Recreation Sites 	<p>Consider lands available for ROWs except for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> VRM Class I and II areas Migratory bird habitats and raptor nesting complexes in riparian habitats and sagebrush and aspen Special status species habitats 	<p>Consider lands available for ROWs except for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> VRM Class I areas Migratory bird habitats and raptor nesting complexes in riparian habitats and sagebrush and aspen Threatened and endangered species habitats 	<p>Consider lands available for ROWs except for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> VRM Class I areas Threatened and endangered species habitats Areas managed as available for oil and gas leasing subject to NSO 	<p>Same as Alternative B except as listed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Non WSA lands with wilderness characteristics
<p>LIVESTOCK GRAZING</p>				
<p>GOALS Achieve Rangeland Health Standards (BLM 1997) and other desired resource conditions.</p>				
<p>MANAGEMENT COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES Manage grazing according to Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Grazing Management (BLM 1997). Maintain lands currently unavailable for livestock grazing (due to vegetation, recreation, wildlife, or other concerns). Maintain existing land treatments as prioritized in Table D.5, Appendix D, to meet RMP objectives and Standards for Rangeland Health (BLM 1997). Any new land treatments developed in addition to those listed would also be maintained as necessary to meet RMP objectives and Standards for Rangeland Health. Modify and implement existing Allotment Management Plans (AMPs) (Tank Draw and East Canyon) as necessary to meet RMP objectives and Standards for Rangeland Health (BLM 1997). Develop and implement 29 new AMPs and others identified on a site-specific basis, for which resource concerns develop that require such action. Continue to make unavailable for grazing 125,356 acres as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bridger Jack Mesa (near relict vegetation) Grand Gulch area (within the canyon) of Cedar Mesa Dark Canyon (partial) Lavender Mesa (relict vegetation) 				

Table 2.1. Summary Table of Alternatives

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Five identified mesa tops (White Canyon area) • Pearson Canyon (old hiking area boundary) • Comb Wash side canyons (Mule Canyon south of U-95, Arch, Fish, Owl, and Road) • Developed recreation sites (currently developed and proposed as listed in the recreation section. Any sites additional to those listed may be unavailable for grazing without a plan amendment and would be analyzed with site-specific NEPA) <p>Continue to allot 17,300 acres to wildlife (parts of the slopes of Peter's Canyon and East Canyon). Continue to authorize current active permitted grazing use unless monitoring data or other factors indicate a need for change (e.g., change in federal land ownership, etc.). Categorize allotments as shown in Chapter 3, Table 3.13, on approval of RMP revision. Designate key forage species for allotments as shown in Appendix D upon approval of RMP revision and as updated. Key species may be revised as needed (without plan amendment) to meet Rangeland Health Standards (BLM 1997) and Desired Future Condition. Manage allotments for ecological condition as shown in Chapter 3, Table 3.13 until replaced by a more suitable allotment objective classification such as Desired Future Condition (DFC).</p> <p><u>Forage, Livestock/Wildlife</u> Coordinate with UDWR and grazing permittees to manage for long-term forage and habitat and/or ecological condition requirements or needs for livestock and wildlife, consistent with grazing allotment and herd management unit objectives.</p> <p><u>Seasons of Use</u> Changes in livestock season of use would be made by the FO on an allotment-specific basis to meet RMP objectives or Standards for Rangeland Health (BLM 1997), as shown by monitoring data, and to provide flexibility in management of livestock grazing. Allotment seasons of use, subject to the statement above, would be the same as in the current RMP (see Appendix D Livestock Grazing) with the following exceptions:</p> <p>MANAGEMENT COMMON TO ALL ACTION ALTERNATIVES</p> <p><u>Season of Use Changes:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Church Rock season of use would end May 31. • Indian Rock season of use would end April 15. • Owens Dugout season of use would end April 30. • Laws season of use would be April 16 through November 15. • Bear Trap Season of use would be December 1 through March 15. • Monument Canyon season of use would be December 1 through May 31. <p><u>New Allotments – Established Since 1991 San Juan RMP:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South Vega season of use would be January 6 through April 30. • Upper Mail Station season of use would be November 15 through April 15. • Big Westwater season of use would be May 1 through December 31. <p><u>Utilization</u> Desired utilization levels as management guidelines for key forage species would be identified as needed on a site-specific basis consistent with Utah's Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Grazing Management (BLM 1997) and DFCs. Where utilization levels have not been established, a use level of 50% would be the management guideline. Utilization is the proportion or degree of current year's forage production that is consumed or removed by animals (including insects). Utilization data should be analyzed in conjunction with climate, actual grazing use, current or historic impacts (wildfire, livestock, wildlife, insects, etc.), and long-term trend data to help evaluate existing and design future management to meet LUP objectives.</p> <p><u>Relinquishment of Preference</u> A grazing permittee may voluntarily relinquish in writing all or a percentage of the grazing preference that is attached to the base property they own or control for any reason they may choose. This action would not require consent or approval by BLM or any other entity. BLM would not be a party to or accept any contingencies or conditions associated with a relinquishment that would require future BLM action(s) such as, but not limited to, discontinuing livestock grazing. Once the preference and associated permitted use has been relinquished in whole or in part, it would remain available for application for preference and a grazing permit. Prior to reissuance of the relinquished permit, the terms and conditions may be modified to meet RMP goals and objectives and/or site specific resource objectives. However, upon relinquishment, BLM may determine through a site-specific evaluation and associated NEPA analysis that the public lands within a grazing allotment are better used for other purposes such as recreation, wildlife, watershed for a culinary water source, disposal, etc., or a combination of other uses. Grazing may then be discontinued on the allotment through an amendment to the existing RMP or a new RMP effort. Any decision issued concerning discontinuance of livestock grazing on federal lands would not be permanent and would be subject to reconsideration during subsequent revision or amendment of the RMP. The evaluation and associated NEPA analysis may also determine that resource conditions are such that livestock grazing should be temporarily discontinued until site-specific resource objectives have been achieved. This evaluation and NEPA analysis would include a narrative with an evaluation time frame and process identified, indicating that once the objectives have been achieved, BLM would reconsider application(s) for grazing use.</p>				
Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Preferred)	Alternative D	Alternative E
<p>The following areas were made unavailable to grazing by court decision pending final determination in RMP revision: Comb Wash side canyons (Mule Canyon south of U-95, Arch, Fish, Owl, and Road). Also unavailable for grazing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bridger Jack Mesa (near relict vegetation) • Grand Gulch area (within the canyon) of Cedar Mesa • Dark Canyon (partial) 	<p>The following areas would be made unavailable to grazing for the life of this plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Slickhorn Canyon (Perkins Brother's Allotment) • Rone Bailey Mesa (Upper Mail Station Allotment) • Dodge Canyon Allotment • Mule Canyon (including North and South Forks north of U-95), Arch Canyon, Fish and Owl Canyon, and Road Canyon • Rogers Allotment 	<p>Same as Alternative B except for Mule Canyon, which would be made unavailable for grazing south of U-95 (North and South Forks north of U-95 would be open).</p>	<p>The following areas would be made unavailable for grazing for the life of this plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Slickhorn Canyon (Perkins Brother's Allotment) • Rone Bailey Mesa (Upper Mail Station Allotment) • Mule Canyon below U-95 • Arch Canyon • Fish and Owl Canyon • Road Canyon • Rogers Allotment 	<p>The following areas would be made unavailable for grazing for the life of this plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Slickhorn Canyon (Perkins Brother's Allotment) • Rone Bailey Mesa (Upper Mail Station Allotment) • Dodge Canyon Allotment • Mule Canyon (including North and South Forks north of U-95) • Arch Canyon • Fish and Owl Canyon

Table 2.1. Summary Table of Alternatives

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lavender Mesa (relict vegetation) • Five identified mesa tops (White Canyon area) • Pearson Canyon (old hiking area boundary) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Portions of West Butler Wash Canyons • Horsehead Canyon within Montezuma Canyon allotment <p>Moki Canyon, Lake Canyon, Harts Canyon, and Indian Creek from Kelly Ranch vicinity to USFS boundary would be restricted to livestock trailing only, no grazing. BLM would develop seasonal restrictions, closures, and/or forage utilization limits on grazing in riparian areas deemed Functioning at Risk.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Portions of West Butler Wash Canyons 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Road Canyon • Rogers Allotment • Portions of West Butler Wash Canyons • Horsehead Canyon within Montezuma Canyon allotment <p>Moki Canyon, Lake Canyon, Harts Canyon, and Indian Creek from Kelly Ranch vicinity to Forest Service boundary would be restricted to livestock trailing only, no grazing. BLM would develop seasonal restrictions, closures, and/or forage utilization limits on grazing in riparian areas Functioning At Risk.</p>
---	--	--	--	--

MINERAL RESOURCES

GOALS

Continue to meet local and national energy and other public mineral needs to the extent possible. Provide opportunities for environmentally responsible exploration and development of mineral and energy resources subject to appropriate BLM policies, laws, and regulations.

Ensure a viable long-term industry related to leasable, locatable, and salable mineral development while providing reasonable and necessary protections to other resources. Establish conditions of use through land use planning to protect other resource values.

The following principles would be applied:

1. encourage and facilitate the development by private industry of public land mineral resources in a manner that satisfies national and local needs and provides for economical and environmentally-sound exploration, extraction and reclamation practices;
2. process applications, permits, operating plans, mineral exchanges, leases, and other use authorizations for public lands in accordance with policy and guidance; and
3. monitor salable and leasable mineral operations to ensure proper resource recovery and evaluation, production verification, diligence and inspection, and enforcement of the lease, sale, or permit terms.

MANAGEMENT COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES

The plan would provide for a variety of mineral exploration and development activities. These activities would be allowed in the PA unless precluded by other program prescriptions. The stipulations identified in Appendix A would apply to these activities where they are applicable. Seasonal wildlife conditions would not apply to maintenance and operation activities for mineral production (see also Wildlife).

WSAs and designated Wilderness would remain closed, by law, to mineral leasing and development.

Where public lands are sold or exchanged under 43 U.S.C. 682(B)(Small Tracts Act), 43 U.S.C. 869 (Recreation and Public Purposes Act), 43 U.S. C. 1718 (Sales) or 43 U.S. C. 1716 (Exchanges), the minerals reserved to the United States would continue to be removed from the operation of the mining laws unless a subsequent land-use planning decision expressly recommends restoring the land to mineral entry.

Leasable Minerals

Oil and Gas

The plan would recognize and be consistent with the National Energy Policy and Conservation Act (EPCA) by:

1. recognizing the need for diversity in obtaining energy supplies;
2. encouraging conservation of sensitive resource values; and
3. improving energy distribution opportunities.

All lands are available for leasing subject to standard lease terms, unless otherwise specified in the plan. Lease stipulations would be developed in the plan, where necessary, to mitigate the impacts of oil and gas activity (see Appendix A). The stipulations would adhere to the Uniform Format prepared by the Rocky Mountain Regional Coordinating Committee in March 1989. Stipulations reflect the minimum requirements necessary to accomplish the desired resource protection and, would contain provisions and criteria to allow for exception, waiver and modification if warranted. Stipulations from Section 6 of the Standard Lease Terms are incorporated for all leases.

Oil and gas leases issued prior to the plan would continue to be managed under the stipulations in effect when issued. Those issued subsequent to this plan would be subject to the stipulations developed in this plan.

Certain federal oil and gas resources within the Monticello PA underlie lands not administered by the BLM. The BLM administers the federal leases on these lands. These lands include:

- 101,720 acres within the Glen Canyon National Recreation Area (NRA)(see Glen Canyon NRA Minerals Management Plan)
- 366,850 acres within the Manti-LaSal National Forest (NF), Monticello Ranger District
- 51,610 acres within the Navajo Indian Reservation
- 1,080 acres within Indian Trust Lands
- 55,390 acres on split-estate lands

Split-estate lands (private surface/federal minerals) and lands administered by other federal agencies are not managed by the BLM. The surface owner or surface management agency (SMA) manages the surface. BLM administers the operational aspects of oil and gas leases. On lands administered by other federal agencies, lease stipulations would include those required by the SMA. On split-estate lands, lease stipulations would consist of those necessary to comply with non-discretionary federal laws, such as the Endangered Species Act. Mitigation measures would also be applied to protect other resource values such as VRM class, Recreation, and non-federally protected fish and wildlife species consistent with section 6 of the standard lease terms. These mitigation measures would be developed during site specific environmental analysis and would be attached as conditions of approval (COA) in consultation with the surface owner or SMA.

Table 2.1. Summary Table of Alternatives

<p>Coal</p> <p>The coal resources within the Monticello PA are limited to the San Juan Coal Field, totaling about 530,000 acres. Approximately 60% of this field is under private ownership (both surface and mineral estate), and about 212,000 acres of federal surface and federal minerals in the coal field are administered by the Monticello FO. The potential for development of coal resources is low (see Mineral Potential Report and RFD [BLM 2005]). The public has expressed no interest in coal leasing. The RMP does not establish conditions for coal leasing or exploration requirements. This would be done through a plan amendment, should sufficient interest warrant. At such time as interest is expressed in coal leasing, the RMP would be amended and mining unsuitability criteria (43 CFR 3461) would be applied by the Monticello FO before any coal leases are issued. If coal leases are issued, they would be subject to special conditions developed in the RMP amendment and the unsuitability assessment. This may restrict all or certain types of mining techniques. Before any coal could be removed, Monticello FO would have to approve the mining permit application package, incorporating stipulations developed in the RMP. Coal underlying non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would not be available for leasing under Alternative E.</p> <p>Tar Sand</p> <p>The White Canyon Special Tar Sand Area (STSA) extends over approximately 10,000 acres in the western portion of the Monticello PA. The STSA is available for leasing subject to the same lease stipulations developed in the RMP for oil and gas. However, the mineral report has documented low potential for development. Site-specific NEPA would be completed at the time of development. Activities consistent with other decisions in this RMP would be allowed. Tar sands underlying non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would not be available for leasing under Alternative E.</p> <p>Note: An Oil Shale and Tar Sands Leasing Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) is being prepared for oil shale and tar sands resources leasing on lands administered by the U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management (BLM) in Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming. Based upon the information and analyses developed in this PEIS, the BLM would amend land use plans for these areas.</p> <p>Potash (Nonenergy Leasable)</p> <p>Within the Monticello PA, two areas fall within Known Potash Leasing Areas (KPLAs). KPLA designations, based on known geologic data, would remain in place until potash resources are depleted. In KPLAs, potash leases are acquired through competitive bidding. In areas where potash values are not known, the Monticello PA could issue prospecting permits, which could lead to issuance of a preference right lease. The RMP establishes stipulations that would apply to prospecting permits and leases. The KPLAs are available for leasing subject to the same lease stipulations developed in the RMP for oil and gas. Additional KPLAs could be designated, based on geologic data, if interest warranted. This would be an administrative action. Exploration and mining operations for potash are conducted in accordance with the regulations at 43 CFR 3590. Potash (KPLA) underlying non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would not be available for leasing under Alternative E.</p> <p>Geothermal</p> <p>A portion of the Warm Springs Canyon geothermal area (approximately 16,320 acres) extends into the Monticello PA. Low temperature geothermal waters have been recorded from springs. Because the Monticello PA is situated within the Colorado Plateau geologic province, where heat flow through the earth's crust is generally low, no high-temperature geothermal resources are expected at reasonable drilling depths. Therefore, development potential is low (see Mineral Potential Report and RFD [BLM 2005]). The public has expressed no interest in geothermal leasing. The RMP does not establish conditions for geothermal leasing or exploration requirements. This would be done through a plan amendment should sufficient interest warrant. Geothermal resources underlying non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would not be available for leasing under Alternative E.</p> <p>Locatable Minerals</p> <p>All public domain lands overlying federal minerals are available for mining claim location unless specifically withdrawn from mineral entry by Secretarial Order or public law or segregated from mineral entry under specific reservations, such as an R&PP lease. The RMP may be used to recommend lands to be withdrawn from mineral entry. Claims located on these areas prior to withdrawal would not be impacted. Operations on BLM-administered lands available for mineral entry must be conducted in compliance with BLM's surface management regulations (43 CFR Subparts 3802, 3809, 3715 and 3814). BLM surface management regulations do not apply to operations on other federal lands but do apply to all operations authorized by the mining laws on public lands where the mineral interest is reserved to the United States, including Stock Raising Homestead lands. The BLM would evaluate all operations authorized by the mining laws in the context of its requirement to prevent unnecessary and undue degradation of Federal lands and resources. Consistent with the rights afforded claimants under the mining laws, operations would conform to the management prescriptions in the plan. Minerals reserved to the United States on tracts of land sold or exchanged, would be removed from the operation of the mining laws. These lands would not be restored to mineral entry without a plan amendment. Federally owned locatable minerals underlying federal lands administered by the NPS are not generally available for mineral entry. However, locatable minerals under Glen Canyon NRA may be leased under Title 43 of the Code of Federal Regulations, part 3500 (43 CFR 3500) in accordance with the Mineral Management Plan for the NRA. Lands containing wilderness characteristics will be recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry in Alternative E.</p> <p>Salable Minerals</p> <p>All BLM-administered lands in the Monticello PA would be placed in one of the following three categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Available for disposal of mineral material subject to standard conditions. • Available for disposal of mineral material subject to special conditions. • Unavailable for disposal of mineral material. All non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics are unavailable for disposal of mineral materials in Alternative E. <p>The plan would develop management conditions for disposal of mineral materials under each category. These management conditions would correspond respectively to the oil and gas leasing stipulations developed in the RMP, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standard lease terms • TL and CSU • NSO and closed <p>There are currently 16 community pits, totaling about 5,505 acres, designated in the current 1991 San Juan RMP.</p>				
Lands Available for Oil and Gas Leasing ¹				
Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Preferred)	Alternative D	Alternative E
Acres available for leasing subject to standard lease terms (Category 1): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 578,604 The RMP reported 584,270 acres but was modified as discussed below***	Approximately 365,170 acres would be administratively available for oil and gas leasing, subject to standard lease terms.	Approximately 629,472 acres would be administratively available for oil and gas leasing, subject to standard lease terms.	Approximately 962,283 acres would be administratively available for oil and gas leasing, subject to standard lease terms.	Approximately 213,290 acres would be administratively available for oil and gas leasing, subject to standard lease terms.

Table 2.1. Summary Table of Alternatives

Acres available for leasing subject to special conditions (Category 2): • 659,626 The RMP reported 815,690 acres but was modified as discussed below***	TL: Approximately 786,489 acres would be administratively available for oil and gas leasing subject to timing limitations. CSU: Approximately 67,288 acres would be administratively available for oil and gas leasing subject to controlled surface use. CST: Approximately 22,963 acres would be administratively available for oil and gas leasing subject to timing limitations and controlled surface use.	TL: Approximately 569,657 acres would be administratively available for oil and gas leasing subject to timing limitations. CSU: Approximately 51,419 acres would be administratively available for oil and gas leasing subject to controlled surface use. CST: Approximately 98,425 acres would be administratively available for oil and gas leasing subject to timing limitations and controlled surface use.	TL: Approximately 418,242 acres would be administratively available for oil and gas leasing subject to timing limitations. CSU: Approximately 2,758 acres would be administratively available for oil and gas leasing subject to controlled surface use. CST: Approximately 0 acres would be administratively available for oil and gas leasing subject to timing limitations and controlled surface use.	TL: Approximately 511,649 acres would be administratively available for oil and gas leasing subject to timing limitations. CSU: Approximately 25,428 acres would be administratively available for oil and gas leasing subject to controlled surface use. CST: Approximately 8,564 acres would be administratively available for oil and gas leasing subject to timing limitations and controlled surface use.
Acres available subject to NSO: • 161,224 The RMP reported 268,080 acres but was modified as discussed below***	NSO: Approximately 125,105 acres would be administratively available for oil and gas leasing subject to no surface occupancy.	NSO: Approximately 39,323 acres would be administratively available for oil and gas leasing subject to no surface occupancy.	NSO: Approximately 14,175 acres would be administratively available subject to no surface occupancy.	NSO: Approximately 53,915 acres would be administratively available for oil and gas leasing subject to no surface occupancy.
Acres unavailable for leasing: • 385,316 – current management The RMP reported 111,170 acres but was modified as discussed below.***	Approximately 416,612 acres would be unavailable for leasing.	Approximately 395,329 acres would be unavailable for leasing.	Approximately 386,853 acres would be unavailable for leasing.	Approximately 974,463 acres would be unavailable for leasing.
*** Actual acreage for current management differs from the RMP acreage because of WSAs were unavailable for leasing by the IMP. The 1991 San Juan RMP did not close the WSAs to leasing and the acres were not taken into account at the time of RMP. Most of these areas were ACECs and available for leasing subject to special conditions. ¹ NSO – No Surface Occupancy; TL – Timing Limitations; CSU – Controlled Surface Use; CST – Controlled Surface Use and Timing Limitations				
Lands Available for Mineral Entry				
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
Approximately 1,675,057 acres would be available for mineral entry.	Approximately 1,527,656 acres would be available for mineral entry.	Approximately 1,682,865 acres would be available for mineral entry.	Approximately 1,739,389 acres would be available for mineral entry.	Approximately 1,015,384 acres would be available for mineral entry.
Approximately 110,066 acres would be recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry.	Approximately 257,467 acres would be recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry.	Approximately 102,258 acres would be recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry.	Approximately 45,734 acres would be recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry.	Approximately 769,739 acres would be recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry.
Lands Available for Mineral Material Disposal				
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
Approximately 584,270 acres would be available for disposal of mineral materials subject to standard terms and conditions.	Approximately 365,168 acres would be available for disposal of mineral materials subject to standard terms and conditions.	Approximately 624,734 acres would be available for disposal of mineral materials subject to standard terms and conditions.	Approximately 962,279 acres would be available for disposal of mineral materials subject to standard terms and conditions.	Approximately 213,290 acres would be available for disposal of mineral materials subject to standard terms and conditions.
Approximately 821,070 acres would be available for disposal of mineral materials subject to special conditions.	Approximately 876,736 acres would be available for disposal of mineral materials subject to special conditions.	Approximately 724,234 acres would be available for disposal of mineral materials subject to special conditions.	Approximately 420,998 acres would be available for disposal of mineral materials subject to special conditions.	Approximately 545,641 acres would be available for disposal of mineral materials subject to special conditions.
Approximately 373,850 acres would be unavailable for disposal of mineral materials.	Approximately 542,402 acres would be unavailable for disposal of mineral materials.	Approximately 435,338 acres would be unavailable for disposal of mineral materials.	Approximately 401,026 acres would be unavailable for disposal of mineral materials.	Approximately 1,025,378 acres would be unavailable for disposal of mineral materials.
NON-WSA LANDS WITH WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS				
BLM has identified non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics for management consideration in this planning effort. Wilderness characteristics include the appearance of naturalness and outstanding opportunities for solitude or primitive and unconfined recreation.				
GOALS AND OBJECTIVES:				
Maintain wilderness characteristics (appearance of naturalness and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation or solitude) of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics as appropriate, considering manageability and the context of competing resource demands. Manage these primitive lands and backcountry landscapes for their undeveloped character, and to provide opportunities for primitive recreational activities and experiences of solitude, as appropriate.				
MANAGEMENT COMMON TO ALL:				
There would be no management common to all for non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics.				
Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Preferred)	Alternative D	Alternative E
Non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics were not addressed in the 1991 San Juan Resource Area RMP, as amended. These lands are managed according to the 1991 San Juan RMP prescriptions.	No management prescriptions identified for non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics.	No management prescriptions identified for non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics.	No management prescriptions identified for non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics.	582,360 acres of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be managed as unavailable for mineral leasing, as unavailable for OHV use, as ROW exclusion areas, as unavailable for disposal of mineral materials, as unavailable for private and commercial

Table 2.1. Summary Table of Alternatives

				woodland harvest, as VRM Class I, and as proposed for withdrawal from mineral entry.
PALEONTOLOGY				
GOALS				
Identify area-wide criteria or site-specific use restrictions where necessary to protect paleontological resources from surface-disturbing activities and to promote the scientific, educational, and recreational uses of fossils. Foster public awareness and appreciation of the paleontological heritage.				
MANAGEMENT COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES				
<p>Recreational collectors may collect and retain reasonable amounts of common invertebrate and plant fossils for personal, non-commercial use. Surface disturbance must be negligible, and mechanized tools may not be used.</p> <p>Petrified wood collection would be limited to amounts mandated in BLM regulations.</p> <p>Collection of scientifically noteworthy and/or uncommon invertebrate and plant fossils may require a permit.</p> <p>Vertebrate fossils may be collected only under a permit issued by the authorized officer to qualified individuals. Vertebrate fossils include bones, teeth, eggs, and other body parts of animals with backbones such as dinosaurs, fish, turtles, and mammals. Vertebrate fossils also include trace fossils such as footprints, burrows, and dung.</p> <p>Casting of vertebrate fossils, including dinosaur tracks, would be prohibited unless allowed under a scientific/research permit issued by the Utah State BLM Office.</p> <p>Fossils collected under a permit remain the property of the federal government and must be placed in a suitable repository (such as a museum or university) identified at the time of permit issuance.</p> <p>Lands identified for disposal or exchange would be evaluated to determine whether such actions would remove important fossils from federal ownership.</p> <p>In areas where surface disturbance, either initiated by BLM or by other land users, may threaten substantial or noteworthy fossils, BLM would follow its policy per Paleontology Resources Management Manual and Handbook 8370-1 (BLM 1998a) to assess any threat and mitigate damage.</p> <p>Where scientifically noteworthy fossils are threatened by natural hazards or unauthorized collection, BLM would work with permittees and other partners to salvage specimens and reduce future threats to resources at risk.</p>				
Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Preferred)	Alternative D	Alternative E
	Conduct on-site evaluation of surface-disturbing activities for all Category 3, 4/5, and 5 areas, and avoid impacts to paleontological resources.	Conduct on-site evaluation of surface-disturbing activities for all Category 5 areas and minimize impacts to paleontological resources to the degree practicable. Evaluation will consider the type of surface disturbance proposed and mitigation will be developed based on site specific information.		Same as Alternative B.
RECREATION				
GOAL				
To provide for multiple recreational uses of the public lands and to sustain a wide range of recreation opportunities and potential experiences for visitors and residents while supporting local economic stability and sustaining the recreation resource base and other sensitive resource values.				
Explanation of Recreation Planning Concepts				
Under all alternatives, the primary framework for recreation management in the Monticello PA is the Special Recreation Management Area (SRMA). This is used to define the following components of the recreation program: OHV designations, recreation permitting, developed recreation facilities, campsite designation, tourism, and heritage tourism. SRMAs are discussed below to provide the reader with an understanding of how this concept would be used to manage recreation in the Monticello PA. The management tools and techniques that would be used to support these concepts are discussed within each alternative.				
Special Recreation Management Areas (SRMAs)				
SRMAs are defined under Manual 8320 (BLM 1981), as "...areas where important public recreation issues or management concerns occur. Special or more intensive types of management are typically needed. Detailed recreation planning is required in these areas and greater managerial investment (e.g., facilities, supervision, etc.) is likely. There may be none to several of these areas within a field office. The size of these management units is typically over 1,000 acres, but exceptions can occur for smaller sites (e.g., very large campground units, trail segments, historical sites, etc.)."				
SRMAs are designated in each of the alternatives to meet the goals and objectives of the recreation program and to adhere to agency guidance as described above.				
Extensive Recreation Management Areas (ERMAs)				
An ERMA is defined as an area where substantial recreation opportunity and problems are limited, and explicit recreation management is not required. The BLM would manage all lands within the PA, not within an SRMA (either initially or through subsequent action as described above) as an ERMA.				
MANAGEMENT COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES				
Continue existing ROWs issued to BLM for all existing developed recreation sites and facilities. Issue similar protective rights-of-way for all new recreation facilities.				
Manage recreation to meet Utah's Rangeland Health Standards guided by the Standards for Public Land Health and Guidelines for Recreation Management. (Reference Appendix E for Standards and Guides). The guidelines describe the procedures that should be applied to achieve standards for rangeland health within the recreation program.				
BLM Recreation Guidelines:				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recognize that various levels of regulations and limits are necessary. Restrictions and limitations on public uses should be as small as possible without compromising the primary goal. Use on-the-ground presence as a tool to protect public lands. Limit or control activities where long-term damage by recreational uses is observed or anticipated through specialized management tools such as designated campsites, permits, area closures, and limitations on number of users and duration of use. Revise recreation management plans and management framework plans when they prove to be either overly restrictive or inadequate to maintain public land health. 				

Table 2.1. Summary Table of Alternatives

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordinate with federal and state agencies, county and local governments, and tribal nations in recreation planning and managing traffic, search and rescue operations, trash control and removal, and public safety. • Consider and, where appropriate, implement management methods to protect the resource, as well as maintain the quality of experience of the various user groups. These methods could include limitation of numbers, types, timing, and duration of use. • Encourage the location of public land recreational activities near population centers and highway corridors by placement of appropriate visitor-use infrastructure. Provide restrooms and other facilities that would be adequate for anticipated uses at designated campgrounds, trailheads, and other areas where there is a concentration of recreational users. • Emphasize "Leave No Trace" camping and travel techniques throughout the Monticello PA. • Consider and, where appropriate, implement management methods to protect natural and cultural resources and while giving consideration to community and economic impacts, implement management methods to maintain or enhance recreation opportunities. Management methods may include limitation of visitor numbers, camping and travel controls, implementation of fees, alteration of when use takes place, and other similar actions as they are approved through normal BLM procedures. • Coordinate management of recreation use with other agencies, state and local government, and tribal units to provide public benefits, help assure public safety, and make effective use of staff and budget resources. • Recreational OHV and mechanized travel would be consistent with route and area designations described in the travel management decisions. BLM would work with agency and government officials and permit holders to develop procedures, protocols, permits or other types of authorization as appropriate to provide reasonable access for non-recreational use of OHVs for military, search and rescue, emergency, administrative, and permitted uses. • OHV access for game retrieval would follow all area and route designations. (There would be no off-road retrieval.) • Dispersed camping, while allowed where not specifically restricted, may be closed seasonally or as impacts or environmental conditions warrant. <p><u>General Recreation Management Decisions</u></p> <p>Allow development of hiking paths and trails within the PA subject to site-specific NEPA.</p> <p>The following actions require a signed agreement with the specified agency:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage BLM portion of the Colorado River in coordination with Canyonlands National Park and the Moab BLM FO. • Manage BLM portion of the San Juan River in coordination with Glen Canyon National Recreation Area and the Navajo Nation. • Manage BLM portion of Dark Canyon Complex in coordination with Manti-LaSal National Forest and Glen Canyon National Recreation Area. • Manage BLM portion of the Keeley Trail in coordination with Hovenweep National Monument. <p><u>Management of Existing And Development of Future Recreation Facilities</u></p> <p>Existing developed recreation sites would be maintained. New sites/facilities/trails would be developed in response to user demand, amenity value, and critical resource protection needs.</p> <p>All developed recreation sites would be recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry.</p> <p>These sites would also be available for oil and gas leasing subject to NSO and unavailable for disposal of mineral materials.</p> <p>Grazing would be excluded from developed recreation sites.</p> <p>These areas are unavailable for private and/or commercial use of woodland products including on-site collection of dead wood for campfires.</p> <p>MANAGEMENT COMMON TO ALL ACTION ALTERNATIVES</p> <p><u>General Recreation Management Decisions</u></p> <p>Benefits Based Management Goals and Objectives (BBMs) have been written for each SRMA. (See Appendix E, Recreation.)</p> <p>No camping within 200 feet of isolated springs to allow space for wildlife water.</p> <p><u>Management of Existing And Development of Future Recreation Facilities</u></p> <p>Develop or improve development of recreation sites as prioritized below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kane Gulch Ranger Station (40 acres) • Sand Island Campground (21 acres) • Mexican Hat launch site (20 acres) • Hamburger Rock Campground (20 acres) • Comb Wash Campground (10 acres) • Butler Wash Ruin (60 acres) • Mule Canyon Ruin (10 acres) • Three Kiva Pueblo (10 acres) • Shay Mountain Vista Campground (20 acres) • Indian Creek Recreational and Camping Facilities as outlined in the Indian Creek Recreation Corridor Plan. • BLM would work with Natural Bridges National Monument to develop an overflow camping area. No campfires would be allowed in these overflow camping areas. • BLM would work with Canyonlands National Park Needles District to develop an overflow camping area. • The bench above Sand Island Campground (256 acres) would be closed to camping.
<p>SRMA Plans</p>
<p>MANAGEMENT COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES</p> <p>Trailheads and associated parking/camping areas are included within the SRMA boundaries where the canyon areas (not the rims) are specified as the SRMA (Dark Canyon, White Canyon).</p> <p>Provide general recreation management guidance and subsequent implementation of management decisions for activity plan-level actions for SRMAs through continuation of approved Recreation Area Management Plans (RAMPs) and development of new RAMPs for all SRMAs.</p> <p>If necessary, activity plans would be written for SRMAs.</p>

Table 2.1. Summary Table of Alternatives

<p>Review and update RAMPS as necessary to make adjustments for changing conditions and opportunities.</p> <p>General SRMA Guidelines</p> <p>Identify additional SRMAs or add areas to SRMAs as necessary to respond to changing management circumstances.</p> <p>Establishment of post-RMP SRMAs or revision of SRMA boundaries would require a plan amendment. The criteria for establishment of post-RMP SRMAs or revising SRMA boundaries include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recreation use requires intensive management to provide recreation opportunities or maintain resource values. • A recreation area management plan or interdisciplinary plan with intensive recreation management decisions is approved. • BLM announces designation and plan approval through media. <p>All recreation management activities and developments in the SRMA would be in support of the individual SRMA goals and objectives.</p> <p>MANAGEMENT COMMON TO ALL ACTION ALTERNATIVES</p> <p>General SRMA Guidelines</p> <p>All SRMAs would be designated as special areas under the Land and Water Conservation Fund definition. As per the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act and the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act, this could require permits and payment of fees for recreation use.</p>				
<p>San Juan River SRMA</p> <p>The SRMA would not include the area along Lime Ridge, the associated state section, or the Holliday Pit Quarry.</p>				
<p>GOALS</p> <p>Integrated management between the BLM, NPS, and the Navajo Nation to provide outstanding recreational opportunities and visitor experiences while protecting natural and cultural resource values.</p>				
<p>OBJECTIVES</p> <p>By the year 2012, manage this zone to provide opportunities for visitors to engage in backcountry river-running, camping, and cultural appreciation recreation, providing no fewer than 75% of responding visitors and impacted community residents at least a moderate realization of these benefits: (i.e., 3.0 on a probability scale where 1 = not at all, 2 = somewhat, 3 = moderate, 4 = total realization).</p>				
<p>MANAGEMENT COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES</p> <p>Permits would be issued to commercial companies on a five-year designated basis. They would also be issued to private users through an annual lottery system.</p> <p>River trips on the San Juan River would require a special use permit.</p> <p>Unavailable for woodland product use except for limited on-site collection of dead wood for campfires, and permitted wood gathering by Native Americans; woodland use within the floodplain would be limited to collection of driftwood for campfires. Cottonwood and willow harvest would be allowed for Native American ceremonial uses only. Restrictions on harvest would be implemented as necessary to achieve or maintain PFC, and to maintain or improve TES/SSS habitat. Harvest would be administered under a permit system.</p> <p>Backpackers in Slickhorn Canyon and Grand Gulch would not be allowed to camp within 1 mile of the river.</p> <p>Open to campfire use with fire pan.</p>				
Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Preferred)	Alternative D	Alternative E
SRMA, 15,100 acres managed to preserve ROS P-class and protect ROS SPNM-class (9,380 acres).	The San Juan River would be managed as an SRMA (10,203 acres). The boundary would remain as in previous RMP. Efforts would be made to purchase private lands within the SRMA boundary. The SRMA boundary east of existing Oil and Gas Leasing Category III (NSO) would be below the bench, thereby allowing access to high-quality gravel.	The San Juan River would be managed as an SRMA (9,859 acres). The boundary would remain as in the previous RMP with the exception of Lime Ridge etc. The ACEC boundary would also be changed to match the D4600 Motorized Trail. The SRMA would include the Hole in the Rock Trail. The SRMA boundary east of existing Oil and Gas Leasing Category III (NSO) would be below the bench, thereby allowing access to high-quality gravel.	The San Juan River would be managed as an SRMA (6,365 acres). The boundary would be changed to make the SRMA the same size as the ACEC. The SRMA boundary east of existing Oil and Gas Leasing Category III (NSO) would be below the bench, thereby allowing access to high-quality gravel.	Same as Alternative B except for non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be managed as unavailable for mineral leasing, as unavailable for OHV use, as ROW exclusion areas, as unavailable for disposal of mineral materials, as unavailable for private and commercial woodland harvest, as VRM Class I, and as proposed for withdrawal from mineral entry.
Motorized Boating Downstream travel is allowed at low, wakeless speed. Upstream travel is prohibited except for emergency purposes (SPM).	No motorized boating would be allowed, except for emergency purposes.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	
Launch Limits Current launch limits allow approximately 40,000 user/days per year, private and commercial trips combined. Trip size is limited to 25 people on private trips, and 25 passengers plus 8 crew on commercial trips.	Launch limits would be reduced to provide a river experience that improves visitor experience and perception of solitude, and would reduce potential impacts on the resource. Launch schedules would allow approximately 30,000 user/days per year. Trip size would be limited to 20 people (including crew) for both private and commercial use.	Launch limits would be changed to allow for an improved visitor experience (e.g., hiking opportunities) and increased perception of solitude below Mexican Hat while remaining within the limitations set by the availability of campsites between Slickhorn Canyon and Clay Hills. Launch limits would allow approximately 40,000 user/days per year.	Launch limits would be raised to allow for increased visitor access to resources. Launch schedules would allow approximately 45,000 user/days per year, private and commercial trips combined. Trip size would be increased to a maximum of 35 people per trip for both private and commercial use.	

Table 2.1. Summary Table of Alternatives

		Trip size would be limited to 25 people (including crew) total for both private and commercial trips.		
Commercial/Private Allocations Commercial use, including day trips, is allowed up to 50% of total use. Commercial day trips are not included in launch limits.	Commercial use would be restricted to 30% of total use. One commercial day trip would be allowed and would be included in the allocation and launch limits.	Commercial use would be allowed up to 40% of total use. One commercial day trip per day would be allowed and would not be included in the launch limits.	Commercial/private allocation would be split on a 50/50 basis. Commercial day trips would be allowed on an unlimited basis and would not be included in the launch limits.	
Administrative/Research Use Administrative and research use is currently not included in the launch limits.	Administrative and research use would be restricted to use that can be accommodated within the launch limit.	Administrative and research use would be authorized on a case-by-case review and determination.	Same as Alternative C.	
Visitor Services Minimal visitor services at Sand Island and Mexican Hat ramp areas are provided for visitor health and safety and resource protection.	Minimal visitor services at Sand Island and Mexican Hat ramp areas would be provided for visitor health and safety and resource protection.	Same as Alternative B.	Increased visitor services, including trash receptacles and toilet clean-out facilities, would be provided for visitor health and safety and resource protection at Sand Island, Mexican Hat ramp areas.	
Designated Campsites To minimize conflict in the area from Slickhorn Canyon to Clay Hills, 9 campsites are available for reservation at the time the permit is issued. From May 15 to June 15, only 1 night is allowed in the reserved area. At other time, 2 nights are allowed if available, but must be at 2 different campsites (i.e., 2 nights cannot be spent at the same campsite).	A Memorandum of Understanding would be signed between the NPS/GCNRA and the Navajo Nation. This memorandum would include details on numbers of campsites and their associated permit restrictions.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.	
Non-Boating Use Vehicle camping is not restricted.	With the exceptions of along Lime Creek Road, the Mexican Hat Rock area, and Mexican Hat Boat Ramp, vehicle camping would be allowed within the San Juan SRMA only upstream of Comb Wash. Lime Creek campsite would be reserved for river runners only. All campers (including backpackers) must have carry-out toilets. The bench above Sand Island Recreation Area would be closed to camping, including portions outside of the SRMA. Area wide, camping would be closed within 0.5 mile of designated campsites.	Same as Alternative B.	Vehicle camping would not be restricted within the San Juan River SRMA except for the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The bench above Sand Island Recreation Area would be closed to camping, including portions outside of the SRMA. Area wide, camping would be closed within a 0.5 mile of designated campsites. 	With the exception of along Lime Creek Road, and the Mexican Hat Rock area, and Mexican Hat Boat Ramp, vehicle camping would be allowed within the San Juan SRMA only upstream of Comb Wash. Lime Creek campsite would be reserved for river runners only. All campers (including backpackers) must have carry-out toilets. The bench above Sand Island Recreation Area would be closed to camping, including portions outside of the SRMA. Area wide, camping would be closed within a ½ mile of designated campsites.
Minerals Managed as described in 1991 San Juan RMP (BLM 1991a), pages 78 and 100. Available for mineral leasing with special conditions. Available for geophysical. Available for mineral entry with an approved plan of operations.	Available for oil and gas leasing subject to NSO and recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry and unavailable for disposal of mineral materials.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.	Available for oil and gas leasing subject to NSO and recommended unavailable for locatable mineral entry. and disposal except for lands with wilderness characteristics which would be unavailable for oil and gas leasing.
Grazing Available for livestock use.	Grazing in the riparian area would be restricted to October 1–May 31 and must meet or exceed PFC, and incorporate rest-rotation and/or deferment systems. This would include Perkins Brothers, East League, and McCracken Wash Allotments.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B. Fire suppression on non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be through light on the land techniques.

Table 2.1. Summary Table of Alternatives

<p>Watershed</p>	<p>Watershed control structures would be subject to surface restrictions and seasonal restrictions to protect bighorn sheep lambing and rutting areas. Vehicle access in other areas within the SRMA would be limited to designated routes. Area would be subject to fire suppression to protect riparian habitat.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative B.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative B.</p>	<p>No vehicle access through non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics. Watershed structures would have to meet VRM Class I objectives.</p>
<p>Other</p>	<p>Would be managed to maintain an environment of isolation insofar as allowed by river permit and patrol system. Recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry. Surface disturbance from mining activities on existing claims would be limited to the extent possible without curtailing valid existing rights. The area above the rim in the vicinity of the Bluff airport lease would be available for mineral materials disposal. No vehicle access would be allowed from Comb Wash downstream to Lime Creek, and below Mexican Hat Bridge. OHV use would be limited to designated roads and trails.</p>	<p>Would be managed to maintain an environment of isolation insofar as allowed by river permit and patrol system. Recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry. Surface disturbance from mining activities on existing claims would be limited to the extent possible without curtailing valid existing rights. No vehicle access would be allowed from Comb Wash downstream to Lime Creek and below Mexican Hat Bridge (except for motorized boat use on the river). In areas open to OHV use, mechanized/motorized travel would be limited to designated routes.</p>	<p>Would be managed to maintain an environment of isolation insofar as allowed by river permit and patrol system. Recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry. Surface disturbing from mining activities on existing claims would be limited to the extent possible without curtailing valid existing rights. The area above the rim in the vicinity of the Bluff airport lease would be available for minerals materials disposal. No vehicle access would be allowed from Comb Wash downstream to Lime Creek, and below Mexican Hat Bridge. OHV use would be limited to designated roads and trails.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative B.</p>
<p>(Cedar Mesa) Cultural SRMA (C-SRMA)</p>				
<p>GOALS Integrated management between the BLM and NPS to provide outstanding recreational opportunities and visitor experiences while protecting natural and cultural resource values.</p>				
<p>OBJECTIVES By the year 2012, manage this zone to provide opportunities for visitors to engage in Backcountry, Middle-country, Front-country, and Rural cultural appreciation recreation, providing no fewer than 75% of responding visitors and impacted community residents at least a moderate realization of these benefits (i.e., 3.0 on a probability scale where 1 = not at all, 2 = somewhat, 3 = moderate, 4 = total realization).</p>				
<p>MANAGEMENT COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES Portions of the Cedar Mesa Cultural SRMA fall within existing WSAs. WSAs would be managed according to the IMP. WSAs would be managed as VRM Class I.</p>				
<p>MANAGEMENT COMMON TO ALL ACTION ALTERNATIVES The Grand Gulch SRMA would be changed to the Cedar Mesa Cultural Special Recreation Management Area and would be managed according to guidelines stipulated below. A joint recreation/cultural resources management plan would be written for this area based on the RMP.</p>				
<p>Alternative A</p>	<p>Alternative B</p>	<p>Alternative C</p>	<p>Alternative D</p>	<p>Alternative E</p>
<p>Camping: Allowed only at existing campsites. No new campsites may be developed. Camping in Grand Gulch between Kane Gulch and Bullet Canyon is limited to no more than 2 consecutive nights at one campsite. The bench surrounding Split Level Ruin in Grand Gulch is closed to camping. No unauthorized use of existing corrals. Campfires: Prohibited in all canyons. Areas for Day Use only: Bullet Canyon from Grand Gulch to Jailhouse Ruin. Two miles upstream Fish Canyon from the confluence with Owl Canyon, McLoyd Canyon to impassable pour-off, and Owl Canyon to Nevill's Arch. Pets: No limit or fees for pets. All pets must be collared, leashed, and under human control at all times. No pets are allowed in Slickhorn Canyon or below</p>	<p>The following stipulations would apply to the Cedar Mesa Cultural SRMA (375,734 acres):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Available for livestock use with special conditions to protect at risk cultural resources. • Available for watershed, range, and wildlife improvements and vegetation treatments. • Mesa tops and canyons closed to campfire use. • Unavailable for commercial and/or private use of woodland products including on-site collection of dead wood for campfires. • Open to dispersed camping except in areas where cultural resources are at risk. • Permits will be Limited (25 people total) for day hikes and overnight camping to prevent cultural site damage. 	<p>Cedar Mesa Cultural SRMA (375,734 acres) would be managed the same as Alternative B except for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Campfires allowed on mesa tops only; fire pan required. • Available for commercial and/or private use of woodland products including on-site collection of dead wood for campfires (outside WSAs and canyons bottoms). <p>Pets and Stock Same as Alternative A with these exceptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If resources or the visitors' experiences are adversely impacted, pets and or stock animals may be limited or prohibited in canyons requiring permits. 	<p>Cedar Mesa Cultural SRMA (375,734 acres) the same as Alternative C except for:</p> <p>Pets and Stock Same as Alternative A with the exceptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If resources or the visitors' experiences are adversely impacted, pets and or stock animals may be limited or prohibited. People with pets would be required to conform to stipulations described in Alternative A. • Stock limitations would be the same as Alternative A. 	<p>The following stipulations would apply to the Cedar Mesa Cultural SRMA (375,734 acres):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Available for livestock use with special conditions to protect at risk cultural resources and wilderness characteristics. • Available for watershed, range, and wildlife improvements and vegetation treatments on lands without wilderness characteristics (acreage). On lands with wilderness characteristics, maintenance of existing improvements is allowed, no new improvements will be allowed. • Mesa tops and canyons closed to campfire use. • Unavailable for commercial and/or private use of woodland products including on-site collection of dead wood for campfires.

