

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 INTRODUCTION

In accordance with the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (FLPMA), the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) is responsible for management of public lands and its resources based on the principles of multiple use and sustained yield. Management direction is provided by land use plans, which determine appropriate multiple uses, allocate resources, develop strategies to manage and protect resources, and establish systems to monitor and evaluate the status of resources and effectiveness of management. Land use plans are intended to guide management, allowing continuing uses of public land over extended time periods.

The Richfield Draft Resource Management Plan/Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DRMP/DEIS) identifies and analyzes five alternatives for future management of the public lands and resources administered by the BLM's Richfield Field Office (RFO). This DRMP/DEIS addresses the future management of 2.1 million surface/mineral estate acres of public land and an additional 95,000 acres of Federal mineral estate (underlying private or state surface) in Sanpete, Sevier, Piute, and Wayne counties, as well as portions of Garfield County. (There are also 21,500 acres of Kane County within the planning area. However, these acres lie entirely within Glen Canyon National Recreation Area (NRA), which is managed by the National Park Service (NPS), so no decisions within this DRMP/DEIS will affect those lands.) This DRMP/DEIS was prepared in cooperation with the five affected county governments, the State of Utah, several American Indian tribes, and other Federal agencies.

1.2 PURPOSE AND NEED

Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations (40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] 1502.13) require the purpose and need of an environmental impact statement (EIS) to "briefly specify the underlying purpose and need to which the agency is responding in proposing the alternatives." The purpose and need section of this DRMP/DEIS provides a context and framework for establishing and evaluating the reasonable range of alternatives described in Chapter 2.

1.2.1 Purpose

Section 102 of FLPMA sets forth the policy for periodically projecting the present and future use of public lands and their resources using the land use planning process. Sections 201 and 202 of FLPMA establish the BLM's land use planning requirements. BLM Handbook H-1601-1, *Land Use Planning Handbook*, provides guidance for implementing the BLM land use planning requirements established by Sections 201 and 202 of FLPMA and the regulations in 43 CFR 1600.

The purpose, or goal, of the land use plan is to provide a comprehensive framework for the BLM's management of the public lands within the planning area, and to ensure these public lands are managed in accordance with FLPMA and the principles of multiple use and sustained yield. The purpose of this plan revision is to consolidate the existing land use plans and their amendments, and to reevaluate, with public involvement, existing conditions, resources, and uses and reconsider the mix of resource allocations and management decisions that are designed to balance uses with the protection of resources pursuant with FLPMA and other applicable law. This Resource Management Plan (RMP) revision will address the growing needs of the planning area and result in selection of a management strategy that best achieves a combination of the following:

- Employ a community-based planning approach to collaborate with Federal, state, and local cooperating agencies.
- Resolve multiple use conflicts or issues between resource values and resource uses. The resulting RMP will establish consolidated guidance and updated goals, objectives, and management actions for the public lands in the RFO. The RMP will be comprehensive in nature and will address issues that have been identified through agency, interagency, and public scoping efforts.
- Establish goals and objectives (desired outcomes) for management of resources and resource uses within the approximately 2.1 million surface/mineral estate acres and an additional 95,000 acres of Federal mineral estate (underlying private or state surface) administered by the BLM's RFO in accordance with the principles of multiple use and sustained yield.
- Identify land use plan decisions to guide future land management actions and subsequent site-specific implementation decisions.
- Identify management actions and allowable uses anticipated to achieve the established goals and objectives and reach desired outcomes.
- Provide comprehensive management direction by making land use decisions for all appropriate resources and resource uses administered by the RFO.
- Provide for compliance with applicable tribal, Federal, and state laws, standards, implementation plans, and BLM policies and regulations.
- Recognize the Nation's needs for domestic sources of minerals, food, timber, and fiber, and incorporate requirements of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (EPCA) Reauthorization of 2000.
- Retain flexibility to adapt to new and emerging issues and opportunities and to provide for adjustments to decisions over time based on new information and monitoring.
- Strive to be compatible with existing plans and policies of adjacent local, state, tribal, and Federal agencies and be consistent with Federal law, regulations, and BLM policy.

1.2.2 Need

Management of the public lands within the planning area is currently guided by the following six land use plans.

- Forest Management Framework Plan (MFP) - approved in 1977
- Mountain Valley MFP – approved in 1982
- Henry Mountain MFP – approved in 1982
- Parker Mountain MFP – approved in 1982
- Cedar-Beaver-Garfield-Antimony RMP – approved in 1986
- San Rafael RMP – approved in 1991

The BLM identified the need, or requirement, to revise these six land use plans through a formal evaluation completed in February 2001. Since completion of these land use plans, considerable changes have occurred within the planning area. Heightened public awareness, increased public demand for use of the lands, and increases in conflict between competing resource values and land uses continue to challenge the BLM's management goals and objectives. The RFO is facing a wide variety of issues affecting local communities, regional and state interests, and the health of the public lands. This, along with emerging issues and changing circumstances, resulted in the need to revise the existing plans. Given the nature of the issues that face the RFO and their overlap between Federal, tribal, state, and local jurisdictions, the RFO will combine the six existing land use plans into one planning document - the Richfield RMP.

