

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT UTAH STATE OFFICE		Date: September 2015
LAND USE PLAN EVALUATION REPORT TITLE PAGE		
Plan Title: Richfield Field Office Approved Resource Management Plan		
Periodic Evaluation Number: I		
Dates Conducted: June 11, 2015		
Conducted By: BLM, Utah State Office		
TEAM MEMBERS		
Name	Title	
Julie Carson	Planning and Environmental Specialist Utah State Office	
Skye Sieber	Planning and Environmental Coordinator Utah State Office	
Assistance Provided by:		
Sue Fivecoat	Assistant Field Manager Henry Mountains Field Station	
Wayne Wetzel	Field Office Manager Richfield Field Office	
Keith Rigtrup	District Planning and Environmental Coordinator Color Country District	
Submitted by: Richfield Field Office		Date

1. Introduction

In October 2008, the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) signed a Record of Decision for the Richfield Field Office Approved Resource Management Plan (RMP). Prior to the 2008 plan revision, the Richfield Field Office (RFO) managed resources under six different land use plans. The 2008 RMP establishes resource allocations and management direction for 2.1 million acres of BLM-administered land across south-central Utah in Sanpete, Sevier, Piute, Wayne, and Garfield counties.

1.1. Purpose

BLM planning regulations require established intervals and standards for monitoring and evaluation of plans (43 CFR 1610.4-9). The BLM land use planning handbook (H-1601-1, V.B.) articulates these intervals and standards:

Evaluation is the process of reviewing the land use plan and the periodic plan monitoring reports to determine whether the land use plan decisions and NEPA analysis are still valid and whether the plan is being implemented. Land use plans are evaluated to determine if: (1) decisions remain relevant to current issues; (2) decisions are effective in achieving (or making progress toward achieving) desired outcomes; (3) any decisions need to be revised; (4) any decisions need to be dropped from their consideration; and (5) any areas require new decisions. [T]he plan should be periodically evaluated (at a minimum every 5 years) as documented in an evaluation schedule.

This report is the first periodic evaluation of the Richfield RMP and fulfills BLM's duties under 43 CFR 1610.4-9. Based on workload in the field office, BLM's Washington Office granted an extension for completion of the first periodic evaluation for the Richfield RMP from Fiscal Year 2013 to Fiscal Year 2015 (September 30, 2015).

1.2. Methodology

The RMP evaluation team included Julie Carson (Utah State Office) and Skye Sieber (Utah State Office) with coordination and support provided by Sue Fivecoat (Assistant Field Manager) and Keith Rigtrup (Color Country District Office). The team met at the RFO in Richfield, Utah on June 11, 2015 to conduct interviews with field office staff. A close-out conference call with the field office was held on September 9, 2015. Resource specialists who helped review and evaluate the RMP are listed in Appendix A.

The Utah State Office developed questions to evaluate the effectiveness, consistency, and conformance of the plan with regard to current BLM policies and initiatives. Recent policies and initiatives considered in this periodic evaluation are listed below. The evaluation questions, along with field office staff responses, are attached in Appendix B. The results are summarized in Sections 2 and 3 of this report. Recent policies and initiatives considered in this periodic evaluation include:

- Renewable energy;
- Priority corridors;
- Leasing reform;
- Climate change;
- Sage-grouse habitat conservation; and
- Regional mitigation.

Additionally, the State Office compiled all management actions from the RMP into a spreadsheet to facilitate a systematic review of each decision. Responses from this review (attached in Appendix C) informed recommendations for plan maintenance or amendments. The evaluation questions and spreadsheet were sent to the field office manager and resource specialists prior to the evaluation

team's visit in Richfield. The questionnaires and subsequent interviews address the evaluation process outlined in the BLM land use planning handbook (H-1601-1, V.B.1.)

1.3. Plan Amendments and Maintenance

Since the Record of Decision was signed in October 2008, the Richfield RMP has been amended three times. First, the West-wide Energy Corridor Programmatic EIS and Approved Plan Amendment (January 2009) designated one energy right-of-way corridor within the RFO planning area per Section 368 of the Energy Policy Act. Second, the Solar Energy Development PEIS and ROD signed in October 2012 designated 107,071 acres as a "variance area" (potentially available for utility-scale solar energy development outside of a solar energy zone). Third, the Oil Shale and Tar Sands PEIS and ROD signed in March 2013 designated 134 acres within the Tar Sand Triangle special tar sand area as available for commercial leasing and added decisions for management of tar sands leasing.

Two maintenance actions have been completed since the RMP was approved. The first action corrected 67 grammatical, formatting and typographical errors found throughout the document prior to final printing and binding of the plan in spring 2009. The second plan maintenance action corrected oil and gas lease stipulations left out of Appendix 11 for the Old Woman Front ACEC.

In November 2010, the Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance (SUWA) and other environmental organizations filed a lawsuit challenging the Monticello, Kanab, and Richfield RMPs and travel plans (*SUWA v. Burke*). In June 2012, plaintiffs requested that the court argue the Richfield RMP first. On May 22, 2015, Judge Kimball issued a Memorandum Decision and Order to remedy deficiencies in the Richfield RMP. The RMP litigation history and recent court order were taken into consideration during this plan evaluation.

2. Results by Resource Topic

The results of the evaluation are organized below by resource topics. Detailed responses from field office specialists can be found in Appendix B and C.

2.1. Air, Water and Soil Resources

Rather than including a set of stand-alone Riparian decisions, the Richfield RMP incorporates direction for riparian areas under the broader Vegetation category. During the review, RFO staff noted air quality non-attainment areas and associated state implementation plan (SIP) are not specifically mentioned in the RMP, due to the fact that there are no non-attainment areas within or adjacent to the planning area. Actions to comply with the SIP, such as smoke management plans, are referenced. The RFO cooperates with the state to monitor water quality and the RMP recognizes current beneficial uses. Staff also pointed out that Ecological Site Description is used as a guide in setting priorities and prescriptions for restoration or rehabilitation work, whereas soil survey data is usually used to determine the limitations or hazards associated with such actions.

2.2. Cultural and Paleontological Resources

The recent Richfield RMP litigation decision and court order is expected to impact the field office's ability to conduct cultural resource inventories in the Horseshoe Canyon South Wilderness Study Area (WSA), Bull Creek Archaeological District, and other areas of special cultural designation not yet fully inventoried. A current contract exists to complete a Class I overview and is almost complete. Limited Class III inventories of designated routes are also currently under contract in response to the Kimball Memorandum Decision and Order which requires Class III inventories of all designated routes.

Completing additional paleontological and cultural inventories identified in the RMP remain outstanding actions.

2.3. Fish, Wildlife and Special Status Species

Development of a Habitat Management Plan for bison, mule deer, and other big game species within the Henry Mountains is in progress. During the evaluation, decisions related to greater sage-grouse were flagged for further review and modification once the Utah greater sage-grouse land use amendment planning process concludes.

2.4. Fire, Forests and Vegetation

Approximately 30,000 acres of fire and fuels treatments have been completed since the RMP was approved. Development of a Forest Woodland Management Plan for the planning area has not yet begun, due to lack of dedicated resources; the field office has requested funding to complete this management plan since 2009. While the RMP does not contain desired future conditions for health and distribution of forest resources, such conditions could be incorporated into a Forests and Woodland Management Plan.

2.5. Lands and Realty

Goals, objectives, and management actions related to lands and realty were determined to be adequate. The RMP identifies specific lands as potentially suitable for disposal by sale or exchange in Appendix 5. During the evaluation, RFO staff noted that conveying reserved Federal interests in split estate lands should be added as another option to adjust land tenure and recommends amending decisions LAR-1 and LAR-16 to include sample language from IM 2011-110 "Conveyance of Reversionary Interests." No new lands have been acquired since the RMP was approved.

2.6. Livestock Grazing and Wild Horses/Burros

During the review, staff noted there is a need to clarify the exclusion of domestic sheep and goat grazing east of Capitol Reef National Park for existing livestock grazing permits. All allotment boundary changes identified in GRA-9 have been completed. There are two wild horse and burro herd management areas within the Richfield planning area; one managed by RFO and one managed by the Price Field Office.

2.7. Minerals and Energy

A reasonable foreseeable development (RFD) scenario was developed for leasable minerals (Appendix 12) and remains current. The Richfield RMP contains management actions addressing abandoned mine lands (AML) under Health and Safety (HAZ), and RFO staff noted that the State Multi-Year Work Plan for AML has not been maintained or updated.

2.8. Recreation and Travel Management

The Richfield RMP designates five special recreation management areas (SRMA) and commits to developing an activity-level plan for each SRMA within five years of the RMP ROD; however, these have not yet been completed due to the ongoing RMP litigation and lack of dedicated resources. The Henry Mountains SRMA includes four WSAs as well as an archeological district. As per BLM's planning for recreation and visitor services handbook (H-8320-1), overlapping recreation management area (RMA) designations with special designations are discouraged because objectives for special designations may be inconsistent with RMA designations (p. I-37). Based on this and other SRMA designation criteria from H-8320-1, RFO staff recommend removing the Henry Mountains as an SRMA.

In the Richfield RMP, there are two types of transportation-related decisions: Travel Management (TRC) and Transportation Facilities (TRV). The plan level travel decisions adequately allocate areas located within the field office as open/limited/closed for motorized use. Regarding designated open areas, RFO staff suggested re-visiting the boundaries and acres for Big Rocks, Glenwood, and Aurora -if there is new information concerning special status species and archeological resources in these areas- because the public would enjoy expanded areas for recreational use. Additionally, Sanpete County requested making the White Hills area near Mayfield open (currently “limited to designated routes”). Current use in this area reveals incursions that are difficult to limit and enforce designated route travel. However, there are also conflicts with private lands that would increase with open use. Implementation level travel route designations have been remanded to BLM for additional review. This intensive effort will delay additional work on other recreation related decisions and activity plans.

2.9. Visual Resources and Special Designations

In the Richfield RMP, special designations fall under one of the following categories of decisions: Wild and Scenic Rivers, Wilderness Study Areas, and Areas of Critical Environmental Concern. Direction related to the Old Spanish National Historic Trail falls under Cultural program decisions. Per *SUWA v. Burke* (May 22, 2015), BLM has been ordered to re-evaluate and issue a new decision regarding the Henry Mountains ACEC and to reconsider if Happy, Buck, and Pasture Canyons are eligible for protection under the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. Both of these processes may result in new decisions and associated plan revision.

As per the 2008 Record of Decision for the RMP (p.32), BLM decided that *non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics* chosen for management of the wilderness characteristics in the RMP will be referred to as *BLM natural areas*. This new, simpler reference was chosen to distinguish between formal designations (e.g. Wilderness) and a discretionary management category. *BLM natural areas* are managed to protect, preserve, and maintain values of primitive recreation and the appearance of naturalness and solitude. For consistency, the RMP evaluation team recommends that ‘*BLM natural areas*’ terminology be added to plan decisions where appropriate via plan maintenance.

3. General Findings

The plan is relatively new and the demographic and resource issues that drove its creation and resulting decisions are applicable today. For the most part, plan decisions also remain relevant to more recent BLM policies and initiatives.

3.1. Renewable Energy

Decisions LAR-30, 31 and 32 support wind and solar energy development and MIN-14 provides direction regarding geothermal leasing. The Geothermal Leasing PEIS and ROD (December 2008) projected only 50 megawatts of geothermal production within the Richfield planning area by year 2025.

3.2. Priority Corridors

There is one designated Section 368 energy corridor (#116-206) within the Richfield planning area, continuing north from the same designated corridor in the Kanab Field Office. The RMP designates several other right-of-way corridors, listed in Appendix 5, along with corresponding management direction.

3.3. Leasing Reform

Surface stipulations applicable to oil and gas leasing are outlined in Appendix 11 and considered the least restrictive to protect resources. A recent NEPA process and decision changed 80 acres from open to NSO; this change affects acres currently listed in MIN-11 and other related decisions. Development of a master leasing plan for the San Rafael Desert north of Hanksville (primarily affecting the Price FO) has been identified as the next MLP effort for BLM Utah.

3.4. Climate Change

Though the Richfield RMP does not contain direction or decisions explicitly addressing climate change, portions of the planning area have been assessed for terrestrial or subsurface carbon sequestration potential (USGS Scientific Investigations Report 2015-5021). The Habitat Management Plan that is in progress (see section 2.3) could include climate change consideration as a standard variable in the definition of habitat. Special Status Species (SSS) and Fish and Wildlife (WL) decisions that manage and promote unfragmented blocks of habitat further support climate adaptation for wildlife species by keeping pathways open for movement.

3.5. Sage-Grouse Habitat Conservation

As a result of the forthcoming Utah Greater Sage-Grouse Resource Management Plan Amendment, new decisions and allocations will be added (or existing ones modified) under the management areas of special status species, fire, vegetation, grazing, minerals, lands and realty, recreation, and travel management. Once the approved plan amendment ROD is signed, the State Office will be assisting field offices with creating an LUP amendment /maintenance sheet catered to each affected land use plan.

3.6. Regional Mitigation

In addition to new decisions, the greater sage-grouse land use plan amendment commits to regional mitigation, which will strategically identify mitigation sites and measures that provide a net conservation gain to the species in Utah. Furthermore, decisions VEG-2 and WL-8 commit to “compensatory mitigation on an ‘as appropriate’ basis where it can be performed on-site, and on a voluntary basis where it is performed off-site, in accordance with current guidance.”

4. Recommendations

Based on the findings, the evaluation team determined two different types of recommendations:

- Areas in which additional action is needed in order to implement RMP objectives and decisions
- Suggested plan maintenance actions or amendments

4.1. Additional Actions

4.1.1. Implementation-Level Planning

Since the plan was approved, much work has gone into implementing actions to meet various goals and objectives. Areas of effort include fire and fuels treatments, allotment boundary changes, and development of a habitat management plan and Class I (cultural resources) overview, both of which are in progress. In order to ensure other goals and objectives are met, the following implementation-level plans still need to be completed: SRMA activity plans, a forest woodland management plan, and cultural and paleontological inventories. An implementation-level travel plan was completed; however per *SUWA v. Burke*, the BLM will need to incorporate additional documentation of designation criteria used to minimize route impacts to resources.

4.1.2. Data and Effectiveness Monitoring

A *Monitoring* section is included under each program area to describe how the program decisions will be tracked to ensure implementation. This section was reviewed and all monitoring requirements were verified as current and achievable. In some instances, there is a reference to reporting monitoring in an “Annual Program Summary and Planning Update.” Based on review of other RMPs completed in 2008, the RMP evaluation team recommends clarifying this language in all plans and including references to “*workload accomplishment reporting*,” which is a method that many resource program areas already use to collect and report monitoring results. Continued monitoring will be necessary to gauge the effectiveness of implementing plan decisions.

4.1.3. Budget and Staffing

During the evaluation, staff noted that many of the outstanding implementation-level plans are the result of a lack of dedicated staff or funding. Implementation-level plans are classified as “one-time decisions” in the RMP and are prioritized as part of the BLM budget process. A five-year Implementation Plan/Framework spreadsheet that establishes time frames and priorities for completion of “one-time” decisions in the approved RMP was developed in 2009 but has not been updated since its creation. To assist managers and staff in the annual budget planning process, the evaluation team suggests that RFO staff update this spreadsheet or develop a similar tool to help track RMP implementation accomplishments and outstanding commitments.

4.1.1. Maintaining Plan Updates

Over the life of the RMP, changes to language and decisions in the RMP are documented on “LUP Amendment/Maintenance Sheets.” An LUP amendment/maintenance sheet is needed to document allocations and decisions resulting from both the solar and oil shale/tar sands plan amendments (see Section 1.3). Updated text attributed to amendments and plan maintenance is not reflected in the body of the RMP. To help ensure that BLM staff are referring to the most up-to-date RMP language, the evaluation team recommends that the Field Office maintain an electronic “redline” or annotated version of the plan that clearly shows these changes. The annotated RMP should also be published to the Field Office webpage to further ensure that BLM staff in other offices, as well as interested publics, are referencing the most current plan language.

4.2. Suggested plan maintenance and amendments

The following table summarizes updates to the plan recommended by field office staff and the evaluation team during their review. A majority of updates are likely to be accomplished via plan maintenance as they reflect minor data changes or help refine, document, or clarify previously approved decisions. Known future updates have also been identified based on knowledge of other current planning or litigation. An initial suggestion regarding plan maintenance or amendment is provided; however the appropriate method for incorporating changes must be determined from the details of each case.