Table 2.1. Summary Table of Alternatives

<p>Collins Canyon in Grand Gulch. Pets are not allowed in or at any alcoves, rock art sites, or ruins. Pets must not harass or harm wildlife. Pets must not harass visitors and other visitors' pets. Pets are not allowed to swim in springs, pot holes, or other natural water sources. Pet waste must be buried in a shallow hole away from trails, campsites, cultural sites, and natural water sources.</p> <p>Stock: horses, llamas, goats, etc: All commercial and private stock use requires a permit. GGPA allows 1 stock trip at any one time allowed in GGPA, includes day use. Other Cedar Mesa canyons allow 1 overnight stock trip at any one time, and unlimited day use.</p> <p>Overnight stock use areas: Kane Gulch, Collins Canyon, Government Trail, Grand Gulch from Kane Gulch to Collins Canyon, Fish Creek Canyon from Comb Wash to confluence with Owl Canyon, Mule Canyon South of U-95, Road Canyon, Lime Creek Canyon, Johns Canyon, and Arch Canyon.</p> <p>Areas Closed to Stock use: Grand Gulch below Collins Canyon, all the Slickhorn Canyons, Mule Canyons north of U-95, Bullet Canyon above Jailhouse Ruin, Fish Creek Canyon from 2 miles upstream from Fish Creek and Owl Creek confluence, and Owl Canyon above Nevill's Arch.</p> <p>Use Limitations: Stock use, both day and overnight, is subject to the provisions of the Grand Gulch Plateau Cultural and Recreation Management Plan, which allows for no more than 1 overnight stock party at a time in any canyon on Cedar Mesa. However, Grand Gulch is limited to only one stock trip at any time, day or overnight. In the other canyon systems on Cedar Mesa, day stock use is not restricted at this time. The BLM would monitor day use, and reserves the right to implement a day-use allocation and reservation future date if the impacts of day-use visitation warrant.</p> <p>Group Size: Overnight and day use in the Grand Gulch Primitive area and other Cedar Mesa Canyons restricted to 12 individuals and 10 animals (pack and/or saddle).</p> <p>Feed: Stock users would be required to take all feed (non-germinating, weed free) necessary to sustain their animals while on the trip.</p> <p>Loose Herding of pack and saddle stock is prohibited. All stock must be under physical control. When tethered, all stock must be at least 200 feet away from any water source and archaeological sites and their surrounding benches.</p> <p>No New Trails would be established for stock use. Use would be restricted to existing trails and routes in areas open to recreational stock use.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Managed as VRM Class III and IV. <p>Pets and Stock</p> <p>Same as Alternative A with the following exceptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pets would not be allowed in canyons requiring permits. (Grand Gulch and its tributaries), Fish Canyon, Owl Canyon, McLoyd Canyon, Slickhorn Canyon, Road Canyon, Lime Canyon, and North and South Mule Canyons). Recreational stock (horses, pack animals, etc.) would not be allowed in canyons requiring permits. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limitations on stock use would be identical to Alternative A with the exception that stock day use would be limited to 1 party per day per trailhead in all canyons requiring permits (except Grand Gulch and McLoyd). Stock would be limited to 8 animals. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Open to dispersed camping except in areas where cultural resources are at risk. Permits will be Limited (25 people total) for day hikes and overnight camping to prevent cultural site damage. Lands without wilderness characteristics will be managed as VRM Class III and IV. Lands with wilderness characteristic will be managed as VRM Class I. <p>Pets and Stock</p> <p>Same as Alternative A with the following exceptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pets would not be allowed in canyons requiring permits. (Grand Gulch and its tributaries), Fish Canyon, Owl Canyon, McLoyd Canyon, Slickhorn Canyon, Road Canyon, Lime Canyon, and North and South Mule Canyon). Recreational stock (horses, pack animals, etc.) would not be allowed in canyons requiring permits.
--	---	--	--	---

Table 2.1. Summary Table of Alternatives

Grand Gulch Plateau (Cedar Mesa) Mesa Top Day Use				
There is no allocation or group size.	No allocations on group numbers. Group size limited to 10 people for both private and commercial use, both within and outside of the WSA.	No allocations on group numbers. Group size limited to 12 people for both private and commercial use, both within and outside of the WSA. No group size limits for groups going to the following areas: Mule Canyon Ruin, Kane Gulch Ranger Station, Salvation Knoll, and other sites as identified.	No allocations on group numbers. Group size limit of 12 people for private and commercial use within the WSA and 25 people outside of the WSA. No group size limits for groups going to the following areas: Mule Canyon Ruin, Kane Gulch Ranger Station, Salvation Knoll, and other sites as identified.	No allocations on group numbers. Group size limited to 10 people for private and commercial use, both within and outside of the WSA.
Grand Gulch Plateau (Cedar Mesa) Mesa Top Camping				
<p>MANAGEMENT COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES Revise the current Grand Gulch Plateau Cultural and Recreation Area Management Plan.</p> <p>MANAGEMENT COMMON TO ALL ACTION ALTERNATIVES 14-day camping limit within any 28 consecutive days, with the options of reducing the number of days or closing campsites if impacts occur.</p>				
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
Cedar Mesa is open to dispersed camping. There is no allocation no group size. No permits or fees required for private or commercial camping.	Designated primitive campsites. Group size limited to 12 people for both private and commercial use. Closure of campsites impacting cultural sites. Overnight campers required to remove their human waste.	Designated primitive campsites. Designated campsites for large groups (12 to 24 people). Group size limited to 24 people for both private and commercial use. Closure of campsites impacting cultural sites. Overnight campers required to remove their human waste.	No designated campsites for groups under 24. Designated campsites for groups of 24 and larger. No group size limit. Closure of campsites impacting cultural sites. Campsite facility development as needed (fire grates, picnic tables, toilets, etc.).	Designated primitive campsites. Group size limited to 12 people for both private and commercial use. Closure of campsites impacting cultural sites. Overnight campers required to remove their human waste.
Grand Gulch Plateau (Cedar Mesa) In-canyon Private/ Commercial Day Use				
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
<p>Private No limits on numbers of parties per day per trailhead for day use. Group size limited to 12.</p> <p>Commercial Group size limited to 12. No limits on number of parties per day per trailhead. Revise The Grand Gulch Plateau Cultural and Recreation Area Management Plan. Advanced permit required through Monticello PA.</p>	<p>Private Limit of 10 people per day per trailhead. Group size limited to 10. Mandatory permits during high-use season.</p> <p>Commercial Group size limited to 10. One commercial group every other day per trailhead. Limit commercial use or close areas to commercial use as necessary to protect cultural and other resources. Advanced permit required through Monticello PA.</p>	<p>Private Limit of 12 people per day per trailhead. Group size limited to 12. A limited day use permit system implemented as necessary to protect cultural and other resources.</p> <p>Commercial Group size limited to 12. One commercial group per day per trailhead. Implement additional restrictions on group size and visitor frequency (based on monitoring of impact) as necessary to protect cultural or other resources. Advanced permit required through Monticello PA.</p>	Same as Alternative C with the following exception: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limit of 2 commercial groups per trailhead per day. 	<p>Private Limit of 10 people per day per trailhead. Group size limited to 10. Mandatory permits during high use season.</p> <p>Commercial Group size limited to 10. One commercial group every other day per trailhead. Limit commercial use or close areas to commercial use as necessary to protect cultural and other resources. Advanced permit required through Monticello PA.</p>
Grand Gulch Plateau (Cedar Mesa) In-Canyon Permitted Overnight Camping				
<p>MANAGEMENT COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES Pack it in, pack it out. All cans, trash, organic garbage, and burnable refuse including toilet paper must be carried out. Liquid garbage may be discarded 200 feet away from water sources. Dish water must be strained and discarded 200 feet from camps, trails, and water sources. No swimming or bathing is allowed in the pools. Commercial allocation would be 30% of the Cedar Mesa permitted use.</p>				
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
Group size limited to 12 people for overnight use. Groups of 8 or more must obtain an advanced reservation. Camping permitted in well-used campsites only. No new campsites may be created. No party may spend more than 2 consecutive nights at campsites near Junction Ruin, Turkey Pen Ruin, Jailhouse Ruin, and the mouth of Bullet Canyon.	Same as Alternative A except for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Designated campsites for groups up to 4, up to 8, and up to 10 people, and groups with stock. In-canyon camping could be limited to certain designated areas if resource or cultural damage occurs. If human waste becomes a public safety and/or resource issue, a requirement to carry out waste may 	Same as Alternative A except for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Designated campsites for large groups of 8-12 people, and for groups with stock animals. Groups of 1-7 people would not have designated campsites and would camp in dispersed campsites. In canyon camping could be limited to certain designated areas if resource or cultural damage occurs. 	Same as Alternative A except for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dispersed camping for groups of 1-7. Designated campsites for groups of 8-12 and groups with stock. If human waste becomes a problem, carrying out waste may be implemented. Total caps on visitor numbers for each trailhead are shown below. Caps on visitor numbers or group size 	Same as Alternative A except for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Designated campsites for groups up to 4, up to 8, and up to 10 people, and groups with stock. In-canyon camping could be limited to certain designated areas if resource or cultural damage occurs. If human waste becomes a public safety and/or resource issue, a requirement to carry out waste may

Table 2.1. Summary Table of Alternatives

<p>No camping allowed at any ruins, rock art sites, or alcoves, nor on the bench area surrounding Split Level Ruin. Backpacker camping is not allowed within 1 mile of the San Juan River in either Grand Gulch or Slickhorn Canyon.</p> <p>No fires allowed in any of the Cedar Mesa Canyons, including Grand Gulch.</p> <p>Latrines or shallow cat-holes for human waste disposal should be dug 4-6" deep and covered with soil. Pack out toilet paper, do not burn it. Burial of human waste prohibited within one mile of the San Juan River. Disposal of human waste at least 200 feet from water sources or dry creek beds.</p> <p>Camping, bathing, and dish washing must be at least 200 feet from water sources or dry creek beds. Soap may not be used in water sources, even if biodegradable.</p> <p>Camping permitted in well-used campsites only. No new campsites may be created. No party may spend more than 2 consecutive nights at campsites near Junction Ruin, Turkey Pen Ruin, Jailhouse Ruin, and the mouth of Bullet Canyon.</p> <p>Commercial trips limited to 1 commercial trip per day per trailhead.</p>	<p>be implemented.</p> <p>Private:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Private group size limited to 6 people per day per trailhead. Total caps on visitor numbers for each trailhead are shown below. <p>Commercial:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Commercial guides would be required to meet all pertinent state requirements. Commercial group size limited to 10 people per day per trailhead. Total caps on visitor numbers for each trailhead are shown below. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If human waste becomes a problem, carrying out waste may become implemented. Total caps on visitor numbers for each trailhead are shown below. Caps on visitor numbers or group size may be modified as necessary to protect resources. <p>Private:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Private group size limited to 8 people per day per trailhead. <p>Commercial:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Commercial group size limited to 12 people per day per trailhead. One commercial group per trailhead per day. Commercial guides are required to meet all pertinent state guidelines. 	<p>may be modified as necessary to protect resources.</p> <p>Private:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Private group size limited to 12 people per day per trailhead. If no commercial group allocation, 12 additional permits would be available. <p>Commercial:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Group size limited to 12 people per day per trailhead. Commercial guides would be required to meet all pertinent state requirements. Commercial trips would be limited to one commercial trip per day per trailhead. 	<p>be implemented.</p> <p>Private:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Private group size limited to 6 people per day per trailhead. Total caps on visitor numbers for each trailhead are shown below. <p>Commercial:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Commercial guides would be required to meet all pertinent state requirements. Commercial group size limited to 10 people per day per trailhead. Total caps on visitor numbers for each trailhead are shown below. 																																																																																																				
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E																																																																																																				
<p>Trailhead allocations</p> <table border="0"> <tr><td>Total overnight visitors per day:</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>Kane</td><td>26</td></tr> <tr><td>Bullet</td><td>22</td></tr> <tr><td>Government</td><td>12</td></tr> <tr><td>Collins</td><td>22</td></tr> <tr><td>Fish/Owl</td><td>26</td></tr> <tr><td>Road Canyon</td><td>22</td></tr> <tr><td>Lime Creek</td><td>22</td></tr> <tr><td>Mule Canyons</td><td>22</td></tr> <tr><td>Slickhorn Canyons</td><td>22</td></tr> </table>	Total overnight visitors per day:		Kane	26	Bullet	22	Government	12	Collins	22	Fish/Owl	26	Road Canyon	22	Lime Creek	22	Mule Canyons	22	Slickhorn Canyons	22	<p>Trailhead allocations</p> <table border="0"> <tr><td>Total overnight visitors per day:</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>Kane</td><td>16</td></tr> <tr><td>Bullet</td><td>16</td></tr> <tr><td>Government</td><td>16</td></tr> <tr><td>Collins</td><td>16</td></tr> <tr><td>Fish/Owl</td><td>16</td></tr> <tr><td>Road Canyon</td><td>16</td></tr> <tr><td>Lime Creek</td><td>16</td></tr> <tr><td>Mule canyons</td><td>16</td></tr> <tr><td>Slickhorn Canyons</td><td>16</td></tr> </table>	Total overnight visitors per day:		Kane	16	Bullet	16	Government	16	Collins	16	Fish/Owl	16	Road Canyon	16	Lime Creek	16	Mule canyons	16	Slickhorn Canyons	16	<p>Trailhead allocations</p> <table border="0"> <tr><td>Total overnight visitors per day:</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>Kane</td><td>20</td></tr> <tr><td>Bullet</td><td>20</td></tr> <tr><td>Government</td><td>20</td></tr> <tr><td>Collins</td><td>20</td></tr> <tr><td>Fish/Owl</td><td>20</td></tr> <tr><td>Road Canyon</td><td>20</td></tr> <tr><td>Lime Creek</td><td>20</td></tr> <tr><td>Mule Canyons</td><td>20</td></tr> <tr><td>Slickhorn Canyons</td><td>20</td></tr> </table> <p>If commercial cap limits are not met on a given day, additional private visitors would be allowed provided the overall cap of 20 people per trailhead is not exceeded.</p>	Total overnight visitors per day:		Kane	20	Bullet	20	Government	20	Collins	20	Fish/Owl	20	Road Canyon	20	Lime Creek	20	Mule Canyons	20	Slickhorn Canyons	20	<p>Trailhead allocations</p> <table border="0"> <tr><td>Total overnight visitors per day:</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>Kane</td><td>24</td></tr> <tr><td>Bullet</td><td>24</td></tr> <tr><td>Government</td><td>24</td></tr> <tr><td>Collins</td><td>24</td></tr> <tr><td>Fish/Owl</td><td>24</td></tr> <tr><td>Road Canyon</td><td>24</td></tr> <tr><td>Lime Creek</td><td>24</td></tr> <tr><td>Mule Canyons</td><td>24</td></tr> <tr><td>Slickhorn Canyons</td><td>24</td></tr> </table> <p>If commercial cap limits are not met on a given day, additional private visitors would be allowed provided the overall cap of 24 people per trailhead is not exceeded.</p>	Total overnight visitors per day:		Kane	24	Bullet	24	Government	24	Collins	24	Fish/Owl	24	Road Canyon	24	Lime Creek	24	Mule Canyons	24	Slickhorn Canyons	24	<p>Trailhead allocations</p> <table border="0"> <tr><td>Total overnight visitors per day:</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>Kane</td><td>16</td></tr> <tr><td>Bullet</td><td>16</td></tr> <tr><td>Government</td><td>16</td></tr> <tr><td>Collins</td><td>16</td></tr> <tr><td>Fish/Owl</td><td>16</td></tr> <tr><td>Road Canyon</td><td>16</td></tr> <tr><td>Lime Creek</td><td>16</td></tr> <tr><td>Mule canyons</td><td>16</td></tr> <tr><td>Slickhorn Canyons</td><td>16</td></tr> </table>	Total overnight visitors per day:		Kane	16	Bullet	16	Government	16	Collins	16	Fish/Owl	16	Road Canyon	16	Lime Creek	16	Mule canyons	16	Slickhorn Canyons	16
Total overnight visitors per day:																																																																																																								
Kane	26																																																																																																							
Bullet	22																																																																																																							
Government	12																																																																																																							
Collins	22																																																																																																							
Fish/Owl	26																																																																																																							
Road Canyon	22																																																																																																							
Lime Creek	22																																																																																																							
Mule Canyons	22																																																																																																							
Slickhorn Canyons	22																																																																																																							
Total overnight visitors per day:																																																																																																								
Kane	16																																																																																																							
Bullet	16																																																																																																							
Government	16																																																																																																							
Collins	16																																																																																																							
Fish/Owl	16																																																																																																							
Road Canyon	16																																																																																																							
Lime Creek	16																																																																																																							
Mule canyons	16																																																																																																							
Slickhorn Canyons	16																																																																																																							
Total overnight visitors per day:																																																																																																								
Kane	20																																																																																																							
Bullet	20																																																																																																							
Government	20																																																																																																							
Collins	20																																																																																																							
Fish/Owl	20																																																																																																							
Road Canyon	20																																																																																																							
Lime Creek	20																																																																																																							
Mule Canyons	20																																																																																																							
Slickhorn Canyons	20																																																																																																							
Total overnight visitors per day:																																																																																																								
Kane	24																																																																																																							
Bullet	24																																																																																																							
Government	24																																																																																																							
Collins	24																																																																																																							
Fish/Owl	24																																																																																																							
Road Canyon	24																																																																																																							
Lime Creek	24																																																																																																							
Mule Canyons	24																																																																																																							
Slickhorn Canyons	24																																																																																																							
Total overnight visitors per day:																																																																																																								
Kane	16																																																																																																							
Bullet	16																																																																																																							
Government	16																																																																																																							
Collins	16																																																																																																							
Fish/Owl	16																																																																																																							
Road Canyon	16																																																																																																							
Lime Creek	16																																																																																																							
Mule canyons	16																																																																																																							
Slickhorn Canyons	16																																																																																																							
Dark Canyon SRMA																																																																																																								
<p>GOALS</p> <p>Integrated management between the BLM, USFS and NPS to provide outstanding recreational opportunities and visitor experiences, while protecting natural and cultural resource values.</p>																																																																																																								
<p>OBJECTIVES</p> <p>By the year 2012, manage this zone to provide opportunities for visitors to engage in backcountry muscle-powered exercise and cultural appreciation recreation, providing no fewer than 75% of responding visitors and impacted community residents at least a moderate realization of these benefits: (i.e., 3.0 on a probability scale where 1 = not at all, 2 = somewhat, 3 = moderate, 4 = total realization).</p>																																																																																																								
<p>MANAGEMENT COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES</p> <p>Create and allocate an interagency permit and fee system for these canyons as necessary to preserve resources and the visitor experience.</p> <p>MANAGEMENT COMMON TO ALL ACTION ALTERNATIVES</p> <p>All Action Alternatives would separate the existing Canyon Basin SRMA into the Dark Canyon SRMA and the Indian Creek SRMA, with management prescriptions described below by alternative.</p> <p>The Dark Canyon SRMA would include canyon rims and bottoms for Dark Canyon, Gypsum Canyon, Bowdie Canyon, Lean To Canyon, Palmer Canyon, Lost Canyon, Black Steer Canyon, Young's Canyon, and Fable Valley Canyon. Trailheads and associated parking/camping areas are included within the SRMA boundaries where the canyons are specified as the SRMA.</p>																																																																																																								

Table 2.1. Summary Table of Alternatives

An Interagency Management Plan would be written in coordination with the NPS and USFS.				
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
<p>* In the current RMP, this area is part of the Canyon Basin's SRMA.</p> <p>The Canyon Basin (214,390) SRMA would include both the proposed Dark Canyon SRMA and the proposed Indian Creek SRMA, and would be managed according to the following stipulations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No group size limit Commercial permits required No private permits required No group limits No permit fees No interagency permitting Little ranger presence Fires permitted Dogs permitted Open dispersed camping permitted Vehicle use 	<p>Dark Canyon (30,820 acres) would be managed as an SRMA with the following prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Group size limit would be limited to 10 people for private groups, 12 people for commercial groups. Implementation of an allocated permit and fee system. 1 commercial trip allowed per week. 15 total private users per day. This number could be altered depending upon future visitor impacts. Camping in designated sites only. Campfires limited to mesa tops. Human waste must be packed out. Unavailable for private and/or commercial collection of woodland products, including on-site collection of dead wood for campfires. No pets would be allowed. 	<p>Dark Canyon (30,820 acres) would be managed as an SRMA with the following prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Group size would be limited to 15 people for private and commercial. 3 commercial trips would be allowed per week. 20 total private users allowed per day. This number may be altered depending upon future visitor impacts. If and where necessary, camping would be restricted to designated sites only. Campfires would be allowed on mesa tops (fire pan required); cook stoves only in canyons. Unavailable for private and/or commercial collection of woodland product use except for the on-site collection of dead wood for campfires on mesa tops. If human waste becomes a problem, carrying out waste may be implemented in canyon. Pets would be allowed on leash and under physical control. 	<p>Dark Canyon (30,820 acres) would be managed as an SRMA with the following prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Group size limited to 15 people for private and commercial. Seven commercial trips would be allowed per week. Dispersed camping would be allowed in canyon and on mesa top. Campfires would be allowed on mesa tops and in canyons (fire pan required). Unavailable for private and/or commercial collection of woodland product use except on-site collection of dead wood for campfires. Pets would be allowed on leash and under physical control. 	<p>Dark Canyon (30,820 acres) would be managed as an SRMA with the following prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Group size limit would be limited to 10 people for private groups, 12 people for commercial groups. An allocated permit and fee system would be implemented. 1 commercial trip would be allowed per week. 15 total private users would be allowed per day. This number could be altered depending upon future visitor impacts. Camping would be allowed in designated sites only. Campfires would be limited to mesa tops. Human waste must be packed out. Unavailable for private and/or commercial collection of woodland products including on-site collection of dead wood for campfires. No pets would be allowed.
<u>Indian Creek SRMA (89,271 acres)</u>				
<p>GOALS</p> <p>Integrated management between the BLM, NPS, and the Nature Conservancy to provide outstanding recreational opportunities and visitor experiences while protecting natural and cultural resource values.</p>				
<p>OBJECTIVES</p> <p>By the year 2012, manage this zone to provide opportunities for visitors to engage in Backcountry, Middle-country, Front-country, and Rural activities and cultural appreciation recreation, providing no fewer than 75% of responding visitors and impacted community residents at least a moderate realization of these benefits: (i.e., 3.0 on a probability scale where 1 = not at all, 2 = somewhat, 3 = moderate, 4 = total realization).</p>				
<p>MANAGEMENT COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES</p> <p>There would be a proposed Open OHV area within the Indian Creek SRMA. See Travel Plan alternatives.</p> <p>Portions of the Indian Creek SRMA lie within portions of the Indian Creek WSA. WSAs are managed under the IMP.</p>				
<p>MANAGEMENT COMMON TO ALL ACTION ALTERNATIVES</p> <p>Indian Creek (89,271 acres) would be managed as an SRMA.</p> <p>Indian Creek SRMA boundary would match the boundary for the Indian Creek Corridor Plan and Environmental Assessment (EA).</p> <p>Management of the Indian Creek Corridor would be in conformance with the guidance outlined in the Indian Creek Corridor Plan, which includes the following guidelines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Camping would be prohibited in the Indian Creek riparian corridor from Newspaper Rock to approximately 1 mile downstream of the Dugout Ranch. Camping outside of the riparian corridor within this area would be limited to designated campsites only. Designated campgrounds would be removed from the Newspaper Rock area and rehabilitated. A picnic area would be constructed adjacent to the Newspaper Rock parking area. Camping along the Bridger Jack Mesa Bench would be limited to designated sites. A new campground called Shay Mountain Vista Campground would be constructed. The area would be unavailable for private and/or commercial use of woodland products, including on-site collection of dead wood for campfires. Campers must bring in their own wood for campfires. Campfires would be restricted to fire rings where fire rings are available. In dispersed camping areas, where fire rings are not available, fires would be subject to "Leave No Trace" standards. Rock-climbing routes in conflict with cultural sites would be closed. Camping fees would be charged if deemed necessary to provide needed facilities. Parking areas would be developed. Additional camping stipulations and regulations could be implemented if monitoring data shows this is necessary. If new climbing routes are established, the BLM may designate a footpath to access the base of the climb to protect wildlife/raptors. 				

Table 2.1. Summary Table of Alternatives

Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
<p>Dispersed camping would be allowed in Indian Creek Corridor.</p> <p>Canyon Basins SRMA (214,390 acres) – The Canyon Basins SRMA would include the existing Dark Canyon SRMA and the proposed Indian Creek, Harts Point, Lockhart Basin, and Beef Basin SRMAs.</p>	<p>Indian Creek SRMA (89,271 acres) – Dispersed camping would not be allowed in the Indian Creek Corridor (see Map 31). Camping would only be allowed in designated sites.</p>	<p>Indian Creek SRMA (89,271 acres) – Dispersed camping would be allowed in the Indian Creek Corridor, except within the following designated dispersed camping zones that have been established: Bridger Jack Mesa, Indian Creek Falls, and Creek Pasture. Camping within these zones is limited to designated sites.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative C.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative B.</p>
<p>White Canyon SRMA</p>				
<p>GOALS</p> <p>Integrated management between the BLM and NPS (including the Glen Canyon National Recreation Area and Natural Bridges National Monument) to provide outstanding recreational opportunities and visitor experiences, while protecting natural and cultural resource values.</p> <p>OBJECTIVES</p> <p>By the year 2012, manage this zone to provide opportunities for visitors to engage in Backcountry recreation, including camping, providing no fewer than 75% of responding visitors and impacted community residents at least a moderate realization of these benefits: (i.e., 3.0 on a probability scale where 1 = not at all, 2 = somewhat, 3 = moderate, 4 = total realization).</p> <p>MANAGEMENT COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES</p> <p>Trailheads and associated parking/camping areas are included within the SRMA boundaries where the canyons are specified as the SRMA. The White Canyon SRMA is defined as from rim to rim.</p> <p>Canyons excluded from woodland product use including on-site collection of dead wood for campfire.</p>				
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
<p>This area was not identified as an SRMA in the 1991 San Juan Resource Area RMP, as amended. These lands are managed according to the 1991 San Juan RMP prescriptions.</p>	<p>White Canyon (2,828 acres) would be managed as a SRMA with the following prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A back-country allocated permit system would be established as necessary to protect resources. • Fire pans would be required for mesa tops. • Campfires would not be allowed. • Human waste must be packed out. 	<p>White Canyon (2,828 acres) would be managed as a SRMA with the same management prescriptions as Alternative B except for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If human waste becomes a problem, carrying out waste may be implemented in the canyon. • Campfires would be allowed on mesa tops (fire pan required); cook stoves would only be allowed in canyons. • Campfires would not be allowed in the canyons. 	<p>White Canyon (2,828 acres) would be managed as a SRMA with the following prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No permit system would be required. • If human waste becomes a problem, carrying out waste may become implemented in the canyon. • Campfires would be allowed on mesa tops and canyons (fire pan required). 	<p>Same as Alternative B.</p>
<p>Extensive Recreation Management Areas (ERMAs)</p>				
<p>An ERMA is defined as an area where substantial recreation opportunity and problems are limited, and explicit recreation management is not required. Minimal management decisions related to the BLM’s stewardship responsibilities are adequate in these areas.</p> <p>GOALS AND OBJECTIVES</p> <p>ERMA lands would be managed to provide an undeveloped setting where visitors can disperse and recreate in a generally unregulated manner, as long as the use is consistent with other resource values.</p> <p>The objective of an ERMA is to provide dispersed recreational opportunities consistent with other resource objectives.</p>				
<p>MANAGEMENT COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES</p> <p>Any portions of an ERMA subject to other management prescriptions (i.e., ACEC, WSA, etc.) would be managed according to those prescriptions.</p> <p>Monitor ERMA to determine if more intensive recreational management is required to protect resource values and preserve the recreational experience.</p> <p>Encourage "Leave No Trace" and "Tread Lightly" principles throughout the ERMA.</p> <p>Manage all lands within the PA, not within an SRMA (either initially or through subsequent action as described above) as the Monticello Extensive Recreation Management Area.</p> <p>ERMA lands may be designated as SRMAs in the future based on intensity of use and would be analyzed through the plan amendment process.</p> <p>Minimal facilities may be constructed in the ERMA as needed to insure visitor health and safety, reduce user conflict, and protect resources.</p> <p>MANAGEMENT COMMON TO ALL ACTION ALTERNATIVES</p> <p>Mesa Top Camping (other than Cedar Mesa):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limit the Bears Ears Road to designated camping only from the intersection of Highway 275 to the USFS boundary. • Limit the Deer Flat Road to designated camping only from the first 4 miles from Highway 275. • Coordinate with Glen Canyon National Recreation Area on building a campground at Muley Point or pursuing a land exchange for Muley Point in order to develop a campground. 				

Table 2.1. Summary Table of Alternatives

Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
Not specified	Dispersed vehicle camping would be allowed only in previously disturbed areas off of designated routes. If use is such that undue environmental impacts are taking place, BLM would close and rehabilitate damaged areas.	Dispersed vehicle camping would be allowed within 150 feet of the centerline of designated route on each side. If use is such that undue environmental impacts are taking place, BLM would close and rehabilitate damaged areas. Dispersed camping would be encouraged in previously disturbed areas.	Dispersed vehicle camping would be allowed 300 feet of the centerline of the road on each side. If use is such that undue environmental impacts are taking place, BLM would close and rehabilitate damaged areas. Dispersed camping would be encouraged in previously disturbed areas.	Dispersed vehicle camping would be allowed only in previously disturbed areas off of designated routes except in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics since the routes would be closed. If use is such that undue environmental impacts are taking place, BLM would close and rehabilitate damaged areas.
General Policy for Issuance and Management of Special Recreation Permits (SRPs).				
<p>MANAGEMENT COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES</p> <p>There would be no competitive mechanized or motorized events in WSAs while these areas are managed under the IMP.</p> <p>Under all alternatives, SRPs would be issued as a discretionary action as a means to help meet management objectives, control visitor use, protect recreational and natural resources, and provide for the health and safety of visitors. All SRPs would contain standard stipulations appropriate for the type of activity and may include additional stipulations (see Appendix E: Recreation) necessary to protect lands or resources, reduce user conflicts, or minimize health and safety concerns.</p> <p>MANAGEMENT COMMON TO ALL ACTION ALTERNATIVES</p> <p>SRPs would be used to manage different types of recreation associated with commercial uses, competitive events, organized groups, vending, and special areas. These recreation uses can include, for example, large group events, river guide services, and commercial recreation activities. BLM would follow the 43 CFR 2930, October 1, 2004, the National Guidelines on Cost Recovery (Federal Register, Volume 67, October 1, 2002), and the Utah Special Recreation Permit Cost Recovery Policy (Utah IM 2004-036). In accordance with BLM's Priorities for Recreation and Visitor Services Work Plan (May 2003, as amended), commercial SRPs would also be issued as a mechanism to provide a fair return for the commercial use of public lands.</p>				
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
Commercial use of any kind requires a permit.	<p>Criteria for requiring an SRP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any commercial use. • Day use organized group or event of more than 25 people in ERMA. • Overnight with group or event of more than 15 people in ERMA. • More than 15 motorized vehicles/OHVs on designated routes (does not include County B Roads or state and federal highways). • More than 15 non-motorized mechanized vehicles on designated routes (does not include County B Roads or state and federal highways). • A group size of more than 10 riding and/or pack animals. • Car camping with more than 10 vehicles or more than 50 people. • Activities or events with the potential to conflict with existing resource management guidelines/prescriptions. • Events with the potential for user conflict. • Events that could impact public health and safety. • Permitted use would only be allowed on designated routes consistent with the travel plan. 	<p>Criteria for requiring an SRP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any commercial use. • Non-mechanized/non-stock day use organized group or event of more than 50 people in ERMA. • Non-mechanized/non-stock overnight with group or event of more than 25 people in ERMA. • More than 25 motorized vehicles/OHVs on designated routes (does not include County B Roads or state and federal highways). • More than 25 non-motorized mechanized vehicles on designated routes (does not include County B Roads or state and federal highways). • A group size of more than 15 riding and/or pack animals. • Car camping with more than 15 vehicles or more than 50 people. • Activities or events with the potential to conflict with existing resource management guidelines/prescriptions. • Events with the potential for user conflict. • Events that could impact public health and safety. • Permitted use would only be allowed on designated routes consistent with the travel plan. 	<p>Criteria for requiring an SRP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any commercial use. • Non-mechanized/non-stock day use organized group or event of more than 75 people in ERMA. • Non-mechanized/non-stock overnight with group or event of more than 50 people in ERMA. • No limits on motorized vehicles/OHVs on designated routes (does not include County B Roads or state and federal highways). • No limits on non-motorized mechanized vehicles on designated routes (does not include County B Roads or state and federal highways). • A group size of more than 20 riding and/or pack animals. • Car camping with more than 20 vehicles groups or more than 50 people. • Activities or events with the potential to conflict with existing resource management guidelines/prescriptions. • Events with the potential for user conflict. • Events that could impact public health and safety. • Permitted use would only be allowed on designated routes consistent with the travel plan. 	<p>Criteria for requiring an SRP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any commercial use. • Day use organized group or event of more than 25 people in ERMA. • Overnight with group or event of more than 15 people in ERMA. • More than 15 motorized vehicles/OHVs on designated routes (does not include County B Roads or state and federal highways). • More than 15 non-motorized mechanized vehicles on designated routes (does not include County B Roads or state and federal highways). • A group size of more than 10 riding and/or pack animals. • Car camping with more than 10 vehicles or more than 50 people. • Activities or events with the potential to conflict with existing resource management guidelines/prescriptions. • Events with the potential for user conflict. • Events that could impact public health and safety. • Permitted use would only be allowed on designated routes consistent with the travel plan.
Commercial use of any kind requires a permit.	<p>Commercial:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commercial motorized/mechanized events/tours allowed on designated routes except in WSAs. • Commercial use permits authorized in conjunction with organized events or when the use supports resource protection and management. • Arch Canyon closed to OHV use. • No commercial motorized/mechanized use in Arch Canyon. • No commercial motorized/mechanized events/tours in crucial bighorn sheep lambing and rutting areas from April 1 to July 15 (lambing) and from October 	<p>Commercial:</p> <p>Managed the same as Alternative B except for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OHV use in Arch Canyon limited to the designated route to the end of the State Section (T37S R20E Section 16) year-round. The canyon would be closed year-round from west boundary of the State Section to the end of the route at the National Forest boundary. • No commercial motorized/mechanized events/tours in crucial bighorn sheep lambing and rutting areas from April 1 to June 15 (lambing) and from October 	<p>Commercial:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commercial motorized/mechanized events/tours allowed on designated routes. • Commercial use permits authorized to enhance recreational experiences and provide recreational opportunities to the public. • OHV use in Arch Canyon limited to designated route year-round. • No commercial motorized/mechanized events/tours in crucial bighorn sheep lambing and rutting areas from April 15 to May 15 (lambing), and from November 1 through December 15 (rutting), unless 	<p>Commercial:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There would be no competitive mechanized or motorized events in lands with wilderness characteristics. • Commercial motorized/mechanized events/tours allowed on designated routes except in WSAs. • Commercial use permits authorized in conjunction with organized events or when the use supports resource protection and management. • Arch Canyon closed to OHV use. • No commercial motorized/mechanized use in Arch Canyon.

Table 2.1. Summary Table of Alternatives

	<p>15 through December 31 (rutting), unless it can be shown that the animals are not present in a specific project location or the activity can be conducted so the animals are not adversely impacted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No commercial motorized/mechanized events/tours in crucial antelope habitat restrictions April 15 through June 30. • No commercial motorized/mechanized events/tours in crucial deer and elk winter range November 1 through May 15. • Group size for commercial motorized events/tours limited to 2 groups of 12 vehicles per route per day. • Special OHV events limited to 350 total vehicles and approved OHV event routes. • Balloon Festival limited to 35 balloons with their associated support vehicles. • Commercial hiking tours in Comb Wash and Butler Wash limited to 10 individuals. A permit system would be established for commercial day and overnight use. • Commercial camping limited to designated areas. • Commercial hiking to cultural sites limited to designated trails and human waste must be packed out. • Ropes and other climbing aides not allowed to access cultural sites. • Commercial guides using dogs to hunt/pursue mountain lion and black bears would not operate in areas where dogs are prohibited. • No commercial motorized/mechanized use in Cedar Mesa ACEC. 	<p>15 through December 15 (rutting), unless it can be shown that the animals are not present in a specific project location or the activity can be conducted so the animals are not adversely impacted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No commercial motorized/mechanized events/tours allowed in crucial antelope habitat restrictions May 1 through June 15. • No commercial motorized/mechanized events/tours allowed in crucial deer and elk winter range November 15 through April 15. • Special OHV events limited to 350 total vehicles and approved OHV event routes. 	<p>it can be shown that the animals are not present in a specific project location or the activity can be conducted so the animals are not adversely impacted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No commercial motorized/mechanized events/tours allowed in crucial antelope habitat restrictions May 15 through June 15. • No commercial motorized/mechanized events/tours allowed in crucial deer and elk winter range December 15 through March 31. • Group size for commercial motorized events/tours limited to 2 groups of 25 vehicles per route per day. • Special OHV events limited to 350 total vehicles and approved OHV event routes. • Balloon Festival limited to 35 balloons with their associated support vehicles. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No commercial motorized/mechanized events/tours in crucial bighorn sheep lambing and rutting areas from April 1 to July 15 (lambing) and from October 15 through December 31 (rutting), unless it can be shown that the animals are not present in a specific project location or the activity can be conducted so the animals are not adversely impacted. • No commercial motorized/mechanized events/tours in crucial antelope habitat restrictions April 15 through June 30. • No commercial motorized/mechanized events/tours in crucial deer and elk winter range November 1 through May 15. • Group size for commercial motorized events/tours limited to 2 groups of 12 vehicles per route per day. • Special OHV events limited to 350 total vehicles and approved OHV event routes. • Balloon Festival limited to 35 balloons with their associated support vehicles. • Commercial hiking tours in Comb Wash and Butler Wash limited to 10 individuals. A permit system would be established for commercial day and overnight use. • Commercial camping limited to designated areas. • Commercial hiking to cultural sites limited to designated trails, and human waste must be packed out. • Ropes and other climbing aides not allowed to access cultural sites. • Commercial guides using dogs to hunt/pursue mountain lion and black bears would not operate in areas where dogs are prohibited. • No commercial motorized/mechanized use in Cedar Mesa ACEC.
Competitive Events				
MANAGEMENT COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES				
<p>Motorized/mechanized competitive events would be authorized consistent with OHV designations. Motorized and mechanized competitive events would not be permitted in WSAs.</p>				
RIPARIAN RESOURCES				
GOALS				
<p>Manage riparian resources for desired future conditions, ensuring ecological diversity, stability, and sustainability, including the desired mix of vegetation types, structural stages, and landscape/riparian/watershed function and provide for native and special status plant, fish, and wildlife habitats. Manage riparian areas for properly functioning condition (PFC) and ensure stream channel morphology and functions are appropriate to the local soil type, climate, and landform. Avoid or minimize the destruction, loss or degradation of riparian, wetland and associated floodplains, and preserve and enhance natural and beneficial values. Public lands would be managed in accordance with laws, executive orders, and regulations on floodplain and wetland areas to reduce resource loss from floods and erosion. BLM would take appropriate actions to maintain water quality in streams within SJRA to meet state and federal water quality standards, including designated beneficial uses and anti-degradation requirements.</p>				
MANAGEMENT COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES				
<p>Oil and gas leasing would be NSO in riparian areas. BLM would follow Utah's Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Grazing and Recreation Management (BLM 1997) to achieve riparian PFC. No new surface-disturbing activities would be allowed within active floodplains or within 100 meters of riparian areas. BLM guidelines would be followed as appropriate for managing riparian areas (See Technical Reference 1737-6: Riparian Area Management as amended).</p>				

Table 2.1. Summary Table of Alternatives

All floodplains and riparian/wetlands would be managed in accordance with Executive Orders 11988 and 11990, sections 303 and 404 of the Clean Water Act, and the Endangered Species Act.

Floodplains and riparian/aquatic areas would be:

- Subject to fire suppression to protect riparian habitat.
- Excluded from private and/or commercial use of woodland products except for Native American traditional purposes as determined on site-specific basis; limited on-site collection of dead wood for campfires would be allowed as per Woodlands section.
- Available for habitat, range, and watershed improvements and vegetation treatments described in 1991 Vegetation EIS (as amended).
- Excluded from surface disturbance by mechanized or motorized equipment (except as allowed above) and from structural development (unless there is no practical alternative or the development would enhance riparian/aquatic values).

Unnecessary multiple social trails in riparian/floodplain areas would be minimized. Social trails in Road Canyon, Fish Creek, and Mule Canyon would be closed to protect riparian resources.

BLM would follow/implement the SWFL Recovery Plan as appropriate.

Monitoring and management strategies and restrictions would be developed as necessary to meet or maintain PFC.

Cottonwood and willow harvest would be allowed for Native American ceremonial uses only. Restrictions on harvest would be implemented as necessary to achieve or maintain PFC. This would be administered through a permit system.

No camping would be allowed within 200 feet of isolated springs or water sources.

Pipeline Crossings

Pipeline crossings of perennial, intermittent, and ephemeral stream channels should be constructed to withstand 100-year floods to prevent breakage and subsequent accidental contamination of runoff during high-flow events. Surface crossings must be constructed high enough to remain above stream flows at each crossing, and subsurface crossings must be buried deep enough to remain undisturbed by scour throughout passage of the peak flow. Hydraulic analysis would be completed in the design phase by the project proponent to eliminate potential environmental degradation associated with pipeline breaks at stream crossings to avoid repeated maintenance of such crossings. Specific recommendations regarding surface and subsurface crossings are found in Guidance for Pipeline Crossings (see Appendix F).

Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Preferred)	Alternative D	Alternative E
BLM would act to avoid degradation of stream banks or aquatic habitats and loss of riparian vegetation. Special conditions found in the 1991 San Juan RMP (BLM 1991a, page 98) for floodplains and riparian/aquatic areas would be implemented.	Close Harts Canyon from private land to Yancy's Fence to OHV and mechanized use. Close routes in other selected riparian areas considered Functioning at Risk if site-specific analysis determines that OHV use is contributing to riparian degradation. Restrict Moki Canyon, Lake Canyon, Harts Canyon, and Indian Creek from Kelly Ranch vicinity to Forest Service to livestock trailing only, not grazing. Develop seasonal restrictions, closures, and/or forage utilization limits on grazing in riparian areas considered Functioning at Risk. Temporarily close riparian areas considered Functioning at Risk to dispersed motorized camping until PFC is restored.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B except non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be managed as unavailable for mineral leasing, as unavailable for OHV use, as ROW exclusion areas, as unavailable for disposal of mineral materials, as unavailable for private and commercial woodland harvest, as VRM Class I, and as proposed for withdrawal from mineral entry.

SOIL AND WATER RESOURCES

GOALS

Manage soils and water resources to maintain watershed health, thereby insuring ecological diversity and sustainability.

Provide for favorable conditions of water flow (quality, quantity, and timing), and maintain stable and efficient stream channels as required and provide for fish and wildlife habitat, recreation, and livestock.

MANAGEMENT COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES

Manage all floodplains and riparian/wetlands in accordance with Executive Orders 11988 and 11990, sections 303 and 404 of the Clean Water Act, and the Endangered Species Act.

Maintain satisfactory watershed conditions as indicated by maintenance of riparian PFC and Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Grazing Management (BLM 1991a) and Guidelines for Grazing and Standards for Public Health and Guidelines for Recreation Management for BLM Lands in Utah (Appendix E).

Manage public lands consistent with the Colorado River Salinity Control Act.

Comply with Utah's state water quality standards.

Collaborate with San Juan County, the State of Utah, tribal governments, and local municipalities on management of municipal watersheds to meet local needs.

Maintain or improve soil quality and long-term soil productivity through the implementation of Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Grazing Management (BLM 1997) and other soil protection measures.

Manage uses to minimize and mitigate damage to soils.

Maintain and/or restore overall watershed health and reduce erosion, stream sedimentation, and salinization of water.

Watershed Health

Prioritize the watersheds identified on the 303d impaired lists.

Modify the BMPs and vegetation management as appropriate to meet water quality standards and maintain watershed function (Montezuma Creek, Indian Creek [Forest Service boundary to Newspaper Rock], Johnson Creek [and tributaries from confluence with Recapture Creek to headwaters], and Recapture Reservoir).

Assess watershed function using Utah's Standards for Rangeland Health, riparian PFC, and state water quality standards.