There are a number of new issues (such as new Federal species listings), higher levels of controversy around existing issues, and new (unforeseen) public land uses and concerns that have arisen over the years which were not included or not adequately addressed in the existing plans. These and other select examples of new data, new and revised policies, and emerging issues and changing circumstances demonstrate the need to revise the existing plans.

1.3 DESCRIPTION OF THE PLANNING AREA

The planning area, located in south-central Utah, includes all of Piute, Sanpete, Sevier, and Wayne counties and portions of Garfield and Kane counties, an area totaling 5.4 million acres (see Map 1-1). The BLM administers 2.1 million acres of public land surface and mineral estate, and an additional 95,000 acres of Federal minerals where the surface estate is in non-Federal (state or private) ownership. The BLM also has administrative responsibility for 2,082,865 acres of mineral estate where the surface is managed by other Federal agencies (U.S. Forest Service and National Park Service). On these lands, leasing of Federal minerals is subject to management as directed by the surface managing agency, and the decisions of this RMP will pertain only to the BLM’s role in administering the minerals. RMP decisions apply only to BLM-administered public lands and resources. Table 1-1 summarizes the surface land ownership within the planning area. In this document, the term “planning area” applies to all lands within the five-county area, regardless of surface ownership. It is important to note that the BLM may only make decisions that affect public lands and resources, but it is responsible for collaborative planning with the public and adjacent jurisdictions so as to consider the impacts of its actions on all resources in the region.

Table 1-1. Land Ownership – Richfield Planning Area

Ownership	Acres	Percent of Planning Area
Public lands (BLM administered)	2,128,200	39
National forests	1,476,400	27
National parks and recreation areas	608,500	11
Private	803,600	15
State of Utah School and Institutional Trust Lands Administration (SITLA)	385,300	7
Other state, county, city, wildlife, park, and outdoor recreation areas	36,700	1
Tribal lands	1,200	<1
Total	5,439,900	100

1.4 PLANNING PROCESS

FLPMA requires the BLM to use land use plans as tools by which "present and future use is projected" (43 U.S.C. 1701 (a)(2)). FLPMA's implementing regulations for planning, 43 CFR Part 1600, state that land use plans are a preliminary step in the overall process of managing public lands, "designed to guide and control future management actions and the development of subsequent, more detailed and limited scope plans for resources and uses" (43 CFR Part 1601.0-2). Public participation and input are important components of land use planning.

Revision of existing land use plans is a major Federal action for the BLM. The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as amended, requires Federal agencies to prepare an EIS for major Federal actions (USDI Departmental Manual Part 516 Chapter 11.4A(1)); thus, this DEIS accompanies the

revision of the existing plans. This DRMP/DEIS analyzes the impacts of five alternative scenarios for management of the public lands and resources within the planning area, including the No Action Alternative. The No Action Alternative reflects current management (the existing plans). NEPA requires analysis of a No Action Alternative.

The BLM uses a nine-step planning process (see Figure 1-1) when developing and revising RMPs, as required by 43 CFR 1600 and planning program guidance in the BLM Land Use Planning Handbook H-1601-1. The planning process is designed to help the BLM identify the uses of BLM administered lands desired by the public and to consider these uses to the extent they are consistent with the laws established by Congress and the policies of the executive branch of the Federal government.

The planning process is issue-driven (Step 1). The plan revision process is undertaken to resolve management issues and problems as well as to take advantage of management opportunities. The BLM utilized the public scoping process to identify planning issues to direct (drive) the revision of the existing plans. The scoping process was also used to introduce the public to preliminary planning criteria, which set limits to the scope of the RMP revision (Step 2).

As appropriate, the BLM used existing data from a variety of sources and collected new data as necessary to address planning issues and to fill data gaps identified during public scoping (Step 3). Using these data, the planning issues, and the planning criteria, the BLM conducted an Analysis of the Management Situation (AMS) (Step 4) to describe current management and identify management opportunities for addressing the planning issues. Current management reflects management under the existing plans and management that would continue through selection of the No Action Alternative. The existing affected environment is summarized from the AMS into Chapter 3 of the DRMP/DEIS. The AMS is included as part of the Administrative Record for this plan and is available in the RFO and on the RFO's planning website (at www.blm.gov/ut/st/en/fo/richfield/planning.html).

Results of the first four steps of the planning process clarified the purpose and need and identified key planning issues that need to be addressed in the new RMP. Key planning issues reflect the focus of the RMP revision and are described in more detail in the Planning Issues section of this DRMP/DEIS.

Alternatives constitute a range of management actions which are anticipated to achieve identified goals or objectives. During alternative formulation (Step 5), the BLM collaborated with cooperating agencies to identify goals and objectives (desired outcomes) for resources and resource uses in the planning area. These desired outcomes addressed the key planning issues, were constrained by the planning criteria, and incorporated the management opportunities identified by the BLM. Details of the alternatives were developed through the identification of management actions and allowable uses anticipated to achieve the goals and objectives. The alternatives represent a reasonable range for managing resources and resource uses within the planning area under the multiple use and sustained yield mandate of FLPMA. Chapter 2 of this document describes and summarizes the alternatives.

This DRMP/DEIS also includes an analysis of the impacts of each alternative in Chapter 4 (Step 6). With input from cooperating agencies and BLM specialists, and in consideration of planning issues, planning criteria, and the impacts of the alternatives, the BLM has identified a Preferred Alternative (Alternative B) from among the five alternatives (Step 7). This is documented in the DRMP/DEIS, which will be distributed to the public for review and comment (also Step 7).

