

1.0 INTRODUCTION, PURPOSE AND NEED

The Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (FLPMA) directs the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) to develop and periodically revise its Resource Management Plans (RMPs), which guide management of BLM-administered public lands. The BLM Moab, Utah, Field Office (MFO) is revising the Grand Resource Area RMP, which was last revised in 1985 (BLM 1985a). The new plan, which is to be called the Moab RMP, in conjunction with the accompanying Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), will provide future management direction for public lands within the boundaries of the Moab Planning Area (MPA). The Moab RMP covers all of Grand County and the northern third of San Juan County. The Proposed Plan presented in this document was crafted from the four alternatives presented in the Draft RMP/EIS that was released to the public for a 90-day comment period on August 25, 2007.

1.1 PURPOSE AND NEED FOR THE PLAN

1.1.1 PURPOSE

FLPMA requires that the BLM "develop, maintain, and when appropriate, revise land-use plans" (43 United States Code [U.S.C.] 1712 [a]). The BLM has determined it is necessary to revise existing land-use plans (LUP) and prepare a new RMP for the MPA based on a number of new issues that have arisen since preparation of the existing plans. In general, the purpose of this RMP is to provide a comprehensive framework for the BLM's management of the public lands within the MPA and its allocation of resources pursuant to the multiple-use and sustained yield mandate of FLPMA. In addition, the purpose of this plan revision is as follows:

- To consolidate the existing LUP and its amendments.
- To reevaluate, with public involvement, existing conditions, resources, and uses, and reconsider the mix of resource allocations and management decisions designed to balance uses and the protection of resources pursuant to FLPMA and applicable law.
- To resolve multiple-use conflicts or issues between resource values and resource uses. The resulting Moab RMP will establish consolidated guidance and updated goals, objectives, and management actions for the public lands in the decision area. The RMP will be comprehensive in nature and will address issues that have been identified through agency, interagency, and public scoping efforts.
- To disclose and assess the direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts of the reasonably foreseeable future actions resulting from the management actions in the Proposed Plan and draft alternatives pursuant to the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), its implementing regulations, and other applicable laws.

1.1.2 NEED

A revision to the 1985 RMP is necessary because there have been significant alterations in the MPA in light of new information and changed resources, circumstances, and policies that may be relevant to the future management of public lands and allocation of resources under the multiple-

use and sustained yield mandate. This determination is further corroborated by a Special Evaluation Report, completed in 2002 by the MFO (BLM 2002a), which concluded that some of the decisions within the 1985 RMP are in need of revision.

There have been changes in the laws, policies, and regulations that direct the management of the resources on MPA public lands. There has also been an increase in the amount of new information and resource data that need to be considered to better manage the public lands. Population in and visitation to the region have grown, and population demographics have changed, as have public awareness and use of lands within the MPA. Specifically, there may be a need to evaluate management prescriptions and resource allocations to address the increases in recreation and visitor use, including scenic quality and open spaces, as well as the increased interest in oil and gas development. Land use plan decisions may be changed only through the amendment or revision process.

1.2 DESCRIPTION OF THE MOAB PLANNING AREA (MPA)

1.2.1 OVERVIEW

The MPA is situated in the canyon, plateau, and desert areas of the Colorado Plateau physiographic province (Figure 1.1). It is located in southeastern Utah and includes all of Grand County and the northern third of San Juan County. Geographically, the MPA is bounded by the Book Cliffs to the north, the Utah-Colorado state line to the east, Harts Point and Lisbon Valley to the south, and the Green River to the west. Major waterways within the MPA include the Colorado River, the Dolores River, and the Green River. Elevations within the MPA range from approximately 13,000 feet above mean sea level in the La Sal Mountains to approximately 3,900 feet above mean sea level at Mineral Bottom along the Green River.

The MPA encompasses Arches National Park, Dead Horse Point State Park, the La Sal Mountains of the Manti-La Sal National Forest, and the Uintah/Ouray Indian Reservation. The MPA shares boundaries with lands administered by the BLM Vernal, Monticello, Grand Junction, Uncompahgre, Dolores, and Price FOs, as well as with Canyonlands National Park (within the Monticello FO).

The MPA comprises approximately 2,756,065 acres of land, of which approximately 1,822,562 acres is public land administered by the BLM (Table 1.1). In addition, the MFO also manages approximately 29,680 acres of subsurface mineral estate within the MPA and manages leasable minerals on 141,240 acres under U.S. Forest Service lands on the Manti-La Sal National Forest. Due to its easier access, the BLM Vernal FO presently manages a small amount of public land (33,331 acres) at the top of the Book Cliffs along the northern portion of the MPA. Decisions for these 33,331 acres are contained in the Vernal RMP. It is important to note that the BLM may only make decisions that affect public lands and resources, but it is responsible for collaborative planning with the public and adjacent jurisdictions so as to consider the impacts of its actions on all the resources in the region. Land ownership and administration of lands within the MPA are described in Table 1.1 and Map 1-1.