Suggested Change	Affected Decision(s)	Suggested Method
Change <i>proved</i> to <i>provided</i>	SOL-8	Maintenance
Add: <i>or in compliance with new/updated requirements to allow for continued compliance with State of Utah standards</i> after every 3 years.	WAT-5	Maintenance

Suggested Change	Affected Decision(s)	Suggested Method
Change phrase <i>wildland fire use</i> to <i>use of wildland fire</i> .	VEG-4; FIRE-4, 8; ACEC-4	Maintenance
Add phrase <i>or most current policy</i> to accommodate future updates to cited references.	VEG-7; WL-3 and 10; WHB-1	Maintenance
Modify decision to read: <i>Follow current management direction and Utah BLM riparian policy regarding retention of riparian areas in the public land system.</i>	VEG-9	Maintenance
Change <i>Old Spanish Trail</i> to <i>Old Spanish National Historic Trail</i> .	CUL-5	Maintenance
Consider dropping; repetitive of SSS-12.	SSS-14	Maintenance
Errata. Section heading mislabeled as a management action.	SSS-11, 15 and 18; WC-2	Maintenance
Add USFWS conservation actions.	WL-4	Maintenance
Change: <i>analyze</i> to <i>consider</i> . Delete: <i>through NEPA evaluation</i> .	WL-28	Maintenance
Add: <i>subject to guidance provided by BLM 1745 policy and by existing or future MOUs with UDWR.</i>	WL-29	Maintenance
Reword wildfire rehabilitation paragraph to retain methods listed and note that specific method(s) will vary <i>commensurate with size and complexity of burned area</i> .	Fire and Fuels Monitoring	Maintenance
Add: <i>(BLM natural areas)</i> wherever <i>non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics</i> is mentioned.	WC-1, 2, 13; FOR-5, 6, 9; REC-27; LAR-12, 27, 29; MIN-20 and 34	Maintenance
Update acres according to GIS on maintenance form.	GRA-8	Maintenance
Update all references to the <i>IMP</i> to the new <i>BLM MS-6330</i> (Management of Wilderness Study Areas).	GRA-16; REC-27, 39; TRC 22, 34; MIN-29; WSA-1, 7, Goals and Objectives.	Maintenance
Clarify decision language to address the existing permit that allows sheep east of the park.	GRA-17	Maintenance
Modify language to accommodate manual updates and new methodologies and scientific understanding.	Livestock grazing Monitoring	Maintenance
Add other known group sites to list.	REC-8	
Change <i>5 years</i> to <i>as funding and staffing permit</i> since activity plans have not yet been started.	REC-23, 26, 30 and 48	Maintenance
Typographical error: acknowledge REC-50 through 54 inadvertently left out of plan and reserve for future use.	<u>Recreation Decisions (REC)</u> numbering	Maintenance
Add: <i>Fillmore is managing Yuba Reservoir in partnership with the RFO and Utah State Parks.</i>	REC-60	Maintenance
Rewrite decision to read: <i>Permit competitive events in WSA in accordance with BLM MS-6330.</i>	REC-61	Maintenance
Modify to explain that Paiute Trail and Great Western Trail have an exception (Arapeen Trail).	REC-65	Maintenance

Suggested Change	Affected Decision(s)	Suggested Method
Delete: <i>near communities such as Caineville, Glenwood, Aurora, and Loa (e.g. Big Rocks SRMA),</i> Delete: <i>Generally these would include areas with existing surface disturbance. (May include the White Hills area in the R&PP authority.)</i>	TRC-11	Maintenance
Update Appendix 9 so it is current.	TRC-21	Maintenance
Reference current policy for travel route designations.	TRC-23, 24 and 25	Maintenance
Add: <i>and/or reciprocal rights of way</i> after <i>Consider obtaining easements.</i>	LAR-25	Maintenance
Add wind and solar PEIS references.	LAR-32	Maintenance
Modify decision language to current standards –OR– combine with MIN-9 –OR– drop decision	MIN-7	Maintenance
80 acres changed from open to NSO based on a NEPA process. Update acreage in related decisions accordingly.	MIN-11	Maintenance
Modify/add decisions as per the OSTIS ROD (March 2013).	MIN-16	Maintenance
Check acreage based on modification to MIN-34.	MIN-35, 36 and 37	Maintenance
Correct acreage for Fremont Gorge	WSA-5 and 6	Maintenance
Add: <i>In cooperation with UDWR</i> under Wildlife subheading.	ACEC-4	Maintenance
Clarify: relinquished road ROWs reclaimed unless identified during NEPA that the road should become a BLM Designated Route.	TRV-5	Maintenance
Add bullet that indicates commitment to appropriate training for personnel.	<u>Health and Safety (HAZ)</u> Goals and Objectives	Maintenance
Modify to include reference to CERCLA funding.	HAZ-14	Maintenance
Add: <i>or workload accomplishment reporting</i> after <i>Annual Program Summary and Planning Update</i>	Monitoring sections	Maintenance
Review/modify/replace/add decisions as needed once the Utah Greater Sage-Grouse RMP Amendment is approved.		
Richfield RMP litigation may modify this decision.	CUL-10	Possible Future Maintenance
RS-2477 litigation may change this decision.	TRV-4	Possible Future Maintenance
<i>Note: There is no requirement or commitment to undertake suggested amendments.</i>		
Remove Henry Mountains as an SRMA (not justified; see H-8320-1 p. I-36). Adjust acreage and map as a result.	Modify: REC-16 Drop: REC-49, 55, 56	Amendment
Designate Otter Creek as an SRMA (see H-8320-1 p. I-36).	REC-16	Amendment
Drop decision (would like option to have competitive events).	REC-64	Amendment
Add: <i>Reserved Federal interests in split estate lands anywhere in the planning area may be considered for conveyance out of Federal ownership</i> [per IM 2011-110]	LAR-1, 16 and Appendix 5	Amendment

Suggested Change	Affected Decision(s)	Suggested Method
Re-visit boundaries and acres if new information is available concerning SSS and archeological resources (Big Rocks, Glenwood, and Aurora). Consider designating the White Hills area as open (currently limited) because requested by county and current use reveals incursions that are difficult to limit and enforce.	TRC-10	Amendment

Appendix A: Interdisciplinary Review Team

Richfield Field Office / Color Country District Staff

Stan Andersen	<i>Minerals</i>
Jason Anderson	<i>GIS</i>
Bob Bates	<i>Fire</i>
Brandon Boshell	<i>Renewable Resources</i>
Jennifer Christensen	<i>Recreation</i>
Dave Cook	<i>Wildlife</i>
Mark Dean	<i>Hydrology</i>
Sue Fivecoat	<i>Assistant Field Manager (Henry Mountains Field Station)</i>
Larry Greenwood	<i>Wildlife</i>
Brant Hallows	<i>Natural Resources</i>
Myron Jeffs	<i>Recreation</i>
Brandon Jolley	<i>Range</i>
Lauren Kingston	<i>Cultural Resources</i>
Matt Madriaga	<i>Fire</i>
Joseph Manning	<i>Minerals</i>
Dustin Mitchell	<i>Engineering Equipment Operator</i>
Todd Murray	<i>Fire</i>
John Reay	<i>Minerals/Paleontology</i>
Keith Rigtrup	<i>Planning</i>
Michael Utley	<i>Lands and Realty</i>
Wayne Wetzel	<i>Field Manager</i>
Alvin Whitehair	<i>Range</i>

Appendix B: Evaluation Questions

Question	Response	Action
Are the leasing restrictions and stipulations affecting energy and renewable energy development (Oil & Gas, Geothermal, Solar, and Wind) appropriate to protect critical resources and special areas or are there additional restrictions or stipulations that are needed to protect resources? Identify the additional restrictions required.	Standardization of sage grouse stipulation with EIS will be necessary.	No change
Is there a Reasonable Foreseeable Development (RFD) scenario for implementing fluid minerals energy-related exploration and development in the planning area? If so, then:	yes, Appendix 12	No change
a. Is it appropriate for the level of activity occurring now and projected in the near term (3-5 years)?	yes	No change
b. Is it appropriate for the level of activity projected in the long term (20 years)?	yes	No change
c. Has the RFD been exceeded or could be exceeded within the lifespan of the RMP?	no	No change
d. Does the RFD consider potential new discoveries from developing tight shale formations with new hydraulic fracturing and horizontal drilling technologies?	yes	No change
e. Was the RFD used as the basis for determining cumulative impacts in the RMP/EIS?	yes	No change
Does the RMP contain an appendix outlining typical BMPs that will be used for fluid mineral development?	Appendix 15	No change
Were the least restrictive constraints selected that that meet the resources protection objective?	No	No change
Does the RMP provide direction and flexibility to accommodate oil & gas and renewable energy development? Are there constraints in the RMP that would affect or delay issuing Rights-of-Way for oil & gas, geothermal, wind or solar energy development?	Yes and No	No change
Are there restrictions that should be eliminated or modified because they no longer are needed/appropriate, or are there other protective mechanisms in place that supersede their use, or are there industry technological changes that make the restriction(s) unnecessary?	No	No change
Are there RFDs outlined in the RMP for other mineral resources, such as locatable or salable? If so, is level of activity commensurate with the RFD?	No	No change
Does the RMP address how the RFD scenario(s) will be kept up to date?	No	No change
Does the RMP describe criteria for the application of appropriate stipulations for fluid minerals, along with criteria for the waiver, exception, or modification of the stipulation?	Yes, Appendix 11	No change
Does the RMP incorporate sustainable development concepts or objectives relative to post-mining uses?	Yes	No change
Does the RMP ensure access to sand and gravel to support infrastructure and communities?	Yes	No change
Monitoring	Verified that all Minerals monitoring requirements are current and achievable.	No change

Question	Response	Action
Is the RMP's policy statement for managing hazardous materials and wastes up to date?	Yes, Table 24	No change
Does the RMP identify an inventory of hazardous materials sites, including FUD (Formerly Used Defense) sites, and outline objectives for management and disposal of known or potential future hazardous materials sites?	No	No change
Is the RMP's policy statement for managing Abandoned Mine Lands (AML) up to date?	Yes, Table 24	No change
Does the RMP address identification, inventory and closure actions for Abandoned Mine Lands?	Yes, Table 24	No change
Monitoring	Modify first paragraph to specify that other sites are included, not just AML sites.	Modify

Question	Response	Action
Do the RMP land tenure decisions provide for consolidating land ownership? If no, please explain.	Yes	No change
Does the RMP include a Table or Map identifying Land and Mineral Ownership in the Planning Area, or something comparable, clearly identifying jurisdiction over various lands or interests in lands?	Yes	No change
Does the RMP identify specific lands, described by legal description as potentially suitable for disposal by sale or exchange? Does the RMP identify acquisition areas such as NCAs, wilderness areas, or other high resource lands, should they become available from a willing seller? Do these areas reflect current resource priorities for landownership adjustments (i.e. sage grouse habitat, mule deer winter range, etc.)? List any new priority areas not described in the RMP.	Yes for all; no new areas to acquire but some areas to dispose of.	No change
How are planning decisions in the RMP being applied to newly-acquired lands? Is future BLM management of the lands or interests in lands addressed in the EIS for the acquisition/exchange?	No new lands acquired since plan approval; yes.	No change
Does the RMP identify right-of-way corridors, avoidance areas, and exclusion areas? For avoidance areas, does the plan outline the terms and conditions that must be met in order for a right-of-way to be granted?	Yes	No change
Does the RMP address the policies and actions under Executive Order (EO) 13211 of May 18, 2001 (President's National Energy Policy) toward expediting the supply and availability of energy in your RMP area?	Yes	No change
Does the RMP identify proposed land withdrawals? Does the RMP identify both previous and new land withdrawals?	Yes and yes	No change
How are planning decisions being applied to lands returned to the public domain from relinquished withdrawals, where administrative jurisdiction is or will likely be returned to the BLM?	No relinquished withdrawals.	No change
Monitoring	Remove the sentence, "The number of acres acquired...Planning updates," since the previous sentence covers the issue.	No change

Question	Response	Action
Does the RMP identify air quality standards and, if appropriate, provide examples of prescriptive management practices to achieve them?	Yes. P. 70	No change
Does the RMP recognize the State's authority to regulate air quality impacts and establish emission standards?	Yes. P. 70	No change
Does the RMP address impairment of visibility in federal and state Class I areas, including those which may be affected in adjacent states?	Yes. P. 70. However impairment in adjacent states is not addressed	No change
Does the RMP identify existing non-attainment areas, state implementation plans (SIP), tribal implementation plans (TIP) when available, and measures/actions to meet conformity with SIP/TIPs?	Non-attainment areas and associated SIPs are not identified. This may be due to the fact that there are no non-attainment areas within or adjacent to the field office area. The EIS does mention the Regional Haze SIP but it is not mentioned specifically in the ROD. Measures/actions to comply with the SIP such as smoke management plans area discussed in the ROD.	No change
Was air quality modeling done for the RMP? If so, was the modeling qualitative or quantitative? Briefly describe the model used. Based upon the information derived from modeling and/or monitoring, are air quality standards being met? If not, what management actions or mitigation measures are prescribed?	Modeling was not completed for the RMP but the ROD does mention that project specific modeling may be completed as needed. Air quality standards are being met. No management actions are prescribed.	No change
Is the plan consistent with the June 2011 Air Quality MOU for Oil and Gas projects?	Yes. The plan does not match details regarding the procedure to be followed in the MOU, but it directs for similar procedures to be followed at p. 70 AQ-06	No change
Monitoring	Verified that all air quality monitoring requirements are current and achievable.	No change

Question	Response	Action
Does the RMP evaluate the availability of water and/or the need to develop additional water sources needed to manage wild horses and burros, livestock, wildlife, recreation, habitat and other beneficial uses allowed under state water law?	No. The RMP does not evaluate the ability of water for these resources but does mention that water for recreation should be maintained or improved (p. 74 WAT-3)	No change
Does the RMP evaluate the availability of water within the plan area for fire suppression or other emergency needs?	No	No change
Does the RMP contain prescriptions for and identify methods of application(s) for emergency fire rehabilitation/restoration?	No	No change
Does the RMP identify Bureau water rights policy, voluntary conformance with state water law, and provisions to perfect and protect sufficient water rights to meet land management activities (BLM 7250 Manual and Utah Water Rights Policy)?	Yes, p. 74	No change
Monitoring	Verified that all Water Resources monitoring requirements are current and verifiable.	No change

Question	Response	Action
Does the RMP discuss water quality, water quantity, and current or foreseeable beneficial uses in the planning area?	the RMP recognizes current beneficial uses but does not foresee any changes in beneficial uses. Management for water quantity is not discussed.	No change
Does the RMP identify State water quality standards or establish water quality objectives where State standards are nonexistent? (BLM 7240 manual).	The RMP recognizes state standards but does not propose or establish any standards where state standards are non-existent or inappropriate.	No change
Does the RMP identify area wide use restrictions and/or Best Management Practices to meet water quality requirements?	Restrictions are best defined for drinking water systems. BMPs are suggested (A14-21)	No change
Are there any impaired water bodies in the planning area identified on the State of Utah's list (303d)? Are any impaired water bodies linked to public land use?	Yes there are impaired water bodies in the PA. Yes, impairment is linked to public land use in some areas	No change
Does the RMP set objectives for the restoration of identified impaired waters?	Only general guidelines to cooperate with the state in writing and implementing TMDLs	No change
As appropriate, does the RMP refer to the state's Report on Water Quality (305b)?	yes	No change
In view of the Unified Federal Policy and other provisions of the Clean Water Act, are there opportunities or needs to identify priority watersheds, or watersheds in need of special protection?	Priority watersheds and issues have been identified (e.g. the Colorado River and salinity) Other needs have been identified through the monitoring and TMDL process	No change
Does the RMP recognize wellhead/source water protection areas and specify land-use restrictions to limit water quality degradation?	Yes	No change
Are management decisions prescribed on a watershed level? Explain.	No, a watershed level emphasis does not appear to be present or necessary	No change
Monitoring	Verified that all Water Resources monitoring requirements are current and verifiable.	No change

Question	Response	Action
Does the RMP require the use of Proper Functioning Condition surveys to assess functionality of riparian areas?	Yes, "PFC inventories with RFO are considered part of water monitoring. As with all phases of water monitoring, efforts are dependent on personnel staffing and funding." see p. 77 and p. 81 (water and vegetation monitoring)	No change
Are there general goals to maintain functional riparian areas at PFC and to improve the condition of areas that are functioning-at-risk or non-functional so that such areas may achieve PFC?	Yes (p. 76)	No change
Does the RMP include objectives/management actions needed to achieve goals described under #2 (actions might also be described under other management areas such as vegetation, soils, sensitive species, etc.)?	Yes (p. 77-78)	No change
Are measures required to collect quantitative monitoring data and additional PFC surveys to evaluate effectiveness of stated management actions?	Yes (p. 75 water resources monitoring)	No change
Is the RMP subject to review under the new Riparian performance standard?	Yes	Specific management actions have been identified to be updated with "most current policy/direction" where applicable
Monitoring	Verified that all Water Resources monitoring requirements are current and verifiable.	No change

Question	Response	Action
Are soil survey data described and used to assess the suitability/capability of landscapes to achieve RMP objectives?	Yes. The soil survey data is at the project level to determine if soil characteristics will be conducive to the proposed actions and if the proposed action will produce beneficial or negative impacts to the soil.	No change
Are soil survey data used to set priorities for restoration/rehabilitation and to guide development of site-specific prescriptions?	No. The Ecological Site Description is the data used as a guide in setting priorities and prescriptions for restoration /rehab work. The soil survey data is usually used to determine the limitations/hazards associated with restoration /rehab work.	No change
Are soil survey data used to identify erosion hazards or erodible classes throughout the planning area?	Yes. It is done on a project by project basis.	No change
Does the RMP utilize or address the use of Ecological Site Descriptions for determining ecological site conditions and treatment options?	No	No change
Monitoring	Verified that all soil monitoring requirements are current and achievable.	No change

Question	Response	Action
Does the RMP provide adequate direction and flexibility for the District/Field Office to plan and implement vegetation treatment projects under programs such as the Watershed Restoration Initiative (WRI) and Healthy Landscapes?	Yes	No change
Does the RMP identify desired future conditions of vegetation resources for land management objectives?	No (Utah GRSG LUPA will include sagebrush DFC).	Consider developing vegetation DFC for Richfield FO if deemed necessary
Does the RMP designate priority plant species and habitats, including special status species and populations of plants? List any priority species and habitats.	Yes	No change
Does the RMP contain strategies to conserve threatened or endangered and special status plant species, including listed species and species proposed for listing?	Yes	No change
Are the RMP decisions consistent with objectives and recommended actions in recovery plans, conservation agreements, and applicable biological opinions for threatened and endangered species?	Yes	No change
Does the RMP provide management direction to address the introduction and spread of noxious and invasive species?	Yes, in BMP's for 'Vegetation Resource Mgmt' pg. 25 and Mgmt considerations for forestry pg. 29.	No change
Is there a current inventory of noxious or invasive species for the planning area?	Yes, continually being updated.	No change
Monitoring	Verified that all vegetation monitoring requirements are current and achievable.	No change

Question	Response	Action
Does the RMP identify desired future conditions for health and distribution of forest resources (broken down by forest type)?	No	This would be incorporated into the Forest and Woodlands Management Plan, once funding is received
Does the RMP address old-growth features of the forest and woodland habitat types? Is management direction provided on how to maintain or contribute to the restoration of old growth forests?	Yes. No details	No change
Does the RMP identify characteristics of healthy forest conditions for forest/woodland types?	Not explicitly	No change
Does the RMP identify resources available for woodland product harvest and identify sustainable harvest levels in those areas?	Plan identifies what is available. Doesn't identify sustainable harvest level	No change
Does the RMP identify areas where commercial and/or non-commercial harvesting is open, restricted or withdrawn from commercial activities?	Yes	No change
Does the RMP comply with the objectives outlined in the Healthy Forest Initiative and the Healthy Forests Restoration Act?	Yes (FOR-3)	No change
Does the RMP support utilization of biomass across broad landscapes and is it consistent with policy?	Biomass is not explicitly stated, but commercial timber harvest is accommodated.	No change
Monitoring	Verified that forestry monitoring requirements are current and achievable.	No change

Question	Response	Action
Does the plan provide adequate direction and flexibility to implement actions to maintain or restore healthy rangelands in Utah?	Yes. Concerns with specificity of the long-term trend monitoring direction in the RMP with ever-changing direction from state and national offices.	Update Vegetation monitoring direction in the Livestock Grazing section to be more flexible and accommodating to updated manuals, methodologies, and scientific understanding (new cited references).
Does the RMP incorporate the Utah Standards and Guidelines for Rangeland Health for livestock grazing management? Does the RMP apply the standards to all programs and uses?	Yes Yes. Concerns with specificity of the long-term trend monitoring direction in the RMP with ever-changing direction from state and national offices.	Add appendix 20 to website Errors in GIS maps need to be updated (maintenance)
Does the RMP identify lands available or not available for livestock grazing? Have the criteria for identifying lands available for grazing changed since the RMP was completed?	Yes Yes. Concerns with specificity of the long-term trend monitoring direction in the RMP with ever-changing direction from state and national offices.	Correct Wildlife AUMs for Robbers Roost in Appendix 7, page. A7-5 (currently 1,9261). Check cumulative total of 35,545 as well.
Maintenance items:	Verified that other livestock monitoring requirements are current and achievable.	See update noted above
Monitoring	Verified that other livestock monitoring requirements are current and achievable.	See update noted above