Table 2.1. Summary Table of Alternatives

<p>Where Utah's Standards for Rangeland Health are not met due to the impairment of biological soil crusts, apply guidelines from Biological Soil Crusts: Ecology and Management (BLM 2001b, as revised), if consistent with the management decisions of this plan. Reduce tamarisk where appropriate using allowable vegetation treatments (refer to vegetation section for treatment acreages).</p> <p>Sensitive Soils Any proposed activities that would be located in sensitive soils (e.g., hydric, saline, gypsiferous, or highly erodible soils, Maps 34-40) would be subject to site-specific NEPA and would incorporate BMPs and other mitigation measures to minimize soil erosion and maintain soil stability.</p>				
Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Preferred)	Alternative D	Alternative E
	<p>If surface-disturbing activities cannot be avoided on slopes between 21 and 40%, an erosion control plan would be required. The plan must be approved by BLM prior to construction and maintenance and include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> An erosion control strategy BLM accepted and/or approved survey and design 	<p>If surface-disturbing activities cannot be avoided on slopes between 21 and 40%, an erosion control plan would be required. The plan must be approved by BLM prior to construction and maintenance and include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> An erosion control strategy BLM-accepted and/or approved survey and design <p>For slopes greater than 40%, no surface disturbance would be allowed unless it is determined that it would cause undue or unnecessary degradation to pursue other placement alternatives. An erosion control plan would be required.</p>	<p>If surface-disturbing activities cannot be avoided on slopes greater than 40%, a plan would be required. The plan must be approved by BLM prior to construction and maintenance, and include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> An erosion control strategy BLM accepted and/or approved survey and design 	<p>Same as Alternative B except for non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be managed as unavailable for mineral leasing, as unavailable for OHV use, as ROW exclusion areas, as unavailable for disposal of mineral materials, as unavailable for private and commercial woodland harvest, as VRM Class I, and as proposed for withdrawal from mineral entry.</p>
SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS – ACECS				
<p>GOALS Designate, modify, and manage areas as ACECs where special management attention is required to protect and prevent irreparable damage to important historic, cultural, or scenic values, fish and wildlife resources, other natural systems or processes, or to protect life and safety from natural hazards. Designate Research Natural Areas and Outstanding Natural Areas as types of ACECs using the ACEC designation process.</p>				
<p>MANAGEMENT COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES In those areas where any of the following ACECs overlap with WSAs, the WSA management prescriptions, as stipulated in the IMP, would take precedence. Within the area managed by the Monticello PA, there is an area totaling 2,155 acres contiguous to the Butler Wash WSA) that was studied as a boundary variation during the wilderness review mandated by Congress in FLPMA Sections 603(a) and (b). These lands were addressed in the Utah BLM Statewide Wilderness Final EIS (November, 1990) and were recommended for congressional wilderness designation in the Utah Statewide Wilderness Study Reports (October, 1991). This recommendation was forwarded by the President of the United States to Congress in 1993. The lands would continue to be managed in a manner that does not impair their suitability for congressional designation in accordance with FLPMA Section 603(c). Subject to valid existing rights, the only case-by-case actions that would be considered would be those where it is determined that wilderness suitability would not be adversely impacted.</p>				
<p>MANAGEMENT COMMON TO ALL ACTION ALTERNATIVES A cultural RMP consistent with the goals and objectives of this RMP would be written for Alkali Ridge, Cedar Mesa, Hovenweep, and Shay Canyon ACECs and would not require a plan amendment to the RMP.</p>				
Alkali Ridge ACEC				
Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Preferred)	Alternative D	Alternative E
<p>Alkali Ridge ACEC (39,202 acres): Would be designated as a Cultural ACEC. It contains a National Historic Landmark (2,340 acres) and would be managed with the following management prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where riparian areas overlap this ACEC, the special conditions for floodplain and riparian/aquatic areas would take precedence. Requirements of appropriate regulations would be met. All cultural properties eligible for the NRHP, would be surrounded by an avoidance area sufficient to allow permanent protection. If cultural resources or their avoidance areas cannot be avoided, appropriate mitigation would be applied, ranging from limited testing to extensive excavation. In any given situation, mitigation would be designed to fit the specific circumstances and reviewed by the SHPO and the Advisory Council 	<p>Alkali Ridge ACEC (39,196 acres): Would be the same as Alternative A except for the following changes in management prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unavailable for private and/or commercial use of woodland products except for limited on-site collection of dead wood for campfires. Watershed improvements allowed. Livestock use may be restricted if cultural resources are being impacted. No surface-disturbing vegetation treatments. Any treatment must avoid cultural sites by sufficient margin as to have no impact. Managed as VRM Class IV. 	<p>Alkali Ridge ACEC (39,196 acres): Would be the same as Alternative A except for the following changes in management prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Available for woodland harvest, limited to designated routes. Off-road travel would only be allowed in chained areas. If woodland product use is impacting cultural resources, woodland product use may be confined to specific areas within Alkali Ridge. Available for watershed improvements. Livestock may be restricted if cultural resources are being impacted. Vegetation treatments would avoid cultural sites wherever possible to prevent impacts. Access routes used for vegetation treatments would be reclaimed to prevent future use. Non-surface disturbing treatments would be preferred. Managed as VRM Class IV. 	<p>Alkali Ridge would not be designated as an ACEC. The area would be managed with the following prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Available for woodland harvest, limited to designated routes. Available for watershed improvements. Livestock use would conform to Rangeland Health Standards. Vegetative treatments would avoid eligible cultural sites and NHL. Managed as VRM Class IV. Available for mineral leasing (Category 1). Available for geophysical work. Available for the disposal of mineral materials. Available for locatable mineral entry with an approved plan of operations. Retained in public ownership and not classified, segregated or withdrawn from entry. Subject to conditional fire suppression. 	<p>Same as Alternative B except for non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be managed as unavailable for mineral leasing, as unavailable for OHV use, as ROW exclusion areas, as unavailable for disposal of mineral materials, as unavailable for private and commercial woodland harvest, as VRM Class I, and as proposed for withdrawal from mineral entry.</p>

Table 2.1. Summary Table of Alternatives

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> on Historic Preservation. • Available for mineral leasing (Category 1). • Available for geophysical work. • Available for the disposal of mineral materials. • Available for locatable mineral entry with an approved plan of operations. • Retained in public ownership and not classified, segregated, or withdrawn from entry. • Available for private and commercial use of woodland products. • Available for livestock use. • Available for land treatments or other range improvements. • Subject to conditional fire suppression. • OHV use limited to existing roads and trails. • Managed as VRM Class III. • Campfires allowed. • Available for wildlife habitat improvement. • Surface disturbance limited to what can be successfully established within 5 years after project completion. 			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OHV use limited to existing roads and trails. • Campfires allowed. • Available for wildlife habitat improvement. • Surface disturbance limited to what can be successfully established within 5 years after project completion. 	
<p>Alkali Ridge National Historic Landmark (Contained within the Alkali Ridge ACEC)</p>				
<p>Management Common to All Action Alternatives A Cultural Resource Management Plan (CRMP) would be written for this NHL.</p>				
<p>National Historic Landmark (2,340 acres): Management would be the same as the management for the Alkali Ridge ACEC above except: All cultural resources would be avoided by 100 feet.</p>	<p>Management prescriptions for the Alkali Ridge NHL 2,146 acres would be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Available for oil and gas leasing subject NSO. • All mechanized/motorized traffic limited to designated routes. • Campfires not allowed. • Unavailable for private and/or commercial use of woodland products including on-site collection of dead wood for campfires. • Available for watershed improvements. • Open to livestock use with restrictions if cultural resources become impacted. • No surface disturbing vegetation treatments. Any treatment must avoid cultural sites by sufficient margin as to have no adverse impact. • Unavailable for geophysical work. • Unavailable for disposal of mineral materials. • Recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry. • Surface disturbance allowed for emergency fire suppression. • Recreation use limited if cultural resources become impacted. • Climbing aids such as ropes not allowed for access into cultural sites/ruins. 	<p>Management Prescriptions for the Alkali Ridge NHL 2,146 acres would be the same as for Alternative B except for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriate Management Response to fire. • Available for geophysical exploration that meets the definition of "casual use" as defined 43 CFR 3150. 	<p>Management Prescriptions for the Alkali Ridge National Historic Landmark (NHL) 2,146 acres would be the same as Alternative C.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative B except for non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be managed as unavailable for mineral leasing, as unavailable for OHV use, as ROW exclusion areas, as unavailable for disposal of mineral materials, as unavailable for private and commercial woodland harvest, as VRM Class I, and as proposed for withdrawal from mineral entry.</p>

Table 2.1. Summary Table of Alternatives

Bridger Jack Mesa ACEC (Mesa Top Only)				
MANAGEMENT COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES				
Bridger Jack Mesa ACEC lies entirely within a WSA.				
The special management prescriptions below apply to the proposed Bridger Jack Mesa ACEC for protection of near-relict vegetation.				
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
<p>Bridger Jack Mesa ACEC (6,260 acres): Designated as an ACEC for Range Management Program/Near-relict Vegetation, and would be managed with the following management prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Available for mineral leasing subject to NSO on mesa top; available for geophysical work. • Unavailable for the disposal of mineral materials. • Available for locatable mineral entry with approved plan of operations, subject to stipulations precluding surface use of the mesa top, insofar as possible. • Retained in public ownership and not classified, segregated, or withdrawn from entry. • Excluded from livestock grazing, including grazing by saddle stock and pack animals allowed for access. • Excluded from land treatments or other improvements, except for test plots and facilities necessary for study of the near-relict plant communities. • Closed to OHV use. • Subject to conditional fire suppression. • Managed to limit recreation use if vegetation resources are being damaged. • Semi-primitive non-motorized (SPNM) ROS class. • Excluded from private or commercial use of woodland products, except for limited on-site collection of dead wood for campfires. • Excluded from wildlife habitat improvements. • Excluded from watershed control structures. • Surface disturbance limited to what can be successfully established within 5 years after project completion. • Excluded from surface disturbance by mechanized or motorized equipment, except helicopter access for scientific study and heliportable equipment, insofar as legally possible. • Excluded from improvements for wildlife habitat, watershed, or vegetative treatments. 	<p>Bridger Jack Mesa ACEC (6,225 acres): Prescriptions are the same as Alternative A except for the boundary change.</p>	<p>Bridger Jack Mesa would not be managed as an ACEC. Management prescriptions for this area would be the same as the surrounding lands except for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unavailable for livestock grazing, including grazing by saddle stock and pack animals allowed for access. • Unavailable for private and/or commercial use of woodland products except for the limited on-site collection of dead wood for campfires. 	<p>Same as Alternative C.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative B except for non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be managed as unavailable for mineral leasing, as unavailable for OHV use, as ROW exclusion areas, as unavailable for disposal of mineral materials, as unavailable for private and commercial woodland harvest, as VRM Class I, and as proposed for withdrawal from mineral entry.</p>

Table 2.1. Summary Table of Alternatives

Butler Wash North ACEC				
<p>MANAGEMENT COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES</p> <p>Butler Wash North ACEC lies within a portion of the Butler Wash WSA. The special management prescriptions below apply to the proposed Butler Wash North ACEC for protection of scenic values.</p>				
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
<p>Butler Wash ACEC (17,464 acres) is designated as an ACEC for scenic values and is managed with the following management prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Managed under the special conditions developed for ROS-P class areas. • Available for mineral leasing subject to NSO; however, the area manager would grant an exception to the NSO stipulation in the event it is determined through an EA, or EIS if necessary, with the adoption and use of appropriate mitigation measures, that the project would meet visual quality standards for the area. • Available for geophysical work. • Unavailable for disposal of mineral materials. • Available for mineral entry with an approved plan of operations. • Retained in public ownership and not classified, segregated, or withdrawn from entry. • Excluded from private and commercial use of woodland products, except for limited on-site collection of dead wood for campfires. • Available for livestock use. • Closed to OHV use. • Managed to limit recreation use if scenic values are being damaged. • Managed as VRM Class I. 	<p>Butler Wash North (17,365 acres) would be designated as a Scenic ACEC and would be managed with the following prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Managed as VRM Class I. • Available for mineral leasing subject to NSO; however, the area manager would grant an exception to the NSO stipulation in the event it is determined through an EA, or EIS if necessary, with the adoption and use of appropriate mitigation measures, that the project would meet visual quality standards for the area. • Unavailable for disposal of mineral materials. • Retained in public ownership and withdrawn from entry. • Closed to private and/or commercial use of woodland products, except for limited on-site collection of dead wood. • Available for livestock use but may be limited if cultural resources are being impacted. • Managed to limit recreation use if scenic values are being damaged. • BLM would seek to acquire state inholdings in this ACEC. • OHV/mechanized use limited to designated routes. 	<p>Butler Wash North area would not be designated as an ACEC. Management prescriptions for this area would be the same as the surrounding lands except for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retained in public ownership. • Unavailable for private and/or commercial use of woodland products, with the exception of the limited on-site collection of wood for campfires. • Available for livestock use but may be limited if cultural resources are impacted. • OHV/mechanized use limited to designated routes. 	<p>Same as Alternative C.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative B except for non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be managed as unavailable for mineral leasing, as unavailable for OHV use, as ROW exclusion areas, as unavailable for disposal of mineral materials, as unavailable for private and commercial woodland harvest, as VRM Class I, and as proposed for withdrawal from mineral entry.</p>
Cedar Mesa ACEC				
<p>Note: In the 1991 San Juan RMP, three ACECs (Dark Canyon, Indian Creek, and Cedar Mesa) were described as protecting values for Recreation/Visual (VRM) because these two programs were combined and managed under the Recreation program. Since that time, the two programs have been separated and are now managed under their own resource management program. Scenic is considered a relevant value under ACEC evaluation processes, however, Recreation is not. Therefore any existing ACECs that are brought forward in this plan will not include Recreation as a value. Management for recreational values would be managed as an SRMA under the Recreation program.</p>				
<p>MANAGEMENT COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES</p> <p>Portions of the Cedar Mesa ACEC lie within 8 WSAs. The special management prescriptions below apply to the proposed Cedar Mesa ACEC for protection of cultural values through a range of alternatives for analysis.</p>				
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
<p>Cedar Mesa ACEC (295,336 acres) is designated as an ACEC for cultural and scenic values.Recreation/ Primitive Area/ Natural Area values would be maintained and would continue to be managed under the Cultural CRMP and Recreation/Scenic programs with the following management prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where riparian areas overlap Cedar Mesa ACEC, the special conditions for floodplains and riparian/aquatic areas would take precedence. • The ROS special conditions include both P and SPNM classes apply, and would be managed for these classes. ROS P-class areas would be managed 	<p>Cedar Mesa ACEC (306,742 acres) would continue to be managed as a Cultural-ACEC with the following prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Available for livestock use with special conditions to protect at-risk cultural resources. • Available for watershed, range, habitat improvements and vegetation treatments. • Unavailable for private and/or commercial use of woodland products except for limited on-site collection of dead wood for campfires. • Campfires limited to mesa tops, would be closed if there are impacts to cultural sites. 	<p>Cedar Mesa area would not be designated as a Cultural ACEC, but it would be managed as a Cultural Special Recreation Management (C-SRMA) area (375,734 acres). The WSAs (209,619 acres) would be managed according to the IMP. Areas outside of the WSAs (166,115 acres) would be managed the same as Alternative B, except for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Available for commercial and/or private use of woodland products, including on-site collection of dead wood for campfires (on mesa tops only, canyons closed). • Open to dispersed camping except in areas where 	<p>Same as Alternative C.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative B except for non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be managed as unavailable for mineral leasing, as unavailable for OHV use, as ROW exclusion areas, as unavailable for disposal of mineral materials, as unavailable for private and commercial woodland harvest, as VRM Class I, and as proposed for withdrawal from mineral entry.</p>

Table 2.1. Summary Table of Alternatives

<p>as NSO.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If cultural resources or their avoidance areas cannot be avoided, appropriate mitigation would be applied, ranging from limited testing to extensive excavation. • In any given case, mitigation would be designed to fit the specific circumstances and reviewed by the SHPO and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. The Cedar Mesa Management Plan developed for the ACEC would guide site protection, data recovery, and all other necessary cultural management activities. • Revegetation for surface disturbance would be limited to what can be successfully established within 5 years after project completion. • Available for mineral leasing (Category 1). • Surface use limited by special conditions. • Available for geophysical work. • Available for disposal of mineral materials. • Available for mineral entry with an approved plan of operations. • Available for livestock use. • Available for land treatments or other range improvements. • Available for wildlife habitat improvements. • Subject to conditional fire suppression with motorized suppression methods used only if necessary to protect life or property. • Excluded from surface disturbance by mechanized or motorized equipment. • OHV use limited to designated roads/trails. • Available for private and commercial use of woodland products in designated areas with designated access, except that on-site collection of dead fuelwood for campfires would be allowed throughout the area. <p><u>Grand Gulch Special Emphasis Area</u> contained within the Cedar Mesa ACEC would be managed as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Closed to mineral leasing (Category 4). • Not available for geophysical work unavailable for disposal of mineral materials. • Retained in public ownership and classified as segregated from entry (a Secretarial withdrawal would be requested). • Excluded from private and commercial use of woodland products, except for limited onsite collection of dead wood for campfires. • Available for livestock use, except Grand Gulch itself, below Kane Gulch fence to the confluence with the San Juan River, 11,200 acres. • Designated as closed to OHV use; • managed to limit recreation use if cultural resources or scenic values are being damaged. • Managed as VRM class I. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Closed to dispersed camping. • Designated parking areas adjacent to designated routes. • Limited number of recreation permits issued for day hikes and overnight camping as necessary to prevent cultural site damage from over-visitation. • Overnight campers must pack out their human waste. • Managed as VRM Class III (except for WSAs within the boundary of the ACEC). <p><u>Grand Gulch Special Emphasis Area:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as Alternative A. <p>The Scenic Highway Corridor ACEC would not be designated under this alternative.</p>	<p>cultural resources are at risk.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There would be no requirement to pack out human waste. <p><u>Grand Gulch Special Emphasis Area:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as Alternative A. <p>The Scenic Highway Corridor ACEC would not be designated under this alternative.</p>		
---	--	---	--	--

Table 2.1. Summary Table of Alternatives

Dark Canyon ACEC				
<p>Note: In the 1991 San Juan RMP, three ACECs (Dark Canyon, Indian Creek, and Cedar Mesa) were described as protecting values for Recreation/Visual (VRM) because these two programs were combined and managed under the Recreation program. Since that time, the two programs have been separated and are now managed under their own RMP. Scenic is considered a relevant value under ACEC evaluation processes, however, Recreation is not. Therefore any existing ACECs that are brought forward in this plan will not include Recreation as a value. Management for recreational values would be handled under the Recreation program, specifically SRMAs.</p>				
<p>MANAGEMENT COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES</p> <p>Dark Canyon ACEC lies within a portion of the Dark Canyon WSA. WSAs are managed under the IMP. The special management prescriptions below apply to the proposed Dark Canyon ACEC for protection of scenic and wildlife values through a range of alternatives for analysis.</p>				
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
<p>Dark Canyon ACEC (61,660 acres) is designated as an ACEC for -Recreation/Natural Area and Visual/VRM values, would be maintained and would continue to be managed with the following management prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unavailable for mineral leasing. • Unavailable for geophysical work. • Unavailable for disposal of mineral materials. • Retained in public ownership and classified as segregated from entry (Secretarial withdrawal would be requested). • Excluded from private and commercial use of woodland products except for limited on-site collection of dead wood for campfires. • Unavailable for livestock use except Fable Valley, where livestock trailing and emergency grazing (drought or severe winter) would be allowed. • Closed to OHV use. • Managed as VRM Class I with projects that meet these visual standards allowed. • Managed to limit recreation use if cultural resources or scenic values are being damaged. • Subject to conditional fire suppression, with motorized suppression methods used only if necessary to protect life or property. 	<p>Dark Canyon (61,660 acres) would be designated as a Scenic and Wildlife ACEC, and would be managed with the following prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unavailable for oil and gas leasing. • Unavailable for geophysical work. • Unavailable for disposal of mineral materials. • Retained in public ownership and recommended for withdrawal from mineral entry. • Unavailable for private and/or commercial use of woodland products except for limited on-site collection of dead wood for campfires on mesa tops. • Campfires limited to mesa top with fire pan (no campfires in canyons). • Human waste to be packed out. • Unavailable for livestock use except Fable Valley, where livestock trailing and emergency grazing (severe winter) would be allowed. • Closed to OHV use. • Managed as VRM Class I with projects that meet these visual standards allowed. • Managed to limit recreation use if wildlife habitat or scenic values are being damaged. • Subject to conditional fire suppression, with motorized suppression methods used only if necessary to protect life or property. • Improvements conditionally allowed for wildlife habitat, watershed, and vegetative treatments that meet VRM Class I management. 	<p>Dark Canyon would not be managed as an ACEC. Dark Canyon WSA would be managed according to the IMP. Areas outside of the WSA would be managed with prescriptions similar to the surrounding BLM lands, which include but are not limited to the following prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Campfires limited to mesa top with fire pan (no campfires allowed in canyon). • Private and/or commercial use of woodland products limited to areas identified in woodlands section. Limited on-site collection of dead wood for campfires is allowed on mesa tops. • Unavailable for livestock use except Fable Valley, where livestock trailing and emergency grazing (severe winter) would be allowed. • Closed to OHV/mechanized use. • Managed to limit recreation use if wildlife habitat or scenic values are being damaged. • Subject to appropriate fire management response with habitat-disturbing suppression methods used only if necessary to protect life or property. • A Secretarial withdrawal for mineral entry would not be requested. 	<p>Same as Alternative C.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative B except for non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be managed as unavailable for mineral leasing, as unavailable for OHV use, as ROW exclusion areas, as unavailable for disposal of mineral materials, as unavailable for private and commercial woodland harvest, as VRM Class I, and as proposed for withdrawal from mineral entry.</p>
Hovenweep ACEC				
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
<p>Hovenweep ACEC (1,798 acres) would continue to be managed as an ACEC for Cultural and Habitat Management values with the following management prescriptions:</p> <p>Visual Protective Zone (880 acres):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Available for mineral leasing with NSO. • Available for livestock use. • Excluded from watershed and grazing (vegetative) treatment improvement. <p>Cajon Pond (Habitat):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Available for mineral leasing and other surface uses with stipulations to prevent surface occupancy or surface disturbance during the shorebird and waterfowl courtship and nesting season of March 	<p>Hovenweep ACEC would continue to be managed as an ACEC with the addition of 620+ acres contiguous with existing ACEC and east of Hovenweep National Monument, for cultural values. Total acres 2,439.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cultural properties eligible for the National Register of Historic Places would be avoided as necessary to provide permanent protection. This would be implemented on a case-by-case basis. • Unavailable for disposal of mineral materials. • Available for mineral entry with an approved plan of operation. • Available for livestock use but may be limited if cultural resources are impacted. • No new routes designated in this ACEC. 	<p>Same as Alternative A except for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The boundary would be expanded to include the addition of 620+ acres contiguous with existing ACEC and east of Hovenweep National Monument, for cultural values. • Available for watershed improvements and vegetative treatments as long as cultural sites are not impacted. Emphasis would be on non-surface disturbing vegetation treatments. • Available for mineral leasing with standard stipulations. • Managed as VRM Class III. 	<p>Hovenweep would not be designated as an ACEC. (Hovenweep National Monument would continue to be managed by the NPS.) Management prescriptions for this area would be the same as the surrounding lands and include but are not limited to the following prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Available for watershed improvements and vegetative treatments as long as cultural sites are not impacted. Emphasis would be on non-surface disturbing vegetation treatments. • Managed as VRM Class IV. • Available for livestock use. • Available for campfire use. • Available for mineral leasing, mineral entry, and disposal of mineral materials. 	<p>Same as Alternative B except for non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be managed as unavailable for mineral leasing, as unavailable for OHV use, as ROW exclusion areas, as unavailable for disposal of mineral materials, as unavailable for private and commercial woodland harvest, as VRM Class I, and as proposed for withdrawal from mineral entry.</p>

Table 2.1. Summary Table of Alternatives

<p>1–June 30 (Category 2). Excluded from use within the fenced portion (about 1 acre).</p> <p>General Area Exclusive of Special Emphasis Zones:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where riparian areas overlap Hovenweep ACEC, the special conditions for floodplains and riparian/aquatic areas would take precedence. • Within Hovenweep ACEC, cultural properties eligible for the NRHP would be avoided by 100 feet. • Cultural properties eligible for the NRHP would be surrounded by an avoidance area sufficient to allow permanent protection. • If cultural resources or their avoidance areas cannot be avoided, appropriate mitigation would be applied, ranging from limited testing to extensive excavation. • In any given case, mitigation would be designed to fit the specific circumstances and reviewed by the SHPO and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. The Cedar Mesa Management Plan developed for the ACEC would guide site protection, data recovery, and all other necessary cultural management activities. • Available for mineral leasing (Category 2). • Available for geophysical work. • Unavailable for disposal of mineral materials. • Available for mineral entry with an approved plan of operation. • Available for livestock use. • Subject to conditional fire suppression. • OHV use limited to designated roads/trails in entire area. • Excluded from private or commercial use of woodland products, except for limited on-site collection of dead wood for campfires. • Open for improvement in habitat, watershed and vegetation treatments. • Managed as VRM Class III. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No surface-disturbing habitat, watershed, or vegetation treatments. Any treatment must avoid cultural sites by sufficient margin as to avoid adverse impact. • Available for campfire use. • Unavailable for private and/or commercial use of woodland products, except for limited on-site collection of dead wood for campfires. • Managed as VRM Class III. • Available for mineral leasing with standard stipulations. 			
<p>Indian Creek ACEC</p>				
<p>Note: In the 1991 San Juan RMP, three ACECs (Dark Canyon, Indian Creek, and Cedar Mesa) were described as protecting values for Recreation / Visual (VRM) because these two programs were combined and managed under the Recreation program. Since that time, the two programs have been separated and are now managed under their own resource management program. Scenic is considered a relevant value under ACEC evaluation processes, however, recreation is not. Therefore any existing ACECs that are brought forward in this plan will not include recreation as a value. Management for recreational values would be handled under the recreation program, specifically SRMAs.</p>				
<p>MANAGEMENT COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES</p>				
<p>Portions of the Indian Creek ACEC lie within portions of the Indian Creek WSA in Alternative B. The special management prescriptions below apply to the proposed Indian Creek ACEC for protection of scenic values through a range of alternatives for analysis.</p>				
<p>Alternative A</p>	<p>Alternative B</p>	<p>Alternative C</p>	<p>Alternative D</p>	<p>Alternative E</p>
<p>Indian Creek ACEC (8,510 acres), which covers an area adjacent to Canyonlands National Park, falls within Canyon Basins SRMA. It would be designated under program 4333, Recreation/VRM, and managed to maintain scenic quality with the following prescriptions:</p>	<p>Indian Creek (8,510 acres) would be designated as a Scenic ACEC and would be managed with the following prescriptions: Same as Alternative A except:</p>	<p>Same as Alternative B except the ACEC would be 3,908 acres (outside of the WSA).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dispersed camping allowed in the Indian Creek Corridor except for the following designated dispersed camping zones that have been established: 	<p>Indian Creek would not be designated as an ACEC. Management prescriptions for this area would be the same as the surrounding lands and include but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dispersed camping allowed throughout the Indian 	<p>Same as Alternative B except for non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be managed as unavailable for mineral leasing, as unavailable for OHV use, as ROW exclusion areas, as unavailable for disposal of mineral materials, as unavailable for private and</p>

Table 2.1. Summary Table of Alternatives

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Almost all the ACEC would be in ROS P-class areas. • All vegetation must be with native species naturally occurring in the vicinity. • Available for mineral leasing with stipulations to prevent surface occupancy (Category 3) NSO; however, the are manager would grant an exception to the NSO stipulation in the event it is determined through and EA or EIS, is necessary, with the adoption and use of appropriate mitigation measures, that the project would meet visual quality standards for the area. • Available for geophysical work. • Unavailable for disposal of mineral materials. • Available for mineral entry with an approved plan of operations. • Retained in public ownership and not classified as segregated, or withdrawn from entry. • Excluded from private and commercial use of woodland products, except for limited on-site collection of dead wood for campfires. • Available for livestock use. • Closed to OHV use. • Managed to limit recreation use if scenic values are being damaged. • Managed as VRM Class I class. • Subject to conditional fire suppression, with motorized suppression methods used only if necessary to protect life and property. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Managed as VRM Class I. • Available for mineral leasing subject to No Surface Occupancy (NSO). • Unavailable for disposal of mineral materials. • Retained in public ownership and recommended for withdrawal from mineral entry. • Available for geophysical work if VRM Class I can be met. • Unavailable for private and/or commercial use of woodland products including on-site collection of dead wood for campfires. However campfires are restricted to fire rings where fire rings are available. • Available for livestock use. • Closed to OHV use. • Dispersed camping not allowed in the Indian Creek Corridor (see Map 44). Camping allowed only in designated sites. 	<p>Bridger Jack Mesa, Indian Creek Falls, and Creek Pasture. Camping within these zones would be limited to designated sites.</p>	<p>Creek corridor.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Managed as VRM Class III. 	<p>commercial woodland harvest, as VRM Class I, and as proposed for withdrawal from mineral entry.</p>
Lavender Mesa ACEC (Mesa Top Only)				
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
<p>Lavender Mesa ACEC (Non-WSA) Grazing Management Program – Relict Vegetation, (649 acres): Would be maintained and would continue to be managed with the following management prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Managed to provide a baseline for rangeland studies through research and experiments and to allow for SPNM recreation. • Managed as ROS SPNM class. • Available for mineral leasing with an approved plan of operations, subject to stipulations precluding surface use of the mesa top insofar as possible (NSO). • Available for geophysical work. • Unavailable for disposal of mineral materials. • Available for mineral entry with an approved plan of operations, subject to stipulations precluding surface use of the mesa top insofar as possible. • Retained in public ownership and not classified, segregated, or withdrawn from entry. • Excluded from private or commercial use of woodland products, except for limited on-site collection of dead wood for campfires. • Unavailable for livestock grazing, including 	<p>Lavender Mesa (649 acres) would continue to be designated as a Vegetation (Relict) ACEC, and would be managed with the same management prescriptions as the Alternative A, except for the following changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-surface disturbing vegetative treatment allowed to control invasive species and for rehabilitation of disturbed surfaces. • Managed as NSO for oil and gas leasing. • Available for locatable mineral entry with approved plan of operations (for the sides of the mesa, not the top), subject to stipulations protecting vegetation on the mesa top. • No campfires allowed. • Managed to limit recreation use if vegetation communities are being adversely impacted. • Helicopter access allowed for scientific study and heliportable equipment. • Managed as VRM Class II. 	<p>Lavender Mesa (649 acres) would continue to be designated as a Vegetation (Relict) ACEC and would be managed with the same management prescriptions as Alternative A, except for the following changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excluded from land treatments or other improvements, except for test plots and facilities necessary for study of the plant communities, and restoration/reclamation activities. • Managed as NSO for oil and gas leasing. • Available for locatable mineral entry with approved plan of operations, subject to stipulations protecting vegetation on the mesa top. • No campfires allowed. • Managed to limit recreation use if vegetation communities are being adversely impacted. • Geophysical exploration allowed if it does not adversely impact vegetation communities. • Managed as VRM Class II. • Helicopter access allowed for scientific study and heliportable equipment. 	<p>Lavender Mesa would not be designated as an ACEC and would be managed the same as the surrounding area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mechanized/motorized travel limited to designated routes. However, it should be noted that the area is inaccessible to motorized travel or grazing. • Helicopter access allowed for scientific study and heliportable equipment. • Managed as VRM Class III. • Unavailable for private and/or commercial use of woodland products including limited on-site collection of dead wood for campfires. 	<p>Same as Alternative B except for non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be managed as unavailable for mineral leasing, as unavailable for OHV use, as ROW exclusion areas, as unavailable for disposal of mineral materials, as unavailable for private and commercial woodland harvest, as VRM Class I, and as proposed for withdrawal from mineral entry.</p>

Table 2.1. Summary Table of Alternatives

<p>grazing by saddle stock and pack animals allowed for access.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excluded from land treatments or other improvements, except for test plots and facilities necessary for study of relict plant communities. Excluded from wildlife habitat improvements. Excluded from watershed control structures. Subject to conditional fire suppression. Closed to OHV use. Managed to limit recreation use if cultural resources or scenic values are being damaged. Excluded from surface disturbance by mechanized or motorized equipment, except helicopter access for scientific study and heliportable equipment, insofar as possible. 				
<p>Lockhart Basin ACEC</p>				
<p>MANAGEMENT COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES</p>				
<p>Lockhart Basin potential ACEC overlays Indian Creek WSA (6,870 acres). WSAs are managed under the IMP. The special management prescriptions below apply to the proposed Lockhart Basin ACEC for protection of scenic values through a range of alternatives for analysis.</p>				
<p>Alternative A</p>	<p>Alternative B</p>	<p>Alternative C</p>	<p>Alternative D</p>	<p>Alternative E</p>
<p>There is not currently an existing ACEC for Lockhart Basin. A portion of the potential Lockhart Basin ACEC area includes the Indian Creek existing ACEC. The current stipulations for the Indian Creek ACEC are listed below.</p> <p><u>Indian Creek ACEC</u> (partial WSA) Scenic value (8,642 acres). Would be maintained and would continue to be managed with the following prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Almost all of the ACEC would be in ROS P-class areas. All vegetation must be with native species naturally occurring in the vicinity. Available for mineral leasing with stipulations to prevent surface occupancy (Category 3) NSO; however, the area manager would grant an exception to the NSO stipulation if is determined through an EA (or EIS, if necessary) that with the adoption and use of appropriate mitigation measures, the project would meet visual quality standards for the area. Available for geophysical work. Unavailable for disposal of mineral materials. Available for mineral entry with an approved plan of operations. Retained in public ownership and not classified as segregated or withdrawn from entry. Excluded from private and commercial use of woodland products, except for limited on-site collection of dead wood for campfires. Available for livestock use. Closed to OHV use. Managed to limit recreation use if scenic values are being damaged. 	<p>Lockhart Basin (47,783) acres would be designated as a Scenic ACEC and would be managed with the following prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Available for mineral leasing subject to NSO. Exemptions may be granted on a case-by-case basis if site-specific NEPA determines that VRM Class I can be met. Surface-disturbing activities would be prohibited. Exemptions may be granted on a case-by-case basis if site-specific NEPA determines that VRM Class I can be met. Available for geophysical work if VRM Class I can be met. Unavailable for disposal of mineral materials. Retained in public ownership and recommended for withdrawal from mineral entry. Available for livestock use. Managed as VRM Class I. Pursue acquisition of state inholdings in this ACEC. Open for campfires. Unavailable for woodland product use except for limited on-site collection of dead wood for campfires. 	<p>Lockhart Basin would not be designated as an ACEC. It would be managed with the following prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Available for mineral leasing subject to timing limitations and controlled surface use in Bighorn Sheep area, and Standard lease terms in remaining area. Retained in public ownership. Available for livestock use. Managed as VRM Class II and III. Open for campfires. Unavailable for woodland product use except for limited on-site collection of dead wood for campfires. 	<p>Same as Alternative C.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative B except for non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be managed as unavailable for mineral leasing, as unavailable for OHV use, as ROW exclusion areas, as unavailable for disposal of mineral materials, as unavailable for private and commercial woodland harvest, as VRM Class I, and as proposed for withdrawal from mineral entry.</p>

Table 2.1. Summary Table of Alternatives

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Managed as VRM Class I. • Subject to conditional fire suppression, with motorized suppression methods used only if necessary to protect life and property. 				
San Juan River ACEC				
MANAGEMENT COMMON TO ALL ACTION ALTERNATIVES				
A Cultural Resources Management Plan would be written for the San Juan River and would not require an amendment to the RMP; the management plan will be based on the RMP.				
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
<p>San Juan River: The area proposed for ACEC designation under alternatives B, C, and E would not be designated as an ACEC under this alternative but would continue to be managed as the San Juan River SRMA (15,100 acres).</p>	<p>The San Juan River (7,590 acres) would be designated as a Scenic, Cultural, Wildlife, and Natural Systems and Processes ACEC and would be managed with the following prescriptions:</p> <p>Note: Increase boundary to include the east flank of Lime Creek Anticline.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vehicle access, including OHVs/mechanized, limited to designated routes. • Unavailable for private and/or commercial use of woodland products except for limited on-site collection of dead wood for campfires; woodland use within the floodplain would be limited to collection of driftwood for campfires. • Available for livestock use October 1–April 30. • Available for watershed, range, wildlife habitat improvements and vegetation treatments. • West Montezuma Creek to Private land managed as VRM Class II. • West of accreted land at Town of Bluff to River mile 9 managed as VRM Class III. • River mile 9 to river mile 23 (above Mexican Hat formation) managed as VRM Class I. • River mile 23.8 to river mile 28 managed as VRM Class III. • River mile 28 to Glen Canyon NRA managed as VRM Class I. • Available for oil and gas leasing subject to NSO. • Unavailable for mineral material disposal. • Recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry. • Managed to limit recreation use if wildlife values are being adversely impacted. • A Cultural Resources Management Plan would be written for all Alternatives (except Alternative A) for the San Juan River, and would not require an amendment to the RMP. • Camping closed in areas as necessary to protect cultural, wildlife, and natural processes. • Designated access trails to cultural sites as necessary to protect cultural resources. • No camping in cultural sites. • Ropes and other climbing aids not allowed for access to ruins, cultural sites, and nesting raptors. 	<p>Same as Alternative B.</p>	<p>The proposed area would not be designated as an ACEC. The area would be managed using the following prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vehicle access, including OHVs, limited to designated routes. • Unavailable for private and/or commercial use of woodland products except for limited on-site collection of dead wood for campfires; woodland use within the floodplain would be limited to collection of driftwood for campfires. • Available for livestock use October 1–May 31 and must meet or exceed PFC, and incorporate restoration and/or deferment systems. • Camping closed in areas as necessary to protect cultural resources, wildlife and natural processes. • Designated access trails to cultural sites as necessary to protect cultural resources. • Available for watershed, range, wildlife habitat improvements, and vegetation treatments. • No camping in cultural sites. • Ropes and other climbing aids not allowed for access to ruins, cultural sites, or nesting raptors. • Managed as VRM Class II and VRM Class III. • Available for oil and gas leasing subject to NSO. • Retained in public ownership and not recommended for withdrawal from mineral entry. • Unavailable for mineral material disposal. 	<p>Same as Alternative B except for non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be managed as unavailable for mineral leasing, as unavailable for OHV use, as ROW exclusion areas, as unavailable for disposal of mineral materials, as unavailable for private and commercial woodland harvest, as VRM Class I, and as proposed for withdrawal from mineral entry.</p>

Table 2.1. Summary Table of Alternatives

Scenic Highway Corridor ACEC				
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
<p>For the 21,380 acres where the Scenic Highway Corridor ACEC (79,017 acres) overlaps the Cedar Mesa ACEC (295,336 acres), the special conditions for Scenic Highway Corridor ACEC would take precedence. Special conditions for the Corridor would be:</p> <p>Open for mineral leasing with stipulations to prevent surface occupancy (Category 3); however, the area manager would grant an exception to the NSO stipulation in the event it is determined, through an environmental assessment or environmental impact statement, if necessary, with the adoption and use of appropriate mitigation measures, that the project would meet visual quality standards.</p> <p>Available for disposal of mineral materials subject to visual quality considerations.</p> <p>Managed to limit recreation use if scenic values are being damaged.</p> <p>Managed as VRM class I with projects that meet these visual quality standards allowed.</p>	<p>Scenic Highway Corridor would not be designated.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative B.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative B.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative B.</p>
Shay Canyon ACEC				
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
<p>Shay Canyon ACEC (3,561 acres): Cultural, and Special Emphasis Area for conservation value would be maintained with the following management prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where riparian areas overlap part of Shay Canyon ACEC, the special conditions for floodplains and riparian/aquatic areas would take precedence. • Within Shay Canyon ACEC, cultural properties eligible for NRHP would be surrounded by a buffer sufficient to allow permanent protection. If cultural resources or their buffers cannot be avoided, appropriate mitigation would be applied ranging from limited testing to extensive excavation. • In any given case, mitigation would be designed to fit the specific circumstances and reviewed by the SHPO and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. The Cedar Mesa Management Plan developed for the ACEC would guide fire protection, data recovery, and all other necessary cultural management activities. • Revegetation must be successfully established within 5 years after project completion. • Available for mineral leasing; surface use limited by special conditions. • Available for geophysical work. • Available for disposal of mineral materials. • Available for mineral entry with an approved plan of operations. • Retained in public ownership and not classified, segregated, or withdrawn from entry. • Excluded from private and commercial use of 	<p>Shay Canyon (119 acres) would be designated as a Cultural ACEC and would be managed with the following prescriptions:</p> <p>Note: Original ACEC boundary would be decreased to 119 acres.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Cultural Resource Management Plan (CRMP) would be written for Shay Canyon ACEC. • OHV and mechanized travel limited to designated routes. • No surface disturbance for vegetation, watershed, or wildlife treatments/improvements. • Manage as NSO for oil and gas. • Open to geophysical exploration as long as it is consistent with the objectives of the ACEC. • Grazing restricted to trailing only. • With the exception of side canyons, hiking limited to designated trails. • Open to mineral entry with an approved plan of operations to avoid impacts to cultural and paleontological resources. • Unavailable for disposal of mineral materials. • Closed to campfires. • Unavailable for private or commercial use of woodland products including on-site collection of dead wood for campfires. • Recreation use may be limited if cultural and paleontological resources are impacted. • Managed as VRM Class II. • Closed to camping. 	<p>Same as Alternative B.</p>	<p>Shay Canyon would not be designated as an ACEC. It would be managed the same as the surrounding area, with the following prescriptions;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open to grazing. • Managed as VRM Class III. • OHV use limited to designated routes. • Unavailable for private or commercial use of woodland products including on-site collection of dead wood for campfires. 	<p>Same as Alternative B except for non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be managed as unavailable for mineral leasing, as unavailable for OHV use, as ROW exclusion areas, as unavailable for disposal of mineral materials, as unavailable for private and commercial woodland harvest, as VRM Class I, and as proposed for withdrawal from mineral entry.</p>

Table 2.1. Summary Table of Alternatives

<p>woodland products, except for limited on-site collection of dead wood for campfires.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Available for livestock use. • Managed as VRM Class I, with projects that meet these visual quality standards allowed. • Subject to conditional fire suppression. • OHV use limited to designated roads/trails. • Open for improvements in habitat and watershed. • Special Emphasis Area (corridor averaging 275 feet wide centered on [upper] Indian Creek): Managed to maintain and enhance riparian/aquatic habitat quality and to increase the extent of fishery habitat. 				
Valley of the Gods ACEC				
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
<p><u>Valley of the Gods: (31,387 acres) Special Emphasis Area for Scenic Value within the Cedar Mesa ACEC.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surface disturbance would be managed to be compatible with VRM Class I criteria. • Surface disturbance would be limited to what can be successfully established within 1 year after project completion. Revegetation must be with native species naturally occurring in the vicinity. • Available for mineral leasing, NSO; however, the manager would grant an exception to the NSO stipulation in the event it is determined through an EA (or EIS, if necessary) that with the adoption and use of appropriate mitigation measures, the project would meet visual quality standards for the area. • Available for geophysical work. • Available for disposal of mineral materials with an approved plan of operations. • Available for mineral entry with an approved plan of operations. • Retained in public ownership and not classified, segregated, or withdrawn from entry. • Available for private and commercial use of woodland. • Open for livestock use. • Managed as VRM Class I. • OHV use limited to designated roads and trails. • Subject to conditional fire suppression. 	<p>Valley of the Gods (22,863 acres) would be designated as a Scenic ACEC and would be managed with the following prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Managed as VRM Class I. • Unavailable for mineral leasing. • Unavailable for disposal of mineral materials. • Recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry. • Available for livestock use. • Available for vegetation treatments. • No campfires allowed. • Unavailable for private and/or commercial use of woodland products. • BLM would pursue acquisition of state in-holdings in this ACEC. 	<p>Same as Alternative B</p>	<p>No ACEC designated.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative B except for non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be managed as unavailable for mineral leasing, as unavailable for OHV use, as ROW exclusion areas, as unavailable for disposal of mineral materials, as unavailable for private and commercial woodland harvest, as VRM Class I, and as proposed for withdrawal from mineral entry.</p>
SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS – WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS				
<p>GOALS</p> <p>Review all eligible rivers to determine suitability for congressional designation into the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System (NWSRS). To the extent of the BLM's authority (limited to BLM lands within the river corridor), maintain and enhance the free-flowing character, preserve and enhance the ORVs, and allow no activities within the river corridor that would alter the tentative classification of those river segments determined suitable for congressional designation into the NWSRS until Congress acts on the designation.</p>				
<p>MANAGEMENT COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES</p> <p>River segments found suitable and/or recommended for designation would be managed in accordance with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to protect the free-flowing nature of the river/segment, the tentative classification level, and to prevent impairment of the outstandingly remarkable values within 0.25 mile from high water mark on each side of the river not to exceed 320 acres per mile. On the San Juan River the area would be 0.25 mile from high water mark on the north side not to exceed 160 acres per mile. On the San Juan River, BLM has jurisdiction on the lands north of the river; and the Navajo Nation has jurisdiction on the southern side of the river. BLM would coordinate with the Navajo Nation in developing consistent management of the river.</p> <p>Management prescriptions for designated Wild and Scenic Rivers are listed in the BLM Manual 8351, Wild and Scenic Rivers – Policy and Program Direction for Identification, Evaluation, and Management (BLM 1993b) by tentative classification: wild, scenic, recreational.</p>				

Table 2.1. Summary Table of Alternatives

<p>Suitable rivers would be managed in a manner similar to the BLM Manual 8351 guidelines. BLM would not seek water rights as part of a suitability decision made in the ROD for this RMP. All floodplains and riparian/aquatic areas would be managed in accordance with Executive Orders 11988 and 11990, and the Endangered Species Act, the BLM Riparian Area Management Policy, and the Utah guidelines for implementing BLM riparian area management policy.</p>				
<p>White Canyon – 30 miles from the Manti-La Sal National Forest boundary to the Glen Canyon National Recreation Area. Found eligible in the 1991 San Juan RMP. Was not recommended suitable under any alternative because it has no perennial water.</p>				
<p>Colorado River (Recreational) Segment 1 (352 acres)</p>				
<p>Alternative A (No Action)</p>	<p>Alternative B</p>	<p>Alternative C (Preferred)</p>	<p>Alternative D</p>	<p>Alternative E</p>
<p><u>Recommendation:</u> This segment of the Colorado River was not evaluated for eligibility in the 1991 San Juan RMP (see segments 2 and 3 below).</p>	<p><u>Recommendation:</u> Suitable – Recreational <u>Size:</u> 352 acres <u>Location:</u> Northern-most Monticello PA boundary, east side of Colorado River (1 mile north of Potash land) south of private land. Total river miles: 6.2 BLM river miles: 2.2 This segment would be managed with the following prescriptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • VRM Class III. • Available for oil and gas leasing subject to standard lease terms, except for floodplains and riparian corridors, which would be managed as available for oil and gas leasing subject to NSO. </p>	<p><u>Recommendation:</u> Not suitable.</p>	<p><u>Recommendation:</u> Not suitable.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative B except for non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be managed as unavailable for mineral leasing, as unavailable for OHV use, as ROW exclusion areas, as unavailable for disposal of mineral materials, as unavailable for private and commercial woodland harvest, as VRM Class I, and as proposed for withdrawal from mineral entry.</p>
<p>Colorado River (Scenic) Segment 2 (880 acres)</p>				
<p><u>Recommendation:</u> The Colorado River was determined eligible in the 1991 San Juan RMP; suitability was not evaluated at that time. <u>Location:</u> From state lands near river mile 44 to the boundary of Canyonlands National Park, 12.5 miles. The eligible segment includes the BLM portion of the Colorado River, from the north line of public land south of the San Juan County line down river to the north boundary of Canyonlands National Park. This segment would be managed under special conditions for floodplains and riparian/aquatic areas (entire 12.5-mile segment) and SPNM class (lower 9.5-mile segment). Floodplains and riparian/aquatic areas would be: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Available for mineral leasing with stipulations to prevent surface occupancy within actual floodplains or riparian/aquatic areas (Category 3). • Managed as ROS SPNM. <u>Note:</u> These stipulations apply to proposed Colorado River segments 2 and 3.</p>	<p><u>Recommendation:</u> Suitable – Scenic. <u>Size:</u> 880 acres <u>Location:</u> State lands near river mile 44 to approximately river mile 38.5. Total river miles: 6.8 BLM river miles: 5.5 miles This segment would be managed with the following prescriptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • VRM Class II. • Available for oil and gas leasing subject to NSO. </p>	<p><u>Recommendation:</u> Suitable – Scenic. <u>Size:</u> 880 acres <u>Location:</u> State lands near river mile 44 to approximately river mile 38.5 (5.5 miles). This segment would be managed with the following prescriptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • VRM Class II. • Available for oil and gas leasing subject to NSO. • Motorized boat use allowed on the river. </p>	<p><u>Recommendation:</u> Not suitable.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative B except for non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be managed as unavailable for mineral leasing, as unavailable for OHV use, as ROW exclusion areas, as unavailable for disposal of mineral materials, as unavailable for private and commercial woodland harvest, as VRM Class I, and as proposed for withdrawal from mineral entry.</p>
<p>Colorado River (Scenic) Segment 3 (1,040 acres)</p>				
<p>See management prescriptions above.</p>	<p><u>Recommendation:</u> Suitable – Scenic. <u>Size:</u> 1,040 acres <u>Location:</u> From approximately river mile 37.5 at state land to boundary of Canyonlands National Park near river mile 31. Total river miles: 6.5 BLM river miles: 6.5 This segment would be managed with the following prescriptions:</p>	<p><u>Recommendation:</u> Suitable – Scenic. <u>Size:</u> 1,040 acres <u>Location:</u> From approximately river mile 37.5 at state land to boundary of Canyonlands National Park near river mile 31 (6.5 miles). Lands along CNP and with WC will be managed as per WC prescriptions (approximately 1 mile). This segment would be managed with the following prescriptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • VRM Class I. </p>	<p><u>Recommendation:</u> Not suitable.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative B except for non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be managed as unavailable for mineral leasing, as unavailable for OHV use, as ROW exclusion areas, as unavailable for disposal of mineral materials, as unavailable for private and commercial woodland harvest, as VRM Class I, and as proposed for withdrawal from mineral entry.</p>

Table 2.1. Summary Table of Alternatives

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • VRM Class I. • Unavailable for oil and gas leasing. • Closed to OHV use. • Recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry. • Closed to motorized boat use. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unavailable for oil and gas leasing. • Closed to OHV use. • Recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry. • Closed to motorized boat use. 		
Indian Creek (Recreational; 1,536 acres)				
<p><u>Recommendation:</u> This segment of Indian Creek was not evaluated for eligibility in the 1991 San Juan RMP.</p>	<p><u>Recommendation:</u> Suitable – Recreational. <u>Size:</u> 1,536 acres <u>Location:</u> Forest boundary to Donnelly Canyon. Total river miles: 6.5 BLM river miles: 4.8 miles This segment would be managed with the following prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • VRM Class III. • Available for oil and gas leasing subject to standard lease terms, except for floodplains and riparian corridors, which would be available for oil and gas leasing subject to NSO. • OHV travel would be limited to designated routes. 	<p><u>Recommendation:</u> Not suitable.</p>	<p><u>Recommendation:</u> Not suitable.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative B except for non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be managed as unavailable for mineral leasing, as unavailable for OHV use, as ROW exclusion areas, as unavailable for disposal of mineral materials, as unavailable for private and commercial woodland harvest, as VRM Class I, and as proposed for withdrawal from mineral entry.</p>
Fable Valley (Scenic; 2,176 acres)				
<p><u>Recommendation:</u> This segment of Fable Valley was not evaluated for eligibility in the 1991 San Juan RMP.</p>	<p><u>Recommendation:</u> Suitable – Scenic. <u>Size:</u> 2,176 acres <u>Location:</u> Source to mouth at Gypsum Creek Total river miles : 6.8 BLM river miles: 6.8 Recommended as Suitable – Scenic. This segment would be managed with the following prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • VRM Class I. • Unavailable for oil and gas leasing. • Managed per IMP. 	<p><u>Recommendation:</u> Not suitable.</p>	<p><u>Recommendation:</u> Not suitable.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative B except for non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be managed as unavailable for mineral leasing, as unavailable for OHV use, as ROW exclusion areas, as unavailable for disposal of mineral materials, as unavailable for private and commercial woodland harvest, as VRM Class I, and as proposed for withdrawal from mineral entry.</p>
Dark Canyon (Wild) 2,048 acres				
<p><u>Recommendation:</u> This segment of Dark Canyon was not evaluated for eligibility in the 1991 San Juan RMP.</p>	<p><u>Recommendation:</u> Suitable – Wild. <u>Size:</u> 2,048 acres <u>Location:</u> Forest boundary to Glen Canyon NRA below Young's Canyon. Total river miles: 13.6 BLM river miles: 6.4 This segment would be managed with the following prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • VRM Class I. • Unavailable for oil and gas leasing. • Closed to OHV use. • Recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry. 	<p>Same as Alternative B.</p>	<p><u>Recommendation:</u> Not suitable.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative B except for non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be managed as unavailable for mineral leasing, as unavailable for OHV use, as ROW exclusion areas, as unavailable for disposal of mineral materials, as unavailable for private and commercial woodland harvest, as VRM Class I, and as proposed for withdrawal from mineral entry.</p>

Table 2.1. Summary Table of Alternatives

San Juan River (Recreational) Segment 1 (1,360 acres)				
<p>Recommendation: This segment of the San Juan River and the upper portion of proposed segment 2 were not evaluated for eligibility in the 1991 San Juan RMP (see segments 2, 3, 4, and 5 below).</p>	<p>Recommendation: Suitable – Recreational. Size: 1,360 acres Location: West Montezuma Creek to private land just before "avulsed" parcel of Navajo land at St. Christopher's Mission. Total river miles: 15.3 BLM River Miles: 8.5 This segment would be managed with the following prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • VRM Class III. • Available for oil and gas leasing subject to standard lease terms except for floodplains and riparian corridors which would be available for oil and gas leasing subject to NSO. 	<p>Recommendation: Not suitable.</p>	<p>Recommendation: Not suitable.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative B except for non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be managed as unavailable for mineral leasing, as unavailable for OHV use, as ROW exclusion areas, as unavailable for disposal of mineral materials, as unavailable for private and commercial woodland harvest, as VRM Class I, and as proposed for withdrawal from mineral entry.</p>
San Juan River (Recreational) Segment 2 (1,600 acres)				
<p>San Juan River (This description covers a portion of proposed San Juan River Segment 2 and all of proposed segments 3, 4, and 5.) The eligible segment includes the BLM portion of the San Juan River from the bridge on US Highway 191 south of Bluff to the Glen Canyon NRA boundary. This segment would be managed under the special conditions listed below:</p> <p><u>ROS P-Class Conditions for San Juan River</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excluded from private and commercial use of woodland products, except for onsite collection of dead wood for campfires. • Available for livestock use. • Excluded from new land treatments. • Managed to allow cultural resources to remain subject to natural forces. • Managed as VRM Class I, with only those projects that meet class-I objective allowed; subject to conditional fire suppression, with motorized suppression methods used only if necessary to protect life and property. • Excluded from surface disturbance by mechanized or motorized equipment. <p><u>Semi-primitive Motorized (SPM) Class within San Juan River SRMA</u> The SPM-class area within San Juan River SPRA (9,380 acres) would be managed under certain conditions listed above for P-class areas, except that motorized boat use on San Juan River would be allowed. This area would be managed to maintain an environment of isolation insofar as allowed by river permit and patrol system. Levels of management and use are aimed at maintaining safety and the riverine ecosystem. The following special conditions are in addition to those listed above for P-class areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The area would be recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry. 	<p>Recommendation: Suitable – Recreational. Size: 1,600 acres Location: West of "accreted" land at town of Bluff, Utah at river mile (minus) -1 to river mile 9. Total river miles: 10 BLM river miles: 10 This segment would be managed with the following prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • VRM Class III. • Available for oil and gas leasing subject to standard lease terms except for floodplains and riparian corridors which would be managed as available for oil and gas leasing subject to NSO. 	<p>Recommendation: Not suitable.</p>	<p>Recommendation: Not suitable.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative B except for non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be managed as unavailable for mineral leasing, as unavailable for OHV use, as ROW exclusion areas, as unavailable for disposal of mineral materials, as unavailable for private and commercial woodland harvest, as VRM Class I, and as proposed for withdrawal from mineral entry.</p>

