

**Pre-Plan Contract  
for the  
Monticello Field Office  
Resource Management Plan**

**Prepared by  
the Monticello Field Office**

**September, 2002**

**Pre-Plan Contract  
for the  
Monticello Field Office  
Resource Management Plan**

**RECOMMENDED:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
ACTING, Field Manager

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

**APPROVED:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Sally Wisely, Utah State Director

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>General Status Map Monticello Field Office</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>A. INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1</b>
1. Background	1
2. Purpose and Need	2
3. Relationship to Other Programs, Plans or Policies	3
<b>B. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PROCESS AND INTEREST GROUPS</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>B. PRELIMINARY PLANNING CRITERIA</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>D. PRELIMINARY PLANNING ISSUES AND MANAGEMENT CONCERNS</b>	<b>8</b>
1. Air Quality	9
2. Cultural, Paleontology, and Natural History	9
3. Fire Management	9
4. Woodland Harvest and Management	9
5. Hazardous Sites, Materials and Wastes	10
6. Lands and Realty	10
7. Minerals Management	10
9. Off-Highway Vehicle Use	11
10. Rangeland Health/Rehabilitation	11
11. Recreation	11
12. Vegetation and Special Status Plants	12
13. Visual Resources	12
14. Watersheds and Water Quality	12
15. Wilderness	13
17. Wild and Scenic Rivers	13
18. Special Management Areas	13
19. Wildlife Habitat and Special Status Species Management	14
<b>E. DATA and GIS NEEDS</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>F. PARTICIPANTS IN THE PROCESS (Planning Team)</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>G. FORMAT AND PROCESS FOR THE PLAN</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>H. PLAN PREPARATION SCHEDULE</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>I. BUDGET</b>	<b>19</b>

**TABLES ..... 20**  
**TABLE 1: MONTICELLO FIELD OFFICE PLAN PREPARATION SCHEDULE**  
**..... 20**

**APPENDICES ..... 23**  
**APPENDIX A: PUBLIC PARTICIPATION SCHEDULE ..... 24**  
**APPENDIX B: CONTACT/COMMENT DOCUMENTATION ..... 27**  
**APPENDIX C: GEOSPATIAL DATA DEVELOPMENT ..... 28**  
**APPENDIX D: PRE-PLAN DATA STATUS ..... 32**  
**APPENDIX E: PRELIMINARY DEIS FORMAT AND CONTENT OUTLINE**  
**..... 43**

**GLOSSARY ..... 43**

**INDEX ..... 43**

# **General Status Map Monticello Field Office**

**PREPARATION PLAN  
FOR THE  
MONTICELLO FIELD OFFICE  
RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN**

**A. INTRODUCTION**

In July 2001, a Land Use Plan Evaluation (Plan Evaluation) was conducted on the San Juan Resource Management Plan (SJRMP). The goal of the Plan Evaluation was to determine if the SJRMP was providing an effective guide for multiple-use management of the public lands or if an amendment or revision was required. The findings and recommendations of the Plan Evaluation was to use the existing decisions from the SJRMP that were still valid for the Monticello Field Office (MFO) and to address needed changes by preparing a plan revision. The evaluation was conducted to identify issues and consider options for resolving the identified issues in new planning efforts.

Based on the results of the Plan Evaluation the MFO proposes to revise the SJRMP and prepare an Environmental Impact Statement/Resource Management Plan (EIS/RMP) for lands previously covered by the SJRMP. Overall much of the management direction, assumptions, goals, and objectives from the SJRMP are still expected to apply, however, a plan revision is necessary to incorporate new circumstances and data, increased demands on limited resources, changing resource use and trends, and address issues related to energy exploration and development.

**1. Background**

The MFO is responsible for management of BLM administered lands and resources in the majority of San Juan County in southeastern Utah. The field office boundary is bordered by the Colorado state line on the east, the Arizona state line on the south, the Colorado River on the west, and Canyonlands National Park and the Moab Field Office on the north. Monticello, Blanding, and Bluff are the three main communities within the field office area.

The MFO is also responsible for management of some resources on lands administered by other federal agencies such as federal minerals on the Manti LaSal National Forest and certain federal minerals on Indian reservation land administered by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The MFO administers grazing allotments that extend into the Moab Field Office area on the north, the San Juan Resource Area (in Colorado) on the east, and lands in the Glen Canyon National Recreation Area. There are complex land ownership patterns and multiple agency jurisdictions within the MFO; the agency administering the surface estate is not always the agency administering the mineral, grazing, or recreation resources.

There are approximately 1.78 million acres of BLM administered lands that the MFO is responsible for. Other stake holders include: the National Park has approximately 0.57 million acres, the U.S. Forest Service 0.37 million acres, the Navajo Indian Reservation 1.22 million acres, private owners 0.34 million acres, and the state 0.24 million acres.

**2. Purpose and Need**

Since completion of the SJRMP (1991), considerable changes have occurred through the planning units. Heightened public awareness, increased public demand for use of the lands, and increases in conflict between competing resource values and conflicting land uses continue to challenge BLM's management goals and objectives. The MFO is facing a wide variety of issues affecting local communities, regional and state interests, and the health of the natural resources.

Given the nature of the issues that face the MFO and their overlap between Federal, Tribal, State and local jurisdictions, the MFO proposes to prepare a plan revision. It is anticipated the plan will revise many of the existing SJRMP decisions related to the management of public lands. There are a number of new issues, 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 were not adequately addressed in the current plan.

The purpose of the plan revision will be to establish guidance, objectives, and management actions for public lands administered by the MFO. The plan will be comprehensive in nature, and will resolve or address issues within the MFO jurisdictional boundaries which are identified through agency, interagency, and public scoping efforts. The plan will explain or identify the current management situations, desired future conditions to be maintained or achieved, management actions necessary to achieve objectives, and a schedule and a cost estimate for implementing the actions for achieving those goals.

The new plan will fulfill requirements and obligations set forth by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA), and BLM Land Use Plan policy.

This Pre-Plan for the Monticello Field Office (Pre-Plan) provides the general blueprint for how the EIS/RMP will be developed. It is our intention that the Pre-Plan be dynamic. Further the RMP/EIS preparation strategy may be modified based on public input and as unforeseen situations arise.

**The purpose of this Pre -Plan is to:**

- Document the Planning Area boundaries covered by the RMP
- Identify the preliminary issues to be resolved and the planning criteria that will be used to address them;
- Document the scope, complexity, major responsibilities and requirements for the planning effort;
- Identify the internal and external coordination for the agencies involved;
- Establish an estimated completion schedule and budget projection; and
- Identify and establish the public participation process.

**3. Relationship to Other Programs, Plans or Policies**

This planning process will recognize the many ongoing programs, plans, and policies that are being implemented in the planning area by other land managers and interested governments. BLM will seek to be consistent with or complimentary to other management actions. Whenever possible, valid resource decisions and management prescriptions would be carried forward into the planning process.

The following plans will be reviewed for decisions or issues/management prescriptions that may need to be carried forward or addressed in the new planning effort:

### **County Land Use Plans**

- San Juan County, Utah

### **Other Federal Agency Plans**

- Glen Canyon National Recreation Area Plan
- Glen Canyon National Recreation Area Grazing Management Plan; 1999
- Natural Bridges General Management Plan (National Park Service)
- Manti-La Sal National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan

### **Minerals Planning**

- Tripartite Memorandum of Understanding (Minerals Management Service, BLM, BIA); 1991
- Reasonable Forseeable Development Scenario for Oil and Gas Activity (Supplement to the SJRMP) District Supplemental O&G Leasing Implementation EA, 1988
- National Energy Policy, May 2001

### **Recreation/Wilderness Management Plans**

Utah Wilderness Inventory 1999

### **Endangered Species Recovery Plans**

- Northern States Bald Eagle Recovery Plan, 1983
- The Recovery Implementation Plan for the Endangered Fish Species in the Upper Colorado River Basin, 1987
- Bonytail Chub Recovery Plan, 1990
- Humpback Chub Recovery Plan, 1990
- Colorado Squawfish Recovery Plan, 1991
- Mexican Spotted Owl Recovery Plan, 1995
- Razorback Sucker Recovery Plan, 1999
- Gunnison Sage Grouse Recovery Plan
- Southwestern Willow Flycatcher Recovery Plan



### **Existing Environmental Impact Statements (EIS)**

- San Juan Resource Management Plan/EIS, Approved 1991
- Utah BLM Statewide Wilderness Final EIS, 1990

### **Other**

Montezuma Creek River Basin Study, June 1992

## **B. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PROCESS AND INTEREST GROUPS**

Successful planning requires an open and honest environment in which to meaningfully involve the public throughout the planning process. BLM will actively seek to involve the public in a manner which will foster long- term relationships and build ownership in the management of public lands (Appendix A). A variety of methods will be used throughout this process. At a minimum, the following actions will be taken to facilitate public involvement in this process.

### **1. Identify Preliminary Issues, Concerns and Planning Criteria:**

- Publish Notice of Intent in the Federal Register.
- Provide notices in media (newspaper, radio, TV, etc.).
- Develop interactive web site.
- Develop mailing list data base and tracking system for comments.
- Publish regular Planning Bulletins.
- Host Planning Orientation/Scoping Meeting.
- Build upon existing collaborative workgroups.
- Use professional facilitators to enhance public and BLM interactions.
- Maintain an open scoping period for public involvement throughout the preliminary phases of the planning process.
- Provide for standardized comment input forms to enhance public input.

### **2. Inventory and Data Collection**

- Invite the public to review existing data, recommend new data needs, and/or provide new data.
- Work with Federal Leadership Forum in accordance with existing MOU.
- Ensure excellent coordination with agencies with jurisdictional expertise in data collection efforts.

### **3. Alternative Formulation**

- Utilize public input to clarify issues in the formulation of alternatives.
- Provide public feed back via Planning Bulletins, open houses, and interactive web site.
- Provide for a variety of public involvement including; written correspondence, e-mail, web site, public contact representatives.
- Invite the public to discuss options for analysis and methodologies used in development of the EIS.

**4. Publish Draft EIS/Draft RMP**

- Provide for a minimum 90 day comment period on the DEIS, allowing for a variety of feedback mechanisms.
- Host open houses for informational and comment purposes.

**5. Publish Final EIS/Proposed RMP**

- Notify public of FEIS
- Welcome informal comment or involvement during this period.
- Initiate public protest period.
- Initiate Governor's Consistency Review.

