

4.14 SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS

In general, management of specially-designated areas (ACECs, Wild and Scenic Rivers, and Wilderness) is focused on allowing those uses and activities that are considered compatible with the specific, special resources of concern, while restricting those uses and activities that would impact those identified value(s). In the case of ACECs, the management focuses on protecting specific, identified relevance and importance values. For river segments that are eligible/suitable for congressional designation into the national system, the management focuses on protecting the specific, identified, outstandingly remarkable values, free-flowing nature, and tentative classifications for eligible river segments. For wilderness, the management focuses on maintaining the wilderness setting, characteristics and experience.

Some of the decisions to be made in this plan would have no adverse impacts on existing or potential ACECs, eligible river segments, or wilderness characteristics regardless of the alternative chosen. Only decisions that may affect the values of these areas are analyzed further.

4.14.1 ACECs

4.14.1.2 Impacts Common to All Alternatives

With all alternatives, the seven currently designated ACECs (Brown's Park, Nine Mile Canyon, Lears Canyon, Red Mountain-Dry Fork, Red Creek Watershed, Pariette Wetlands, and Lower Green River Corridor) would continue to be managed as designated ACECs, and their relevance and importance values, including historic, cultural, scenic, fish and wildlife resources, would continue to be protected, subject to valid existing rights.

With all alternatives, relevance and importance values of potential and existing ACECs would benefit from the special management attention they would receive if designated, including development of comprehensive, integrated activity plans in some cases. The plans would address the maintenance and development of OHV or non-OHV trails, minimal facilities development necessary for human health and safety, and other surface disturbing activities that may be complementary to the goals and objectives of each ACEC.

In alternatives where some potential ACECs would not be designated or where surface disturbance may occur, the relevant and importance of these areas may be at some risk of irreparable damage during the life of the plan, depending upon the specific resource use categories or other actions proposed by alternative.

Decisions that would generally have a positive impact on potential and existing ACECs, regardless of which alternative is chosen, include those involving fire resources, soil and watershed actions, and vegetation resources (including riparian areas and woodlands). Positive impacts of treatments would, in the long-term, restore vegetative components to resemble more natural ecosystems, which are important to identified relevant and important values in some ACECs.

In general, the more acres where mineral development is likely within potential and existing ACECs, the less acres there would be that would retain relevance and importance values. In cases where mineral development would be allowed, the likelihood of surface disturbance affecting relevance and importance values would be much greater in areas where standard stipulations or timing and controlled use would apply. Also, some areas are at risk where open OHV categories would continue in the No Action Alternative.

4.14.1.3 Alternatives Impacts

The following table summarizes the acres proposed for ACEC designation by alternative:

TABLE 4.14.1. AREAS AND ACRES OF ACECs THAT WOULD BE DESIGNATED BY ALTERNATIVE				
Area	Alternative A (acres)	Alternative B (acres)	Alternative C (acres)	Alternative D (acres)
Bitter Creek	68,834	0	68,834	0
Bitter Creek – P.R. Spring	0	0	78,591	0
Coyote Basin	87,743	47,659	0	0
Coyote Basin – Coyote Basin	0	0	26,590	0
Coyote Basin – Kennedy Wash	0	0	10,670	0
Coyote Basin – Myton Bench	0	0	36,670	0
Coyote Basin – Shiner	0	0	21,957	0
Coyote Basin - Snake John	0	0	28,274	0
Four Mile Wash	0	0	50,280	0
Middle Green River	0	0	6,768	0
Lower Green River	10,170	0	10,170	8,470
White River Corridor	17,810	0	47,130	0
Nine Mile Canyon	48,000	44,181	81,168	44,181
Main Canyon	0	0	100,915	0
Browns Park	52,721	18,474	52,721	52,721
Red Mountain-Dry Fork	24,285	24,285	24,285	24,285
Lears Canyon	1,375	1,375	1,375	1,375
Red Creek Watershed	24,475	24,475	24,475	24,475
Pariette Wetlands	10,437	10,437	10,437	10,437
Totals	345,850	170,886	681,310	165,944

4.14.1.3.1 Bitter Creek and Bitter Creek-P.R. Spring ACECs

The Bitter Creek ACEC would be 68,834 acres under Alternatives A and C. The Bitter Creek/P.R. Spring ACEC would be 78,591 acres under Alternative C only. The ACECs are adjoining and together under Alternative C they would be managed as a contiguous polygon of 147,425 acres. For either alternative the management would be the same. The area would be managed to protect old-growth pinion pines, cultural resources, historical features, and watersheds. Special management actions would include the following: establishing a research/monitoring program, enhancing habitat through forest manipulation and tree spraying, and restricting wood cutting around old-growth pinion. These management actions would preserve pinion pine habitat, with indirect positive benefits to wildlife that use that type of habitat (See Wildlife Section). They would also likely result in decreased fire risk and improved water quality in streams in the Bitter Creek Watershed. Because Alternative C designates both ACECs there would be over twice as much acreage as Alternative A and this would likely result in roughly twice as much benefits to existing habitat and watershed health in the area.

Alternatives B and D would not designate Bitter Creek or Bitter Creek-P.R. Springs as ACECs and would therefore have no benefits to piñon pine habitat or watershed health in this area.

Alternative A and C would have similar restrictions on OHV use and mineral development in the area. Alternative C would require somewhat more area that would be closed to leasing or managed as NSO. Based on the acres designated under each alternative and these increased restrictions, Alternative C would result in greater restrictions to mineral development in the ACEC, followed by Alternatives A, B and D respectively.

4.14.1.3.2 Coyote Basin ACEC and the Coyote Basin Complex ACEC¹

Under Alternatives A and B the Coyote Basin ACEC would include 87,743 acres and 47,659 acres, respectively. The Coyote Basin ACEC proposed for Alternative A includes most of the area proposed under Alternatives B with additional acreage that extends northward beyond Highway 40.

Under Alternative C, the Coyote Basin Complex ACEC would include the sub-complexes of Coyote Basin, Snake John, Shiner, Kennedy Wash, and Myton Bench for a total of 124,161 acres.

These areas are proposed as ACECs because they contain populations of white-tailed prairie dogs and/or habitat.

Plague has resulted in adverse impacts to white-tailed prairie dog in Utah. Designation of the Coyote Basin ACEC or Coyote Basin Complex ACEC would not prevent the continued adverse impacts from the plague. However, it would provide positive benefits in the form of preservation of essential habitat for remaining prairie dog populations in the planning area. Alternative C would provide the greatest amount of habitat, and therefore, the greatest potential benefit to prairie dog. Alternative A would provide the next greatest benefit, followed by Alternative B. Alternative D does not designate either ACEC thereby offering no additional benefits for protection of the white-tailed prairie dog or black-footed ferret.