Question	Response	Action
How well do the Fire Planning Units (FPU) match up with FPUs of adjoining BLM districts in Utah, and adjoining states?	Yes, FPU for Central Utah is now split between West Desert District and Color Country District	No change
In cases where FPUs do not match, is there sufficient rationale to validate the FPU boundaries for the planning area?	Not applicable	No change
Does the RMP present any constraints or issues relative to complying with the Wildland Fire Policy? If so, please explain.	No	No change
Does the RMP present any constraints to approving biomass utilization or stewardship projects for energy production, commercial and/or non-commercial uses (e.g., public woodcutting, commercial, co-generation energy production, etc.)?	No constraints	No change
Does the RMP conform to current policies on Fire Management Planning for identifying fire management units (FMU)?	Yes	No change
Does the RMP provide objectives for appropriate use of managed fire for resource benefit?	Yes	<p>New terminology will be modified in plan maintenance</p> <p>Modify to keep the various methods with caveat that specific method used is commensurate with size and complexity of burned area.</p> <p>Change to "workload accomplishment reports"</p> <p>*change applies to other program areas</p>
Monitoring	ES&R Monitoring references Line-Point Intercept Method, Nested Plot Study, Soil Condition Rating Assessment: not sure these are the "right" methods.	
	Tracking and reporting of Condition Class ratings in "Annual Program Summary and Planning Update"	

Question	Response	Action
Does the RMP address special cultural and paleontological resource issues, including traditional cultural properties and NRHP-eligible or listed districts or sites that may affect the location, timing, or method of development or use of other resources in the planning area?	Yes	No change
Does the RMP refer to requirements for consultation under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and other laws and directives for with tribal governments, including general timeframes for completing consultation?	Yes (8); no timeframes specified.	No change
Does the RMP adequately describe or summarize the extent and type of significant archaeological resources known and assign cultural resources to the use categories specified in BLM Manuals?	No	No change
Does the RMP fully protect significant cultural and paleontological resources through special designations?	No (No ACECs specifically for cultural or paleo. If special designations don't mean ACECs, then the answer may not be no (unsure).	No change
Do route and area travel designations in the RMP address cultural and paleontological resource needs and protection?	No - see SUWA v. Burke.	No change
Does the RMP allow for the definition and management of Traditional Cultural Properties?	Yes	No change
Does the RMP address land use applications that may affect cultural and paleontological resources, including tribal resources?	Cul-6: protect eligible cultural sites and mitigate impacts.	No change
Are the decisions in the RMP based on adequate cultural and paleontological resource data as specified in BLM Planning Guidance? Is a new Class I overview needed?	Part 1: no. Part 2: a current contract exists for the class 1 overview that is almost complete.	No change
Does the RMP include goals of identifying, preserving, and protecting significant cultural and paleo resources and ensuring that they are available for present and future use?	Yes	No change
Does the RMP include the stated goal of reducing threats and resolving potential conflicts by ensuring compliance with NHPA Section 106 and Paleontological Resource Protection Act?	No specific reference to Paleo Resource Protection Act (except as part of Pal-9); other parts yes.	No change
Cultural Resources Monitoring	Accurate, except Modify final paragraph of Cultural Resource Monitoring section (p. 84) so that it is consistent with BLM policy on Cultural Inventory on Route Designations.	Modify
Paleontological Resources Monitoring	Modify final line of paleontological resources monitoring section so that collection of petrified wood is not encouraged.	Modify

Question	Response	Action
Do all special management designations have clear management objectives? If not, explain.	Yes. They are identified in the RMP. (WSA p.143, WSR P147, ACEC p.149)	No change
Does the planning area have overlapping special management designations and if so, are the management objectives conflicting with one another? This could include an ACEC or SRMA overlapping a WSA, or various OHV designations within a single management area.	Some areas do overlap. Most overlap is between SRMAs and WSAs (Henry Mountains, Dirty Devil, and Capitol Reef Gateway). No conflicting objectives have been identified.	No change
Does the District have designated wilderness? If so, has a wilderness management plan completed?	No designated wilderness.	No change
Are there citizen-proposed wilderness areas identified in the planning area. If so, describe.	Yes. SUWAs America red rock wilderness act.	No change
Does the RMP state clearly that Wilderness Study Areas will be managed under the "Interim Management Policy (IMP) for Lands under Wilderness Review" (H-8550-1) or BLM Manual 6330 "Management of Wilderness Study Areas"?	Yes. The RMP clearly references the old IMP. (p.143) Yes. Additional inventories have been conducted since the RMP and are kept on file. They have not yet been added to the GIS database.	No change No change
Has the District wilderness characteristics inventory been updated since the original inventory?	Yes. Some were identified as natural areas which have management constraints to help preserve the wilderness characteristics. (p. 103)	No change
Does the RMP identify lands with wilderness characteristics and apply management constraints to some lands identified as possessing wilderness characteristics?	Yes	No change
Are allocations appropriate for areas with wilderness characteristics that have been designated for protection of the wilderness values?	Yes. Area within WSAs is either identified as closed or limited to designated routes/ways. (p. 144)	No change
Do planning decisions identify wilderness study areas as either designated or closed to OHV use? Do planning decisions identify OHV use within Wilderness Study Areas as limited to "designated" ways or "closed to OHV use"?	Yes. One section of the Fremont River was tentatively classified as suitable for inclusion. (p.147)	No change Per <i>SUWA v. Burke</i> (May 22, 2015), BLM will reconsider if Happy, Buck, and Pasture Canyons are eligible for protection under the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act by May 22, 2016.
Are wild and scenic river studies completed for the planning area which identify and evaluate river segments to determine eligibility, tentative classification, protection requirements, and suitability?	Yes. Management actions are established in the RMP. (P.148)	No change
For public lands along streams identified as potentially suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, have interim management measures been established?		

Does the RMP contain a separate section on managing National Historic Trails as specified by BLM Manual 6280?	No. National Historic Trails are discussed in a Transportation Table (pg 153), but it does not have its own separate section. (Manual 6280 came out in Sept. 2012).	No change
Does the RMP establish National Historic Trail Management Corridors as specified by BLM Manual 6280, or address how such corridors will be established in the future?	No. Corridors are not established in the RMP. (Manual 6280 came out in Sept. 2012).	No change
Are there National Historic Trails designated on the District? If so, has a comprehensive trail management plan been completed?	Yes. The Old Spanish Trail. Not sure about a comprehensive trail management plan. The UT SO was working on an Old Spanish Trail Comprehensive Administration Strategy, not sure of status.	No change
Are there objectives and management actions identified through either the RMP or the comprehensive management plan, for high priority trail segments or segments eligible or listed on the NHRP?	Yes, there are references to the Old Spanish Trail.	No change
Is the plan consistent with updated National Conservation Lands policies?	Yes, WSA Manual 6330, LWC Manuals 6310 and 6320?	No change
Does the RMP address Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACECs)?	Yes. They are addressed. (p.149)	Per <i>SUWA v. Burke</i> (May 22, 2015), BLM will re-evaluate and issue a new decision regarding the Henry Mountains ACEC by November 22, 2016.
Does the RMP outline management objectives and restrictions that would apply to the ACECs?	Yes. (p. 149)	No change
Have management plans been developed for designated ACECs that identify objectives and management actions?	No. The RMP does not specify that management plans should be written, neither does ACEC Manual 1541. The RMP itself identifies management actions to prevent irreparable damage to values. (p.149)	No change
Does the plan identify protective management for relevance and importance values?		
If the RMP says that activity (implementation) plans will be developed for Special Designations such as ACECs, Wild & Scenic Rivers, Wilderness or National Scenic & Historic Trails; have these plans been completed? If the RMP say that activity plans will be developed for other designated management areas such as SRMAs, Back Country Byways, OHV use areas, etc...; have these plans been completed? If so, list the name of the plan and date it was completed.	Mgmt plans should be written for five SRMAs. None of these have been completed. (p. 114-118)	No change
WC Monitoring	OHVs are singled out in the monitoring section, but monitoring should include more than for OHVs. Last line: monitoring actions are tracked through 1220 recreation acres monitoring.	Modify
WSA Monitoring	IMP is no longer interim guidance (two references). Lands Under Wilderness Review Handbook should be 6330.	Modify
WSR Monitoring	Remove reference to Annual Program Summary and Planning update.	Modify

Question	Response	Action
Does the RMP identify the allowable kinds and levels of recreational use to protect or conserve other resource values in the planning area? List any limitations or restrictions on recreational activities to protect or conserve other resource values.	Yes. (Example: seasonal route closures in wildlife habitat p. 95). List of other restrictions: Allow no rock climbing within 300 ft of cultural sites or within 1/4 mile of raptor nests during nesting seasons. Allow no camping within 1/2 mile of any Mexican spotted owl protected activity center. Consider limiting recreational access, season of use, and numbers of user, if needed, to protect other resources (p. 116). Other area-specific ones exist as described within SRMAs. Limited season of use and size on some routes.	No change
Does the RMP identify allowable kinds and level of land uses to sustain recreational values? List any limitations or restrictions on land uses to sustain recreational values.	Yes. Group size is restricted to no more than 12 in canyons within Dirty Devil SRMA. (p. 116). Require SRPs for organized groups outside designated large group areas meeting any on of the following criteria: Group includes 50 or more participants or Group uses 10 or more vehicles. (P. 120)	No change
Have the Recreation Management issues changed since the RMP was completed? If yes, how are those issues being handled?	No. Issues have generally not changed.	No change
Are all public lands clearly designated as SRMAs, ERMAAs, or public lands not designated as recreation management areas?	Yes. (p. 112)	No change
Does the RMP identify recreation setting characteristics? Are recreation management zones identified for SRMAs (wherever necessary)?	Yes. Setting and zones are identified within SRMAs where necessary. (Factory Butte SRMA p. 114)	No change
Does the RMP include management objectives for the specific recreation opportunities to be produced in both SRMAS and ERMAAs?	Yes. Objectives are identified for both SRMAs and ERMAAs. (p. 112-118)	No change
Are there significant cave resources present? If yes, are specific management goals outlined for the preservation or protection of significant cave resources?	No significant cave resources are present.	No change
Monitoring	Drop the "annual program summary and planning update." Clarify results of soil monitoring (first line of last paragraph).	Modify

Question	Response	Action
Does the RMP identify all public lands as; open, limited, or closed to OHV use?	Yes. (p. 122)	No change
Are the OHV designations still meeting resource objectives?	Yes.	No change
Does the RMP outline travel prescriptions under each designation?	Yes. Prescriptions are outlined for each designation. (p. 123-124)	No change
Have implementation level travel plans been completed? If not, does the RMP provide a mechanism to complete an implementation plan? Explain.	Yes. Under <i>SUWA v. Burke</i> (May 22, 2015), BLM is completing additional documentation of minimization criteria for the travel plan.	No change
Is the plan consistent with updated TTM policy/manual?	Pending litigation.	No change
TRC Monitoring	Remove references to "Annual Program Summary and Planning Update." In first line of last paragraph, remove reference to soils monitoring (same as in Rec section).	Modify
TRV Monitoring	Remove last line, "The number of projects...Planning update." Move second paragraph to a National Historic Trails section	Modify

Question	Response	Action
Does the RMP identify visual resource management classes?	Yes. Classes are identified. (p. 87)	No change
Do the VRM management classes consider the relationships between the visual resource inventory values and resource allocations?	Yes. For example, the WSAs are all Class I. (p. 87)	No change
Are the constraints imposed by the VRM classes appropriate for protecting sensitive resources and managing development?	Yes.	No change
Does the RMP include visual resource inventory classes and visual resource management classes?	No. Management classes were based on an older VRI, but the VRI was not discussed in the RMP. A new VRI was conducted in 2011.	No change
Monitoring	Modify final line to remove the “annual program summary and planning update.”	No change

Question	Response	Action
Do the designated Herd Management Areas (HMA) in the RMP contain adequate water and forage to maintain the Appropriate Management Level (AML) and achieve a thriving ecologic balance?	The Robbers Roost HMA straddles the Wayne-Emery County line. The Price FO manages this HMA and no decisions were made in the RFO RMP regarding this HMA. The Robbers Roost HMA is limited due to the lack of water. Mgmt intervention is required to maintain a viable population level of 15 to 25 horses.	No change Robbers Roost HMA, partially within RFO is managed by Price FO. Canyonlands HMA is managed by RFO.
Do the existing populations in HMA's confine their use within the HMA? Are there opportunities to expand HMA's where WH&B populations regularly stray from the HMA?	Currently, no. No	No change
Are there HMA's where conditions are such (ecological, animal health, public safety, etc.) that the population should be removed and the HMA returned to Herd Area status?	Yes The RFO RMP identifies management for the Canyonlands HMA. The Robbers Roost HMA is managed by Price FO and directed by the PFO RMP.	No change
Does the RMP identify guidelines and criteria to limit population growth within the HMA	Monitoring every spring is completed when vegetation monitoring is done.	No Change
Monitoring		

Question	Response	Action	Decision
Does the RMP identify priority wildlife species and habitats?	Yes, it mentions the WAP which state to work the best we can with priority species and habitats. It also list important species and habitat.		WL-10
Are there management plans or prescriptions in place for priority habitats?	There is a Habitat Management Plan in Progress and other general prescriptions. Such as use perscriptive grazing. Also, NSO and timing restrictions are in place.		WL-11, W_14
Does the RMP contain measurable objectives for desired wildlife habitat conditions for major habitat types?	It has some, travel limited to designated routes in habitat etc. It also has AUMs for wildlife listed. It gives project target for habitat improvements.		
Are the Western Association of the Fish and Wildlife Agency (WAFWA) guidelines for wildlife (sage grouse, mule deer, bighorn sheep, etc.) incorporated into the RMP?	They are in the HMP for mule deer and bighorn sheep. Not for sage grouse.	We used state of Utah, and the old BLM 2004 guidelines. We can incorporate the WAFWA guidelines and MOU with DWR. And the new BLM SG Conservation Strategy when it gets signed.	
Does the RMP provide adequate direction to protect migratory birds and their associated habitat?	Listed in goals and objectives support USFWS and correctly manage habitat.	Add USFWS conservation actions	WL-4
Does the RMP provide adequate direction to protect raptors and their associated habitat?	yes		WL-30, Appendix 10
Has the RMP undergone Section 7 consultation for all listed species within the planning area?	yes		Appendix 4
Are RMP decisions consistent with the supporting Biological Assessments, Biological Opinions, and Recovery Plans? If not, explain.	yes, RMP says to follow recovery plans, conservation agreements etc.		
Does the RMP contain strategies to conserve threatened or endangered and special status species, including listed species, species proposed for listing, and BLM sensitive species?	yes		Appendix 14
Does the RMP provide direction to manage priority wildlife, fish, T&E, rare plants, including transplant, augmentations, seasonal restrictions, guidelines, etc.?	yes, and HMP is underway. Need work on NEPA decision for transplants.	Get HMP done. Get direction on transplants.	WL-28
Does the RMP provide objectives and actions for containing the potential spread of wildlife diseases, such as adequate separation between domestic and wild species; or white nose syndrome?	Somewhat with DBH, allotment, When we cooperate with UDWR, their plans have disease sections. They have a disease specialist. They do test bison. Deer are tested for CWD. HMP will have updated disease info. GSG plan should have section on West Nile etc.	Need whitenose option if it comes this far west. Need to include references to Other Plans and guidance docs that have disease measures.	
Does the RMP contain effective strategies for no net loss threatened or endangered, special status or sensitive species?	yes, conservation measures, goals and objectives SSS		Appendix 14, SSS several decisions.
Does the RMP include use of the State Wildlife Action Plan? Does the RMP include consideration of climate adaptation for T&E, and BLM sensitive species (i.e. keeping pathways open for movement to refugia, etc.)?	Yes the Utah Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy (2005) is included. The RMP does not seem to specifically mention climate adaption for TEC and SSS, however it does state that appropriate habitat will be provided and protected which would include refugia and required movement.	Incorporate the new strategy (WAP) that is now under review, once completed. Include climate change consideration as a standard variable (multi variables are included within climate change alone) in the definition of habitat. Habitats are an Nth dimensional hypervolume in which all characteristics can possibly interact.	WL-10
Monitoring	Verified that all wildlife monitoring requirements are current and achievable.	No change	

Question	Response	Action
Does the RMP incorporate BLM's Wind Energy Development Policy? If not, how is wind energy being addressed? Yes	Yes	No change
Does the RMP incorporate the allocations and stipulations developed through the National Wind, Solar, and Geothermal PEISs? If not explain:	No - needs to be added	Add
Does the RMP reference the DOE/BLM publication of February 2003 on Assessing the Potential for Renewable Energy on public land? If not, how is renewable energy being addressed?	Renewable Energy is being addressed (p. 133, LAR-30, -31, and -32). Not sure that the 2003 report is fully incorporated, but it is referenced.	No change
Does the RMP incorporate the Solar Energy Development Policy (IM 2007-097 updated to IM 2011-003 and extended to 9/30/15)? If not, how is solar energy addressed?	LAR-30, -31, and -32 reference BLM's "Solar Energy Policy."	No change
Does the RMP address or incorporate the Fish and Wildlife Service Bald and Golden Eagle Guidelines with respect to renewable energy development? If not, how are these guidelines being addressed?	Guidelines not specifically referenced; could be addressed under raptor nesting guideline (LAR-31).	No change
Does the RMP reference the 2008 BLM/DOD Wind Energy Protocol? If not, explain:	LAR-30 references Wind Energy Development Program ROD	No change
Does the RMP address transmission issues and identify transmission corridors? If corridors are identified, do they adequately match corridors established on the other side of the boundaries (i.e. does the corridor extend beyond the boundary of the RMP into the jurisdiction of the next RMP, and are they consistent across boundaries with respect to corridor widths, requirements, etc.)?	Yes and yes	No change

Question	Response	Action
Does the RMP provide for orderly corridor planning to meet current National needs and technological trends?	Yes	No change
Does the RMP adequately consider ROW corridors, ROW use areas, and other ROW issues as outlined in IM 2002-196 Right of Way Management – Land Use Planning (6/26/02)?	Yes	No change
Does the scope of designated corridors within the planning area accommodate existing, compatible, proposed and/or new uses?	Yes	No change
Do designated corridors have appropriate width given potential and existing uses or energy demand?	Yes	No change
Are there resource management objectives for TES for designated corridors?	Yes (SSS-6).	No change
Are there vegetation management objectives identified specifically within designated corridors that provide for sustainability of habitat while accommodating long-term maintenance of rights of way within the corridor?	Yes (nothing specific to designated corridors, but NEPA documents include vegetation management goals that would apply to corridors - first goal and objective in Vegetation section).	No change

Question	Response	Action
Does the RMP address the intent of WO-IM-2012-117 leasing reform? I.E: a) Standardized Stipulations; b) Master Leasing Plans; c) Lease sale parcel review process?	RMP addresses standardized stips and lease sale parcel review process, but not master leasing plans.	No change

Question**Response****Action**

Does the RMP address mitigation and monitoring in such a way to meet the Regional Mitigation objectives as identified in BLM 1794 Manual [draft] on Regional Mitigation?

BLM Manual 1794 is still in draft form.

No change

If not, does the plan require maintenance to incorporate the new 1794 Manual?