**Affected Interests - Who Will be Involved?**

A wide variety of people, agencies and organizations will become involved with this planning process. All comments will be noted and recorded (APPENDIX B). Known participants will include but are not limited to:

**1. Governor's Consistency/Resources Development Coordination Committee (RDCC)**

Coordination of Utah State concerns is handled through the State RDCC. Membership on this committee includes representatives from all the major State agencies. Their job is to review actions that impact State lands including RMPs and other major BLM actions. The RDCC is the reviewing authority for the Governor's consistency review. Presentations of the Draft and Final RMP/EIS will be made to RDCC at the time of release to the public.

**2. Indian Tribe Coordination**

The BLM will contact Indian tribal councils to initiate coordination for areas of common interest and concern.

**3. County and Association of County Governments Coordination**

San Juan County has been active in past BLM planning efforts. County Commissions will be briefed on the RMP process and the preliminary issues identified by the ID Team and will be encouraged to participate in the planning process.

**4. Other Federal Agency Coordination**

The BLM will work with the Forest Service, Fish and Wildlife Service, Environmental Protection Agency, Bureau of Reclamation, Bureau of Indian Affairs, National Park Service, and other Federal Agencies in matters of joint concern.

**5. Coordination with Other BLM Field Offices**

All adjacent BLM Field Offices will be contacted and briefed on the new planning effort. Land Use Plans for other BLM offices in Utah will be reviewed and every effort made to be consistent with decisions in these plans.

#### **6. State Land Management Coordination**

The State of Utah has responsibility for the management of certain lands within the planning area boundary. The State School Institutional Trust Lands Administration (SITLA) and the Utah Division of Lands and Forestry are responsible for School Trust Lands, and the Utah Division of Parks and Recreation is responsible for the management of State Parks and Recreation sites. The Utah Division of Wildlife Resources is responsible for lands owned by them. The BLM will work closely with the Division of Oil, Gas, and Mining as the State agent for SITLA lands and minerals. Close coordination with all of these agencies will be a matter of standard operating procedure. BLM will also coordinate closely with SHPO in compliance with the state protocol for archaeology and cultural resource values.

#### **7. Interest Groups and Other Organizations**

There are many groups that will play an active role in the RMP process. They will be included on mailing lists along with interested citizens. Special meetings may be held to address specific concerns of interest groups. These groups will include: environmental organizations, industry interests, grazing permittees, private land owners, local and regional news media, sportsmen and wildlife groups, ATV users and groups, and other individuals and groups that will be identified during the scoping process.

#### **8. Congressional Delegations**

Keep appropriate Congressional delegates informed of key issues and meetings.

#### **9. Advisory Committee**

The Utah Resource Advisory Committee (RAC) provides advice to the BLM on resource issues in Utah. The RAC will be consulted early in the preparation process.

### **B. PRELIMINARY PLANNING CRITERIA**

Planning criteria are the constraints or ground rules that guide and direct the development of the plan, and determine how the planning team approaches the development of alternatives and ultimately, selection of a Preferred Alternative. They ensure that plans are tailored to the identified issues and ensure that unnecessary data collection and analyses are avoided. These criteria are preliminary at this stage of planning and will undoubtedly be modified as the public becomes more fully involved. They focus on the decisions to be made in the plan and achieve the following:

- Provide an early, tentative basis for inventory and data collection needs
- Enable the manager and staff to develop a preliminary planning base map delineating geographic analysis units.

#### **Preliminary Planning Criteria:**

- This plan will recognize the existence of valid existing rights.

- Lands covered in the RMP will be public lands, including split estate lands, managed by BLM. Decisions on lands not managed by BLM will not be made in the RMP.
- The BLM will use a collaborative and multi-jurisdictional approach, where possible, to jointly determine the desired future condition of Public Lands. At a minimum, the Utah Rangeland Health Standards will be met.
- BLM will strive to ensure that its management prescriptions are consistent as possible to other planning jurisdictions, within the boundaries described by law and policy.
- Final management prescriptions will consider a range of alternatives that focus on the relative values of resources and not the combination of uses that will give the greatest economic return or output and ensure responsiveness to the issues.
- Sensitive watersheds will be identified and watershed conditions determined, in particular on Utah Category One (A,B and C) watersheds and those HUC-8 sub-basins ranked highest in the Utah Interagency Colorado River Salinity Ranking Process (BLM, NRCS, USGS, BOR) and assure that they meet Utah Rangeland Health Standards or are making progress towards meeting those standards.
- The socioeconomic impacts of the alternatives will be addressed.
- The BLM will use current scientific information, research, technologies, and results of inventory, monitoring and coordination to determine appropriate local, and regional management strategies that will enhance or restore impaired ecosystems.
- Direction provided by the 2001 Federal Wildland Fire Policy will be incorporated into the planning process. Planning will be consistent with the National Fire Plan.
- Management of existing Wilderness Study Areas (WSAs) and new WSAs established through planning will be guided by the Interim Management Policy (IMP) and Guidelines for Lands Under Wilderness Review. Land use allocations made for WSAs must be consistent with the IMP and with other laws, regulations and policies related to WSA management. The RMP must also address how these lands would be managed if released by Congress from WSA status. If areas are designated as wilderness by Congress, they will be managed to preserve their wilderness values, according to applicable laws and policy. Areas found to have wilderness characteristics (wilderness inventory areas) in the *1999 Utah Wilderness Inventory* and externally generated wilderness proposals will be addressed consistent with current policy.
- Comprehensive Land Health Standards will apply to all activities and uses and will generally be evaluated on a watershed basis. Standards and guides would be applicable to all alternatives.
- Baseline Reasonable Foreseeable Management/Development (RFD) scenarios will be developed and portrayed based on historical, existing, and projected levels.
- BLM will coordinate with Indian Tribes to identify sites, areas, and objects important to their cultural and religious heritage.

- Paleontological and cultural resources will be evaluated for use allocations and if appropriate, include provisions for interpretation, preservation, conservation and enhancement.
- The decisions of this plan will comply with the Endangered Species Act and follow interagency agreements with the USFWS regarding the Section 7 Consultation Process.
- Areas potentially suitable for Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACECs) and other special management designations will be identified and brought forward for analysis in the RMP.
- All river segments will be considered and determinations of eligibility, suitability, tentative classification, and protective management will be made in accordance with Section 5 (d) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act and BLM Manual 8351. Public nominations will be requested.
- Vegetation management objectives will be developed for specific areas. Limits will be identified on the type and amount of disturbance that will be allowed before mitigation is required.
- Management actions will be responsive to the issues, concerns, and opportunities identified for resolution in this plan.
- Decisions regarding off-highway vehicle driving will be consistent with the BLM's National OHV Strategy.

#### **D. PRELIMINARY PLANNING ISSUES AND MANAGEMENT CONCERNS**

Increased population in the West, increased visitation to southeastern Utah, changing resource use and demand, and increased awareness for environmental conservation and protection have all changed since the SJRMP was approved. Limited space and resources and increasing demands have created a source of conflict. The MFO is facing a wide variety of issues, which impact local communities, affect regional and state interests and the health of sensitive natural resources.

Planning issues can generally be stated as resource management problems and opportunities that BLM needs to address to ensure as an agency it is fulfilling its multiple use resource management mission. Issues may be identified by local, state or national needs, or may reflect conditions specific to the MFO. Identified issues are subject to change throughout the planning process as new conditions are identified and the public becomes more fully involved.

##### **Planning issues identify concerns that:**

- Present unresolved questions regarding allocation of a specific resource.
- Present major land use conflicts regarding management or maintenance of a base resource.
- Can be resolved by BLM within the life of the plan.

The following preliminary planning issues and management concerns were identified by the MFO during an evaluation conducted in July 31-August 1, 2001. A copy of this evaluation is available for review at the MFO. The evaluation consisted of a review of the SJRMP.

**Note: These issues are preliminary and may be modified, deleted, or added to, through the scoping process.**

1. **Air Quality:** In conducting this regional planning effort, BLM will ensure compliance with all applicable local, state, tribal and Federal air quality laws, statutes, regulations, standards and implementation plans. Mandatory Federal PSD Class I areas are located within the study area (Canyonlands National Park) with an additional mandatory Federal PSD Class I areas nearby (Arches National Park). Baseline data to address potential air quality impacts is needed for the RMP process.
2. **Cultural, Paleontology, and Natural History:**
  - This planning effort will take into consideration all new laws, regulations, manuals, and program guidance for cultural and paleontological resources in the planning area.
  - This planning effort will seek to actively consult with, and fully address concerns and recognize values important to Indians in compliance with all current laws, regulations, policies, and strategies. This will include guidance on tribal government sovereignty and orientation between governments.
  - In addition the Class I Overview is out of date and upgrades are necessary to appropriately address cultural and paleontological resource issues.
  - This planning effort will seek to provide a more active and educational forum for the management of these cultural and paleontological resources including consideration of values for science, education, recreation, research.
3. **Fire Management:** Associated with the urban interface issues, is the ongoing concern related to wildfire risk. At issue are the types of fuels and the proximity of those types of fuels to homes. This planning effort will also address appropriate fire management actions including areas where fire is not desired, where fire can be used as a resource management tool for habitat restoration, and where fuel reductions are necessary as required by the 2001 Federal Wildland Fire Policy.
4. **Woodland Harvest and Management:** The assessment of forest resources to support decisions relating to environmental justice and the needs of minority populations, primarily Native American groups, that depend upon fire wood for their primary source of heat will be to be updated and evaluated for the planning area. Demand for permits for seed collection have increased for the past several years causing concerns over fees, seed identification, use areas and conflicts with other resource values, as well as compliance with existing regulations. This proposed plan

revision would address allowing cutting of green pinyon juniper, identifying seed collection areas, and the possible free use for Native Americans for religious and cultural purposes on some species.

5. **Hazardous Sites, Materials and Wastes:** The proposed plan revision will address several issues related to management of hazardous materials including employee safety, waste management, criteria for evaluation and handling hazardous waste, and updated policy and regulations. In addition, the assessment of current hazards to public and employee safety, such as open mine shafts, needs to be updated and management plans developed primarily in existing and proposed recreation areas so the hazards can be eliminated.
  
6. **Lands and Realty:** The proposed plan revision will ensure that the following are appropriately addressed:
  - Transportation planning, complete Travel Route Inventory.
  - Utility right-of-way corridors (including avoidance and exclusion areas, and coordination with neighboring BLM and other tribal or agency jurisdictions).
  - Ensuring access to public lands.
  - Proposals for land tenure adjustments, including the State focus List, will be evaluated and prioritized in the context of facilitating resource management objectives.
  - Review recent land tenure adjustments or ownerships and management agreements that were not addressed in the SJRMP
  - This planning effort will also direct management of acquired lands.
  - Current withdrawals need to be reviewed.
  - Alternative Energy Resource (wind power, etc)
  - Source protection for municipal culinary water needs to be addressed.
  