Each of the areas under Alternatives A, B, and C, would be designated as a Research Natural Area. Designation of the Research Natural Area would provide additional opportunities for research to identify the potential vectors for transmission of plague. This in term could provide some long-term benefit in the treatment of this disease. However, designation of these ACECs does not guarantee the continued population viability of the white-tailed prairie dog in view of the potential mortality from continued spreads of the plague.

Designation of the Coyote Basin ACEC or the Coyote Basin Complex also impacts other resources found within the ACECs. These ACECs would provide essential habitat for the potential reintroduction of black-footed ferret. The white-tailed prairie dog provides forage for the black-footed ferret and is considered necessary for its successful recovery in the project area. Accordingly, Alternative C would provide the greatest potential positive benefit to the black-footed ferret, followed by Alternatives A and B respectively. Under Alternatives A, B, and C habitat in the ACEC would also be managed to protect critical habitat for other wildlife species that use the Coyote Basin ACEC. These species include the pronghorn, as well as sensitive

¹ There are two different polygons under the title Coyote Basin ACEC. One is proposed in Alternative A and comprises 84,743 acres. The second is proposed in Alternative B and comprises 47,659 acres. In addition, there is a Coyote Basin sub-complex called Coyote Basin under Alternative C and it comprises 26,590 acres. They are all somewhat inclusive of one another in regards to geographic location. Refer to Figures 22-24.

species such as bobolink, ferruginous hawk, peregrine falcon, sage grouse, long-billed curlew, grasshopper sparrow, short-eared owl, big free-tailed bat, black-footed ferret, ringtail cat, and dwarf shrew. Accordingly, Alternative C would have the greatest potential benefits to these species, followed by A and B respectively.

Under Alternative C, the area would be subject to standard lease terms, and managed with timing and controlled surface use or NSO for oil and gas leasing. Alternatives A and B would be subject to standard lease terms and timing and controlled surface use. OHV use would be limited to designated routes or closed under all alternatives. These stipulations, combined with the size of the proposed Coyote Basin ACEC or Coyote Basin Complex ACEC, would cause the greatest restriction to oil and gas development and OHV use under Alternative C, followed by Alternatives A and B respectively.

4.14.1.3.3 Four Mile Wash ACEC

Alternative C would designate 50,280 acres in the Four Mile Wash area as an ACEC/Outstanding Natural Area to protect high-value scenic values, riparian ecosystems, and special status fish species. Management actions include closing the area to oil and gas leasing. Visual Resources would be managed as class II, III, and IV. OHV use would be limited to designated routes. Alternatives A, B, and D would not designate Four Mile Wash as an ACEC. The management actions described under Alternative C would reduce potential short-term surface disturbance in the area, as well as preventing the installation of any additional long-term development structures. These actions would reduce visual impacts and improve the recreational experience in the area. Indirectly, they may result in reduced sedimentation impact and higher water quality, which, in turn, would have a positive impact on critical habitat for the four endangered fish located within this potential ACEC: Colorado pikeminnow (*Ptychocheilus lucius*), Bonytail (*Gila elegans*), Humpbacked chub (*Gila cypha*), and the Razorback sucker (*Xyrauchen texanus*). Additionally, this decreased potential for development would result in benefits to terrestrial wildlife habitat in the area. Accordingly, Alternative C would have the greatest benefits to wildlife, visual resources, and recreation in the area. Alternatives A, B, and D would have the greatest adverse impacts to these resources, but would also the least amount of restrictions to oil and gas development.

4.14.1.3.4 Middle Green River ACEC

Under Alternative C, 6,768 acres of the Middle Green River (line of sight from the centerline of the river up to one-half mile along both sides) between Dinosaur National Monument and the boundary of the Ouray National Wildlife Refuge would be designated as an ACEC to protect riparian ecosystems. Special management attention would include permitting only surface disturbing activities found complimentary to the goals and objectives of the ACEC. The area would be open to oil and gas leasing subject to standard lease terms or managed with timing and controlled surface use. Visual Resources would be managed as Class II, III or IV. OHV use would be limited to designated routes. Alternatives A, B, and D would not designate this area as an ACEC. Currently, this section of the river is used for recreational use (hunting and fishing) as well as some OHV use. Designations would likely result in some protection to riparian resources. Impacts to riparian resources from Alternative C would be positive in the form of reduced potential disturbance to riparian resources with associated improvements in riparian wildlife habitat and water quality. This section of the Green River does provide habitat for Colorado pikeminnow and Razorback sucker. Accordingly, designation of this section as an ACEC would

likely have some positive impact on these species. However, the management actions associated with this ACEC would not extensively change the use of the area, therefore, these benefits are unlikely to be substantial in relation to the other existing threats to these species (i.e., exotic fish introductions and existing dams on the Green River). This section of the Green River is used for recreational boaters. Limiting development along this corridor to activities complimentary to maintaining the riparian area would improve the recreational experience for these users.

4.14.1.3.5 Lower Green River Expansion ACEC

Alternatives A and C would designate 10,170 acres of the Lower Green River between the trust land boundary at Ouray National Wildlife Refuge and the Carbon County line as an ACEC. This is an expansion of the existing Lower Green River ACEC. The 1,700-acre increase adds the eastern portion of the river (line of sight from the center line of the river up to one-half mile).

Alternative D would designate 8,470 acres with the protection extending only west from the centerline of the river. The area would be managed as NSO for oil and gas leasing. Visual Resources would be managed as Class II. OHV would be limited to designated routes. These restrictions would protect both riparian and upland habitat along the corridor. This would have positive impacts on resident and migrating birds and other wildlife. It would also help protect critical habitat for such sensitive species as the American white pelican, bald eagle, long-billed curlew, black tern, mountain plover, Caspian tern, common yellow throat, ferruginous hawk, osprey, peregrine falcon, grasshopper sparrow, Lewis' woodpecker, short-eared owl, black-footed ferret, Townsend's big-eared bat, Utah milk snake, Colorado pikeminnow, razorback sucker, roundtail chub, and the Uinta Basin hookless cactus. The river corridor is a prime location for prehistoric and historical cultural sites and as well. Therefore these Alternatives would result in reduced potential impacts to these resources and enhance recreational activities.

Alternative D would not have the benefits described above and would have less restrictions to oil and gas development within the ACEC.

4.14.1.3.6 White River ACEC

Under Alternative A, 17,810 acres along the White River corridor would be designated as an ACEC to protect unique geologic formations with spectacular vistas and high-value river riparian ecosystems. The western portion would be managed as VRM I and closed to oil and gas leasing or NSO and would be closed to OHV use. The eastern portion would be managed as VRM II and OHV use would be limited to designated routes. NSO would be within line of sight from centerline, up to one-half mile either side of the river. Areas beyond the one-half mile buffer would be open to oil and gas leasing subject to standard lease terms or managed with timing and controlled surface use. These management actions would serve to protect such resources as Goblin City, as well as reducing potential impacts to other fragile geological formations. They would also reduce potential disturbance to riparian habitat and surrounding upland habitat. This would preserve riparian vegetation, maintain wildlife habitat in the riparian and surrounding uplands, and improve the recreational experience for boaters using the White River.