Table 2.1. Summary Table of Alternatives

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surface disturbance from mining activities on existing claims would be limited to the extent possible without curtailing valid existing rights. • The area above the rim in the vicinity of the Bluff airport lease would be available for mineral material disposal. • Except for motorized boat use on the San Juan River, no vehicle access would be allowed from Comb Wash downstream to Lime Creek and south of Mexican Hat bridge. In areas closed to OHV use, a plan of operations is required for any mining-related activity other than casual use. In other areas within the SRMA, vehicle access would be limited to designated roads and trails. 				
San Juan River Wild Segment 3 (2,128 acres)				
<p>See management prescriptions above.</p>	<p><u>Recommendation:</u> Suitable – Wild. <u>Size:</u> 2,128 acres <u>Location:</u> River mile 9 to river mile 23 above the Mexican Hat formation. Total river miles: 13.3 BLM river miles: 13.3 This segment would be managed with the following prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • VRM Class I. • Unavailable for oil and gas leasing. • Closed to OHV use. • Recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry. 	<p><u>Recommendation:</u> Not suitable.</p>	<p><u>Recommendation:</u> Not suitable.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative B except for non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be managed as unavailable for mineral leasing, as unavailable for OHV use, as ROW exclusion areas, as unavailable for disposal of mineral materials, as unavailable for private and commercial woodland harvest, as VRM Class I, and as proposed for withdrawal from mineral entry.</p>
San Juan River (Recreational) Segment 4 (672 acres)				
<p>See management prescriptions above.</p>	<p><u>Recommendation:</u> Suitable – Recreational. <u>Size:</u> 672 acres <u>Location:</u> River mile 23.8 west to river mile 28. Total river miles: 5.3 BLM river miles: 4.2 This segment would be managed with the following prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • VRM Class III. • Available for oil and gas leasing subject to standard lease terms, except for floodplains and riparian corridors, which would be available for oil and gas leasing subject to NSO. 	<p><u>Recommendation:</u> Not suitable.</p>	<p><u>Recommendation:</u> Not Suitable</p>	<p>Same as Alternative B except for non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be managed as unavailable for mineral leasing, as unavailable for OHV use, as ROW exclusion areas, as unavailable for disposal of mineral materials, as unavailable for private and commercial woodland harvest, as VRM Class I, and as proposed for withdrawal from mineral entry.</p>
San Juan River Wild Segment 5 (2,768 acres)				
<p>See management prescriptions above.</p>	<p><u>Recommendation:</u> Suitable – Wild. <u>Size:</u> 2,768 acres <u>Location:</u> River mile 28 to Glen Canyon NRA at river mile 45. Total river miles: 17.3 BLM river miles: 17.3 This segment would be managed with the following</p>	<p><u>Recommendation:</u> Not suitable.</p>	<p><u>Recommendation:</u> Not suitable.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative B except for non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be managed as unavailable for mineral leasing, as unavailable for OHV use, as ROW exclusion areas, as unavailable for disposal of mineral materials, as unavailable for private and commercial woodland harvest, as VRM Class I, and as proposed for withdrawal from mineral entry.</p>

Table 2.1. Summary Table of Alternatives

	<p>prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • VRM Class I. • Available for oil and gas leasing subject to NSO. • Closed to OHV use. • Recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry. 			
Arch Canyon (Recreational; 2,208 acres)				
<p>This segment was not evaluated for eligibility in the 1991 San Juan RMP.</p>	<p><u>Recommendation:</u> Suitable – Recreational. <u>Size 2,208 acres</u> <u>Location:</u> Forest boundary to 0.5 mile west of its confluence with Comb Wash. Total river miles: 7.7 BLM river miles: 6.9 This segment would be managed with the following prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • VRM Class III. • Open to oil and gas leasing subject to standard lease terms, except for floodplains and riparian corridors, which would be managed as open to oil and gas leasing subject to NSO. 	<p><u>Recommendation:</u> Not suitable.</p>	<p><u>Recommendation:</u> Not suitable.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative B except for non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be managed as unavailable for mineral leasing, as unavailable for OHV use, as ROW exclusion areas, as unavailable for disposal of mineral materials, as unavailable for private and commercial woodland harvest, as VRM Class I, and as proposed for withdrawal from mineral entry.</p>
SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS – Lands Studied For Congressional Wilderness Designation Under FLPMA Section 603				
GOALS AND OBJECTIVES FOR LANDS STUDIED FOR CONGRESSIONAL WILDERNESS DESIGNATION UNDER FLPMA SECTION 603				
<p>Manage FLPMA Section 603 wilderness study areas in a manner that does not impair their suitability for congressional designation into the National Wilderness Preservation System. This is the protective mandate of FLPMA Section 603(c).</p>				
MANAGEMENT COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES FOR LANDS STUDIED FOR CONGRESSIONAL WILDERNESS DESIGNATION UNDER FLPMA SECTION 603				
<p>All lands studied during the FLPMA Section 603 wilderness review will continue to be managed in a manner that does not impair their suitability for congressional designation in accordance with FLPMA Section 603(c), subject to valid existing rights. Actions may be allowed on a case-by-case basis only where BLM determines that such action would not impair the lands' wilderness suitability.</p> <p>The Monticello FO manages 13 wilderness study areas (386,027 GIS acres and 387,410 acres were listed in the 1991 San Juan RMP): Mancos Mesa (51,440 acres), Grand Gulch ISA Complex (37,810), Road Canyon (52,420), Fish Creek Canyon (46,440), Mule canyon (5,990), Cheese box Canyon (15,410), Dark Canyon ISA Complex (62,040), Butler Wash (22,030), Bridger jack Mesa (5,290), Indian Creek (6,870), South needles (160), Squaw and Papoose Canyons (6,560), Cross Canyon (1,000)</p> <p>Within the area managed by the Monticello FO, there is an area totaling 2,155 acres contiguous to the Butler Wash WSA, that was studied as a boundary variation during the wilderness review mandated by Congress in FLPMA Sections 603(a) and (b). These lands were addressed in the Utah BLM Statewide Wilderness Final EIS (November 1990) and were recommended for congressional wilderness designation in the Utah Statewide Wilderness Study Reports (October 1991). This recommendation was forwarded by the President of the United States to Congress in 1993 as part of the recommendation for the Butler Wash WSA, and thus in the Butler Wash WSA acreage addressed in this document.</p> <p>WSAs are managed in a manner consistent with the IMP. When appropriate, a land use plan amendment or amendments may be initiated. The only decisions related to WSA management that would be made in this plan are VRM, OHV designations, and route designations. WSA management prescriptions, as stipulated in the Interim Management Policy for Lands Under Wilderness Review (IMP), would take precedence over other management prescriptions. Designation of routes can only be on existing ways identified during the initial wilderness inventory.</p> <p>Under Alternatives A, C, and D, where some routes would remain available for motorized use within WSAs, such use could continue on a conditional basis. Use of the existing routes in the WSAs (called "ways" when located within WSAs, see Glossary) could continue as long as use of these routes does not impair wilderness suitability, as provided by the Interim Management Policy and Guidelines for Lands Under Wilderness Review (BLM 1995). The miles of motorized routes in WSAs (see below for miles of route per WSA) are only conditionally open to vehicle use. If Congress designates the area as wilderness, the routes will be closed. In the interim, if use and/or non-compliance are found through monitoring efforts to impair the area's suitability for wilderness designation, BLM would take further action to limit use of the routes, or close them. The continued use of these routes, therefore, is based on user compliance and non-impairment of wilderness values.</p> <p>Wilderness Study Areas would be managed as VRM Class I.</p> <p>Only Congress can release a WSA from wilderness consideration. Should any WSA, in part or in whole, be released from wilderness consideration, proposals in the released area would be examined on a case-by-case basis for consistency with the goals and objectives of the RMP decisions. Actions inconsistent with RMP goals and objectives would be deferred until completion of requisite plan amendments. Should any WSA, in part or in whole, be released by Congress from wilderness consideration, proposals in the released area would be examined on a case-by-case basis for consistency with the goals and objectives of the RMP decisions. Because the management direction of the released land would continue in accordance with the goals and objectives established in the RMP, there is no separate analysis required in this land use plan to address resource impacts if any WSAs are released.</p>				
SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES				
GOALS				
<p>Maintain, protect, and enhance habitats (including but not limited to designated critical habitat) of federally listed Threatened, Endangered, or Candidate plant or animal species to actively promote recovery to the point that they no longer need protection or prevent the listing of species under the Endangered Species Act.</p>				

Table 2.1. Summary Table of Alternatives

<p>Maintain, protect, and enhance habitats of BLM State Director's sensitive plant and animal species to ensure that actions requiring authorization or approval by the BLM are consistent with the conservation needs of special status species and do not contribute to the need to list any special status species, either under provisions of ESA or other provisions in the BLM Manual 6840 (BLM 2001c).</p> <p>Develop conservation measures to minimize long-term habitat fragmentation through avoidance and site-specific reclamation to provide habitat quality and quantity adequate to fulfill the life history requirements and to support a natural diversity of species.</p>
<p>MANAGEMENT COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES</p> <p>Threatened and Endangered species avoidance and minimization measures would be used for all surface-disturbing activities to comply with the Endangered Species Act, the BLM State Director's sensitive plant and animal species, and the BLM Manual 6840, Special Status Species Management. See Appendix A.</p> <p>Oil and gas and mineral development BMPs would be used, including minimizing roadbed width and footprint size, co-location of facilities, etc., to minimize habitat fragmentation.</p> <p>BLM would continue to use the lease notices that BLM and FWS agreed to in the recent section 7 consultation on the oil and gas leasing program.</p> <p>Inventories and monitoring studies would be conducted in order to determine special status plant and animal species locations, potential habitat, population dynamics, and existing and potential threats.</p> <p>The protection of species and potential and/or occupied habitat for special status species would be considered and implemented prior to any authorization or action by the BLM that could alter or disturb such habitat.</p> <p>No management action would be permitted on BLM lands that would jeopardize the continued existence of species that are listed, proposed for listing, or candidates for listing under the Endangered Species Act.</p> <p>BLM would follow and implement the guidelines and management recommendations presented in species recovery or conservation plans (as updated), or alternative management strategies developed in consultation with USFWS.</p> <p>BLM would support and implement where possible current and future sensitive species Conservation Agreements, including the Colorado River Cutthroat Trout Conservation Agreement and Strategy and Conservation Agreement for the roundtail chub, bluehead sucker, and flannelmouth sucker.</p> <p>BLM would continue to work with USFWS and others to ensure that plans and agreements are updated to reflect the latest scientific data.</p> <p>BLM would work cooperatively with USFWS and UDWR to obtain and/or maintain maps of current occupied and potential habitats for special status species.</p> <p>BLM would work with the UDWR to implement the Utah Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy (UDWR 2005) to coordinate management decisions that would conserve native species and prevent the need for additional listings.</p> <p>Translocations of population augmentation of special status species would be allowed to aid in conservation and recovery efforts. Necessary habitat manipulations and monitoring would be implemented to ensure successful translocation efforts.</p> <p>BLM would implement and follow the guidelines in the Colorado River Fishes Recovery and Implementation Program (as updated).</p> <p>Implement BLM's Guidance for the Management of Sagebrush Plant Communities for Sage-grouse Conservation and BLM's National Sage-grouse Habitat Conservation Strategy.</p> <p>Consistent with RMP goals and objectives, the following plans or best available scientific information would be utilized and applied, as needed, as part of implementing the BLM's National Sage-grouse Habitat Conservation Strategy: Strategic Management Plan for Sage-grouse (BLM 2004d), WAFWA Conservation Assessment of Greater Sage-grouse and Sagebrush Habitats (Connelly et al. 2004), and the Gunnison Sage-grouse Rangewide Conservation Plan (2005, as revised).</p> <p>The Gunnison Sage-grouse Conservation Easement (320 acres) would be managed to protect and enhance habitat for sage-grouse and allow for land-ownership changes on conservation easements for sage-grouse.</p> <p>Retain potential/occupied special status species habitat in federal ownership. Acquisition of potential/occupied special status species habitat would be high priority. These acquired/exchanged lands would be managed according to BLM land management prescriptions for special status species.</p> <p>Any non-essential routes developed for a project located in special status species habitat would be closed and rehabilitated when the project is complete.</p> <p>Raptor management would be guided by the use of Best Management Practices for Raptors and Their Associated Habitats in Utah (Appendix M), utilizing seasonal and spatial buffers, as well as mitigation, to maintain and enhance raptor nesting and foraging habitat, while allowing other resource uses.</p> <p><u>Bald Eagle</u></p> <p>Any BLM lands that contain nesting or winter roost habitat for the bald eagle would be avoided or use restrictions may be implemented depending on activity. Implementation of appropriate measures would depend on whether the action is temporary or permanent, and whether it occurs within or outside the bald eagle nesting or roosting season. A temporary action would be one that is completed outside of the breeding or roosting season leaving no permanent structures and resulting in no permanent habitat loss. A permanent action would be one that continues for more than one breeding or roosting season and/or causes a loss of eagle habitat or displaces eagles through disturbances, i.e., creation of a permanent structure. Raptors would be managed according to the USFWS Guidelines for Raptor Protection from Human and Land Use Disturbances (Romin and Muck 2002, as amended) and BLM's Best Management Practices.</p> <p>Avoidance and minimization measures include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surveys may be required prior to implementation of proposed action. All surveys must be conducted by qualified individual(s), be conducted according to protocol, and be acceptable to BLM. • Activities may require monitoring throughout the duration of the project. To ensure desired results are being achieved, minimization measures would be evaluated and, if necessary, Section 7 consultation reinitiated. • Any activity should be managed to ensure maintenance or enhancement of riparian habitat. • Temporary activities within 1 mile of nest sites would not occur during the breeding season of January 1 to August 31, unless the area has been surveyed according to protocol and determined to be unoccupied as of June 1 of a given year. • Temporary activities within 0.5 miles of winter roost areas, e.g., cottonwood galleries, would not occur during the winter roost season of November 1 to March 31, unless the area has been surveyed according to protocol and determined to be unoccupied. • Seasonal and spatial buffers would be implemented in accordance with USFWS Raptor Guidelines when temporary daily activities must occur within winter roosting buffers. • No future ground-disturbing activities would be authorized within 0.5 mile of known bald eagle nest sites year-round. Deviations may be allowed only after appropriate levels of consultation and coordination with the USFWS. • No permanent above-ground structures would be allowed within 0.5 miles of a winter roost site, if the structure would result in the habitat becoming unsuitable for future winter roosting by bald eagles. • In conjunction with the county, public notices would be posted instructing drivers to watch for eagles on roads within bald eagle foraging range. • Avoid loss or disturbance to large cottonwood gallery riparian habitats. • Avoid surface disturbance in riparian areas. If impracticable, all areas of surface disturbance within riparian areas and/or adjacent uplands should be re-vegetated with native species. <p>Exceptions to the above-described prescriptions or additional measures may be implemented to avoid or minimize impacts to the species at any time in consultation with the USFWS to ensure continued compliance with the ESA.</p> <p><u>Mexican Spotted Owl (MSO)</u></p> <p>Avoidance and minimization measures would include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess habitat suitability for both nesting and foraging using accepted habitat models in conjunction with field reviews. Apply the appropriate conservation measures below if project activities occur within 0.5 mile of suitable owl habitat. Determine potential impacts of actions to owls and their habitat. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Document type of activity, acreage, and location of direct habitat impacts, type and extent of indirect impacts relative to location of suitable owl habitat. ▪ Document if action is temporary or permanent.

Table 2.1. Summary Table of Alternatives

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For all temporary actions that may impact owls or suitable habitat (Map 86). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ If the action occurs entirely outside of the owl breeding season (March 1–August 31), and leaves no permanent structure or permanent habitat disturbance, action can proceed without an occupancy survey. ▪ If action would occur during a breeding season, survey for owls prior to commencing activity. If owls are found, activity should be delayed until outside of the breeding season. ▪ Rehabilitate access routes created by the project through such means as raking out scars, re-vegetation, gating access points, etc. <p>For all permanent actions that may impact owls or suitable habitat:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Survey two consecutive years for owls according to accepted protocol prior to commencing activities. ▪ If owls are found, no disturbing actions would occur within 0.5 mile of identified nest site. If nest site is unknown, no activity would occur within the designated current and historic Protected Activity Center (PAC). ▪ Avoid permanent structures within 0.5 mile of suitable habitat unless surveyed and not occupied. ▪ Reduce noise emissions (e.g., use hospital-grade mufflers) to 45 dBA at 0.5 mile from suitable habitat, including canyon rims. Placement of permanent noise-generating facilities should be contingent upon a noise analysis to ensure noise does not encroach upon a 0.5 mile buffer for suitable habitat, including canyon rims. ▪ Limit disturbances to and within suitable habitat by staying on designated and/or approved routes. ▪ Limit new access routes created by the project. <p>Exceptions to the above-described prescriptions or additional measures may be implemented to avoid or minimize impacts to the species at any time in consultation with the USFWS to ensure continued compliance with the ESA.</p> <p><u>Southwestern Willow Flycatcher and Yellow-billed Cuckoos</u></p> <p>Any BLM lands that contains riparian habitat that falls within the range for southwestern willow flycatcher or yellow-billed cuckoos would be avoided or use restrictions may be implemented depending on activity. Application of appropriate measures would depend on whether the action is temporary or permanent, and whether it occurs within or outside the nesting season. A <i>temporary</i> action is completed prior to the following breeding season leaving no permanent structures and resulting in no permanent habitat loss. A <i>permanent</i> action continues for more than one breeding season and/or causes a loss of habitat or displaces flycatchers or cuckoos through disturbances, i.e., creation of a permanent structure.</p> <p>Avoidance and minimization measures include the following (note that these would apply to both temporary and permanent actions):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surveys may be required prior to implementation of proposed action. All surveys must be conducted by qualified individual(s), be conducted according to protocol, and be acceptable to BLM. • Activities may require monitoring throughout the duration of the project. To ensure desired results are being achieved, minimization measures would be evaluated and, if necessary, Section 7 consultation reinitiated. • Any activity would be managed to ensure maintenance or enhancement of riparian habitat. • All surface-disturbing activities would maintain a 300-foot buffer from suitable riparian habitat year-long. • Construction or disturbing activities within 0.25 mile of occupied breeding habitat would not occur during the breeding season of May 1 to September for flycatchers, and May 1 to August 31 for cuckoos. • Permanent facilities that emit high noise levels would maintain a 0.25 buffer from riparian areas yearlong. • Ensure that water extraction or disposal practices do not result in change of hydrologic regime that would result in loss or degradation of riparian habitat. • Revegetation of disturbed areas within riparian areas and adjacent uplands would be done with native species or ecological equivalents. <p>Exceptions to the above-described prescriptions or additional measures may be implemented to avoid or minimize impacts to the species at any time in consultation with the USFWS to ensure continued compliance with the ESA and BLM's 6840 Manual.</p> <p><u>Endangered Colorado River Fishes</u></p> <p>Any BLM areas, watersheds, or tributaries to the section of rivers that are Designated Critical Habitat for Colorado River fish (bonytail, humpback chub, Colorado pikeminnow, and razorback sucker) would be avoided or use restrictions may be implemented depending on activity. Designated critical habitat for all the endangered fishes includes those portions of the 100-year floodplain that contain primary constituent elements necessary for survival of the species.</p> <p>Avoidance and minimization measures include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surveys may be required prior to implementation of proposed action. All surveys must be conducted by qualified individual(s) and be acceptable to BLM. • Activities may require monitoring throughout the duration of the project. To ensure desired results are being achieved, minimization measures would be evaluated and, if necessary, Section 7 consultation reinitiated. • Any activity would be managed to ensure maintenance or enhancement of riparian habitat. • Avoid loss or degradation of riparian habitats. • Implement the Utah Oil and Gas Pipeline Crossing Guidance (Appendix F). • Follow Executive Orders 11990 and 11988 to ensure protection to listed fish species and/or their critical habitat. <p>Water depletions from any portion of the Upper Colorado River drainage basin above Lake Powell are considered to adversely impact or adversely modify the critical habitat of the four resident endangered fish species, and must be evaluated with regard to the criteria described in the Upper Colorado River Endangered Fish Recovery Program. Formal consultation with USFWS is required for all depletions. All depletion amounts must be reported to BLM.</p> <p>Exceptions to the above-described prescriptions or additional measures may be implemented to avoid or minimize impacts to the species at any time in consultation with the USFWS to ensure continued compliance with the ESA.</p> <p><u>California Condor</u></p> <p>Any BLM lands that are utilized by communal roosting or nesting California condors (if and when they utilize the PA) would be avoided or use restrictions may be implemented depending on activity. Appropriate measures would depend whether the action is temporary or permanent, and whether it occurs within or outside the condor nesting season. A <i>temporary</i> action is completed outside of the breeding season leaving no permanent structures and resulting in no permanent habitat loss. A <i>permanent</i> action continues for more than one breeding season and/or causes a loss of condor habitat or displaces condors through disturbances, i.e., creation of a permanent structure.</p> <p>The following avoidance and minimization measures would apply if and when condors nest in the PA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surveys may be required prior to implementation of proposed action. Surveys must be conducted by qualified individual(s), be conducted according to protocol, and be acceptable to BLM. • Temporary land-use activities would not occur within 1 mile of a California condor nest site during the breeding season. • Recreation uses would be monitored within 1 mile of condor nest sites and activities temporarily restricted if necessary to protect the condor. • Special use permit group events would be prohibited within 1 mile of condor nest sites during the breeding season. • No permanent structures or roads would be allowed within 1 mile of condor nest sites. • Educational opportunities would be promoted, with an emphasis on use of non-lead ammunition and minimizing interaction of condors with recreationists.
--

Table 2.1. Summary Table of Alternatives

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> BLM would work with utility companies or permit holders to minimize impacts to condors. <p>Gunnison Sage-grouse New fences built within Gunnison sage-grouse habitat should be fitted with visual devices (flagging, white-tipped t-posts, etc.) to minimize grouse collision. Where possible, place fences in areas where topographic features can be used to deter collisions.</p>				
Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Preferred)	Alternative D	Alternative E
Gunnison Sage-grouse				
Unspecified.	<p><u>Crucial Year-round Habitat:</u> 145,583 acres (BLM lands: 4,524 acres)</p> <p>The following prescriptions would apply to BLM lands and/or BLM-permitted activities associated with the administration of federal minerals on split-estate lands:</p> <p><u>Lek habitat (within 2 miles of active strutting ground)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prohibit year-round construction of fences. Retrofit visual devices on existing fences to prevent collisions. Where opportunity exists, remove existing fences. Prohibit construction of power lines or other tall structures year-round. CSU for oil and gas leasing activities. Unavailable for non-ground disturbing geophysical work from March 20 to May 15. Prohibit construction of roads year-round. Prohibit construction of wind power turbines year-round. Avoid all permitted activities from March 20 to May 15. If impracticable, no activity from sunset the evening before to 3 hours after sunrise the next morning. 	<p><u>Crucial Year-round Habitat:</u> 145,583 acres (BLM lands: 4,524 acres)</p> <p>The following prescriptions would apply to BLM lands and/or BLM-permitted activities associated with the administration of federal minerals on split-estate lands:</p> <p><u>Lek habitat (within 0.6 miles of active strutting ground)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retrofit visual devices on existing fences to prevent collisions year-round. Where opportunity exists, remove existing fences. Avoid construction of new fences as much as possible. If new fences have to be built, fit with visual devices. Prohibit construction of power lines or other tall structures year-round. CSU for oil and gas leasing activities. Unavailable for non-ground disturbing geophysical work from March 20 to May 15. Prohibit construction of roads year-round. Avoid construction of wind power turbines year-round. With the exception of grazing, prohibit all permitted activities from 1 hour before sunrise to 3 hours after sunrise from March 20 to May 15. 	<p><u>Crucial Year-round Habitat:</u> 70,460 acres (BLM Lands- 2,877 acres)</p> <p>The following prescriptions would apply to BLM lands and/or BLM-permitted activities associated with the administration of federal minerals on split-estate lands:</p> <p><u>Lek habitat (within 0.25 miles of active strutting ground)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Avoid construction of fences wherever possible. Avoid construction of power lines or other tall structures. If impractical, bury power lines or retrofit them to prevent perching by raptors. CSU for oil and gas leasing activities. Unavailable for non-ground disturbing geophysical work from March 20 to May 15. Prohibit maintenance and operation activities for mineral production from 1 hour before sunrise to 3 hours after sunrise from March 20 to May 15. Prohibit construction of roads year-round. Avoid construction of wind power turbines year-round. Avoid permitted activities from 1 hour before sunrise to 3 hours after sunrise from March 20 to May 15. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as Alternative B except that non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be managed as unavailable for mineral leasing, as closed to OHV use, as ROW exclusion areas, as unavailable for disposal of mineral materials, as unavailable for private and commercial woodland harvest, as VRM Class I, and proposed for withdrawal from mineral entry.
	<p><u>Year-round habitat (within 6 miles of active strutting ground).</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sagebrush treatments must have recovery objectives that meet the habitat objectives listed in the Gunnison Sage-grouse Rangewide Conservation Plan (2005, as amended). Any variance from these recovery objectives would be subject to site-specific NEPA, including collaboration with stakeholder groups. Prohibit the construction of new fences. If impracticable, increase the visibility of the fences and monitor effectiveness of visual devices and modify or remove fences if necessary to minimize sage-grouse mortality. Leasing would be available with standard stipulations for oil and gas development to minimize impacts to sage-grouse and sagebrush habitat. Follow Suggested Management Practices, where applicable, for oil and gas development listed in the Gunnison Sage-grouse Rangewide Conservation Plan (2005, as amended). Prohibit the construction of power lines or other tall structures. Prohibit construction of wind power turbines. Limit grazing use levels as necessary to maintain and/or improve sage-grouse habitat. 	<p><u>Year-round habitat (within 6 miles of active strutting ground from June 1 to March 14).</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sagebrush treatments must have recovery objectives that meet the habitat objectives listed in the Gunnison Sage-grouse Rangewide Conservation Plan (2005, as amended). Any variance from these recovery objectives would be subject to site-specific NEPA, including collaboration with stakeholder groups. Avoid the construction of new fences. If impracticable, increase the visibility of the fences and monitor effectiveness of visual devices and modify or remove fences if necessary to minimize sage-grouse mortality. Leasing would be available with standard stipulations for oil and gas development to minimize impacts to sage-grouse and sagebrush habitat. Follow Suggested Management Practices, where applicable for oil and gas development listed in the Gunnison Sage-grouse Rangewide Conservation Plan (2005, as amended). Avoid the construction of power lines or other tall structures. If impractical, bury power lines or retrofit them to prevent perching by raptors. Prohibit construction of wind power turbines. Limit grazing use levels as necessary to maintain and/or improve sage-grouse habitat. 	<p><u>Year-round habitat (within 6 miles of active strutting ground from June 1 to March 14).</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sagebrush treatments must have recovery objectives that meet the habitat objectives listed in the Gunnison Sage-grouse Rangewide Conservation Plan (2005, as amended), or, if varied, must be approved by local sage-grouse working group. Construction of new fences must be made as visible as possible to avoid grouse collisions. Leasing would be available with standard stipulations for oil and gas development to minimize impacts to sage-grouse and sagebrush habitat. Manage grazing to maintain Rangeland Health. BLM lands within sage-grouse habitat in the following grazing allotment would not be grazed from March 20 to May 15: Sage Flat, Upper East Canyon, Sage-grouse, and Dry Farm. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as Alternative B except that non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be managed as unavailable for mineral leasing, as closed to OHV use, as ROW exclusion areas, as unavailable for disposal of mineral materials, as unavailable for private and commercial woodland harvest, as VRM Class I, and proposed for withdrawal from mineral entry.

Table 2.1. Summary Table of Alternatives

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> BLM lands within sage-grouse habitat in the following grazing allotments would not be grazed from March 20 to May 15: Sage Flat, Upper East Canyon, Sage-grouse, Dry Farm. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> BLM lands within sage-grouse habitat in the following grazing allotments would not be grazed from March 20 to May 15: Sage Flat, Upper East Canyon, Sage-grouse, Dry Farm. 		
Habitat for Mexican Spotted Owl and Flannelmouth Sucker Arch Canyon				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Closed to OHV use. Group size limited to 10 vehicles and 2 groups per day. A permit system would be implemented. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> OHV use would be limited to the designated route to the end of the State Section (T37S R20E Section 16) year-round. The canyon would be closed year-round from west boundary of the state section to the end of the route at the National Forest boundary. Group size limited to 12 vehicles and two groups per day. A permit system would be implemented. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> OHV use limited to the designated route year-round. Commercial motorized use limited to 12 vehicles and up to 2 trips a day. 	
TRAVEL MANAGEMENT				
GOALS AND OBJECTIVES BLM would provide opportunities for a range of motorized recreation experiences on public lands while protecting resources and minimizing conflicts among various users. All BLM lands would be designated as open, limited, or closed. Seasonal restrictions can be applied to the limited category. Any fire, military, emergency, or law enforcement vehicle being used for emergency or administrative purposes is exempt from OHV decisions. OHV vehicle use would be managed in accordance with BLM's National OHV strategy.				
MANAGEMENT COMMON TO ALL ACTION ALTERNATIVES Designated routes would be categorized as mechanized only (bicycles), single-track motorized (dirt bikes), or two-track motorized (4-wheelers, jeeps), or available to all vehicles, or any combination of these categories. Adjustments of these categories would be made based on recreational demand and potential conflict. The impacts of these adjustments would be analyzed and disclosed at the activity planning level. All non-motorized travel would be allowed on designated routes unless otherwise prohibited. OHV and mechanized travel would be allowed on some routes unless otherwise designated. There would be no exceptions that allow for cross-country travel for game retrieval or antler gathering in areas designated as limited or closed. OHV use for game retrieval would adhere to all OHV classifications in all alternatives. BLM Back Country Byways and National Recreation Trails may be designated in the future, as deemed appropriate, with site-specific environmental analysis. Where the authorized officer determines that OHVs are causing or would cause considerable adverse impacts, the authorized officer shall close or restrict such areas. The public would be notified. <u>Making Modifications to Travel Plan Designated Route Network [IM UT 2004-061] See Appendix G Monticello Travel Plan.</u> Recreation management decisions concerning designation modifications and recreational facility or trail proposals would be evaluated annually. Representatives from interested user groups would be asked to participate and comment during the review process. Decision-making criteria including visitor numbers, user complaints, user conflicts, quantity and variety of recreation uses occurring, types and numbers of recreation violations, proliferation of unauthorized routes, changes in visitor needs, and documented resource damage would provide the basis for recreation management determinations. Final route determinations would be approved by the field manager. Through additional analysis and land use planning (i.e., activity level planning), BLM would collaborate with impacted 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trails suitable for different categories could include equestrian/stock, mechanized vehicles (bicycles), and OHVs (dirt bikes, ATVs, and 4-wheel drive touring vehicles) as well as opportunities for joint trail use. Needs for parking, trailheads, informational and directional signs, mapping, and development brochures or other materials for public dissemination. Opportunities to tie into existing or planned trail networks. Measures needed to avoid on- and off-site impacts to current and future land uses and important resources. Among others, issues include noise and air pollution, erodible soils, stream sedimentation, non-point source water pollution, listed and sensitive species habitats, historic and archeological sites, wildlife, special management areas, grazing operations, fence and gate security, needs of recreationists, and recognition of property rights for adjacent landowners. Public land roads or trails determined to cause considerable adverse impacts 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. BLM would make future route adjustments based on access needs, recreational opportunities, and resource constraints. These activities would be analyzed at the site-specific activity planning level. BLM would manage bicycle and other mechanized uses consistent with the National Mountain Bicycling Strategic Action Plan (BLM 2002a).				
OHV Area Designations				
Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Preferred)	Alternative D	Alternative E
Open to OHV use: 611,310 acres Squaw Canyon and Cross Canyon WSAs are within this acreage but would not be designated as open unless and until Congress releases them from WSA status. This would require a plan amendment.	Open to OHV use: 0 acres	Open to OHV use: 2,311 acres	Open to OHV use: 2,311 acres	Open to OHV use: 0 acres

Table 2.1. Summary Table of Alternatives

<p><u>Limited use with seasonal restrictions:</u> 540,260 acres to protect the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • bighorn sheep lambing and rutting areas • antelope fawning areas • deer winter ranges <p><u>Limited to existing roads and trails:</u> 570,390 acres To protect cultural, scenic, and recreational values:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alkali Ridge ACEC • Scenic Highway Corridor ACEC • Most SPNM-class areas <p><u>Limited to Designated Roads and Trails:</u> 218,780 acres To protect cultural, scenic, and recreational values:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cedar Mesa ACEC (partial) • Hovenweep ACEC • Pearson Canyon hiking area • Shay Canyon ACEC • SPNM-class areas in SRMAs • Road corridors adjacent to SPNM-class areas • Developed recreation sites • Floodplains, riparian/aquatic areas 	<p><u>Limited to designated routes:</u> 1,359,417 acres Mountain bike use would be limited to the same designated routes as OHV travel.</p> <p><u>Limited to designated routes with seasonal restrictions:</u> 0 acres</p>	<p><u>Limited to designated routes:</u> 1,362,142 acres <u>Limited to designated routes with seasonal restrictions:</u> Approximately 3.8 miles. (Arch Canyon) Four WSAs would allow for conditional motorized use of 7 ways to provide access to trailheads:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fish Creek WSA 2 ways • Road Canyon WSA 1 way • Mancos Mesa WSA 2 ways • Grand Gulch WSA 2 ways <p>Where routes would remain available for motorized use within WSAs, such use could continue on a conditional basis. Use of the existing routes in the WSAs, ("ways" when located within WSAs – see Glossary) could continue as long as the use of these routes does not impair wilderness suitability, as provided by the IMP (BLM 1995). If Congress designates the area as wilderness, the routes will be closed. In the interim, if use and/or non-compliance are found through monitoring efforts to impair the area's suitability for wilderness designation, BLM would take further action to limit use of the routes, or close them. The continued use of these routes, therefore, is based on user compliance and non-impairment of wilderness values.</p>	<p><u>Limited to Designated Routes:</u> 1,780,807 acres Mountain bike use would be limited to the same designated routes as OHV travel.</p> <p><u>Limited to Designated Routes with Seasonal Restrictions:</u> 0 acres</p>	<p><u>Limited to Designated Routes:</u> 812,679 acres Mountain bike use would be limited to the same designated routes as OHV travel.</p> <p><u>Limited to Designated Routes with Seasonal Restrictions:</u> 0 acres</p>
<p><u>Closed to OHV Use:</u> 276,430 acres To protect the following vegetation study areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bridger Jack Mesa • Lavender Mesa <p>To protect the following cultural, scenic, and recreational values:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Butler Wash ACEC • Cedar Mesa ACEC (partial) • Dark Canyon ACEC • Indian Creek ACEC • Most ROS-P areas <p>San Juan River SRMA SPM-class area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RN-class area on Mancos Mesa <p>Note: Acres may not be additive because of overlap.</p>	<p><u>Closed to OHV Use:</u> 423,698 acres To protect the following vegetation study areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bridger Jack Mesa • Lavender Mesa <p>To protect the following cultural, scenic, and recreational values:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • San Juan River SRMA SPM-class area <p>To protect the following cultural values:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tank Bench C-SMA, Outlaw Canyon • Tank Bench C-SMA, South Cottonwood Wash <p>To protect the wilderness character of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cross Canyon WSA • Squaw and Papoose WSA • Mule Canyon WSA • Fish Creek WSA • Grand Gulch ISA Complex • Road Canyon WSA • Dark Canyon WSA • Indian Creek WSA • Bridger Jack Mesa WSA • Butler Wash WSA • Mancos Mesa WSA • Cheesebox Canyon WSA • South Needles WSA and the Administratively Endorsed Lands that are contiguous to Butler Wash WSA. 	<p><u>Closed to OHV Use:</u> 418,667 acres To protect the following vegetation study areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bridger Jack Mesa • Lavender Mesa <p>To protect the following cultural, scenic, and recreational values:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • San Juan River SRMA (partial) minus CR D4602 (Rincon Rd) is a cherry-stem route <p>To protect the following cultural values:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tank Bench C-SMA, Outlaw Canyon • Tank Bench C-SMA, South Cottonwood Wash <p>To protect wilderness character of the following except for "ways" noted above:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cross Canyon WSA • Squaw and Papoose WSA • Mule Canyon WSA • Fish Creek WSA • Grand Gulch WSA ISA Complex • Road Canyon WSA • Dark Canyon WSA • Indian Creek WSA • Bridger Jack Mesa WSA • Butler Wash WSA • Mancos Mesa WSA • Cheesebox Canyon WSA • South Needles WSA and the Administratively Endorsed Lands that are contiguous to Butler Wash WSA. 	<p><u>Closed to OHV Use:</u> 0 acres</p>	<p><u>Closed to OHV Use:</u> 970,436 acres To protect vegetation study areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bridger Jack Mesa • Lavender Mesa <p>To protect cultural, scenic, and recreational values:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • San Juan River SRMA SPM-class area <p>To protect cultural values:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tank Bench C-SMA, Outlaw Canyon • Tank Bench C-SMA, South Cottonwood Wash <p>To protect wilderness character:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cross Canyon WSA • Squaw and Papoose WSA • Mule Canyon WSA • Fish Creek WSA • Grand Gulch WSA ISA Complex • Road Canyon WSA • Dark Canyon WSA • Indian Creek WSA • Bridger Jack Mesa WSA • Butler Wash WSA • Mancos Mesa WSA • Cheesebox Canyon WSA • South Needles WSA and the Administratively Endorsed Lands that are contiguous to Butler Wash WSA • Non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics as shown in Table 3.19 Lands evaluated for Wilderness Characteristics (page 3-73)

Table 2.1. Summary Table of Alternatives

Miles of Designated Roads on Public Lands within the Monticello PA				
Open B-Class Roads: 890 miles Open D-Class Roads: 2,179 miles Closed D-Class Roads: 0 miles	Open B-Class Roads: 875 miles Open D-Class Roads: 1,521 miles Closed D-Class Roads :780 miles	Open B-Class Roads: 873 miles Open D-Class Roads: 1,947 miles Closed D-Class Roads: 316 miles	Open B-Class Roads: 873 miles Open D-Class Roads: 2,205 miles Closed D-Class Roads: 45 miles	Open B-Class Roads: 875 miles Open D-Class Roads: 1,342 miles Closed D-Class Roads: 959 miles
Special Stipulation Areas within the Limited to Designated Routes Category				
MANAGEMENT COMMON TO ALL ACTION ALTERNATIVES				
Routes in riparian areas designated as Functioning at Risk would be closed if site-specific analysis determines that OHV use is contributing to riparian degradation.				
Arch Canyon (to protect wildlife)				
Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
See also Special Status Species section.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Area would be closed to OHV use. Group size (for non-mechanized, non-motorized) limited to 10 individuals and two groups per day. A permit system would be implemented. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> OHV use would be limited to the designated route to the end of the State Section (T37S R20E Section 16) year-round. The canyon would be closed year-round from the west boundary of the State Section to the end of the route at the National Forest boundary. Group size for OHV use limited to 12 individuals and two groups per day. There would be no limits on non-mechanized, non-motorized group size. A permit system would be implemented for OHV use only. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> OHV use would be limited to designated route year-round. Commercial motorized use would be limited to 12 people per trip and up to 2 trips per day. Private OHV group size would be unlimited. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Area would be closed to OHV use. Group size (for non-mechanized, non-motorized) would be limited to 10 individuals and two groups per day. A permit system would be implemented.
McLoyd Canyon-Moon House (for cultural protection)				
See also Cultural section.	The "way" D4798, which is within Fish Creek WSA, would be closed to motorized use.	No motorized travel would be allowed on northern section of road (approximately 500 feet) D4798, which crosses onto BLM land (and lies within Fish Creek WSA) at the northern State Section boundary.	Travel would be allowed on Road D4798 and would be limited to the designated route (which lies within the Fish Creek WSA).	The "way" D4798, which is within Fish Creek WSA, would be closed to motorized use.
Non-mechanized (e.g., Hiking, Equestrian, and Backpacking)				
MANAGEMENT COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES				
Non-mechanized travel is not restricted on public lands except where limited or prohibited to protect specific resource values, provide for public safety, or maintain an identified opportunity.				
Provide opportunities for non-mechanized travel (hiking) on all routes open to mechanized use. Manage routes identified in each alternative to exclude motorized and mechanized use and provide opportunities for non-mechanized travel independent of motorized and mechanized routes.				
Limit non-mechanized travel on specific lands to designated routes for resource protection purposes.				
Continue to manage non-mechanized travel under the 1991 San Juan RMP (BLM 1991a) and under closure and restriction notices published in the Federal Register under the authority of 43 CFR 8364.				
MANAGEMENT COMMON TO ALL ACTION ALTERNATIVES				
Manage the following trails for non-mechanized use:				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Open to foot travel</u>: Kane Gulch, Todie Canyon, Bullet Canyon, Shieks Canyon, Government Trail, Collins Canyon, Slickhorn Canyon, Point Lookout Canyon, Grand Gulch (from junction to San Juan River), Fish Canyon, Owl Canyon, Road Canyon, McLoyd Canyon, Lime Creek Canyon, North Mule Canyon, South Mule Canyon, Lower Mule Canyon from Comb Wash, Mule Canyon or Cave Canyon Towers, Arch Canyon, Johns Canyon, Honaker Trail, Keeley Trail, Dark Canyon (Sundance Trail), Fable Valley Trail, Salt Creek Mesa Trail, Butler Ruin Interpretative Trail, Sand Island Petroglyph Trail, Shay Canyon Petroglyph Trail, Newspaper Rock Trail, Salvation Knoll Trail, Monarch Cave Trail, Fish Mouth Trail, Cold Springs Trail, Procession Panel Trail, Wolf Man Panel Trail, Moon House Trail, Ball Room Cave Trail. <u>Open for Stock overnight use</u>: Kane Gulch, Bullet Canyon, Government Trail, Collins Canyon, Grand Gulch (from Kane Gulch to the junction of Collins Canyon; no stock below Collins Canyon), Fish Canyon (from Comb Wash to confluence with Owl Canyon), Road Canyon, McLoyd Canyon, Lime Creek Canyon, Lower Mule Canyon from Comb Wash, Arch Canyon, Johns Canyon, Salt Creek Mesa Trail. <u>Open for stock day use</u>: Bullet Canyon (from Grand Gulch to Jailhouse Ruin), Fish Canyon (2 miles above the confluence with Owl Canyon), Owl Canyon (to Neville's Arch), Road Canyon, McLoyd Canyon (to the impassible pour-off), Lime Creek Canyon, Salt Creek Mesa Trail, Monarch Cave Trail, Fish Mouth Trail, Cold Springs Trail, Procession Panel Trail, Wolf Man Panel Trail, Moon House Trail, Ball Room Cave Trail. 				
Non-mechanized routes may be added through subsequent planning at the activity plan level on a case by case basis.				
Indian Creek Climbing Trails would include the following: Bridger Jack Mesa, Super Crack Buttress, Cat Wall, Broken Tooth Wall, Scarface, and Battle of the Bulge.				