Step 8 of the land use planning process will occur following receipt and consideration of public comments on the DRMP/DEIS. In preparing the Proposed RMP/Final EIS, BLM will consider all comments received during the public comment period. In developing the Proposed RMP/Final EIS, the Utah BLM State Director, who is the decision maker for this plan revision, has the authority and discretion to select

an alternative in its entirety or to combine components of the various alternatives presented to prioritize differing resources and/or uses consistent with the multiple use and sustained yield mandate. The regulations at 43 CFR Part 1610 provide, prior to the approval of the proposed RMP, a 60-day period for the Governor of Utah for “consistency review” and a 30-day period to protest the Proposed RMP to the BLM Director for “any person who participated in the planning process and has an interest which is or may be adversely affected by the approval” of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS. Step 9, Monitoring and Evaluation, occurs after a Record of Decision (ROD) is issued and the Approved RMP is being implemented.

Figure 1-1. Nine Step Planning Process

- Step 1** Scoping and Identification of Issues.*
- Step 2** Development of Planning Criteria.*
- Step 3** Inventory Data and Information Collection.
- Step 4** Analysis of the Management Situation.
- Step 5** Formulation of Alternatives.
- Step 6** Estimation of Effects of Alternatives.
- Step 7** Selection of Preferred Alternative. This step includes preparation and public distribution of the DRMP/DEIS for public review and comment.
- Step 8** Selection of the RMP. This step involves preparation and public distribution of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS.*
- Step 9** Monitoring and Evaluation.**

*Public participation is invited throughout the planning process but is formally requested at these steps.

**The RMP will be revised as necessary based on monitoring and evaluation findings, new data, new or revised policy, and changes in circumstances consistent with applicable laws and regulations.

1.5 DECISION FRAMEWORK

As stated in the previous section, identifying the planning issues and developing planning criteria are the first steps in defining the scope of the RMP revision. The planning issues and criteria provide the framework in which planning decisions are made. Planning decisions refer to what is established or determined by the approved RMP. The RMP provides guidance for planning decisions according to the following categories:

- Physical, biological, and cultural resources
- Resource uses
- Special designations

In the context of these categories, management strategies were developed to provide viable options for addressing planning issues. The management strategies provide the building blocks from which general management scenarios and the more detailed resource management alternatives were developed. The resource management alternatives reflect a reasonable range of management options that fall within limits set by the planning criteria. The planning issues and planning criteria used to revise the existing plans are described in the following sections.

1.5.1 Planning Issues

The BLM conducted an early and open scoping process to determine the scope, or range, of issues to be addressed in this DRMP/DEIS. Scoping identifies the affected public and agency concerns, defines the relevant issues and alternatives that will be examined in detail in the RMP/EIS, and eliminates those that are not significant. The BLM's Handbook H-1601-1 *Land Use Planning Handbook* defines planning issues as "...disputes or controversies about existing and potential land and resource allocations, levels of resource use, production, and related management practices."

Public scoping was designed to meet the public involvement requirements of FLPMA and NEPA. This cooperative process included soliciting input from interested state and local governments, tribal governments, other Federal agencies and organizations, and individuals, to identify the scope of issues to be addressed in the plan and to assist in the formulation of reasonable alternatives. The scoping process was an excellent method for opening dialogue between the BLM and the general public about management of the public lands and for identifying the concerns of those who have an interest in the area.

As part of the scoping process, the BLM also requested that the public submit nominations for potential Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACECs) and nominations of rivers for potential inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System (NWSRS).

The scoping period for the Richfield RMP began on November 1, 2001 with publication of the Notice of Intent (NOI) in the Federal Register, and ended on April 1, 2002. Scoping included open-house meetings in five communities (Richfield, Junction, Manti, Loa, and Salt Lake City, Utah). In addition, news releases were used to notify the public regarding the scoping period and the planning process and to invite the public to provide written comments. The RFO received written comments via email, fax, and regular mail. Comments obtained from the public during the scoping period were used to define the relevant issues that would be addressed by a reasonable range of alternatives.

For the Richfield planning process, scoping comments received were placed in one of three categories:

- Issues to be resolved in the DRMP/DEIS;
- Issues addressed through other policy or administrative action (and therefore not addressed in the DRMP/DEIS);
- Issues eliminated from detailed analysis because they are beyond the scope of the DRMP/DEIS.

Some important issues to be addressed in the RMP were identified by the public and other agencies during the scoping process. The Richfield RMP/EIS Scoping Report (available for review on the RMP planning web page at www.blm.gov/ut/st/en/fo/richfield/planning.html) summarizes the scoping process. The issues identified in the Scoping Report fall into one of 12 broad categories. Other resource and use issues are identified in the BLM Planning Handbook (H-1601-1). All of these issues were considered in developing the alternatives brought forward in this DRMP/DEIS.

1.5.1.1 Issues to be Addressed in the Richfield RMP

Those planning issues determined to be within the scope of the EIS are used to develop one or more of the alternatives or are addressed in other parts of the EIS. For example, as planning issues were refined, the BLM collaborated with cooperating agencies to develop a reasonable range of alternatives designed to address and (or) resolve key planning issues, such as what areas, if any, contain unique or sensitive resources requiring special management. A reasonable range of alternatives provides various scenarios for how the BLM and cooperating agencies can address this and other key planning issues, including the management of resources and resource uses in the planning area. In other words, key planning issues

serve as the rationale for alternative development. The key planning issues identified for developing alternatives in this DEIS are listed below:

Issue 1: Where and to what extent can transportation and access be managed to satisfy public demand while protecting natural and cultural resource values?