Question	Response	Action
Does the RMP recognize the 2009 BLM Air Quality Manual (MS 7300) and assess climate change as required by Secretarial Order 3289-I and Departmental Manual 523 DMI (dated 12/20/2012)?	No	No change
Does the RMP analysis address greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions for affected resource programs such as fluid mineral production or other activities with GHG generating potential?	No	No change
Does the RMP analysis address climate change effects and adaptation measures on natural resources? Explain:	No	No change
Has the planning area been inventoried for terrestrial or subsurface carbon sequestration potential?	Portions of the planning area have been assessed (USGS Scientific Investigations Report 2015-5021)	No change
Are there areas of terrestrial or subsurface carbon sequestration potential in the planning area as evidenced by applications to explore or develop?	No applications have been received	No change

Question	Response	Action
Does the RMP provide adequate policy to preserve or enhance sage-grouse habitat and implement sage-grouse conservation planning? [Note: Greater-sage grouse in Richfield, Kanab, Vernal, and Price planning areas; Gunnison sage-grouse in Moab and Monticello planning areas.]	Utah GRSR RMPA will be amending all sage-grouse related decisions in the RMP	Plan on future LUP amendment/maintenance sheet to document changes

Question	Response	Action
Is the RMP geospatial data in digital format? If not, is it in hardcopy and do you know where the spatial data is located?	Yes, it is in GIS. No; new data standards have likely been developed since 2008.	No change
Does the geospatial data meet BLM National data standards where they exist? Is the geospatial planning data managed and archived according to WO IM 2003-238?	Yes	No change
Is the RMP selected alternative geospatial data incorporated into the corporate data for the State and District?	Yes (incorporated at the State Office level)	No change
Does the geospatial data for the RMP have metadata? If so, is this metadata up to date and maintained? If there is no metadata, explain:	Yes	No change

Question	Response	Action
Are management actions outlined in the plan in the plan being implemented?	Yes, contingent on funding and staff.	Update specific timeframes to "as funding and staff permit"
Does the RMP have an implementation schedule and is it current?	Richfield RMP Implementation Priorities worksheet dated August 5, 2009	Update or develop new schedule
Is the rate and degree to which plan implementation is being completed meeting the goals and objectives of the RMP?	Due to current litigation workload and uncertainty, the rate and degree of implementation is not meeting our goals and objectives.	No change
Are management actions (decisions implemented) effective in achieving management goals and objectives?	Yes	No change

Question	Response	Action
Are there major changes in the related plans of other agencies (including tribal, state and county) since the RMP was approved which are resulting in RMP direction to be inconsistent with the direction contained in those plans?	Local counties have initiated plans and ordinances which are now inconsistent with the RMP.	No change

Question	Response	Action
Are there new data or analyses that significantly affect the planning decisions or validity of the NEPA analysis?	VRI updated in 2011; does not change VRM. No others at this time	No change
Are there unmet needs or new opportunities that can best be met through a plan amendment or revision, or will current management be sufficient?	Current management is sufficient. Suggested amendments are noted in the evaluation report.	No change
Are new inventories warranted pursuant to the BLM's duty to maintain inventories on a continuous basis (FLPMA Section 201)?	Not at this time. T&E, wilderness characteristics, and travel inventories are on-going.	No change
Based on this evaluation, is there sufficient cause to warrant amendment or revision of the RMP to accommodate implementation of National and State priorities and initiatives? If so, identify the program area(s) which warrant plan modification and the initiative/priorities affected.	None noted beyond greater sage-grouse (statewide plan amendment pending)	No change
Based on new information or circumstances, is there sufficient cause to warrant completing supplemental NEPA analyses or RFDs to keep the RMP current? If so, identify the specific program areas which require focused supplemental analysis or RFDs.	Not at this time	No change

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
AQ-01	Mitigate potential adverse impacts of site-specific actions identified in NEPA documents prepared at the time an action is proposed, through best available control technology as part of the state permitting process and PSD review.	x				
AQ-02	BLM will continue to work cooperatively with state, federal, and tribal entities in developing air quality assessment protocols to address cumulative impacts and regional air quality issues.	x				
AQ-03	BLM will continue to work cooperatively with the Utah Airshed Group to manage emissions from wildland and prescribed fire activities.	x				
AQ-04	National Ambient Air Quality Standards are enforced by the Utah Department of Environmental Quality, Division of Air Quality (UDEQ-DAQ), with EPA oversight. Special requirements to reduce potential air quality impacts will be	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	considered on a case-by-case basis in processing land use authorizations.					
AQ-05	BLM will utilize BMPs and site specific mitigation measures, when appropriate, based on site specific conditions, to reduce emissions and enhance air quality. Examples of these types of measures can be found in the Four Corners Air Quality Task Force Report of Mitigation Options, November 1, 2007.	x				
AQ-06	Project specific analyses will consider use of quantitative air quality analysis methods (i.e. modeling), when appropriate as determined by BLM, in consultation with state, federal, and tribal entities.	x				
AQ-07	Mitigate actions that compromise ambient air quality standards or visibility within the Class I airsheds.	x				
SOL-01	Utah Standards for Rangeland Health would be followed to maintain or improve soil	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	conditions.					
SOL-02	Activities would be the minimum necessary to accomplish the task.	x				
SOL-03	Reclamation would be required for road realignments.	x				
SOL-04	Reclamation of all surface disturbances would be initiated during or immediately upon completion of the authorized project. Reclamation could include recontouring the disturbed area to blend with the surrounding terrain, ripping compacted areas, replacement of topsoil, seeding, planting, and/or providing effective ground cover.	x				
SOL-05	Reclamation of all surface disturbances would be initiated during or immediately upon completion of the authorized project. Reclamation could include recontouring the disturbed area to blend with the surrounding terrain, ripping compacted areas, replacement of topsoil, seeding, planting, and/or providing effective ground cover.	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
SOL-06	Implement appropriate BMPs designed to protect water quality for all ground disturbing activities (Appendix 14).	x				
SOL-07	Close and reclaim all temporary roads immediate upon completion of the project. Reclaimed roads could be barricaded or signed until reclamation objectives were achieved.	x				
SOL-08	Remove facilities or improvements no longer necessary, reclaim them, proved no historic properties would be affected.		x			Change “proved” to “provided”
WAT-1	Implement appropriate BMPs designed to protect water quality for all ground disturbing activities (Appendix 14).	x				
WAT-2	Utah DEQ-Division of Water Quality identifies impaired watersheds for which total maximum daily loads (TMDL) must be developed. BLM will continue to cooperate and contribute to both the completion of the TMDL process and implementation of	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	recommendations in the final reports.					
WAT-3	Maintain or improve water quality and quantity for recreational uses	x				
WAT-4	Manage culinary water sources to preserve the quality and health of water sources.	x				Culinary is a Utah state-recognized beneficial use term
WAT-5	Continue to operate and maintain public drinking water systems at BLM facilities to comply with transient non-community water system requirements as defined by State of Utah Administrative Code 309—Water Quality Monitoring Standards. The RFO would continue to gather source samples for laboratory analysis when the water system is operating (seasonal use), including coliform samples quarterly; nitrates yearly; and nitrite/sulfate every 3 years.		x			Add “or in compliance with new/updated requirements to allow for continued compliance with State of Utah standards” after “and nitrite/sulfate every 3 years.”
WAT-6	Identify public water systems with surface water or ground water sources (e.g., delineated drinking water source protection zones) that may be affected by BLM-authorized activities. Ensure that	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	BLM-authorized activities do not pose a threat to public water systems.					
WAT-7	Maintain buffer zones of no surface disturbance and/or occupancy around natural springs unless it can be shown that (1) there are no practical alternatives, or (2) all long-term impacts can be fully mitigated, or (3) the activity will benefit and enhance the riparian area. Base the size of the buffer zone on geohydrological, riparian, and other factors necessary to protect the water quality of the springs. If these factors cannot be determined, maintain a buffer zone of the 100-year floodplain or 330 feet on either side from the centerline, whichever is greater.	x				
VEG-1	Treat areas determined to need reseeding with a variety of plant species that are desirable for wildlife habitat, livestock, watershed management, and other resource values while maintaining	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	vegetation species diversity.					
VEG-2	Where appropriate, require on-site mitigation when surface disturbance cannot be avoided on a site-specific basis. The BLM will approach compensatory mitigation on an “as appropriate” basis where it can be performed on-site, and on a voluntary basis where it is performed off-site, or, in accordance with current guidance.	x				
VEG-3	Maintain existing vegetative treatments to provide suitable habitats for wildlife and adequate forage for livestock.	x				
VEG-4	Maintain existing vegetation treatments and implement additional treatments (e.g., prescribed fire and wildland fire use, mechanical, biological, manual, and chemical) to achieve or maintain Standards for Rangeland Health and desired vegetation condition. Vegetation treatments (e.g., wildlife habitat treatments, watershed treatments,		x			Change “wildland fire use” to “use of wildland fire” (NWCG. Oct. 2014. Glossary of Wildland Fire Terminology PMS 205) Currently working on vegetation treatment NEPA. (See FIRE-8)

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	livestock grazing treatments, fuels treatments, stewardship contracts, etc.) could be conducted on up to 1,472,000 acres over the life of the plan. (An annual average of 73,600 acres would need to receive treatment to reach the total treatment acreage. Actual annual treatment acreage would vary depending on conditions, staffing, etc. These acreage figures include all vegetation and fire fuels treatments.					
VEG-5	Allow temporary non-renewable use of targeted grazing to reduce site-specific fuels and/or noxious and invasive weeds (e.g. cheat grass).	x				
VEG-6	The use and perpetuation of native species would be emphasized. However, when restoring or rehabilitating disturbed or degraded rangelands, non-intrusive, non-native plant species may be used where native species: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Are not available - Are not economically 	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	feasible - Cannot achieve desired conditions, desired plant communities (DPC), or other ecological objectives as well as non-native species, and/or - Cannot compete with already established non-native species. - Non-native forbs and perennial grasses could be used in preference to monocultures of non-native annuals.					
VEG-7	Allow uses and activities in riparian areas consistent with Utah BLM Riparian Management Policy and in compliance with Executive Orders 11990 and 11988.		x			Add: "most current" before cited policies
VEG-8	Allow no new surface disturbing activities within a specified distance of riparian areas (see specific buffer sizes below), as measured from bank-full width along all perennial streams or streams with perennial reach	x				Buffers noted in VEG-11

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	unless the following criteria can be met: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There are no practical alternatives to the surface disturbance; or - All long-term impacts could be fully mitigated; or - The activity would benefit the riparian area. 					
VEG-9	The Utah BLM Riparian Management Policy identifies that Riparian areas will be retained in the public land system unless it can be clearly demonstrated that specific sites are so small or isolated that they cannot be managed in an effective manner by BLM or through agreement with State or Federal agencies or interested conservation groups.		x			“Follow current Utah BLM riparian policy and management direction regarding retention of riparian areas in the public land system.”
VEG-10	Coordinate riparian management with interested federal, state, tribal and local governments and private conservation groups, etc.	x				
VEG-11	The buffer zone would be equal to the 100-year floodplain or 330 feet on either side from the centerline,	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	whichever is greater, and would be included for riparian areas.					
VEG-12	Implement noxious weed and invasive species control actions as per national guidance and local weed management plans in cooperation with state, federal, affected counties, adjoining private land owners, and other partners or interests directly affected.	x				
VEG-13	Adhere to the Standard Operating Procedures and Guidelines for All Treatment Methods from the Biological Opinion from the Vegetation Treatments on BLM lands in 17 Western States Programmatic Environmental Report, 2007.	x				
VEG-14	Control invasive and non-native weed species and prevent the introduction of new invasive species by implementing a comprehensive weed program including: coordination with key partners, prevention and early detection, education, inventory and	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	monitoring, and using principles of integrated weed management.					
VEG-15	Apply approved weed control methods to noxious weeds in an identified integrated weed management program (including preventive management and education, as well as mechanical, biological, and chemical techniques). Do so in cooperation with state, federal, affected county governments, adjoining private land owners, and other directly affected interests.	x				
VEG-16	Treat insect pests that exceed an economic threshold on public land adjacent to other landowners or that impact resources in coordination with the State of Utah, adjacent states, federal agencies, affected counties, adjoining private land owners, and other directly affected interests.	x				
CUL-1	Identify and manage traditional cultural properties (TCP) in coordination with American Indian tribes.	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
CUL-2	Mitigate adverse impacts to cultural resources resulting from authorized surface disturbing activities.	x				
CUL-3	Meet responsibilities under the NHPA as addressed in the State Protocol Agreement between the Utah State Director of BLM and the Utah State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) and the Programmatic Agreement among the BLM, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and the National Conference of SHPOs.	x				
CUL-4	Complete cultural resources inventories prior to allowing permitted surface disturbing activities, excluding those areas and circumstances identified in BLM- Manual M-8110.23, Identifying & Evaluating Cultural Resources, and Handbook UT-BLM-H-8110, Guidelines for Identifying Cultural Resources, Section II.C.	x				
CUL-5	Coordinate Old Spanish Trail		x			If this needs its own section

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>management with the National Park Service (NPS) and other agencies under Public Law 107-325. Specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provide interpretive information at appropriate locations - Retain public lands in federal ownership - Limit OHV use to designated routes. 					<p>under NHT (based on other questions during this review), then this decision should be relocated.</p> <p>Update “Old Spanish Trail” to “Old Spanish National Historic Trail.”</p>
CUL-6	Protect eligible cultural sites and mitigate impacts.	x				
CUL-7	Allocate and manage cultural resource sites for scientific use, public use, conservation use, traditional use, and experimental use categories described in Manual BLM-M-8110.4, Identifying and Evaluating Cultural Resources.	x				
CUL-8	Reevaluate and revise cultural resources site allocations by site or area when circumstances change or when new data becomes available. Consult with the SHPO	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	and Native American tribes as appropriate.					
CUL-9.	Mitigation actions would not be necessary on cultural resource sites if both of the following conditions are met and documented: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - BLM and the SHPO have formally agreed the site is not eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) - The site has no value for other cultural uses (as described in BLM-M-8110.4). 	x				
CUL-10	Inventory the following priority areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Horseshoe Canyon South WSA - Bull Creek Archaeological District - Areas of special cultural designation that have not been fully inventoried. 		x			This is an outstanding action. Richfield litigation will impact this decision.
CUL-11	Work with Native American tribes to accommodate tribal access to	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	sacred sites and traditional cultural properties and prevent or mitigate physical damage or intrusions that might impede their use.					
CUL-12	Establish agreements with all Native American tribes interested in the lands managed by the RFO to identify the types of projects on which they want to consult.	x				
CUL-13	Manage the Bull Creek Archaeological District with major constraints (NSO).	x				
PAL-1	Mitigate adverse impacts to vertebrate and significant non-vertebrate paleontological resources resulting from surface disturbing activities.	x				
PAL-2	Support and provide public education and interpretive opportunities for paleontological resources, including agreements with visitor information providers, use of special designations, or interpretive sites.	x				
PAL-3	Issue paleontological resource use permits for scientific study as appropriate.	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
PAL-4	Prohibit commercial collection of invertebrate and plant fossils without a BLM-issued permit.	x				
PAL-5	Require on-the-ground paleontological inventories prior to permitting surface disturbing activities in areas where there is a high potential to affect scientifically significant paleontological resources.	x				
PAL-6	Require paleontological assessments prior to permitting surface disturbing activities in areas where there is a moderate potential to affect scientifically significant paleontological resources.	x				
PAL-7	Conduct paleontological inventories intermittently as resources allow.	x				This is an outstanding action.
PAL-8	Allow surface collection (as defined in BLM Manual 8270, Paleontological Resources Management) of common invertebrate and botanical paleontological resources for personal (non-commercial) use	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	without permits and if consistent with other management decisions in this RMP. Significant resources of critical scientific and educational value would be protected.					
PAL-9	Allow surface collection (as defined in BLM Manual 8270, Paleontological Resources Management) of common invertebrate and botanical paleontological resources for personal (non-commercial) use without permits and if consistent with other management decisions in this RMP. Significant resources of critical scientific and educational value would be protected.	x				
PAL-10	When appropriate, target fossil localities with significant scientific value for excavation and curation either by the BLM or by a qualified outside academic or curatorial/research facility to protect them from theft, erosion, and/or vandalism. If excavation is	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	not carried out within one field season, periodically monitor to document the integrity of the locality until excavation and curation are completed.					
PAL-11	Monitor highly significant (scientific) localities with paleontological resources that are not feasible to excavate, curate, or interpret. Frequency of monitoring for identified localities would be determined by the significance of the resource and the risk of damage by either natural processes or human intrusion.	x				
PAL-12	Develop interpretation for significant localities and sites with displays that foster scientific knowledge of the unique nature of the resource and that create opportunities for public education and access to such resources.	x				
PAL-13	For all permitted actions occurring in paleontologically sensitive areas, include stipulation(s) to cover unanticipated paleontological discoveries	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	during disturbance. This stipulation would mandate work stoppage (or avoidance), notification to the authorized officer, and protection of the material and geological context if any paleontological resources were discovered during disturbance activities. Other stipulations might be appropriate on a case-by-case basis.					
VRM-1	Designate WSAs as VRM Class I to maintain an undeveloped landscape and preserve their natural values according to direction in Instruction Memorandum IM- 2000-096, Use of Visual Resource Management Class I Designation in Wilderness Study Areas.	x				
VRM-2	Ensure all activities authorized by the BLM meet the management objectives for the designated VRM class in that particular area.	x				
VRM-3	To the extent practicable, bring existing visual contrasts into VRM class conformance as the	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	opportunity arises.					
VRM-4	Designate the following VRM classes, as indicated on Map 13: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Class I: 446,900 acres - Class II: 249,800 acres - Class III: 393,100 acres - Class IV: 1,038,200 acres. 	x				Note: VRI Inventory was updated in 2011.
VRM-5	To avoid potential conflicts with the construction, operation, maintenance, and termination of facilities and improvements located on existing ROWs on public land, apply the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Where a ROW grant specifically identifies an area and/or width, the VRM class within the specified area/width would be VRM Class IV. - Where no width is specified, the VRM class within the interior boundaries of the area 	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	disturbed when the facility or improvement was initially constructed would be VRM Class IV.					
SSS-1	For listed species that do not have designated critical habitat, cooperate with the USFWS and other agencies, such as the UDWR, in managing the species and their habitat.	x				
SSS-2	Allow, initiate, or participate in scientific research of listed and sensitive species and their habitats.	x				
SSS-3	Collaborate with the appropriate local, state, and federal agencies to promote public education on species at risk, their importance to the human and biological community, and reasons for protective measures that would be applied to the lands involved.	x				
SSS-4	Implement species-specific conservation measures to avoid or mitigate adverse effects to known populations of listed and non-listed special status plant and animal species on public lands.	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
SSS-5	Prohibit actions that destroy, adversely modify, or fragment listed threatened or endangered species' habitat.	x				
SSS-6	Maintain the integrity of SSS habitat to provide the quantity, continuity, and quality of habitat necessary to maintain SSS populations.	x				
SSS-7	Conduct habitat improvement treatments for SSS. Future consultation would be needed for biological controls in SSS habitat.	x				
SSS-8	Retain habitat for federally listed and candidate species in federal ownership. Exceptions may be considered in exchanges with the State of Utah and others after consultation with and concurrence from the USFWS.	x				
SSS-9	Consider SSS habitat in all wildfire suppression efforts.	x				
SSS-10	Conduct Section 7 consultation with the USFWS if biological treatments as a result of vegetation management actions are proposed in federally listed species habitats.	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
SSS-11	Recovery Plans and Conservation Agreements		x			Errata. This is a section heading, not a management action
SSS-12	Implement the goals and objectives of recovery plans, conservation agreements and strategies, and activity level plans using best available information to recover and conserve species to the point where requirements of the ESA are no longer necessary.	x				Focusing on goals and objectives and using best available information provides sufficient flexibility for BLM
SSS-13	Work with USFWS and others to ensure that plans and agreements are updated and implemented as necessary to reflect the latest scientific data.	x				
SSS-14	Implement the specific goals and objectives of recovery plans, conservation agreements and strategies, and approved activity-level plans.			x		Repetitive of SSS-12
SSS-15	Recovery Actions for Listed Species		x			Errata. This is a section heading, not a management action
SSS-16	Do not adversely modify or destroy designated critical habitats for federally listed species.	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
SSS-17	Provide habitat improvements and other management actions to promote conservation and recovery of listed species.	x				
SSS-18	Reintroduction/Translocation of SSS		x			Errata. This is a section heading, not a management action
SSS-19	Allow translocations of listed and non-listed SSS to aid in conservation and recovery efforts. Implement necessary habitat manipulations and monitoring in translocation plans and allow identification and manipulation of Utah prairie dog translocation sites to achieve suitable conditions for successful translocations.	x				
SSS-20	Use strategies to avoid or reduce habitat fragmentation when possible, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Co-locating communication and other facilities - Employing directional drilling for oil and gas - Closing and reclaiming roads 	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Landscape scale evaluations - Using topographic and vegetative screening to reduce the influence of intrusions. 					
SSS-21	Mitigate the effects of proposed projects that have the potential to cause long-term or permanent habitat impacts or losses by enhancing, restoring, or creating other habitat within the project's region of influence. Consider protecting the habitat when the habitat type is rare and under severe development pressures. Protection should only be a portion of the mitigation and must contain elements of restoration or enhancement.	x				
SSS-22	Use species-specific buffers and seasonal, temporal, and spatial restrictions to conserve habitat for SSS (Appendix 11 and Appendix 14).	x				
SSS-23	Employ "Raptor Best Management Practices"	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	(Appendix 10), using seasonal and spatial buffers, as well as mitigation, to maintain and enhance raptor nesting and foraging habitat, while allowing other resource uses.					
SSS-24	Comply with Suggested Practices for Avian Protection on Power Lines: the State of the Art in 2006 (APLIC 2006) and Avian Protection Plan (APP) Guidelines (APLIC and USFWS 2005) for new power line construction (including upgrades and reconstruction) to prevent electrocution of raptors.	x				
SSS-25	Limit OHV use to designated routes and/or seasonal closure of designated routes in all Greater sage-grouse habitats, including: breeding (leks), nesting, brood-rearing, and wintering habitats.	x				
SSS-26	Implement the most current <i>UDWR Strategic Management Plan for Sage-Grouse</i> (UDWR, 2002 and its future revisions), the <i>BLM National Sage-Grouse Habitat Conservation Strategy</i> (BLM, 2004), and		x			Utah GRSG LUPA will be amending this decision