Table 2.1. Summary Table of Alternatives

VEGETATION				
GOALS				
<p>Manage vegetation resources for desired future conditions, ensuring ecological diversity, stability, and sustainability, including the desired mix of vegetation types, structural stages, and landscape/riparian/watershed function, and provide for native plant, fish, and wildlife habitats.</p> <p>Provide opportunities for plant material gathering (seed collection, plant collection, etc.) of various vegetation types while protecting other resources.</p> <p>Maintain existing vegetative treatment areas as appropriate.</p> <p>Sustain the integrity of the sagebrush steppe community type to provide the amount, continuity, and quality of habitat that is necessary to maintain sustainable populations of sage-grouse and other sagebrush obligate species.</p> <p>Control invasive and non-native weed species and prevent the introduction of new invasive species through the implementation of a comprehensive weed program, including coordination with partners; prevention and early detection; education; inventory and monitoring; and principles of integrated weed management.</p> <p>Control invasive and non-native weed species and prevent the introduction of new invasive species through the implementation of the BLM National Strategy and Action Plan as outlined in documents such as, "Pulling Together: National Strategy for Invasive Plant Management Initiative" and "Partners Against Weeds" (1994).</p> <p>Control insect pest species as necessary to protect vegetation resources in conjunction with Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS).</p>				
MANAGEMENT COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES				
<p>Areas that meet Utah's Rangeland Health Standards would be open to seed gathering and plant collection, including commercial seed gathering.</p> <p>Seed gathering would be managed according to Utah BLM guidance for Seed Collection Policy and Pricing (as amended).</p> <p>1.3.1 Guidance for Addressing Sagebrush Habitat Conservation (November, 2004) as described in BLM's National Sage-grouse Habitat Conservation Strategy (WO-IM-2005-024) would be implemented.</p> <p>Necessary vegetation information would be gathered and monitoring continued to assess if planning objectives are being met.</p> <p>Invasive and non-native weed species (as identified in Table 3.56, Invasive and Noxious Weeds of San Juan County) would be controlled, and the infestation and spread of new invasive species prevented through cooperative agreements, implementing the principles in BLM weed management policies and action plans.</p> <p>Poisonous plant species would be controlled as necessary based on site-specific needs.</p> <p>Cooperating agreements with other federal, state, local, and private organizations would be developed to control invasive non-native species, control insect pest species, and implement fuels vegetation treatments and WUI risk assessments and management.</p> <p>Vegetation treatments from Utah ROD for the 1991 Vegetation EIS [as amended by Vegetation Treatments Using Herbicides on Bureau of Land Management Lands in 17 Western States PEIS (2007)] would be incorporated.</p> <p>Upland areas would be managed to achieve DFC.</p> <p>Unnecessary social trails would be minimized throughout the PA.</p> <p>Pack stock and riding stock users on BLM-administered land would be required to use certified weed-free feed.</p> <p>Restoration/rehabilitation activities would be required to use certified weed-free seed mixes, mulch, fill, etc.</p> <p>The power washing of equipment used for permitted uses may be required to help control noxious weeds.</p>				
MANAGEMENT COMMON TO ALL ACTION ALTERNATIVES				
<p>Implement 30,000 to 50,000 acres of vegetation treatments in Fire Regime Condition Class III areas over a 15-year period.</p> <p>The following sagebrush communities would be prioritized for treatment: Harts Draw, Beef Basin, Black Mesa, Alkali, Mustang, Cedar Point, Shay Mesa, and all areas with Gunnison sage-grouse habitat.</p> <p>Treat greasewood in Comb Wash, Butler Wash, Montezuma, East Canyon, Indian Creek, South and North Cottonwood Wash, and Cross Canyon to improve ground cover, biodiversity, and water quality.</p>				
Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Preferred)	Alternative D	Alternative E
Maintain existing land treatments and provide new land treatments; apply RMP stipulations and special conditions through NEPA documentation (232,130 acres).	<p>Maintain an estimated 1,000 acres/year of existing land treatments and implement new vegetation treatments to restore ecosystem health, functioning condition, etc. in the following vegetation cover types:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • sagebrush 1,000 acres/year • weed treatments 3,000 acres/year • pinyon-juniper 2,000 acres/year • riparian 500 acres/year • greasewood 100 acres/year 	<p>Maintain an estimated 1,500 acres/year of existing land treatments and implement new vegetation treatments to restore ecosystem health, functioning condition, etc. in the following vegetation cover types:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • sagebrush 1,500 acres/year • weed treatments 3,000 acres/year • pinyon-juniper 3,000 acres/year • riparian 100 acres/year • greasewood 200 acres/year 	<p>Maintain an estimated 2,000 acres/year of existing land treatments and implement new vegetation treatments to restore ecosystem health, functioning condition, etc. in the following vegetation cover types:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • sagebrush 2,000 acres/year • weed treatments 3,000 acres/year • pinyon-juniper 4,000 acres/year • riparian 100 acres/year • greasewood 200 acres/year 	<p>Same as Alternative B except for non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be managed as unavailable for mineral leasing, closed to OHV use, proposed for withdrawal from mineral entry, right-of-way exclusion area, unavailable for disposal of mineral materials, unavailable for private and commercial woodland harvest, and managed as VRM Class I, Land treatments would be maintained with non-surface disturbing techniques.</p>

Table 2.1. Summary Table of Alternatives

VISUAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT (VRM)				
<p>GOALS Designate VRM classes. Manage activities consistent with VRM Management Class objectives.</p> <p>MANAGEMENT COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES All permitted activities would have to comply with VRM management class objectives, unless a waiver, exemption, or modification is granted by the Authorized Officer. WSAs would be managed as VRM Class I. Allow for recreational viewing platforms and special recreation facilities in all high scenic areas. VRM classifications need to match Minimum Impact Criteria.</p> <p>MANAGEMENT COMMON TO ALL ACTION ALTERNATIVES Visual resources would be managed as the VRM inventory class (see Maps 55–59) unless specified otherwise in the management prescriptions. In areas available for oil and gas leasing subject to standard lease terms or available to oil and gas leasing subject to Timing and CSU, visual resources would be managed as VRM Class III or IV (depending on inventory) unless otherwise specified in the management prescriptions. Areas that inventory as VRM Class II but are in areas that are available for oil and gas leasing subject to standard lease terms or available to oil and gas leasing subject to Timing and Controlled Surface Use would be managed as VRM Class III unless otherwise specified in the management prescriptions below. Wild segments of a WSR would be managed as VRM Class I. Scenic segments of a WSR would be managed as VRM Class II. Recreation segments of a WSR would be managed as the same VRM class as surrounding land. High-volume film areas should be visually protected for filming. Actions would be mitigated to reduce visual impacts in those areas. Visual Impact analysis would use GIS technology.</p>				
(Lists below are not meant to be inclusive – See Maps 55-59 and Matrix)				
Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Preferred)	Alternative D	Alternative E
<p>371,575 acres would be managed as VRM Class I.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Monticello FO manages 13 wilderness study areas (387,410 acres): Mancos Mesa (51,440 acres), Grand Gulch ISA Complex (37,810), Road Canyon (52,420), Fish Creek Canyon (46,440), Mule Canyon (5,990), Cheesebox Canyon (15,410), Dark Canyon ISA Complex (62,040), Butler Wash (22,030), Bridger Jack Mesa (5,290), Indian Creek (6,870), South Needles (160), Squaw and Papoose Canyons (6,560), Cross Canyon (1,000). Castle Creek, Horse Pasture, and Steer Pasture Moqui Canyon; south end of Mancos Mesa Scenic Highway Corridor ACEC to the intersection with Natural Bridges 	<p>497,668 acres would be managed as VRM Class I.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> WSAs (same as Alternative A) <p><u>Potential ACECs:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Butler Wash North Dark Canyon Lockhart Basin Valley of the Gods Indian Creek San Juan River sections 3 and 5 <p><u>WSRs:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dark Canyon WSR Colorado Number 3 	<p>425,179 acres would be managed as VRM Class I.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> WSAs (same as Alternative A) <p><u>Potential ACECs:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Valley of the Gods Indian Creek San Juan River sections 3 and 5 <p><u>WSRs:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dark Canyon WSR Colorado River Number 3 	<p>390,424 acres would be managed as VRM Class I.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> WSAs (same as Alternative A) 	<p>998,370 acres would be managed as VRM Class I.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> WSAs (same as Alternative A) <p>Non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics: (Total acres 582,360), Arch Canyon (50), Bridger Jack Mesa (23050), Butler Wash (1660), Cheesebox Canyon (13240), Comb Ridge (13,760), Cross Canyon (1350), Dark Canyon (66330), Fish and Owl Creeks (24650), Fort Knocker Canyon (12410), Gooseneck (3570), Grand Gulch (55240), Gravel and Long Canyons (36890), Hammond Canyon (4700), Harmony Flat (9660), Harts Point (24740), Hatch Lockhart (1760), Indian Creek (23260), Lime Creek (5560), Mancos Mesa (61570), Nokai Dome (94270), Red Rock Plateau (17010), Road Canyon (11320), San Juan River (14340), Shay Mountain (6710), Sheep Canyon (4000), Squaw and Papoose Canyon (3570), Upper Red Canyon (24920), Valley of the Gods (13670), White Canyon (9080)</p>
<p>355,112 acres would be managed as VRM Class II.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sweet Alice South/Ruin Canyon North of Highway 95 in the Comb Ridge Area South Cottonwood, east of Black Mesa Road Clay Hill's Crossing (west end to state land) and the southern polygon (as shown on Map 55) Highway 276 National Bridges area east, and southwest of UT 95 and 261 junction. Mesa shoulders for Tables of the Sun 	<p>250,641 acres would be managed as VRM Class II.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Castle Creek, Horse Pasture, and Steer Pasture <p><u>Potential ACECs:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bridger Jack Mesa Lavender Mesa Shay Canyon San Juan River section 1 Colorado River #2 <p><u>WSRs:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Colorado Number 2 Fable Valley 	<p>132,001 acres would be managed as VRM Class II.</p> <p><u>Potential ACECs:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lavender Mesa Shay Canyon San Juan River (portions) <p><u>WSRs:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Colorado River Number 2. Southern boundary of Indian Creek east to rims is the northern boundary, and the southern boundary is Forest Service northern boundary. On the east, the canyon rims then west to Highway 211. 	<p>8,838 acres would be managed same as VRM Class II.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> San Juan River (portions) 	<p>111,478 acres would be managed same as VRM Class II.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Castle Creek, Horse Pasture, and Steer Pasture <p><u>Potential ACECs:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bridger Jack Mesa Lavender Mesa Shay Canyon San Juan River section 1 Colorado River Number 2 <p><u>WSRs:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Colorado Number 2 Fable Valley

Table 2.1. Summary Table of Alternatives

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Castle Creek, Horse Pasture, and Steer Pasture. • Old Scenic Highway Corridor ACEC (from west to east) to the intersection with Natural Bridges. • Comb Ridge south of Highway 95, except for proposed campgrounds and Butler Wash OHV area. • Highway 276 to Clay Hills Crossing (as shown on Map 57). • Mesa tops for Tables of the Sun. 		
<p>416,806 acres would be managed as VRM Class III.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Southern boundary of Indian Creek east to rims is the northern boundary, and the southern boundary is Forest Service northern boundary. On the east the canyon rims then west to Highway 211. • Arch Canyon. 	<p>426,350 acres would be managed as VRM Class III.</p> <p><u>Potential ACECs:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alkali Ridge. • Cedar Mesa (outside of WSAs). • Hovenweep. • San Juan River sections 2 and 4. <p><u>WSRs:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Colorado River Number 1 • Indian Creek • Arch Canyon • San Juan River sections 1, 2, and 4 	<p>531,920 acres would be managed as VRM Class III.</p> <p><u>Potential ACECs:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hovenweep • San Juan River sections 2 and 4 • Cedar Mesa (C-SRMA) portions • Lockhart Basin • Sweet Alice South / Ruin Canyon • Moqui Canyon • Bridger Jack Mesa from mesa top to ATV trails/roads on west, north, and sides, and on the east to the private land boundary. • Shay Mesa (119 acres) and areas for proposed campgrounds, parking lots and associated facilities. • North of Highway 95 in the Comb Ridge Area • South Cottonwood east of Black Mesa Road. • Clay Hill's Crossing (west end to state land), and the southern polygon (as shown on Map 57) southwest of D2621 and D3514. • Highway 276 National Bridges area east, and southwest of UT 95 and 261 junction. • Portions of Cedar Mesa area. • Tables of the Sun-shoulders of the mesa. 	<p>692,741 acres would be managed as VRM Class III.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Castle Creek, Horse Pasture, Steer Pasture • Sweet Alice South/Ruin Canyon • Moqui Canyon, south end of Mancos Mesa • North of Highway 95 in the Comb Ridge area • South Cottonwood, east of Black Mesa Road. • Clay Hill's Crossing (west end to state land) and the southern polygon (as shown on Map 58). • Highway 276 National Bridges area east, and southwest of UT 95 and 261 junction. • Shoulders of the mesa of Tables of the Sun • Southern boundary of Indian Creek east to rims is the northern boundary, and the southern boundary is Forest Service northern boundary. On the east the canyon rims then west to Highway 211. • Comb Ridge south of Highway 95 except for proposed campgrounds and Butler Wash OHV area. • Old Scenic Highway Corridor ACEC (from west to east) to the intersection with Natural Bridges. • Arch Canyon. 	<p>264,369 acres would be managed as VRM Class III.</p> <p><u>Potential ACECs:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alkali Ridge • Cedar Mesa (outside of WSAs) • Hovenweep • San Juan River sections 2 and 4 <p><u>WSRs:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Colorado River Number 1. • Indian Creek. • Arch Canyon. • San Juan River sections 1, 2, and 4.
<p>637,875 acres would be managed as VRM Class IV.</p>	<p>608,463 acres would be managed as VRM Class IV.</p>	<p>693,995 acres would be managed as VRM Class IV.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Portions of Cedar Mesa areas as inventoried. <p><u>Potential ACECs:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alkali Ridge. 	<p>691,119 acres would be managed as VRM Class IV.</p>	<p>407,459 acres would be managed as VRM Class IV.</p>

WILDLIFE AND FISHERIES RESOURCES

GOALS

- Maintain, protect, and enhance habitats to support natural wildlife diversity, reproductive capability, and a healthy, self-sustaining population of wildlife and fish species.
- Recognize crucial and non-fragmented habitats as management priorities.
- Maintain or improve vegetation condition and/or avoid long-term disturbance in habitat sites for wildlife and fish species.
- Minimize long-term habitat fragmentation as much as possible through avoidance and site-specific reclamation to provide habitat quality and quantity adequate to fulfill the life history requirements and to support a natural diversity of species.
- Maintain and enhance aquatic and wildlife resources, and provide for biological diversity of plants and wildlife resources while ensuring healthy ecosystems.

MANAGEMENT COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES

Migratory Birds

Comply with the Migratory Treaty Bird Act and implement the Executive Order 13186 ("Responsibilities of Federal Agencies to Protect Migratory Birds") during all activities to protect habitat for migratory birds. Management would emphasize birds listed on the current USFWS "Birds of Conservation Concern" (2002 or as updated) and Partners-in-Flight priority species (as updated). As specific habitat needs and population distribution to Birds of Conservation Concern and Partners-in-Flight priority species the Partners-In-Flight Avian Conservation Strategy (UDWR, 2000, as updated) priority species are identified, BLM would use adaptive management strategies to further conserve habitat and avoid impacts to these species.

During nesting season for migratory birds (May 1–July 30), avoid surface-disturbing activities and vegetative-altering projects and broad-scale use of pesticides in identified occupied priority migratory bird habitat.

Prioritize the maintenance and/or improvement of lowland riparian, wetlands, and low and high desert scrub communities, which are the four most important and used habitat types by migratory birds in the Monticello PA.

Prevent the spread of invasive and non-native plants, especially cheatgrass, saltcedar, and Russian olive. Strive for a dense understory of native species with a reduction in salt cedar and improvement of cottonwood and willow regeneration.

Table 2.1. Summary Table of Alternatives

As a supplement to comply with Executive Order 13186, the Bird Habitat Conservation Areas identified in the Coordinated Implementation Plan for Bird Conservation in Utah (2005, or as updated), would receive priority for conducting bird habitat conservation projects through cooperative funding initiatives such as the Intermountain West Joint Venture.

Raptors
Raptor management would be guided by the use of Best Management Practices for Raptors and Their Associated Habitats in Utah (Utah BLM, 2006, Appendix M), utilizing seasonal and spatial buffers, as well as mitigation, to maintain and enhance raptor nesting and foraging habitat, while allowing other resource uses.
Cooperate with utility companies, UDWR, and USFWS to prevent electrocution of raptors.
Temporarily close areas (amount of time depends on species) near raptor nests to rock climbers or other activities if activity may result in nest abandonment.

Bighorn Sheep
Five mesa tops (56,740 acres) within the crucial bighorn sheep habitat have been identified as areas of potential conflict between bighorn and activities that cause surface disturbance resulting in permanent loss of bighorn sheep habitat. Bighorn sheep habitat improvement projects would be prioritized in these areas.
On-site mitigation would be required for projects that disturb or remove forage and browse species used by desert bighorn sheep; the purpose of the mitigation would be to replace the forage lost. Livestock grazing and associated range improvement projects would not be allowed on the five mesa tops.
Any future proposal for a change in kind of livestock from cattle to sheep in crucial desert bighorn sheep habitat would be denied in order to prevent competition for forage and the transmission of disease from domestic to wild sheep.
Adhere to the recommendations in the BLM Bighorn Sheep Rangeland Management Plan (BLM 1993c, as revised); and the Utah BLM Statewide Desert Bighorn Sheep Management Plan, 1996 (as revised), where practicable.

Introduction, Transplantation, Augmentation, and Reestablishment
BLM would continue to cooperate with and provide support to UDWR in reintroducing native fish and wildlife species into historic or suitable ranges, as determined appropriate through case-by-case NEPA analysis.
Introduction, transplantation, augmentation, and re-establishment of both native and naturalized species would be considered and would include but may not be limited to pronghorn, desert bighorn sheep, wild turkey, beaver, chukar, Colorado River cutthroat trout, and Endangered Colorado River fish species.

Animal Damage Control
Predator management would continue to be coordinated with APHIS and UDWR, and would be conducted utilizing the guidance provided by the existing MOU with APHIS.

Habitat Improvements and Protection
In areas lacking proper water distribution or natural water sources, allow for installation of precipitation catchments (guzzlers) or the development of springs on rangelands.
Adhere to BLM fence standards to allow wildlife movement when fences are being developed or maintained.
Wildlife habitat objectives would be considered in all reclamation activity. Priority would be given to meeting Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Grazing Management (BLM 1997).
Adhere to the recommendations in the BLM Habitat Management Guides for the American Pronghorn Antelope (1980 as revised), wherever practicable.
Ground-disturbing and permitted activities carried out in all seasonal wildlife protection areas would be subject to special conditions regulating use during certain seasons. These seasonal conditions would not impact maintenance and operation activities for mineral production or hunting during a recognized hunting season established by the UDWR.
Recognize 17,300 acres as allotted to wildlife (parts of the slopes of Peter's Canyon and East Canyon).
Ground-disturbing actions in crucial habitats would be avoided where practical. Where unavoidable disturbances are required, BLM would follow BLM Washington Office Guidance (IM 2005-069) on application of compensatory measures.
In all seasonal wildlife protection areas, the Field Manager may grant exceptions on a case-by case basis during any year if it can be shown that 1) legal rights would be curtailed; 2) the animals are not present in the specific project location; or 3) the activity can be conducted so as not to adversely impact the animals.

Seasonal Wildlife Protection Areas
In addition to any other special conditions that may be in effect, crucial big game habitats are subject to special conditions regulating use during certain seasons. These seasonal conditions would not impact maintenance and operation activities for mineral production or hunting during a recognized hunting season established by the UDWR. The Area Manager may grant exceptions on a case-by-case basis during any year if it can be shown that 1) legal rights would be curtailed; 2) the animals are not present in a specific project location; or 3) the activity can be conducted so as not to adversely impact the animals.

Alternative A (No Action) (see rows below for species)	Alternative B (see rows below for species)	Alternative C (Preferred) (see rows below for species)	Alternative D (see rows below for species)	Alternative E (see rows below for species)
Unspecified.	Special conditions for the seasonal wildlife protection areas include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All land use authorizations, with the exception of woodland harvest, would be required to conform to seasonal, noise, and disturbance restrictions outlined below. Closed to the following uses during the established season: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No oil and gas exploration, drilling and production activities or geophysical work. ▪ No permitted or commercial OHV use. ▪ No use of pyrotechnics, shooting, etc. during permitted filming because of noise impacts. ▪ No use of low-flying aircraft. 	Same as Alternative B, except: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Permitted or commercial OHV use may be limited in number of participants and duration depending on the event. 	Same as Alternative B, except: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All land use authorizations, with the exception of woodland harvest, would be required to conform to seasonal and noise and disturbance restrictions outlined below. 	Same as Alternative B.

Table 2.1. Summary Table of Alternatives

<p><u>Bighorn Sheep Lambing and Rutting Areas</u> Part of the 329,750-acre bighorn crucial habitat area falls in ROS classes P and SPNM. The following special conditions are in addition to the ROS special conditions, which take precedence. Crucial bighorn sheep habitat would be closed to certain surface uses during the lambing season (April 1–July 15) and the rutting (mating) season (October 15–December 31). During these periods, no oil and gas leasing activities, geophysical work, or OHV use may take place. Mining activities during these periods would require an approved plan of operations. Any future proposal for a change in kind of livestock from cattle to sheep in crucial desert bighorn sheep habitat would be denied in order to prevent competition for forage and the transmission of disease from domestic to wild sheep.</p>	<p>Adhere to special conditions (above) on 453,388 acres from April 1 to July 15 for lambing, and from October 15 to December 31 for rutting.</p>	<p>Adhere to special conditions (above) on 415,395 acres from April 1 to June 15 for lambing, and on 453,390 acres from October 15 to December 15 for rutting.</p>	<p>Adhere to special conditions (above) on 299,009 acres from April 1 to June 15 for lambing, and October 15 to December 15 for rutting.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative B.</p>
<p><u>Pronghorn Fawning Area</u> The antelope crucial habitat area would not subject to the ROS special conditions. Use within the 12,960-acre crucial antelope habitat would be closed to certain surface uses during the fawning season (May 15–June 15). During this period, no oil and gas leasing activity, geophysical work, or OHV use may take place. Mining activities during this period would require an approved plan of operations.</p>	<p>Adhere to special conditions (above) on 29,365 acres from May 1 to June 15.</p>	<p>Adhere to special conditions (above) on 29,365 acres from May 1 to June 15.</p>	<p>Adhere to special conditions (above) on 13,961 acres from May 1 to June 15.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative B.</p>
<p><u>Grazing Management in Pronghorn Ranges</u> No current prescription.</p>	<p>Spring grazing (April 15–June 15) would be eliminated in allotments within antelope habitat and livestock utilization levels would not exceed 50% or current year's growth to encourage forb production and provide adequate cover for newborn fawns. This would include the following grazing allotments: Mail Station, Upper Mail Station, Dry Valley/Deer Neck, Lone Cedar, Tank Draw, and Hart Draw.</p>	<p>Current livestock-grazing prescriptions would continue and, where opportunities exist, would be adjusted to enhance forb production on pronghorn ranges. This would include the following grazing allotments: Mail Station, Upper Mail Station, Dry Valley/Deer Neck, Lone Cedar, Tank Draw, and Hart Draw.</p>	<p>Prescriptive livestock grazing would be used to favor forb production on pronghorn ranges. This would include the following grazing allotments: Mail Station, Upper Mail Station, Dry Valley/Deer Neck, Lone Cedar, Tank Draw, and Hart Draw.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative B.</p>
<p><u>Deer Winter Range</u> Part of the deer crucial winter range areas fall in ROS class SPNM. The following special conditions are in addition to the ROS special conditions, which take precedence. Use within the 197,550-acre crucial deer winter habitat areas would be closed to certain surface uses during periods of critical winter use (December 15–April 30). During this period, no oil and gas leasing activities, geophysical work, or OHV use may take place. Mining activities during this period would require an approved plan of operations. Certain sagebrush parks within crucial deer winter range areas (9,800 acres) have been identified as providing a concentrated food source for wintering deer. Large-scale sagebrush removal could cause a substantial loss of winter forage. The areas fall within various ROS classes; the following special conditions, which take precedence, are in addition to the ROS special conditions: Land treatments would be considered on a case-by-case basis.</p>	<p>Adhere to special conditions (above) on 785,921 acres from November 1 to May 15.</p>	<p>Adhere to special conditions (above) on 266,406 acres from November 15 to April 15.</p>	<p>Adhere to special conditions (above) on 182,315 acres from December 1 to April 15.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative B.</p>

Table 2.1. Summary Table of Alternatives

<p>Elk Winter Range No identified crucial elk habitat.</p>	<p>Adhere to special conditions (above) on 191,173 acres from November 1 to May 15.</p>	<p>Adhere to special conditions (above) on 97,471 acres from November 15 to April 15.</p>	<p>Adhere to special conditions (above) on 62,484 acres from December 1 to April 15.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative B.</p>
<p>WOODLANDS</p>				
<p>GOALS Manage woodlands for DFC, ensuring ecological diversity, stability, and sustainability (including the desired mix of structural stages and landscape/watershed functions), and provide for native plant and wildlife habitats. Provide woodland products on a sustainable basis to meet local needs where such use does not limit the accomplishment of goals for the management of other resources. Provide opportunities for pine nut gathering on a sustainable basis while protecting other resources. Encourage, where feasible, the harvest of woodland products in areas of proposed or existing vegetative treatments to lessen the need for additional treatment or land disturbance, and in areas that need restoration for ecological benefits (for example, <i>Pinus edulis</i>). Use the document, "Recommended Old-Growth Definitions and Description, USDA Forest Service Southwestern Region (Sept. 1992)." Identify, maintain, and restore forest and woodland old-growth stands to a pre-fire suppression condition. The Monticello FO would adopt the USFS old growth definitions and identification standards as per the USFS document "Characteristics of Old-Growth Forests in the Intermountain Region (April 1993)" in instances where the area of application in the previous document doesn't apply (for example, pinyon pine).</p>				
<p>MANAGEMENT COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES Implement the Healthy Forest Initiative and the Healthy Forest Restoration Act of 2003. Follow National BLM Forest Health and Forest Management Standards and Guidelines to assess conditions and guide management decisions for woodland resources. Prioritize treatment in high-value/high-risk areas (WUI, developed recreation facilities including campgrounds, FRCC III). Allow live woodland harvest in areas with pinyon pine and juniper encroachment with focus on sagebrush steppe community. Fuel treatment projects would allow for harvest of woodland products. The Field Manager may approve exceptions to these specific management prescriptions on a case-by-case basis if sufficient justification exists to show the prescription is not needed (e.g., granting an exception to a seasonal use requirement if a protected wildlife species is not using crucial habitat in a specific year). Permits for private and/or commercial use of woodland products would continue to be issued to the public, consistent with the availability of woodland products and the protection of other resource values. Cottonwood and willow harvest would be allowed for Native American ceremonial uses only. Restrictions on harvest would be implemented as necessary to achieve or maintain PFC, and maintain or improve TES/SSS habitat. Harvest would be administered under a permit system.</p> <p>MANAGEMENT COMMON TO ALL ACTION ALTERNATIVES Harvest woodland products (per table below) subject to the following exceptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exclude from woodland product use except for limited on-site collection of dead wood for campfires in all WSAs, Arch Canyon, Alkali Ridge NHL, Grand Gulch NHD (mesa top), Beef Basin, Fable Valley, Comb Ridge CSRMA (south of Highway 95), San Juan River SRMA. • Exclude floodplains, riparian/aquatic areas from woodland product use except for limited on-site collection of driftwood for campfires, and uses for Native American ceremonial purposes as determined on site specific basis. Cottonwood and willow harvest would be allowed for Native American ceremonial uses only. Restrictions on harvest would be implemented as necessary to achieve or maintain PFC, and maintain or improve TES/SSS habitat. Harvest would be administered under a permit system. • Exclude from all woodland product use, including on-site collection of dead wood for campfires, all developed recreation sites, livestock/wildlife enclosures, and cultural sites, Indian Creek Corridor, McLoyd Canyon-Moon House Ruin, Grand Gulch Plateau CSRMA (in-canyon), Grand Gulch NHD (in canyon). • Limitations on off-road travel for wood gathering would be modified as necessary to maintain long-term sustainability or facilitate wood gathering where resource impacts are not a concern. • Permits would be limited and/or areas closed, as necessary, to maintain sustainability and protect resources. 				
<p>Alternative A (No Action)</p>	<p>Alternative B</p>	<p>Alternative C (Preferred)</p>	<p>Alternative D</p>	<p>Alternative E</p>
<p>Zones in Field Office <i>considered</i> for private and/or commercial use of woodland products: East Canyon; Harts Draw; Salt Creek Mesa; Dark Canyon Plateau; White Canyon; Cedar Mesa; North Comb Ridge; South Cottonwood; and Montezuma Watershed (Maps 77–80).</p>				
<p>Areas <i>not</i> identified in zones below would be unavailable for private and/or commercial use of woodland products. However, pinyon pine nut gathering would not be restricted. For Alternative E, all non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics will not be available for woodland product use in Alternative E.</p>				
<p>East Canyon Zone was not addressed in the 1991 San Juan Resource Area RMP, as amended.</p>	<p>East Canyon (64,559 acres) Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland products with permitted off-road travel within 150 feet of designated routes to collect wood. Peter's Point Seasonal restriction on private and/or commercial use of woodland products in the deer and elk winter range from November 1 to May 15. Big Indian, East Canyon, Peters Canyon Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland products with permitted off-road travel to collect wood.</p>	<p>East Canyon (64,559 acres) Peter's Point Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland products with permitted off-road travel to collect wood. Big Indian, East Canyon, Peters Canyon Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland products with permitted off-road travel to collect wood.</p>	<p>East Canyon (64,559 acres) Peter's Point Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland products with permitted off-road travel to collect wood. Big Indian, East Canyon, Peters Canyon Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland products with permitted off-road travel to collect wood.</p>	<p>East Canyon (64,559 acres) Same as Alternative B. Same as Alternative B.</p>

Table 2.1. Summary Table of Alternatives

	NE of Monticello, South Canyon Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland products with permitted off-road travel to collect wood.	NE of Monticello, South Canyon Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland products with permitted off-road travel to collect wood.	NE of Monticello, South Canyon Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland products with permitted off-road travel to collect wood.	Same as Alternative B.
Harts Draw Zone was not addressed in the 1991 San Juan Resource Area RMP, as amended.	Harts Point, Harts Draw, Shay Mesa, Photograph Gap/ Lone Cedar 64,671 Acres Seasonal restriction on private and/or commercial use of woodland products in the deer and elk winter range from November 1 to May 15, and antelope fawning habitat from April 15 to June 30.	Harts Point, Harts Draw, Shay Mesa, Photograph Gap/ Lone Cedar 64,671 Acres Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland products with permitted off-road travel within 150 feet of designated routes to collect wood.	Harts Point, Harts Draw, Shay Mesa, Photograph Gap/ Lone Cedar 64,671 Acres Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland products with permitted off-road travel to collect wood.	Harts Draw 51,743 Acres Same as Alternative B.
Salt Creek Mesa Zone was not addressed in the 1991 San Juan Resource Area RMP, as amended.	Salt Creek Mesa 5,271 Acres Seasonal restriction on private and/or commercial use of woodland products in the deer and elk winter range from November 1 to May 15.	Salt Creek Mesa 5,271 Acres Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland products with permitted off-road travel to collect wood.	Salt Creek Mesa 5,271 Acres Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland products with permitted off-road travel to collect wood.	Salt Creek Mesa 5,136 Acres Same as Alternative B.
Dark Canyon Plateau Zone was not addressed in the 1991 San Juan Resource Area RMP, as amended.	Dark Canyon Plateau 23,288 Acres Seasonal restriction on private and/or commercial use of woodland products in the deer and elk winter range from November 1 to May 15.	Dark Canyon Plateau 23,288 Acres Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland products with permitted off-road travel within 150 feet of designated routes and permitted off-road travel in chained areas to collect wood.	Dark Canyon Plateau 23,288 Acres Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland products with permitted off-road travel to collect wood.	Dark Canyon Plateau 2,015 Acres Same as Alternative B.
White Canyon Zone was not addressed in the 1991 San Juan Resource Area RMP, as amended.	White Canyon (255,267 acres) Wooden Shoe, Deer Flat, Horse Flat, extending out towards Jacob's Chair, Pinyon Point Seasonal restriction on private and/or commercial use of woodland products in the deer and elk winter range from November 1 to May 15, and Bighorn sheep lambing and rutting areas from October 15 to December 31, and April 1 through July 15. Moss Back Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland products with permitted off-road travel within 150 feet of designated routes to collect wood. Grand Flats Seasonal restriction on private and/or commercial use of woodland products in the deer and elk winter range November 1 to May 15, and in bighorn sheep habitat from April 1 through July 15.	White Canyon (255,267 acres) Wooden Shoe, Deer Flat, Horse Flat, extending out towards Jacob's Chair, Pinyon Point Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland products with permitted off-road travel within 150 feet of designated routes and permitted off-road travel in chained areas to collect wood. Moss Back Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland products with permitted off-road travel within 150 feet of designated routes to collect wood. Grand Flats Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland products with permitted off-road travel within 150 feet of designated routes to collect wood.	White Canyon (255,267 acres) Wooden Shoe, Deer Flat, Horse Flat, extending out towards Jacob's Chair, Pinyon Point Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland products with permitted off-road travel to collect wood. Moss Back Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland products with permitted off-road travel to collect wood. Grand Flats Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland products with permitted off-road travel to collect wood.	White Canyon (177,587 acres) Same as Alternative B. Same as Alternative B. Same as Alternative B.
Cedar Mesa Zone was not addressed in the 1991 San Juan Resource Area RMP, as amended.	Cedar Mesa (outside of WSA)(0 Acres) Closed.	Cedar Mesa (outside of WSA) (65,807 acres) Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland products, limited to designated routes, dependent on cultural Class III surveys.	Cedar Mesa (outside of WSA) (65,807 acres) Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland products, limited to designated routes, dependent on cultural Class III surveys.	Cedar Mesa (outside of WSA) (0 acres) Closed.
North Comb Ridge Zone was not addressed in the 1991 San Juan Resource Area RMP, as amended.	North of Highway 95 (North Comb) (5,670 acres) Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland products, limited to designated routes, dependent on cultural Class III surveys.	North of Highway 95 (North Comb) (5,833 acres) Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland products, limited to designated routes, dependent on cultural Class III surveys.	North of Highway 95 (North Comb) (5,833 acres) Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland products, limited to designated routes, dependent on cultural Class III surveys.	North Comb Ridge (5,666 acres) Same as Alternative B.
South Cottonwood Zone was not addressed in the 1991 San Juan Resource Area RMP, as amended.	South Cottonwood (108,719 acres) Texas Flat Seasonal restriction on private and/or commercial use of woodland products in the deer and elk winter range from November 1 to May 15.	South Cottonwood (117,399 acres) Texas Flat Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland products with permitted off-road travel within 150 feet of designated routes and permitted off-road travel in chained areas to collect wood.	South Cottonwood (117,399 acres) Texas Flat Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland products with permitted off-road travel to collect wood.	South Cottonwood (104,017 acres) Same as Alternative B.

Table 2.1. Summary Table of Alternatives

	<p>Brushy Basin, Black Mesa, Little Baullies, Upper South Cottonwood Seasonal restriction on private and/or commercial use of woodland products in the deer and elk winter range from November 1 to May 15.</p>	<p>Brushy Basin, Black Mesa, Little Baullies, Upper South Cottonwood Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland products with permitted off-road travel within 150 feet of designated routes and permitted off-road travel in chained areas to collect wood.</p>	<p>Brushy Basin, Black Mesa, Little Baullies, Upper South Cottonwood Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland products with permitted off-road travel to collect wood.</p>	Same as Alternative B.
<p>Montezuma Watershed Zone (249,673 acres) was not addressed in the 1991 San Juan Resource Area RMP, as amended.</p>	<p>Montezuma Watershed (202,630 acres) Seasonal restriction on private and/or commercial use of woodland products in the deer and elk winter range from November 1 to May 15. Limited to designated routes, dependent on cultural Class III surveys.</p>	<p>Montezuma Watershed (239,841 acres) Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland products, limited to designated routes, dependent on cultural Class III surveys. Permitted off-road travel would be allowed only in chained areas.</p>	<p>Montezuma Watershed (239,841 acres) Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland products, limited to designated routes, dependent on cultural Class III surveys.</p>	<p>Montezuma Watershed (197,753 acres) Same as Alternative B.</p>

2.2 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS

Table 2.2 provides a comparative summary of the environmental impacts associated with each alternative. BLM evaluated the environmental impacts that would result from the implementation of the various management decisions proposed under the five alternatives described above. Alternative A (No Action), a continuation of the existing 1991 San Juan RMP, is presented for comparison to the action alternatives.

Impacts are defined as modifications to the existing environment brought about by implementing an alternative. Impacts can be beneficial or adverse, result from the action directly or indirectly, and can be long-term, short-term, or cumulative in nature. Direct impacts are caused by the action and occur at the same time and place. Indirect impacts are caused by the action and are later in time or farther removed in distance, but are still reasonably foreseeable (CEQ 1508.8). Cumulative impacts are impacts on the environment that result from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions (CEQ 1508.7). If impacts are not discussed, the analysis has indicated that none would occur or their magnitude would be negligible. Impacts from actions to be carried out under more than one alternative are discussed under the first applicable alternative. Cumulative impacts are discussed in Chapter 4 for all of the resources instead of under each resource section.

Table 2.2. Summary of Impacts

AIR QUALITY					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
Fire Management	Short-term air quality impacts include and increase in PM _{2.5} particulate and CO ₂ emissions specific to the burn area and locations downwind. Long-term, direct air-quality impacts include a general increase in airborne particulate materials from the burn site as a result of ash dispersion and transport.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Minerals and Energy Resources	Impacts of mineral extraction management decisions on air quality under Alternative A would maintain existing levels of use without additional constraints and not exceed NAAQS.	Impacts of mineral extraction management decisions under Alternative B would result in a reduction of approximately 9% in opportunities for oil and gas extraction as compared to Alternative A, with impacts on NAAQS similar to or slightly lower than Alternative A.	Impacts of mineral extraction management decisions under Alternative C would result in an increase of approximately 1% in opportunities for oil and gas extraction as compared to Alternative A, with impacts on NAAQS similar to Alternative A.	Impacts of mineral extraction management decisions under Alternative D would result in an increase of approximately 1% in opportunities for oil and gas extraction as compared to Alternative A, with impacts on NAAQS similar to Alternative A.	Impacts of mineral extraction management decisions under Alternative E would result in a reduction of approximately 26% in opportunities for oil and gas extraction as compared to Alternative A, with impacts on NAAQS similar to or lower than Alternative A.
Recreation	Minor, short-term, adverse air quality impacts from OHVs, automobiles, and other combustion exhaust sources. Projected air quality constituents of concern specific to recreational use would include particulate matter (PM ₁₀ and PM _{2.5}),	Impacts to air quality resulting from Alternative B would be less than Alternative A due to additional constraints on motorized recreation.	Under Alternative C, recreation management decisions would result in minor additional constraints to motorized vehicle use as compared to Alternative A. Adverse impacts to air quality similar to Alternative A.	Under Alternative D, recreation management decisions would result in minor additional constraints to motorized vehicle use as compared to Alternative A. Adverse impacts to air quality similar to Alternative A.	Under Alternative E, recreation management decisions would result in additional constraints to motorized vehicle use as compared to Alternative A, specifically for areas that contain non-WSA areas with wilderness characteristics. Adverse impacts to air quality

AIR QUALITY					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
	hydrocarbons and combustion by-products. Long-term, beneficial impacts from prescriptions that improve road surfaces, limit vegetation disturbances, and reduce OHV and other vehicle use.				similar to or slightly smaller than Alternative A.

CULTURAL RESOURCES					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
Cultural Resources	Long-term, adverse impacts to cultural resources from of the lack of restrictions on surface disturbance, OHV use, and other recreational uses, but with beneficial impacts from protection of high site-density areas on 37,433 acres in Grand Gulch Special Emphasis Area.	Same impacts as Alternative A, except additional beneficial impacts on 98,348 acres of high site-density areas from special protection of cultural resources. Long term, beneficial impacts from limiting OHV use to designated routes.	Same impacts as Alternative B.	Same impacts as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B, except additional beneficial impacts from protection of 582,357 acres of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics,
Fire Management	Potential for negligible to minor adverse impacts on cultural resources from wildland fire on 33,556 acres of high and moderate site-density. Negligible impacts on cultural resources from restrictions on fuels reduction treatments within NRHP-eligible sites.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.

CULTURAL RESOURCES					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
Health and Safety	Minor, adverse, long term impacts to historic mine structures from AML site remediation.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Livestock Grazing	Improved stability of cultural sites in the Comb Wash side canyons from grazing unavailability. Long-term, adverse impacts to cultural resources outside of these areas (90% of areas with high site-density and 94% with moderate site density) where sites may be impacted by livestock trampling or brushing against structures and/or rock art.	Improved stability of cultural sites from grazing unavailability in selected allotments. Long-term, moderately beneficial impacts from grazing restrictions. Potential long-term adverse impacts outside of these areas where sites may be impacted by livestock trampling.	Same impacts as Alternative B.	Same impacts as Alternative A,	Same as Alternative B.
Mineral and Energy Resources	Potential long-term, adverse impacts within 417 acres of high site density lands and 313 acres of medium site density lands. Adverse impacts from geophysical exploration on 886 acres.	Same impacts as Alternative A, except that fewer acres (338 acres) in high and medium (298 acres) site density areas would potentially be disturbed by minerals development. Same geophysical impacts as Alternative A.	Same impacts as Alternative A, except that slightly fewer acres (381 acres) in high site density areas and 391 acres in medium site-density areas could be impacted by minerals development. Slightly greater geophysical impacts than Alternative A from impacts to 903 acres.	Same as Alternative A, except that slightly fewer acres (391 acres total) in high site density areas are projected for disturbance associated with minerals development. More acres (330 total) in medium site density areas are projected for disturbance under Alternative D.	Same as Alternative B, except that fewer acres (327 acres total) in high and medium (192 acres total) site density areas are projected for disturbance associated with minerals development.
Non-WSA lands with Wilderness Characteristics	Same impacts to cultural resources within these areas as discussed under other resources, as non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would not be protected	Same impacts to cultural resources as discussed under Alternative B resources, as non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would not be protected under this	Same impacts to cultural resources as discussed under Alternative C resources, as non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would not be protected under this	Same impacts to cultural resources as discussed under Alternative D resources, as non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would not be protected under this	582,357 acres protected as non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics which does not allow surface disturbing activities or OHV access.

CULTURAL RESOURCES					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
	under this alternative.	alternative.	alternative.	alternative.	
Paleontology	Minor to moderate, long-term, beneficial impacts from protections afforded to paleontologically sensitive geologic formations. Minor, adverse impacts to sites from fossil collection.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Recreation	Impacts are the same as described for cultural resource management decisions because of program overlap.	Impacts are the same as described for cultural resource management decisions because of program overlap.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.
Riparian Resources	Negligible to minor, beneficial impacts to cultural resources from restrictions on surface-disturbing activity within riparian and floodplain areas.	Same impacts as Alternative A, except additional beneficial impacts from additional restrictions on OHV use and livestock grazing by reducing opportunities for surface disturbances.	Same impacts as Alternative B.	Same impacts as Alternative A.	Same impacts as Alternative B.
Special Designations-ACECs	Alkali Ridge ACEC – Long-term beneficial impacts to cultural resources within the 39,202-acre ACEC from the use of disturbance avoidance buffers around known sites. Long-term, adverse impacts from allowable surface disturbing activities in areas outside of known sites.	Alkali Ridge ACEC – Same as Alternative A for the 39,196-acre ACEC, but with greater long-term beneficial impacts and decreased potential for long-term adverse impacts from restrictions on surface disturbances.	Alkali Ridge ACEC – Same as Alternative A for this 39,196-acre ACEC, but with slightly greater long-term beneficial impacts and decreased opportunities for long-term adverse impacts from OHV travel restrictions for woodland harvesting.	Alkali Ridge ACEC – Same as Alternative A, but with less long-term benefits and greater potential for long-term adverse impacts because of fewer restrictions on surface-disturbing activities.	Alkali Ridge ACEC – Same as Alternative B.

CULTURAL RESOURCES					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
	Bridger Jack Mesa ACEC – Long-term, beneficial impacts from protection under WSA land status.	Bridger Jack Mesa ACEC – Same as Alternative A.	Bridger Jack Mesa ACEC – Same as Alternative A.	Bridger Jack Mesa ACEC – Same as Alternative A.	Bridger Jack Mesa ACEC – Same as Alternative A.
	Butler Wash North ACEC – Same as Bridger Jack Mesa ACEC above.	Butler Wash North ACEC – Same impacts as Alternative A.	Butler Wash North ACEC – Same impacts as Alternative A.	Butler Wash North ACEC – Same impacts as Alternative A.	Butler Wash North ACEC – Same as Alternative A.
	Cedar Mesa ACEC – Long-term, beneficial impacts within 295,336-acre area from designated OHV use, specific protection of at-risk cultural resources, and areas managed for scenic quality and non-motorized uses.	Cedar Mesa ACEC – Long-term, beneficial impacts from limiting day use and overnight camping to protect cultural resources within 306,742-acre area.	Cedar Mesa ACEC – Long-term, beneficial impacts same as B, but to a lesser degree, because the ACEC would be open to dispersed camping impacts on cultural resources.	Cedar Mesa ACEC – Impacts same as Alternative C.	Cedar Mesa ACEC – Same as Alternative B.
	Dark Canyon ACEC – Long-term, beneficial impacts from protection under WSA land status.	Dark Canyon ACEC – Same as Alternative A.	Dark Canyon ACEC – Same as Alternative A.	Dark Canyon ACEC – Same as Alternative A.	Dark Canyon ACEC – Same as Alternative A.
	Hovenweep ACEC – Impacts would be same as Cedar Mesa ACEC.	Hovenweep ACEC – Impacts same as Alternative A.	Hovenweep ACEC – Impacts same as Alternative A.	Hovenweep ACEC – ACEC would not be established, with increased potential for adverse, long-term impacts from minerals development, vegetation treatment projects, and recreational activities, including OHV use.	Hovenweep ACEC – Same as Alternative B.

CULTURAL RESOURCES					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
	Indian Creek ACEC – Long-term beneficial impacts to cultural resources from management decisions that would limit surface disturbances and close the area to OHV use.	Indian Creek ACEC – Impacts same as A, except that ACEC would be reduced in area by 36%.	Indian Creek ACEC – Impacts same as B, except that the ACEC would be reduced in area by 71% of Alternative A.	Indian Creek ACEC – The ACEC would not be established, with increased potential for long-term adverse impacts to cultural resources that lie outside of WSAs from lack of specific resource protections. Beneficial impacts on cultural resources from designated OHV use.	Indian Creek ACEC – Same as Alternative B.
	Lockhart Basin ACEC – The area would not be managed as an ACEC. Long-term, beneficial impacts on cultural resources from VRM II surface disturbance restrictions, prohibitions on woodcutting, and closure of the area to OHV use.	Lockhart Basin ACEC – Impacts to resources and users same as A, but to a greater degree, from designation as a 47,783-acre ACEC and restrictions on surface disturbance under VRM I objectives.	Lockhart Basin ACEC – Not designated as an ACEC. Increased potential for adverse impacts from mineral leasing, livestock grazing, OHV use on designated routes in VRM III areas.	Lockhart Basin ACEC – Impacts same as Alternative C.	Lockhart Basin ACEC – Same as Alternative B.
	Lavender Mesa ACEC – Designated as a 649-acre ACEC, with long-term, beneficial impacts on cultural resources from protection of visual, cultural, and natural resources.	Lavender Mesa ACEC – Impacts same as Alternative A.	Lavender Mesa ACEC – Impacts same as Alternative A.	Lavender Mesa ACEC – The ACEC would not be established, with increased potential for long-term, adverse impacts from unrestricted surface-disturbing activities.	Lavender Mesa ACEC – Same as Alternative B.
	Shay Canyon ACEC – Management of the 3,561-acre ACEC for cultural conservation, with long-term, beneficial impacts from protective	Shay Canyon ACEC – Managed as a 119-acre ACEC, with long-term beneficial impacts from surface disturbance prohibitions, closed to	Shay Canyon ACEC – Impacts identical to Alternative B.	Shay Canyon ACEC – Long-term, adverse impacts on cultural resources from management under VRM III objectives, open to	Shay Canyon ACEC – Same as Alternative B.

CULTURAL RESOURCES					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
	buffers around cultural resources that are eligible for the NRHP, management under VRM I conditions, exclusion of private and commercial woodland harvesting, and conditional fire suppression. Potential for long-term, adverse impacts from minerals activities, and livestock grazing. Adverse impacts from open OHV use.	camping, and grazing restrictions. Long term, beneficial impacts in areas closed or limited to OHV routes.		livestock grazing, and subject to fuels and watershed treatments.	
	San Juan River ACEC – The area would be managed as a 15,100-acre ACEC, with impacts same as the San Juan River SRMA.	San Juan River ACEC – Managed as a 7,590-acre ACEC, with long-term, beneficial impacts on cultural resources from actions that limit or restrict surface disturbances and provide for closure of areas to protect specific cultural sites.	San Juan River ACEC – Impacts the same as Alternative B.	San Juan River ACEC – No designation of ACEC, with impacts same as Alternative B. Greater surface disturbance would be allowable, with greater potential for long-term, adverse impacts to cultural resources.	San Juan River ACEC – Same as Alternative B.
	Valley of the Gods ACEC – Managed as 31,387-acre ACEC under VRM I objectives, with long term, beneficial impacts from limitations on surface disturbances. Potential for long-term adverse impacts from livestock grazing, woodland harvesting, and minerals activities, and OHV use.	Valley of the Gods ACEC – Managed as a 22,863-acre ACEC, with impacts same as A. Slightly increased beneficial impacts to cultural resources within the smaller ACEC from closure to woodland harvesting.	Valley of the Gods ACEC – Impacts same as Alternative B.	Valley of the Gods ACEC – No designation of an ACEC and management under VRM III would have potential for long-term, adverse impacts to cultural resources through greater allowance of surface-disturbing activities than under any other alternative.	Valley of the Gods ACEC – Same as Alternative B.

CULTURAL RESOURCES					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
Special Designations- Wild and Scenic Rivers	Wild and Scenic River – Colorado Segments Negligible impact on cultural resources from prohibitions on surface disturbances.	Wild and Scenic River – Colorado Segments Long-term, beneficial impact on cultural resources from management of Segments 2 and 3 under VRM I and II, and from closure of Segment 3 to OHV use.	Wild and Scenic River – Colorado Segments Impacts same as Alternative B.	Wild and Scenic River – Colorado Segments Increased potential for long-term, adverse impacts to cultural resources from a lack of special restrictions on surface-disturbing activities.	Wild and Scenic River – Colorado Segments Same as Alternative B.
	Wild and Scenic – San Juan River Segments Long-term, beneficial impacts to cultural resources from management under VRM I restrictions on surface-disturbing activities.	Wild and Scenic – San Juan River Segments Long-term beneficial impacts on cultural resources from implementation of NSO stipulations and restrictions on mineral disposal and geophysical work.	Wild and Scenic – San Juan River Segments Long-term adverse impacts to cultural resources from not designating the area as suitable and subsequent increases in surface-disturbing activities.	Wild and Scenic – San Juan River Segments Same as Alternative C.	Wild and Scenic – San Juan River Segments Same as Alternative B.
	Wild and Scenic – All Other Segments Long-term adverse impacts from not evaluating river segments for suitability and not implementing restrictions on surface-disturbing activities.	Wild and Scenic – All Other Segments Long-term beneficial and adverse impacts from management under VRM II and III, and application of Standard or NSO oil and gas leasing stipulations.	Wild and Scenic – All Other Segments Long-term adverse impacts from not designating rivers segments as suitable and implementing related restrictions on surface-disturbing activities.	Wild and Scenic – All Other Segments Same as Alternative C.	Wild and Scenic – All Other Segments Same as Alternative B.
Special Designations- Wilderness Study Areas	387,410 acres would be protected to meet the non-impairment criteria of the IMP which limits surface disturbing activities and access.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.

CULTURAL RESOURCES					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
Special Status Species	Long-term beneficial impacts from spatial buffers with restrictions on surface-disturbing activities and vegetation treatments.	Impacts as Alternative A, except slightly more beneficial impacts from increased spatial buffers.	Greater long term, beneficial impacts than Alternatives A and B from increased spatial buffers.	Impacts same as Alternative A.	Impacts same as Alternative B.
Travel Management	Long-term, beneficial impacts to cultural resources on 142,008 acres of high site-density area that is closed to OHV use. Long-term adverse impacts to cultural resources on 423,619 acres open to OHV use in high site-density areas.	Long-term, beneficial impacts to cultural resources on 238,879 acres of high site density area that is closed to OHV use, and 325,669 acres of high site-density where OHV use is limited to designated routes.	Long-term, beneficial impacts to cultural resources on 234,890 acres of high site density area that is closed to OHV use and 750,153 acres limited to designated routes.	Long-term, beneficial impacts on cultural resources from limiting OHV use to designated routes on 985,043 acres in high site-density areas.	Same as Alternative B except that 474,291 acres of high site-density lands would be beneficially closed to OHV use.
Vegetation	Impacts same as Fire Management because treatments and impacts are the same.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Visual Resources	Long-term, beneficial impacts on cultural resources from protection of 395,797 acres of high site-density and 330,313 acres of medium site-density under VRM Class I and Class II designations. Potentially adverse impacts to cultural resources on lands designated as VRM Class III and IV (1,054,681 acres).	Long-term, beneficial impacts on cultural resources from management of 431,797 acres in high site-density and 315,022 acres of medium site-density under VRM Class I and II, with slightly more benefit than Alternative A. Adverse impact to cultural resources from designation of 1,034,813 acres as VRM Class III and IV.	Long-term, beneficial impacts on cultural resources from management of 324,539 acres of high site-density and 242,876 acres of medium site-density under VRM Class I and II. Slightly less beneficial impacts than Alternative A from designation of 1,225,915 acres as VRM Class III and IV.	Long-term, beneficial impacts from management of 237,057 acres of high site-density and 162,201 acres of medium site-density under VRM Class I and II designations. Slightly higher benefit than Alternative A. Long term, adverse impacts from designation of 1,383,860 acres as VRM Class III and IV.	Long-term, beneficial impacts on cultural resources from management of 565,528 acres of high site-density and 544,314 acres of medium site-density under VRM Class I and II objectives. Slightly higher benefit than Alternatives A and B. Adverse impact to cultural resources from designation of 671,828 acres as VRM Class III and IV.