Under Alternative C, these benefits would be increased due to the ACEC designation of 47,130 acres along the White River corridor to protect unique geologic formations with spectacular vistas and high-value river riparian ecosystems. The area would be managed as VRM I, II, III, or IV and closed or limited to designated routes for OHV use. NSO would be within line of sight from the centerline, up to one-half mile either side of the river. Areas beyond the one-half mile

buffer would be open to oil and gas leasing subject to standard lease terms, managed with timing and controlled surface use, or closed to oil and gas leasing. This increased acreage would result in an associated increase in the potential benefits to geological formations, riparian and upland habitat, and the recreational experience.

The White River provides critical habitat for the endangered Colorado pikeminnow, as well as habitat for other threatened, endangered, and sensitive species, including the razorback sucker, flannel mouth sucker, roundtail chub, yellow-billed cuckoo, peregrine falcon, and bald eagle. Both Alternatives A and C would likely result in positive impacts to these species through the preservation of riparian habitat and the associated improvements to water quality. Alternatives A and C, in particular, are very restrictive to OHV use with the western portion of the ACEC completely closed to OHVs. This would also have additional benefits for the species.

Neither Alternatives B or D would designate the White River corridor as an ACEC. Accordingly, they would likely result in greater adverse impacts to the previously described resources along the corridor. However, they would also have fewer restrictions to oil and gas development and OHV use.

4.14.1.3.7 Nine Mile Canyon Expansion ACEC

Alternatives A and C would designate 48,000 acres and 81,168 acres, respectively, in Nine Mile Canyon as an ACEC. These are both expansions of the current 44,181 acres Nine Mile Canyon ACEC. Each alternative would require the development and implementation of a comprehensive integrated activity plan. The area would be open subject to standard lease terms or managed as NSO for oil and gas leasing. Visual Resources would be managed as Class II, III, or IV. OHV use would be limited to designated routes. Alternatives B and D would carry forward the current Nine Mile Canyon ACEC. All of these alternatives would provide protection to existing cultural resources in Nine Mile Canyon, including nationally significant Fremont, Ute, and Archaic rock art and structures. Additionally, this ACEC would protect habitat wildlife, vegetation (including special status species), and visual resources. Because of its high visitation, these changes would also have a benefit on recreational opportunities in the ACEC. Based on the acres that would be designated, Alternative C would have the greatest benefit to these resources, followed by Alternatives A, B and D, respectively.

4.14.1.3.8 Main Canyon ACEC

Alternative C would designate 100,915 acres in Main Canyon as an ACEC. Special management attention would include permitting surface disturbing activities found to be complimentary or compatible to the goals and objectives of the ACEC. The area would be closed or managed with timing and controlled surface use for oil and gas leasing. Visual Resources would be managed as Class I or II. OHV use would be closed or limited to designated routes. These management actions would protect numerous cultural sites, including sites associated with the historical Northern Ute migration route along Main Canyon. Management of the visual resources in Class I or II would preserve the visual aesthetics of the area and enhance the recreational experience. However, closures to oil and gas development and OHVs would restrict the use of these resources in the area. Alternatives A, B, and D would not designate the Main Canyon ACEC and, consequently, would have potential negative impacts to cultural and visual resources and potential benefits to oil and gas development and OHV recreation.

4.14.1.3.9 Browns Park ACEC

Alternatives A and C would designate 52,721 acres in Brown's Park as an ACEC. It would develop a comprehensive integrated activity plan that would address protection of high-value scenic views, wildlife habitat, and cultural and historic resources. The area would be closed, NSO, or managed with timing and controlled surface use for oil and gas leasing. Visual Resources would be managed as Class I or II. OHV use would be closed or limited to designated routes. This would preserve existing wildlife habitat and cultural resources. It would also afford protection to visual resources, and would consequently improve the recreational experience in the area. Closing the area to OHV use or restricting it to existing routes would also decrease disturbance but would also decrease the motorized recreational opportunities in the area.

Under Alternative B 18,474 acres would be designated as an ACEC. The area would be open subject to standard lease terms, closed, NSO, or managed with timing and controlled surface use for oil and gas leasing. Visual Resources would be managed as Class I, II, III, or IV. OHV use would be closed or limited to designated routes.

Since Alternatives A and C have a higher amount of acreage being managed as an ACEC and they have greater restrictions on minerals development and VRM this would result in a greater benefit to wildlife habitat, cultural resources, and recreation in comparison with Alternative B.

Under Alternative D, 52,721 acres of Browns Park would continue to be designated as an ACEC (52,721 acres). However, the area would have less restriction on oil and gas development, including portions that would be open subject to standard lease terms. Visual Resources management requirements would not be as stringent as portions would be managed as III, or IV. OHV use would be open, closed or limited to designated routes. Accordingly, this alternative would provide less protection to wildlife habitat, cultural resources, and visual resources than A and C but more than B due to the increased acreage.

4.14.1.4 Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

Unavoidable adverse impacts would occur from mineral development and OHV activity, depending upon the alternative.

4.14.1.5 Short-term Uses Versus Long-term Productivity

Any loss of values would be throughout the life of the plan.

4.14.1.6 Irreversible and Irretrievable Impacts

Any loss of identified relevant and important values within potential and existing ACECs that would result from mineral development would be irreversible and irretrievable during the life of the plan.

4.14.2 Wild and Scenic Rivers

4.14.2.1 Impacts Common to All Alternatives

Under all of the alternatives, segments of the Upper Green and Lower Green River would continue to be managed to protect the outstandingly remarkable values, free-flowing nature, and tentative classifications of these segments, subject to valid existing rights.

In all alternatives where eligible rivers would be determined suitable, the BLM would protect the outstandingly remarkable values, tentative classification, and free-flowing nature of these rivers

to the extent of its authority, which is limited to those portions of the segment where BLM manages the shoreline or other lands within the corridor, and is subject to valid existing rights. The free-flowing character of eligible river segments would be protected to the extent that modifications such as stream impoundments, channelization, and/or rip-rapping would not be permitted along BLM shorelines. However, depending upon the alternative, values may be at risk from potential mineral development, OHV activity, or other surface disturbing activities. Also, the protection is limited because there are no federal reserved water rights established for in-stream flow purposes because of eligibility or suitability determinations. In addition, unless BLM land is somehow involved in a proposed action, BLM has no control of potential modifications of the shoreline or other development (including development related to the perfection of water rights) on non-public lands. Because of these factors, there would be no affect on the Colorado River Compact from protective management of eligible/suitable segments.