Table 1.1. Land Management within the MPA (acres)

Land Management	Grand County	San Juan County	Total
BLM	1,529,390*	293,172	1,822,562*
Indian Lands	197,992	0	197,992
Department of Defense	1,631	0	1,631
National Park Service	76,396	0	76,396
Private	101,976	56,294	158,270
State Trust Lands	283,613	56,608	340,221
State Parks, County, City, Wildlife Park, and Outdoor Recreation Areas	16,339	1,068	17,407
USDA Forest Service	57,298	83,942	141,240
Acreage of Water	168	178	346
Total	2,264,803	491,262	2,756,065

*This total includes the 33,331 acres managed by the BLM Vernal FO.

Source: BLM 2004a.

Also contained within the MPA are several communities, diverse terrain, and scenic landscapes that figure prominently in the settlement, history, culture, and recreational enjoyment of southern Utah. Many occupational pursuits historically associated with this region of the Intermountain West—including farming, ranching, mining, tourism, retail trade, transportation, and construction—are practiced by residents within the MPA. Major communities in the MPA are Moab, La Sal, Castle Valley, Thompson, Crescent Junction, and Elgin. Major transportation routes include Interstate 70 (I-70), U.S. Highway 191, and State Routes 279 (Potash State Scenic Byway), 128 (Colorado River State Scenic Byway), and 313 (Dead Horse Mesa State Scenic Byway).

1.2.2 LAND USES

The MPA is internationally renowned for both its scenic quality and its recreational opportunities, which are the primary land uses in the MPA. Approximately 2 million visitors per year enjoy the diverse and varied recreational opportunities of the MPA and form the basis for Grand County's tourism-based economy. Recreational opportunities include scenic driving, mountain biking, hiking, rafting and boating, rock climbing, riding off-highway vehicles (OHVs), and horseback riding. The many trail-based recreational activities in the MPA are highly dependent upon route systems. Many of these route systems have been based on the network of roads and trails created originally for mineral exploration.

Mineral exploration and development are the next most prominent use of public lands in the MPA. Oil and gas exploration and production has occurred within the MPA continually for the past 100 years. Production of oil and gas is currently taking place in Greater Cisco and the eastern Book Cliffs, in Lisbon Valley, and on Big Flat. Another current mineral activity in the MPA is copper development; a large commercial copper deposit has been delineated in Lisbon Valley, and production is currently underway. Uranium deposits can be found throughout the southern half of the MPA. These deposits have been mined continually for over 90 years, first for

their radium content and later for their vanadium co-product. Other mineral deposits within the MPA include potash, coal, placer gold, limestone, building stone, travertine, humate, sand and gravel, and clay.

Another aspect of the MPA is the protection of certain natural and cultural resources from the impacts of human use. A number of federally listed endangered or threatened wildlife species inhabit the MPA, including the Mexican spotted owl, southwestern willow flycatcher, Colorado pikeminnow, humpback chub, bonytail chub, bald eagle, and peregrine falcon. The MPA also contains habitat for deer, elk, bighorn sheep (both desert and Rocky Mountain), and pronghorn. Prehistoric archaeological sites of ancestral Pueblo and Fremont cultures are also known to be in the MPA, as are later historical sites of cultural significance.

Other land uses within the MPA include rights-of-way (ROWs) for roads, pipelines, power lines, and communication sites, as well as commercial filming and livestock grazing.

1.3 BLM'S PLANNING PROCESS

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

Revision of an existing plan is a major federal action for the BLM. NEPA requires federal agencies to prepare an EIS for major federal actions; thus, this EIS accompanies the revision of the existing RMP. This EIS analyzes the impacts of **the Proposed Plan and three draft alternatives** for the MPA, including the No Action Alternative. The No Action Alternative reflects current management (the existing plan). NEPA requires analysis of a No Action Alternative.

1.3.1 NINE-STEP PLANNING PROCESS

The BLM uses a nine-step planning process (Figure 1.1) when developing and revising RMPs as required by 43 CFR Part 1600 and planning program guidance in the BLM Handbook H-1601-1, Land Use Planning Handbook (BLM 2005a). The planning process is designed to help the BLM identify the uses of BLM-administered lands desired by the public and to consider these uses to the extent they are consistent with the laws established by Congress and the policies of the executive branch of the federal government.

As depicted in Figure 1.1, the planning process is issue-driven (**Step 1**). The plan revision process is undertaken to resolve management issues and problems as well as to take advantage of management opportunities. The BLM utilized the public scoping process to identify planning issues to direct (drive) the revision of the existing plan. The scoping process also was used to

introduce the public to preliminary planning criteria, which set limits to the scope of the RMP revision (**Step 2**).




Figure 1.1. Nine-step planning process.

As appropriate, the BLM used existing data from files and other sources and collected new data necessary to update or supplement existing data in order to address planning issues and to fill data gaps identified during public scoping (**Step 3**). Using these data, information concerning the resource management programs, and the planning criteria, the BLM completed an Analysis of the Management Situation (AMS) (**Step 4**) to describe current management and to identify management opportunities for addressing the planning issues. Current management reflects management under the existing plan as well as management that would continue through selection of the No Action Alternative. The existing affected environment is summarized from the AMS into Chapter 3, Affected Environment, of the Draft RMP/EIS revision.