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>recommendations from local sage-grouse working groups to protect, maintain, enhance, and restore Greater sage-grouse populations and habitat.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All surface disturbing activities would be prohibited within ½ mile of Greater sage-grouse leks on a year-round basis. Oil and gas leasing would be open subject to major constraints (NSO). - Allow no surface disturbing or otherwise disruptive activities within 2 miles of Greater sage-grouse leks from March 15 to July 15 to protect nesting and brood rearing habitat. Oil and gas leasing would be open subject to a controlled surface use and timing stipulation. - Allow no surface disturbing or otherwise disruptive activities within Greater sage-grouse winter habitat from December 15 – March 14. Oil and gas leasing would be open subject to a controlled surface use and 					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	timing stipulation. See Appendix 11 for exceptions, modifications, or waivers.					
WL-1	Recognize and coordinate with UDWR on its Management Plans and associated revisions, and (where appropriate) plans of other cooperating agencies. To the extent practicable, implement future plans on a case-by-case basis through applicable regulations.	x				
WL-2	Implement BLM wildlife management plans.	x				
WL-3	Implement the conservation actions identified in Executive Order 13186, Federal Agency Responsibilities under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, with particular emphasis on those migratory birds identified as Priority Species in the Utah Avian Conservation Strategy (Parrish et al. 2002).		x			Add “or most current guidance”
WL-4	Consider the USFWS Birds of Conservation Concern and the Utah Partners in Flight Priority		x			Add USFWS conservation actions.

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	Species to identify and conserve priority nesting habitats for migratory birds. Cooperate with UDWR in the management of fisheries, including habitat improvements and treatments.					
WL-5	Work with UDWR to establish and maintain Blue Ribbon Fisheries, as defined by the Utah Blue Ribbon Fishery Advisory Council.	x				
WL-6	Coordinate with UDWR to address population dynamics and habitat conditions for major habitat types that support a wide variety of game and non-game species.	x				
WL-7	Use strategies to avoid or reduce habitat fragmentation, such as collocating facilities, employing directional drilling, reclaiming redundant roads, reclaiming roads no longer serving intended purpose, reducing road densities, and using topographic and vegetative screening to reduce influence of intrusions.	x				
WL-8	The BLM will approach	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	compensatory mitigation on an “as appropriate” basis where it can be performed onsite, and on a voluntary basis where it is performed off-site, or, in accordance with current guidance.					
WL-9	Minor adjustments to crucial wildlife habitat boundaries periodically made by the UDWR would be accommodated through plan maintenance.	x				
WL-10	Where possible, implement the conservation actions identified in the Utah Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy (UDWR 2005c), which identifies priority wildlife species and habitats, identifies and assesses threats to their survival, and identifies long-term conservation actions needed, including those on BLM-administered lands.		x			Add “most current” before Utah and delete (UDWR 2005c)
WL-11	Use prescriptive grazing to favor forage production for big game crucial winter range.	x				
WL-12	On suitable allotments, as determined on a case-by-case	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	basis, authorize livestock grazing only on a nonrenewable basis to meet wildlife habitat objectives. These actions would be limited to crucial wildlife habitat where conventional grazing management practices were not allowing attainment of RMP objectives.					
WL-13	Accomplish habitat treatments to meet terrestrial, aquatic, and riparian habitat objectives through the use of prescribed and/or wildland fire, chemical, biological, and mechanical methods.	x				
WL-14	Develop a Habitat Management Plan (HMP) for bison, mule deer, and other big game species within the Henry Mountain area in consultation with UDWR. (The HMP would address management objectives with respect to size of herds (numbers of animals), desired ratio of male to female animals, and the reauthorization of voluntarily relinquished grazing preference and reallocation of forage on	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	specific grazing allotments. The HMP would also address needed improvements for range conditions, including proposed habitat improvement projects for both livestock and big game species to mitigate potential conflicts during seasons of use and the strategies required for herd adjustments during critical droughts.)					
WL-15	Prohibit change in the kind of livestock from cattle to domestic sheep in those allotments with bighorn sheep habitat identified in the Desert Bighorn Sheep HMP.	x				
WL-16	Limit OHV use to designated routes in deer and elk crucial winter habitat (806,700 acres), except for Glenwood and Aurora, Managed Open Areas.	x				
WL-17	Close 4,500 acres of deer and elk crucial winter range to OHV use.	x				
WL-18	Consider seasonal closure of designated routes on a case-by-case basis. (Maps 15 and 16)	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
WL-19	OHV use in 257,600 acres of crucial bison habitat would be limited to designated routes.	x				
WL-20	1,000 acres of crucial bison habitat would be closed to OHV use.	x				
WL-21	Consider seasonal closure of designated routes on a case-by-case basis.	x				
WL-22	Manage OHV use for game retrieval consistent with OHV area and route designations.	x				
WL-23	Restrict surface disturbing activities in crucial bison habitats (Map 8) from November 1 through May 15 for protection of winter habitats and species sensitivity during calving season unless the action is carried out to enhance habitats for bison and/or other wildlife. See Appendix 11 for exceptions, modifications, or waivers.	x				
WL-24	Restrict surface disturbing activities in crucial mule deer and elk habitats (Maps 9 and 10) from December 15 through April 15 for protection of winter habitats,	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	unless the action is carried out to enhance habitats for mule deer, elk, and/or other wildlife. See Appendix 11 for exceptions, modifications, or waivers.					
WL-25	Prohibit surface disturbing activities in crucial Desert bighorn sheep habitat (Map 8) from April 15 through June 15 for protection of species sensitivity during lambing season. See Appendix 11 for exceptions, modifications, and waivers.	x				
WL-26	Restrict surface disturbing activities in crucial pronghorn habitat (Map 8) from May 15 through June 15 for protection of species sensitivity during fawning season. See Appendix 11 for exceptions, modifications, or waivers.	x				
WL-27	Prohibit surface disturbing activities within the 100-year floodplain or 330 feet on either side from the centerline,	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	whichever is greater, of streams with intermittent or perennial reaches, resulting in NSO in this area, for protection of habitat for riparian-obligate species.					
WL-28	Analyze UDWR and USFWS proposals to introduce, augment, transplant, and reestablish wildlife species through NEPA evaluation.		x			Change “analyze” to “consider.” Delete: “through NEPA evaluation” (NEPA criteria outlined in BLM handbook 1790-1, 3.1)
WL-29	Allow introduction, translocation, transplantation, augmentation, and reestablishment of both native and naturalized fish and wildlife species in cooperation and collaboration with UDWR.		x			Add: “subject to guidance provided by BLM 1745 policy and by existing or future MOUs with UDWR.”
WL-30	Implement the following direction: “Raptor management will be guided by the use of “Best Management Practices for Raptors and Their Associated Habitats in Utah” (BLM 2006) (Appendix 10), utilizing seasonal and spatial buffers, as well as mitigation, to maintain and enhance raptor nesting and foraging habitat, while allowing other resource uses.”	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
WHB-1	<p>Manage wild burro populations for appropriate age and sex ratios, genetic viability, and adoptability, as well as maintaining AML on the established HMA (Map 11). Allow wild burro research, as long as other wild horse and burro program goals are met. Wild burro herd research data that may be collected include, but are not limited to, data to determine population size and characteristics, assess herd health, determine herd history and genetic profile (blood and hair sampling, Instruction Memorandum IM # 2002-095 Gather Policy and Selective Removal Criteria for Wild Horses Program Area: Wild Horse and Burro Program), and conduct immuno-contraceptive research and monitor results as appropriate. Other data that could be useful in population management would include general characteristics such as age</p>		x			Change IM reference to “most current direction/policy”

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	ratios, sex ratios, and color, as well as health characteristics such as pregnancy rates, parasite loading, and the general physical condition of the burros. In addition, genetic sampling would determine the genetic health of the herd.					
WHB-2	BLM will coordinate with the NPS to address burro trespass issues.	x				
WHB-3	Allocate 600 AUMs for wild burros to meet an AML upper limit of 100.	x				
WHB-4	Maintain the AML of the Canyonlands HMA at levels to maintain genetic viability.	x				
WHB-5	Allow introductions of wild burros from other herd areas to maintain genetic viability, given the burros being introduced have characteristics similar to the burros in the Canyonlands HMA.	x				
FIRE-1	Employ Fire and Fuels Management according to national policy to meet vegetation treatment goals.	x				
FIRE-2	Work with partners in the WUI in	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	prescribed fires, hazardous fuels reduction, prevention and education, and technical assistance.					
FIRE-3	Apply Resource Protection Measures for fire management practices to protect natural or cultural resource values as described in Appendix 19 (obtained from the Utah Land Use Plan Amendment for Fire and Fuels Management Finding of No Significant Impact and Decision Record).	x				
FIRE-4	Implement appropriate management response (AMR) according to General Risk Categories (GRC), as contained in Appendix 6. The GRCs contain criteria for managing dynamic vegetation communities. Wildland fire use would not be appropriate in the following areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Administrative sites - Developed recreation sites - Communication sites - Oil and gas facilities 		x			Change “wildland fire use” to “use of wildland fire”

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mining facilities - Above-ground utility corridors - High-use travel corridors - Crucial wildlife habitats where fire is unwanted - GRC A, such as desert scrub communities. 					
FIRE-5	Prioritize other fire management activities as directed and prioritized in the GRCs.	x				
FIRE-6	Adhere to specific fire suppression directions within Potential ACECs for protection of identified relevant and important values from irreparable damage.	x				
FIRE-7	Give specific considerations when implementing suppression activities to SSS habitats and cultural resource sites.	x				
FIRE-8	Manage fire and fuels through treatments conducted on up to 1,472,000 acres over the life of the plan. Use the full range of treatment types (e.g., prescribed and wildland fire use, mechanical, chemical, biological, and cultural		x			<p>Change “wildland fire use” to “use of wildland fire”</p> <p>Note: Approx. 30,000 acres treated to date</p>

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>treatments). An annual average of 73,600 acres would need to receive treatment to reach the total treatment acreage listed. Actual annual treatment acreage would vary depending on conditions, staffing, etc. These acreage figures include all vegetation and fire fuels treatments.</p>					
FIRE-9	<p>Prevent human-caused fires through coordination with partners and affected groups and individuals. Use a full range of prevention and mitigation activities.</p>	x				
FIRE-10	<p>Use prioritization criteria contained in the GRCs (Appendix 6).</p>	x				
FIRE-11	<p>Undertake ESR efforts to protect and sustain ecosystems, public health, and safety, and to help communities protect infrastructure.</p>	x				
FIRE-12	<p>Prioritize implementation of post-fire emergency stabilization and rehabilitation activities considering the following criteria: - Areas that could pose a</p>		x			<p>Utah GRSG LUPA will likely be amending this MA</p>

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	threat to life and property - Areas with potential for invasive species invasion, significant ecosystem alteration (e.g., Condition Class 3 areas), and soil stabilization					
WC-1	Manage the following 12 non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristic areas (78,600 acres) specifically to maintain their wilderness characteristics: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Dirty Devil/French Spring (6,100 acres) - Dogwater Creek (3,100 acres) - Horseshoe Canyon South (12,200 acres) - Jones Bench (2,600 acres) - Labyrinth Canyon (2,800 acres) - Little Rockies (9,500 acres) - Mount Ellen-Blue Hills (3,900 acres) - Mount Pennell (4,700 acres) 		x			Add "(BLM natural areas)"

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Notom Bench (8,200 acres) - Ragged Mountain (7,900 acres) - Red Desert (8,900 acres) - Wild Horse Mesa (8,700 acres). 					
WC-2	Protect preserve and maintain the wilderness characteristics of the 12 areas (78,600 acres) of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics through the following management actions.		x			Errata. This is a section heading, not a management action Add “(BLM natural areas)” Confirm number of areas and acreage.
WC-3	Designate as Visual Resource Management (VRM) Class II	x				
WC-4	Limit motorized use to designated routes	x				
WC-5	Retain lands in public ownership	x				
WC-6	Designate as an Avoidance Area for rights-of-way (ROW)	x				
WC-7	Designate leasing category as no surface occupancy (NSO), no exceptions, waivers, or modifications	x				
WC-8	Close to mineral material sales	x				
WC-9	Designate as unavailable for further consideration for coal leasing	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
WC-10	Continue maintenance and use of existing facilities	x				
WC-11	Prohibit private or commercial woodland harvest or seed collection	x				
WC-12	Healthy Lands Initiative projects could be considered where they improve the overall goals and objectives for managing the wilderness characteristics of these areas	x				
WC-13	Consider no coal leasing proposals in the 12 (78,600 acres) identified non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics.		x			Replace “non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics” with “natural areas.”
FOR-1	Allow use of forest and woodland species to achieve desired conditions.	x				
FOR-2	Reforest sites after disturbances.	x				
FOR-3	Manage forests and woodlands to meet objectives of the Healthy Forest Restoration Act of 2003, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Develop a Forest and Woodlands Management Plan - Give priority to restoration 	x				RFO has requested funding for a management plan every year since 2008 and it has not been approved.

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>of destroyed or degraded woodland ecosystems</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Employ commercial uses to improve forest and woodland ecosystem health - Emphasize partnerships among internal programs and outside agencies for forest and woodland management - Increase monitoring of forest and woodland conditions - Emphasize public education on forest and woodland health, fire danger, and resource uses - Identify, maintain, and restore old-growth forests. 					
FOR-4	Provide for commercial and non-commercial timber harvest where feasible, sustainable, and compatible with restoring, maintaining, or improving forest health.	x				
FOR-5	The 12 non-WSA lands (78,600 acres) with wilderness		x			Add “(BLM natural areas)”

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	characteristics would be closed to commercial and non-commercial use of forest and woodland products. Exceptions for traditional Native American use may be considered.					
FOR-6	Provide for commercial and non-commercial use of forest and woodland products where sustainable and compatible with restoring, maintaining, and improving woodland health, in areas specified by permit. WSAs, the 12 non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics (78,600 acres), and suitable WSR corridors would be closed to commercial and non-commercial use of forest and woodland products. Exceptions for traditional Native Americans use may be considered.		x			Add "(BLM natural areas)"
FOR-7	Allow commercial and non-commercial live plant and seed collecting by permit.	x				
FOR-8	Consider designating specific seed collecting areas for resource benefits.	x				
FOR-9	Allow no commercial or non-commercial live plant and seed collecting within WSAs, non-		x			Add "(BLM natural areas)"

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	WSA lands with wilderness characteristics (78,600 acres), and suitable WSR corridors. Exceptions for traditional Native American use may be considered.					
GRA-1	Monitor and evaluate grazing allotments to maintain or improve rangeland productivity.	x				
GRA-2	Adjust permit terms and conditions (e.g., permitted use, amount of use, season of use, and kind and class of livestock) when grazing permits are renewed, transferred, or as otherwise deemed necessary by site-specific evaluation of monitoring data and environmental analysis.	x				
GRA-3	Use livestock grazing to enhance ecosystem health or mitigate resource problems (e.g., noxious/invasive weed control and hazardous fuel reduction) where supported by site-specific environmental analysis.	x				
GRA-4	During periods of drought, adjust livestock numbers annually based on estimates of the available	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	forage.					
GRA-5	Exclude livestock grazing from small areas (such as springs) within allotments that cannot meet Rangeland Health Standards with livestock grazing.	x				
GRA-6	Site-specific management actions that protect riparian areas would be addressed at the project level.	x				
GRA-7	Handle on a case-by-case basis voluntary relinquishment of grazing permits and preference, in whole or in part, by a permittee in writing to the BLM. The BLM would not recognize as valid, relinquishments that are conditional on specific BLM actions, and BLM would not be bound by them. Relinquished permits and the associated preference would remain available for application by qualified applicants after BLM considers whether such action would meet Rangeland Health Standards and would be compatible with achieving LUP goals and	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>objectives. Prior to re-issuance 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 environmental analysis that the public lands involved would be better used for other purposes. Grazing may then be discontinued on the allotment through an amendment to the RMP. Any decision issued concerning discontinuance of livestock grazing would not be permanent and may be reconsidered and changed through future LUP amendments and updates.</p>					
GRA-8	<p>Permit livestock use on those allotments shown on Map 12 and in Appendix 7. Acres available for grazing: 1,989,048 Acres unavailable for grazing:</p>		x			Update acres according to GIS on maintenance form.