In the No Action Alternative, a suitability determination would not be made, and BLM would continue to manage some of the eligible river segments to protect their outstandingly remarkable values, free-flowing nature and tentative classification to the extent of its authority as identified above, consistent with existing land use plan decisions and subject to valid existing rights. In the case of those river segments that were reviewed and determined unsuitable in the Diamond Mountain RMP, that decision would remain in effect.

Refer to Table 4.14.2 for a listing of river segments and total river miles that would be determined suitable by alternative.

River / River Segment	Alternative A (river miles)	Alternative B (river miles)	Alternative C (river miles)	Alternative D (river miles)¹
White River 'Scenic' between the state line and its confluence with Asphalt Wash (Segment 1) ²	10	0	24	0
White River 'Wild' between Asphalt Wash to where the river leaves Section 18 T10S R23E SLBM (Segment 2)	10	0	10	0
White River 'Scenic' from where the river leaves Section 18 T10S R23E SLBM, and the Indian trust land boundary (Segment 3).	0	0	10	0
Nine Mile Creek 'scenic' within Duchesne County between the Green River and the Duchesne County Line (Segment A)	0	0	13	0
Nine Mile Creek 'recreational' within Duchesne County, between the Carbon county line and its confluence with Gate Canyon (Segment B)	0	0	6	0
Upper Green River	22	22	22	22

TABLE 4.14.2. RIVER SEGMENTS THAT WOULD BE DETERMINED SUITABLE AND TOTAL RIVER MILES BY ALTERNATIVE

River / River Segment	Alternative A (river miles)	Alternative B (river miles)	Alternative C (river miles)	Alternative D (river miles) ¹
Lower Green River	30	30	30	30
Middle Green River	0	0	36	0
Evacuation Creek	0	0	21	0
Bitter Creek	0	0	22	0
Argyle Creek	0	0	22	0
Total River Miles	72	52	216	52
Total BLM Shoreline Miles	55	39	112	39

¹In addition, 87 miles of river involving the White River (Segments 1, 2, and 3), Evacuation Creek, and Bitter Creek would remain eligible with this alternative.
²Alternative A only recommends a portion of Segment One of the White River.
 Note: Mileage is approximate.

4.14.2.2 Alternative Impacts

4.14.2.2.1 Alternative A

4.14.2.2.1.1 Wild and Scenic Rivers

With Alternative A, 72 river miles (55 miles of BLM shoreline) involving the following eligible river segments - White River (Segments 1 and 2), and Green River (Upper, and Lower Segments) would be determined suitable for designation into the National Wild and Scenic River System (Table 4.14.2). Where BLM manages the shoreline or other lands within the river corridors, BLM would protect the outstandingly remarkable values (unique natural, scenic, recreational, fish and wildlife and cultural values) tentative classification, and free-flowing nature of these rivers. Overall, because of the increased acreage identified and managed as suitable, and because other resource allocations would be consistent with management of the rivers’ suitability, this alternative would provide greater protection to outstanding remarkable values than does the No Action Alternative. However, where mineral leasing would be allowed with standard stipulations or timing and controlled surface use, or where other mineral development would be allowed within the corridor of the White River (Segments 1 and 3), Nine Mile Creek (Segments A and B), Evacuation Creek, Argyle Creek, Middle Green River, and Bitter Creek, the outstandingly remarkable values of these rivers would be at risk. The Bitter Creek, White River, and Evacuation Creek segments are most at risk as they are within an area of foreseeable mineral development, and Segment 1 of the White River has been identified as a potential dam site.

With Alternative A, a mineral withdrawal would be pursued to restrict mineral-related disturbance, and therefore protect the outstandingly remarkable values and tentative classification of the Upper Green River, the White River (Segment 2), and the Lower Green River.

With this alternative, public access (which may involve easement or exchange and improvement of existing routes) would be pursued for Segment 1 of the White River at the mouth of Cowboy

Canyon, Bonanza Bridge, and Wagon Hound Road. This would enhance this segment's recreational values, and would not affect the other outstandingly remarkable values. It would not affect the free-flowing nature of the river, and would be in keeping with the tentative classification of scenic.

With this alternative, a suitable decision for Segment 1 of the White River would be incompatible with the continuation of an existing permit for a dam site. Development of a dam would impact the free-flowing nature of this segment.

The Upper and Lower Green River and the White River (Segments 1 and 2) would largely be protected from disturbance related to mineral development by either being closed to mineral leasing or by no surface occupancy stipulations.

All eligible river segments would be in a limited or closed OHV category, with most of the segments limited. River corridors would largely be protected from disturbance related to OHV activity. No loss of outstandingly remarkable values from OHV use would be anticipated during the life of the plan. The closed category for Segment 2 of the White River would be consistent with the tentative classification of wild.

4.14.2.2.2 Alternative B

4.14.2.2.2.1 Wild and Scenic Rivers

With Alternative B, only the 52 miles of currently suitable river (39 miles of BLM shoreline) on the Upper and Lower Green River (Table 4.14.2) would be managed (involving only the public lands within the river corridor) so as to protect their outstandingly remarkable values, tentative classification, and free-flowing nature.

This alternative would result in the most impact to wild and scenic values from mineral-related development. Where mineral leasing would be allowed with standard stipulations or timing and controlled surface use, or where other mineral development would be allowed within the corridor of the White River (Segments 1, 2, and 3), Nine Mile Creek (Segments A, B), Evacuation Creek, Argyle Creek, Bitter Creek, and Middle Green River, the outstandingly remarkable values of these rivers would be at risk. The Bitter Creek, White River, and Evacuation Creek segments are most at risk as they are within an area of foreseeable mineral development, and Segment 1 of the White River has been identified as a potential dam site. With this alternative, a non-suitable decision for Segment 1 of the White River would be compatible with continuation of an existing permit for a dam site . Development of a dam would impact the free-flowing nature of this segment.

If acquired lands along Nine Mile Creek are grazed, the outstandingly remarkable cultural and scenic values, would be more at risk than with Alternatives A and C. Water quality of the segment would not be enhanced.

All eligible river segments would be in a limited or closed OHV category, with most of the segments limited. River corridors would largely be protected from disturbance related to OHV activity. No loss of outstandingly remarkable values from OHV use would be anticipated during the life of the plan.

4.14.2.2.3 Alternative C

4.14.2.2.3.1 Wild and Scenic Rivers

With Alternative C, 216 river miles (112 miles of BLM shoreline) involving all 11 eligible river segments would be determined suitable for designation into the National Wild and Scenic River System (Table 4.14.2). Where BLM manages the shoreline or other lands within the river corridors, BLM would protect the outstandingly remarkable values (unique natural, scenic, recreational, fish and wildlife and cultural values) tentative classification, and free-flowing nature of these rivers. Overall, this alternative would provide the greatest protection to the outstandingly remarkable values, free-flowing nature and tentative classification of these segments. However, where mineral leasing would be allowed with standard stipulations or timing and controlled surface use, or where other mineral development would be allowed within the corridor of Evacuation Creek, White River (Segments 1), and Nine Mile Creek (Segment A and B), the outstandingly remarkable values of these rivers would be at risk. The White River and Evacuation Creek segments are most at risk as they are within an area of foreseeable mineral development.