Results of the first four steps of the planning process clarified the purpose and need and identified key planning issues that need to be addressed by the RMP revision. Key planning issues reflect the focus of the RMP revision and are described in more detail in Section 1.3.2, below.

Alternatives constitute a range of management actions that set forth different priorities and measures to emphasize certain uses or resource values over other uses or resource values (usually representing a continuum from extraction and development to preservation/conservation) pursuant to the multiple-use and sustained yield mandates, so as to achieve certain goals or

objectives. During alternative formulation (**Step 5**), the BLM collaborated with cooperating agencies to identify goals and objectives (desired outcomes) for resources and resource uses in the MPA. These desired outcomes addressed the key planning issues, were constrained by the planning criteria, and incorporated the management opportunities identified by the BLM. The details of alternatives were filled in through the development of management actions and allowable uses anticipated to achieve the goals and objectives. The alternatives represent a reasonable range for managing resources and resource uses within the MPA. Chapter 2 of this document, Proposed Plan and Draft Alternatives, describes and summarizes the Proposed Plan and draft alternatives considered in detail.

This Proposed RMP/Final EIS also includes an analysis of the impacts of the Proposed Plan and the draft alternatives in Chapter 4, Environmental Consequences of Proposed Plan and Draft Alternatives, (**Step 6**). With input from cooperating agencies and BLM specialists, and consideration of planning issues, planning criteria, and the impacts of alternatives, the BLM identified and recommended that, at the time of the Draft RMP/EIS, Alternative C was the Preferred Alternative from among the four alternatives presented (**Step 7**). This is documented in the Draft RMP/EIS, which was distributed for a 90-day public review and comment period on August 25, 2007.

Step 8 of the land-use planning process occurred following receipt and consideration of public comments on the Draft RMP/EIS. In preparing the Proposed RMP/Final EIS, the BLM considered all comments it received during the public comment period. The Proposed Plan was crafted from the draft alternatives.

Step 9 is the monitoring and evaluation process. Monitoring is the repeated measurement of activities and conditions over time. Evaluation is a process in which the plan and monitoring data are reviewed to see if management goals and objectives are being met and if management direction is sound. Monitoring data gathered over time is examined and used to draw conclusions on whether management actions are meeting stated objectives, and if not, why. Conclusions are then used to make recommendations on whether to continue current management or what changes need to be made in management practices to meet objectives.

The two types of monitoring that are tied to the planning process include implementation and effectiveness monitoring. Land use plan monitoring is the process of (1) tracking the implementation of land use planning decisions and (2) collecting and assessing data/information necessary to evaluate the effectiveness of land use planning decisions. The two types of monitoring are described below.

Implementation Monitoring: Implementation monitoring is the most basic type of monitoring and simply determines whether planned activities have been implemented in the manner prescribed by the plan. Some agencies call this compliance monitoring. This monitoring documents BLM's progress toward full implementation of the land use plan decision. There are no specific thresholds or indicators required for this type of monitoring.

Effectiveness Monitoring: Effectiveness monitoring is aimed at determining if the implementation of activities has achieved the desired goals and objectives. Effectiveness

monitoring asks the question: Was the specified activity successful in achieving the objective? This requires knowledge of the objectives established in the RMP as well as indicators that can be measured. Indicators are established by technical specialists in order to address specific questions, and thus avoid collection of unnecessary data. Success is measured against the benchmark of achieving desired future conditions established by the plan.

Regulations at 43 CFR 1610.4-9 require that the proposed plan establish intervals and standards, as appropriate, for monitoring and evaluation of the plan, based on the sensitivity of the resource decisions involved. Progress in meeting the plan objectives and adherence to the management framework established by the plan is reviewed periodically. CEQ regulations implementing NEPA state that agencies may provide for monitoring to assure that their decisions are carried out and should do so in important cases (40 CFR 1505.2(c)). To meet these requirements, the BLM will review the plan on a regular schedule in order to provide consistent tracking of accomplishments and provide information that can be used to develop annual budget requests to continue implementation.

Land use plan evaluations will be used by BLM to determine if the decisions in the RMP, supported by the accompanying NEPA analysis, are still valid. Evaluation of the RMP will generally be conducted every five years per BLM policy, unless unexpected actions, new information, or significant changes in other plans, legislation, or litigation triggers an evaluation. Land use plan evaluations determine if decisions are being implemented, whether mitigation measures are satisfactory, whether there are significant changes in the related plans of other entities, whether there is new data of significance to the plan, and if decisions should be changed through amendment or revision. Evaluations will follow the protocols established by the BLM Land Use Planning Handbook H-1601-1 in effect at the time the evaluation is initiated. Specific monitoring and evaluation needs are identified by resource/uses throughout Chapter 2.

1.3.2 SCOPING AND IDENTIFICATION OF ISSUES FOR DEVELOPMENT OF THE PROPOSED PLAN AND DRAFT ALTERNATIVES

1.3.2.1 THE SCOPING PROCESS

Public input was generated through a formal public scoping period, which began with the publication of the Notice of Intent in the Federal Register on June 4, 2003. The scoping period included six public scoping meetings. The formal scoping period ended on January 31, 2004. The majority of comments emphasized OHV management, recreation, and areas of special designation. Other issues of high interest included non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics, minerals, livestock grazing, wildlife resources, and cultural resources. The scoping process identified the affected public and agency concerns, defined the relevant issues and draft alternatives that were examined in detail in the Draft RMP/EIS, and eliminated those that are not significant.