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	138,952 Available AUMs: 146,202					
GRA-9	<p>Authorize allotment boundary changes, including combining and splitting allotments, on a case-by-case basis after environmental analysis. Provide for the following allotment combinations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Combine Long Hollow, Terza Flat, and Deleeuw allotments with the Loa Winter Allotment. - Combine Flat Top and King Sheep allotments with the Bicknell Winter Allotment. - Combine Cedar Peak, Hare Lake, and Smooth Knoll allotments with the Bicknell Spring Allotment. - Combine the Cyclone Allotment with the Cyclone Co-Op Allotment. 	x				Note: The allotment boundary changes have been completed.
GRA-10	Authorize conversion in kind of livestock on a case-by-case basis when justified through environmental analysis. Permittees	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>may be required to provide needed range improvements to support the conversion. A conversion may be justified when it meets the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Monitoring studies or other acceptable data support the conversion. - Environmental conditions (e.g., vegetation types, topographic features, and water availability) can accommodate the conversion. - Change in kind of livestock poses no threat to other resources. - A trial change proves acceptable. 					
GRA-11	<p>Consider adjustments to season of use when resource conditions indicate a change is needed. Conduct appropriate environmental analysis prior to any changes. Resource conditions include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Physiological requirements 	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>(reproduction and maintenance) of desired plant species are not being met.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Range conditions are declining because of season of use. - Conflicts with other resources or uses are identified. 					
GRA-12	<p>Consider the following actions if livestock grazing is contributing to declining range conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Shorten the grazing period - Temporarily suspend use - Implement or change grazing system - Authorize non-use until conditions improve. 	x				
GRA-13	<p>Authorize permittee requests for changes to livestock season of use when the following conditions are met:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Physiological requirements (e.g., reproduction and maintenance) of desired plants can be met. 	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - On community allotments, all permittees in that allotment agree to the change. - Requested changes do not conflict with other established land uses. - A trial of the change proves acceptable. - Permittees may be required to provide needed range improvements to support changing the season of use. 					
GRA-14	<p>Consider changes to permitted use if:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Change is supported by monitoring data, field observations, ecological site inventory, or other acceptable data. - Conflicts with other uses are identified. - There is a change in public land ownership (increase or decrease). - Protection of other resources is required. 	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	- Changes are required by 43 CFR 4180 (Rangeland Health regulations).					
GRA-15	Continue to allow motorized access to range improvements for allotment management purposes.	x				
GRA-16	Allow access within WSAs according to IMP.		x			Update IMP reference to new Wilderness Manuals
GRA-17	Permit no domestic sheep and goat grazing east of Capitol Reef National Park, subject to existing livestock grazing permits.		x			There is one existing permit that allows sheep east of the park. If a transfer application was received, BLM would like to re-evaluate. Need to clarify.
REC-1	Implement the Guidelines for Recreation Management as identified in the Utah BLM Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Grazing as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Recognize that various levels of regulations and limits may be necessary, but that restrictions and limitations on public uses should be as minimized as possible without 	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>compromising the primary goal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Use an on-the-ground presence as a tool to protect public lands. - Use enhanced off-site interpretation, education, and information as a tool to protect public lands. - Where long-term damage by recreational usage is observed or anticipated, limit or control activities through special management tools such as designated campsites, permits, area closures, and limitations on numbers of users and duration of usage. - Revise recreation management plans and RMPs when they prove to be either overly restrictive or inadequate to protect public land health. - Coordinate with other 					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consider and implement where appropriate, management methods to protect resources while maintaining the quality of the experience of various users. Limitations could include numbers, types, timing, and duration of usage. - Encourage the location of public land recreational activities near population centers and highway corridors by the placement of appropriate visitor use infrastructure. Provide restrooms and other 					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>facilities adequate for anticipated uses at designated campgrounds, trailheads, and other areas where recreational users concentrate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Allow non-commercial dispersed camping without permit, throughout the RFO administered lands, unless directed by other management prescriptions. - Allow no rock climbing within 300 feet of cultural sites or within one-quarter mile of raptor nests during nesting seasons. - Allow no camping within one-half mile of any Mexican spotted owl protected activity center (PAC). - BLM Back Country Byways may be designated in the future as deemed appropriate with site-specific environmental 					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>analysis.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - National Recreation Trails may be designated in the future as deemed appropriate with site-specific environmental analysis. - Encourage “Leave No Trace” and “Tread Lightly” camping and travel techniques. - Site-specific management actions that protect riparian areas would be addressed at the project level. 					
REC-2	<p>Identify portions of the decision area not delineated as a SRMA as an ERMA. ERMA's would receive only custodial management (which addresses only activity opportunities) of visitor health and safety, user conflict, and resource protection issues, with no activity-level planning. Therefore, actions within ERMA's would generally be implemented directly from LUP decisions.</p>	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
REC-3	Manage the ERMAs to provide a variety of recreational opportunities, including primitive, semi-primitive non-motorized, semi-primitive motorized, roaded natural, and rural. Provide outdoor settings ranging from areas with a high-to-moderate opportunity for solitude and closeness to nature, where visitors should be prepared for a high level of self-reliance, challenge, and risk; to areas where visitors have the convenience of facilities and a higher interaction with other users.	x				
REC-4	Consider limiting recreational access, season of use, and numbers of users, if needed, to protect other resources.	x				
REC-5	Provide facilities based on needs for resource protection and user demand. Consider site-specific development on a case-by-case basis, ranging from minimal, rustic facilities to larger developments that would require major site modifications.	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
REC-6	<p>Manage public lands in the Fiddler Butte, Labyrinth Canyon, Blue Hills, and Little Rockies areas in a primitive, naturally appearing setting for a high probability of experiencing solitude, freedom, closeness to nature, self-reliance, challenge, and risk. Interaction and evidence of other users would be low. Achieve this by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Preserving resources while providing for a sustainable recreational opportunity - Managing access and travel primarily as non-motorized, with motorized travel limited to designated routes (access for people with disabilities would be difficult) - Providing minimum improvements needed for site protection - Providing no on-site interpretative facilities. 	x				
REC-7	Manage public lands adjacent to other federal and state lands to	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	complement the recreational experience on the adjoining lands.					
REC-8	<p>Designate sites and areas appropriate for large group events and camping, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Starr Spring campground - McMillan Spring campground - Sandy Creek Overlook - Apple Brush Flat near McMillan Spring road junction - Turkey Haven - Two sites along Sulphur Creek <p>Others as necessary to meet recreation demand and protect resources</p>		x			Would like to add more group sites to list.
REC-9	Provide signs, trails, trailhead parking, and staging areas to facilitate the use and enjoyment of the ERMA and to protect visitor health, safety, and resources.	x				
REC-10	Maintain and/or improve the Paiute, Great Western, and other motorized trail systems.	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
REC-11	Designate, maintain, and improve a non-motorized trail system.	x				
REC-12	Establish and manage SRMAs, as identified below.	x				
REC-13	Manage recreation activities and developments in the SRMA to support SRMA goals and objectives.	x				
REC-14	Establish recreation management zones (RMZ) to address specific recreation uses, user types, and site-specific prescriptions during activity planning for each SRMA, except for the Factory Butte SRMA.	x				
REC-15	Develop recreation facilities in response to resource management needs appropriate to the intent of the SRMA.	x				
REC-16	Five SRMAs, 860,390 acres (Map 14) OHV: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Factory Butte - Big Rock Dispersed Recreation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Henry Mountains - Dirty Devil 		x			Remove Henry Mountains as a SRMA (doesn't need the designation; Reference H-8320-1 p. I-36). Adjust acreage and map as a result. Otter Creek should be designated as a SRMA (Reference H-8320-1 p. I-36).

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
REC-17	<p>- Capitol Reef Gateway</p> <p>Identify 24,400 acres of public land as the Factory Butte SRMA (Appendix 18) to provide a motorized recreational experience that involves a high degree of self-reliance, challenge, and risk in a natural setting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Allow moderate to extensive landscape modifications. - Develop facilities to provide for visitor health and safety and support the objectives of the SRMA. - Establish three RMZs including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *OHV Play Area RMZ (8,500 acres) *Motorized Touring RMZ (11,300 acres) *Landmarks RMZ (4,600 acres) 	x				
REC-18	Designate three OHV open areas as the OHV Play Area RMZ. The RMZs in the Factory Butte SRMA will not be open to cross-country	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>use until a number of criteria have been met. These criteria include ensuring appropriate infrastructure is in place to protect the threatened and endangered cacti, a monitoring plan is completed and enacted, and the authorized officer formally rescinds the Factory Butte OHV Restriction Order of 2006 when the above is completed. Upon signature of the ROD/Approved Plan, these cross-country RMZs remain under the Restriction Order until it is formally rescinded.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Factory Butte (5,800 acres) - Caineville Cove Inn (100 acres) - Swing Arm City (2,600 acres) 					
REC-19	Manage the Factory Butte SRMA according to the prescriptions outlined in Appendix 18.	x				
REC-20	Designate SRMA as open to OHV use in the OHV Play Area RMZ (8,500 acres).	x				
REC-21	Limited to Designated Routes in the Motorized Touring RMZ	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
REC-22	Closed to motorized use in the Landmarks RMZ. (Appendix 18).	x				
REC-23	Complete an SRMA activity plan within 5 years of the RMP ROD.		x			Change the time frame for completion, since an activity plan has not yet been completed.
REC-24	<p>Identify Big Rocks SRMA (90 acres) to provide for motorized recreational use, including competitive motorized recreation events (Map 14).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Manage motorized recreational activities to sustain natural resources while meeting social and economic needs. - Provide access ranging from moderate to easy through a full range of motorized vehicle types with little self-reliance and a high or moderate level of interaction between users. - Provide signing and interpretation as needed. 	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	- Develop facilities to support motorized and dispersed recreational activities, such as restrooms, staging areas, loading facilities, and parking areas.					
REC-25	Manage SRMA as an OHV open area.	x				
REC-26	Complete an activity plan within 5 years of the RMP ROD.		x			Change the time frame for completion, since an activity plan has not yet been completed.
REC-27	Identify the Dirty Devil/Robbers Roost area as an SRMA (290,500 acres, Map 14) to provide recreational experiences complementary with the remote and scenic nature and other resource values of the area. (SRMA includes Dirty Devil WSA, Horseshoe Canyon WSA, and the Happy Canyon—French Springs WSA.) - Manage the portions of the WSAs within the SRMA according to the IMP.		x			Global change: update IMP with the current guidance (no longer interim). Add “(BLM natural areas)”

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Manage the portions of the Dirty Devil/French Springs non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics in accordance with the management prescriptions identified for these areas. - Manage SRMA for a high probability of experiencing solitude, closeness to nature, self-reliance, challenge, and risk in an unmodified and natural appearing environment with very low interaction or evidence of other users. - Provide opportunities for primitive and semi-primitive, non-motorized recreation within the Dirty Devil River corridor, its tributaries, and the Horseshoe Canyon drainage. - Provide semi-primitive motorized activity on 					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>designated routes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provide non-motorized access by means of trails, cross-country travel, and some primitive roads. (Access for people with disabilities would be most difficult.) - Provide no site developments or only the minimum required for site protection, considering user comfort secondarily. - Provide no on-site interpretive facilities. - Manage to allow natural processes to achieve self-sustaining systems. 					
REC-28	Close canyons and portions of WSAs to OHV use. Limit OHVs to designated routes elsewhere (Table 20)	x				
REC-29	Consider limiting recreational activities if they conflict with other resources or users, if necessary. (Limitations could include numbers of people, season	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	of use, or area of use.)					
REC-30	Develop an activity plan for the SRMA within 5 years to address developed facilities, special recreation permits (SRP), and special rules for protecting resources such as regulating campfire use, camping, sanitation, backcountry permits, group size, spatial and seasonal restrictions.		x			Change time frame from 5 years to “as funding and staffing permit.”
REC-31	Continue to issue current SRPs according to site-specific analysis already completed and according to existing permit stipulations. (SRPs are currently in place for commercial uses such as canyoneering, rock climbing, backpacking, hiking, guided hunting, and vehicle tours.)	x				
REC-32	Prior to completing the activity plan, issue additional similar SRPs, subject to the following stipulations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Within one-half mile of canyon rims and below the rim, limit group size to 12 or fewer. Allow no 	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>commercial or organized group larger than 12 to operate in this area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Allow only one commercial group to occupy the same side of the canyon at any one time. - Review itineraries prior to each operating season. - Allow no camping within one-half mile of Mexican spotted owl protected activity centers. Require all activities be consistent with the guidelines in the Mexican spotted owl recovery plan. - Allow no camping within the 100-year floodplain or 330 feet on either side from the centerline, whichever is greater, of any spring or water sources in Desert bighorn sheep use areas during the lambing season (April 15–June 15). - Stipulate additional 					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	requirements, if needed, to protect sensitive species and their critical habitats.					
REC-33	Consider developing facilities to support the objectives of the SRMA, to provide for visitor health and safety, and for resource protection.	x				
REC-34	Locate facilities such as trailheads, instructional signs, group sites, and parking areas on the bench lands near existing access roads.	x				
REC-35	Address changes to OHV route designations, if needed.	x				
REC-36	Conduct environmental analysis on SRP proposals that do not meet the criteria above or that are different than existing SRPs.	x				
REC-37	Manage oil and gas leasing in SRMA (outside WSAs) as follows (Map 23): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lease VRM Class II areas and canyon rims within the viewshed of all canyons (approximately one-quarter mile), with major constraints (NSO). 	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	- Lease the remainder of the SRMA subject to CSU and/or timing limitations.					
REC-38	Identify the Capitol Reef Gateway as an SRMA (12,800 acres, Map 14) to manage recreation opportunities associated with Capitol Reef National Park. SRMA boundary includes the Fremont Gorge WSA and the suitable Fremont Gorge wild river segment.	x				
REC-39	Manage the Fremont Gorge WSA under the IMP.		x			Global change: update IMP with the current guidance (no longer interim).
REC-40	Manage the Fremont Gorge suitable wild river segment to protect its outstandingly remarkable values.	x				
REC-41	Manage the Capitol Reef Gateway SRMA for a moderate probability of experiencing solitude, closeness to nature and tranquility, high degree of self-reliance, challenge, and risk in a predominately natural-appearing environment with low interaction but often	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	evidence of other users.					
REC-42	Provide access into the area through motorized and non-motorized routes. (Access for people with disabilities would be difficult.)	x				
REC-43	Allow facilities to reduce resource impacts, including campgrounds, picnic areas, restrooms, parking and staging areas, and interpretive facilities.	x				
REC-44	Explore concession opportunities for management and development of additional facilities.	x				
REC-45	Close the Fremont Gorge WSA and Fremont Gorge wild river corridor to OHV use.	x				
REC-46	Limit OHVs to designated routes elsewhere.	x				
REC-47	Manage oil and gas leasing as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Close to oil and gas leasing the portion of the SRMA in the Fremont Gorge WSA and the Fremont Gorge wild river corridor. - Lease the remainder of the 	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	SRMA subject to CSU and/or timing limitations. (Map 23).					
REC-48	Complete a SRMA activity plan within 5 years of RMP ROD.		x			Adjust “within 5 years.”
REC-49	<p>Identify a Henry Mountains SRMA (532,600 acres, Map 14). Area includes the Mount Ellen–Blue Hills WSA, Bull Mountain WSA, Mount Pennell WSA, Mount Hillers WSA, and Bull Creek Archaeological District.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Manage WSAs according to the IMP. - Manage Bull Creek Archaeological District to protect cultural resource values. - Emphasize opportunities for a combination of semi-primitive non-motorized and motorized recreational experiences in a natural or predominately natural setting with a high or very high probability of experiencing solitude, 			x		Henry Mountains not justified as a SRMA (Reference H-8320-1 p. I-36).

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>closeness to nature, self-reliance, challenge, and risk (interactions between users would be low with minimal evidence of other users).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provide facilities needed to protect resources and provide for visitor safety. - Provide signs, trails, trailhead parking, and staging areas to facilitate the use and enjoyment of the SRMA and protection of resources. - Maintain and improve non-motorized trails, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Panorama Knoll * Mount Ellen * Burro Wash * Cottonwood Wash * Sheets Gulch * Five Mile Wash. - Designate areas for large group events and camping, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Starr Springs Campground * McMillan Spring 					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	Campground * Sandy Creek Overlook * Apple Brush Flat * Turkey Haven.					
REC-55	Manage according to area designations in Table 17.			x		If REC-49 is dropped, drop REC-55 and REC-56.
REC-56	Complete an SRMA activity plan within 5 years of the RMP ROD.			x		If REC-49 is dropped, drop REC-55 and REC-56.
REC General	Numbering		x			Renumber section so that REC-50 – REC-54 exist.
REC-57	Manage as part of the Dirty Devil SRMA (see above)	x				
REC-58	Manage OHVs per management direction in the Dirty Devil SRMA (above) and Table 17.	x				
REC-59	Complete an SRMA activity plan within 5 years of the RMP ROD.	x				
REC-60	Implement the Yuba Reservoir Management Plan, as revised by the Fillmore FO.		x			Add remarks in plan to specify that Fillmore is managing Yuba Reservoir in partnership with the RFO and Utah State Parks.
REC-61	Permit no competitive events in WSAs.		x			Modify decision, since might be in conflict with WSA manual and would be addressed in WSA manual and guidance.