The locatable mineral withdrawals proposed would also be protective of the outstandingly remarkable values of the Upper Green River, the White River (Segment 2), and the Lower Green River. With this alternative, public access (which may involve easement or exchange and improvement of existing routes) would be pursued for Segment 1 of the White River at the mouth of Cowboy Canyon, Bonanza Bridge, and Wagon Hound Road. This would enhance this segment's recreational values, and would not affect the other outstandingly remarkable values. It would not affect the free-flowing nature of the river, and would be in keeping with the tentative classification of scenic.

An easement for the old Uintah Railroad bed from the UT/ CO line to Watson in Evacuation Creek, a river which would be found suitable with this alternative, would be pursued with the purpose of improving access along this portion of the creek. This would not affect this segment's free-flowing nature, outstandingly remarkable values or tentative classification (recreational).

The suitability decision for Segment 1 of the White River would result in the discontinuance of the existing permit for the dam site Accordingly, the free-flowing nature of Segment 1 would be maintained.

Not grazing the lands acquired along Nine Mile Creek would protect the outstandingly remarkable cultural and scenic values, and would enhance water quality of the segment.

Overall, this alternative would provide the greatest protection to the outstandingly remarkable values, free-flowing nature and tentative classification of all the eligible river segments. The Upper and Lower Green River, the White River (Segments 1 and 2), Nine Mile Creek (Segment A), and Bitter Creek, would largely be protected from disturbance related to mineral development by either being closed to mineral leasing or by no surface occupancy stipulations. However, where mineral leasing would be allowed with standard stipulations or timing and controlled surface use, or where other mineral development would be allowed within the corridor of Evacuation Creek, White River (Segments 1 and 3), and Nine Mile Creek (Segment B), the outstandingly remarkable values of these rivers would be at risk. The White River and Evacuation Creek segments are most at risk as they are within an area of foreseeable mineral development.

All eligible river segments would be in a limited or closed OHV category, with most of the segments closed. This alternative would best protect these river corridors from disturbance related to OHV activity. No loss of outstandingly remarkable values from OHV use would be anticipated during the life of the plan. The closed category for Segment 2 of the White River would be consistent with the tentative classification of wild.

4.14.2.2.4 Alternative D

4.14.2.2.4.1 Wild and Scenic Rivers

With Alternative D, the currently suitable Upper and Lower Segments of the Green River (Table 4.14.2) involving 52 river miles (39 miles of BLM shoreline) would remain suitable, and be managed so as to protect their outstandingly remarkable values, tentative classification, and free-flowing nature. Although suitability findings would not be made for the other eligible rivers in this plan, non-suitable findings were made for Nine Mile Creek, Argyle Creek, and Middle Green River in the Diamond Mountain RMP, and these unsuitable decisions would continue with this alternative. However, in keeping with BLM Manual 8351, Sections .32C and .33C, the White River (Segments 1, 2, and 3) Evacuation Creek, and Bitter Creek would remain eligible with this alternative and, where BLM manages the shoreline or other lands within the river corridors, they would be managed in a manner that would protect their outstandingly remarkable values, tentative classification, and free-flowing nature until such time as suitability findings are made. Approximately 87 river miles (34 miles of BLM shoreline) would be involved. However, protective management would be restricted by other decisions made in the Diamond Mountain RMP. Where mineral leasing would be allowed with standard stipulations or timing and controlled surface use, or where other mineral development would be allowed in the corridors of the Middle Green River, Bitter Creek, Nine Mile Creek, White River Segments 1 and 3, Argyle Creek, and Evacuation Creek, the outstandingly remarkable values of these rivers would be at risk. Segments 1 and 3 of the White River Corridor would be most at risk because they are in an area of foreseeable mineral development, and Segment 1 has been identified for a potential dam site. Also, river corridors which would remain in an open category for OHV use would also be at risk from increased surface disturbance.

A locatable mineral withdrawal or other protective measures would be pursued that would preclude mineral entry and agricultural entry within the corridors of the Upper Green River, and the lower Green River.

Under this alternative, the continued eligibility decision for Segment 1 of the White River would be incompatible with continuance of the existing permit for the dam site. Because this permit would continue under this alternative, the free-flowing nature of Segment 1 would not be maintained and this segment would no longer be eligible for designation as a Wild and Scenic River.

4.14.2.3 Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

Unavoidable adverse impacts would occur from mineral development and OHV activity, depending upon the alternative.

4.14.2.4 Short-term Uses Versus Long-term Productivity

Any loss of values would be throughout the life of the plan.

4.14.2.5 Irreversible and Irretrievable Impacts

Any loss of outstandingly remarkable values of eligible or currently suitable river segments that would result from mineral development would be irreversible and irretrievable during the life of the plan.

4.14.3 Wilderness

For analysis purposes, the following assumptions are made for oil and gas exploration and development:

- 75 percent of the wells will produce.
- 75 percent of the wells will be producing at any given time.
- 25-year average well life.
- 0.20 miles of new road construction per well.
- The number of miles of pipelines will equal the numbers of miles of new roads.
- 2.4 acres of surface disturbance per well.

Within each area, there are a number of variables that would determine adverse impacts, depending on where surface-disturbing activities would occur. These variables are; topography, vegetation type, sequence of development and reclamation time. Soil types and climatic variations would be major determinates to reclamation that would range from ten years to permanent scarring of the landscape.

Construction and operation of oil and gas wells and associated support facilities, including roads, surface and buried pipelines, and compressor stations would degrade the roadless and natural character of areas containing wilderness values. In addition to site-specific surface disturbance, the cumulative number of wells and density of spacing would change the natural landscape to an industrial landscape.

The noise of construction and operation of producing wells, including the presence of work crews and equipment, would degrade opportunities for solitude and primitive recreation in proximity to industrial development. As recreational visitors move away from the sources of development, the sights and sounds of development would diminish. However, it can be expected that sights and sounds from development would reduce opportunities for solitude and primitive and unconfined recreation ½ mile beyond the direct loss of natural character. Given the number and spacing of industrial facilities, it would be difficult to escape the adverse effects on solitude and primitive recreation throughout the areas having wilderness character. The potential for oil and gas development was derived from the Mineral Potential Report for the Vernal Planning Area, (June 2004). Definitions of “high“, “medium“, and “undetermined“ oil and gas development potential can be found in this publication. For analysis purposes, high and medium potential is considered as reasonable foreseeable development, but undetermined potential is considered as unlikely to occur.