Use of the public lands in southern Utah (for recreation, commercial uses, and general enjoyment) has grown in popularity in recent years. With this popularity has come a demand for greater variety and availability of access opportunities, including off-highway vehicle (OHV) use. With the number of visitors growing, resource and user conflicts are becoming more common. OHV use needs to be managed, including identifying areas to be restricted or closed for the protection of other resource values.

Issue 2: What areas should be designated for special management (e.g., ACECs and Wild and Scenic Rivers) and how should these areas be managed?

FLPMA and BLM policy require the BLM to give priority to designation and protection of ACECs during the land use planning process. The Wild and Scenic River (WSR) Act directs Federal agencies to consider the potential for including watercourses into the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System during the land use planning process. The alternatives analyzed in this DRMP/DEIS include a range of management prescriptions for managing the potential ACECs, as well as for managing the eligible rivers as suitable WSRs.

Issue 3: Where should non-wilderness study area (WSA) lands with wilderness characteristics be managed?

The RFO includes lands outside of designated WSAs that contain the wilderness characteristics of naturalness, outstanding opportunities for solitude, and outstanding opportunities for primitive or unconfined recreation. The DRMP/DEIS will analyze alternative decisions and levels of protection for non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics.

Issue 4: How should recreation activities be managed to satisfy public demand while protecting natural and cultural resource values?

Recreation in southern Utah has grown in popularity in recent years. With this popularity has come a demand for a greater variety and availability of recreation opportunities such as motorized and non-motorized trails (including equestrian trails), climbing, mountain biking, hiking, and camping. With the number of visitors growing, resource and user conflicts are becoming more common. Recreational use needs to be managed, including identifying special recreation management areas (SRMAs) where management attention is needed to highlight important recreational opportunities or deal with problems such as conflicts between users or impacts on other resources.

Issue 5: What areas will be available for mineral development, and what restrictions should be imposed?

Mineral development is considered a major issue for the planning area not only for economic reasons but also for the degree to which it can potentially affect other resources (including soils, vegetation, water quality, wildlife habitat and naturalness, solitude, and opportunities for primitive or unconfined recreation). Throughout this DRMP/DEIS, energy and mineral development will be analyzed in the context of the need for protection of other resources. BLM has management discretion in four areas, and the alternatives include a range of options for each:

- Areas closed or open to oil and gas leasing and the stipulations on leasing within the open areas
- Areas closed or open to disposal of salable minerals (mineral materials)
- Areas proposed for withdrawal from entry under the mining laws
- Areas available for further consideration for coal leasing (coal unsuitability)

Issue 6: What areas will be available for livestock grazing, in light of resource conflicts?

The Secretary of the Interior, through the BLM, manages approximately 264 million acres of public rangelands throughout the Western U.S. The Taylor Grazing Act of 1934, FLPMA, and the Public Rangelands Improvement Act of 1978 together guide the BLM's management of livestock grazing on public lands. The objectives for grazing administration regulations are to: "promote healthy sustainable rangeland ecosystems; accelerate restoration and improvement of public rangelands to properly functioning condition; efficiently and effectively administer domestic livestock grazing; and provide for the sustainability of the Western livestock industry and communities that are dependent upon productive, healthy public rangelands" (43 CFR § 4100.0-2).

This DRMP/DEIS will review and update the status of lands available or unavailable for livestock grazing, as referred to in 43 CFR 4130.2. When rangeland health assessment, monitoring data, inventory data, or other inputs indicate changes are needed for resource improvement, these changes will be pursued at the implementation level on a site-specific basis, as per the BLM's Land Use Planning Handbook (H-1601-1).

Issue 7: How can resources such as vegetation, soils, and wildlife be protected, maintained, or restored?

Some resource uses (e.g., grazing, mineral development, OHV use, and recreation) can affect the natural function and condition of plant communities that provide habitat for wildlife. A healthy cover of perennial vegetation stabilizes the soil, increases infiltration of precipitation, reduces runoff, provides clean water to adjacent streams, and minimizes noxious weed invasion. Healthy plant communities provide habitat for a variety of wildlife species, including special status species.

The alternatives address wildlife and wildlife habitat in terms of the interactions of other resources and resource uses (such as oil and gas leasing, OHV area and route designations, and development of rights-of-way [ROWs]) with wildlife and their habitat.

The management of habitat for plant and animal species listed under the Endangered Species Act (ESA), such as the Mexican spotted owl, Wright fishhook cactus, and the Utah prairie dog, as well as other species considered sensitive, such as the greater sage grouse and the pygmy rabbit, were raised as issues by the BLM, other Federal and state agencies, and the public. In recognition of their importance, the alternatives address special status species separately from other wildlife species.

Issue 8: Where is fire desired and not desired, and in what areas could fire be utilized as a management tool for vegetative treatments?