CULTURAL RESOURCES					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
Wildlife and Fisheries Resources	Negligible impacts on cultural resources from seasonal restrictions.	Same as Alternative A, but with moderate long-term, beneficial impacts from on minor restrictions on OHV use and minerals development.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.
Woodlands	Long-term, direct and indirect adverse impacts to cultural resources on 464,446 acres of high site-density and 392,559 acres of medium site-density from a lack of restrictions on woodland harvesting and related OHV use.	Slightly less long-term adverse impacts than Alternative A from designating 307,179 acres in high site density areas and 504,391 acres in medium density areas as open to woodland harvesting, with limited restrictions on related OHV travel. Long-term beneficial impacts to cultural resources in areas closed to woodland harvesting, especially in the Cedar Mesa CRSMA.	Impacts same as Alternative B, from designating 367,319 acres of high site-density and 229,492 acres of medium site-density as available for woodland harvesting.	Same as Alternative C.	Similar to Alternative B, except fewer acres (241,712 total) of high site density lands and 129,498 acres of medium site-density would be open to woodland harvesting, with greater long-term beneficial impact to cultural resources from less opportunity for surface disturbances.

FIRE MANAGEMENT					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
Air Quality	All prescribed burns would be in accordance with applicable air quality regulations and the Smoke Management MOU, which could impact the size and timing of fire management activities. Limitations would not substantially reduce the effectiveness of fire management or increase	Same as Alternative A.			

FIRE MANAGEMENT					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
	fire risk.				
Cultural Resources	Restrictions on pinyon-juniper treatments on 26,902 acres to protect cultural resources would adversely increase fuel loading, slightly increasing the risk of wildland fire.	Adverse impacts on fire management on 49,244 acres from fire management restrictions in pinyon-juniper and prohibitions on treatments in the 37,433-acre Grand Gulch Historic District to protect cultural resources. Adverse restrictions on fuels management would be second greatest under this alternative (after Alternative E).	Same types and acres of potential fire management treatments as Alternative A, but with additional beneficial impacts from additional 26,902 acres available for fire management in pinyon-juniper.	Same impacts as Alternative C.	Same impacts as Alternative B, but with slightly increased fire risk from prohibitions on treatments on 20,302 acres in Beef Basin.
Fire Management	5,000-10,000 acres per year of prescribed fire and non-fire treatments would beneficially reduce fuels and lessen wildfire severity in the long term.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Lands and Realty	Beneficial, but minor, risk reduction of accidental fire starts due to limits on the number of people and vehicles associated with filming, and on the use of pyrotechnics and explosives.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Mineral and Energy Resources	Adverse, but minor, increase in fire risks from creation of additional WUI areas.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.

FIRE MANAGEMENT					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
Non-WSA Lands with Wilderness Characteristics	Negligible impacts to fire management, as non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would not be protected (with no prohibitions on fuel load reductions and treatments.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Adversely increased risks of fire from prohibitions on treatments and fuel load reductions on 582,360 acres of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics
Recreation	Adverse, but minor, impacts from risks of fire along trails, in campgrounds, and from dispersed camping campfires, and increased number of WUI areas.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Special Designations	Adverse impacts from additional fuel loading that would increase the risk of wildland fire from restrictions on vegetation treatments over 386,027 acres in WSAs and 488,616 acres in ACECs (totaling 48.6% of the PA).	Adverse impacts from additional fuel loading that would increase the risk of wildland fire from restrictions on vegetation treatments over 386,027 acres in WSAs and 521,141 acres in ACECs (totaling 50.4 1% of the PA).	Reduced risks of fuel loading from fewer restrictions on treatments in ACECs (76,764 acres), with same restrictions in WSAs. (totaling 25.7% of the PA)	Restrictions on fuel treatments in 386,027 acres of WSAs would reduce fire risks in 21.4% of the PA.	Same impacts as Alternative B.

HEALTH AND SAFETY					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
Health and Safety	Hazardous material health and safety risks from mineral exploration and development on 69% of the PA open to standard and special mineral leasing stipulations.	Same as Alternative A, as 70% of PA would be at risk from minerals exploration and development.	Same as Alternative A, except 76% of PA open to standard and special leasing would create minimal additional risks to health and safety.	Same as Alternative C, as approximately 78% of PA would be open to standard and special minerals leasing stipulations, with activities that could cause risks to health and safety.	Permitted standard and special minerals leasing on 43% of PA would moderately reduce the potential risks to health and safety from minerals exploration and development activities.

LANDS AND REALTY					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
Lands and Realty	<p>Application of the minimum impact criteria for filming permits would facilitate use of public lands for this purpose while protecting other resources and meeting the resource goals and objectives of the RMP.</p> <p>385,316 acres of ROW exclusion and 161,224 acres of avoidance areas would restrict ROW placement, limit future access, increase energy supply costs, or delay the availability of communication services.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative A.</p> <p>Impacts same as Alternative A, from 416,612 acres of proposed ROW exclusion areas and 125,105 acres of ROW avoidance areas.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative A.</p> <p>Same as Alternative A from 395,329 acres of ROW exclusion areas and 39,323 acres of ROW avoidance areas.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative A.</p> <p>Same as Alternative A from 386,853 acres of ROW exclusion areas and 14,175 acres of ROW avoidance areas.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative A.</p> <p>Same as Alternative A, except that an additional 582,360 acres within non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would also be exclusion areas for ROWs (974,463 acres of ROW exclusion, and 53,915 acres of ROW avoidance).</p>

LIVESTOCK GRAZING					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
Cultural Resources	<p>Long term, beneficial impacts from Comb Ridge, Tank Bench, Beef Basin, and Grand Gulch National Historic District beneficially open to grazing (except Grand Gulch Canyon and associated tributaries). Minor impacts from acres unavailable to grazing within Grand Gulch Special Emphasis Area.</p>	<p>Same impacts as Alternative A.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative A</p>	<p>Same as Alternative A.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative A.</p>

LIVESTOCK GRAZING					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
Fire Management	Short-term, adverse impacts on livestock grazing in treated areas. Long-term, beneficial impacts from reduced risk of fire and improved forage productivity.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Health and Safety	Negligible impacts on livestock grazing in the short-term. Reclamation of mine sites could beneficially expand grazing opportunities in the long-term.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Lands and Realty	Land exchanges and sales could adversely decrease forage in AUMs available to livestock, but acquisitions could beneficially increase acres and AUMs available for livestock. Short-term loss of AUMs from construction activities. Long term loss of AUMs and forage acres from facility construction.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Livestock Grazing	Adverse impacts to grazing from existing and proposed areas unavailable for livestock grazing.	Same impacts as Alternative A, except additional areas would be designated as unavailable for livestock grazing.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.
Minerals and Energy Resources	Surface disturbing activities on 699 total acres under this alternative could lead to	Same impacts as Alternative A, except surface disturbances would total 636 acres.	Minor, adverse impacts from surface disturbances totaling 710 acres.	Long term, adverse impacts from surface disturbances totaling 721 acres.	Same as Alternative A, except surface disturbances would total 518 acres.

LIVESTOCK GRAZING					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
	long term, adverse losses of AUMs and acres available to livestock grazing.				
Non-WSA Lands with Wilderness Characteristics	Negligible impacts to livestock grazing.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Long term, beneficial impacts to livestock grazing on 582,357 acres of lands with non-WSA wilderness characteristics from no surface disturbances to vegetation, and no OHV disturbances.
Recreation	Negligible impacts from grazing prohibitions within Pearson Canyon and developed recreation sites. Beneficial impacts from allowed grazing in San Juan River SRMA and the Cedar Mesa CSRMA.	Same as Alternative A, except adverse impacts from timing restrictions in San Juan River SRMA riparian areas.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.
Riparian Resources	Short term, adverse decrease in the acres and AUMs available to livestock from exclusion, seasonal closure, and forage limitations to improve riparian areas. Long-term beneficial impacts from increase in acres and/or AUMs available to livestock after riparian rehabilitation.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Soil and Water Resources	Short term and long term decreases in acres or AUMs available to livestock from mitigation to improve damaged	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.

LIVESTOCK GRAZING					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
	soils.				
Special Designations-ACECs	Long term, adverse impacts to grazing from unavailable acreages in ACECs.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Special Designations-Wild and Scenic Rivers	Minor impacts to livestock grazing from prohibitions or limits on livestock structure construction and fencing.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Special Designations-Wilderness	Minor impacts to livestock grazing from prohibitions or limits on livestock structure construction and fencing.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Travel Management	Long term, adverse impacts from 611,310 acres open to cross-country OHV use from noise disturbances, and reduction of vegetation/forage productivity.	Long term, beneficial impacts from reduction of noise impacts and surface disturbances to forage.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.
Vegetation	Short-term, adverse impacts on livestock grazing in areas that are closed following vegetation treatments (232,130 acres). Long-term, beneficial impacts from improved forage conditions and productivity.	Same as Alternative A, but to a lesser degree from treatments on approximately 152,000 acres during life of the RMP.	Same as Alternative A, but to a lesser degree from treatments on approximately 186,000 acres during life of the RMP.	Same as Alternative A, from treatments impacts to 226,000 acres during life of the RMP.	Same as Alternative B.

MINERALS AND ENERGY RESOURCES					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
Minerals and Energy Resources- Open to leasing	Approximately 1,238,230 acres (69.4% of BLM lands) would be beneficially open under standard and special stipulations.	Approximately 1,241,910 acres would be open under standard and special stipulations. This decision would result in a more beneficial impact to minerals resources compared to A, as 0.3% more acres would be open to leasing.	Approximately 1,348,973 acres would be open under standard and special stipulations. This decision would result in a more beneficial impact compared to A, as 8.9% more acres would be open to leasing.	Approximately 1,383,283 acres would be open under standard and special stipulations. This decision would result in a more beneficial impact compared to A, as 11.7% more acres would be open to leasing.	Approximately 758,929 acres would be open under standard and special stipulations. This decision would result in an adverse impact to minerals resources, compared to A, as 26.9% fewer acres would be open to leasing.
Minerals and Energy Resources- Oil and gas wells	An average of 73 RFD-predicted oil and gas wells would be drilled over the life of the RMP.	An average of 66 RFD-predicted oil and gas wells would be drilled over the life of the RMP, with adverse impacts compared to A, as 9.6% fewer wells would be drilled.	An average of 74 RFD-predicted oil and gas wells would be drilled over the life of the RMP, with beneficial impacts compared to A, as 1.4% more wells would be drilled.	An average of 75 RFD-predicted oil and gas wells would be drilled over the life of the RMP, with beneficial impact compared to A, as 2.7% more wells would be drilled.	An average of 54 RFD-predicted oil and gas wells would be drilled over the life of the RMP, with adverse impacts compared to A, as 26.0% fewer wells would be drilled.
Minerals and Energy Resources- Geophysical	Approximately 559 linear miles of source line would be conducted over the life of the RMP.	Approximately 507 linear miles of source line would be conducted over the life of the RMP, with long term, adverse impacts compared to A, as 10.4% fewer linear miles of source line would be conducted.	Approximately 573 linear miles of source line would be conducted over the life of the RMP, with long term, beneficial impacts compared to A, as 1.9% more linear miles of source line would be conducted.	Approximately 585 linear miles of source line would be conducted over the life of the RMP, with long term, beneficial impacts compared to A, as 4.3% more linear miles of source line would be conducted.	Approximately 380 linear miles of source line would be conducted over the life of the RMP, with long term, adverse impacts compared to A, as 32.0% fewer linear miles of source line would be conducted.
Minerals and Energy Resources- Locatable	Approximately 1,675,057 acres (93.8% of BLM lands) would be open to mineral entry.	Approximately 1,527,656 acres would be open to mineral entry. This decision would result in an adverse impact compared to A, as 8.8% fewer acres would be open.	Approximately 1,682,865 acres would be open to mineral entry. This decision would result in a beneficial impact compared to A, as 0.5% more acres would be open.	Approximately 1,739,389 acres would be open to mineral entry. This decision would result in a beneficial impact compared to A, as 3.8% more acres would be open.	Approximately 1,015,384 acres would be open to mineral entry. This decision would result in an adverse impact compared to A, as 39.4% fewer acres would be open.
Minerals and Energy Resources- Saleable	Approximately 1,389,256 acres (77.8% of BLM lands) would be open to	Approximately 1,241,906 acres would be open to mineral material disposal.	Approximately 1,358,968 acres would be open to mineral material disposal.	Approximately 1,383,277 acres would be open to mineral material disposal.	Approximately 758,931 acres would be open to mineral material disposal.

MINERALS AND ENERGY RESOURCES					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
	mineral material disposal.	This decision would result in an adverse impact compared to A, as 10.6% fewer acres would be open.	This decision would result in an adverse impact compared to A, as 2.2% fewer acres would be open.	This decision would result in an adverse impact compared to A, as 0.4% fewer acres would be open.	This decision would result in an adverse impact compared to A, as 45.4% fewer acres would be open.
Cultural Resources-Grand Gulch Historic District	Long term, adverse impacts from closing the 37,433-acre Grand Gulch Historic District (2.1% of planning area) to mineral material disposal.	Same impacts as Alternative A, except closing the 37,388-acre Grand Gulch Historic District to geophysical exploration would have additional adverse impacts.	Same as Alternative B.	Same impacts as Alternative B, except opening the Historic District to "casual use" geophysical exploration would be less adverse than Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.
Cultural Resources-Grand Gulch Special Emphasis Area	Long-term, adverse impacts from closing the 4,240-acre Grand Gulch SEA (0.2% of planning area) to leasing and geophysical work.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Cultural Resources-Comb Ridge	N/A	Long term, adverse impacts from closing the 38,012-acre Comb Ridge (2.1% of planning area) to mineral entry, mineral material disposal, and geophysical work, and leasing as NSO.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative A.	Impacts same to Alternative B, except the area would be closed to leasing rather than NSO. Alternative E would result in slightly more adverse impacts than Alternative B.
Cultural Resources-Tank Bench	N/A	Long term, adverse impacts from closing the 2,646-acre Tank Bench (0.1% of planning area) to mineral entry, mineral material disposal, and geophysical work, and leasing as NSO.	Long term, beneficial impacts from allowing leasing in the 2,646-acre Tank Bench (0.1% of the planning area) as open to mineral entry, mineral material disposal, and geophysical work.	Same as Alternative C.	Same as Alternative B.
Lands and Realty-Recommendations for withdrawal from mineral	Long-term, adverse impacts on approximately 132,380 acres (7.4% of	Impacts same as Alternative A, except approximately 263,467	Impacts same as Alternative A, except approximately 147,435	Impacts same as Alternative A, except approximately 47,124	Impacts same as Alternative A, except approximately 582,357

MINERALS AND ENERGY RESOURCES					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
entry	planning area) recommended for withdrawal from mineral entry.	acres (14.8% of PA) would be recommended for withdrawal from mineral entry.	acres (8.3% of PA) would be recommended for withdrawal from mineral entry.	acres (2.6% of PA) would be recommended for withdrawal from mineral entry.	acres (32.6% of PA) of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be managed as exclusion areas for ROWs, which would have adverse impacts on mineral production and access for exploration.
Non-WSA Lands with Wilderness Characteristics	No impacts to mineral and energy resources as non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics are not protected under this alternative.	Same as Alternative A	Same as Alternative A	Same as Alternative A	Adverse impacts from closing approximately 582,357 acres of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics (or 32.6% of BLM lands) to mineral resource development.
Recreation-San Juan River SRMA	Non-riparian areas in the 10,203-acre SRMA are open subject to Standard and Special Stipulations.	The entire 10,203-acre SRMA—not just riparian areas—would be subject to NSO. This decision results in an adverse impact compared to A.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.
Recreation-Cedar Mesa CSRMA	The areas of the 375,734-acre CSRMA that are outside WSAs would be subject to Standard, Special, and NSO stipulations.	The areas of the 375,734-acre CSRMA outside WSAs would be subject to Standard and Special stipulations, with beneficial, long term impacts, compared to A.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.
Soil and Water Resources-Sensitive Soils	Long term, adverse impacts from a minimum of 1,063,019 acres of sensitive soils with medium and high limitations available for development, requiring BMPs and mitigation.	Same impacts as A, except a minimum of 1,049,158 acres of sensitive soils with medium and high limitations would be available for development.	Same as Alternative A.	Same impacts as A, except a minimum of 1,069,495 acres of sensitive soils with medium and high limitations would be available for development.	Same impacts as A, except a minimum of 659,170 acres of sensitive soils with medium and high limitations would be available for development.

MINERALS AND ENERGY RESOURCES					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
Soil and Water Resources- Slopes over 20%	N/A	Long-term, adverse impacts from 21–40% steep slope and > 40% slopes requiring plans and/or no surface disturbances.	Impacts same as Alternative B, except >40% slopes would not allow surface disturbances unless project re-siting is problematic.	Long-term, adverse impacts from >40% slopes that would require a plan.	Same as Alternative B.
Special Designations- ACECs	Long-term, adverse impacts from approximately 119,397 acres (6.7% of planning area) closed or NSO due to ACEC designation.	Long-term, adverse impacts from approximately 87,567 acres (26.7% fewer acres of planning area than Alternative A) closed or NSO due to ACEC designation.	Long-term, adverse impacts from approximately 37,274 acres (68.8% fewer acres of planning area than Alternative A) closed or NSO due to ACEC designation.	Long-term, beneficial impacts to minerals as no acres would be closed or subject to NSO due to ACEC designation.	Long-term, adverse impacts from approximately 38,668 acres (67.6% fewer acres of planning area than Alternative A) closed or NSO due to ACEC designation.
Special Designations- Wild and Scenic Rivers	N/A	Long-term, adverse impacts from Closed or NSO leasing on approximately 11,040 acres (2.6% of planning area) due to WSR recommendations.	Long-term, adverse impacts from Closed or NSO leasing on approximately 3,968 acres (0.2% of planning area) due to WSR recommendations.	Long-term, beneficial impacts to minerals from no acres lands Closed or NSO due to WSR recommendations.	Same as Alternative B.
Special Status Species- Gunnison Sage-grouse	N/A	Long-term, adverse impacts from 4,524 acres reserved as critical habitat, limiting minerals activities on 0.2% of planning area.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B, except 2,877 acres would be affected.	Same as Alternative B.
Special Status Species- Wildlife habitat	Seasonal and other restrictions would be enforced on up to 527,300 acres (or 29.5% of BLM lands), assuming no overlap. This would be an adverse impact to mineral resource development.	Seasonal and other restrictions would be enforced on up to 876,736 acres. This would be an adverse impact compared to A, as 66.3% more acres would be restricted due to wildlife management decisions.	Seasonal and other restrictions would be enforced on up to 729,567 acres. This would be an adverse impact compared to A, as 38.4% more acres would be restricted due to wildlife management decisions.	Seasonal and other restrictions would be enforced on up to 420,998 acres. This would be a beneficial impact compared to A, as 20.2% fewer acres would be restricted due to wildlife management decisions.	Same as Alternative B.

MINERALS AND ENERGY RESOURCES					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
Special Status Species-Days that limitations are in effect	Adverse impacts from limitations on speed and schedule for minerals activities for approximately 273 days of the year to protect species.	Same as Alternative A.	Impacts same as Alternative A, except limitations would be in effect for approximately 243 days of the year.	Same as Alternative C.	Same as Alternative B.
Vegetation-Protection of relict and near-relict vegetation	Minor, adverse impacts from protection of 662 acres of relict and near-relict vegetation.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Long-term, beneficial impacts to minerals from no protection of relict and near-relict vegetation.	Same as Alternative A.
Visual Resources-VRM I designation	Long-term, adverse impacts from designation of approximately 371,575 acres (20.9% of planning area) as VRM I, with surface disturbance limits on minerals activities.	Same as Alternative A, except approximately 497,668 acres (33.9%) would be designated as VRM I.	Same as Alternative A, except approximately 425,179 acres (14.4%) would be designated VRM I.	Same as Alternative A, except approximately 390,424 acres (5.1%) would be designated as VRM I.	Same as Alternative A, except approximately 998,370 acres (56.0%) would be designated as VRM I.

NON-WSA LANDS WITH WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
Non-WSA Lands with Wilderness Characteristics	Adverse impacts to non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics from minerals-related surface disturbances in 98.0% of these areas (571,057 acres), 55.0 % (319,218 acres) of areas managed under VRM III and IV with degradation of scenic quality, and all of the areas open to woodland harvesting impacts. Approximately 24.0% or 139,351 acres would be subject to	Impacts same as Alternative A from loss of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics values from mineral development in 83.0% (482,979 acres) of these areas, management of 53.0% (362,985 acres) of these areas under VRM III and IV permitting scenic quality degradation, and 31.0% (181,595 acres) of these areas managed as open for woodland harvesting.	Adverse loss of natural character on approximately 94.0% (546,182 acres) of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics from minerals development, management for lower levels of scenic quality (VRM III and IV) on 78.0% (454,205 acres) of these areas, and 37.0% (218,643 acres) of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics	Adverse loss of natural character from minerals development in 99.0% (576,860 acres) of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics, management of 99.0 % (575,686 acres) of these areas under VRM III and IV that would permit scenic quality degradation, and 37.0% (218,643 acres) open to surface disturbances from woodland harvesting.	Beneficial impacts to non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics (on approximately 582,357 acres) from protection of naturalness and opportunities for solitude, primitive recreation through prohibitions on surface disturbances from woodland harvesting, oil and gas leasing and mineral materials activities, from ROW exclusion, and from

NON-WSA LANDS WITH WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
	impacts from cross-country OHV use.	Beneficial impacts from limiting cross-country OHV travel on 546,739 acres and closing the area to OHV travel on 34,033 acres.	as open to woodland harvesting surface disturbances. Beneficial impacts from limiting cross-country OHV travel on 551,565 acres and closing the area to OHV travel on 29,186 acres.	Beneficial impacts from limiting cross-country OHV travel on 580,772 acres.	management under VRM I objectives for high scenic quality. Beneficial impacts from limiting cross-country OHV travel on 580,772 acres.

PALEONTOLOGY					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
Lands and Realty	Adverse impacts from increased public access and surface disturbing activities, and beneficial impacts from land acquisition and stewardship. No specified restrictions on wind and solar exploration and development.	Impacts same as Alternative A, with more acres excluded from wind and solar development than under Alternatives, A, C and D.	Impacts same as Alternative A, with more acres excluded from wind and solar development than under Alternatives A and D, but less acres than Alternatives B and E.	Impacts same as Alternative A, with more acres excluded from wind and solar development than under Alternative A, but less acres than under Alternatives B, C and E.	Impacts same as Alternative A, with would exclude the most acres from wind and solar development than any of the Alternatives.
Livestock Grazing	Adverse impacts from livestock trampling causing damage or destruction of surface fossils. Highest potential for impacts due to least acres unavailable for livestock grazing.	Adverse impacts same as Alternative A, but to a lesser degree due to more acres unavailable to and greater restrictions on livestock grazing than Alternatives A and D.	Adverse impacts and restrictions same as Alternative B, but with 7,220 more acres of Class 3 units unavailable for livestock grazing than Alternative B, and greater overall restrictions than Alternatives A and D.	Adverse impacts same as Alternative A, but to a slightly greater degree due to fewer acres unavailable to livestock grazing than Alternative A.	Adverse impacts same as Alternative A, but to a lesser degree due to greater restrictions on livestock grazing than any of the alternatives.
Minerals and Energy Resources	Adverse impacts from damage or destruction of Paleontological resources from surface disturbance, particularly in Class 3, 4/5, and 5 lands. Lands open to minerals	Adverse impacts same as Alternative A, but to a somewhat greater degree due to 20,111 (2%) more acres of Class 3, 4/5, and 5 lands open to minerals development than under	Adverse impacts same as Alternative A, but to a greater degree due to 87,911 (10%) more acres of Class 3, 4/5, and 5 lands open to minerals development than under	Adverse impacts same as Alternative A, but to a greater degree due to 120,747 (14%) more acres of Class 3, 4/5, and 5 lands open to minerals development than under	Adverse impacts same as Alternative A, but to a lesser degree due to 98,299 (11%) less acres of Class 3, 4/5, and 5 lands open to minerals development than under

PALEONTOLOGY					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
	development would include 865,559 acres of Class 3, 4/5, and 5 paleontologically sensitive geologic units.	Alternative A.	Alternative A.	Alternative A.	Alternative A.
Non-WSA Lands with Wilderness Characteristics	No impacts to paleontological resources, as non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would not be protected under this alternative.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Surface disturbance restrictions on 582,357 acres to protect non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would have greater beneficial impacts on sensitive resources than under Alternative A.
Recreation	Adverse impacts include damage or destruction of important surface fossils from motorized vehicles, illegal collection, and vandalism. Beneficial impacts from regulated recreational use and awareness programs. This alternative would provide the fewest restrictions on recreational activities.	Impacts same as Alternative A with lower potential for adverse impacts and more potential beneficial impacts due to increased restrictions on recreational activities compared to Alternatives A, C and D.	Impacts same as Alternative A, with lower potential for adverse impacts and more potential beneficial impacts due to increased restrictions on recreational activities compared to Alternatives A and D, but higher potential for adverse impacts than Alternatives B and E.	Impacts same as Alternative A, with lower potential for adverse impacts and more potential beneficial impacts due to a high number of restrictions on recreational activities compared to Alternatives B, C, and E, but higher potential for adverse impacts than Alternative A.	Impacts same as Alternative A, with the lowest potential for adverse impacts due to increased restrictions on recreational activities and surface disturbance compared to the other alternatives.
Special Designations	Potential adverse impacts include increased public access, unlawful collection or vandalism of sensitive resources, increased vehicle access, and surface disturbing actions. Potential beneficial impacts from restrictions on public access and surface disturbing activities.	Potential impacts same as Alternative A, but with greater beneficial impacts from increased restrictions on access to sensitive paleontological resources compared to Alternative A.	Potential impacts same as Alternative A, but with greater restrictions on surface disturbing actions, and commercial and recreational access than Alternatives A and D, and fewer restrictions than Alternatives B and E.	Potential impacts same as Alternative A, but with somewhat greater restrictions on surface disturbing actions, and commercial and recreational access than Alternative A, but fewer restrictions than Alternatives B, C and E.	Potential impacts same as Alternative A, but with the greatest beneficial restrictions on access and surface disturbing actions of any of the alternatives.

PALEONTOLOGY					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
	Alternative A would have limited restrictions on both commercial and recreational access.				
Travel Management	Potentially adverse, direct and indirect impacts from surface disturbing actions, and increased public access resulting in unlawful collection, vandalism, or destruction of sensitive resources. Alternative A would open the most acreage to travel and public access.	Potential impacts same as Alternative A, but to lesser degree due to greater restrictions on travel and public access compared to Alternative A.	Potential impacts same as Alternative A, but to lesser degree due to greater restrictions on travel and public access than Alternatives A and D, but greater potential impacts than Alternatives B and E.	Potential impacts same as Alternative A, but to somewhat lesser degree due to fewer restrictions on travel and public access than Alternatives B, C and E, but greater restrictions than Alternative A.	Potential impacts same as Alternative A, but to a lesser degree due to the greatest level of restrictions on travel and public access of any of the alternatives.
Woodlands	Adverse impacts include surface disturbance during harvest and road construction, and increased OHV access and access to sensitive resources. There would be limited restrictions on woodlands harvesting under Alternative A with the potential impacts on 662,223 acres of Class 3, 4/5, and 5 units.	Adverse impacts same as Alternative A, but to a lesser degree due to greater seasonal restrictions, limits and closures for woodland harvesting. Potential impacts on 254,765 fewer acres of Class 3, 4/5, and 5 units than Alternative A.	Adverse impacts same as Alternative A, but to a lesser degree due to increased seasonal restrictions, limits and closures for woodland harvesting. Potential impacts on 167,389 fewer acres of Class 3, 4/5, and 5 units than Alternative A.	Adverse impacts same as Alternative A, but to somewhat lesser degree from seasonal restrictions, limits, and closures to woodland harvesting. Potential impacts on fewer acres than Alternative A, but greater impacts than Alternatives B, C and E.	Adverse impacts same as Alternative A, but to lesser degree than any of the alternatives due to limited acreage available for harvesting, and restrictions on surface disturbance to protect wilderness characteristics.

RECREATION					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
Air Quality	Long-term, beneficial impacts on recreation-related scenic quality from management decisions that would limit smoke, haze, and other	Same as Alternative A.			

RECREATION					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
	pollutants.				
Cultural Resources	<p>Long-term, substantially adverse impacts to recreation resources in Comb Ridge, Tank Bench, and Beef Basins from lack of restrictions.</p> <p>Long-term, adverse impacts to recreation from access restrictions to the McLoyd Canyon-Moon House .</p> <p>Managing the Grand Gulch Historic District for primitive recreation would have beneficial impacts on non-mechanized or specialized users, and adverse impacts on other user groups.</p>	<p>Restrictions or limitations on access to Cedar Mesa would have long-term, preservation-related impacts on recreation resources.</p> <p>Long-term, beneficial impact to Comb Ridge from reduced resource degradation, with beneficial impacts to mechanized and scenic driving groups, and adverse impacts to non-mechanized users (from lack of recreational opportunities).</p> <p>Beneficial impacts on scenic drivers and non-mechanized users in Tank Bench , with adverse impacts on motorized OHV, mountain biking, and motorized specialized users. Beef Basin same as those for Comb Ridge above.</p> <p>Long-term, beneficial impacts on mountain biking, non-mechanized, specialized, scenic driving, and motorized OHV users in McLoyd Canyon-Moon House .</p> <p>Potentially adverse impacts on recreational opportunities and satisfying experiences from restrictions to</p>	<p>Management action impacts for Comb Ridge, Tank Bench, Beef Basin, and McLoyd Canyon-Moon House s same as Alternative B. Impacts to Grand Gulch Historic District same as Alternative B, except pack animal camping permitted.</p>	<p>Comb Ridge, Tank Bench, and Beef Basin not managed as s. Recreation resource protection same as Alternative B, but slightly less. Impacts to users more beneficial in the short-term, but more adverse in the long-term from user conflicts and resource degradation.</p> <p>Impacts to McLoyd Canyon-Moon House same as Alternative B.</p> <p>Impacts to Grand Gulch Historic District same as Alternative C.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative B, except more beneficial impacts from surface disturbance restrictions on 18,514 (39%) of Comb Ridge from protection of non-WSA wilderness characteristics areas.</p>

RECREATION					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
		protect the cultural site. Adverse impacts on mechanized and specialized recreation within Grand Gulch Historic District because of limited opportunities, with beneficial impacts on non-mechanized users.			
Fire Management	Short-term, adverse impacts on all recreational user groups from loss of recreation opportunities in affected areas. Long-term, beneficial impacts from reduced risk of fire, improved wildlife habitat and vegetation (with greater opportunities for wildlife viewing).	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Health and Safety	Short-term health and safety risks to recreational users in those areas where hiking, OHV use, and target shooting are in close proximity to hazardous materials and AML sites. Reclamation of AML mine sites would beneficially expand recreational opportunities in the long-term.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Lands and Realty	Short-term, beneficial impacts on non-mechanized, specialized, river floating, and mountain biking users	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.

RECREATION					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
	from prohibitions on pyrotechnics and explosives use during filming. Long-term, beneficial impacts from protection of natural resources for recreation during filming.				
Livestock Grazing	Long-term, beneficial impacts on recreation resources and non-mechanized users from areas unavailable for livestock grazing on 20,361 acres within Mule, Comb Wash side canyons, Arch, Fish, Owl, and Road canyons. Negligible impacts on other recreation resource users.	Same impacts as Alternative A, except that 29,790 acres would be unavailable for livestock grazing (a 46% increase in exclusions).	Same impacts as Alternative A.	Same impacts as Alternative A, except that 20,569 acres would be unavailable for livestock grazing.	Same as Alternative B.
Minerals and Energy Resources	Impacts on recreation resources would be minor, but adverse because of potential visual degradation, from 76 predicted wells drilled over life of the RMP, with surface disturbances of 730 acres, and 886 acres from geophysical (0.11% of the planning area).	Same impacts as Alternative A, except that 66 wells predicted with total surface disturbances over life of RMP of 636 acres, and 794 acres from geophysical (0.11% of planning area).	Same impacts as Alternative A, except that 74 wells predicted with total surface disturbances over life of RMP of 710 acres, and 903 acres from geophysical (0.12% of planning area).	Same impacts as Alternative A, except that 75 wells predicted with total surface disturbances over life of RMP of 721 acres, and 924 acres from geophysical (0.12% of planning area).	Same impacts as Alternative A, but to a lesser degree, from additional 582,357 acres protected from minerals-related surface disturbances within areas with non-WSA wilderness characteristics.
Non-WSA Lands with Wilderness Characteristics	Negligible impacts to recreation resources and uses as non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics are not protected under this alternative.	Same as Alternative A	Same as Alternative A	Same as Alternative A	Long-term, beneficial impacts on recreation resources and opportunities for non-mechanized, motorized, scenic driving, and mountain biking groups

RECREATION					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
					from preservation of 165,831 acres for non-WSA wilderness characteristics within the SRMAs and CSRMA's, and 416,357 acres within the ERMA. Long-term, adverse impacts on competitive, motorized and mountain biking events in this area.
Paleontology	Paleontological management decisions would have negligible impacts on recreation.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Recreation	San Juan River SRMA – Short-term, beneficial impacts from timing stipulations and reserved campsites along river. Long-term, adverse impacts from lack of resource protection and continued intense river use, motorized boating.	San Juan River SRMA – Long-term, beneficial impacts on river experience from reduced crowding by reducing commercial use (beneficial impacts on private users, adverse impacts on commercial users), from limited vehicle camping, from additional campsites on Navajo Reservation (subject to MOU). Limited camping would have adverse impacts on non-river-floating users. An adverse reduction in size of the SRMA by 30% compared to the No Action.	San Juan River SRMA – Commercial floating, vehicle camping impacts as under Alternative B. Vehicle camping, impacts as under B. Motorized boating impacts as under A. Adverse impacts from 33% reduction in SRMA, compared to the No Action.	San Juan River SRMA – Impacts same as Alternative A for river users. Designated camping impacts as under Alternative B. Adverse impacts from 58% reduction in SRMA size.	San Juan River SRMA – Same as Alternative B.

RECREATION					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
	Cedar Mesa – Long-term, beneficial impacts on resources and non-mechanized users from designated campsites, pet controls, no campfires, limited group size.	Cedar Mesa – Same as Alternative A, except pets excluded from specified areas, no woodland harvesting or collecting. Long-term, beneficial impacts from permitted camping and day use.	Cedar Mesa – Same impacts to Alternative B, except pet control would be same as A. Short-term adverse impacts to stock users, but long-term benefits from resource preservation.	Cedar Mesa – Management decisions and impacts same as C, except that pets and stock would be prohibited or limited if causing adverse impacts to recreation resources.	Cedar Mesa – Same as Alternative B, except 109,700 acres (29%) within the proposed SRMA would be protected for preservation of non-WSA wilderness characteristics.
	Grand Gulch SRMA – Mesa-top, in-canyon day-use would have long-term, adverse impacts on recreation from conflicts, overcrowding. In-canyon camping actions would have long-term, beneficial impacts on resources and on users from use restrictions that would preserve resources and provide more recreational opportunities.	Grand Gulch SRMA – Long-term, beneficial impacts on mesa-top day-use and camping from resource preservation, limits on group size, and waste removal. Impacts on in-canyon day-use would be beneficial in the long-term from limits on group size and numbers, which would reduce user conflicts. Beneficial, long-term impacts on in-canyon camping from limits on group size and numbers, waste removal.	Grand Gulch SRMA – Day-use impacts same as Alternative B. Mesa-top camping impacts same as B, except group size would be increased, with adverse impacts on back-country opportunities. Impacts from larger group sizes and numbers would vary: adverse impacts to resources, but designated campsites would be beneficial for resources. In-canyon day-use impacts same as Alternative B. In-canyon camping impacts same as Alternative B.	Grand Gulch SRMA – Mesa-top day-use impacts same as Alternative C. Mesa-top camping adversely impacted in the long-term, same as A, from resource use conflicts, potential over-crowding, concentrations of large camping and hiking groups. Beneficial impacts on some users from campsite facilities, with adverse impacts on other users expecting primitive, undeveloped, natural settings. In-canyon day-use impacts same as Alternative B. In-canyon camping impacts same as Alternative C.	Grand Gulch SRMA – Same as Alternative B.
	Dark Canyon SRMA – Long-term, adverse impacts to resources from unlimited group sizes, dogs and vehicles, dispersed camping, campfires, and minimal	Dark Canyon SRMA – Short- and long-term, beneficial impacts on resources from limits on users per day, designated campsites, limits on campfires (mesa tops),	Dark Canyon SRMA – Impacts same as Alternative B, but decreased long-term, beneficial impacts by increased group size and numbers.	Dark Canyon SRMA – Impacts same as Alternative A from unrestricted dispersed camping, permitted large and numerous commercial groups,	Dark Canyon SRMA – Same as Alternative B, except for additional beneficial impacts from protection of 2,522 acres (8%) to preserve non-WSA wilderness

RECREATION					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
	ranger presence. Long-term, adverse impacts to users from over-crowding, user conflicts, loss of recreational opportunities.	waste management, pet restrictions, and prohibitions on firewood collecting. Short-term, adverse impacts on users from group size and number limits, but long-term, beneficial impacts from improved backcountry opportunities.		unrestricted use of campfires, no designated campsites, and unrestricted firewood collection.	characteristics.
	Indian Creek SRMA – Long-term, adverse impacts on resources and resource users from unlimited, unrestricted user group sizes, minimal monitoring of surface disturbances, unrestricted camping and use of campfires, potential degradation of cultural-recreational resources, and unrestricted presence of pets.	Indian Creek SRMA – Short- and long-term, beneficial impacts on resources from designated camping, prohibitions on dispersed camping, prohibitions on wood gathering, and adaptive management to preserve resources. Short-term, beneficial impacts on resource users from additional recreational facilities. Long-term, beneficial impacts on users from management decisions that address the increasing popularity and recreational use of the area.	Indian Creek SRMA – Same as Alternative B.	Indian Creek SRMA – Same as Alternative B.	Indian Creek SRMA – Same as Alternative B.
	White Canyon SRMA – Area not managed as an SRMA. Long-term, adverse impacts from unrestricted private and commercial use, open camping and campfires.	White Canyon SRMA – Managed as 2,828-acre SRMA. Short-term and long-term, beneficial impacts from fire pan use, permit system, primitive campground	White Canyon SRMA – Same as Alternative B.	White Canyon SRMA – Managed as a SRMA. Long-term, adverse impacts from lack of permit system to limit resource use and visitation. Long-term,	White Canyon SRMA – Same as Alternative B.

RECREATION					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
		development, prohibitions on campfires in-canyon.		beneficial impacts from developed campsites, fire pan use.	
	Monticello FO ERMA – No specified management decisions. Long-term, beneficial impacts to resources and users from adaptive management to protect resources.	Monticello FO ERMA – Long-term, beneficial impacts from adaptive management, limits on dispersed vehicle camping, camping limited to designated sites along Bears Ears Road and Deer Flat Road, and coordination with Glen Canyon Rec Area on campground construction.	Monticello FO ERMA – Same as Alternative B, except allowing dispersed vehicle camping within 150 of roadways would have long-term, adverse impacts on resources from surface disturbances.	Monticello FO ERMA – Same as Alternative C, except that dispersed vehicle camping allowed within 300 feet of roadways.	Monticello FO ERMA – Same as Alternative B.
	Special Recreation Permits (SRPs) – Long-term, beneficial impacts from stipulations in the permit that would ensure that resources were not adversely impacts.	Special Recreation Permits (SRPs) – Same as Alternative A.	Special Recreation Permits (SRPs) – Same as Alternative A.	Special Recreation Permits (SRPs) – Same as Alternative A.	Special Recreation Permits (SRPs) – Same as Alternative B, but reduced beneficial impacts from fewer opportunities for commercial, specialized recreation.
Riparian Resources	No specific management decisions would affect recreation, but current adverse impacts would have long-term recreation opportunity-degrading impacts on hiking, trail use, wildlife viewing, sightseeing, and camping.	Riparian management decisions would have long-term, beneficial impacts on recreation by excluding livestock in specified riparian areas, closing areas to OHV use, and closing functioning at risk areas to motorized camping. Short-term, adverse impacts on recreational opportunities until riparian area were restored.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.

RECREATION					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
Soil and Water Resources	Soils and watershed management decisions are unspecified.	No specific management action impacts on recreation, but erosion control planning and mitigation on steep slopes would have long-term, beneficial impacts on recreation-related scenic quality.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.
Special Designations	Alkali Ridge ACEC – Beneficial, long-term impacts on the 39,202-acre ACEC from resource preservation and/or mitigation of disturbances.	Alkali Ridge ACEC – 39,196-acre ACEC would receive long-term, beneficial impacts from cultural resource management plan, and prohibitions on surface-disturbing activities that might threaten the area's cultural resources.	Alkali Ridge ACEC – Same as Alternative A, except that a management plan would be prepared and limits placed on surface disturbances, which would have beneficial impacts.	Alkali Ridge ACEC – Not designated as an ACEC. The impacts would be adverse in the long-term because surface disturbances would not be limited, visual quality would be adversely affected.	Alkali Ridge ACEC – Same as Alternative B.
	Bridger Jack Mesa ACEC – Long-term, beneficial, impacts on recreation resources and non-mechanized users. Long-term, adverse impacts on motorized OHV, mountain biking, specialized, and scenic driving user groups within the ACEC because it lies within a WSA.	Bridger Jack Mesa ACEC – Same as Alternative A.	Bridger Jack Mesa ACEC – Same as Alternative A.	Bridger Jack Mesa ACEC – Same as Alternative A.	Bridger Jack Mesa ACEC – Same as Alternative A.
	Butler Wash North ACEC – Long-term, beneficial impacts on non-mechanized users from maintenance of	Butler Wash North ACEC – Same as Alternative A.	Butler Wash North ACEC – Same as Alternative A.	Butler Wash North ACEC – Same as Alternative A.	Butler Wash North ACEC – Same as Alternative A.

RECREATION					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
	wilderness values, but long term adverse impacts on mechanized and specialized users from prohibitions on surface disturbances. because the ACEC lies within a WSA.				
	Cedar Mesa ACEC – Managed as a 295,336-acre ACEC for cultural, scenic/ recreational, primitive/natural area values. Short-term, adverse impacts from rangeland and wildlife improvement projects, and fire suppression. Long-term, adverse impacts from potential minerals resource exploration and development. Long-term, beneficial impacts from designated OHV use, protection of cultural resources, and areas managed for scenic quality and non-motorized uses.	Cedar Mesa ACEC – Managed as a 306,742-acre ACEC for cultural resources. Long-term, beneficial impacts from waste management, prohibitions on dispersed camping, and limiting day use and overnight camping to protect cultural resources. Long-term, adverse impacts on recreation users from reduced recreational opportunities.	Cedar Mesa ACEC – Long-term beneficial impacts same as Alternative B. Long-term adverse impacts same as Alternative B, but to a lesser degree, because the ACEC would be open to dispersed camping.	Cedar Mesa ACEC – Same as Alternative C.	Cedar Mesa ACEC – Same impacts as Alternative B, but more beneficial to non-mechanized recreation, from protection of 60,049 acres of area with non-WSA wilderness characteristics within the proposed ACEC.
	Dark Canyon ACEC – Dark Canyon lies entirely within a WSA, so there would be long-term, beneficial impacts on non-mechanized users from maintenance of wilderness values, but long term adverse	Dark Canyon ACEC – Same as Alternative A.	Dark Canyon ACEC – Same as Alternative A.	Dark Canyon ACEC – Same as Alternative A.	Dark Canyon ACEC – Same as Alternative A.

RECREATION					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
	impacts on mechanized and specialized users from prohibitions on surface disturbances.				
	Hovenweep ACEC – Impacts would be same as Cedar Mesa ACEC because management decisions are similar.	Hovenweep ACEC – Same as Alternative A.	Hovenweep ACEC – Same as Alternative A.	Hovenweep ACEC – ACEC would not be established. Adverse impact to recreation in the short- and long-term from minerals development, watershed and vegetation treatment projects, impacts to cultural resources. Long-term, beneficial impacts for OHV users and non-motorized trail users. Adverse impacts on users seeking remoteness, solitude, and naturalness.	Hovenweep ACEC – Same as Alternative A.
	Indian Creek ACEC – Managed to protect visual quality, management decisions would permit minimal surface disturbances and closed to OHV use, with long-term, beneficial impacts on recreation resources. Variable impacts on recreation users: beneficial impacts on non-mechanized and scenic drivers; adverse impacts on mechanized users from limited recreational opportunities.	Indian Creek ACEC – Same impacts as Alternative A, except that ACEC would be reduced in area by 36% in comparison to Alternative A.	Indian Creek ACEC – Same impacts as Alternative B on recreation resources, but reduced degree of beneficial impacts on resources and users because the ACEC would be reduced in area by 71% in comparison to Alternative A.	Indian Creek ACEC – The ACEC would not be established, with no emphasis on managing the area for scenic quality except those areas that lie within WSAs. Adverse, long-term impacts on recreation resources that lie outside of WSAs from lack of resource protection. Variable impacts on resource users: non-mechanized and scenic drivers would be adversely impacted; mechanized, specialized users would benefit in the short-term. Long-term,	Indian Creek ACEC – Same as Alternative B, but to a greater degree, because, 30% of the ACEC (3,887 acres) would be protected to preserve lands with non-WSA wilderness characteristics.

RECREATION					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
				adverse impacts on all users from user conflicts, resource degradation, and crowding.	
	<p>Lockhart Basin ACEC – The area would not be managed as an ACEC. Long-term, beneficial impacts on recreation resources from VRM II designation, prohibitions on woodcutting, and closed to OHV use. Long-term, adverse impacts on OHV users, but beneficial impacts on scenic drivers, non-motorized, and non-mechanized users.</p>	<p>Lockhart Basin ACEC – The area would be designated as a 47,783-acre ACEC, managed for scenic quality under VRM I. Impacts to resources and users same as Alternative A, but to a greater degree, in order to protect scenic resources.</p>	<p>Lockhart Basin ACEC – Not designated as an ACEC, and managed as VRM Class II and VRM Class III. Adverse impacts to recreation resources because the area would be open to mineral leasing, livestock grazing in VRM III areas. Long-term, adverse impacts to non-mechanized, scenic drivers, and mountain biking recreation users from degradation of scenic quality in VRM Class III areas. Short-term, beneficial impacts to OHV users, but long-term, adverse impacts from resource degradation in VRM III areas.</p>	<p>Lockhart Basin ACEC – Same as Alternative C.</p>	<p>Lockhart Basin ACEC – Same as Alternative B, except to a greater beneficial degree for non-mechanized users and greater adverse impacts to motorized OHV users, from management of 45% of the ACEC (21,298 acres) for preservation of lands with non-WSA wilderness characteristics.</p>
	<p>Lavender Mesa ACEC – The 649-acre ACEC would be managed to preserve relict vegetation on the mesa top, with long-term, beneficial impacts on recreation resources from protection of visual, cultural, and natural resources. Negligible impacts on</p>	<p>Lavender Mesa ACEC – Same as Alternative A.</p>	<p>Lavender Mesa ACEC – Same as Alternative A.</p>	<p>Lavender Mesa ACEC – The ACEC would not be established. Long-term, adverse impacts to recreation resources from unrestricted surface-disturbing activities. Long-term, adverse impacts on non-mechanized and specialized users from</p>	<p>Lavender Mesa ACEC – Same as Alternative A.</p>

RECREATION					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
	mechanized recreation users because the area is inaccessible. Beneficial impacts on non-mechanized and specialized (climbers) from preservation of an undeveloped recreation area.			lack of protection-related management decisions that would allow resource degradation.	
	Shay Canyon ACEC – Continued management of the 3,561-acre ACEC for cultural resource conservation. Minor impacts on resources from actions that limit OHV use, protect scenic quality, and protection of cultural resources. Minor impacts on resource users because opportunities would be available for mechanized and non-mechanized users.	Shay Canyon ACEC – The ACEC would be managed as a 119-acre area to conserve cultural resources. Impacts on recreation resource would be beneficial in the long-term because surface disturbances would be prohibited. Impacts on all recreation use would be adverse in the long-term from limitations imposed to protect cultural resources, and from reduction of ACEC area, when compared to Alternative A that would limit recreational opportunities.	Shay Canyon ACEC – Same as Alternative B.	Shay Canyon ACEC – The ACEC would not be established, with VRM III objectives, limited OHV use, livestock grazing, fuels and watershed treatments that would have long-term, adverse impacts on resources. Short-term, beneficial impacts on mechanized and non-mechanized users from expanded opportunities, but long-term, adverse impacts on users from resource degradation through lack of protection prescriptions.	Shay Canyon ACEC – Same as Alternative B.
	San Juan River ACEC – The area would be managed as a 15,100-acre ACEC. Impacts would same as the San Juan River SRMA impacts.	San Juan River ACEC – Managed as a 7,590-acre ACEC for protection of scenic, cultural, wildlife, and natural systems values. Long-term, beneficial impacts on resources from decisions that limit or restrict surface disturbances.	San Juan River ACEC – Same as Alternative B.	San Juan River ACEC – The ACEC would not be designated, but impacts would be same as Alternative B because of similar management decisions to protect recreational resources and allow similar range of recreational opportunities.	San Juan River ACEC – Same as Alternative B.