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

1. Issues identified for consideration in the Moab RMP;

2. Issues to be addressed through policy or administrative action (and therefore not addressed in the RMP);
3. Issues eliminated from detailed analysis because they are beyond the scope of the RMP (and therefore not addressed in the RMP).

The Final Scoping Summary (available for review on the Moab planning web page at www.blm.gov/rmp/ut/moab), prepared in conjunction with the Draft RMP/EIS, summarizes the scoping process. Other resource and use issues are identified in the BLM Planning Handbook and Manual (H1610-1). All of these issues were considered in developing the draft alternatives that were brought forward in the Draft RMP/EIS.

1.3.2.2 ISSUES ADDRESSED THROUGH POLICY OR ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION

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

- Compliance with existing laws and policies (e.g., FLPMA, NEPA, Endangered Species Act, American Antiquities Act, Clean Air Act, Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Act, and the National Historic Preservation Act).
- Application of the BLM's Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management addresses, among other issues, the allocation of forage for grazing animals and wildlife, the numbers of livestock, and changes in grazing management practices.
- Education, enforcement/prosecution, vandalism, and volunteer coordination.
- Consistency with existing federal, state, and local plans.
- Management of cultural resources, which includes up-to-date inventories, non-disclosure of sensitive sites, proposal of cultural sites for the National Register of Historic Places, and Native American consultation.
- Management of the MPA's 11 existing Wilderness Study Areas (WSAs; approximately 348,800 acres) under the Interim Management Policy for Lands Under Wilderness Review (IMP; H-8550-1; BLM 1995). These WSAs are statutorily required (pursuant to FLPMA Section 603[c]) to be managed to protect their suitability for Congressional designation into the National Wilderness Preservation System. There are, however, a few decisions that will be made for WSAs in this planning effort. They include applying a visual resources management (VRM) Class I objective to the WSAs and determining if the WSAs will be limited or closed to off-highway vehicle (OHV) use. Because this planning effort will also consider designating ways in the limited areas as an implementation action, specific ways available for use will be disclosed and analyzed.
- Management of the Black Ridge Canyons Wilderness Area. This wilderness area was Congressionally designated in 2000 under Public Law 106-353 and is managed by the Grand Junction Field Office through an RMP for the McInnis Canyons National Conservation Area and Black Ridge Canyons Wilderness.

- Completion of inventory of riparian and wetland areas and the use of monitoring and mitigation to help protect these resources.
- Continuing work on a comprehensive sign system and maps for recreational and other users.
- Administration of existing mineral leases, permits, and other authorized uses.
- Use of valid existing rights.
- Monitoring wildlife and biodiversity.
- Monitoring air quality.
- Mitigation measures for site-specific projects.
- Eligibility standards for specially designated areas.
- Protection of threatened, endangered, or sensitive species.
- Coordination with local, state, and federal agencies.
- Cooperation with user groups.
- The allocation of forage between livestock and wildlife and the application of specific management practices on allotments within the planning area. (This issue is provided for through the application of Utah's Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Livestock Management and supporting monitoring data. When monitoring and inventory data indicate, changes are made to livestock and wildlife numbers and their management to assure that resource objectives will be met. These allocation and management adjustments are implementation decisions according to the BLM's planning handbook and are done on an allotment or other site specific basis.)

1.3.2.3 ISSUES ELIMINATED FROM DETAILED ANALYSIS BECAUSE THEY ARE BEYOND THE SCOPE OF THE PLAN

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

- The State of Utah and Grand and San Juan counties may hold valid existing rights-of-way in the planning area pursuant to Revised Statute (RS) 2477, Act of July 28, 1866, Chapter 262, 8, 14 Stat. 252, 253, *codified at* 43 U.S.C. 932. On October 21, 1976, Congress repealed R.S. 2477 through passage of FLPMA. This RMP does not adjudicate, analyze, or otherwise determine the validity of claimed rights-of-way. However, nothing in the RMP extinguishes any valid right-of-way, or alters in any way the legal rights the state and counties have to assert and protect RS 2477 rights or to challenge in federal court or other appropriate venues any use restrictions imposed by the RMP that they believe are inconsistent with their rights.
- New wilderness or WSA proposals.
- Eliminating grazing, mineral development, and OHV use on all public lands.
- Activities and uses beyond the jurisdiction of the BLM.
- Changing existing laws, policies, and regulations.

- Availability of funding and personnel for managing programs.
- Considering alternative energy sources as substitutes for activities related to mineral development.

1.3.3 DEVELOPMENT OF PLANNING CRITERIA

Planning criteria are based on appropriate laws, regulations, BLM Manual sections, and policy directives, as well as on public participation and coordination with cooperating agencies, other federal agencies, state and local governments, and Indian tribes. Planning criteria are the standards, rules, and factors used to resolve issues and develop alternatives. Planning criteria are prepared to ensure decision making is tailored to the issues and to ensure that the BLM avoids unnecessary data collection and analysis.