In addition to oil and gas development, other activities, such as construction of livestock and wildlife facilities, vegetation treatments and harvesting of forest products would likely occur in various areas having wilderness character. However, at this time, site-specific project locations are not known.

It can be expected that as a result of cumulative effects, entire areas having wilderness character would become ineligible for consideration as Congressionally designated wilderness areas. The following table (Table 4.14.3) outlines impacts to WSAs, Non-WSA Lands with Wilderness Characteristics, and Non-WSA Lands Likely to have Wilderness Characteristics.

TABLE 4.14.3 ALTERNATIVES IMPACTS TO WILDERNESS STUDY AREAS													
Name of Unit	Oil & Gas Development Potential ²			Lease Stipulations				Other Potential Impacting Land Uses			Wilderness Characteristic Lost		
	H	M	U	Standard Stipulations	Timing and Controlled Surface Use	NSO	Closed to Leasing	Wildlife habitat and improvement projects, including water and vegetation developments. Forest products harvest, including firewood cutting post/pole cutting, and timber harvest	Livestock and water development, including pipelines and stock ponds.	None	Direct loss of natural characteristics during life of Plan (acres)	Reduction (directly or indirectly) in quality of opportunities for solitude and primitive, unconfined recreation due to sights and sounds of development (acres)	Total area affected during life of the plan (acres and %)
Winter Ridge ³ (42,462 acres)													
Alternatives A, B, C & D	X						X			X	10,616	13,832	13,832 (33%)
Daniels Canyon (2,496 acres)													
Alternatives A, B, C & D			X				X			X	0	0	0 (0)
Diamond Breaks (3,900 acres)													
Alternatives A, B, C & D			X				X			X	0	0	0 (0)
West Cold Springs (3,200 acres)													
Alternatives A, B, C & D		X	X				X			X	0	0	0 (0)
Bull Canyon (520 acres)													

² H (High), M (Medium), U (Undetermined)

³ 25% of WSA leased under valid existing rights

Name of Unit	Oil & Gas Development Potential ²			Lease Stipulations				Other Potential Impacting Land Uses			Wilderness Characteristic Lost		
	H	M	U	Standard Stipulations	Timing and Controlled Surface Use	NSO	Closed to Leasing	Wildlife habitat and improvement projects, including water and vegetation developments. Forest products harvest, including firewood cutting post/pole cutting, and timber harvest	Livestock and water development, including pipelines and stock ponds.	None	Direct loss of natural characteristics during life of Plan (acres)	Reduction (directly or indirectly) in quality of opportunities for solitude and primitive, unconfined recreation due to sights and sounds of development (acres)	Total area affected during life of the plan (acres and %)
Alternatives A, B, C & D		X					X			X	0	0	0 (0)
Book Cliffs Mountain Browse Instant Study Area (400 acres)													
Alternatives A, B, C & D	X						X			X	0	0	0 (0)

Name of Unit	Oil & as Development Potential			Lease Stipulations				Other Potential Impacting Land Uses			Wilderness Characteristic Lost		
	H	M	U	Standard Stipulations	Timing and Controlled Surface Use	NSO	Closed to Leasing	Wildlife habitat and improvement projects, including water and vegetation developments. Forest products harvest, including firewood cutting post/pole cutting, and timber harvest	Livestock and water development, including pipelines and stock ponds.	None	Direct loss of natural characteristics during life of the Plan (acres)	Reduction (directly or indirectly) in quality of the opportunities for solitude and primitive and unconfined recreation due to sights and sounds of development (acres)	Total area affected during life of the plan (acres and %)
Cold Spring Mountain (9,430 acres)													

Vernal Resource Management Plan—Draft Environmental Impact Statement

TABLE 4.14.4 ALTERNATIVES IMPACTS TO OTHER LANDS WITH WILDERNESS CHARACTER													
Name of Unit	Oil & as Development Potential			Lease Stipulations				Other Potential Impacting Land Uses			Wilderness Characteristic Lost		
	H	M	U	Standard Stipulations	Timing and Controlled Surface Use	NSO	Closed to Leasing	Wildlife habitat and improvement projects, including water and vegetation developments. Forest products harvest, including firewood cutting post/pole cutting, and timber harvest	Livestock and water development, including pipelines and stock ponds.	None	Direct loss of natural characteristics during life of the Plan (acres)	Reduction (directly or indirectly) in quality of the opportunities for solitude and primitive and unconfined recreation due to sights and sounds of development (acres)	Total area affected during life of the plan (acres and %)
Alternative A	X	X			X	X				X	9,030	9,430	9,430 (100%)
Alternative B	X	X		X	X	X				X	9,030	9,430	9,430 (100%)
Alternative C	X	X			X	X				X	9,030	9,430	9,430 (100%)
Alternative D	X	X		X	X	X				X	5,600	8,673	8,673 (92%)
Diamond Breaks (4,560 acres)													
Alternative A			X		X					X	0	0	0 (0)
Alternative B			X	X						X	0	0	0 (0)
Alternative C			X	X	X					X	0	0	0 (0)
Alternative D			X	X	X					X	0	0	0 (0)
Wild Mountain (965 acres)													
Alternative A			X		X					X	0	0	0 (0)

Vernal Resource Management Plan—Draft Environmental Impact Statement

TABLE 4.14.4 ALTERNATIVES IMPACTS TO OTHER LANDS WITH WILDERNESS CHARACTER													
Name of Unit	Oil & as Development Potential			Lease Stipulations				Other Potential Impacting Land Uses			Wilderness Characteristic Lost		
	H	M	U	Standard Stipulations	Timing and Controlled Surface Use	NSO	Closed to Leasing	Wildlife habitat and improvement projects, including water and vegetation developments. Forest products harvest, including firewood cutting post/pole cutting, and timber harvest	Livestock and water development, including pipelines and stock ponds.	None	Direct loss of natural characteristics during life of the Plan (acres)	Reduction (directly or indirectly) in quality of the opportunities for solitude and primitive and unconfined recreation due to sights and sounds of development (acres)	Total area affected during life of the plan (acres and %)
Alternative B			X	X						X	0	0	0 (0)
Alternative C			X		X					X	0	0	0 (0)
Alternative D			X		X					X	0	0	0 (0)
Moonshine Draw (2,700 acres)													
Alternative A			X		X					X	0	0	0 (0)
Alternative B			X	X	X					X	0	0	0 (0)
Alternative C			X		X					X	0	0	0 (0)
Alternative D			X	X						X	0	0	0 (0)
Daniels Canyon (3,045 acres)													
Alternative A			X	X						X	0	0	0 (0)
Alternative B			X	X						X	0	0	0 (0)