RECREATION					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
		Long-term, adverse impacts on motorized, mountain biking, non-mechanized users from reduced recreational opportunities. Negligible impacts on river users.			
	<p>Valley of the Gods ACEC – The area would be managed as 31,387-acre ACEC for scenic quality under VRM I objectives. Impacts on resources would be beneficial in the long-term through limitations on surface disturbances. Long-term, beneficial impacts on non-mechanized, mechanized, and scenic drivers because opportunities would be available.</p>	<p>Valley of the Gods ACEC – Managed as a 22,863-acre ACEC for scenic quality preservation. Impacts would be same as A because of VRM I objectives for the area.</p>	<p>Valley of the Gods ACEC – Same as Alternative B.</p>	<p>Valley of the Gods ACEC – No designation of an ACEC. VRM III management objectives would permit long-term, adverse impacts to resources, with long-term, adverse impacts to scenic drivers, non-motorized, and non-mechanized users from diminished recreational opportunities.</p>	<p>Valley of the Gods ACEC – Impacts the same as Alternative B.</p>
	<p>Wild and Scenic River – Colorado Segments Impacts on segment #1 would be beneficial in the long-term from restrictions to preserve ORVs, with beneficial, long-term impacts on all users because opportunities would continue to be available. Impacts on Segment #2 and #3 would be the same as for #1 above.</p>	<p>Wild and Scenic River – Colorado Segments Impacts on segment #1 would be beneficial in the long-term from preservation of ORVs. Impacts on specialized, mountain biking, non-mechanized, river users, and motorized users would be beneficial because opportunities would be available for recreation. Impacts on Segment #2</p>	<p>Wild and Scenic River – Colorado Segments Recommended as not suitable, the impacts on Segment resources and users would be adverse in the long-term. Impacts to Segment #2 would be same as Alternative B, except that motorized use would create user conflicts and diminish the river user experience. Impacts to Segment #3</p>	<p>Wild and Scenic River – Colorado Segments Segments would be recommended as Not Suitable, with long-term, adverse impacts on recreation.</p>	<p>Wild and Scenic River – Colorado Segments Same as Alternative B.</p>

RECREATION					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
		would be same as to #1 above. Impact to Segment #3 would have long-term, beneficial impacts on resources, but long-term, adverse impacts on mountain biking and motorized users from reduced opportunities.	would be same as Alternative B, except that motorized use would create user conflicts and diminish the river user experience.		
	Wild and Scenic River-Indian Creek Segment Not evaluated for eligibility, but impacts on recreation would continue to be beneficial through management decisions under the current RMP, with a range of beneficial recreational opportunities for mechanized and non-mechanized users.	Wild and Scenic River-Indian Creek Segment Long-term, beneficial impacts on resources and resource users because ORVs would be protected, while allowing recreation opportunities for motorized, non-motorized, and mountain bike users.	Wild and Scenic River-Indian Creek Segment Long-term, adverse impacts on resources from likely degradation of ORVs. Impacts on users would be long-term and adverse from degradation of resources and reduction in recreational opportunities.	Wild and Scenic River-Indian Creek Segment Same as Alternative C.	Wild and Scenic River-Indian Creek Segment Same as Alternative B, except that additional resource protection along 0.6 miles of river corridor to protect areas with non-WSA wilderness characteristics.
	Wild and Scenic – Fable Valley Segment Not evaluated for eligibility, but it's location within a WSA ensures that impacts on recreation resources and non-mechanized recreation would be beneficial in the long term. Long-term, adverse impacts on all other user groups from WSA restrictions on mechanized use and surface disturbances.	Wild and Scenic – Fable Valley Segment Same as Alternative A.	Wild and Scenic – Fable Valley Segment Same as Alternative A.	Wild and Scenic – Fable Valley Segment Same as Alternative A.	Wild and Scenic – Fable Valley Segment Same as Alternative A.

RECREATION					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
	<p>Wild and Scenic – Dark Canyon Segment Not evaluated for eligibility, but it's location within a WSA ensures that impacts on recreation resources and non-mechanized recreation would be beneficial in the long term. Long-term, adverse impacts on all other user groups from WSA restrictions on mechanized use and surface disturbances.</p>	<p>Wild and Scenic – Dark Canyon Segment Same as Alternative A.</p>	<p>Wild and Scenic – Dark Canyon Segment Same as Alternative A.</p>	<p>Wild and Scenic – Dark Canyon Segment Same as Alternative A.</p>	<p>Wild and Scenic – Dark Canyon Segment Same as Alternative A.</p>
	<p>Wild and Scenic – San Juan River Segments Segment #1 not evaluated for eligibility, with impacts same as Colorado River Segment #1. Segment #2 determined to be eligible. Limited OHV use, VRM I objectives, and withdrawn mineral entry would have long-term, beneficial impacts on resources and users because opportunities would continue to be available for mechanized, river floating, and non-mechanized users. Segments #3, #4, and #5 would have same impacts as #2.</p>	<p>Wild and Scenic – San Juan River Segments Segment #1 recommended as Suitable for Recreation, managed as VRM III, NSO for minerals. Impacts to recreation would be negligible to minor because no recreation ORVs were found during eligibility study. Segment #2 recommended as Suitable for Recreation with ORV protection that would have long-term, beneficial impacts on recreation resources and users. Segment #3 recommended as Suitable for Wild, with</p>	<p>Wild and Scenic – San Juan River Segments Segment #1 impacts same as Alternative B. Segment #2 Recommended as Not Suitable. Impacts on recreation would be adverse in the long-term because eligibility study determined that the segment has ORVs. Impacts on users would be adverse in the long-term because of likely resource degradation and diminished recreation opportunities. Segment #3 Impacts same as Segment #2. Segment #4 Impacts same as Segment #2. Segment #5 Impacts same as Segment #2.</p>	<p>Wild and Scenic – San Juan River Segments Segment #1 Impacts same as Alternative C. Segment #2 Impacts same as Alternative C. Segment #3 Impacts same as Alternative C. Segment #4 Impacts same as Alternative C. Segment #5 Impacts same as Alternative C.</p>	<p>Wild and Scenic – San Juan River Segments Same as Alternative B.</p>

RECREATION					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
		<p>VRM I management, closed to OHV use, and mineral withdrawal that would have long-term, beneficial impacts on resources. Impacts on users would be variable: OHV users would be adversely affected, but river floaters and non-mechanized users would benefit.</p> <p>Segment #4 would have impacts same as Segment #2.</p> <p>Segment #5 would have impacts same as Segment #3.</p>			
	<p>Wild and Scenic – Arch Canyon Segment Not evaluated for eligibility. Impacts same as Indian Creek segment.</p>	<p>Wild and Scenic – Arch Canyon Segment Same as Indian Creek segment.</p>	<p>Wild and Scenic – Arch Canyon Segment Same as Indian Creek segment.</p>	<p>Wild and Scenic – Arch Canyon Segment Same as Indian Creek segment.</p>	<p>Wild and Scenic – Arch Canyon Segment Same as Alternative B.</p>
	<p>Wild and Scenic – White Canyon Determined to be eligible. Beneficial, long-term impacts on recreation and users from resource protection and continued recreational opportunities.</p>	<p>Wild and Scenic – White Canyon Determined to be Not Suitable. Negligible impacts on recreation because of proposed SRMA under this alternative to protect recreation resources and opportunities.</p>	<p>Wild and Scenic – White Canyon Same as Alternative B.</p>	<p>Wild and Scenic – White Canyon Same as Alternative B.</p>	<p>Wild and Scenic – White Canyon Same as Alternative B.</p>

RECREATION					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
	<p>Wilderness Study Areas (WSAs) Impacts on recreation and users would be negligible because past and future status would not change until congressional release.</p>	<p>Wilderness Study Areas (WSAs) Same as Alternative A.</p>	<p>Wilderness Study Areas (WSAs) Same as Alternative A.</p>	<p>Wilderness Study Areas (WSAs) Same as Alternative A.</p>	<p>Wilderness Study Areas (WSAs) Same as Alternative A.</p>
Special Status Species	Negligible impacts on recreation.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Travel Management	<p>OHV – Open to cross-country travel and limited to designated routes OHV use would be adverse in the long-term from resources degradation and intensifying resource use conflicts. Special Stipulation Areas – Long-term, adverse impacts from OHV exclusion and access within McLoyd Canyon-Moon House site. Long-term, beneficial impacts from restricting travel in Arch Canyon by preserving wildlife viewing opportunities.</p>	<p>OHV – Short- and long-term, beneficial impacts to resources from eliminated OHV cross-country travel and restrictions to designated routes, and reduction in user conflicts. Beneficial impacts on non-mechanized, mountain biking, and river floaters from closed or designated routes. Long-term, adverse impacts on motorized OHV groups from elimination of Open OHV areas. Special Stipulation Areas – Impacts to McLoyd Canyon-Moon House same as Alternative A, but long-term, beneficial impacts to resource preservation. Long-term, adverse impacts to recreation from closing Arch Canyon to OHV use</p>	<p>OHV – Same as Alternative B, except that long-term, adverse impacts would occur within 2,311 acres designated as Open to OHV use. Special Stipulation Areas – Impacts to McLoyd Canyon-Moon House same as Alternative B. Impacts to Arch Canyon same as Alternative A.</p>	<p>OHV – Resource impacts same as Alternative C. Long-term, adverse impacts to mountain biking and non-mechanized users from resource conflicts with motorized OHV users throughout planning area. Long-term, adverse impacts on motorized OHV cross-country use from substantial reduction in area, but increased opportunities for designated route OHV recreation. Special Stipulation Areas – Impacts to McLoyd Canyon-Moon House same as Alternative A. Impacts to Arch Canyon resources same as Alternative A. impacts to users same as Alternative C.</p>	<p>OHV – All OHV travel within non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be prohibited, with long-term, substantially adverse impacts on motorized OHV, mountain biking, and competitive (specialized) motorized and non-motorized users from reduced opportunities. Long-term, beneficial impacts on non-mechanized users from increased areas closed to motorized users. Special Stipulation Areas – Same as Alternative B.</p>

RECREATION					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
		by reducing recreational opportunities.			
Vegetation Management	Impacts same as Fire Management because treatments and impacts are the same.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Visual Resources	Long-term, beneficial protection-related impacts on recreation resources and related scenic quality preservation, and long-term, beneficial impacts on all resource user groups from designation of 371,575 acres as VRM Class I and 355,112 acres as VRM II (41% of the PA).	497,668 acres designated under VRM Class I (33% more than Alternative A) and 250,641 acres as VRM II, with impacts same as Alternative A, but to a greater degree. Approximately 42% of the planning area would be managed for high scenic quality.	425,179 acres designated under VRM Class I (14% more than Alternative A) and 132,001 as VRM II, with long-term, adverse impacts to recreation from 10% less protection of scenic quality than Alternative A. Approximately 31% of the planning area would be managed for high scenic quality.	390,424 acres designated under VRM Class I (5% more than Alternative A) and 8,838 acres as VRM II, with long-term, adverse impacts to recreation from a 19% reduction in scenic quality protection than Alternative A. High scenic quality would be protected on 22% of the PA.	998,371 acres designated as VRM I (269% more acreage than Alternative A), including areas designated as VRM Class I to protect non-WSA wilderness characteristics, with long-term, beneficial impacts on scenic resources. This alternative would protect scenic quality under VRM Class I and II management objectives on 62% of the PA.
Wildlife and Fisheries Resources	Seasonal closing of wildlife habitat would have short-term, adverse impacts on motorized OHV recreation to protect crucial habitat.	Short-term, adverse restrictions on all commercial or permitted OHV use within crucial wildlife habitat. Approximately 512 miles of OHV routes would be affected.	Same as Alternative B, except that 135 miles of commercial and permitted OHV routes would be affected.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B.
Woodlands	Long-term, adverse noise and visual impacts on non-mechanized, some motorized OHV, specialized, scenic driving, and mountain biking groups from intrusive OHV and chainsaw noise impacts, trash, OHV surface	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.

RECREATION					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
	disturbances, and remnants of woodland harvesting.				

RIPARIAN RESOURCES					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
Fire Management	Fuels management treatments on approximately 5,000 to 10,000 acres annually would be adverse in the short-term from increased sedimentation and runoff from prescribed burn surface disturbances. Long-term beneficial impacts from reduction in wildland fire risk and establishment of a more natural fire return interval.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Lands and Realty	Beneficial impacts from ROW exclusions on 120,800 acres that would limit surface and vegetation disturbances and changes in hydrology.	Beneficial impacts from ROW exclusions in bird habitat, in designated VRM Class I and II areas through limits on surface and vegetation disturbances and changes in hydrology.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B, but with additional beneficial impacts from ROW exclusions in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics.
Livestock Grazing	The total riparian area open to grazing would be 17,600 acres; unavailable acreage would be 2,400 acres. Beneficial impacts from resource protection and enhancement through proper herd management. Proper	17,200 riparian acres would be open to grazing; 2,800 would be unavailable. Seasonal restrictions, closures, and/or forage utilization limits on grazing in riparian areas, especially those Functioning at Risk.	Same as Alternative B.	Alternative D would have 18,020 acres open and 2,380 acres unavailable to livestock grazing. There would be no seasonal restrictions, closures, and/or forage utilization limits on grazing riparian areas	Same as Alternative B.

RIPARIAN RESOURCES					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
	livestock grazing would benefit riparian systems by ensuring recruitment of riparian plant species. Riparian exclosures would protect and enhance riparian vegetation. Overall, Alternative A has the fewest riparian areas unavailable for livestock grazing compared to all other alternatives.	The closure of riparian areas to grazing would protect riparian vegetation, as described under A. Alternative B provides the largest number of riparian acres excluded from grazing, which would have more long-term, beneficial impacts on riparian resources in those excluded areas than Alternative A.		Functioning At Risk, therefore fewer reductions in adverse impacts would occur, as compared to Alternatives B and C. This alternative would have impacts the same as Alternative A.	
Non-WSA Lands with Wilderness Characteristics	No impacts to riparian resources in these lands from special management to protect non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics because no lands would be managed to protect their wilderness characteristics.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Beneficial impacts to riparian resources from protection of wilderness characteristics on 582,360 acres from closure to minerals, OHV travel, ROW permitting, and through management under VRM Class I objectives.
Recreation	Short term and Long-term, adverse impacts to riparian resources from dispersed recreation-related and OHV-caused stream bank vegetation trampling; soil compaction, sedimentation, erosion, and indirect spread of invasive species. Impacts mitigated by BLM through recreation guidelines and stipulations to protect riparian resources.	Similar to Alternative A, but with less adverse impacts from increased restrictions on recreation in riparian areas, riparian areas closed to OHV use, limits on river use, and other recreation restrictions that would protect riparian resources.	Recreation actions would provide more protection to riparian resources than Alternatives A and D, but less than Alternatives B and E.	Similar to Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B, except that restrictions on OHV use would be greater, with fewer potential impacts to riparian areas from OHV use.

RIPARIAN RESOURCES					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
Riparian Resources	Long-term, beneficial impacts on riparian resources from NSO stipulations, grazing and rangeland health standards, and floodplain protection.	Same as Alternative A.	Similar to Alternative B, with less protective ACEC prescriptions.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B.
Soil and Water Resources	Indirect, long term, adverse impacts from sedimentation and soil erosion on riparian because of a lack of steep-slope surface disturbances restrictions.	Long-term, beneficial indirect impacts from surface disturbance restrictions on slopes >40% slopes (approximately 87,456 acres).	Same as Alternative B, except surface-disturbing activities would not be permitted on slopes greater than 40% unless determined that it would cause undue or unnecessary degradation to pursue other placement alternatives.	Same as Alternative B, except the impacts of soils and watershed management decisions would require a plan including an erosion control strategy, survey, and design for development of land with a slope greater than 40%.	Same as Alternative B.
Special Designations	Long-term, adverse impacts from minerals activities within ACECs through vegetation trampling and removal, habitat fragmentation, and invasive species infestation. Long-term, beneficial impacts from OHV motorized-use protection, and protection within WSAs.	Long-term, beneficial protection within WSAs and W&SR segments, from OHV limitations, and limits on vegetation treatments.	Same as Alternative B.	Impacts the same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B, except that riparian areas in 109,206 acres of ACECs in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be managed with additional protective restrictions from woodland harvest, mineral entry, surface disturbance, and ROWs.
Special Status Species	Long-term, beneficial impacts to riparian areas, from protection of special status species habitat.	Same as Alternative A, except additional beneficial impacts from protection of Arch Canyon through OHV closure and permitted limits on visitor impacts to the canyon to protect riparian resources.	Impacts same as A, except OHV use in Arch Canyon limited to the designated route.	Same as Alternative A, except additional riparian protection from travel limits within Arch Canyon.	Same as Alternative B.

RIPARIAN RESOURCES					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
Vegetation	No impacts on riparian resources because no vegetation treatments are proposed in riparian areas.	Adverse, direct and indirect short term impacts from vegetation treatments causing increased runoff and sedimentation due to loss of vegetative cover. Long-term, beneficial impacts from riparian condition improvement after treatments. This would be 500 (100%) more acres of riparian treatment than under Alternative A.	Impacts same as B, except treatment of 400 (80%) fewer acres of riparian habitat than under Alternative B.	Same as Alternative C.	Same as Alternative B.
Visual Resources	Under Alternative A, 12,200 acres of riparian habitat would be beneficially protected under VRM Class I and II objectives.	Same as Alternative A, except 1,000 fewer acres (11,200 total acres) of riparian habitat would be protected.	Same as Alternative A, except 8,600 acres of riparian habitat would be beneficially protected under VRM Class I and II objectives.	Under Alternative D, 5,300 acres of riparian habitat would be beneficially protected under VRM Class I and II objectives. This alternative would provide the least benefit to riparian resources.	Same as Alternative B, except more riparian area would be beneficially protected under VRM Class I and II objectives than any of the other alternatives (13,704 acres of riparian habitat).
Wildlife and Fisheries Resources	Long-term, direct benefits to riparian resources from maintenance and/or improvement of lowland riparian and wetlands habitats. Some loss of riparian vegetation from elk grazing.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Woodlands	Potential adverse impacts from vegetation disturbance, reduction or loss of woody shrub and canopy vegetation in riparian habitat from permitted harvesting of cottonwood and willow for	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.

RIPARIAN RESOURCES					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
	ceremonial purposes.				

SOCIOECONOMICS					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
Cultural Resources	Long-term, adverse impacts to cultural resource-related tourism revenue from minimal restrictions and protection of cultural resources (37,433 acres).	A 162% increase (98,348 acres) in protected cultural resources could beneficially increase cultural resource-related tourism. Increased quality and quantity of cultural sites would likely have long-term beneficial impacts on the local economy as compared to Alternative A.	Impacts same as Alternative B, except reduced protection for the Tank Bench areas could have adverse impacts on tourism and connections to the cultural heritage of the area.	Impacts same as Alternative A, except acreage subject to special management considerations increased by 5% (38,995 acres).	Same as Alternative B, except that areas designated as NSO would be closed in the Comb Ridge.
Livestock Grazing	No changes in existing socioeconomic conditions (employment, sales tax revenue, culture).	Same as Alternative A, except a 0.5% reduction in acres available for grazing and a 0.03% reduction in AUMs. This is not likely to impact social conditions, jobs or income.	Same as Alternative D.	Same as Alternative A, but with a 0.01% reduction in acres and 0.02% reduction in AUMs	Same as Alternative B.
Minerals and Energy Resources	Long-term, beneficial economic impacts to local communities from employment, taxes, royalties, bonus payments and annual rent payments from minerals development: Estimated annual revenue from oil and gas development: 5 oil wells-\$251,225 and 5 natural gas wells-\$312,350.	Same as Alternative A, except total well potential would differ by only 7 wells (73 wells under Alternative A and 66 wells under B)	Same as Alternative A, except the total well potential would differ by only one well (73 wells under Alternative A and 74 under Alternative C).	Same as Alternative A, except total well potential would differ by only 2 wells (73 wells under Alternative A and 75 wells under Alternative D).	Same as Alternative A, with the well potential differing by 19 wells (73 wells under Alternative A and 54 wells under Alternative E). Estimated annual revenue from oil and gas development: 3 oil wells - \$150,735 and 3 natural gas wells - \$187,410.

SOCIOECONOMICS					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
Non-WSA Lands with Wilderness Characteristics	No impacts, as no non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be managed for wilderness characteristics.	No impacts, as no non-WSA lands would be managed for wilderness characteristics.	No impacts, as no non-WSA lands would be managed for wilderness characteristics.	No impacts, as no non-WSA lands would be managed for wilderness characteristics.	Management prescriptions for 582,357 acres of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics likely to have positive impacts on local economy with the potential for some socioeconomic losses due to restricted activities in these areas.
Recreation	No changes in current socioeconomic trends (\$35.5 million in spending and 1,083 jobs in 2003).	Minor, adverse impacts on socioeconomics from decreased group/trip sizes within SRMAs, resulting in fewer visitors. OHV impacts would be the same as Alternative A. Long-term, beneficial impacts on non-motorized activities would be the greatest under this alternative.	Similar impacts to Alternative A, with greater potential for increased visitation and economic contributions to local economy than Alternative B. Potential for long-term, adverse social impacts due to user conflicts, crowding, and degradation to the environment.	Similar to Alternative A, except for a slightly greater potential benefit to short-term economic conditions as group, trip, and use limits would be least restrictive under this alternative. Potential for long-term, adverse social impacts due to user conflicts, crowding, and degradation to the environment.	Similar to Alternative B, with unknown gains and losses due to management prescriptions for 582,360 acres of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics.
Special Designations	Negligible economic impacts from anticipated level of minerals development.	Impacts same as Alternative A, except adverse impacts to mineral development and subsequent economic revenue would be slightly greater with 310,651 acres (60 % of total ACECs) closed to oil and gas development. Adverse impacts from seasonal prohibitions of SRPs in ACECs.	Impacts same as Alternative A, with 291,605 acres of ACECs closed to development (56 % of total ACECs). Long-term beneficial and adverse impacts same as B for WSRs, but more beneficial for minerals development and less beneficial for recreation users. Opportunities for tourism-based revenue	Impacts same as Alternative A, with 287,492 acres of ACECs closed to development (55 % of total ACECs). Beneficial minerals-related impacts, as Alternative D would not recommend WSR designations.	ACECs – Impacts same as Alternative B, with 399,345 acres of ACECs closed to development (77% of total ACECs).

SOCIOECONOMICS					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
		Long-term, adverse impacts from designating 92.4 miles as recommended for W&SR status, limiting minerals development. Long-term, beneficial impacts from revenue generated from river user groups.	as a result of the designations would be less than Alternative B.		
Visual Resources	Adverse impacts to socioeconomics would be negligible to minor given the amount of VRM III and IV lands (over 1 million acres) open for mineral development and the small amount of wells projected to be drilled over the life of the plan (76 wells).	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A, though fewer acres of VRM III and VRM IV.

SOIL AND WATER RESOURCES					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
Air Quality	No impacts to soils and water resources.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Cultural Resources	Adverse impacts to soils and water resources from watershed treatments and limited controls on disposal of human waste, pets and livestock, and other soil disturbing activities. Long-term, adverse impacts of cultural decisions on soils and water resources would be	Same as Alternative A, except 78,012 acres would be protected as designated CSMA's, with fewer adverse impacts to soils and water resources than Alternative A due to greater restrictions on human waste, pets and livestock.	Adverse impacts to soils and water resources same as Alternative A with same restrictions as Alternative B, except a smaller area would be designated as CSMA's. This alternative would have fewer short- and long-term adverse impacts on soils and water resources than	Adverse impacts on soils and water resources same as Alternative A, but to a greater degree. This alternative would have fewer short- and long-term adverse impacts than Alternative A, but greater impacts than Alternatives B and C.	Adverse impacts on soils and water resources same as Alternative A with same restrictions as Alternative B, except the Comb Ridge and Beef Basin CSMA's would also be closed to oil and gas leasing, new improvements for range/wildlife/watersheds and OHV use. This

SOIL AND WATER RESOURCES					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
	partially mitigated due to the closure of the Grand Gulch Special Emphasis area to surface disturbing activities (37,433 acres).		Alternative A, but greater impacts than Alternative B.		alternative would provide greater protection for soils and water resources than any other alternative.
Fire Management	Short-term, adverse impacts on soils and water resources due to increased sedimentation and run-off in areas where vegetation has been treated, with long-term beneficial impacts due to reduced fuel loading and reduced fire risk.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Health and Safety	Short term, beneficial impacts on soils and water resources where Abandoned Mine Lands (AMLs) are rehabilitated; long term, beneficial impacts on soils and water resources by reducing the detrimental impacts of AML water drainage.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Lands and Realty	No impacts to soils and water resources.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Livestock Grazing	Long-term, beneficial impacts from livestock grazing reductions on 23,200 acres of soils with limitations.	Long-term, beneficial impacts from seasonal restrictions, closures, and/or forage utilization limits on grazing in riparian areas, especially those Functioning at Risk. Alternative B would exclude grazing on	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B.

SOIL AND WATER RESOURCES					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
		26,200 acres, which would have greater long-term, beneficial impacts than Alternative A.			
Minerals and Energy Resources	Short-term and long-term, adverse impacts from minerals disturbances from loss of vegetative cover, sedimentation of surface waters and loss of soil productivity. Under Alternative A, the following approximate acreages of sensitive soils would be open for mineral leasing and potential adverse impacts: 77,600 acres of highly wind erodible soils; 15,000 acres of highly water erodible soils; 217,300 acres of reclamation sensitive soils, and a total 1,585 acres estimated surface disturbance from mineral development and exploration.	Same impacts as Alternative A, except: 74,000 acres of highly wind erodible soils; 15,100 acres of highly water erodible soils; 276,930 acres of reclamation sensitive soils would be open for mineral leasing. A total of 3,300 more wind erodible; 200 less water erodible; and 37,500 less reclamation sensitive soils would be closed compared to Alternative A. Total estimated surface disturbance from mineral development and exploration would be 155 fewer acres than under Alternative A.	Same impacts as Alternative A, except: 65,200 acres of highly wind erodible soils; 34,800 acres of highly water erodible soils; and 311,700 acres of reclamation sensitive soils would be open for mineral leasing. A total of 5,800 less wind erodible, 4,800 more water erodible, and 19,100 less acres of reclamation sensitive soils would be closed compared to Alternative A. Total estimated surface disturbance from mineral development and exploration would be 28 more acres than under Alternative A.	Same impacts as Alternative A, except: 84,700 acres of highly wind erodible soils; 17,000 acres of highly water erodible soils; and 314,800 acres of reclamation sensitive soils would be open for mineral leasing. A total of 21,600 less wind erodible acres, 2,100 less water erodible, and 22,300 less acres of reclamation-limited soils would be closed compared to Alternative A. Total estimated surface disturbance from mineral development and exploration would be 60 more acres than under Alternative A.	Same impacts as Alternative A, except: 29,732 acres of highly wind erodible soils; 7,878 acres of highly water erodible soils; 196,031 acres of reclamation sensitive soils would be open for mineral leasing. A total of 47,769 more wind erodible, 7,028 more water erodible, and 96,491 more acres of reclamation sensitive acres would be closed compared to Alternative A. Total estimated surface disturbance from mineral development and exploration would be 476 fewer acres than under Alternative A.
Non-WSA Lands with Wilderness Characteristics	No effect on soil and water resources as no actions are prescribed to protect the wilderness characteristics of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	A total of 582,360 acres of non-WSA lands would be managed to maintain their wilderness characteristics, with long-term beneficial impacts to soils and water resources.
Paleontology	Negligible impacts to soils and water resources.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.

SOIL AND WATER RESOURCES					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
Recreation	Potential short- and long-term impacts to soils and water resources associated with recreation activities include damage to streambanks and associated vegetation, soil compaction, increased erosion, and sedimentation of surface waters.	Impacts same as Alternative A, except to a lesser degree, from restrictions on recreation-related soil and water resource impacts within SRMAs.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B, except more adverse, long term impacts from fewer restrictions and limits on recreational use.	Same as Alternative B.
Riparian Resources	Long-term, beneficial protection of soils and water resources from NSO in riparian areas, management to achieve riparian PFC, and no new surface disturbing activities allowed within active floodplains or within 100 meters of riparian areas.	Same as Alternative A, except selected areas would be closed to motorized use and livestock trailing, which would result in minor beneficial reductions in impacts to soils and water resources.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B.
Soil and Water Resources	There would be no additional impacts under Alternative A.	Long-term, beneficial impacts from prohibitions on steep-slope surface-disturbing activities (slopes >40%), and erosion control designs and plans for slopes between 21 and 40%. These measures would reduce erosion and sedimentation relative to Alternative A.	Long-term, beneficial impacts from restrictions on surface disturbance on slopes >40% unless it were determined that it would cause undue or unnecessary degradation to pursue other placement alternatives. These measures would reduce erosion and sedimentation relative to Alternative A.	Adverse impacts same as Alternative A, but to a lesser degree, from required plans and erosion control strategies for slopes >40%. Under Alternative D, the impacts of soils and watershed management decisions on soils resources would require a plan including an erosion control plan. These measures would reduce erosion and sedimentation relative to Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B, except there would be additional restrictions on surface disturbing activities in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics. Overall impacts to soils and water resources would be less adverse under Alternative E than under any of the alternatives.

SOIL AND WATER RESOURCES					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
Special Designations	Long-term, adverse impacts from mineral leasing, geophysical work, mineral material disposal, mineral entry, woodland harvesting, vegetation treatments, grazing, and OHV use within ACECs. A total of 113,000 acres of sensitive soils would be within designated ACECs, wherein impacts to soil and water resources would be reduced.	Impacts same as Alternative A, except with fewer adverse impacts within ACECs from greater surface disturbance restrictions. ACEC designation would result in the protection of 7,385 more acres of sensitive soils than under Alternative A.	Impacts same as Alternative B, but to a greater degree from an increase in allowable surface-disturbing activities. ACEC designation would result in the protection of 98,000 fewer acres of sensitive soils than under Alternative A.	Long-term, adverse impacts from allowed surface disturbance impacts to soils and water. There no special designations and zero acres of sensitive soils protected, which is 113,000 fewer acres than Alternative A. This alternative would have the least protections for sensitive soils of the alternatives.	Same as Alternative B.
Special Status Species	Long-term, beneficial impacts to soils and water from special status species habitat protection.	Beneficial impacts same as Alternative A, except to a greater degree, due to more acres of protected habitat for special status species that would protect soils and water resources.	Beneficial impacts same as Alternative B, except to a lesser degree due to fewer acres of protected habitat for special status species.	There would be negligible beneficial impacts compared to Alternative A, as this alternative would have the fewest acres with surface disturbance restrictions in special status species habitat, with the greatest potential for long-term, adverse impacts on soils and water resources of the alternatives.	Same as Alternative B.
Travel Management	Potential short- and long-term impacts to soils and water resources associated with travel management decisions include damage to streambanks and associated vegetation, soil compaction, increased erosion, and sedimentation of surface	Impacts same as Alternative A, except a total of 63,900 acres would be open to OHV use on designated routes, which is 221,800 fewer acres of sensitive soils open than under Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B, except 64,400 acres of sensitive soils would be open to OHV use on designated routes, which is 221,300 fewer acres of sensitive soils open than under Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B, except 64,500 acres of sensitive soils would be open to OHV use, mostly limited to designated routes, which is 221,200 fewer acres of sensitive soils open than under Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B, except no OHV travel would be permitted in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics (582,360 acres), which is 296,660 more acres of closed or limited OHV use than Alternative A.

SOIL AND WATER RESOURCES					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
	waters. A total of 285,700 acres of sensitive soils would be closed to OHV use or limited to designated routes.				
Vegetation	Short-term adverse impacts from vegetation increased erosion and water runoff. Long-term, beneficial impacts from reduced soil compaction, erosion, and sedimentation through increase in native vegetation cover, and a reduction of invasive weed species. Existing vegetation treatments would occur on 232,100 acres.	Fewer short-term adverse impacts and fewer long-term beneficial impacts than Alternative A on soils and water resources than Alternative A from treatments on 6,600 acres/year, with 133,100 fewer acres of vegetation treatment over the LOP than Alternative A. Alternative B would have fewer short-term adverse impacts and long-term beneficial impacts to soils and water resources than Alternative A	Same as Alternative B, except 7,800 acres would be open to vegetation treatments each year to restore ecosystem health, with 115,100 fewer acres of vegetation treatment over the LOP than Alternative A. Alternative C would have fewer short-term adverse impacts and long-term beneficial impacts to soils and water resources than Alternative A, more than Alternatives B and E.	More long-term beneficial impacts from vegetation treatments on soils and water resources under Alternative D than under Alternatives B or C due to 9,300 acres/year targeted for vegetation treatment, with 92,600 fewer acres of vegetation treatment over the LOP than Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B.
Visual Resources	Under Alternative A, 187,400 acres of sensitive soils would be managed as VRM Class I & II, with the second greatest level of beneficial, long-term protection for soils and water resources due to an increase in surface disturbing restrictions under VRM Class I & II objectives.	Under Alternative B, 186,000 acres of sensitive soils, 1,400 fewer acres than Alternative A, would be managed as VRM Class I & II, with the second greatest long-term, beneficial impacts from surface disturbance restrictions.	Same impacts as Alternative B, except 146,600 acres of sensitive soils, 40,800 fewer acres than Alternative A, would be managed as VRM Class I & II with beneficial impacts from surface disturbance restrictions.	Greatest potential for adverse impacts due to 87,500 acres of sensitive soils, 99,900 fewer acres than Alternative A, managed as VRM Class I & II to restrict surface disturbances.	Under Alternative E, 293,059 acres of sensitive soils, 105,659 more acres than Alternative A, would be managed as VRM Class I & II, with the greatest potential long-term, beneficial impacts from surface disturbance restrictions.

SOIL AND WATER RESOURCES					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
Wildlife and Fisheries Resources	Maintenance and/or improvement of wildlife and fisheries habitats would have indirect, beneficial impacts by ensuring the ecological functions of these systems, including soils and water within lowland riparian and wetland areas, and low and high desert scrub communities.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Woodlands	Under Alternative A, 1,309,894 acres would be open to woodland harvest, with the highest risk of adverse, long-term impacts to soils and water resources from vegetation loss and surface disturbances by motorized OHV and foot traffic during harvesting.	Adverse impacts same as Alternative A, except to a lesser degree due to 579,820 (44%) fewer acres open to woodland harvest than under Alternative A. This alternative would have fewer adverse impacts on soils and water resources than Alternative A, but greater impacts than Alternative E.	Adverse impacts same as Alternative A, except to a lesser degree due to 467,956 (36%) fewer acres open to woodland harvest than under Alternative A.	Same as Alternative C.	Adverse impacts same as Alternative A, except to a lesser degree due to 761,417 (58%) fewer acres open to woodland harvest than under Alternative A. This alternative would have the least adverse impacts on soils and water resources of the alternatives.

SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
Special Designations	Management of 488,616 acres as ACECs, but under prescriptions that would generally not be as beneficially protective of ACEC values as Alternatives B, C, and E. River segments	521,141 acres managed as ACECs, with long term, beneficial impacts from protection of ACEC values. 92.4 miles of river segments would be beneficially protected	Smallest area (76,764 acres) of the Monticello Planning Area as ACECs, except for Alternative D. Alternative C would be more beneficial to ACECs' values than Alternatives D or A, and	Long-term, adverse impacts from no ACEC designation to protect relevant and important resource values. Long-term, adverse impacts along river corridors from no recommended	Impacts the same as Alternative B, except additional long-term, beneficial impacts to ACEC relevant and important values from management of 109,206 acres of non-WSA lands

SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
	determined eligible in the 1991 San Juan RMP would be beneficially protected, and WSAs would be managed to beneficially protect their wilderness values.	under suitability recommendations, with WSA impact same as Alternative A.	less beneficial than Alternatives B and E. 18.4 miles of river beneficially protected in the long term under suitability recommendations, with WSA impacts same as Alternative A.	suitability. WSA impacts same as Alternative A.	with wilderness characteristics to protect wilderness values. River suitability recommendation impacts same as Alternative B, with WSA impacts same as Alternative A.
All other resources	Impacts to specially designated areas from other resource management decisions are discussed under the applicable resources' analysis of impacts.				

SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
Air Quality	No impacts to special status species.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Cultural Resources	Long-term, adverse impacts from cultural resource decisions include disturbance of wildlife, trampling of sensitive plants, and introduction of invasive species. These impacts would be partially mitigated by the closure of Grand Gulch Special Emphasis Area (37,433 acres) to surface disturbing activities such as woodland products gathering, mineral leasing, OHV use, and vegetation treatments.	Adverse impacts same as Alternative A, except surface disturbance restrictions on 62,567 acres would reduce impacts to special status wildlife and plants from surface disturbance. This alternative would restrict surface disturbing activities on 25,134 more acres than Alternative A.	Same total acreage and impacts as Alternative B, except more surface disturbing activities and visitors would be permitted in these areas than Alternative B, with overall impacts less than under Alternative A.	No acres would be designated as special management areas, which would have greater short-term and long-term, adverse impacts than Alternatives B and C, but fewer impacts than Alternative A.	Impacts same as Alternative B, except for additional reductions in adverse impacts to special status species due to restrictions on surface disturbing activities in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics, which includes 8,514 acres within Comb Ridge.

SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
Fire Management	Short-term adverse impacts from surface disturbance associated with fuels treatments, including trampling and crushing, habitat alteration, and introduction of invasive species. Long-term beneficial impacts would also occur due to reduced fuel loading, reduced fire risk, and diversified habitat on 5,000-10,000 acres/year.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Health and Safety	Potential adverse loss of special status bat habitat. Benefits to fish species due to reduced threat of groundwater contamination.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Lands and Realty	Long-term, adverse impacts from potential land disposal on 5,911 acres, and permitted facility construction of roads, pipelines, wind power generators, solar power generators, and communication towers.	Long-term, adverse impacts from potential land disposal of 2,280 additional acres (28% more than under Alternative A). Impacts of lands and realty decisions on special status species would be less than under Alternative A. Authorization of ROWs would not be permitted in WSAs, WSR corridors, VRM class I, II and III areas, ACECs, raptor and migratory bird habitat, and special status species habitat.	Impacts same as Alternative A due to an increase in acres of surface disturbance associated with the allowance of ROWs in ACECs, VRM class II and III areas, and non-federally listed special status species habitat.	Alternative D would have the greatest adverse, long-term impacts because surface disturbance would be allowed in more of the planning area than under the other alternatives.	Same as Alternative B, except for long-term, beneficial impacts to special status species habitat from ROWs exclusions in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics (33% of the planning area).

SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
Livestock Grazing	Adverse impacts include trampling, reduced forage and cover, reduced habitat quality and biodiversity, and introduction of invasive species. Under Alternative A, 78,394 acres of special status species habitat would be unavailable for grazing.	Adverse and beneficial impacts same as Alternative A, except 83,724 acres of special status species habitat would be unavailable for grazing, which is 5,330 (7%) more acres than under Alternative A.	Adverse and beneficial impacts same as Alternative B, except Mule Canyon south of I-95 (1,324 acres) would be unavailable for grazing, with the same total acres of special status species habitat excluded as Alternative B.	Alternative D would have the least beneficial impacts of the action alternatives due to only 13 more acres unavailable to grazing than Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B.
Minerals and Energy Resources	Adverse impacts from mineral development and exploration include direct mortality, surface disturbance, habitat degradation, and habitat fragmentation. Oil and gas leasing would include 212,532 acres of special status species habitat open to standard stipulations and 123,893 acres closed to leasing and mineral entry.	Adverse impacts same as Alternative A, except fewer acres of special status species habitat would be affected: 43,594 acres open to standard lease terms; 407,592 acres CSU and/or timing limitations; 71,142 acres NSO; and 136,182 acres closed.	Adverse impacts same as Alternative A, except more acres of special status species habitat would be affected than Alternatives A, B or E: 121,565 acres open to standard lease terms; 375,940 acres CSU and/or timing limitations; 19,803 acres NSO; and 136,226 acres closed.	Adverse impacts same as Alternative A, except the most acres of special status species habitat would be affected: 219,060 acres open to standard lease terms; 287,574 acres CSU and/or timing limitations; 20,404 acres NSO; and 126,559 acres closed.	Adverse impacts same as Alternative A, except the fewest acres of special status species habitat would be affected: 26,447 acres open to standard lease terms; 237,625 acres CSU and/or timing limitations; 41,135 acres NSO; and 348,386 acres closed.
Non-WSA Lands with Wilderness Characteristics	No impacts to special status species as non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics are not protected under this alternative.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Long-term, beneficial impacts to species from restricted surface disturbances to habitat within 582,357 acres of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics.
Paleontology	No impacts to special status species.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Recreation	Long-term, adverse impacts from human presence, noise, and	Long-term, adverse impacts same as Alternative A, except with	Long-term, adverse impacts same as Alternative A, with same	Long-term, adverse impacts same as Alternative A, except this	Same as Alternative B.

SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
	surface disturbance associated with mechanized and dispersed recreation on 361,972 acres of federally listed species habitat within SRMAs.	increased protection for special status species and 180,032 fewer acres of federally listed species habitat within SRMAs than under Alternative A.	acres of federally listed species habitat within SRMAs as Alternative B, but greater potential impacts due to more recreational users within SRMAs.	alternative would have the most acres of potential special status species habitat subject to adverse impacts from recreation. Adverse impacts would be greater than Alternative A, even with 184,576 fewer acres of federally listed species habitat within SRMAs,	
Riparian Resources	Short-term adverse impacts to special status plant and fish species could occur from vegetation treatments. Long-term beneficial impacts include reduced weeds and restoration of native vegetation.	Impacts same as Alternative A, except with long-term, beneficial impacts from closing OHV routes in riparian areas, closing areas to livestock grazing, seasonal restrictions, and setting forage use limits.	Impacts same as Alternative B with fewer adverse impacts to special status species and habitats than Alternatives A and D.	Impacts same as Alternative A, with greater impacts to special status species and habitats than Alternatives B and C.	Same as Alternative B.
Socioeconomics	No impacts to special status species.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Soil and Water Resources	Adverse impacts include habitat loss or degradation from erosion in upland habitats, and sedimentation and contamination of special status fish habitats. Alternative A would have the greatest potential for adverse impacts on special status species habitat due to limited surface disturbance restrictions on steep slopes.	Impacts same as Alternative A, except surface disturbing activities would be prohibited on slopes >40%, with erosion control measure required on 21 to 40% slopes. Impacts would be less than Alternatives A, C and D.	Impacts same as Alternative A, with greater potential for adverse impacts on slopes >40% than Alternatives B and E. Impacts would be less than Alternatives A and D.	Impacts same as Alternative A, with greater potential for adverse impacts on slopes >40% than Alternatives B, C and E due to fewer steep-slope erosion control restrictions, but with fewer adverse impacts than Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B.

SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
Special Designations	Beneficial impacts within 488,616 acres designated as ACECs, with long-term adverse impacts on 106,569 acres available to mineral leasing within ACECs, and impacts associated with permitted woodland harvesting, open OHV use, livestock grazing, and vegetation treatments.	Impacts same as Alternative A, except 521,141 acres of designated ACECs with 147,706 acres available for oil and gas leasing. Overall fewer impacts than Alternative A due to more acres subject to surface disturbance restrictions.	Impacts same as Alternative A, except 417,343 acres of designated ACECs with 34,885 acres available for oil and gas leasing. Overall greater impacts than Alternative A due to fewer acres subject to surface disturbance restrictions.	No acres designated as ACECs and limited restrictions on surface disturbances to special status species habitat. Overall greater impacts than Alternatives A, B, C and E.	Same as Alternative B.
Special Status Species	Long-term, beneficial impacts on species from restrictions, protective measures, and spatial and seasonal buffers to preserve species habitat.	Impacts same as Alternative A, except Alternative B would provide more acres of protected habitat for special status species.	Impacts same as Alternative A, except Alternative C would provide fewer acres of protected habitat for special status species than Alternatives A, B and E.	Impacts same as Alternative A, except Alternative D would protect the fewest acres of special status species habitat from surface disturbance with greater potential impacts than any of the alternatives.	Same as Alternative B.
Travel Management	Adverse impacts include surface and noise disturbance, crushing of individual plants and animals, habitat, and introduction of invasive species. Adverse impacts would be reduced by the closure of 276,430 acres to OHV use. Beneficial impacts from fewer miles of available OHV trails due to reduced potential for habitat fragmentation.	Impacts same as Alternative A, except 147,268 acres (35%) more acres closed to OHV use than Alternative A and fewer associated adverse impacts to special status species and their habitat.	Impacts same as Alternative A, except 142,237 acres (34%) more acres closed to OHV use than Alternative A, with slightly greater impacts than under Alternative B.	Impacts same as Alternative A, except no acres closed to OHV use and the greatest potential long-term adverse impacts to special status species from travel of any of the Alternatives.	Same as Alternative B.
Vegetation	Short-term adverse impacts include trampling and removal of habitat, and collection of sensitive	Adverse impacts same as Alternative A, except 7,875 (51%) fewer acres of vegetation treatments	Adverse impacts same as Alternative A, except to a lesser degree due to 6,175 (40%) fewer acres	Adverse impacts same as Alternative A, except to a lesser degree due to 4,175 (27%) fewer acres	Same as Alternative B, except 582,357 acres would have restrictions on vegetation treatments,

SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
	plant species on 232,130 acres open to vegetation treatments per year. Beneficial impacts from habitat improvements and control of invasive and weedy species.	per year, and greater beneficial impacts on species and habitat due to treatment of specific vegetation communities compared to unfocused treatment under Alternative A.	of vegetation treatments per year. Long-term beneficial impacts would be less than Alternative A due to unfocused treatments occurring on fewer acres.	of vegetation treatments per year. Long-term beneficial impacts would be greater than under Alternatives B or C due to more targeted vegetation treatments.	with fewer short-term adverse impacts than Alternative A, and more long-term beneficial impacts due to habitat protection for special status species.
Visual Resources	Under Alternative A 726,687 acres would be subject to VRM Class I or II restrictions, with long-term beneficial impacts to special status species due to restrictions on surface disturbing activities.	Impacts same as Alternative A, except 21,622 (3%) more acres subject to VRM Class I or II restrictions, and greater protection from surface disturbing activities than Alternative A.	Impacts same as Alternative A, except 169,507 (23%) less acres subject to VRM Class I or II restrictions and less protection from surface disturbing activities than Alternative A.	Impacts same as Alternative A, except 327,426 (45%) less acres subject to VRM Class I or II restrictions, and the least protection from surface disturbing activities of the alternatives	Impacts same as Alternative A, except 383,161 (53%) more acres subject to VRM Class I or II restrictions than Alternative A and the greatest protection for special status species habitats.
Wildlife and Fisheries Resources	Long-term, beneficial impacts from seasonal restrictions in migratory bird habitat, and maintenance and improvements to riparian, wetland, and desert scrub habitats. Long-term, beneficial impacts on 279,787 acres of special status species habitat due to seasonal restrictions for big game.	Long-term, beneficial impacts same as Alternative A, but to a greater degree due to 278,254 (99%) more acres of special status species habitat with seasonal restrictions for big game, and more acres subject to special wildlife conditions than under Alternative A.	Long-term, beneficial impacts same as Alternative A, but to a greater degree due to 47,112 (17%) more acres of special status species habitat with seasonal restrictions for big game, and more acres subject to special wildlife conditions than under Alternative A.	Long-term, beneficial impacts same as Alternative A, but to a less degree due to 14,563 (5%) fewer acres of special status species habitat with seasonal restrictions for big game, but 17% more acres subject to special wildlife conditions than under Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B.
Woodlands	Adverse impacts include removal or alteration of habitat, noise, trampling and crushing during harvesting, and surface disturbance. Beneficial impacts from reduced potential for wildfire and enhancement of	Impacts same as Alternative A, except to a lesser degree due to 579,820 (44%) fewer acres open to woodland harvest and wood gathering, and fewer potential long-term benefits from wildfire	Impacts same as Alternative A, except to a lesser degree due to 467,956 (36%) fewer acres open to woodland harvest and wood gathering, and fewer potential long-term benefits from wildfire	Same as Alternative C.	Same as Alternative B with additional protections on 582,357 acres of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics, which would be closed to woodland harvesting and wood gathering, and

SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
	understory habitats. 1,309,894 acres would be open to woodland harvest and wood gathering and pose the greatest potential disturbance to special status species in woodland habitats.	reduction than Alternative A.	reduction than Alternative A.		provide reduced surface disturbances in special status species habitat.