Drought and beetle infestation in southern Utah have contributed to hazardous fuel loading, increasing the threat of wildfires. Areas of pinyon die-off and dry grasslands have also created areas of higher risk for fire hazard and could require treatment. A fire management plan is to be developed to address high risk areas, fire prevention, prescribed burns, rehabilitation and restoration, hazardous fuels reduction, and the protection of life and property.

Issue 9: What lands within the planning area should be identified as targets for acquisition, disposal or withdrawal?

As mandated by Section 102 (a)(1) of FLPMA (43 U.S.C. § 1701), public lands are retained in Federal ownership, the exception being those public lands that have future potential for disposal (e.g., sale or exchange), as described under Section 203(a) and Section 206 of FLPMA (43 U.S.C. §§ 1713 and 1716).

Public lands cannot be effectively administered without legal and physical access. Therefore, public lands have potential for disposal when they are isolated and/or difficult to manage. Lands identified for disposal must meet public objectives, such as community expansion and economic development. Disposals would be accomplished using a variety of methods, including land sales, land exchange, sale or lease under the Recreation and Public Purposes Act of 1926 (R&PP), etc. Public lands can be considered for disposal, other than via FLPMA sale, on a case-by-case basis. Disposal actions are usually in response to a public request or an application and result in a title transfer, wherein the lands leave the public domain. In addition, the BLM will consider acquisition of non-Federal lands that meet resource management objectives through negotiated purchase, donation, or exchange from willing sellers. In a withdrawal of lands, an area of public land is withheld from settlement, sale, location, or entry, for the purpose of limiting activities in order to maintain other public values.

Although specific decisions on social and economic factors are not included as part of the DRMP/DEIS, the impacts of the management actions contained within the alternatives are analyzed for their impacts on socioeconomic conditions. Social and economic factors are identified in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment) and analyzed in Chapter 4 (Environmental Consequences). There are also other issues related to resources and resource uses that are required to be considered during land use planning efforts in accordance with BLM's Land Use Planning Handbook (H-1610-1) and NEPA regulations and policy. These include decisions for soil and water, management of rights-of-way (ROWs), environmental justice, and air quality.

1.5.1.2 Issues Considered But Not Further Analyzed

1.5.1.2.1 Issues Addressed Through Policy or Administrative Action

Policy or administrative actions include those actions that are implemented by the BLM because they are standard operating procedure, because Federal law requires them, or because they are BLM policy. Administrative actions do not require a planning decision to implement. They are, therefore, issues that are eliminated from detailed analysis in this planning effort. The following issues can be addressed by policy or administrative actions:

- Compliance with existing laws and policies (e.g., FLPMA, NEPA, Endangered Species Act, American Antiquities Act, Clean Air Act, Clean Water Act, National Historic Preservation Act [NHPA]).
- The allocation of forage between livestock and wildlife, and the application of specific management practices on allotments within the RFO is provided for through the application of Utah's Standards for Rangeland Health, Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management, and supporting monitoring data. When monitoring and inventory data indicate a need, changes to the allocation of forage for livestock and wildlife are made after coordination with permittees, the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources, and other affected interests in order to assure that resource objectives are met. Livestock grazing management practices may also be adjusted to assure that grazing practices are compatible with other uses of the public lands. These allocation and management adjustments are implementation decisions according to the BLM's Land Use Planning Handbook (H-1601-1), and are done on an allotment or other site-specific basis.

- Education, enforcement/prosecution, vandalism, and volunteer coordination.
- Assist in resolving, to the extent possible, inconsistencies between Federal and non-Federal agency plans, and to be consistent with state and local plans to the maximum extent, consistent with Federal law and the purposes of FLPMA.
- Management of cultural resources, which includes up-to-date inventories, non-disclosure of sensitive sites, proposal of cultural sites for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), and Native American consultation.
- Management of the RFO's 11 existing WSAs (approximately 348,800 acres) under the Interim Management Policy (IMP) for Lands Under Wilderness Review (BLM Handbook H-8550-1). The BLM is statutorily (FLPMA Section 603(c)) required to manage these areas to protect their suitability for Congressional designation into 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 visual resource management (VRM) Class I and determining if the WSAs will be limited or closed to OHV use.
- Completion of inventory of riparian and wetland areas and the use of monitoring and mitigation to help protect these resources.
- Recreation management improvements, including a comprehensive sign system and maps.
- Administration of existing mineral leases, permits, and other authorized uses.
- Administration of valid existing rights.
- Monitoring wildlife and biodiversity.
- Monitoring air quality.
- Mitigation measures for site-specific projects.
- Noxious weed control.
- Eligibility standards for specially designated areas.
- Protection of threatened, endangered, or sensitive species.
- Coordination with local, state, and Federal agencies.
- Cooperation with user groups.

1.5.1.2.2 Issues beyond the Scope of the RMP

Issues beyond the scope of the RMP process include all issues not related to decisions that would occur as a result of the planning process. They include decisions that are not under the jurisdiction of the RFO or are beyond the capability of the BLM to resolve as part of the planning process. Issues identified in this category include:

- Settlement of RS 2477 claims. The State of Utah and Garfield, Piute, Sanpete, Sevier and Wayne counties may hold valid existing highway rights-of-way across public lands in the planning area pursuant to Revised Statute (RS) 2477, Act of July 26, 1866, chapter 262, § 8, 14 Stat. 251, 253, *codified at* 43 USC § 932. This RMP does not adjudicate, analyze, or otherwise determine the validity of claimed RS 2477 rights-of-way. Nothing in this RMP extinguishes any valid right-of-way, or alters in any way the legal rights the State of Utah and Garfield, Piute, Sanpete, Sevier and Wayne counties have to assert and protect RS 2477 rights, and to challenge in Federal court or other appropriate venue any use restrictions imposed by the RMP that they believe are inconsistent with their rights. Once a claimed right-of-way is recognized by the BLM through an administrative determination, or a right-of-way is determined to be valid by a court of law, any use restriction imposed by this RMP shall no longer apply to it.
- New proposals for WSAs or wilderness.