Vernal Resource Management Plan—Draft Environmental Impact Statement

TABLE 4.14.4 ALTERNATIVES IMPACTS TO OTHER LANDS WITH WILDERNESS CHARACTER													
Name of Unit	Oil & as Development Potential			Lease Stipulations				Other Potential Impacting Land Uses			Wilderness Characteristic Lost		
	H	M	U	Standard Stipulations	Timing and Controlled Surface Use	NSO	Closed to Leasing	Wildlife habitat and improvement projects, including water and vegetation developments. Forest products harvest, including firewood cutting post/pole cutting, and timber harvest	Livestock and water development, including pipelines and stock ponds.	None	Direct loss of natural characteristics during life of the Plan (acres)	Reduction (directly or indirectly) in quality of the opportunities for solitude and primitive and unconfined recreation due to sights and sounds of development (acres)	Total area affected during life of the plan (acres and %)
Alternative C			X		X	X				X	0	0	0 (0)
Alternative D			X	X		X				X	0	0	0 (0)
Bull Canyon (2,470 acres)													
Alternative A	X				X					X	2,470	2,470	2,470 (100%)
Alternative B	X				X					X	2,470	2,470	2,470 (100%)
Alternative C	X				X					X	2,470	2,470	2,470 (100%)
Alternative D	X			X						X	2,470	2,470	2,470 (100%)
White River (13,609 acres)													
Alternative A	X			X	X	X				X	8,628	13,544	13,544 (99.5%)
Alternative B	X			X	X	X				X	8,628	13,327	13,327 (98%)
Alternative C	X				X	X	X			X	4,554	11,393	11,393 (84%)

Vernal Resource Management Plan—Draft Environmental Impact Statement

TABLE 4.14.4 ALTERNATIVES IMPACTS TO OTHER LANDS WITH WILDERNESS CHARACTER													
Name of Unit	Oil & as Development Potential			Lease Stipulations				Other Potential Impacting Land Uses			Wilderness Characteristic Lost		
	H	M	U	Standard Stipulations	Timing and Controlled Surface Use	NSO	Closed to Leasing	Wildlife habitat and improvement projects, including water and vegetation developments. Forest products harvest, including firewood cutting post/pole cutting, and timber harvest	Livestock and water development, including pipelines and stock ponds.	None	Direct loss of natural characteristics during life of the Plan (acres)	Reduction (directly or indirectly) in quality of the opportunities for solitude and primitive and unconfined recreation due to sights and sounds of development (acres)	Total area affected during life of the plan (acres and %)
Alternative D	X			X		X				X	5,790	10,620	10,620 (78%)
Cripple Cowboy (13,592 acres)													
Alternative A	X				X			X			13,592	13,592	13,592 (100%)
Alternative B	X			X	X			X			13,592	13,592	13,592 (100%)
Alternative C	X						X	X			13,592	13,592	13,592 (100%)
Alternative D	X			X	X	X		X			13,592	13,592	13,592 (100%)
Desolation Canyon (58,984 acres)													
Alternative A	X			X	X	X				X	40,038	56,603	56,603 (96%)
Alternative B	X			X	X	X				X	58,802	58,984	58,984 (100%)
Alternative C	X			X			X			X	14,592	31,044	31,044 (53%)
Alternative D	X			X	X	X				X	40,601	54,210	54,210 (92%)

TABLE 4.14.5 ALTERNATIVES IMPACTS TO LANDS LIKELY TO HAVE WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS													
Name of Unit	Oil & as Development Potential			Lease Stipulations				Other Potential Impacting Land Uses			Wilderness Characteristic Lost		
	H	M	U	Standard Stipulations	Timing and Controlled Surface Use	NSO	Closed to Leasing	Wildlife habitat and improvement projects, including water and vegetation developments. Forest products harvest, including firewood cutting post/pole cutting, and timber harvest	Livestock and water development, including pipelines and stock ponds.	None	Direct loss of natural characteristics during life of the Plan (acres)	Reduction (directly or indirectly) in quality of the opportunities for solitude and primitive and unconfined recreation due to sights and sounds of development (acres)	Total area affected during life of the plan (acres and %)
Bitter Creek (32,961 acres)													
Alternative A	X				X	X		X			32,961	32,961	32,961 (100%)
Alternative B	X			X	X	X		X			32,961	32,961	32,961 (100%)
Alternative C	X						X	X			32,961	32,961	32,961 (100%)
Alternative D	X			X	X	X		X			32,961	32,961	32,961 (100%)
Bitter Creek/Rat Hole (11,150 acres)													
Alternative A	X				X			X			11,150	11,150	11,150 (100%)
Alternative B	X			X	X			X			11,150	11,150	11,150 (100%)
Alternative C	X						X	X			11,150	11,150	11,150 (100%)
Alternative D	X			X	X	X		X			11,150	11,150	11,150 (100%)

TABLE 4.14.5 ALTERNATIVES IMPACTS TO LANDS LIKELY TO HAVE WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS													
Name of Unit	Oil & as Development Potential			Lease Stipulations				Other Potential Impacting Land Uses			Wilderness Characteristic Lost		
	H	M	U	Standard Stipulations	Timing and Controlled Surface Use	NSO	Closed to Leasing	Wildlife habitat and improvement projects, including water and vegetation developments. Forest products harvest, including firewood cutting post/pole cutting, and timber harvest	Livestock and water development, including pipelines and stock ponds.	None	Direct loss of natural characteristics during life of the Plan (acres)	Reduction (directly or indirectly) in quality of the opportunities for solitude and primitive and unconfined recreation due to sights and sounds of development (acres)	Total area affected during life of the plan (acres and %)
Bourdette Draw (15,460 acres)													
Alternative A			X		X	X				X	0	0	0 (0)
Alternative B			X	X	X					X	0	0	0 (0)
Alternative C			X		X	X				X	0	0	0 (0)
Alternative D			X	X		X				X	0	0	0 (0)
Desolation Canyon (11,330 acres)													
Alternative A	X			X	X					X	11,330	11,330	11,330 (100%)
Alternative B	X			X	X					X	11,330	11,330	11,330 (100%)
Alternative C	X			X	X					X	11,330	11,330	11,330 (100%)
Alternative D	X			X	X	X				X	10,973	11,330	11,330 (100%)

Vernal Resource Management Plan—Draft Environmental Impact Statement

TABLE 4.14.5 ALTERNATIVES IMPACTS TO LANDS LIKELY TO HAVE WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS													
Name of Unit	Oil & as Development Potential			Lease Stipulations				Other Potential Impacting Land Uses			Wilderness Characteristic Lost		
	H	M	U	Standard Stipulations	Timing and Controlled Surface Use	NSO	Closed to Leasing	Wildlife habitat and improvement projects, including water and vegetation developments. Forest products harvest, including firewood cutting post/pole cutting, and timber harvest	Livestock and water development, including pipelines and stock ponds.	None	Direct loss of natural characteristics during life of the Plan (acres)	Reduction (directly or indirectly) in quality of the opportunities for solitude and primitive and unconfined recreation due to sights and sounds of development (acres)	Total area affected during life of the plan (acres and %)
Diamond Mountain (26,645 acres)													
Alternative A			X		X					X	0	0	0 (0)
Alternative B			X	X	X	X				X	0	0	0 (0)
Alternative C			X		X					X	0	0	0 (0)
Alternative D			X	X	X	X				X	0	0	0 (0)
Hell's Hole Canyon (2,370 acres)													
Alternative A	X				X				X		2,370	2,370	2,370 (100%)
Alternative B	X			X	X				X		2,370	2,370	2,370 (100%)
Alternative C	X						X		X		2,370	2,370	2,370 (100%)
Alternative D	X			X	X	X			X		2,370	2,370	2,370 (100%)

