

**Table 2.1.22 Proposed RMP and Alternatives – Roads and Trails**

PROPOSED RMP	Alternative A (Draft RMP/EIS Preferred Alternative)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D Current Management (No Action)	Alternative E
<b>TRAVEL — ROADS AND TRAILS — MAP FIGURES 33–38</b>					
<b>GOALS AND OBJECTIVES</b>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Establish working partnerships with local and state agencies, user groups, commercial providers, and other interested parties that would facilitate effective OHV program development, including the planning for and implementation of successful trail systems and use areas.</li> <li>Provide areas for OHV and motorized use, while protecting other resource values.</li> <li>The Proposed RMP and all alternatives would comply with the BLM’s National OHV Policy.</li> </ul>					
<b>MANAGEMENT COMMON TO THE PROPOSED RMP AND ALL ALTERNATIVES</b>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In collaboration with interested parties, the BLM would make future route adjustments based on access needs, recreational opportunities, and natural resource constraints. These adjustments would occur only in areas with open and/or limited route designations and would be analyzed at the activity planning level.</li> <li>The BLM, in preparing its RMP designations and its implementation-level travel management plans, is following policy and regulation authority found at: 43 C.F.R. Part 8340; 43 C.F.R. Subpart 8364; and 43 C.F.R. Subpart 9268.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>The BLM could impose limitations on types of vehicles allowed on specific designated routes if monitoring indicates that a particular type of vehicle is causing disturbance to the soil, wildlife habitat, cultural or vegetative resources, especially by off-road travel in an area that is limited to designated routes.</li> <li>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, the 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.</li> <li>As per the State of Utah v. Andrus, October 1, 1979 (Cotter Decision), the BLM would grant the State of Utah reasonable access to state lands for economic purposes, on a case-by-case basis.</li> </ul>					
<b>SCENIC BACKWAYS AND BYWAYS</b>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Continue to manage Nine Mile Canyon as a National Backcountry Byway.</li> <li>Crouse Canyon would be managed as a State of Utah Scenic Byway.</li> <li>The Flaming Gorge–Uintas Scenic Byway and the Dinosaur Diamond Prehistoric Highway would be managed as National Scenic Byways.</li> </ul>					
<i>* The Chipeta Canyon road would be open up to the Chipeta cabin.</i>	Same as the Proposed RMP.	Same as the Proposed RMP.	The Chipeta Canyon road would be closed at the mouth of Chipeta Canyon.	Unspecified in the current management plan	Same as Alternative C.
Newly permitted routes would be obliterated and/or returned to their original condition when they no longer serve their permitted purpose or public interest.	Same as the Proposed RMP.	Newly permitted routes would not be obliterated if the route serves a public interest.	Newly permitted routes would be obliterated when they no longer serve their permitted purpose.	Unspecified in the current management plan	Same as Alternative C.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Routes causing resource damage would be repaired by maintenance, upgrade, or realignment.</li> <li>BLM routes would be closed if none of the above is economically feasible.</li> </ul>	Same as the Proposed RMP.	Routes causing resource damage would be maintained, upgraded, and/or realigned.	Routes causing resource damage would be maintained, upgraded, realigned, and/or closed.	Unspecified in the current management plan	Same as Alternative C.
<p>OHV travel would be limited to designated routes or closed except for managed open areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Acres that would be open to OHV travel: 6,202</li> <li>Acres that would be limited to OHV travel: 1,643,475</li> <li>Acres that would be closed to OHV travel: 75,845</li> </ul> <p>This includes: all WSAs and ISA; the White River area (SRMA, river corridor); Lears Canyon ACEC, the Nine Mile Acquired Area; and the upper portion of the Lower Flaming Gorge non-WSA lands with wilderness</p>	Same as the Proposed RMP.	<p>OHV travel would be limited to designated routes or closed except for managed open areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Acres that would be open to OHV travel: 5,434</li> <li>Acres that would be limited to OHV travel: 1,659,901</li> <li>Acres that would be closed to OHV travel: 60,187</li> <li>Miles of routes that would be designated to OHV travel: 4,861</li> </ul>	<p>OHV travel would be limited to designated routes or closed except for managed open areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Acres that would be open to OHV travel: 5,434</li> <li>Acres that would be limited to OHV travel: 1,353,529</li> <li>Acres that would be closed to OHV travel: 366,559</li> <li>Miles of routes that would be designated to OHV travel: 4,707</li> </ul>	<p>OHV travel would be open, limited to designated routes, or closed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Acres that would be open to OHV travel: 787,859</li> <li>Acres that would be limited to OHV travel: 887,275</li> <li>Acres that would be closed to OHV travel: 50,388</li> <li>Miles of routes not designated.</li> </ul>	<p>OHV travel would be limited to designated routes or closed except for managed open areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Acres that would be open to OHV travel: 5,434</li> <li>Acres that would be limited to OHV travel: 1,326,024</li> <li>Acres that would be closed to OHV travel: 392,818</li> <li>Miles of routes that would be designated to OHV travel: 4,654</li> </ul>

**Table 2.1.22 Proposed RMP and Alternatives – Roads and Trails**

PROPOSED RMP	Alternative A (Draft RMP/EIS Preferred Alternative)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D Current Management (No Action)	Alternative E
<b>TRAVEL — ROADS AND TRAILS — MAP FIGURES 33–38</b>					
characteristics. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Miles of routes that would be designated to OHV travel: 4,860</li> </ul> <hr/> *This is an implementation-level decision that cannot be protested under the planning regulations. Please see the cover letter for further information.					