7. **Minerals Management:** Projected mineral development will be revisited in the proposed plan revision. Baseline minerals information for the existing LUP area needs to be revised based on new and developing information (i.e. McCracken Extension, Lockhart Basin). This planning effort will ensure that minerals management issues, opportunities, and potential impacts would be addressed at an appropriate regional scale and would including the following:
  - RFD scenarios for mineral development will be coordinated with the Moab FO on a regional scale. Criteria for updating RFDs over time will also be developed.
  - Update and identify mineral development potential throughout the planning area.
  - Review mitigation and lease stipulations and ensure consistency throughout the planning area. Develop guidelines for surface use stipulations based upon expected impacts that could apply to surface disturbing activities. Development of these stipulations should be coordinated with the Moab FO.

- Increased demand for energy and minerals would be analyzed in the context of the need for protection of other resources. Analyze potential for unleased coal, combined hydrocarbon leases, and salable and locatable minerals.
  - Evaluate coal potential for suitability criteria for coal leasing as listed in 43 CFR 3461.5 (a) through (t).
- 9. Off-Highway Vehicle Use:** Growth of OHV use has become a significant issue within the planning area. OHV use and management would be addressed and updated in an effort to resolve resource conflicts with natural resources and still provide for responsible recreational use of OHVs.
- Existing OHV designations should be reviewed and modified where needed to meet changing resource objectives. Designations should be coordinated with the Moab FO and Durango FO. A usable map that can be periodically updated will be developed.
- 10. Rangeland Health/Rehabilitation:** The existing LUP does not address Comprehensive Land Health Standards. Issues to be considered include the following:
- Incorporate Rangeland Health Standards and Guidelines to apply to all activities.
  - Incorporate Recreation Standards and Guidelines into the Planning effort.
  - Apply standards to all surface disturbing activities.
  - The proposed plan revision will identify best management practices and rehabilitation techniques to assure properly functioning ecosystems. Criteria and guidelines for rehabilitation will be coordinated across all programs.
  - Incorporate in the plan Bureau policy regarding native versus introduced species for rangeland rehabilitation.
- 11. Recreation:** Recreation management is of significant concern due to the presence of world class recreational resources. This planning effort would review current and projected recreation uses to determine appropriate management. The following will be considered:
- Utah Recreation Standards for public land health and Guidelines for Recreation Management (I.M. UT 2001-090).
  - Existing Special Recreation Management Areas requiring enhanced or special management for recreational uses or for protection of recreational related resource values.
  - Incorporate into the plan Special Recreation Permit (SRP) policies and regulations that require consistent application within the planning area and coordinated with neighboring BLM units. Establish limits of use or limits of acceptable change that will protect resource values while satisfying the public's demand for these uses.
  - Assess recreation use patterns and analyze impacts on other resource values. Establish limits of use where appropriate.



- Establish criteria to provide consistent application of special and extensive recreation management areas with the planning area.
- Evaluate the management of existing recreation developments as well as the need for new facilities.
- Review management prescriptions from the SJRMP and evaluate their application in the proposed plan revision.

**12. Vegetation and Special Status Plants:** Management of vegetation for forage, watershed, or of special status plant species has changed in a number of ways since the completion of the SJRMP. Issues to be considered include the following:

- In consultation with the Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS), adopt the list of special status plants for the proposed plan revision. Establish criteria for keeping this list current for newly listed species or critical habitat through plan maintenance.
- Utilize current and new science for the protection and management of special status plants. Evaluate needs for new data regarding amount, distribution, and habitat requirements for special status plant species.
- Update the new plan regarding current recovery plans, conservation agreements, and biological opinions developed throughout the planning area. Implement actions identified in recovery plans for listed species and protection of critical habitat.
- Management of noxious weeds and non-native invasive species is not addressed in the current LUP. The proposed plan revision would establish integrated pest management criteria in light of current policy and laws for management of these species.

**13. Visual Resources:** Visual resource management (VRM) is of significant concern given the spectacular scenery of the planning area. Changes in visitor use patterns and frequency is causing concerns in some areas and enhanced protection of visual resources may be necessary.

- Current VRM classifications vary considerably in application within the current LUP. These classifications will be reviewed in the proposed plan revision to assure consistency of application.
- Modify where appropriate and incorporate into plan VRM management classes. Develop a useable map that shows the VRM management classes and establish limits of acceptable change.

**14. Watersheds and Water Quality:** Management of these programs is not consistent in the planning area. The State of Utah has developed non-point source Best Management Practices (BMPs) and these are applied by stipulation on a voluntary basis. Water inventory database needs updating in areas such as springs, wells, and groundwater in order to support future planning efforts. This planning effort will address the following management needs:

- Identify water quality concerns, including ground water, related to activities on public lands, including but not limited to, the requirements mandated by the Clean Water Act, state water classifications in the 303 D and 305 report, state water inventories, as well as sources at risk for water quality due to naturally occurring formations.
- Identify priority watersheds within the planning area. Develop management criteria for actions allowed within priority watersheds.

**15. Wilderness:** Management of lands with wilderness characteristics and the use of those lands remains extremely controversial in Utah. Areas have been designated as Wilderness Study Areas (WSAs), and are being managed to preserve their wilderness character, according to the Interim Management Policy and Guidelines for Lands Under Wilderness Review (IMP). Other issues to consider include the following:

- The proposed plan revision will address inconsistencies with management prescriptions resulting for OHV designations, oil and gas leasing categories, etc. and interim management of WSAs.
- Additional areas have been inventoried and found to possess wilderness character by BLM (as per the *1999 Utah Wilderness Inventory and the Monticello Wilderness Inventory Area Revision Document*). These areas are termed “wilderness inventory areas”. This planning effort will consider whether or not these areas with wilderness character should be managed as WSAs and subject to IMP.
- New information regarding wilderness characteristics will be considered.

**17. Wild and Scenic Rivers:**

- Wild and scenic river considerations will be made in this planning effort, including finding of river eligibility, tentative classification, and suitability. Public nominations will be solicited.

**18. Special Management Areas:** Through this planning effort, existing designations as well as other lands within the planning area which may meet specific criteria (such as ACECs) will be reviewed. Other issues to be considered include:

- Management prescriptions for existing ACECs will be reviewed and modified if appropriate. Priorities for implementation of management plans will be set.
- New nominations will be solicited through this planning effort. Priorities for management plan development and implementation for new ACECs will be established.

**19. Wildlife Habitat and Special Status Species Management:** Increased use of public lands, changing laws and guidance, and new listings require that some goals and objectives in the Wildlife Habitat and Special Status Species management portions

of the SJRMP need to be updated. Other issues related to wildlife and special status species include:

- This planning effort will use and assess the wildlife habitat inventories to assist in identifying measurable objectives for important wildlife habitats including desired future conditions, habitats (special status species), and identify opportunities or restrictions needed to achieve management objectives.
- Include prescriptions from the sage grouse management guidelines related to the protection of buffer zones around leks, etc., as well as the general management of the sagebrush ecosystem to ensure that the integrity of sage grouse habitat is protected.
- Consistent riparian habitat management guidelines that directly address scheduled deferment/rest of riparian areas from livestock grazing.
- Obtain maps or digitized data which delineate boundaries for crucial big game ranges as well as designated critical habitat within the planning unit.
- Include the management of the Animal Damage Control (ADC) program in accordance with the National and State MOUs.

## **E. DATA and GIS NEEDS**

The overall data management strategy and effort expended to acquire, develop, use and share geospatial data for the this planning effort/process will be integrated and coordinated with existing national Federal governmental, BLM, and Utah BLM data management initiatives (Appendix C). Much of the data gathered and used for this planning effort will become corporate data and will be used during plan implementation and by other programs to conduct their day-to-day business. In addition, the jurisdictional boundaries of this planning effort are contiguous with other Utah BLM planning starts and it is important to coordinate data development and data management for all planning efforts to insure consistent data.

Collaboration is a key component to be incorporated into the planning process and this includes the development and acquisition of data used during planning. Existing and new partnerships and cooperative agreements, as appropriate, will be extensively used to assist in the development of the planning database and to also insure the data is developed to existing corporate data standards and available to the public and concerned parties as appropriate.

An important goal of this effort will be to integrate the data collected and developed for use in this planning effort into the Utah BLM corporate geospatial database to insure this data is accessible for use during RMP implementation and use by other programs in conducting their day-to-day business. This task will be one of the most intensive during the first and second years of the planning effort. The Utah BLM database will continue to be developed in a coordinated manner to accommodate future planning. The scope of work for this planning effort includes validating data converted from the Maps Overlay Statistical System (MOSS) Geographic Information System (GIS) to ARC/INFO format, horizontal and vertical data integration, and preparation of metadata documentation for the database. Portions of this work may be accomplished through partnerships between the BLM and the State of Utah, Division of Information Technology Services, Automated Geographic Reference Center (AGRC) and others. In addition to sharing data through BLM mechanisms, per a data sharing agreement with the State of Utah, much of the resulting data will be available to the public through the State Geographic Information Database (SGID).

Appendix D provides a table which identifies current data needs, GIS data layers, data layer condition and known data layer gaps. Availability of meta data is also specified. In many instances it has been found that existing data bases need to be updated (integrated with other data layers), compiled, and put into appropriate digital formats in order to provide a basis for impact analysis, and alternative formulation. These data layer “themes” are the building blocks necessary to quantify and portray resources, resource condition, and resource use areas and are used extensively throughout the planning process.

In many cases, existing resource information available in BLM offices or from other federal, state, or local agencies will be used during this planning effort in order to maximize planning efficiencies and reduce costs. It remains however, that workloads associated with current GIS data will be high. If these needs can not be met timely with contractor assistance, additional support from the State Office will be required, or an additional position for support of the GIS program will be sought for the MFO.

The land use plan evaluations for the planning area included an intensive GIS evaluation which identified a significant amount of data and GIS needs that will be required to address issues, formulate alternatives and conduct impact analysis for this planning effort.

## **F. PARTICIPANTS IN THE PROCESS (Planning Team)**

1. **Utah Planning Management Team (PMT):** This team consists of the State Director, Field Managers, State Office Resource Planning Specialist, and a Planning Coordinator. This team is responsible for regional coordination and oversight of controversies and issues and that surround this regional planning effort and may affect other ongoing planning efforts. This team will ensure appropriate logistical support and pursue opportunities for increasing planning efficiencies through coordination of contracting, hiring, travel, training etc. The PMT Coordinator will ensure smooth coordination of the many anticipated issues this team is likely to face.
2. **MFO Management Team (MT):** This team consists of the Field Manager, Assistant Field Manager (AFM) for the MFO, and the Core Team Manager. The team ensures full compliance with the planning regulations and handbooks. It is responsible for ensuring that a collaborative process is used, wherever possible, and that a high degree of meaningful public involvement is achieved. This team is responsible for selecting the appropriate issues and concerns that will be resolved in the planning effort and that a reasonable range of alternatives are developed. This team will also ensure that appropriate budgets are provided to complete the plan over the expected three year duration of this project.
3. **Core Team Manager (CTM):** The CTM is responsible for the day to day management and coordination of this planning effort and keeps the PMT and MT apprized of controversies and conflicts as they arise and recommends courses of actions to resolve problems. The CTM has primary responsibilities for contract oversight and directs staff involvement in contract execution and review. The CTM has overall responsibility to assure completion of the Proposed plan revision, quality control, and collaborative interactions or partnerships with interested publics. The CTM also has direct supervision of the Core Team and the Interdisciplinary Team and directs their involvement throughout the planning process as required. The CTM is responsible for ensuring that appropriate project management and records management techniques are followed.

4. **Core Team (CT):** This team consists of a Natural Resource Specialist/writer editor and GIS specialist, in addition to the CTM. Also, there is the possibility that other term activity specialists could be added to the CT if needed during the plan process. This team assists the CTM in the day to day management of the planning effort including but not limited to coordination with contractors and IDT staff, public outreach, management of documents and records management.
5. **Interdisciplinary Team (IDT):** The team is represented by staff professionals across a wide variety of resource management fields. This team is directed by the CTM and has primary responsibilities in public outreach, oversight on contracts for the collection of data or directing inventory needs, as well as working with both the secondary and primary contractors to ensure data accuracy and adequate impact analysis.
6. **State Office Wilderness Planning Team (SOWPT):** This permanent State Office Team includes wilderness planners, GIS specialists, and a field inventory specialist. Members function as support for all components of the planning process and are an integral part of all the Teams described above. The wilderness component of this RMP revision would not be part of the contract, the wilderness planners would compile the wilderness portion of the MSA; work in close coordination with the MFO and the contractor during alternative development; would be responsible for writing the wilderness components of the draft and final RMP revision; complete responses to wilderness comments; and work on protest resolution, as necessary.

## **G. FORMAT AND PROCESS FOR THE PLAN**

### **1. Format**

The format and outline for the plan will come from the NEPA and land use planning manuals. All legal and policy requirements will be met in the plan and in the process regarding public notices, required elements, distribution of the draft and final documents, and specific laws. NEPA and Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) guidelines will be met. Both the Draft and Final EIS will be published with the draft and final versions of the plan.

### **2. Planning Process**

This planning process will be guided by the planning regulations as set forth in 43 CFR 1600 and the H-1601-1 Land Use Planning Handbook. The regulations and manual provide the procedural guidance for implementing Sections 201 and 202 of FLPMA.

The Proposed plan revision which is the primary outcome of this effort will establish the basic goals and objectives for resource management activities, provide for desired future conditions, and the measures needed to achieve these goals and objectives. Planning decisions are generally made on a broad scale and guide subsequent development of implementing activities (activity level plans).

In accordance with the directions set forth in FLPMA, this planning effort will recognize the following principles:

- Use and observe the principals of multiple use and sustained yield;

- Use a systematic interdisciplinary approach to integrate, physical, biological, economic, and other sciences;
- Give priority to the designation and protection of ACEC's;
- Rely, to the extent possible on available data regarding natural resources;
- Consider present and potential uses of public lands;
- Consider the relative scarcity of values and availability of alternative means and sites for recognizing those values;
- Weigh long term benefits to the public against short term benefits;
- Provide for compliance with Tribal, Federal and state pollution laws, standards and implementation plans;
- Provide for consistency and coordination with other programs, plans and policies in accordance with 43 CFR 1600 regulations.

### **3. EIS Process**

Completion of the DEIS/DRMP revision will follow basic process requirements specified by the CEQ for the preparation of EIS's. Supplementary guidance provided by the Bureau Manual 1790 Handbook will also be followed. Appendix E provides a basic outline illustrating the format and content expected in the DEIS.

The CTM will be responsible for ensuring that the primary contractor responsible for preparation of the EIS does so in a manner consistent with Bureau Manual and CEQ requirements. As data collection, compilation and analysis is completed by contractors, the CTM will ensure that all written materials receive appropriate internal or external review and that corrections or additions to written materials made by IDT members receive appropriate consideration. All comments made by the IDT will be in standardized written format in order to facilitate contractor understanding of staff concerns and issues.

The CTM will coordinate appropriate State Office reviews in a timely manner and ensure that applicable comments are coordinated with the contractor.

Four weeks will be permitted for the internal review of the draft and final plan and EIS by the BLM and cooperating agencies, including time required to transmit comments to the core team, State Office, and Washington Office. Forms will be supplied electronically to all reviewers to facilitate receipt of comments and to facilitate the analysis of the comments and needed corrections. For the BLM, review will take place at the MFO, State Office, and Washington Office.

### **4. Format for Input from ID Team and Reviewers**

BLM input will be paper copies, typed, and on 3.5" floppy discs or CDs, current BLM word processing software; input also will be provided verbally, on flipcharts, via e-mail, and at group and one-on-one meetings and contacts. Submissions will be as polished as possible. The State Office will assist in obtaining timely input from reviewers.

### **5. Alternative Formulation**

The MT will ensure that all action alternatives are formulated in a manner which will resolve the planning issues, meet the purpose and need of the planning effort and can be realistically implemented. While it is too early in the process to identify specific alternatives, the

following alternative concepts or themes are provided as food for thought, and to stimulate involvement in the alternative development process.

- The No Action Alternative will be represented by the existing management decisions. This alternative is required by the CEQ.
  - represents continuation of current management; and
  - provides a baseline for comparing the other alternatives and the effects of their implementation.
- Alternative Two could be formulated to provide emphasis and focus for :
  - production of mineral resources; and
  - production of forage and use of public lands for grazing
- Alternative Three could be formulated to provide emphasis and focus for:
  - use of the public lands for recreation by maintaining the spectrum of recreational opportunities now present;
  - production of wildlife habitat and protection of specialized wildlife habitats; and
  - preservation of watershed values through protection of certain soil resources.
- Alternative Four could be formulated to provide for focus and emphasis for:
  - preservation of natural succession of plant communities by minimizing surface disturbance;
  - protection of cultural resources beyond the requirements of law; and
  - increasing the extent of areas available for primitive uses.

## **H. PLAN PREPARATION SCHEDULE**

Table 1 outlines a proposed plan preparation schedule for the Planning Process. The schedule gives estimated time frames for the completion of the required plan components including:

- All planning actions (43 CFR 1610.4) and support actions expected to be done either consecutively or concurrently,
  - Target initiation and completion dates for each action,
  - Time periods needed for preparation and award of contracts required for use in development of the RMP.
- C A primary contractor (environmental consultant) would be used to conduct a significant portion of the planning functions including scoping, comment tracking, data collection and impact analysis.

## **I. BUDGET**

The Budget includes projected costs associated with development of the plan including, data collection, contracting costs, BLM staff work months, Federal Register notices, vehicle, travel and support costs. The following assumptions were used during the preparation of these budget estimates:

- C GS 12 = \$7,100 per WM
- C GS 11 = \$5,900 per WM

C      GS 9 = \$5,000 per WM

Table 2 outlines a proposed budget for the Planning Process. The schedule gives preliminary estimates for the completion of the required plan actions noted in the plan schedule through year 2005 including:

- All labor costs, contracts and support requirements that are expected to facilitate completion of the plan,
- Estimated expenditure dollars for each action,
- Preparation costs required for use in development of the RMP.

It is recognized that these are only preliminary estimates and that actual cost may vary as the process moves forward. The projections do not include increased cost due to inflation or cost of living increases throughout the three year period. The dollar amounts do provide targets for funding requests and help define the scope of expenditures relative to each of the out-years.



**TABLES**

<b>TABLE 1: MONTICELLO FIELD OFFICE PLAN PREPARATION SCHEDULE</b>			
<b>Planning Phase</b>	<b>Actions</b>	<b>Dates</b>	<b>Responsibilities</b>
Formally Initiate Planning Effort -initiate preliminary scoping	Publish NOI in Federal Register	12/01/2002	FO
	Update Field Office Mailing Lists	12/01/02	FO/SO/CTM/PA
	Release Monticello Wilderness Inventory Revision Document	After NOI Publication	SOWPT
	Provide Preliminary Planning Bulletin	01/15/03	CTM/PA
	Provide Planning Orientation Open Houses and begin formal solicitation for issues, concerns, alternatives/ Begin Issue Workgroup Meetings *(This time frame includes significant feedback to involve publics)	02/10/03-06/10/03	FO/PA/SOWPT/FM/CTM/IDT/
	Issue Scoping Report	06/10/03	
	Formally establish collaborative working groups if applicable	02/10/03	FO (ALL)
	Pursue MOUs or cooperating agency status for entities with jurisdiction expertise.	07/01/02	FM/CTM
	Initiate contract development (see additional items below)	06/01/02	CTM
Hire Core Team	5/15/02-10/01/02	FM	
Inventory and Data Collection	Initiate Comprehensive Plan Contract and prepare RFQ and SOW. Award contract.	06/01/02-09/30/02	CTM/ CT and IDT
	Wildlife Data Assessment and Habitat Assessments and data verification OHV overview and data verification Cultural Resource Overview and Assessment, data compilation	10/15/02-06/15/03	IDT/C
	Paleontology Visual Resource Management classes	10/15/02-06/15/03	IDT
	Mineral Technical Reports	10/15/02-06/15/03	FM/CTM/C/SO
	Compile all new data as addendum to MSA  **A contractor representative will be involved with all significant aspects of data collection and issue identification.	08/15/03 08/01/03	IDT/CTM/SOWPT/C