- Activities and uses beyond the jurisdiction of the BLM.
- Changing existing laws, policies, and regulations.
- Availability of funding and personnel for managing programs.

1.5.2 Planning Criteria

BLM planning regulations (43 CFR 1610) require the preparation of planning criteria as preliminary to the development of all RMPs. Planning criteria are the standards, rules, and guidelines that help to guide the planning process. These criteria influence all aspects of the planning process, including inventory and data collection, developing issues to address, formulating alternatives, estimating impacts, and selecting the Preferred Alternative. In conjunction with the planning issues, planning criteria ensure that the planning process is focused and incorporates appropriate analyses. Planning criteria are developed from appropriate laws, regulations, and policies as well as from public participation and coordination with cooperating agencies, other Federal agencies, state and local governments, and American Indian tribes.

Planning criteria used in the development of this RMP are:

- The RMP will recognize the existence of valid existing rights.
- The RMP will comply with applicable laws, regulations, executive orders, and BLM supplemental program guidance.
- Planning decisions will cover BLM-administered public lands, including split-estate lands where the Federal government has retained the sub-surface mineral estate.
- Planning decisions will use and observe the principles of multiple use and sustained yield set forth in FLPMA and other applicable law (43 United States Code [USC] 1701 (c)(1)).
- The BLM will use a systematic interdisciplinary approach to achieve integrated consideration of physical, biological, economic, and other sciences (43 USC 1701 (c)(2)).
- Areas potentially suitable for ACEC or other special designations will be identified and, where appropriate, brought forward for analysis in the EIS (43 USC 1701 (c)(3)).
- The BLM will rely, to the extent it is available, on the inventory of public lands, their resources, and other values (43 USC 1701 (c)(4)).
- The BLM will consider present and potential uses of the public lands (43 USC 1701 (c)(5)).
- The BLM will consider the relative scarcity of the values involved and the availability of alternative means (including recycling) and sites for the realization of those values (43 USC 1701 (c)(6)).
- The BLM will consider the relationship between short-term uses of man's environment and the maintenance and enhancement of long-term productivity.
- Decisions in the RMP will comply with applicable pollution control laws, including state and Federal air, water, noise, or other pollution standards or implementation plans (43 USC 1701 (c)(8)).
- To the extent consistent with the laws governing the administration of the public lands" (FLPMA 202 b(9)), BLM will be consistent with existing officially adopted and approved resource-related plans, policies, or programs of other Federal agencies, state agencies, American Indian tribes, and local governments that may be affected (43 CFR 1610.3-1 (c)(9)).

1.6 RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER PROGRAMS, PLANS, AND POLICIES

1.6.1 Other Related Plans

FLPMA requires that the BLM, when developing or revising land use plans, shall—

...to the extent consistent with the laws governing the administration of the public lands, coordinate the land use inventory, planning, and management of activities of or for such lands with the land use planning and management programs of other Federal departments and agencies and of the States and local governments within which the lands are located...and assure that consideration is given to those State, local and tribal land use plans for public lands [and] assist in resolving, to the extent practical, inconsistencies between Federal and non-Federal Government plans...(43 U.S.C. S 1712 (c) (9))

The BLM must keep apprised of the many ongoing programs, plans, and policies that are being implemented in the planning area by other Federal, state, local, and tribal governments. The BLM will seek to be consistent with or complementary to other management actions whenever possible. Plans that need to be considered during the RFO's planning effort are identified in Table 1-2.

Table 1-2. Plans to be Considered in the Richfield Resource Management Plan

Plan Types	Specific Plans
County Plans	Garfield County General Plan, 1998 General Plan for Piute County, 1994 Sanpete County General Plan, 1997 Sevier County General Plan, 1998 General Plan for Wayne County, 1994 Utah Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy (State Wildlife Action Plan), 2005
State of Utah	Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP), 2000 Utah Water Quality Plan
National Forest Plans	Manti-LaSal National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan Dixie National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan Fishlake National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan Uinta National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan
National Park Service Plans	Capitol Reef National Park General Management Plan, 1988 Glen Canyon National Recreation Area General Management Plan Glen Canyon National Recreation Area Grazing Management Plan Canyonlands National Park General Management Plan