Vernal Resource Management Plan—Draft Environmental Impact Statement

TABLE 4.14.5 ALTERNATIVES IMPACTS TO LANDS LIKELY TO HAVE WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS													
Name of Unit	Oil & as Development Potential			Lease Stipulations				Other Potential Impacting Land Uses			Wilderness Characteristic Lost		
	H	M	U	Standard Stipulations	Timing and Controlled Surface Use	NSO	Closed to Leasing	Wildlife habitat and improvement projects, including water and vegetation developments. Forest products harvest, including firewood cutting post/pole cutting, and timber harvest	Livestock and water development, including pipelines and stock ponds.	None	Direct loss of natural characteristics during life of the Plan (acres)	Reduction (directly or indirectly) in quality of the opportunities for solitude and primitive and unconfined recreation due to sights and sounds of development (acres)	Total area affected during life of the plan (acres and %)
Lower Flaming Gorge (17,830 acres)													
Alternative A			X		X	X	X			X	0	0	0 (0)
Alternative B			X	X	X	X				X	0	0	0 (0)
Alternative C			X		X	X	X			X	0	0	0 (0)
Alternative D			X	X	X	X				X	0	0	0 (0)
Moonshine Draw (1,828 acres)													
Alternative A			X		X	X				X	0	0	0 (0)
Alternative B			X		X	X				X	0	0	0 (0)
Alternative C			X		X	X				X	0	0	0 (0)
Alternative D			X		X					X	0	0	0 (0)

TABLE 4.14.5 ALTERNATIVES IMPACTS TO LANDS LIKELY TO HAVE WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS													
Name of Unit	Oil & as Development Potential			Lease Stipulations				Other Potential Impacting Land Uses			Wilderness Characteristic Lost		
	H	M	U	Standard Stipulations	Timing and Controlled Surface Use	NSO	Closed to Leasing	Wildlife habitat and improvement projects, including water and vegetation developments. Forest products harvest, including firewood cutting post/pole cutting, and timber harvest	Livestock and water development, including pipelines and stock ponds.	None	Direct loss of natural characteristics during life of the Plan (acres)	Reduction (directly or indirectly) in quality of the opportunities for solitude and primitive and unconfined recreation due to sights and sounds of development (acres)	Total area affected during life of the plan (acres and %)
Red Creek Badlands (1,600 acres)													
Alternative A	X	X		X	X					X	1,600	1,600	1,600 (100%)
Alternative B	X	X		X						X	1,600	1,600	1,600 (100%)
Alternative C	X	X		X						X	1,600	1,600	1,600 (100%)
Alternative D	X	X			X					X	1,600	1,600	1,600 (100%)
Sweet Water Canyon (7,030 acres)													
Alternative A	X				X			X			7,030	7,030	7,030 (100%)
Alternative B	X				X			X			7,030	7,030	7,030 (100%)
Alternative C	X						X	X			7,030	7,030	7,030 (100%)
Alternative D	X				X	X		X			7,030	7,030	7,030 (100%)
White River (10,590 acres)													

Vernal Resource Management Plan—Draft Environmental Impact Statement

TABLE 4.14.5 ALTERNATIVES IMPACTS TO LANDS LIKELY TO HAVE WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS													
Name of Unit	Oil & as Development Potential			Lease Stipulations				Other Potential Impacting Land Uses			Wilderness Characteristic Lost		
	H	M	U	Standard Stipulations	Timing and Controlled Surface Use	NSO	Closed to Leasing	Wildlife habitat and improvement projects, including water and vegetation developments. Forest products harvest, including firewood cutting post/pole cutting, and timber harvest	Livestock and water development, including pipelines and stock ponds.	None	Direct loss of natural characteristics during life of the Plan (acres)	Reduction (directly or indirectly) in quality of the opportunities for solitude and primitive and unconfined recreation due to sights and sounds of development (acres)	Total area affected during life of the plan (acres and %)
Alternative A	X			X	X	X				X	9,135	10,590	10,590 (100%)
Alternative B	X			X	X	X				X	9,135	10,590	10,590 (100%)
Alternative C	X			X	X	X				X	9,135	10,590	10,590 (100%)
Alternative D	X			X		X				X	7,773	9,954	9,954 (94%)
Wolf Point (14,570 acres)													
Alternative A	X				X	X				X	14,400	14,570	14,570 (100%)
Alternative B	X				X	X				X	14,400	14,570	14,570 (100%)
Alternative C	X						X			X	7,285	10,928	10,928 (75%)
Alternative D	X			X	X	X				X	13,668	14,570	14,570 (100%)
Lower Bitter Creek (11,540 acres)													
Alternative A	X			X						X	11,540	11,540	11,540 (100%)

TABLE 4.14.5 ALTERNATIVES IMPACTS TO LANDS LIKELY TO HAVE WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS													
Name of Unit	Oil & as Development Potential			Lease Stipulations				Other Potential Impacting Land Uses			Wilderness Characteristic Lost		
	H	M	U	Standard Stipulations	Timing and Controlled Surface Use	NSO	Closed to Leasing	Wildlife habitat and improvement projects, including water and vegetation developments. Forest products harvest, including firewood cutting post/pole cutting, and timber harvest	Livestock and water development, including pipelines and stock ponds.	None	Direct loss of natural characteristics during life of the Plan (acres)	Reduction (directly or indirectly) in quality of the opportunities for solitude and primitive and unconfined recreation due to sights and sounds of development (acres)	Total area affected during life of the plan (acres and %)
Alternative B	X			X	X					X	11,540	11,540	11,540 (100%)
Alternative C	X			X	X					X	11,540	11,540	11,540 (100%)
Alternative D	X			X		X				X	10,527	11,540	11,540 (100%)

4.14.3.1 Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

Unavoidable adverse impacts would occur from mineral development and OHV activity, depending upon the alternative.

4.14.3.2 Short-term Uses Versus Long-term Productivity

Any loss of values would be throughout the life of the plan.

4.14.3.3 Irreversible and Irretrievable Impacts

Any loss of wilderness characteristics that would result from mineral development would be irreversible and irretrievable during the life of the plan.