Planning criteria have been developed to guide the development of the Proposed Plan and draft alternatives. The planning criteria to be considered in the development of the RMP are as follows:

- The planning process would recognize the existence of valid existing rights, including water rights.
- All decisions made in the planning process would apply only to public lands and, where appropriate, split-estate lands where the subsurface mineral estate is managed by the BLM.
- As described by law and policy, the BLM would strive to ensure that its management actions are as consistent as possible with other adjoining planning jurisdictions, both federal and non-federal.
- Management of existing WSAs would be guided by the IMP (BLM 1995). Should Congress release all or part of a WSA from wilderness study, resource management would be determined by preparing an amendment to the RMP. Actions inconsistent with RMP goals and objectives would be deferred until completion of requisite plan amendments. Because the management direction of the released land would continue in accordance with the goals and objectives established in the RMP, there is no separate analysis required in this land-use plan to address resource impacts if any WSAs are released. If Congress acts to designate any lands within the MPA as wilderness, they would be managed pursuant to Congress's designation and the Wilderness Act.
- The Standards for Public Land Health (BLM 1997a, 2002b) would apply to all activities and uses. The Standards, as well as the BLM guidelines for grazing and recreation management implemented to achieve the Standards, would be applicable to the Proposed Plan and the draft alternatives to the RMP analyzed in this Final EIS.
- Baseline Reasonably Foreseeable Management/Development scenarios would be developed and portrayed for oil and gas, and other uses as appropriate, based on historical, existing, and projected levels for all mineral resource programs.
- Based on consultation with Native Americans, the BLM would consider sites, areas, issues, and objects important to their cultural and religious heritage.
- The BLM would adhere to all applicable laws, including those on water rights and state and local laws where appropriate; regulations; BLM manual sections; and current policy

directives pertaining to management of public lands. For example, all management actions would comply with the Endangered Species Act and all laws concerning cultural resources.

- The socioeconomic impacts of the Proposed Plan and draft alternatives would be addressed.
- Areas potentially suitable for designation as ACECs and other special designations would be identified and, where appropriate, brought forward for analysis in the EIS.
- River segments would be considered for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and determinations of eligibility, suitability, tentative classification, and protective management would be made in accordance with Section 5(d) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act and BLM Manual 8351.

1.4 RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER POLICIES, PLANS, AND PROGRAMS

This RMP is a preliminary step in the overall process of managing public lands. Subsequent more detailed or limited decisions and plans may implement BLM's projections. As a result, this planning process must recognize the many ongoing programs, plans, and policies that are being implemented in the MPA by other land managers and government agencies. The BLM will seek to be consistent with or complementary to other management actions whenever possible. Plans that need to be considered during the MFO's planning effort include the following:

1.4.1 STATE OF UTAH

- Dead Horse Point State Park Resource Management Plan
- Plans of the Utah School and Institutional Trust Lands Administration (SITLA)
- Regional plans of the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT)
- State of Utah plans relating to water management, water quality, nonpoint source pollution, watershed management, and air quality
- Utah's State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP)

1.4.2 COUNTY LAND USE PLANS

- San Juan County, Utah: San Juan County Master Plan (1996)
- Grand County, Utah: Grand County General Plan Update (2004)

1.4.3 OTHER FEDERAL PLANS

- Canyonlands National Park Natural Resource Management Plan
- Canyonlands National Park general management plans (NPS 1974, 2003, 2006)
- Canyonlands National Park backcountry management plan (1984, 1995)
- Land and Resource Management Plan, Manti-La Sal National Forest (USDA [USFS] 1986)
- General Management Plan and Development Concept Plan: Arches National Park (NPS 1989)
- RMPs for the BLM Vernal, Grand Junction, Uncompahgre, Dolores, and Price field offices (BLM 1985b, 1985c, 1985d, 1987, 1989a, 1993a)

- Colorado Canyons National Conservation Area Management Plan (BLM 2003a)

1.4.4 ENDANGERED SPECIES RECOVERY PLANS

Endangered species recovery plans are prepared by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to promote the recovery of threatened and endangered species.

- Colorado Pikeminnow Recovery Plan (USFWS 1978, 1990, 1991, 2002a)
- Humpback Chub Recovery Plan (USFWS 1979, 1990a, 2002b)
- Northern States Bald Eagle Recovery Plan (USFWS 1983)
- Bonytail Chub Recovery Plan (USFWS 1984, 1990b, 2002c)
- Recovery Implementation Program EA for the Endangered Fish Species in the Upper Colorado River Basin (USFWS 1987)
- Black-footed Ferret Recovery Plan (USFWS 1988)
- Mexican Spotted Owl Recovery Plan (USFWS 1995)
- Razorback Sucker Recovery Plan (USFWS 1999, 2002d)
- Final Recovery Plan for the Southwestern Willow Flycatcher (USFWS 2002e)

1.4.5 ENERGY POLICY AND CONSERVATION ACT (EPCA)

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

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

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

In April 2003, the BLM specified four EPCA integration principles, as follows:

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

1.4.6 ENERGY POLICY ACT OF 2005 AND THE WESTERN ENERGY CORRIDOR PROGRAMMATIC EIS (PEIS)

Section 368 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (designation of West-wide energy corridors) is being implemented via the current development of an interagency, Programmatic EIS (PEIS). The Final PEIS could amend numerous RMPs in the western U.S., providing decisions that will address numerous energy corridor-related issues, including the utilization of existing corridors (with enhancements and upgrades), identification of new corridors, supply and demand considerations, and compatibility with other corridor and project planning efforts.