Plan Types	Specific Plans
Habitat Plans	Parker Mountain Habitat Management Plan Henry Mountains Desert Bighorn Sheep Habitat Management Plan Antimony Habitat Management Plan
Threatened and Endangered Species Recovery Plans	Maguire Daisy Recovery Plan, 1995 Mexican Spotted Owl Recovery Plan, 1995 Utah Reed-Mustards Recovery Plan, 1994 Last Chance Townsendia Recovery Plan, 1993 Northern States Bald Eagle Recovery Plan, 1983 Wright Fishhook Cactus Recovery Plan, 1985 Southwest Willow Flycatcher Recovery Plan, 2001 Utah Prairie Dog Recovery Plan, 1991 Utah Prairie Dog Interim Conservation Strategy, 1997
BLM Programmatic Environmental Analyses	Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement on Oil Shale and Tar Sands Leasing Energy Corridor Programmatic EIS Utah Land Use Plan Amendment for Fire and Fuels Management, 2005 Wind Energy Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement, 2005 Vegetation Treatments on BLM lands in 17 Western States Programmatic Environmental Report, 2007 Vegetation Treatments Using Herbicides in 17 Western States Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement, 2007

Consistency with national forest plans is ongoing because three of the four national forests that share boundaries with the RFO are revising their land use plans. In developing their respective management plans, the U.S. Forest Service (USFS) and BLM have coordinated OHV area and route designations, potential wild and scenic rivers evaluations, and other resources of mutual concern.

1.6.2 Energy Policy and Conservation Act

In May 2001, the Bush administration's Comprehensive National Energy Policy was issued, which directed the Secretary of the Interior to:

... examine land status and lease stipulation impediments to Federal oil and gas leasing, and review and modify those where opportunities exist (consistent with the law, good environmental practice and balanced use of other resources).

Under this directive, the Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Land and Minerals Management delivered to Congress an inventory of U.S. oil and gas resources in five western basins, as well as the extent and nature of any restrictions or impediments to their development. This report was prepared at the request of Congress under the provisions of the 2000 Energy Policy and Conservation Act.

In April 2003, the BLM Washington Office (WO) specified the following four EPCA integration principles to be incorporated into planning:

1. Environmental protection and energy production are both desirable and necessary objectives of sound land management practices and are not to be considered mutually exclusive priorities.
2. The BLM must ensure appropriate accessibility to energy resources necessary for the nation's security, while recognizing that special and unique non-energy resources can be preserved.
3. Sound planning will weigh the relative resource values, consistent with FLPMA.
4. All resource impacts, including those associated with energy development and transmission, will be mitigated to prevent unnecessary or undue degradation.

1.6.3 Tar Sands Programmatic EIS

The RFO contains areas of tar sands resources. This resource has been, and currently is, available for lease under the Combined Hydrocarbon Leasing Act of 1981 and in accordance with the decisions in the existing BLM land use plans.

The major tar sand resources lie only in Utah within 11 designated Special Tar Sands Areas (STSAs) managed by the BLM's Vernal, Price, Richfield, and Monticello Field Offices (FOs). The RFO manages one of these STSAs.

When the Richfield RMP was initiated in 2001, there was no reasonably foreseeable development (RFD) expectation for tar sands over the life of the plan. The mineral report identified this resource, but did not foresee any leasing or development due to prevailing and anticipated economic factors.

Since the start of this RMP revision, Congress enacted the Energy Policy Act of 2005. Section 369 of the Energy Policy Act requires the Secretary of Interior to "complete a programmatic environmental impact statement for a commercial leasing program for oil shale and tar sands resources on public lands, with an emphasis on the most geologically prospective lands within each of the States of Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming." On December 13, 2005 the BLM published a Notice of Intent in the *Federal Register* initiating a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) to support a commercial oil shale and tar sands leasing program on Federal lands in these three states.

In light of this statutory requirement, all decisions related to tar sands leasing in this RMP are being deferred to the ongoing Oil Shale and Tar Sands Leasing PEIS and subsequent Record of Decision. The Record of Decision on the final PEIS will amend the existing land use plans by changing allocation decisions on whether or not to allow leasing and future development of tar sands on public lands for those areas where the resource is present. Additional opportunities for public involvement and comment will occur when the PEIS becomes available in draft form. Site-specific requirements will be addressed in future NEPA analysis for specific project applications after the PEIS is completed. This RMP will, however, develop allocation decisions for conventional oil and gas leasing in the STSAs.

1.6.4 Energy Corridor Programmatic EIS

Section 368 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (designation of West-wide energy corridors) is being implemented through the current development of an interagency PEIS. The PEIS will address numerous energy corridor related issues, including the utilization of existing corridors (enhancements and upgrades), identification of new corridors, supply and demand considerations, and compatibility with other corridor and project planning efforts. It is likely that the identification of corridors in the PEIS will affect the RFO, and the decisions in the approved PEIS will be carried forward into the Approved RMP, or depending on timing, the PEIS will amend the RFO RMP.

1.6.5 Utah Land Use Plan Amendment for Fire and Fuels Management

The decisions reached through the *Utah Land Use Plan Amendment for Fire and Fuels Management* process, approved in September 2005, are common to all alternatives and the analysis is incorporated by reference. The fire plan amendment:

- Established landscape-level, fire management goals and objectives.
- Described desired wildland fire conditions (DWFC) by Fire Regime Condition Class (FRCC) and the management strategies and actions to meet DWFC and land use allocations.
- Described areas where fire may be restored to the ecosystem through wildland fire use for resource benefit and areas where wildland fire use is not appropriate.
- Identified criteria that would be used for establishing fire management priorities.
- Identified maximum burned areas and treatment acres for wildland fire, wildland fire use for resource benefit, prescribed fire treatments, non-fire fuel treatments, and emergency stabilization and rehabilitation (ESR) actions.