**TABLE 1: MONTICELLO FIELD OFFICE PLAN PREPARATION SCHEDULE**

<b>Planning Phase</b>	<b>Actions</b>	<b>Dates</b>	<b>Responsibilities</b>
Formulate Alternatives	Based on information received from scoping and workgroups-formulate management alternatives with contractor focused on issue resolution. Continue public involvement through the alternative development stage.  Initiate Chapters 1-3 and 5 as information becomes available.	09/01/03-01/30/04	FM/CTM/IDT/SOWPT/Contractor
Write and publish Draft EIS	Allow for comprehensive distribution based on up-to-date public involvement and allow minimum 90 day review.	05/01/04-08/30/04	Contractor with FO assistance/SOWPT
Analyze Public Comment and Prepare and Distribute Final EIS	Work continuously with contractor on this phase to ensure relevant comments are addressed and incorporated into FEIS	11/30/04-02/30/05	Contractor/FM/CTM/IDT/SOWPT
Initiate Protest Period and Governor's Consistency Review		02/30/05	SO
Prepare and Finalize Approved RMP/ROD		02/30/05-7/15/05	Contractor with FO assistance/SOWPT
Prepare Implementation Plan		7/15/05-09/30/05	CTM



# APPENDICES

**APPENDIX A: PUBLIC PARTICIPATION SCHEDULE**

PLANNING PHASE	PURPOSE	METHOD/ACTIVITY	DATES	RESPONSIBILITY
<b>ISSUE, PLANNING CRITERIA IDENTIFICATION</b>	Announce upcoming scoping meetings. Request written comments on issues/scope of Plan.	Notice of Intent in <u>Federal Register</u> .  30 Day Comment Period.		Core Team
	Develop mailing list.	Newsletter to names on Plan mailing list.  Press release to media		Team Leader, FO Admin. Assistant  Public Affairs
	Release Wilderness Inventory Revision Document	Available to Public - Print 500 copies		SOWPT
	Explain planning process to public. Solicit issues and concern. Identify scope of Plan.	Public Meetings(At least 3) in: to be determined		Core Team, FO Manager
	Explain planning process and consistency requirements to local and state government officials. Identify agency issues and concerns.	Meet with interested groups and organizations.		Core Team, FO Manager
		Meet with local governments and other agencies.		Core Team, FO Manager
	Review input from groups showing interest in Plan.	Forum Issue/Alt. Workgroups Public comment period.		Core Team & ID Team FO Manager, SOWPT
	Respond back to the public on issues to be addressed initially. Collect additional data where needed.	News article.		Core & ID Team, FO Manager, Public Affairs, SOWPT

**APPENDIX A: PUBLIC PARTICIPATION SCHEDULE**

PLANNING PHASE	PURPOSE	METHOD/ACTIVITY	DATES	RESPONSIBILITY
<b>ALTERNATIVE FORMULATION</b>	Describe alternatives that have been developed. Make sure issues are addressed. Assure focus of plan.	Newsletter to public, Plan mailing list.		Core & ID Team, Public Affairs, SOWPT
	Request comments on alternatives.		30 Day comment period.	
	Obtain comments on content.	Written, verbal responses comment period.		
<b>DRAFT PLAN/EIS</b>	Request comment on draft Plan/EIS. Announce upcoming public meetings.	Draft Plan/EIS mailed. 90 Day comment period.		Core Team, Printer
		Press release to local and Denver media.		Team Leader
		Notice of Availability in <u>Federal Register</u> .		Team Leader
	Describe components of the Draft Plan/EIS and solicit comments on it.	Public hearings to be determined		Core & ID Teams, FO Manager
	Inform key individuals, agencies, government.	Meetings with groups, key people, government.		Core & ID Teams, FO Manager, SOWPT
	Obtain comments on Draft Plan/EIS.	Written and verbal responses. 90 day comment period.		Publics
<b>PROPOSED PLAN/FINAL EIS</b>	Give publics opportunity to review proposed decisions and protest decisions if adversely affected.	Publish Proposed Plan/FEIS to publics & mail list.		Core Team, FO Manager
		Begin 60 day Governor consistency review. Include notice explaining protest period (30 days).		

**APPENDIX A: PUBLIC PARTICIPATION SCHEDULE**

PLANNING PHASE	PURPOSE	METHOD/ACTIVITY	DATES	RESPONSIBILITY
	Opportunity to comment on any significant changes made as result of a protest.	Federal Register Notice requesting comments.		Core Team
		News release		Team Leader, Public Affairs
<b>APPROVED PLAN/ROD</b>	Notify publics of final decisions.	News Article, Newsletter, transmittal letters,		Team Leader, Public Affairs
	Distribute Plan.	Mail approved plan		Team Leader, FO Administrative Staff Assistant
<b>IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE</b>	Document & Prioritize Plan Implementation, Modification, and Monitoring	Prepare Office Document		Team Leader, FO Manager and ID Team

**APPENDIX B: CONTACT/COMMENT DOCUMENTATION**

1. NAME OF COMMENTOR(S): \_\_\_\_\_
2. LOCATION OF CONTACT: \_\_\_\_\_
3. PERSON DOCUMENTING CONTACT:
4. DATE: \_\_\_\_\_
5. WHAT PART OF THE PLANNING PROCESS DOES THIS CONTACT DEAL WITH?
  - \_\_\_ A. Mailing List
  - \_\_\_ B. Response to News Article/Letter
  - \_\_\_ C. Response to Fed Reg Notice
  - \_\_\_ D. Schedule
  - \_\_\_ E. Preplan Analysis
  - \_\_\_ F. Maps
  - \_\_\_ G. Issues
  - \_\_\_ H. Mgmt Obj & Goals
  - \_\_\_ I. Mgmt Actions
  - \_\_\_ J. Mgmt Concerns
  - \_\_\_ K. Draft Plan: Which Chapter \_\_\_\_\_
  - \_\_\_ L. Alternative(s): Which Ones \_\_\_\_\_
  - \_\_\_ M. Final Plan: Which Chapter \_\_\_\_\_
  - \_\_\_ N. Record of Decision: Which Section? \_\_\_\_\_
  - \_\_\_ O. Other: \_\_\_\_\_
6. SUMMARY OF CONTACT AND INPUT (Use reverse side if necessary):



## APPENDIX C: GEOSPATIAL DATA DEVELOPMENT

### Geospatial Database Development Assumptions:

The development of the geospatial database for this planning effort will be accomplished within the context of existing bureau data management strategies currently under development. Database development will incorporate goals, objectives, mandatory policies, and procedures identified in national Federal governmental guidance and instructions regarding the use, development and sharing of geospatial data and its management including the following:

- Executive Order 12906 of 1994 - Coordinating Geographic Data Acquisition and Access: The National Spatial Data Infrastructure (NSDI)
- OMB Circular A-16 & the expected revision
- OMB Information Initiative of 2000 - “Collecting Information in the Information Age”

Database development will incorporate goals, objectives, mandatory policies, and procedures identified in national BLM guidance and instructions regarding the use, development and sharing of geospatial data and its management which include the following:

- Incorporate goals, objectives, mandatory policies, and procedures identified in Washington Office BLM planning guidance and other instructions regarding data management
- BLM H-1601-1 Land Use Planning Handbook
- BLM IM No. 2001-038 (11/30/2000) - Development/Approval of Preparation Plans for New Planning Starts
- BLM IM No. 2001-029 (11/13/2000) -Interim Data Management Interim Guidance

Database development will incorporate goals, objectives, mandatory policies, and procedures identified in Utah BLM planning guidance, cooperative agreements, MOUs, and other instructions regarding data management which include the following:

- Utah BLM IM No. UT 2001-021(12/12/2000) - Utah BLM GIS Implementation Plan
- “A Workforce Strategy for Meeting Utah BLM’s Land Use Planning Challenge” – Final Recommendations to the Utah Leadership Team of 11/23/2000
- Utah Implementation Team (I-Team) Plan - “Utah Framework Implementation Plan”
- Use lessons learned and the GIS data development model for Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument RMP

GIS hardware/software resources assembled to support these planning efforts will be integrated and coordinated with:

- Bureau Architecture Design and Implementation, a national BLM initiative to define Information Technology processes, hardware, and software and implement the results as an enterprise system.

- BLM GIS Transition Strategy, a national BLM initiative understand the existing situation and identify a strategy to transition the bureau to the enterprise GIS.

The Utah BLM is currently implementing its “GIS Implementation Plan” which documents GIS hardware/software installations, geospatial data management processes and policies for Utah BLM. This plan serves as the guiding document to manage and maintain an interim corporate GIS for Utah BLM. The document may be downloaded at:

[http://www.utso.ut.blm.gov/GeoSciences/utah\\_blm\\_gis.htm](http://www.utso.ut.blm.gov/GeoSciences/utah_blm_gis.htm)

This plan identifies a GIS hardware/software implementation strategy, outlines corporate data management processes, and calls out GIS Specialist/Deal maker roles and responsibilities, including performance standards. A standard directory structure and naming conventions for the data layers have been identified and implemented, preliminary geospatial datasets have been documented with FGDC compliant metadata, loaded on the master GIS server in the USO and are currently being replicated to the MFOs. The next phases of this implementation effort will be the finalization and implementation of the GIS data standards/data stewardship process, the development of interim data standards, the integration of the multiple MFO datasets into seamless statewide corporate data layers and serving the resultant data to the field. The implementation of this plan sets the stage for a future transition to the bureau enterprise GIS that is being defined by the Bureau Architecture project. It is within this context that data for the proposed plan revision will be developed.

#### **Geospatial Database Development Guidelines:**

The following guidelines will be adhered to as data is developed for this planning effort:

1. Existing data will be used where possible and new data will be collected only where absolutely necessary. All new data will be collected to established data standards. Existing data will be converted to accepted and established data standards.
2. The development of redundant data will be avoided by extensive coordination with our data partners. Data from existing sources will be used when possible.
3. Data for this planning effort will be integrated into seamless corporate datasets.
4. The data standards strategy used will be the following:
  - b. Established national data standards will be used when available.
  - b. Data standards from other agencies will be adopted when appropriate.
  - c. Data standards will be jointly developed and documented with our statewide data partners as appropriate. Data category standards teams, which include state data stewards, resource specialists, and GIS specialists from BLM and other agencies, will be used as necessary. The national BLM data stewards will be included in the review process as appropriate.
5. All geospatial data used in this planning effort will be documented with Federal Geographic Data Committee (FGDC) compliant metadata.
6. Data sharing with the public will be accomplished through the use of BLM GIS data servers and interactive GIS Map Servers connected through the Internet. The national BLM website design guidelines and deployment strategy will be followed.

Data will also be available to the public through links to the Utah State Geographic Information Database (SGID) as appropriate and as existing laws and regulations allow.

7. Existing GIS-related agreements/partnerships will be used to supplement BLM resources for the data development and data integration efforts. Partners that are familiar with these datasets and that have a proven track record will be used.
8. Existing Utah BLM GIS Implementation Plan process/procedures will be followed to achieve a consistent corporate geospatial database in Utah BLM.

### **GIS Data Management Tasks**

A brief overview of the specific data management tasks and processes is presented below.

1. Internal Coordination  
A Utah BLM GIS Data Development coordination team will be formed to coordinate the development of a GIS database to support the planning efforts. This team will be composed of GIS Specialists/Deal makers from the USO, from each FO with a planning start, and the GIS Specialist from the respective support center and will communicate on a weekly basis via conference call. This task will be coordinated and lead by the USO.
2. External Coordination  
USO GIS/Geospatial Data personnel will continue to coordinate with our data partners through participation in Utah GISAC meetings and activities and coordinate with Utah BLM. Coordination with other entities will continue to be accomplished as required. This task will be coordinated and lead by the USO.
3. Data Inventory  
This task includes cataloging available data sets, producing maps and screen displays of data for evaluation by the resource specialists. A preliminary information needs assessment has been conducted to identify data requirements for this planning effort. See the Data Matrix in Appendix D for more information. This will be coordinated by the USO and conducted by the MFO.
4. Data Acquisition  
This task includes contacting data providers to request data and metadata. This data will then be added to the BLM corporate GIS database. Metadata will be prepared or modified as necessary. This task will be lead and coordinated by the USO. The MFO staff will assist as necessary.
5. Data Development Process  
Core Data Standards Development  
Utah BLM Data Stewards/Program Leads  
Data Category Standards Teams  
Data Integration  
Includes data editing/updating  
Horizontal Data Integration  
    USO GIS staff  
    Use of partnerships/contracts  
        Contract Management (USO GIS staff/FO GIS staff)

Vertical Data Integration  
USO GIS staff  
Use of partnerships/contracts  
Contract Management (USO GIS staff/FO GIS staff)

Attribute Integration/Updates  
USO GIS staff  
Use of partnerships/contracts  
Contract Management (USO GIS staff/FO GIS staff)

Data Validation/Verification  
Includes verification map production and staff review of datasets.

Spatial Data  
FO GIS staff  
FO Resource Specialists  
USO GIS staff

Attribute Data  
FO GIS staff  
FO Resource Specialists  
USO GIS staff

Metadata Documentation  
FO GIS staff  
FO Resource Specialists  
USO GIS staff

Combine Planning Data Into Utah BLM Corporate GIS Database  
Arc/Info Librarian  
Data Maintenance/Update Process  
USO GIS staff

SDE/Informix Transition  
Pilot Project beginning FY2001  
USO GIS staff  
USO IRM staff  
Data Maintenance/Update Process  
USO GIS staff

**APPENDIX D: PRE-PLAN DATA STATUS**

1 Planning Questions	2 Needed Data Set (s)	3 Is Needed Data Set Available? <i>Yes/No/Partially</i>	4 Work Needed to Obtain New Data or Prepare Existing Data?	5 Est. Cost \$\$	6 *Are FGDC Metadata Available? <i>Yes/No</i>	7 Name/Source of Data Standard?	8 Does Available Data Meet a National or Regional Standard?	9 Name/Source of Potential National or Regional Data Standard?
1. Air Quality	Air Quality Data  Precipitation	Yes	Obtain from EPA??  Obtain from Utah State University	\$1000	Unknown  Yes	Unknown  Utah State University	Unknown  Unknown	Unknown  Unknown
2. Cultural, Paleontology, and Natural History	Cultural Sites and Surveys  Archeology Sensitivity Areas  Paleontology Potential (Fossil Yield Potential Classification)  Paleontology Sites	Partially  No  No  No??	Coordinate with and obtain from Utah SHPO  Digitize data  Use geology data-attribute potential of the various formations  Field Inventory???	NA  .25 wms  .5 wms  1 year??	Unknown  No  No  No	Utah SHPO Cultural Data Standard  Utah BLM to develop  Review BLM GSENM data standard  Utah BLM/Wyoming BLM	Regional  Will be regional  Will be regional  Will be regional	NA  Utah BLM  USFS/University of Wyoming-Utah BLM Paleontologist  Utah BLM/Wyoming BLM
3. Fire Management	Fire Management Zones  Fire Suppression Areas  Wildfire History	Yes  Partially  Partially	Data is available-review and validate  Data is available-review and validate (Data complete A,B,C,D polygons completed with the 2000 updated FMP)  Data is currently available on CDs in dispatch	.25 wms  .5 wms??	Yes  Yes  Yes	Utah BLM  Utah BLM  DOI 1202 – BLM	Will be regional  Will be regional  National	Utah BLM  Utah BLM  DOI 1202 – BLM
4. Woodland Harvest and Management	Woodland Collection Areas	Partially	Review/update existing data  Review/use USFS statewide woodland inventory data.	.5 wms	Partially	Review BLM GSENM data standard	Will be regional	Review/adapt BLM GSENM data standard
5. Hazardous Materials and Wastes	Abandoned Mine Land Inventory  Mining Districts	No  Yes	Use MILS and Crib data for indication of the problem. Need a complete field inventory- priority near recreation sites  Review data. May require vertical integration with PLSS	2 years w/three (2person) crews  NA	No  No	BLM AML & State Abandoned Mine Reclamation Program Forms  BLM Utah	National/regional  Regional	BLM AML & State Abandoned Mine Reclamation Program Forms  Utah BLM

**APPENDIX D: PRE-PLAN DATA STATUS**

1 Planning Questions	2 Needed Data Set (s)	3 Is Needed Data Set Available? <i>Yes/No/Partially</i>	4 Work Needed to Obtain New Data or Prepare Existing Data?	5 Est. Cost \$\$	6 *Are FGDC Metadata Available? <i>Yes/No</i>	7 Name/Source of Data Standard?	8 Does Available Data Meet a National or Regional Standard?	9 Name/Source of Potential National or Regional Data Standard?
6. Lands and Realty	Easements	No	Review case records and digitize for FO	.25 wms	No	Utah BLM to develop/adopt	Will be regional	Utah BLM
	Rights-o- Way (point, line, polygon)	Partially	Review/update data. Develop data for balance of FO based on MTP review.	4 wms	No	Utah BLM to develop/adopt	Will be regional	Utah BLM/State of Utah State of Institutional Trust Lands Administration (SITLA)
	Rights-of-Way Corridors (Pipelines, etc.)	Partially	Review/update data. Develop data for balance of FO. Acquire or digitize pipeline data	.5 wms	No	Utah BLM to develop/adopt	Will be regional	Utah BLM/State of Utah SITLA
	Land Tenure Adjustments - Disposal/Acquisition	Partially	Review/update data. Develop data for balance of FO. Vertically integrate with land status dataset	2 wms	No	Utah BLM to develop/adopt	Will be regional	Utah BLM/State of Utah SITLA
	Public Water Reserves	Partially	Review/update data. Develop data for balance of FO. Vertically integrate with land status dataset	.5 wms	No	Utah BLM/State of Utah SITLA	Will be regional	Utah BLM/State of Utah SITLA
	Withdrawals	Partially	Review/update data. Develop data for balance of FO. Integrate with land status dataset	.5 wms	No	Utah BLM to develop/adopt	Will be regional	Utah BLM/State of Utah SITLA
	Land Status	Partially	Review/update data. Develop data for balance of FO. Vertically integrate with GCDB based PLSS dataset	2 wms	No	Utah BLM/State of Utah SITLA	Will be regional	Utah BLM/State of Utah SITLA
	Transportation (For detail, see #21. "All Questions" section at end of this table.)	Partially	Photo revise USFS fringe quads (approx. 73). Integrate county GPS data. Photo revise balance of FO.	NA				
	RS 2477 Assertions	Partially	Acquire from Counties	.25 wms	Yes	State of Utah AGRC/Utah BLM	Will be regional	Utah Canyon Country Partnership Transportation Share Codes
	Municipal Watersheds	No	Manuscript & digitize for FO	.5 wms	No	Utah BLM to develop/adopt	Will be regional	Utah BLM
	Municipal Boundaries	Partially	Revise and update based on municipal records	1 wms	No	State of Utah AGRC/Utah BLM	Will be regional	State of Utah AGRC/Utah BLM

**APPENDIX D: PRE-PLAN DATA STATUS**

1 Planning Questions	2 Needed Data Set (s)	3 Is Needed Data Set Available? <i>Yes/No/Partially</i>	4 Work Needed to Obtain New Data or Prepare Existing Data?	5 Est. Cost \$\$	6 *Are FGDC Metadata Available? <i>Yes/No</i>	7 Name/Source of Data Standard?	8 Does Available Data Meet a National or Regional Standard?	9 Name/Source of Potential National or Regional Data Standard?
7. Rangeland Management	Grazing Allotments  Range Improvements (point, line, polygon)  Vegetation (see # 14 for detail)	Partially  Partially	Revise and update existing data, revise to meet BLM Utah data standard  Review/update data. Develop data for balance of FO. Vertically integrate with base datasets-plss, transportation, etc.	2 wms.  4 wms	Partially  No	BLM Rangeland Information System & GABBS  BLM Rangeland Information System & RIPS	National Core Standard & BLM Utah Regional Standard  National Core Standard & BLM Utah Regional Standard	BLM Rangeland Information System Data Standard  BLM Rangeland Information System Data Standard
8. Mineral Management	Subsurface Mineral Reservations/Status  Locateable Mineral Occurrence Potential  Uranium Potential  Mining Claim Density  Crib Data  MILS Data  Mineral Material Occurrence Potential  Community Pits/Free Use Areas  Oil and Gas Potential (including oil shale)	No  Partially  Partially  Yes  Yes  Yes  Partially  Partially  Partially	Review MTPs/digitize and attribute data for all of the FO.  Review/update data. Develop data for balance of FO.  Review/update data. Develop data for balance of FO.  Regenerate using Premier software.  Data is available  Data is available  Review/update data. Develop data for balance of FO.  Review/update data. Develop data for balance of FO.  Review/update data. Develop data for balance of FO.	4 wms.  .5 wms  .25 wms  .25 wms    .5 wms  .5 wms  .5 wms	No  No  No  Partially  Partially  No  No  No	Utah BLM/State of Utah SITLA  Utah BLM to develop/adopt  Utah BLM to develop/adopt  Utah BLM to develop/adopt  Utah BLM / UDOGM  Utah BLM / UDOGM  Utah BLM to develop/adopt  Utah BLM to develop/adopt  Utah BLM to develop/adopt	Will be regional  Will be regional  Will be regional  Will be regional  Will be regional  Will be regional  Will be regional  Will be regional	Utah BLM/State of Utah SITLA  Utah BLM  Utah BLM  Utah BLM  Utah BLM / UDOGM  Utah BLM / UDOGM  Utah BLM  Review/adapt BLM GSENM data standard  Utah BLM

**APPENDIX D: PRE-PLAN DATA STATUS**

1 Planning Questions	2 Needed Data Set (s)	3 Is Needed Data Set Available? <i>Yes/No/Partially</i>	4 Work Needed to Obtain New Data or Prepare Existing Data?	5 Est. Cost \$\$	6 *Are FGDC Metadata Available? <i>Yes/No</i>	7 Name/Source of Data Standard?	8 Does Available Data Meet a National or Regional Standard?	9 Name/Source of Potential National or Regional Data Standard?
9. Mineral Management	Special tar sand areas	No	Manuscript and digitize, verify	.25 wms	No	Utah BLM to develop/adopt	Will be regional	Utah BLM
	Oil and Gas Leases	Partially	Regenerate using Premier software	.25 wms	No	Utah BLM	Will be regional	Utah BLM
	Oil and Gas Categories	Partially	Review/update data. Develop data for balance of FO.	.5 wms	No	Utah BLM to develop/adopt	Will be regional	Utah BLM
	Coal Potential	Partially	Review/update data. Develop data for balance of FO. Coordinate with UGS/USGS	.75 wms	No	Utah BLM to develop/adopt	Will be regional	Utah BLM
	Coal Leases	Partially	Regenerate using Premier software	.25 wms	No	Utah BLM	Will be regional	Utah BLM
	SITLA Leases	Yes	Acquire from SITLA and integrate into planning database.		No	Utah BLM/State of Utah SITLA	Will be regional	State of Utah SITLA
	Subsurface Minerals Status	No	Manuscript, digitize, verify for FO.	6 wms	No	Utah BLM/State of Utah SITLA	Will be regional	Utah BLM/State of Utah SITLA
	Geology Data	Partially	Acquire from UGS. Develop data (100K) otherwise use 500K data	.5 wms	No	Utah Geologic Survey	Will be regional	Utah Geologic Survey
10. Off-Highway Vehicle Use	ORV Designations	Partially	Review/update data. Develop data for balance of FO.	.5 wms	No	Utah BLM	Will be regional	Utah BLM
	Transportation (For detail, see #21. "All Questions" section at end of this table.)	Partially	Photo revise USFS fringe quads (approx. 73). Integrate county GPS data. Photo revise balance of FO.					
	ORV Inventory-impact areas	No	Manuscript, digitize, verify for FO. May include field inventory	4 wms	No	Utah BLM	Will be regional	Utah BLM
11. Rangeland Health/Rehabilitation	Vegetation (see #14)							
	Relic Plant Communities	No	Manuscript, digitize, verify for FO.	1 wms	No	Utah BLM		Review/adapt BLM GSENM data standard



**APPENDIX D: PRE-PLAN DATA STATUS**

1 Planning Questions	2 Needed Data Set (s)	3 Is Needed Data Set Available? <i>Yes/No/Partially</i>	4 Work Needed to Obtain New Data or Prepare Existing Data?	5 Est. Cost \$\$	6 *Are FGDC Metadata Available? <i>Yes/No</i>	7 Name/Source of Data Standard?	8 Does Available Data Meet a National or Regional Standard?	9 Name/Source of Potential National or Regional Data Standard?
12. Recreation	Recreation Sites-Developed  Recreation Trails  National Historic/Scenic Trails  Recreation Use Pattern Inventory (??)  ROS Classes  SRMA/ERMA  Back Country Byways	Partially  No  No  No  No  No	Review/update data. Develop data for balance of FO.  Manuscript, digitize, verify for FO. Integrate into transportation dataset.  Manuscript, digitize, verify for FO. Integrate into transportation dataset.  Field inventory, GPS?, manuscript, digitize, verify for FO.  Manuscript, digitize, verify for FO.  Manuscript, digitize, verify for FO.  Manuscript, digitize, verify for FO. Integrate into transportation dataset.	.5 wms  1 wms  .25 wms  1 year  4 wms  1 wms  .25 wms	No  No  No  No  No  No	Utah BLM  Utah BLM  Utah BLM  Utah BLM  Utah BLM  Utah BLM  Utah BLM	Will be regional  Will be regional  Will be regional  Will be regional  Will be regional  Will be regional  Will be regional	Utah BLM  Utah BLM  Utah BLM  Utah BLM  Utah BLM  Utah BLM  Utah BLM
13. Riparian Resources	Riparian Areas (point, line, polygon)	Partially	Review/update data. Develop data for balance of FO. Integrate proper functioning condition (PFC) attributes.	4 wms	No	Utah BLM/USFS	Will be regional	Utah BLM/USFS
14. Soils	Soil Survey (3 <sup>rd</sup> order)  Ecological Site Inventory (SWA) Data	Partially  No	Review/update data. Field inventory, manuscript, digitize, verify for FO.  Field inventory, manuscript, digitize, verify for FO. (Part of soil survey workload???)	2 years??  2 years??	No  No	NRCS  BLM	National  BLM??	NRCS  BLM
15. Vegetation and Special Status Plants	Vegetation  Invasive/Noxious Plant Inventory Data  Special Status Species (T&E) Habitat  State Special Status Species List  Grasshopper/Mormon Cricket Potential Habitat	No  Yes  No  Yes  No	Complete EIS (SWA) inventory  Append and integrate into statewide dataset convert to the national data standard (when adopted).  Manuscript, digitize, verify for FO.  Acquire from State of Utah DNR.  Manuscript, digitize, verify for FO.	2 years??  1 wms  4 wms    .5 wms	No  No  No  Unknown  No	Utah BLM  NAWMA Data Standard  Utah BLM  Utah BLM  Utah BLM	Will be regional  National  Will be regional  Will be regional  Will be regional	Utah BLM  NAWMA Data Standard  Utah BLM  Utah BLM  Utah BLM

**APPENDIX D: PRE-PLAN DATA STATUS**

1 Planning Questions	2 Needed Data Set (s)	3 Is Needed Data Set Available? <i>Yes/No/Partially</i>	4 Work Needed to Obtain New Data or Prepare Existing Data?	5 Est. Cost \$\$	6 *Are FGDC Metadata Available? <i>Yes/No</i>	7 Name/Source of Data Standard?	8 Does Available Data Meet a National or Regional Standard?	9 Name/Source of Potential National or Regional Data Standard?
16. Visual Resources	Scenic Quality Inventory	No	Manuscript, digitize, verify for FO.	4 wms	No	Utah BLM	Will be regional	Utah BLM
	Visual Sensitivity Inventory	No	Manuscript, digitize, verify for FO.	1 wms	No	Utah BLM	Will be regional	Utah BLM
	Distance Zone Inventory/Observation Points/Routes	No	Manuscript, digitize, verify for FO.	1 wms	No	Utah BLM	Will be regional	Utah BLM
	VRM Inventory Classes	No	Generate in GIS using above datasets	.25 wms	No	Utah BLM	Will be regional	Utah BLM
17. Watersheds and Water Quality	Ground Water Aquifer Data	Partially	Generate/model from geology dataset or obtain from State Water Resources	.5 wms	No	Utah BLM/State of Utah Water Resources	Will be regional	Utah BLM
	Watershed Boundary (Level 6)	Partially	Develop dataset using contract with USGS	\$15000	Yes	FGDC/USGS/NRCS (Federal Standards for Delineation of Hydrologic Unit Boundaries)	National	NA
	Threatened Water Sources (303 waters)	Yes	Obtain from State of Utah Division of Water Resources or EPA website	.25 wms	Yes	EPA data standard	National	NA
	Drinking Water Sources	Yes	Obtain from State of Utah Division of Water Resources	.25 wms	Unknown	State of Utah Division of Water Resources State of Utah	Regional?	State of Utah Division of Water Resources
	Water Quality Data	Partially	Obtain from State of Utah Division of Water Resources	.25 wms	Unknown	USGS National Hydrology Data Standard	Regional?	State of Utah Division of Water Resources
	National Hydrology Dataset	No	Conflate attributes from 1:100k data as part of AGRC/USGS data development partnership project	\$50000	No		National	NA

**APPENDIX D: PRE-PLAN DATA STATUS**

1 Planning Questions	2 Needed Data Set (s)	3 Is Needed Data Set Available? <i>Yes/No/Partially</i>	4 Work Needed to Obtain New Data or Prepare Existing Data?	5 Est. Cost \$\$	6 *Are FGDC Metadata Available? <i>Yes/No</i>	7 Name/Source of Data Standard?	8 Does Available Data Meet a National or Regional Standard?	9 Name/Source of Potential National or Regional Data Standard?
19. Wilderness	WSA Boundaries  Wilderness Inventory Area Boundaries  Potential Boundaries for Externally Generated Wilderness Proposals	Yes  Yes  Partially	Review and update as required for FO  Review and update as required for FO  Supplied By Outside Data Source	1 wms  1 wms	Yes  Yes  Unknown	BLM -Wilderness and Wilderness Study Area GIS Boundary Mapping Standards  BLM -Wilderness and Wilderness Study Area GIS Boundary Mapping Standards  <b>Unknown</b>	National BLM  National BLM  <b>Unknown</b>	NA  NA  <b>N/A</b>
20. Wild and Scenic Rivers	Wild & Scenic Rivers Inventory Data	No	Manuscript, digitize, verify for FO. Integrate with hydrology (water courses) dataset	2 wms	No	Under development	Regional	Review/adapt BLM GSENM data standard
21. Special Management Areas	ACECs (includes Outstanding Natural Areas, Research Natural Areas)	Partially	Review/update data. Develop data for balance of FO.	1 wms	No	Utah BLM	Under development	Review/adapt BLMGSENM data standard

**APPENDIX D: PRE-PLAN DATA STATUS**

1 Planning Questions	2 Needed Data Set (s)	3 Is Needed Data Set Available? <i>Yes/No/Partially</i>	4 Work Needed to Obtain New Data or Prepare Existing Data?	5 Est. Cost \$\$	6 *Are FGDC Metadata Available? <i>Yes/No</i>	7 Name/Source of Data Standard?	8 Does Available Data Meet a National or Regional Standard?	9 Name/Source of Potential National or Regional Data Standard?
22. Wildlife Habitat and Special Status Species Management	Antelope Habitat	Partially	Obtain from State of Utah DWR, review and update as required for FO.	.5 wms	Unknown	State of Utah DWR	Regional (Utah)	Will adapt/use State of Utah DWR
	Elk Habitat	Partially	Coordinate with State of Utah DWR, review and update as required for FO.	.5 wms	No	State of Utah DWR	Regional (Utah)	Will adapt/use State of Utah DWR
	Desert Bighorn Sheep Habitat	Partially	Coordinate with State of Utah DWR, review and update as required for FO.	.5 wms	No	State of Utah DWR	Regional (Utah)	Will adapt/use State of Utah DWR
	Mtn. Bighorn Sheep Habitat	Partially	Coordinate with State of Utah DWR, review and update as required for FO.	.5 wms	No	State of Utah DWR	Regional (Utah)	Will adapt/use State of Utah DWR
	Mule Deer Habitat	Partially	Coordinate with State of Utah DWR, review and update as required for FO.	.5 wms	No	State of Utah DWR	Regional (Utah)	Will adapt/use State of Utah DWR
	Sage Grouse Habitat	Partially	Coordinate with State of Utah DWR, review and update as required for FO.	.5 wms	No	State of Utah DWR	Regional (Utah)	Will adapt/use State of Utah DWR
	Sage Grouse Leks	Partially	Coordinate with State of Utah DWR, review and update as required for FO.	.25 wms	No	State of Utah DWR	Regional (Utah)	Will adapt/use State of Utah DWR
	Raptor Nests	Partially	Coordinate with State of Utah DWR, review and update as required for FO. Field inventory??	1 year?	No	State of Utah DWR	Regional (Utah)	Will adapt/use State of Utah DWR
	Turkey Habitat	Partially	Coordinate with State of Utah DWR, review and update as required for FO.	.5 wms	No	State of Utah DWR	Regional (Utah)	Will adapt/use State of Utah DWR
	Upland Game Bird Habitat	Partially	Coordinate with State of Utah DWR, review and update as required for FO.	.5 wms	No	State of Utah DWR	Regional (Utah)	Will adapt/use State of Utah DWR

**APPENDIX D: PRE-PLAN DATA STATUS**

1 Planning Questions	2 Needed Data Set (s)	3 Is Needed Data Set Available? <i>Yes/No/Partially</i>	4 Work Needed to Obtain New Data or Prepare Existing Data?	5 Est. Cost \$\$	6 *Are FGDC Metadata Available? <i>Yes/No</i>	7 Name/Source of Data Standard?	8 Does Available Data Meet a National or Regional Standard?	9 Name/Source of Potential National or Regional Data Standard?
23. Wildlife Habitat and Special Status Species Management	UDWR Management Units	Yes	Coordinate with State of Utah DWR, review and update as required for FO.	.25 wms	Unknown	State of Utah DWR	Regional (Utah)	Will adapt/use State of Utah DWR
	Wildlife Habitat Management Plans	Partially	Coordinate with State of Utah DWR, review and update as required for FO.	.25 wms	Unknown	State of Utah DWR	Regional (Utah)	Will adapt/use State of Utah DWR
	Fish Habitat	Partially	Coordinate with State of Utah DWR, review and update as required for FO.	.5 wms	Unknown	State of Utah DWR	Regional (Utah)	Will adapt/use State of Utah DWR
	Special Status Species (T&E Mammals-Utah Prairie Dog, etc.) Habitat	Partially	Coordinate with State of Utah DWR, review and update as required for FO.	.5 wms	Unknown	Utah BLM/State of Utah DWR	Regional standard will be developed	Utah BLM 1994 Content Standard
	Special Status Species (T&E Birds) Habitat	Partially	Coordinate with State of Utah DWR, review and update as required for FO.	.5 wms	Unknown	Utah BLM/State of Utah DWR	Regional standard will be developed	Utah BLM 1994 Content Standard
	Special Status Species (T&E Fish) Habitat	Partially	Coordinate with State of Utah DWR, review and update as required for FO.	.5 wms	Unknown	Utah BLM/State of Utah DWR	Regional standard will be developed	Utah BLM 1994 Content Standard
	Special Status Species (T&E Invertebrates) Habitat	Partially	Coordinate with State of Utah DWR, review and update as required for FO.	.25 wms	Unknown	Utah BLM/State of Utah DWR	Regional standard will be developed	Utah BLM 1994 Content Standard
	Special Status Species Habitat Management Plans	Partially	Coordinate with State of Utah DWR, review and update as required for FO.	.25 wms	Unknown	Utah BLM/State of Utah DWR	Regional standard will be developed	Utah BLM 1994 Content Standard
	State Sensitive Wildlife Species Data	Yes	Obtain from State of Utah DWR	.25 wms	Unknown	State of Utah DWR	Regional (Utah)	State of Utah DWR
	Animal Damage Control Data	Partially	Integrate and attribute grazing allotment data	.25 wms	No	Utah BLM/State of Utah	Regional standard will be developed	Utah BLM
Watchable Wildlife Viewing Sites	No	Develop during planning process	.25 wms	No	Utah BLM	Regional standard will be developed	Utah BLM	

## APPENDIX D: PRE-PLAN DATA STATUS

1 Planning Questions	2 Needed Data Set (s)	3 Is Needed Data Set Available? <i>Yes/No/Partially</i>	4 Work Needed to Obtain New Data or Prepare Existing Data?	5 Est. Cost \$\$	6 *Are FGDC Metadata Available? <i>Yes/No</i>	7 Name/Source of Data Standard?	8 Does Available Data Meet a National or Regional Standard?	9 Name/Source of Potential National or Regional Data Standard?
24. All Planning Questions/Issues (Base Data)	Cadastral (GCDB)	Partially	Complete GCDB collection, integrate various sources (AGRC cadastral data, Utah BLM wilderness team GCDB and FO data) into a single seamless "cadastral" coverage.	9 wms	Partially	Cadastral Data Standard	National FGDC Standard	NA
	PLSS	Partially	Integrate various data sources with GCDB	2 wms	Partially	State of Utah AGRC/Utah BLM	Regional	State of Utah AGRC/Utah BLM
	Land Status	Partially	Review/update data. Develop data for balance of FO. Vertically integrate with GCDB based PLSS dataset Coordinate with SITLA	4 wms	Yes	State of Utah SITLA/AGRC/Utah BLM	Regional	State of Utah SITLA
	Boundaries (Jurisdictional-state, county, federal agency)	Partially	Review/update data. Develop data for balance of FO. Vertically integrate with GCDB based PLSS dataset Coordinate with SITLA	1 wms	Partially	State of Utah SITLA/AGRC/Utah BLM	Regional standard will be developed	State of Utah SITLA
	Municipal Boundaries	Partially	Review with municipalities and update as required.	1 wms	No	State of Utah AGRC/Utah BLM	Regional standard will be developed	State of Utah AGRC
	Transportation	Partially	Photo revise USFS fringe quads (approx. 73). Integrate county GPS data. Photo revise balance of FO.	\$48000 \$20000	Partially	State of Utah AGRC/Utah BLM	Will meet regional standard	Canyon Country Partnership Transportation Share Codes
	Hydrology	Partially	Photo revise USFS fringe quads (approx. 73). Photo revise balance of FO.	\$10000	Partially	State of Utah AGRC/Utah BLM/USGS	Will meet regional standard	State of Utah AGRC/Utah BLM/USGS
	Geographic Place Names	Yes	Obtain from USGS and/or State of Utah AGRC	NA	Yes	USGS	Yes	NA

\* Executive Order #12906 requires FGDC-compliant metadata for geospatial data used by Federal agencies.

**Notes**

1. PLANNING QUESTION - The question, or issue with a data requirement. (Pre-Plan Question/Issue from I.M. 2001-038)

2. NEEDED DATA SETS - The specific data needed to address the PLANNING QUESTION.

3. AVAILABILITY OF DATA SETS - Is there existing data or new data yet to be collected or acquired?

4. WORK TO OBTAIN/PREPARE DATA - If new data, describe how the data will be obtained. If existing data will be converted to GIS or some other format, describe processing.

5. ESTIMATED COSTS - Summary of costs associated with collecting or converting required data.

6. AVAILABILITY OF FGDC METADATA - Does metadata exist that is in compliance with the FGDC Geo-Spatial Metadata Content Standard?

7. NAME/SOURCE OF DATA STANDARD - What is or will be the name/source of the data standard? What kind of data is it: has it been designated by BLM at the National, State, Regional, Local level? If the data does not meet a national standard, be sure to document the standard being used. If the data does not meet that standard, indicate that.

8. DATA MEETS NATIONAL OR REGIONAL STANDARD - If there is a national or regional standard, does/will the data meet that standard? (*Verify with Data Steward*)

9. NAME/SOURCES OF POTENTIAL DATA NATIONAL OR REGIONAL STANDARD - If there is a national or regional data standard in general use, but is not being used in your plan, and you believe it would be an appropriate standard to work toward, list it.

*Entries for data sets that apply to more than one question should be cut and pasted to complete the entry for each line so that each action type/question is self-contained. This will enable us to more readily*

*transfer information to a database.*

## APPENDIX E: PRELIMINARY DEIS FORMAT AND CONTENT OUTLINE

Cover Sheet: Title, Type, Lead Agencies and Cooperators, Project Lead/public contact person for comments, Abstract, EIS review and consultation requirements, date of issuance, date comments due, Name, Title of responsible official

Dear Reader Letter

Executive Summary

Table of Contents

Chapter I: Introduction  
Historical Background  
Purpose and Need  
Public Scoping/Planning Issue Identification  
Issues and Alternatives Considered for Detailed Analysis  
Issues and Alternatives Rejected for Detailed Analysis  
Planning Criteria  
Conformance with Land Use Plans  
Relationship to Ongoing Programs, Plans and Policies

Chapter II: Alternatives Considered for Detailed Analysis  
Management Common to the Action Alternatives  
No Action Alternative-1  
Alternative - 2  
Alternative - 3  
Alternative - 4

Chapter III: Affected Environment

This section will show baseline, condition or trends that may be affected by the various alternatives, relative importance of the affected resources and relationships to the region, highlight those values that do not fit traditional resources categories, and incorporate by reference suitable affected environment material from the existing land use planning base.

Chapter IV: Environmental Consequences  
Analysis Assumptions  
Reasonable Foreseeable Development Scenarios  
Impact Analysis by Alternatives  
Summary Table of Impacts

Chapter V: Coordination and Consultation  
Describe scoping process and efforts  
Summarize comments received  
Identify Agencies, Organizations Participating in Process  
List of Preparers

**GLOSSARY**

**INDEX**