1.4.7 MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING (MOU) BETWEEN THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR; THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT (BLM); AND THE U.S DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, U.S. FOREST SERVICE CONCERNING OIL AND GAS LEASING OPERATIONS

The purpose of this Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) is to establish joint BLM and Forest Service policies and procedures for managing oil and gas leasing and operational activities pursuant to oil and gas leases on National Forest Service (NFS) lands, consistent with applicable law and policy. The MOU was signed in 2006 for the purpose of efficient, effective compliance with statutory and regulatory requirements. The MOU establishes the roles of the Forest Service and the BLM in processing Applications for Permits to Drill and review of subsequent operations.

1.4.8 ACTIVITY PLANS AND AMENDMENTS TO THE GRAND RESOURCE AREA RMP (1985)

The existing Grand Resource Area RMP has undergone numerous land-use plan amendments from which decisions will either be carried forward under this new RMP or would be changed via the Proposed Plan and draft alternatives. The same is true for the activity level plans that have been completed in conformance with the Grand Resource Area RMP. The activity plans and amendments that will continue to be brought forward under the Proposed Plan and draft alternatives are noted below. Those that may be changed under the Proposed Plan and draft alternatives are also noted.

- Grazing Amendment to RMP (Livestock conversions) (1988); (changed by the Proposed Plan and draft alternatives in this planning process)
- Grand Resource Area RMP Oil and Gas Supplemental Environmental Assessment (1988); (changed by the Proposed Plan and draft alternatives in this planning process)
- Bighorn Sheep Amendment (1990, 1993b); (common to the Proposed Plan and draft alternatives)
- Colorado Riverway Recreation Area Management Plan (1992a); (common to the Proposed Plan and draft alternatives)
- Sand Flats Recreation Management Plan (1994a); (common to the Proposed Plan and draft alternatives)
- Livestock Grazing Use Adjustments (1996); (common to the Proposed Plan and draft alternatives)

- Ken's Lake Emergency Plan (1996); (common to the Proposed Plan and draft alternatives)
- Utah's Colorado Riverway Special Management Recreation Area Amendment (2001a); (common to the Proposed Plan and draft alternatives)
- Mill Creek Canyon Management Plan (2001b); (common to the Proposed Plan and draft alternatives)
- Canyon Rims Recreation Area Management Plan (2003b); (common to the Proposed Plan and draft alternatives)
- Three Rivers Withdrawal (2004b); (common to the Proposed Plan and draft alternatives)
- Cameo Cliffs Special Recreation Management Area Plan (2005b); (common to the Proposed Plan and draft alternatives)
- Normal Year Fire Rehabilitation and Stabilization Plan (2006a); (common to the Proposed Plan and draft alternatives)
- Moab District Fire Management Plan (2006b); (common to the Proposed Plan and draft alternatives)

1.4.9 HABITAT MANAGEMENT PLANS (HMP)

A Habitat Management Plan (HMP) provides guidance for the management of a defined habitat for a target wildlife species, protecting and improving habitat for that species and for other species utilizing the habitat. These plans are usually written in coordination with the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources

- Cisco Desert HMP (1985a); (common to the Proposed Plan and draft alternatives)
- Hatch Point HMP (1985b); (common to the Proposed Plan and draft alternatives)
- Dolores Triangle HMP (1985c); (common to the Proposed Plan and draft alternatives)
- The Potash-Confluence HMP (1986); (common to the Proposed Plan and draft alternatives)
- Wild and Scenic River Study Colorado and Lower Dolores Rivers EIS (NPS 1979); (changed by the Proposed Plan and draft alternatives in this planning process)
- Utah BLM Statewide Wilderness EIS (1990); (common to the Proposed Plan and draft alternatives)
- Lisbon Valley Copper Project EIS (BLM 1997b); (common to the Proposed Plan and draft alternatives)
- Questar, Williams, and Kern River Pipeline Project EIS (BLM 2001c); (common to the Proposed Plan and draft alternatives)
- Remediation of the Moab Uranium Tailings, Grand and San Juan Counties, Utah EIS (DOE 2005); (common to the Proposed Plan and draft alternatives)
- Vegetation Treatment on BLM Lands in Thirteen Western States (1991a); (common to the Proposed Plan and draft alternatives)
- Final Vegetation Treatments on Bureau of Land Management Lands in 17 Western States Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement and Associated Record of Decision. USDI, Bureau of Land Management, 2007 (FES 07-21)

- Final Vegetation Treatments on Bureau of Land Management Lands in 17 Western States Programmatic Environmental Report. USDI, Bureau of Land Management, 2007 (FES07-21)

1.5 SUMMARY OF CHANGES FROM THE DRAFT RMP/EIS TO THE PROPOSED PLAN RMP/FINAL EIS

The Draft RMP/EIS was released to the public on August 25, 2007, which initiated a 90-day comment period. Comments were received from the public, cooperators, and other interested parties. See Chapter 5, Consultation and Coordination, for details of the public comment process.