TRAVEL MANAGEMENT					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
Air Quality	Minor, short-term adverse impacts from reroutes or travel delays for dust abatement.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Cultural Resources	Long-term, adverse impacts from closure of McLoyd Canyon-Moon House road.	Long-term, adverse impacts from OHV exclusion from Tank Bench and McLoyd Canyon-Moon House road closure.	Impacts in Tank Bench same as Alternative B. Impacts on travel in McLoyd Canyon-Moon House same as Alternative A.	Long-term, beneficial impacts to travel from access to Tank Bench and McLoyd Canyon-Moon House.	Same as Alternative B.
Fire Management	Short-term, minor, adverse impacts from route closures from prescribed burns or wildland fire.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Lands and Realty	Minor, beneficial, long-term impacts from granting ROWs for minerals leasing (to extend travel routes along spur roads).	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Minerals and Energy Resources	Impacts same as Lands and Realty.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.

TRAVEL MANAGEMENT					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
Non-WSA Lands with Wilderness Characteristics	No impacts to travel management as non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics are not protected under this alternative.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Long-term, adverse impacts to travel and access as 582,360 acres and 179 miles of D-Class routes are closed to OHV travel.
Recreation	Long-term, adverse impacts from travel access restrictions within the San Juan River SRMA between Comb Wash and Lime Creek.	Long-term, adverse impacts from travel access restrictions within the San Juan River SRMA between Comb Wash and Lime Creek. Short-term, adverse impacts from seasonal prohibitions on commercial travel within crucial wildlife habitat.	Impacts along San Juan River SRMA same as Alternative B. Short-term, adverse impacts on travel from seasonal limits in big game habitat.	Impacts along San Juan River SRMA same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.
Riparian Resources	Negligible impacts from actions that would not specifically restrict travel through riparian areas.	Short-term, adverse impacts from temporary travel closures until restoration of riparian PFC. Long-term, adverse impacts from closure if travel activities were determined to be causing riparian degradation.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.
Special Designations	Impacts same as discussed under Recreation, Travel, and Riparian above for OHV and road travel.	Impacts same as discussed under Recreation, Travel, and Riparian above for OHV and road travel.	Impacts same as discussed under Recreation, Travel, and Riparian above for OHV and road travel.	Impacts same as discussed under Recreation, Travel, and Riparian above for OHV and road travel.	Impacts same as discussed under Recreation, Travel, and Riparian above for OHV and road travel.
Special Status Species	Impacts same as discussed under Recreation and Travel above.	Impacts same as discussed under Recreation and Travel above.	Impacts same as discussed under Recreation and Travel above.	Impacts same as discussed under Recreation and Travel above.	Impacts same as discussed under Recreation and Travel above.
Travel Management – OHV	Long-term, beneficial impacts from Open OHV and Limited route travel	Long-term, adverse impacts from no designated Open OHV	Similar to Alternative B, except 2,311 acres open to OHV use, and	Minor impacts on travel from no OHV Closed areas, seasonal	Same as Alternative B.

TRAVEL MANAGEMENT					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
	areas. Limited OHV with seasonal restrictions routes would have short-term, adverse impacts on travel.	areas, and Arch Canyon closure to OHV travel.	conditional motorized travel in 4 WSAs.	restrictions on commercial OHV travel, and OHV access to Arch Canyon	
Travel Management – Non-mechanized	Long-term, beneficial impacts from no restrictions on non-mechanized travel, and travel opportunities that exclude motorized and mountain biking travel to reduce user conflicts.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Travel Management – Roads	Negligible impacts to travel from no road closures, and unrestricted travel along B- and D-Class roads.	Long-term, adverse impacts from B- and D-Class road closures to resolve resource use conflicts.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.
Travel Management – Scenic Byways and Backways	Long-term, beneficial impacts from management for high-quality travel opportunities along these routes.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Vegetation	Same impacts as discussed under Fire because treatments are the same.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Wildlife and Fisheries Resources	Negligible to minor impacts from lack of restrictions on travel except for restrictions on cross-country OHV travel within bighorn sheep habitat.	Short-term, adverse impacts from seasonal restrictions in wildlife crucial habitat for commercial and permitted travel. No impacts on private travel.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B.

TRAVEL MANAGEMENT					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
Woodlands	Negligible impacts on travel from unspecified actions.	Short-term, adverse impacts from route closures to protect wildlife species.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Long-term, adverse impacts from prohibitions on off-road travel within areas with non-WSA wilderness characteristics.

VEGETATION					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
Air Quality	No impacts to vegetation resources.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Cultural Resources	Long-term, adverse impacts of cultural resource decisions on vegetation would be partially mitigated by closure of the Grand Gulch Special Emphasis area to surface disturbing activities such as woodland harvesting, mineral leasing, OHV use, and mechanized or mechanical surface disturbance (including vegetation treatments). These restrictions would limit vegetation-harming surface disturbance associated with these activities on 37,387 acres.	Fewer short- and long-term adverse impacts than under Alternatives A, C or D, due to restrictions on surface disturbing activities on 62,567 acres of designated CSMA's. This alternative would have fewer adverse impacts on vegetation than Alternatives A, C and D.	Same beneficial surface disturbance restrictions and impacts as under Alternative B, except some CSMA's would have fewer restrictions on surface disturbing activities than Alternatives B and E, but greater restrictions than Alternatives A and D. This alternative would have fewer short- and long-term adverse impacts than Alternative A and D, but more than Alternatives B and E.	Same impacts as Alternative C, except fewer areas would be managed as CSMA's. Overall, this alternative would have fewer short- and long-term adverse impacts than Alternative A, but more than Alternatives B, C and E.	Same as B, except more short- and long-term beneficial impacts from vegetation resource preservation within Comb Ridge to preserve non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics.
Fire Management	Surface-disturbing fuels treatments on 5,000 to 10,000 acres/year would have long-term beneficial and short-term adverse	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.

VEGETATION					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
	impacts on vegetation communities in treated areas. Thinning vegetation and treating areas for weeds would benefit vegetation by removing competition from weedy natives and invasive species. Short-term, adverse impacts include trampling and crushing of individual plants during treatment.				
Health and Safety	No impacts to vegetation resources.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Lands and Realty	Under Alternative A, construction of roads, pipelines, wind power generators, solar power generators, and communication towers would result in adverse impacts to vegetation from removal of individual plants and other surface disturbances, which can lead to the introduction of weedy plant species.	There would be fewer adverse impacts on vegetation resources under this alternative than Alternative A due to restrictions on ROWs for wind and solar energy development in WSAs, WSR corridors, VRM Class I and II areas, ACECs, raptor and migratory bird habitat, and special status species habitat. Overall, Alternative B would have fewer adverse impacts on vegetation resources than Alternatives A, C or D.	Adverse impacts would be same as under Alternative A due to increased surface disturbance associated with ROWs in ACECs, VRM Class II and III areas, and non-federally listed sensitive species habitat. Overall, Alternative C would have fewer impacts on vegetation resources than Alternatives A and D, but more than B and E.	Alternative D would have greater adverse impacts on vegetation resources than Alternative A due to more acres of surface disturbance associated with ROWs than would occur under any of the other alternatives.	Same impacts as Alternative B, except ROWs would be prohibited in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics, which would reduce long-term, adverse impacts to vegetation more than any of the other alternatives.
Livestock Grazing	Beneficial impacts from 17,300 acres allotted to wildlife on the slopes of Peter's Canyon and East Canyon, which would help maintain native	Same impacts as Alternative A, except allotment closures would exclude more acreage from grazing than any of the other alternatives,	Same as Alternative B, except the Mule Canyon Allotment south of U-95 would be unavailable. This alternative would have similar impacts as	Alternative D would have the smallest area excluded from grazing and, therefore greater adverse impacts to vegetation.	Same as Alternative B.

VEGETATION					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
	vegetation in those areas due to the lower grazing impact of lower numbers of wildlife than livestock.	which would have long-term, beneficial impacts on native vegetation in excluded areas.	Alternative B, and lower impacts than Alternative A.		
Minerals and Energy Resources	Approximately 73 wells drilled (701 acres of surface disturbance), 886 acres of short-term impacts from geophysical exploration, and infrastructure construction with direct adverse impacts on vegetation. Overall, the second fewest number of acres of native vegetation would be impacted by minerals development under this alternative.	Impacts would be the same as Alternative A, except there would be approximately 66 wells and 634 acres of disturbance (10% fewer acres than under Alternative A), and 794 acres of adverse impacts from geophysical exploration (10% fewer acres than under Alternative A). Alternative B would have fewer adverse impacts than Alternative A and greater impacts than Alternative E.	Impacts would be the same as Alternative A, except there would be approximately 74 wells and 710 acres of disturbance (1% more than under Alternative A), and 904 acres of adverse impacts from geophysical exploration (2% more than under Alternative A). Overall, this alternative would have greater adverse impacts to vegetation than Alternatives A, B and E, and slightly fewer impacts than Alternative D.	Impacts would be the same as Alternative A, except there would be approximately 75 wells and 720 acres (2% more than under Alternative A), and 924 acres of surface disturbance from geophysical exploration (4% more than under Alternative A). This alternative would have greater adverse impacts to vegetation than any of the alternatives.	Same as Alternative B, except for long term, beneficial impacts from mineral leasing prohibitions on 582,357 acres of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics. Alternative E would have the most acres closed or NSO to oil and gas leasing, and the least negative impacts on vegetation resources of the alternatives.
Non-WSA Lands with Wilderness Characteristics	No impacts to vegetation, as non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics are not protected under this alternative.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Long-term, beneficial impacts from resource preservation on 582,357 acres. Long-term and short-term, adverse impacts from prohibitions on mechanical treatment of vegetation and harvesting to reduce fire risks and invasive species spread.
Paleontology	Short-term adverse impacts on vegetation due to trampling.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Recreation	Alternative A would have the second most acres of native vegetation subject	Alternative B would have the fewest user/days per year and number of	Impacts same as Alternative B, but to a less beneficial degree,	Same impacts as C, but to a less beneficial degree due to fewer	Same impacts as Alternative B, except protection of non-WSA

VEGETATION					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
	to adverse impacts associated with recreation activities of the alternatives.	visitors per day of the alternatives, which would reduce trampling of native vegetation and introduction of weedy plant species associated with human presence. This alternative would have greater long-term, beneficial impacts and fewer adverse impacts on vegetation than any of the other alternatives.	due to fewer restrictions on surface disturbances to vegetation.	restrictions on surface disturbances to vegetation.	lands with wilderness characteristics would beneficially limit or prohibit surface disturbances to vegetation within SRMAs. This alternative would have the least impacts on vegetation of the alternatives.
Riparian Resources	Vegetation treatments would have both beneficial and adverse impacts on vegetation in riparian habitat. Beneficial impacts would include reduction of weed populations and the restoration of diverse native vegetation. Adverse impacts would include crushing and removal of native vegetation during the treatment process.	If determined to be the cause, OHV routes in selected riparian areas would be closed if riparian areas are found to be Functioning at Risk. In addition, some riparian areas would be unavailable for grazing, while others would be subject to seasonal restrictions and forage utilization limits if found to be Functioning At Risk. These restrictions would reduce adverse impacts to riparian vegetation. This alternative would have fewer impacts on vegetation than Alternatives A and D.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B, except surface disturbing activities would be limited or prohibited in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics. This alternative would have the greatest beneficial impacts and least adverse impacts on riparian vegetation of the alternatives.
Socioeconomics	No impacts to vegetation resources.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Soil and Water Resources	Long-term, adverse impacts on vegetation due to limited restrictions	Long-term, beneficial impacts on vegetation from prohibitions on	Long-term, beneficial impacts on vegetation due to restrictions on	Impacts same as A, but to a less adverse degree due to required plans and	Same as Alternative B, except surface disturbing activities would be limited

VEGETATION					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
	on surface disturbances on steep slopes.	surface disturbing activities on slopes >40%, and erosion control designs and plans for surface disturbing activities on slopes between 21 and 40%. This alternative would have fewer adverse impacts on vegetation than Alternatives A, C, and D.	surface disturbance on slopes >40%, unless it were determined that it would cause undue or unnecessary degradation to pursue other placement alternatives. This alternative would have fewer adverse impacts on vegetation than Alternatives A and D, but greater impacts than Alternatives B and E.	erosion control strategies for slopes >40%, which would help mitigate adverse impacts on vegetation located on and down slope from disturbance areas on steep slopes. This alternative would have greater adverse impacts on vegetation than Alternatives B, C, and E, but fewer impacts than Alternative A.	or prohibited in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics. This alternative would have the least adverse impacts on vegetation of the alternatives.
Special Designations	Long-term, adverse impacts to vegetation within ACECs from surface disturbances related to mineral leasing, geophysical work, mineral material disposal and mineral entry. Other adverse impacts would include woodland harvesting, vegetation treatments, livestock grazing and open OHV use.	The increased number of acres designated as ACECs and decrease in allowable surface-disturbing activities under this alternative would result in fewer long-term, adverse impacts on vegetation resources than would occur under Alternatives A, C, and D.	Alternative C would have limited ACEC designation and more acres subject to surface disturbing activities than Alternatives A, B, and E, but fewer adverse impacts than Alternative D.	No ACECs would be designated under Alternative D. This alternative would have the greatest long-term, adverse impacts to vegetation from the increase in permitted surface disturbances of any of the alternatives.	Same impacts as Alternative B, except there would be beneficial, long-term impacts on vegetation due to restrictions on surface disturbing activities in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics within designated ACECs.
Special Status Species	Alternative A would specify acres of protected habitat for special status species, which would also protect vegetation resources. This alternative would provide the least beneficial protection of the alternatives.	Alternative B would provide the most acres of protected habitat for special status species, which would indirectly provide protection for vegetation in special status species habitat. This alternative would provide greater beneficial protections and have the lower adverse impacts on	Alternative C would provide fewer protected acres of habitat for special status species habitat, and vegetation therein, than Alternatives B and E, but would have greater protections in place than Alternatives A and D.	Alternative D would provide fewer protected acres of special status species habitat, and the vegetation therein, than Alternatives B, C, and E, but would have greater protections in place than Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B, except there would be beneficial, long-term impacts on vegetation due to restrictions on surface disturbing activities in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics. This alternative would have the fewest adverse impacts on vegetation of

VEGETATION					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
		vegetation than Alternatives A, C, and D.			the alternatives.
Travel Management	This alternative would have 276,430 acres closed to OHV use. These closures would eliminate OHV related surface disturbance to native vegetation in closed areas.	Alternative B would close 423,582 acres to OHV use, which is 135,502 acres (47%) more than Alternative A. This alternative would have the fewer adverse impacts on vegetation associated with travel than Alternatives A, C, and D.	Alternative C would close 418,549 acres to OHV use, which is 130,469 acres (45%) more than Alternative A. This alternative would have fewer adverse impacts on vegetation associated with travel than Alternatives A and D, but greater impacts than B and E.	This alternative would have no closures to OHV use, which is 288,080 acres less than under Alternative A. This alternative would have the greatest adverse impacts on vegetation from travel of any of the alternatives.	Same as Alternative B, except there would be 582,356 additional acres closed to OHV use in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics. This alternative would have the least adverse impacts on vegetation due to 694,006 (251%) more acres closed to OHV use than Alternative A.
Vegetation	15,475 acres vegetation treatments per year. This alternative would have short-term, adverse impacts on vegetation due to the large acreage open to disturbances associated with widespread, unspecified vegetation treatments. Long-term, beneficial impacts would include reduced competition with exotic species.	Under Alternative B, 7,600 acres of vegetation treatments/year represent a 51% reduction in annual treatments compared to A. This alternative would provide the least long-term benefits and fewer adverse impacts to vegetation, due to targeted treatments over a smaller area, than Alternatives A, C and D.	Impacts same as Alternative B, except 9,300 acres would be treated/year. This alternative would provide greater long-term benefits to vegetation than Alternatives A, B, and E, due to a greater number of acres receiving targeted vegetation treatment.	Under Alternative D, 11,300 acres would be open to vegetation treatments/year with potentially greater long-term beneficial impacts on vegetation resources than would occur under Alternatives A, B, C and E due to a greater number of acres receiving targeted vegetation treatment.	Same as Alternative B, except no surface disturbing land treatments would be permitted in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics. This alternative would have the least short-term adverse impacts, but limited long-term benefits to vegetation of the alternatives.
Visual Resources	Minor, short-term, adverse impacts to vegetation in VRM I and II areas from restrictions on surface disturbance, and long-term, beneficial impacts to vegetation under VRM III and IV objectives. Alternative A would have the smallest	Impacts same as A, except this alternative would have a larger area subject to VRM class I surface disturbance restrictions (with long-term, beneficial impacts on vegetation resources under these VRM classes) than Alternative	Impacts same as A, except this alternative would have a larger area subject to VRM class I and III surface disturbance restrictions, and a smaller area subject to VRM class II restrictions than Alternative A. Alternative	Impacts same as A, except this alternative would have a larger area subject to VRM class I, III and IV restrictions, and a smaller area subject to VRM class II restrictions than Alternative A. Alternative D would have the largest area subject to	Same as Alternative B, except additional protection of acreage within non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics under VRM I would have long-term, beneficial impacts on vegetation resources. This alternative would

VEGETATION					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
	area subject to VRM class I restrictions on surface disturbances and the largest area subject to VRM class II restrictions of the alternatives.	A. Alternative B would have more area subject to VRM III and less area under VRM II and IV restrictions than Alternative A.	C would have the largest area subject to class IV restrictions of the alternatives.	VRM class III restrictions and the second largest areas subject to class IV restrictions of the alternatives.	have the most acres managed as VRM I of the alternatives.
Wildlife and Fisheries Resources	Beneficial impacts on vegetation from habitat protection and mitigation of surface disturbances to vegetation: 247,938 acres subject to bighorn sheep special conditions; 13,954 acres of pronghorn habitat; and 180,089 acres of protected deer winter range.	Beneficial impacts same as A, but to a greater degree due to increased mitigation potential for the adverse impacts of surface disturbing activities on vegetation resources, including: 83% more acres subject to bighorn sheep special wildlife conditions; 110% more acres of protected pronghorn habitat; 330% more protected deer habitat; and 184,248 more acres of protected elk habitat than Alternative A.	Beneficial impacts same as A, but to a greater degree due to increased mitigation potential for the adverse impacts of surface disturbing activities on vegetation resources, including: 21% more acres subject to bighorn sheep special wildlife conditions; 110% more acres of protected pronghorn habitat; 45% more protected deer habitat; and 93,104 more acres of protected elk habitat than Alternative A.	Beneficial impacts same as A, but to a greater degree due to increased mitigation potential for the adverse impacts of surface disturbing activities on vegetation resources, including: 26% fewer acres subject to bighorn sheep special wildlife conditions; same number of acres of protected pronghorn habitat; 17% fewer protected deer habitat; and 60,103 more acres of protected elk habitat than Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B.
Woodlands	Short-term, adverse impacts on 1,147,407 acres of the pinyon-juniper vegetation open to woodland harvesting, include trampling and removal of native trees. Long-term, indirect impacts include the potential introduction of weedy, non-native species during wood harvesting operations.	Impacts same as Alternative A, except impacts would be on 504,666 acres of pinyon-juniper vegetation (56% fewer acres open to harvest than Alternative A). This alternative would have the fewest acres open to the adverse impacts of woodland harvest.	Impacts same as Alternative A, except impacts would be on 597,086 acres of pinyon-juniper vegetation open to woodland product harvest (48% fewer acres open to harvest than under Alternative A).	Same as Alternative C.	Same as Alternative B, except that no woodland product harvest would be allowed in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics. This would result in the fewest acres open to surface-disturbing activities that would have long term, adverse impacts on vegetation resources.

VISUAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT					
VRM Class	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
VRM I (Very low impacts to scenic quality allowed)	371,575 acres	497,668 acres	425,179 acres	390,424 acres	998,370 acres
VRM II (Low impacts to scenic quality allowed)	355,112 acres	250,641 acres	132,001 acres	8,838 acres	111,478 acres
VRM III and IV (Moderate to major impacts to scenic quality allowed, short-term and long-term impacts from surface disturbing activities in VRM III and VRM IV areas).	1,054,681 acres	1,034,813 acres	1,225,915 acres	1,383,860 acres	671,828 acres
Scenic Quality/Viewshed, Lockhart Basin	VRM Class III designation for Lockhart Basin not managed as a Visual ACEC, more potential adverse short-term and long-term impacts on 47,783 acres than for the action alternatives	No scenic quality degradation because of management under VRM I for 47,783 acres for Lockhart Basin ACEC	VRM Class II designation for Lockhart Basin, but not managed as a Visual ACEC, more potential adverse impacts on 47,783 acres than for Alternatives B & E, but less than Alternative A.	VRM Class III designation for Lockhart Basin, Not managed as a Visual ACEC, with more potential adverse impacts on 47,783 acres than for Alternatives B & E.	No scenic quality degradation because of management under VRM I for 47,783 acres for Lockhart Basin ACEC.
Scenic Quality/Viewshed, Valley of the Gods	No scenic quality degradation because of VRM I designation for 31,387 acres for Valley of the Gods ACEC	No scenic quality degradation because of VRM I designation for 22,863 acres for Valley of the Gods ACEC	Valley of the Gods designated as VRM I as a Visual ACEC, with no scenic quality degradation for 22,863 acres.	Designation as VRM III, Valley of the Gods is not managed as a Visual ACEC, with more potential adverse impacts on 22,863 acres than for Alternatives A, B, C, and E.	No scenic quality degradation because of VRM I designation for 22,863 acres for Valley of the Gods ACEC.
Scenic Quality/Viewshed, Indian Creek	No scenic quality degradation because of VRM I designation for 13,100 acres in the Indian Creek ACEC	No scenic quality degradation because of VRM I designation on 8,510 acres for Indian Creek ACEC	Indian Creek is managed as a Visual ACEC, with no scenic quality degradation on 3,908 acres in the ACEC (outside the WSA).	Indian Creek is not managed as a Visual ACEC, designated as VRM III, with more potential adverse impacts on 8,510 acres than for Alternatives A, B, C & E.	No scenic quality degradation because of VRM I designation for 8,510 acres for Indian Creek ACEC

WILDLIFE AND FISHERIES RESOURCES					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
Wildlife and Fisheries Resources	Long-term beneficial impacts to wildlife from seasonal wildlife protection areas: 329,750 acres of bighorn sheep habitat, 12,960 acres pronghorn habitat, and 197,550 acres mule deer habitat (540,260 acres total).	Beneficial impacts same as Alternative A, but to a greater degree, from proposed 453,388 acres of protection areas for bighorn sheep habitat, 29,365 acres pronghorn habitat, 785,921 acres mule deer habitat, and 191,173 acres elk habitat (total of 1,459,847).	Impacts same as Alternative A, but to a greater degree from proposed habitat protection areas: 415,395 (lambling) and 453,390 (rutting) acres for bighorn sheep, 29,365 acres for pronghorn, 266,406 acres for mule deer, and 97,471 acres for elk habitat (total of 808,637 acres).	Beneficial impacts same as Alternative A from proposed seasonal wildlife protection areas: 299,009 acres desert bighorn sheep, 13,961 acres for pronghorn, 182,315 acres for mule deer, and 62,484 acres for elk (total of 557,769 acres subject to special wildlife conditions).	Impacts same as Alternative B.
Cultural Resources	Long-term adverse impacts of cultural resource decisions on wildlife resources from restrictions on habitat improvements, watershed improvements, and vegetation treatments. Beneficial impacts on wildlife from restrictions on surface-disturbing activities including woodland gathering and harvesting, minerals leasing, and OHV use and restrictions on visitor numbers and activities.	Beneficial impacts same as Alternative A, but to a greater degree, due to greater restrictions on surface disturbing activities.	Beneficial impacts same as Alternative A, except woodland gathering and harvesting, and vegetation treatments would be allowed. Alternative C would have fewer adverse impacts on wildlife than Alternative A due to greater restrictions on surface disturbing activities.	Adverse impacts same as Alternative A, but to a greater degree, and beneficial impacts to a lesser degree than Alternative A.	Impacts same as Alternative B, but to a greater degree due to increased restrictions on surface-disturbing activities.
Fire Management	Fuels treatments would have short-term adverse impacts to wildlife species from habitat disturbance and removal, and long-term beneficial impacts due to reduced fuel loading, reduced fire risk, and diversified habitat.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.

WILDLIFE AND FISHERIES RESOURCES					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
Lands and Realty	Lands and realty decisions would result in adverse surface disturbance, causing loss of wildlife habitat, habitat fragmentation, direct disturbance to wildlife during construction and maintenance, potentially introduce invasive species, and/or wildlife to avoid areas that were previously considered viable habitat. Beneficial impacts would include areas excluded from surface disturbing activities and mitigation measures that accompany surface disturbing activities.	Impacts same as Alternative A, except that Alternative B would exclude more areas from wind or solar energy exploration and development, thereby having fewer adverse impacts than Alternative A.	Impacts same as Alternative B, except that fewer areas would be excluded from wind or solar energy exploration and development.	Impacts same as Alternative B, except fewer exclusions from wind or solar energy exploration and development. Alternative D would result in more adverse impacts to wildlife in the short- and long-term than any other alternative.	Impacts same as Alternative B, except that non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would also be excluded from ROWs for wind or solar energy exploration and development. Alternative E would be more beneficial to wildlife than all other alternatives since it prescribes more exclusions than any other alternative.
Livestock Grazing	The exclusion of livestock from sensitive habitats (such as riparian areas and zones with limited soils) would beneficially impact wildlife species by maintaining more native plant forage and cover. Where livestock grazing is allowed there would be adverse long-term impacts on wildlife due to competition with wildlife for forage, possible trampling of individual animals or nests, and susceptibility to invasion by noxious weeds. Under all alternatives grazing	Alternative B prescribes the largest area unavailable for livestock grazing and therefore would have the greatest beneficial impacts on native vegetation and wildlife habitat.	Alternative C is the same as Alternative B, except that Mule Canyon would be open to grazing north of U-95. Alternative C would have fewer adverse impacts to wildlife than Alternative A, but greater impacts than Alternatives B and E.	Alternative D is the same as Alternative B, except fewer acres would be unavailable to grazing, but with greater restrictions on grazing than Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B.

WILDLIFE AND FISHERIES RESOURCES					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
	would continue to be excluded from 118,424 acres, and 17,300 acres in Peter's Canyon and East Canyon would be allotted to wildlife.				
Minerals and Energy Resources	Surface disturbance due to mineral development would degrade and fragment wildlife habitat, and displace wildlife. Leasable mineral development would impact 699 acres of primarily pinyon-juniper and desert shrub habitats, 886 acres of wildlife habitats adversely impacted by geophysical exploration in the short term, and 1,652,743 acres open to locatable minerals activities under standard stipulations.	Impacts same as Alternative A, but to a lesser degree. Leasable mineral development would adversely impact 636 acres of primarily pinyon-juniper and desert shrub habitats, 794 acres of wildlife habitats adversely impacted in the short term by geophysical exploration, and 1,521,656 acres open to locatable minerals activities under standard stipulations.	Impacts same as Alternative A, but to a greater degree, from leasable mineral development that would impact 710 acres of primarily pinyon-juniper and desert shrub habitats, 903 acres of wildlife habitats temporarily impacted by geophysical exploration, and by 1,637,688 acres open to locatable minerals activities under standard stipulations.	Impacts same as Alternative A, but to a greater degree, from leasable mineral development that would impact 721 acres of primarily pinyon-juniper and desert shrub habitats, 924 acres of wildlife habitats temporarily impacted by geophysical exploration, and 1,737,999 acres open to locatable minerals activities under standard stipulations.	Impacts same as Alternative A, but to a lesser degree, from leasable mineral development that would impact 518 acres of primarily pinyon-juniper and desert shrub habitats, 591 acres of wildlife habitats temporarily impacted by geophysical exploration, and 1,521,656 acres open to locatable minerals activities under standard stipulations.
Recreation	Adverse impacts to wildlife species and their habitats from recreation, include noise disturbance, vehicle traffic, trampling of native vegetation, and other human-related disturbances. Where designated, SRMAs would reduce adverse impacts to wildlife by restricting recreation or reducing dispersed recreational	Adverse impacts same as Alternative A, but to a lesser degree due to greater restrictions on surface disturbing activities in SRMAs.	Adverse impacts same as Alternative A, but to a lesser degree, due to greater restrictions on surface disturbing activities in SRMAs.	Adverse impacts same as Alternative A, but to a greater degree, due to fewer restrictions on surface disturbing activities. Overall, this alternative would have the most acres of native vegetation and potential wildlife habitat subject to adverse impacts associated with recreation activities.	Adverse impacts same as Alternative A, but to a lesser degree, due to greater restrictions on surface disturbing activities. Overall, Alternative E would be most beneficial to wildlife because it prescribes the greatest restrictions, of all alternatives, on surface disturbing activities.

WILDLIFE AND FISHERIES RESOURCES					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
	activities.				
Riparian Resources	<p>Under all alternatives riparian areas would be managed as NSO for oil and gas leasing but open to mineral entry and disposal of mineral materials (though not in active floodplains or within 100 meters of riparian areas). Livestock grazing would be allowed in riparian areas under all alternatives.</p> <p>The long-term adverse impacts of these activities would be mitigated by management in accordance with laws, executive orders, and regulations on floodplains and wetlands.</p>	<p>Impacts same as Alternative A, but to a lesser degree, due to prescriptions limiting OHV use, livestock grazing, and motorized camping.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative B.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative A.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative B.</p>
Soil and Water Resources	<p>Under all alternatives, soils and watershed decisions would comply with Utah's Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Grazing and Recreation. All floodplains and riparian/wetlands would be managed in accordance with Executive Order 11988. There would be no slope restrictions on allowable disturbance under Alternative A.</p>	<p>Adverse impacts same as Alternative A, but to a lesser degree since unavoidable surface-disturbance on slopes between 21 and 40% would require a plan (with an erosion control strategy and approved survey and design). Also, surface-disturbing activities would not be permitted on slopes greater than 40% (excluding 87,599 acres of land in the Monticello PA).</p>	<p>Adverse impacts same as Alternative B and E, but to a greater degree since surface-disturbing activities would not be permitted on slopes greater than 40% unless it determined that it would cause undue or unnecessary degradation to pursue other placement alternatives. Unavoidable surface-disturbing activities on slopes between 21 and 40% would require a plan (with an erosion control strategy and approved</p>	<p>Adverse impacts same as Alternative A, but to a greater degree since surface disturbing activities would not be ruled out for slopes of any grade and a plan would only be required for slopes greater than 40%. This alternative would have more adverse impacts on vegetation resources and therefore wildlife resources than any other alternative.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative B.</p>

WILDLIFE AND FISHERIES RESOURCES					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
			survey and design).		
Special Designations	<p>The designation of ACECs and WSR segments would have long-term beneficial impacts on wildlife species and their habitats because ACECs and WSR segments limit or prohibit surface-disturbing activities, decreasing the potential for damage to native vegetation or avoidance behavior in individual animals.</p> <p>The designation of ACECs and WSR segments would also have long-term adverse impacts on wildlife where protective management prohibits habitat or watershed improvements or vegetation treatments. Under Alternative A, 10 of the 12 proposed ACECs would continue to be managed as ACECs and 6 of 12 river segments reviewed for WSR status would be recommended as suitable.</p>	Beneficial impacts same as Alternative A but to a greater degree since all 12 of the proposed ACECs would be designated and managed as ACECs and all 12 river segments reviewed for WSR status would be recommended as suitable.	Beneficial impacts same as Alternative A but to a lesser extent since 6 of the 12 proposed ACECs would be designated and managed as ACECs and 3 of the 12 river segments reviewed for WSR status would be recommended as suitable.	Under Alternative D none of the ACECs would be designated and managed as ACECs and none of the river segments reviewed for WSR status would be recommended as suitable. Alternative D would result in more adverse impacts to wildlife than any other alternative since there are fewer restrictions on surface disturbing activities under this alternative.	Same as Alternative B.
Special Status Species	Under all alternatives no management actions would be permitted on public lands that would jeopardize the continued existence of plant or animal species that are	Beneficial impacts same as Alternative A, but to a greater degree since Alternative B would provide more acres of protected habitat for special status species	Beneficial impacts same as Alternative A, but to a greater degree since Alternative C would provide more acres of protected habitat for special status species	Beneficial impacts same as Alternative A, but to a lesser degree since Alternative D would provide the fewest number of acres of surface disturbance	Same as Alternative B.

WILDLIFE AND FISHERIES RESOURCES					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
	listed, officially proposed, or candidates for listing as Threatened or Endangered and the BLM would commit to current and future conservation agreements, management plans, and recovery plans. These actions would have long-term beneficial impacts on wildlife that share habitat with targeted special status species.	than any other alternative.	than Alternative A (but fewer acres than Alternatives B and E).	restrictions in special status species habitat, resulting in a greater potential for adverse impacts on wildlife in special status species habitat.	
Travel Management	OHV use has short- and long-term adverse impacts on wildlife by causing damage to vegetation used as wildlife forage and cover, as well as causing noise. Habitat fragmentation and degradation and the spread of noxious weeds also result from OHV use. Under Alternative A: 611,310 acres would be open to OHV use.	Adverse impacts same as Alternative A, but to a much lesser degree. Under Alternative B: zero acres would be open to OHV use.	Adverse impacts same as Alternative A, but to a lesser degree. Under Alternative C: 2,311 acres would be open to OHV use however, designated 'ways' would be established in corridors leading to trailheads.	Adverse impacts same as Alternative A, but to a lesser degree. Under Alternative D: 2,311 acres would be open to OHV use.	Same as Alternative B.
Vegetation	Under Alternative A, 15,475 acres would be open to vegetation treatments each year. This is substantially greater than under any of the other alternatives. There are more short-term adverse impacts associated with Alternative A because of the large number of acres	Under Alternative B, 7,600 acres would be open to vegetation treatments each year, which is 51% fewer acres of treatment than under Alternative A. Overall, this alternative is likely to have more beneficial short-term impacts on wildlife and habitat than Alternative A due to	Impacts same as Alternative B, but to a greater degree. Under Alternative C, 9,300 acres would be open to vegetation treatments each year, which is 40% fewer acres of treatment than under Alternative A.	Impacts same as Alternative B, but to a greater degree. Under Alternative D, 11,300 acres would be open to vegetation treatments each year, which is 27% fewer acres of treatment than under Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B.

WILDLIFE AND FISHERIES RESOURCES					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
	open to trampling and disturbance associated with widespread, less targeted, vegetation treatments, and seed gathering and plant collection activities.	fewer, short-term, adverse impacts associated with habitat disturbance, and the increased likelihood of successful vegetation treatments due to the concentration of efforts in specified vegetation communities outlined under this alternative.			
Visual Resource Management	<p>VRM Classes I and II are generally more beneficial to wildlife since they result in less surface disturbance than VRM Classes III and IV. However, in some cases VRM Class I or II can have adverse impacts on wildlife by limiting or prohibiting habitat and watershed improvements and vegetation treatments.</p> <p>Under Alternative A: VRM Class I: 371,575 acres (21%) VRM Class II: 355,112 acres (20%) VRM Class III: 416,806 acres (23%) VRM Class IV: 637,875 acres (36%)</p>	<p>Impacts same as Alternative A, but to a greater degree, due to increased acreage managed as VRM Classes I and II.</p> <p>Under Alternative B: VRM Class I: 497,668 acres (28%) VRM Class II: 250,641 acres (14%) VRM Class III: 426,350 acres (24%) VRM Class IV: 608,463 acres (34%)</p>	<p>Impacts same as Alternative A, but to a lesser degree due to decreased acreage managed as VRM Class II.</p> <p>Under Alternative C: VRM Class I: 425,179 acres (24%) VRM Class II: 132,001 acres (7%) VRM Class III: 531,920 acres (30%) VRM Class IV: 693,995 acres (39%)</p>	<p>Impacts same as Alternative A, but to a lesser degree due to decreased acreage managed as VRM Class II.</p> <p>Under Alternative D: VRM Class I: 390,424 acres (22%) VRM Class II: 8,838 acres (<1%) VRM Class III: 692,741 acres (39%) VRM Class IV: 691,119 acres (39%)</p>	<p>Impacts same as Alternative A, but to a greater degree due to increased acreage managed as VRM Classes I and II.</p> <p>Under Alternative E: VRM Class I: 998,370 acres (56%) VRM Class II: 111,478 acres (6%) VRM Class III: 264,369 acres (15%) VRM Class IV: 407,459 acres (23%)</p>
Woodlands	Short- and long-term adverse on 1,309,894 acres impacts from harvesting from wildlife habitat loss, habitat	Adverse impacts same as Alternative A, but to a lesser degree since fewer acres would be open to woodland harvest.	Adverse impacts same as Alternative A, but to a lesser degree since fewer acres would be open to woodland harvest.	Adverse impacts same as Alternative A, but to a lesser degree since fewer acres would be open to woodland harvest.	Adverse impacts same as Alternative A, but to a lesser degree since fewer acres would be open to woodland harvest.

WILDLIFE AND FISHERIES RESOURCES					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
	degradation, and habitat fragmentation, and noise disturbance. Long-term beneficial impacts from reduced fire risk from fuel load reductions and thinning, and opening up the forest floor for understory growth. Long-term beneficial impacts from harvesting on sagebrush steppe communities and wildlife.	Under Alternative B, 730,074 acres would be open to woodland harvest. Also, limitations on off-road travel and wood product use in the deer and elk winter range (Nov. 1 – May 15) would help mitigate the short-term adverse impacts of woodland product collection and harvest on wildlife and habitat.	Under Alternative C, 841,938 acres would be open to woodland harvest. Also, wood collection in certain areas would be restricted to within 150 feet of designated routes and permitted off road travel.	Under Alternative D, 841,938 acres would be open to woodland harvest but wood collection would not be limited to any buffer zone along designated routes or permitted off road travel.	Under Alternative E, 548,477 acres would be open to woodland harvest with limitations on collection and use the same as Alternative B.
Management Decisions pertaining to Air Resources, Hazardous Materials, and Paleontology were excluded from analysis because they would have a negligible effect on wildlife and fisheries resources.					

WOODLANDS					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
Cultural Resources	Excluding 33,433-acre Grand Gulch Historic District from harvesting opportunities would have long-term, adverse impacts on woodland resources.	Long-term, beneficial impacts on woodlands from fuels reductions around sites. Long-term, adverse impacts from harvesting restrictions on 99,955 acres.	Beneficial impacts same as Alternative B. Long-term, adverse impacts from harvesting exclusions on 61,943 acres.	Beneficial impacts same as Alternative B. Long-term, adverse impacts from harvesting exclusions on 59,297 acres (1.5 times more acreage than Alternative A).	Same as Alternative B.
Fire Management	Short-term, adverse impacts from fire treatments through resource loss, surface disturbances, soil compaction and erosion, opportunities for exotic species establishment, and restrictions on harvesting in treated	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Long-term, adverse impacts from prohibitions on fire treatments treatment-related harvesting within 582,357 acres of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics, and increased wildland fire risks.

WOODLANDS					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
	areas. Long-term, beneficial impacts from reduced risks of wildland fire and improved fire condition classes, and sustainable yields of woodland products.				
Minerals and Energy Resources	Short-term and long-term, adverse, but minor, impacts on woodland productivity from RFD minerals exploration and development affecting 0.1% of the area available for minerals development.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Non-WSA Lands with Wilderness Characteristics	No impacts to woodlands as non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics are not protected under this alternative.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Impacts on woodlands would be adverse in the long term from prohibitions on fire and vegetation treatments, and control of invasive species on 582,357 acres in woodland zones managed for protection of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics.
Recreation	Long-term, beneficial impacts from unrestricted opportunities for harvesting opportunities in SRMAs and ERMA, except for restrictions on a total of 196,040 acres in ROS P-class areas, 250 acres of developed recreation sites, and along the 1,280-acre	Long-term, beneficial impacts from sustainable riparian woodlands resource use along San Juan River. Long-term, adverse impacts from harvesting prohibitions or restrictions on 416,757 acres in SRMAs.	Impacts same as Alternative B, with long-term, except adverse harvesting prohibitions on 406,554 acres in SRMAs.	Impacts same as Alternative B, with long-term, except adverse harvesting prohibitions on 406,554 acres in SRMAs.	Same as Alternative B, but to a more adverse degree, from harvesting prohibitions in SRMAs and in riparian areas (for riparian woodland species) that lie within non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics. Long-term, adverse impacts

WOODLANDS					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
	Pearson hiking trail. Long-term, adverse impacts from potential reductions in woodland productivity and unsustainable harvesting from relatively few harvesting restrictions in the PA.				within non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics on 416,526 acres in the ERMA.
Riparian Resources	Long-term, adverse, but minor, impacts from harvesting restrictions in riparian areas. Long-term, beneficial impacts from maintained productivity and sustainable harvesting of riparian woodlands.	Same as Alternative A, except long-term, beneficial impacts on riparian woodlands from closing riparian areas to OHV use.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B, but with a greater degree of adverse impacts, from prohibitions on riparian woodland harvesting within non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics.
Soil and Water Resources	Negligible impacts on woodland resources or harvesting opportunities because soil and water decisions would not affect woodland resources.	Impacts same as for Fire Management from vegetation treatments to control tamarisk.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.	Long-term, adverse impacts from prohibitions on vegetation treatments to control tamarisk replacement of and encroachment on riparian woodland stands.
Special Designations – WSAs	Long-term, adverse, but minor, impacts on harvesting opportunities from closure of 399,600 acres of WSAs (22% of the PA).	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Special Designations – ACECs	Long-term, adverse, but minor, impacts on harvesting from closure of 139,796 acres within ACECs to woodland harvesting opportunities (8% of the PA).	Same as Alternative A, but to a greater degree, from harvesting restrictions on 522,035 acres in ACECs (29% of the PA).	Same as Alternative A, but to a lesser degree, from harvesting restrictions within 39,093 acres of ACECs (2% of the PA)	Same impacts as Alternative C, with 22,863 acres excluded from harvesting in ACECs (1% of the PA).	Same as Alternative B, except adverse impacts to woodland harvesting from exclusions within 109,205 acres within proposed ACECs for preservation of non-WSA lands with wilderness

WOODLANDS					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
					characteristics.
Special Designations – Wild and Scenic Rivers	Long-term, adverse, but minor, impacts on harvesting from harvesting exclusions within 7,168 acres along the San Juan River and 1,920 acres along the Colorado River.	Same as Alternative A, but to a greater degree, from harvesting exclusions on 18,768 acres along eligible and recommended river segments (2.5 times more acreage than Alternative A).	Beneficial, long-term impacts from few harvesting exclusions except on 3,968 acres along eligible and recommended river segments.	Beneficial, long-term impacts from no harvesting exclusions along all PA river segments (no eligible river segments).	Same as Alternative B.
Travel Management	Long-term, adverse impacts to harvesting opportunities on 276,430 acres designated as closed to OHV use or access.	Long-term, adverse impacts to harvesting on 423,698 acres closed to OHV use or access (53% more than Alternative A).	Same as Alternative A, but to a greater degree, from 418,667 acres closed to OHV use or access (51% more acreage than Alternative A).	Negligible impacts on woodland harvesting from no OHV closed areas.	Long-term, adverse impacts to woodlands harvesting access from designated closed OHV areas (970,436 acres), and 179 miles of OHV routes in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics.
Vegetation	Short-term, minor, but long-term, indirect, beneficial impacts from vegetation treatments to reduce fuel loads and invasive species on 232,130 acres managed for vegetation treatments.	Short-term and long-term impacts same as discussed under Fire Management from potential treatment of 37,500 acres of pinyon-juniper and riparian woodlands.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.	Long-term, adverse impacts on woodland productivity and woodland ecosystem health within areas with non-WSA wilderness characteristics from prohibitions on vegetation treatments to restore pinyon-juniper communities.
Visual Resources	Long-term, adverse, but minor, impacts on harvesting from scenic protection on 726,687 acres within VRM Class I and Class II areas (41% of the PA).	Same as Alternative A, with 748,309 acres protected for scenic quality under VRM Class I and Class II areas (42% of the PA).	Same as Alternative A, from designation of 557,180 acres under VRM Class I and Class II (31% of the PA).	Same as Alternative A, but to a lesser degree, from designation of 399,262 acres under VRM Class I and Class II (22% of PA).	Same as Alternative B, except greater long-term, adverse impacts on woodland harvesting from designation of 998,370 acres as VRM Class I and 111,478 acres as VRM Class II (62% of the PA).

WOODLANDS					
Resource	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
Wildlife and Fisheries Resources	Beneficial impacts on woodland resources from riparian habitat protection and control of invasive species.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Woodlands	Beneficial impacts on woodland resources harvesting opportunities on 73% of the planning area (1,309,894 acres).	Same impacts as Alternative A, except 41% of PA available for harvesting (730,074 acres) in woodland zones, with beneficial impacts from controlled OHV use.	Same as Alternative A, except 47% of PA (841,938 acres) would be open to harvesting opportunities.	Same as Alternative C.	Impacts the same as non-WSA Wilderness Characteristics impacts above from additional prohibitions on woodland harvesting and treatments within 582,357 acres managed for non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics. 548,477 acres (31% of the PA) would be beneficially available for woodland harvesting.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

2.3 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT ELIMINATED FROM ANALYSIS

Table 2.3 provides a summary of those alternatives the BLM initially considered but later eliminated, and the justifications for their dismissal from further evaluations.

Table 2.3. Alternative Elements Eliminated from Detailed Analysis

Rationale for Elimination	<u>Alternative A</u>	<u>Alternative B</u>	<u>Alternative C</u>	<u>Alternative D</u>
Livestock Grazing				
<p><u>Action:</u> The PA would be unavailable for livestock grazing.</p> <p><u>Rationale for Elimination:</u> An alternative that proposes to close the entire PA to grazing would not meet the purposes and needs of this RMP/Draft EIS. NEPA requires that agencies study, develop, and describe appropriate alternatives to recommended courses of action in any proposal which involves unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources. No issues or conflicts have been identified during this land use planning effort, which requires the complete elimination of grazing within the PA for their resolution. Where appropriate, closures and adjustments to livestock use have been incorporated into the alternatives on an allotment or area basis to address issues identified in the LUP. Since the BLM has considerable discretion, through its grazing regulations, to determine and adjust stocking levels, seasons-of-use, and grazing management activities, and to allocate forage to uses of the public lands in LUPs, the analysis of an alternative to entirely eliminate grazing is not needed.</p> <p>An alternative that proposes to close the entire PA to grazing would also be inconsistent with the intent of the Taylor Grazing Act (TGA), which directs the BLM to provide for livestock use of BLM lands, to adequately safeguard grazing privileges, to provide for the orderly use, improvement, and development of the range, and to stabilize the livestock industry dependent upon the public range.</p> <p>The Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA) requires that public lands be managed on a "multiple use and sustained yield basis" (FLPMA Sec. 302(a) and Sec. 102(7)) and includes livestock grazing as a principal or major use of public lands. While multiple use does not require that all lands be used for livestock grazing, complete removal of livestock grazing on the entire PA would be arbitrary and would not meet the principle of multiple use and sustained yield.</p> <p>Livestock grazing is and has been an important use of the public lands in the PA for many years, and is a continuing government program. Although the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) guidelines for compliance with NEPA require that agencies analyze Alternative A (the No Action Alternative) in all EISs, for the purposes of this NEPA analysis, Alternative A is to continue the status quo, which includes livestock grazing (CEQ Forty Most Asked Questions, Question 3). For this reason and those stated above, a no-grazing alternative for the entire PA has been dismissed from further consideration in this LUP.</p>				
Travel Management				
<p><u>Action:</u> Travel on roads would be eliminated based upon a model that uses distances from roads so as to protect solitude and remoteness.</p> <p><u>Rationale for Elimination:</u> An alternative that proposes to close the roads based on this model in the PA would not meet the purposes and needs of this RMP/Draft EIS. No issues or conflicts have been identified during this land use planning effort that requires this particular method for determining which roads would be designated and which areas would remain open, limited, or closed to cross-country travel. Since the BLM has considerable discretion through its regulations, the analysis of an alternative to close roads based on this model is not needed. BLM did consider the idea of remoteness and solitude and provided protection for these values in a reasonable range of alternatives. Alternative E protects non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics by closing these lands to OHV travel. Additionally, Alternative B closes all WSAs to OHV use. Instead, BLM chose to take a hard look at each route and measure the purpose and need for that particular route against resource conflicts. This methodology was presented in the travel report and was the basis for the range of alternatives for</p>				

Table 2.3. Alternative Elements Eliminated from Detailed Analysis

Rationale for Elimination	<u>Alternative A</u>	<u>Alternative B</u>	<u>Alternative C</u>	<u>Alternative D</u>
travel management.				
Enlarge Canyonlands National Park				
<p><u>Action:</u> Enlarge Canyonlands National Park to include Lockhart Basin.</p> <p><u>Rationale for Elimination:</u> An alternative that proposes to enlarge Canyonlands National Park to include Lockhart Basin has been proposed many times in the media and discussion with interested groups. However, no complete serious proposal has ever been brought forward. This would not meet the purposes and needs of this RMP/Draft EIS. No issues or conflicts have been identified during this land use planning effort that requires this particular method for determining which roads would be designated and which areas would remain open, limited, or closed to cross country travel.</p>				