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
REC-62	Authorize commercial use permits that provide recreational opportunities, enhance recreational experiences, and protect resources on a case-by-case basis, subject to environmental analysis.	x				
REC-63	Authorize motorized and non-motorized competitive events consistent with OHV area and route designations on a case-by-case basis, subject to environmental analysis.	x				
REC-64	Permit no competitive events in the Dirty Devil/Robbers Roost SRMA.			x		Drop decision. Want the option to have competitive events. If not, that would be addressed in an activity plan.
REC-65	Require SRPs for organized groups outside designated large group areas meeting any one of the following criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Group includes 50 or more participants. - Group uses 10 or more vehicles. 		x			Modify to specify that Paiute Trail and Great Western Trail have an exception (Arapeen Trail).
REC-66	Authorize vending on a case-by-case basis subject to environmental analysis in conjunction with organized events	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	or when the vending is necessary to support protection of resources or recreational use.					
REC-67	Authorize vending permits for uses that enhance recreational experiences.	x				
REC-68	Authorize no vending along scenic byways and backways.	x				
TRC-1	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.	x				
TRC-2	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.	x				
TRC-3	The BLM could impose limitations on types of vehicles allowed on specific designated	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	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.					
TRC-4	Site-specific management actions that protect riparian areas would be addressed at the project level.	x				
TRC-5	Designate WSAs as closed or limited to designated ways for OHV use (Table 18, WSA decisions for details).	x				
TRC-6	<p>If OHV use in areas designated as open or limited causes threats or adverse impacts to resources, take appropriate steps, including, but not limited to, use restrictions or closures, installation of additional signs and barricades, restoration of affected areas, etc.</p> <p>Balance motorized access to public lands with other resource and resource use needs. Designate areas as follows (Map 15):</p>	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
TRC-7	Open: 9,890 acres	x				
TRC-8	Limited: 1,908,210 acres	x				
TRC-9	Closed: 209,900	x				
TRC-10	<p>Designate the following managed open areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Factory Butte Play Area (5,800 acres)—Designate and manage as an OHV open area to provide a unique OHV riding experience on Mancos shale badlands to accommodate existing use and future growth. - Swing Arm City Play Area (2,600 acres)— Designate and manage as an OHV open area. - Caineville Cove Inn Play Area (100 acres)— Designate and manage as an OHV open area. - Big Rocks Trials Play Area (90 acres)—Designate and manage as an OHV open area to provide trials motorcycle/rock crawling 		x			<p>May want to re-visit boundaries and acres if new information is available concerning SSS and archeological resources (Big Rocks, Glenwood, and Aurora). Public response would enjoy expanded areas.</p> <p>May also consider the White Hills area as open (currently limited). Request has been made by county to make the area an open area. Current use reveals incursions that are difficult to limit and enforce designated routes travel.</p>

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>OHV recreational opportunity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Glenwood Play Area (1,000 acres)—Designate as an OHV open area and manage as a community OHV area. - Aurora Play Area (300 acres)—Designate as an OHV open area and manage as a community OHV area. 					
TRC-11	<p>Consider and promote leasing the identified OHV open areas near communities such as Caineville, Glenwood, Aurora, and Loa (e.g. Big Rocks SRMA) under Recreation and Public Purposes Act (R&PP) authorities to encourage local management of OHV play areas. Generally these would include areas with existing surface disturbance. Requests would be considered on a case-by-case basis, subject to an environmental analysis</p>		x			<p>Strike “near communities such as Caineville, Glenwood, Aurora, and Loa (e.g. Big Rocks SRMA),” and “Generally these would include areas with existing surface disturbance.”</p> <p>May include the White Hills area in the R&PP authority.</p>
TRC-12	<p>Prohibit all motorized travel in</p>	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	closed areas, with the following exceptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - For emergency and other purposes as authorized under 43 CFR 8340.0-5(a)(2),(3),(4) and (5); - Minimum use necessary to exercise a valid existing right or authorized use. 					
TRC-13	WSAs: To prevent impairment of the areas' suitability for preservation as wilderness. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Little Rockies WSA - Portions of the Dirty Devil, Fiddler Butte, Fremont Gorge, French Spring/Happy Canyon, Horseshoe Canyon North, Horseshoe Canyon South and Mount Ellen/Blue Hills WSAs. 	x				
TRC-14	WSRs: to protect outstandingly remarkable values. (Refer to Wild and Scenic River Decisions) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Fremont Gorge Suitable Wild River. 	x				
TRC-15	ACECs: to protect R & I values	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	(Refer to ACEC Decisions) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - North Caineville Mesa ACEC - Old Woman Front ACEC. 					
TRC-16	SRMAs: Portions of the proposed SRMAs to retain the desired recreation setting and for consistency with other management decisions. (Refer to Recreation Decisions) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Dirty Devil SRMA - Fremont Gorge SRMA - Factory Butte SRMA (Landmarks RMZ). 	x				
TRC-17	Manage 1,908,210 acres identified on Map 15 as limited to designated routes or designated routes with seasonal closures or size/ width restrictions.	x				
TRC-18	Prohibit all cross-country (off-transportation system) motorized travel in limited areas, with the following exceptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - For emergency and other purposes as authorized under 43 CFR 8340.0-5(a)(2),(3),(4) and (5). 	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
TRC-19	Coordinate OHV route designations with USFS, NPS, State of Utah, counties, and communities, where possible.	x				
TRC-20	Rehabilitate closed OHV routes on a case-by-case basis as required to mitigate impacts to resources. Closed or non-designated routes would be allowed to rehabilitate naturally unless a specific resource impact was occurring that warranted expedited rehabilitation of the route (e.g., soil erosion, water quality concerns, and/or continued illegal use).	x				
TRC-21	Route designations are implementation decisions that are subject to change based upon future site-specific environmental analysis. Appendix 9 provides additional details of the travel management/route designation process, the implementation process, and the process that would be required to add or remove route designations		x			Appendix 9 needs to be updated or generalized so that it is current.

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	following completion of the RMP.					
TRC-22	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.		x			IMP no longer interim direction.
TRC-23	Designate routes for motorized use unless significant, undue damage		x			Needs to refer to the current policy for designations.

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	to or disturbance of the soil, wildlife, wildlife habitat, improvements, cultural or vegetative resources, or other authorized uses of the public lands is imminent.					
TRC-24	Designate routes to minimize harassment of wildlife or significant disruption of wildlife habitats. Give special attention to protecting SSS and their habitats.		x			Needs to refer to the current policy for designations.
TRC-25	Designate routes to minimize conflicts between OHV use and other existing or proposed recreational uses of the same or neighboring public lands, and to ensure the compatibility of such uses with existing conditions in populated areas, taking into account noise and other factors.		x			Needs to refer to the current policy for designations.
TRC-26	Limit OHV use to designated routes in deer and elk crucial winter range, except for Glenwood and Aurora Managed Open Areas.	x				
TRC-27	Consider seasonal closure of designated routes on a case-by-case basis, subject to	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	environmental analysis. (Maps 9 and 10)					
TRC-28	Limit OHV use to designated routes in bison crucial habitat. Consider seasonal closure of designated routes on a case-by-case basis. (Map 8).	x				
TRC-29	Route designations are implementation decisions that are subject to change in the future based on site-specific environmental analyses (Map 16). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Designated routes: 3,739 miles - Designated routes with seasonal closures or size/width restriction: 538 miles - Closed routes: 345 miles. (Map 16)	x				
TRC-30	Allow motor vehicles to pull off a designated route up to 50 feet of either side of the centerline for the purposes of parking/staging.	x				
TRC-31	Allow motor vehicles to use existing spur routes for ingress and egress to established campsites	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	within 150 feet of designated routes. (Previous campsites can be distinguished by evidence of rock fire rings, old tent sites, and tracks from earlier vehicle access.) This does not authorize creation of new campsites or travel ways.					
TRC-32	Prohibit motorized travel ways between multiple campsites, establishment of motorized play areas, race tracks, or travel across wet meadows or riparian areas.	x				
TRC-33	Prohibit motorized access to camping areas where conflicts with other resources are identified.	x				
TRC-34	Require vehicles to stay on designated ways or cherry-stemmed routes within WSAs, in accordance with IMP direction.		x			IMP is no longer interim direction.
TRC-35	Do not allow use of non-motorized wheel carriers to retrieve game kills inside of WSAs.	x				
TRC-36	Cooperatively manage with the USFS, State of Utah, and local governments the portions of the Paiute ATV Trail and Great Western Trail systems that lie on	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	public lands managed by the RFO.					
LAR-1	<p>For any form of land tenure adjustment (including, but not limited to, exchanges, in lieu selections, state grants, desert land entries, R&PP patents, easement acquisitions, etc.), except for FLPMA Section 203 sales, ensure it meets one or more of the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is in the public interest and accommodates the needs of state, local, or private entities, including needs for the economy, community growth and expansion, and be in accordance with other land use goals, objectives, and planning decisions - Results in a net gain of important and manageable resource values on public lands such as crucial wildlife habitat, significant cultural sites, high-value recreation areas, high- 		x			<p>Include IM 2011-110 – Conveyance of Reversionary Interests sample language: “Reserved Federal interests in split estate lands anywhere in the planning area may be considered for conveyance out of Federal ownership.”</p>

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>quality riparian areas, live water, SSS habitat, or areas key to maintenance of productive ecosystems</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ensures the accessibility of public lands in areas where access is needed and cannot otherwise be obtained; - Is essential to allow effective management of public lands in areas where consolidation of ownership is necessary to meet resource management objectives - Is not suitable for management by another federal department or agency - Results in the acquisition of lands that serve a national priority as identified in national policy directives. 					
LAR-2	In addition to the above criteria, require a site-specific	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>environmental analysis in accordance with NEPA for all future land disposal actions. Critical Elements of the Human Environment and other resource issues identified through public and agency involvement would be adequately considered and appropriately evaluated. Certain elements of the human environment are subject to requirements specified in statutes, regulations, or executive orders. Program-specific consultation would occur (if required), and respective on-site surveys and documented clearances would be obtained prior to any land disposal action. This subsequent analysis and documentation may reveal resource conditions that could not be mitigated to the satisfaction of the authorized officer and may, therefore preclude disposal.</p>					
LAR-3	<p>Ensure all land tenure adjustments must be in conformance with other decisions (goals, objectives,</p>	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	management actions) within this RMP.					
LAR-4	Habitat for listed and candidate T&E species are generally required to be retained in Federal ownership. Consider exceptions in disposal actions with the State of Utah and others with consultation with and concurrence of the USFWS.	x				
LAR-5	Permit surface lands identified for disposal with unpatented mining claims to be conveyed if the purchaser is the mining claimant, or the mining claims are relinquished if the purchaser is other than the mining claimant.	x				
LAR-6	Issue patents for existing shooting ranges [Appendix 5). No portions of these R&PP patented lands, under any circumstances, would revert to the United States if any such portion was used for solid waste disposal or for any other purpose that may result in the disposal, placement, or release of any hazardous substance.	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
LAR-7	Where consistent with the goals and objectives of the RMP, classify as suitable for lease and/or disposal under Section 7 of the Taylor Grazing Act of 1934, as amended, lands disposed of or leased under the R&PP Act, Desert Land Entry (DLE) Act, Color of Title, Carey Act, and state grants.	x				
LAR-8	As the preferred method, manage OHV Open Play Areas located near communities by issuing a lease or patent under the R&PP Act, and have the relevant state, county, or local community manage the areas.	x				
LAR-9	Pursue land acquisitions from willing sellers when lands: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Are within or adjacent to WSAs, ACECs, WSRs, or other special designations - Are associated with key fisheries or wildlife habitats and riparian zones - Provide linkage or public access to other public lands - Have significant 	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>paleontological or cultural resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provide high recreation or other significant resource or public values - Are needed to improve manageability of public lands. 					
LAR-10	Give land exchanges with the State of Utah priority consideration to resolve inholdings issues.	x				
LAR-11	Retain the suitable WSR segment (1 segment—5 miles) in federal ownership, unless such action would benefit outstandingly remarkable values and improve WSR management potential.	x				
LAR-12	Retain non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics carried forward (78,600 acres) in federal ownership.		x			Add “(BLM natural areas)”
LAR-13	Maintain important recreational values and sites in federal ownership	x				
LAR-14	The Utah BLM Riparian Management Policy identifies that Riparian areas will be retained in	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	the public land system unless it can be clearly demonstrated that specific sites are so small or isolated that they cannot be managed in an effective manner by BLM or through agreement with State or Federal agencies or interested conservation groups. Retain identified, relatively undisturbed Old Spanish Trail segments in federal ownership.					
LAR-15	Retain habitat for federally listed and candidate species in federal ownership. Exceptions may be considered in exchanges with the State of Utah and others after consultation with and concurrence with the USFWS.	x				
LAR-16	Make approximately 13,400 acres of public land available for FLPMA Section 203 sales (as listed in Appendix 5 and shown on Maps 17 through 22) subject to NEPA compliance and consistent with other decisions in this RMP.		x			Include IM 2011-110 – Conveyance of Reversionary Interests sample language: “Reserved Federal interests in split estate lands anywhere in the planning area may be considered for conveyance out of Federal ownership.”
LAR-17	Review existing withdrawals to	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	determine whether they are serving the purposes for which they were withdrawn. (Existing withdrawals are listed in Table 5-7 in Appendix 5.)					
LAR-18	Manage any lands becoming unencumbered by withdrawals in a manner consistent with adjacent or comparable public land within the RFO.	x				
LAR-19	Review existing classifications and segregations on a case-by-case basis to determine whether the classification or segregation is appropriate and should be continued, modified, or terminated.	x				
LAR-20	Continue existing withdrawals (154,700 acres).	x				
LAR-21	Recommend withdrawing the following areas from mineral entry (map 26): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - North Caineville Mesa ACEC - Old Woman Front ACEC - Fremont (Fremont Gorge) suitable wild river within one-quarter mile of each 	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>side of high water mark on each bank of the river</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Developed recreation sites, including Lonesome Beaver Campground, McMillan Spring Campground, Starr Springs Campground, Dandelion Flat Picnic Area, Hog Springs Picnic Area, Otter Creek Reservoir Recreation Sites, Kingston Canyon Recreation Site, and Koosharem Picnic Area. <p>New recommended acres: 21,500 Total acres: 176,200</p>					
LAR-22	<p>In existing ROWs, authorize culinary water source developments (Culinary Water Sources Table 5-12 in Appendix 5) subject to valid existing rights and future land use authorizations to ensure that they do not lead to degradation, pollution, or contamination of water supply.</p>	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
LAR-23	When compatible, require multiple communication site users to share the same sites and buildings, and use the same facilities. See Existing Communication Sites Table 5-10 in Appendix 5.	x				
LAR-24	Continue to maintain roads for resource management purposes.	x				
LAR-25	Consider obtaining easements across non-federal land to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provide public access - Enhance resource management in key fishery and wildlife habitats and riparian zones - Cooperate with other federal, state, and local governing agencies, organizations, tribes, and private individuals in obtaining ROW easements - Enhance resource management. 		x			Add “and/or reciprocal rights of way” after “Consider obtaining easements.”
LAR-26	Apply the spatial and temporal restrictions outlined in Fish and Wildlife Decisions to ROW construction and maintenance	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	activities. These restrictions do not apply to emergency maintenance.					
LAR-27	Manage the following as ROW avoidance areas (Map 3): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ACECs - Non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics - Areas open to oil and gas leasing with NSO stipulations. 		x			Add “(BLM natural areas)”
LAR-28	Manage the following areas as exclusion areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Areas closed to oil and gas leasing - WSAs. - Suitable WSR corridor-Fremont Gorge 	x				
LAR-29	Consider exceptions in the avoidance areas on a case-by-case basis if the proposed ROW would: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Not create substantial surface disturbance or would cause only temporary impacts - Be compatible with the resource values being protected by the goals and 		x			Add “(BLM natural areas)”

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>objectives of the avoidance areas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Be consistent with management prescriptions for ACECs and WSRs and pose no irreversible or irretrievable impacts - Be consistent with the goals and objectives of the identified non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics. 					
LAR-30	<p>For authorization of any ROW for wind or solar energy development, incorporate best management practices (BMP) and provisions contained in the Wind Energy Development Program Record of Decision and BLM’s Solar Energy Policy.</p>	x				
LAR-31	<p>Consider proposals for wind and solar energy development throughout the RFO except within the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - WSAs (ROW exclusion areas in accordance with IMP) 		x			IMP is no longer interim direction.

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Fremont (Fremont Gorge) suitable wild river corridor - ACECs - Areas open to oil and gas leasing with NSO and areas closed to leasing. - VRM Class I and II areas - Migratory bird habitats and raptor nesting complexes - Threatened & Endangered Species habitats 					
LAR-32	Consider proposals for wind and solar energy exploration throughout the RFO managed lands. Except for WSAs, exploration may be allowed within special management areas if the proposal would not adversely affect the resources of concern.		x			<p>Add references to wind and solar PEISs</p> <p>Solar PEIS Amendment completed; document changes in LUP Amendment/ Maintenance Sheet.</p>
LAR-33	To minimize adverse environmental impacts and the proliferation of separate ROWs, use common ROWs whenever possible, including collocation of new utility transmission lines and other facilities within existing utility and highway corridors.	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
LAR-34	Carry forward to or amend the Richfield RMP with any decisions on designation of energy corridors contained within the “West-wide Energy Corridor Programmatic EIS” currently being developed separately from this RMP analysis that affect public lands in the RFO.	x				
LAR-35	Designate those transportation and utility corridors listed in Appendix 5.	x				
LAR-36	Consider authorizing leases, permits, and easements that are compatible with other decisions throughout this RMP.	x				
MIN-1	Issue oil and gas leases and allow for oil and gas exploration and development.	x				
MIN-2	Continue closure of WSAs to leasing, pursuant to the federal onshore Oil and Gas Leasing Reform Act of 1987.	x				
MIN-3	To the extent allowed by a site-specific environmental analysis that justifies a constraint, consistent with 43 CFR 3101.1-2, and consistent with the terms of	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	an existing lease, apply the constraints and requirements for leasing implemented in this RMP to leases that were authorized prior to the signing of the ROD and the approval of the RMP.					
MIN-4	Manage Incorporated municipalities as closed to leasing:	x				
MIN-5	Manage the following additional sites as open to leasing with NSO, except as otherwise provided in other management decisions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All cemeteries - Culinary water sources - Landfills—existing and closed - Lands managed under a R&PP lease - Sites listed on the NRHP - Developed recreation sites - BLM administrative sites. 	x				
MIN-6	Lease split-estate lands according to BLM RMP stipulations for adjacent or nearby public lands or plans of other surface management agencies as consistent with federal laws, 43 CFR 3101, and the	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	surface owner's rights.					
MIN-7	Work cooperatively with stakeholders to research interim measures, such as those presented by the Four Corners Air Quality Task Force (i.e., limits of 2g/bhp-hr on engines less than 300 HP), to determine which emission mitigation strategies should be required as conditions for future lease and land use authorizations.		x			Modify to current standards. MIN-7 could be combined with MIN-9, or one could be dropped.
MIN-8	Site-specific management actions that protect riparian areas would be addressed at the project level.	x				
MIN-9	In accordance with an UDEQ-DAQ letter dated June 6, 2008, (see Appendix 13) requesting implementation of interim nitrogen oxide control measures for compressor engines; BLM will require the following as a Lease Stipulation and a Condition of Approval for Applications for Permit to Drill: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All new and replacement internal combustion gas field engines of less than or 		x			MIN-9 could be combined with MIN-7, or one could be dropped.

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>equal to 300 design-rated horsepower must not emit more than 2 gms of NOx per horsepower-hour. This requirement does not apply to gas field engines of less than or equal to 40 design-rated horsepower.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All new and replacement internal combustion gas field engines of greater than 300 design rated horsepower must not emit more than 1.0 gms of NOx per horsepower-hour. 					
MIN-10	Area closed to leasing: 447,300 acres	x				
MIN-11	<p>Manage fluid mineral leases as shown on Map 23:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Areas open to leasing with standard lease terms: 608,700 acres - Areas open to leasing subject to CSU and/or timing limitations: 917,500 acres - Areas open to leasing 		x			80 acres have changed from open to NSO based on a NEPA process, which will affect acreages in MIN-11 and other decisions' acreages.

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	subject to NSO: 154,500 acres					
MIN-12	Subject geophysical operations under 43 CFR 3150 to the oil and gas leasing restrictions with the following exception: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consider geophysical operations proposed for lands that are designated as NSO or closed to leasing for approval when (1) the circumstances or relative resource values in the area have changed, (2) less restrictive requirements could be developed to protect the resource of concern, or (3) operations could be conducted without causing unacceptable impacts to the resource of concern. 	x				
MIN-13	Lease split-estate lands according to BLM RMP stipulations for adjacent or nearby public lands or plans of other surface management agencies, consistent with	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	federal laws, 43 CFR 3101, and the surface owner's rights.					
MIN-14	Lease geothermal resources in conformance with the oil and gas leasing restrictions (open, open with moderate constraints, open with major constraints, and closed) for oil and gas leasing, consistent with the authorities granted at 43 CFR 3200, including 3201 and 3250.	x				
MIN-15	Exploration operations under 43 CFR 3250 proposed for lands that are designated as NSO or closed to leasing may be considered for approval when (1) the circumstances or relative resource values in the area have changed, (2) less restrictive requirements could be developed to protect the resource of concern or (3) operations could be conducted without causing unacceptable impacts to the resource or concern.	x				
MIN-16	Areas available for future consideration for tar sands leasing will be identified in the ROD for		x			Programmatic EIS has been completed.

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	the National Oil Shale and Tar Sands Programmatic EIS, being conducted by BLM separately from this analysis. If lands are identified, future leasing considerations will be conducted under site-specific NEPA analyses, and would be subject to the oil and gas leasing restrictions identified in the Approved RMP.					Add LUP Amendment/ Maintenance Sheet to plan to document. [See Vernal Maintenance Change Sheet No. 2013-01 as an example]
MIN-17	Consider applications for exploration licenses for lands that are subject to leasing as defined at 43 CFR 3400.2. Licenses would be subject to the surface disturbing restrictions and the provisions for exceptions, modifications, and waivers, similar to the oil and gas restrictions consistent with the regulations at 43 CFR 3400.	x				
MIN-18	Consider proposals for coal leasing on public lands determined to be acceptable for further consideration for leasing in the coal unsuitability analysis (Appendix 8), if and when there is	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>interest. Prior to leasing, complete a multiple use analysis (43 CFR 3420.1 (3)), consult with other surface owners (43 CFR 3420.1-5 (4) (i)), and address other applicable requirements of 43 CFR 3400 Coal Management.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In the Henry Mountains coal field, 14,719 acres are acceptable for consideration for leasing by surface mining methods. - In the Wasatch Plateau and Emery coal fields, 0 acres are acceptable for consideration for leasing by surface mining methods. 					
MIN-19	<p>Consider no coal leasing proposals in VRM Class I areas. VRM Classes II, III, and IV areas would be subject to coal exploration and development mitigation requirements, with VRM Class II being most restrictive and VRM Class IV least restrictive.</p>	x				
MIN-20	<p>Consider no coal leasing proposals in the 12 (78,600 acres) identified</p>		x			Add "(BLM natural areas)"

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics.					
MIN-21	Consider applications for exploration licenses for lands that are subject to leasing as defined at 43 CFR 3400.2. Licenses would be subject to the surface disturbing restrictions and the provisions for exceptions, modifications, and waivers, similar to the oil and gas restrictions consistent with the regulations at 43 CFR 3400.	x				
MIN-22	Consider proposals for coal leasing on public lands determined to be acceptable for further consideration for leasing in the coal unsuitability analysis (Appendix 8), if and when there is interest. Prior to leasing, complete a multiple use analysis (43 CFR 3420.1 (3)), consult with other surface owners (43 CFR 3420.1-5 (4) (i)), and address other applicable requirements of 43 CFR 3400 Coal Management.	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
MIN-23	In the Henry Mountains coal field, 41,842 acres of BLM lands are acceptable for consideration for leasing by underground mining methods.	x				
MIN-24	In the Wasatch Plateau coal field, 18,672 acres of National Forest, and in the Emery coal field, 9,624 acres of BLM lands and 3,542 acres of National Forest are acceptable for consideration for leasing by underground mining methods.	x				
MIN-25	Consider no coal leasing proposals in VRM Class I areas. VRM Class II, III, and IV areas would be subject to coal exploration and development mitigation requirements, with VRM Class II being most restrictive and VRM IV least restrictive.	x				
MIN-26	Mineral use authorizations for non-energy solid leasable minerals include: prospecting permits, exploration licenses, preference right leases, competitive leases, fringe acreage leases, lease	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>modifications, and use permits. As used herein, the term leasing is used to refer to any of the mineral use authorizations, because if the area is not open to leasing, then an exploration authorization or lease modification would not be considered. Any mineral use authorization issued after the RMP is approved would be subject to the stipulations developed in the RMP. The open and closed areas for leasing of non-energy solid leasable minerals would be the same as provided for oil and gas leasing, including exceptions, modifications, and waivers.</p>					
MIN-27	<p>Manage leasing as shown on Map 23.</p>	x				
MIN-28	<p>Closed to leasing in WSAs and, within one-quarter mile of the high water mark on each bank of the Fremont Gorge WSR recommended as suitable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Areas closed to leasing: 447,300 acres - Areas open to leasing 	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	subject to standard conditions of approval: 608,700 acres - Areas open to leasing subject to CSU and/or timing limitations: 917,500 acres - Areas open to leasing subject to NSO: 154,500 acres					
MIN-29	Continue to make existing operations subject to the stipulations developed for the notice or plan of operations. 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 and the non- impairment standards of the federal regulations at 43 CFR 3802 and the IMP for WSAs. Consistent with the rights afforded claimants under the mining laws, operations conducted after the RMP is approved would		x			IMP is no longer interim guidance.

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>be required to conform to the stipulations developed in the RMP and as generally provided in the oil and gas stipulations. The oil and gas stipulations would be a general guideline and may not apply uniformly to all operations under the mining laws. Operations on BLM-administered lands open to mineral entry must be conducted in compliance with all of the BLM’s surface management regulations The BLM surface management regulations apply to public lands, including split estate lands where the minerals are reserved to the United States, but the regulations do not apply to surface lands managed by other federal agencies. All public lands with federal mineral estate are open to mining claim location unless specifically withdrawn from mineral entry by Secretarial order or by a public land law. Therefore, other than the existing withdrawals and those recommended by this</p>					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	RMP, all public lands within the RFO remain open to mineral entry under the mining laws. The BLM may recommend future withdrawals in areas identified as closed or with a NSO stipulation for oil and gas leasing, if it becomes necessary to prevent unacceptable resource impacts.					
MIN-30	Allow location, exploration, and development of locatable minerals on public lands while preventing unnecessary and undue degradation of other resources and preventing impairment to wilderness suitability of WSAs.	x				
MIN-31	Continue existing withdrawals (154,700 acres). Recommend withdrawing the following areas from mineral entry: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Developed recreation sites, including Lonesome Beaver Campground, McMillan Spring Campground, Starr Springs Campground, Dandelion Flat Picnic Area, Hog 	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>Springs Picnic Area, Otter Creek Reservoir Recreation Sites, Kingston Canyon Recreation Site, and Koosharem Picnic Area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - North Caineville Mesa ACEC - Old Woman Front ACEC - Fremont Gorge Suitable WSR (within one-quarter mile of the high water mark of each bank of the river). The proposed new withdrawals would encompass 21,500 acres. <p>Total acres: 176,200</p>					
MIN-32	<p>Authorizations for mineral materials include: exploration permits, exclusive sale contracts, free use permits, community pits, and common use areas. As used herein, the term disposal is used as inclusive of any mineral material authorization, because exploration permits would not be issued in areas closed to disposals. Existing disposals would continue to be subject to the existing stipulations and conditions for that disposal.</p>	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	Disposals issued or designated after the RMP is approved would be subject to the stipulations developed in the RMP. The open and closed areas for mineral material disposals would be the same as provided for oil and gas leasing, including exceptions, modifications, and waivers.					
MIN-33	Manage disposal of mineral materials as shown on Map 24.	x				
MIN-34	Allow no disposal of mineral materials in WSAs, non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics, and within one-quarter mile of the high water mark on each bank of the Fremont Gorge suitable WSR.		x			Add "(BLM natural areas)"
MIN-35	Areas closed to mineral material disposals: 601,800 acres	x				Check acreage based on change to MIN-34.
MIN-36	Areas open to disposal of mineral materials subject to standard conditions of approval: 608,700 acres	x				Check acreage based on change to MIN-34.
MIN-37	Areas open to disposal of mineral materials subject to CSU and/or timing limitations: 917,500 acres	x				Check acreage based on change to MIN-34.
WSA general	Desired Outcomes Section		x			IMP is no longer interim guidance.

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
WSA-1	Manage WSAs according to the IMP (BLM-H-8550-1). The BLM is statutorily (FLPMA Section 603(c)) required to manage these areas to protect their suitability for congressional designation to the National Wilderness Preservation System unless and until Congress either designates an area as wilderness or releases it from further consideration. The BLM's discretion to make planning decisions on management of WSAs is limited to designating WSAs as VRM Class I and determining whether the WSAs will be limited or closed to OHV use.		x			IMP is no longer interim guidance.
WSA-2	Close all WSAs to leasing pursuant to the Federal Onshore Oil and Gas Leasing Reform Act of 1987.	x				
WSA-3	Designate all WSAs as VRM Class I.	x				
WSA-4	Where routes would remain available for motorized use within WSAs, such use could continue	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>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>					
WSA-5	<p>Designate the following WSAs as closed for OHV use (as shown on Map 15):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Little Rockies (40,700 acres) - Dirty Devil (70,500 acres) 		x			Exact acreage for Fremont Gorge incorrect.

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Fiddler Butte (2,200 acres) - Fremont Gorge (2,800 acres) - French Spring/Happy Canyon (11,400 acres) - Horseshoe Canyon North (500 acres) - Horseshoe Canyon South (7,500 acres) - Mount Ellen/Blue Hills (39,700 acres) 					
WSA-6	<p>Designate the following WSAs as limited to OHV use (as shown on Map 15):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Bull Mountain (13,200 acres) - Mount Hillers (19,300 acres) - Mount Pennell (77,100 acres) - Dirty Devil (1,600 acres) - Fiddler Butte (71,800 acres) - Fremont Gorge (16 acres) - French Spring/Happy Canyon (12,900 acres) - Horseshoe Canyon North (x			Exact acreage for Fremont Gorge incorrect.

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	1,600 acres) - Horseshoe Canyon South (32,400 acres) - Mount Ellen/Blue Hills (41,700 acres)					
WSA-7	A total of 44 miles of inventoried vehicle ways would be designated for use subject to the IMP Table - Bull Mountain: 2.8 miles - Dirty Devil: 6.8 miles - Fiddler Butte: 4.1 miles - French Spring/Happy Canyon: 3.6 miles - Horseshoe Canyon South: 5.6 miles - Little Rockies: .8 miles - Mount Ellen/Blue Hills: 8.7 miles - Mount Hillers: 5.0 miles - Mount Pennell: 6.4 miles		x			Update IMP reference
WSA-8	Only Congress can release a WSA from wilderness consideration. Should any WSA, in part or in whole, be released from wilderness consideration, examine proposals in the released area on a case-by-case basis for consistency	x				Note: Essentially the same language found in Price, Vernal, Kanab, Moab, and Monticello RMPs

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	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. Because the management direction of the released land would continue in accordance with the goals and objectives established in the RMP, no separate analysis is required in this LUP to address resource impacts if any WSAs are released by Congress.					
WSR-1	BLM would work with the State of Utah, local and tribal governments, and other federal agencies, in a state-wide study, to reach consensus regarding recommendations to Congress for the inclusion of rivers in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. Besides applying consistent criteria across agency jurisdictions, the joint study would avoid piece-mealing of river segments in logical watershed	x				This is an outstanding action: a state survey has not yet been completed.

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>units in the state. The study would evaluate, in detail, the possible benefits and effects of designation on the local and state economies, agricultural and industrial operations and interests, outdoor recreation, natural resources (including the outstandingly remarkable values for which the river was deemed suitable), water rights, water quality, water resource planning, and access to and across river corridors within, and upstream and downstream from the proposed segments(s). Actual designation of river segments would only occur through congressional action or as a result of Secretarial decision at the request of the Governor in accordance with provisions of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (the Act). BLM will work with the State, local and tribal governments, and the agencies involved to coordinate its decision making on wild and scenic river</p>					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	issues and to achieve consistency wherever possible.					
WSR-2	BLM recognizes that water resources on most river and stream segments within the State of Utah are already fully allocated. Before stream segments that have been recommended as suitable under this Approved RMP are recommended to Congress for designation, BLM will continue to work with affected local, state, federal, and tribal partners to identify in-stream flows necessary to meet critical resource needs, including values related to the subject segment(s). Such quantifications would be included in any recommendation for designation. BLM would then seek to jointly promote innovative strategies, community-based planning, and voluntary agreements with water users, under State law, to address those needs	x				
WSR-3	Should designations occur on any	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>river segment as a result of Secretarial or congressional action, existing rights, privileges, and contracts would be protected. Under Section 12 of the Act, termination of such rights, privileges, and contracts may happen only with the consent of the affected non-federal party. A determination by the BLM of eligibility and suitability for the inclusion of rivers on public lands to the Wild and Scenic Rivers System does not create new water rights for the BLM. Federal reserved water rights for new components of the Wild and Scenic Rivers System are established at the discretion of Congress. If water is reserved by Congress when a river component is added to the Wild and Scenic Rivers System, it would come from water that is not appropriated at the time of designation, in the amount necessary to protect features which led to the river's</p>					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>inclusion into the system. BLM's intent would be to leave existing water rights undisturbed and to recognize the lawful rights of private, municipal, and state entities to manage water resources under state law to meet the needs of the community. Federal law, including Section 13 of the Act and the McCarren Amendment (43 U.S.C. 666), recognizes state jurisdiction over water allocation in designated streams. Thus, it is BLM's position that existing water rights, including flows apportioned to the State of Utah interstate agreements and compacts, including the Upper Colorado River Compact, and developments of such rights would not be affected by designation or the creation of the possible federal reserved water right. BLM would seek to work with upstream and downstream water users and applicable agencies to ensure that water flows</p>					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	are maintained at a level sufficient to sustain the values for which affected river segments were designated.					
WSR-4	Recommend and manage the Fremont River in Fremont Gorge with a tentative classification as “wild” (5 miles) as suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System.	x				
WSR-5	Manage the Fremont River in Fremont Gorge (5 miles) as suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System and tentatively classified as a wild river. Management would protect the outstandingly remarkable scenic values. Specific management prescriptions within one-quarter mile of the high water mark on each bank of the river include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Closed to oil and gas leasing - Close to OHV use - Recommend for withdrawal from mineral 	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	entry.					
ACEC-1	Designate and manage the following areas as ACECs (Map 28): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - North Caineville Mesa (2,200 acres) - Old Woman Front (330 acres) Total acres: 2,530 	x				
ACEC-2	Continue designation of the North Caineville Mesa ACEC (Map 28).	x				
ACEC-3	Manage to protect the relevant and important relict vegetation values: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Allow no uses that would cause irreparable damage to relevant and important values - Close to OHV use - Manage as open to oil and gas leasing with major constraints (NSO) - Designate as unavailable for livestock grazing - Identify area as unsuitable for surface coal mining - Acquire inholdings within ACEC - Recommend withdrawing 	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
ACEC-4	<p>from mineral entry</p> <p>Designate the Old woman Front area as an RNA ACEC for protection of the relevant and important values of relict vegetation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Coordinate special management for protection of relict vegetation with the USFS Old Woman Cove RNA Plan. - Manage the area for multiple use, while protecting the relict vegetation. <p>Ecological Processes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Permit no human activities that directly or indirectly modify ecological processes <p>Wildlife</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Allow no wildlife habitat manipulation. - Prohibit the introduction or spread of exotic animal 		x			<p>Change “wildland fire use” to “use of wildland fire.”</p> <p>Under Wildlife, it is unclear that the second bullet refers to actions under BLM jurisdiction, since DWR has jurisdiction over wildlife.</p>

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>species.</p> <p>Fire and Fire and Fuels Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Allow wildland fire use within the parameters of an approved fire plan and only under a prescription designed to accomplish the objectives of the area. - Suppress fires using minimal impact tools and techniques. - Avoid the use of heavy equipment. - Avoid post-fire rehabilitation; if needed, use seed of indigenous species, and locally adapted ecotypes. <p>Forest Products</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Allow no logging or harvest of woodland products, fuelwood gathering, or Christmas tree cutting. 					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>Livestock Grazing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Unavailable for livestock grazing. - Construct no range improvements. <p>Recreation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Issue no SRPs. <p>Travel Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Close area to OHV use. <p>Facilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Authorize no roads, new trails, fences, signs, buildings, or other physical improvements. Lands and Realty - Recommend withdrawing from mineral entry. <p>Minerals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Manage as open to oil and gas leasing with major constraints, such as NSO. 					
TRV-1	As per the State of Utah v.	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	Andrus, Oct. 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.					
TRV-2	Continue to support Sanpete, Sevier, Piute, Garfield and Wayne counties and the State of Utah in providing a network of roads for movement of people, goods, and services across public lands.	x				
TRV-3	Review requests for administrative access on a case-by-case basis.	x				
TRV-4	Develop, implement, and maintain cooperative agreements with counties and the State of Utah for maintenance of the transportation system.		x			RS-2477 litigation may change this decision.
TRV-5	Require reclamation of redundant road systems and/or roads that no longer serve their intended purpose in order to reduce road density and reduce habitat fragmentation.		x			Need to clarify: When road ROW (or road authorized as part of a permit) is relinquished, road reclaimed unless identified during NEPA that the road should become a BLM Designated Route.
TRV-6	Manage designated scenic byway	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	and backway corridors for the purposes for which they were designated.					
TRV-7	Coordinate with the NPS and the State of Utah for management and interpretation of scenic byway and backway corridors.	x				
TRV-8	Install directional, informational, regulatory, and interpretive signs at appropriate locations throughout the planning area.	x				
TRV-9	There are a number of locations throughout the RFO that are commonly known and consistently used for aircraft landing and departure activities that, through such casual use, have evolved into backcountry airstrips (the definition contained in Section 345 of Public Law 106-914, the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriation Act of 2001). In accordance with that law, require full public notice, consultation with local and state government officials, the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA),	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	and compliance with all applicable laws, including NEPA, when considering any closure of an aircraft landing strip.					
HAZ general	Desired Outcomes section		x			Add bullet that indicates commitment to appropriate training for personnel.
HAZ-1	In conformance with BLM’s long-term strategies and National Policies regarding Abandoned Mine Lands (AML), work with state agencies toward identifying and addressing physical safety and environmental hazards at all AML sites on public lands. To accomplish this long-term goal, establish the following criteria to assist in determining priorities for site and area mitigation and reclamation.	x				
HAZ-2	The highest priority of the AML physical safety program would be cleaning up those 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	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	areas with high visitor use, and (c) upon formal risk assessment, a high or extremely high risk level is indicated.					
HAZ-3	AML would be factored into future recreation management area designations, land use planning assessments, and all applicable use authorizations.	x				
HAZ-4	Sites listed or eligible for listing would be entered in the Abandoned Mine Site Cleanup Module of Protection and Response Information System.	x				
HAZ-5	AML hazards should be, to the extent practicable, mitigated or remediated on the ground during site development.	x				
HAZ-6	The criteria that would be used to establish water-quality based AML program priorities are:	x				
HAZ-7	Watersheds identified by the state as a priority based on (a) one or more water laws or regulations; (b) a threat to public health or safety; and (c) a threat to the environment	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
HAZ-8	Projects reflecting a collaborative effort with other land managing agencies	x				
HAZ-9	Sites listed or eligible for listing in the Abandoned Mine Site Cleanup Module of the Protection and Response Information System	x				
HAZ-10	Projects that would be funded by contributions from collaborating agencies.	x				
HAZ-11	The State Multi-Year Work Plan would be maintained and updated as needed to reflect current policies for identifying program physical safety and water quality AML sites priorities for reclamation or remediation.	x				The State Multi-Year Work Plan is an outstanding action.
HAZ-12	Identify and clean up unauthorized dumping sites and hazardous materials spills in the RFO as required to comply with applicable state, local, and federal laws and regulations.	x				
HAZ-13	Clean up and restore areas known to have hazardous materials, hazardous wastes, or solid wastes. Areas that have been cleaned up	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	and restored would be maintained and monitored.					
HAZ-14	Actively seek responsible parties to reimburse hazardous materials cleanup costs.		x			Modify to include reference to CERCLA funding.