As a result of public comment and internal review of the Draft RMP/EIS, the BLM has formulated the Proposed Plan in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS. The Proposed Plan/FEIS does not carry forward Alternative C (the Preferred Alternative) from the Draft RMP/EIS. Rather the Proposed Plan/RMP consists of a combination of all the alternatives.

Changes regarding the Proposed Plan and draft alternatives focused on adjustments in order to address public concerns while continuing to meet the BLM's legal and regulatory mandates. Additional information and changes throughout Chapters 1 through 4 have been shaded in light gray. Changes are a result of

- adjustments to Decisions,
- clarifications to better explain the management proposed in the Draft RMP/EIS,
- updates to information,
- updates to maps, and
- minor corrections, including typographical errors.

1.5.1 SUMMARY OF CHANGES TO DECISIONS BETWEEN THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE (DRAFT EIS) AND THE PROPOSED PLAN (FINAL EIS)

- Add six decisions clarifying the BLM's responsibilities regarding Air Quality.
- Delete the Cultural Resources decision allocating percentages of sites to various categories.
- Delete prioritization of National Register nominations.
- Add a decision to Lands and Realty that specifically grants reasonable access to SITLA lands.
- Add two grazing allotments (Pear Park and Ida Gulch) to those not available for grazing.
- Add a decision to Minerals on working with stakeholders to determine emissions mitigation strategies for future leases.
- Add a decision regarding management of the Fisher Towers Trail as a National Recreation Trail.
- Delete a decision on AUMs in the Cisco Allotment in the Riparian Resources section.
- Add exception language to the decision prohibiting new OHV routes in saline soils. New routes would be allowed in saline soils in the Utah Rims SRMA and in the Dee Pass Motorized Focus Area.

- Add "Mel's Loop" motorcycle route to the Travel Plan.
- Delete the decision regarding voluntary relinquishment of grazing in Ten Mile Wash.
- Add three decisions regarding Wild and Scenic rivers that recognize existing rights, privileges, and contracts along these rivers.
- Change the classification of Segment 1 of the Green River to "Wild," Segment 2 of the Green River to "Recreational," and Segment 5 of the Colorado River to "Scenic."
- Change the greater sage-grouse lek buffer area from 0.5 miles to 2.0 miles.
- Replace the Wildlife decision on mitigation to comply with BLM policy.
- Delete Parcel R-11 as an area available for disposal due to the presence of special status species on that parcel .

1.5.2 CLARIFICATIONS

In addition to the modifications to the Proposed Plan, information has been updated and language clarified in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS in response to questions and comments received on the Draft RMP/EIS. Major clarifications are

- Implementation-level decisions have been identified by placing them in italics and asterisking with a footnote.
- clarify the definition of a "new route" for the cultural resources inventory requirement;
- clarify the extent of the Area of Potential Effect (660 feet) for cultural actions;
- clarify "reasonable access" to SITLA lands;
- clarify the merger of two utility corridors in the Proposed Plan and Alternatives B and D (rather than the elimination of a corridor);
- clarify that SITLA has priority in land exchanges;
- clarify the Spring Creek–Buckhorn allotment's location;
- clarify the three types of Special Recreation Management Areas;
- clarify boating management numbers on Colorado and Dolores Rivers;
- clarify authority for potential recreation fee for White Wash Sand Dunes;
- clarify protection of relevant and important values for those ACECs not carried forward to the Proposed Plan;
- clarify Wild and Scenic River management by listing the oil and gas leasing category, Visual Resource Management class and OHV designation for each suitable river segment;
- clarify wording in Travel Management to fully explain actions;
- clarify that elk and deer habitat are not identical;
- clarify development of cultural model for analysis; and
- clarify motorcycle routes in the Proposed Plan and Alternatives B and D.

1.5.3 UPDATES TO DATA

- Correct acreages of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics in Alternative B
- Add information on global climate change
- Add air quality data from Canyonlands National Park
- Add information on SITLA lands within the Moab Field Office
- Add Utah State University social survey results
- Add wage distribution for recreation jobs
- Remove bald eagle from Threatened and Endangered Species headings
- Update socioeconomic data from the year 2000 to the year 2007
- Add data on socioeconomics, including severance taxes and property taxes
- Add mileage data on miles of routes not designated for various resource values
- Add information on fiscal impacts to SITLA from BLM restrictions
- Add data on OHV impacts to resources in Appendix G (Travel Plan)
- Update Conservation Measures from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

1.5.4 MAP CHANGES

- Map 2-3: Remove parcel R-11 from Lands Identified for Disposal.
- Map 2-4: Correct confusion concerning Spring Creek allotments.
- Map 2-4-C: Add Pear Park and Ida Gulch to allotments not available for livestock grazing.
- Maps 2-5-B, C and D: Remove area in Arches National Park as erroneously shown as available for leasing.
- Map 2-9-C: Adjust acreage of White Wash Sand Dunes Open OHV Area.
- Map 2-10-C: Adjust acreage of area open to cross country OHV.
- Map 2-11-A: Add map showing designated routes.
- Map 2-11-B, C and D: Remove roads in Arches National Park; add two routes on Colorado border.
- Map 2-11-E: Add Alternatives A and B maps for motorcycle routes; add Slickrock Trail; distinguish which motorcycle routes are also available for ATV's; add Thompson-Colorado BLM Alt C route to map; add Mel's Loop to the Proposed Plan.
- Map 2-24-C: Add names of areas with wilderness characteristics.
- Map 2-25: Make correction to pronghorn kidding habitat.
- Map 2-27 A, B, and C/D: Change name to Deer and/or Elk Habitat.