1.6.6 Wind Energy Programmatic EIS

The Record of Decision for the *Wind Energy Development Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement*, which implements a comprehensive wind energy development program to administer the development of wind energy resources on BLM-administered public lands in 11 western states (including Utah), was approved in December 2005. The decisions reached through the Wind Energy Development Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement process are common to all alternatives in the Richfield RMP and the analysis is incorporated by reference. The decision established policies and best management practices (BMPs) for the administration of wind energy development activities and established minimum requirements for mitigation measures.

1.7 CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION

This section describes specific actions taken by the BLM to consult and coordinate with American Indian tribes, government agencies, and interest groups, and to involve the interested public during preparation of the DRMP/DEIS. A Notice of Intent published in the *Federal Register* (FR) on November 1, 2001 formally announced the intent of the BLM to revise the existing plans and prepare the associated EIS. Publication of the NOI initiated the scoping process and invited participation of affected and interested agencies, organizations, and the general public in determining the scope and issues to be addressed by alternatives and analyzed in the EIS. Additional detail regarding actions taken by the BLM to involve the public and consult and coordinate with American Indian tribes, government agencies, and interest groups is provided in Chapter 5.

1.7.1 Consultation with American Indian Tribes

Consultation with American Indian tribes is part of the NEPA scoping process and a requirement of FLPMA. RMPs must address consistency with tribal plans and protection of treaty rights and must observe specific planning coordination authorities, including complying with relevant portions of the National Historic Preservation Act, American Indian Religious Freedom Act, Executive Order 13007 (*Indian Sacred Sites*), and Executive Order 12898 (*Environmental Justice*). In developing the Richfield DRMP/DEIS, BLM representatives have met with representatives of several American Indian tribes to inform them of the planning process and solicit information on potential issues and concerns. Tribal

consultation on the RMP revision began in May of 2002 and is still ongoing. American Indian tribes and organizations consulted to date include:

- Hopi Tribe (Kykotsmovi, Arizona)
- Ute Tribe (Ft. Duchesne, Utah)
- Southern Ute Tribe (Ignacio, Colorado)
- Ute Mountain Ute Tribe (Towaoc, Colorado)
- Navajo Nation (Window Rock, Arizona)
- Kaibab Band of Paiute Indians (Pipe Springs, Arizona)
- Paiute Indian Tribe of Utah (Cedar City, Utah)
- Navajo Utah Commission (Montezuma Creek, Utah)
- Moapa Paiute Tribe (Moapa, Nevada)
- Utah Division of Indian Affairs, Salt Lake City, Utah

A more detailed discussion of consultation with American Indian tribes can be found in Chapter 5 of this DRMP/DEIS.

1.7.2 Cooperating Agencies

CEQ requirements contained in 40 CFR 1501.6 and 1508.5 implement the NEPA mandate that Federal agencies responsible for preparing NEPA analysis and documentation do so “in cooperation with state and local governments” and other agencies with jurisdiction by law or special expertise (42 USC 4331(a), 4332(2)). In support of this mandate, the BLM invited local, county, state, and tribal agencies to participate as cooperating agencies in the development of the Richfield RMP. Cooperating agency status offers the opportunity for interested agencies to assume additional roles and responsibilities beyond the collaborative planning processes of attending public meetings and reviewing and commenting on plan documents. Six agencies accepted the invitations to become formal cooperating agencies in developing the RMP and signed cooperating agency agreements: the State of Utah; and Garfield, Piute, Sanpete, Sevier, and Wayne counties. Other Federal agencies, including the U.S. Forest Service U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), and National Park Service also participated as members of the interdisciplinary team to develop the RMP but were not formal cooperating agencies.

1.7.3 Consultation with USFWS

In 2001, the BLM and USFWS signed and implemented a Consultation Agreement for the RMP revisions in the Vernal, Price, and Richfield Field Offices (BLM and USFWS 2001). That document defined the respective roles and responsibilities of the two agencies and addressed the Section 7 consultation process to be followed for listed, proposed, or candidate species and their habitat located within the respective planning areas. As part of the implementation of this agreement, the RFO has consulted with USFWS throughout development of the DRMP/DEIS. The RFO will continue consultation with the USFWS through completion of the final biological assessment (BA) and Proposed RMP/Final EIS.

The BLM sent a letter to the USFWS concerning Section 7 consultation, presenting the approach for consultation, including the process of Programmatic Species-Specific Section 7 consultations on Utah BLM RMPs. The USFWS provided a species list to the RFO for evaluating BLM Section 7 responsibilities. A draft biological assessment analyzing potential impacts to these species has been prepared and informally submitted to the USFWS for comment. The BLM has incorporated into the DRMP/DEIS a list of species-specific conservation measures common to all alternatives that will serve to provide management direction for habitat of listed species (Appendix 14). These measures were

developed as a result of a statewide programmatic Section 7 consultation effort on existing land use plans. Section 7 consultation has previously occurred for the oil and gas lease sale program within the RFO. A set of lease notices, developed as part of that consultation, have been incorporated into this DRMP/DEIS, as standard requirements common to all alternatives (see Appendix 11).

Formal Section 7 consultation will proceed with the BLM's submission of a final biological assessment prepared for the Proposed RMP/Final EIS. The USFWS will respond with a biological opinion that will be included in the administrative record. The BLM will consider application of all measures suggested by the USFWS.