In addition to the above changes, adjustments were made to correct typographical or grammatical errors, add references, and clarify wording. Changes of this nature are not listed above.

1.5.5 CRUCIAL WILDLIFE HABITAT CHANGES

In August 2005, the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources (UDWR) changed its wildlife habitat classification system. Prior to 2005, the UDWR classification system distinguished between "critical" habitat (an area that provides for biological and/or behavioral requisites necessary to sustain the existence and/or perpetuation of a wildlife population) and "high value" habitat (an area that provides for intensive use by the species). The UDWR has been criticized for using the term "critical," as the same term refers to habitat federally designated by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service as required by the Endangered Species Act (ESA).

In previous BLM planning efforts, mitigation decisions (usually timing stipulations) for impacts to the UDWR's "critical" habitats have been integrated into the planning process. The BLM rarely incorporated management decisions in its RMPs for "high value" habitats. The UDWR changed its classification system to include "critical" habitat with "high value" habitat, in part to accommodate the limitations of having classifications that were of no practical value to land managers. The new term "crucial" habitat is defined by the UDWR as "habitat on which the local population of a wildlife species depends for survival because there are no alternative ranges or habitats available. Crucial habitat is essential to the life-history requirements of a wildlife species. Degradation or loss of crucial habitat will lead to significant declines in the wildlife population in question."

Crucial habitat boundaries appear larger on the wildlife maps in this Proposed Plan because they are a combination of the UDWR's old "critical" habitat and "high value" habitat, with some minor modifications. Timing stipulations for each of the species now apply to the whole crucial habitat area. It is important to note, however, that the application of waivers, exceptions, and modifications, as outlined in Appendix C, will be taken into consideration and used where/when applicable for all surface-disturbing activities in these areas. The range of alternatives in the Draft RMP/Draft EIS considered both of the UDWR's old classifications of critical and high value habitat. Minor boundary modifications have been made by the UDWR prior to incorporating them into crucial habitat boundaries. Because this information was taken into consideration and analyzed in the Draft, these minor changes are not considered significant in terms of resource uses and/or analysis in this Proposed Plan, and therefore a supplement to this EIS is not necessary for this purpose.

1.5.6 SUMMARY OF CHANGES

The BLM has made numerous changes between the Draft RMP/Draft EIS and Proposed RMP/Final EIS. These changes are described above and detailed in Appendix U. The BLM has prepared this appendix to document whether changes between the Draft RMP/Draft EIS and the Proposed RMP/Final EIS resulted in a significant change in circumstances or conditions, or whether the Proposed RMP/Final EIS contains different information from that which was presented to the public in the Draft RMP/Draft EIS. Finally, the BLM wanted to confirm that all changes made to the Proposed RMP/Final EIS fall within the range of alternatives presented and analyzed in the Draft RMP/Draft EIS.

The regulation controlling whether or not a supplement is required is found at 40 CFR 1502.9(c), which provides that agencies

- shall prepare supplements to either draft or final environmental impact statements if (1) the agency makes substantial changes in the proposed action that are relevant to environmental concerns, or (2) there are significant new circumstances or information relevant to environmental concerns and bearing on the proposed action or its impact;
- may also prepare supplements when the agency determines that the purposes of the Act will be furthered by doing so;
- shall adopt procedures for introducing a supplement into its formal administrative record, if such a record exists; and
- shall prepare, circulate, and file a supplement to a statement in the same fashion (exclusive of scoping) as a draft and final statement unless alternative procedures are approved by the Council.

All changes to the MFO Draft RMP/Draft EIS were made in response to public comment and/or internal review. The majority of the changes were editorial changes made to add clarity to the document. In some cases, alternatives presented in the Draft RMP/Draft EIS were modified in the PRMP to reflect technical corrections and data updates. In other cases, such as in Chapter 3, Affected Environment, incorporation of updated information was necessary to refine the analysis in Chapter 4, Environmental Consequences of Proposed Plan and Draft Alternatives, that was incomplete or needed augmentation.

None of the changes described above and further detailed in Appendix U meet the regulatory definition for significance in 40 CFR 1508.27(a) and (b). These regulations require an agency preparing a NEPA document to review the changes for significant new circumstances or information relevant to environmental concerns and bearing on the Proposed Plan or its impacts, using context and intensity as the trigger for significance. The BLM has reviewed each substantive change through this regulatory standard and has determined that none of the changes, individually or collectively, require a supplement to this Final EIS.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK