

RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN  
RECORD OF DECISION  
AND  
RANGELAND PROGRAM SUMMARY  
FOR THE  
SAN JUAN RESOURCE AREA  
MOAB DISTRICT  
UTAH


Prepared by  
Bureau of Land Management  
U.S. Department of the Interior  
March 1991

SAN JUAN RESOURCE AREA


RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN  
RECORD OF DECISION  
AND  
RANGELAND PROGRAM  
SUMMARY

We have recommended and approved for implementation the proposed decisions of the San Juan Resource Management Plan and Rangeland Program Summary. The specific details of the decisions are included in Chapters 2 and 3 of the Resource Management Plan.

Recommended By:


  
Edward R. Scherick  
Area Manager

3/18/91  
Date

  
Gene Nodine  
District Manager

3/18/91  
Date

Approved by:

  
James M. Parker  
State Director

3-18-91  
Date

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|  | <u>Page</u> |
|--|-------------|
| Alternatives Assessed  | 4           |
| Reason for Selection   | 5           |
| Minimization of Environmental Harm                                   | 5           |
| Public Involvement and Intergovernmental/Interagency<br>Coordination | 6           |
| Protest Resolution   | 6           |
| Consistency Review   | 6           |
| Plan Availability  | 6           |
| <br>Chapter 1, Introduction  |             |
| Organization of the Resource Management Plan                         | 7           |
| The Resource Area  | 7           |
| The Planning Process   | 7           |
| Purpose and Need   | 7           |
| Implementation   | 15          |
| Monitoring and Evaluation  | 15          |
| Anticipated Implementation and Monitoring Needs                      | 15          |
| Plan Amendment or Revision   | 26          |
| Relationship to Other BLM Planning Levels and Studies                | 26          |
| Public Involvement and Intergovernmental/Interagency<br>Coordination | 26          |
| <br>Chapter 2, Resource Management Program Decisions                 |             |
| Overview   | 27          |
| Oil and Gas Management   | 27          |
| Geothermal Management  | 29          |
| Coal Management  | 29          |
| Oil Shale/Tar Sand Management  | 30          |
| Mineral Materials Management   | 30          |
| Mining Law Administration  | 33          |
| Mineral Management (Nonenergy Leasables)                             | 35          |
| Rights of Way  | 37          |
| Lands  | 38          |
| Withdrawal Processing and Review                                     | 40          |
| Forest Management  | 45          |
| Forest Development   | 46          |

Table of Contents Continued

Page

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Grazing Management - Rangeland Program Summary                                    | 46  |
| Cultural Resource Mangement   | 73  |
| Wilderness Management   | 75  |
| Recreation Resource Management  | 75  |
| Visual Resource Management  | 80  |
| Soil, Water and Air Management  | 80  |
| Hazardous Waste Management  | 81  |
| Habitat Management  | 82  |
| Endangered Species Management   | 82  |
| Fire Management   | 83  |
| Chapter 3, Special Management Conditions  |     |
| Overview  | 84  |
| Special Conditions for ACEC's   | 85  |
| Alkali Ridge  | 85  |
| Bridger Jack Mesa   | 86  |
| Butler Wash   | 86  |
| Cedar Mesa  | 87  |
| Dark Canyon   | 89  |
| Hovenweep   | 90  |
| Indian Creek  | 91  |
| Lavender Mesa   | 91  |
| Scenic Highway Corridor   | 92  |
| Shay Canyon   | 93  |
| Special Conditions for Areas Other Than ACECs                                     | 94  |
| Floodplains and Riparian/Aquatic Areas  | 94  |
| Seasonal Wildlife Protection Areas  | 94  |
| Identified Mesa Tops, Bighorn Sheep   | 95  |
| Recreation Opportunity Spectrum Class Areas                                       | 96  |
| Wild and Scenic Rivers  | 98  |
| Pearson Canyon Hiking Area  | 101 |
| Developed Recreation Sites  | 101 |
| Existing Land Leases  | 101 |
| Material Site Rights-of-Way   | 102 |
| Appendix 1 - Public Involvement and Intergovernmental/Interagency<br>Coordination | 103 |
| List of Tables  |     |
| Table 1 - Land Surface Administration   | 8   |
| Table 2 - Management of Mineral Resources   | 9   |
| Table 3 - Management of Grazing and Recreation Resources                          | 13  |

Table of Contents Continued

Page

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Table 4 - Previous Management Framework Plan, SJRA   | 14 |
| Table 5 - Anticipated Implementation and Monitoring of<br>Resource Management Plan Decisions, by<br>Management Program | 16 |
| Table 6 - Material Site Rights-of-Way Granted Prior to RMP   | 31 |
| Table 7 - Community Pits Existing Prior to the RMP   | 32 |
| Table 8 - Areas Not Open to Mineral Entry  | 34 |
| Table 9 - Known Potash Lease Areas   | 36 |
| Table 10 - Classifications and Segregations Made Prior to<br>the RMP   | 39 |
| Table 11 - Tracts Identified for Disposal  | 41 |
| Table 12 - Grazing Actions to be Implemented, by Allotment   | 47 |
| Table 13 - Current and Future Ecological Condition by<br>Percentage of Allotment                                       | 58 |
| Table 14 - Existing Allotment Management Plans   | 67 |
| Table 15 - New Allotment Management Plans  | 67 |
| Table 16 - Existing Seedings   | 68 |
| Table 17 - Key Forage Species, By Grazing Allotment  | 70 |
| Table 18 - Percent Proper Utilization of Key Forage Species  | 72 |
| Table 19 - Cultural Resource Use Zones   | 74 |
| Table 20 - Wilderness Review Areas   | 76 |

List of Figures

|                                      |     |
|--------------------------------------|-----|
| Figure 1 - Potential Land Treatments | 108 |
| Figure 2 - Wilderness Study Areas    | 109 |

## RMP ALTERNATIVES ASSESSED

Five alternatives were considered in detail in the EIS.

The five alternatives present different ways of answering the questions raised by the planning issues. These answers were used to formulate specific management actions under each alternative.

Existing management practices that were determined adequate, along with administrative changes based on the management opportunities identified in the MSA (management actions common to all alternatives) were considered to be part of every alternative.

### Alternative A (the no action alternative)

- represents continuation of current management; and
- provides a baseline for comparing the other alternatives and the effects of their implementation.

### Alternative B gives priority to:

- production of mineral resources; and
- production of forage and use of public lands for grazing.

### ALTERNATIVE C gives priority to:

- 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
- preserving watershed values through protection of certain soils resources.

### ALTERNATIVE D gives priority to:

- preserving natural succession of plant communities by minimizing surface disturbance, particularly in four specific areas;
- protecting cultural resources beyond the requirements of law in certain areas; and
- increasing the extent of areas available for primitive uses.

## ALTERNATIVE E

(the preferred alternative) gives priority to:

- protecting the opportunity for primitive and semi-primitive recreation uses in certain areas;
- protecting scenic values in certain area;
- protecting cultural resources beyond the requirements of the law in certain areas;
- protecting certain wildlife habitat areas;
- preserving watershed values through protection of certain soils resources;
- continuing livestock grazing at current use levels in areas where no conflict with other resource values occurs; and
- otherwise making public lands available for the production of mineral resources.

## REASONS FOR SELECTION

The RMP is essentially the same as Alternative E, the preferred alternative. This alternative was selected because it:

best resolves the planning issues

strikes a balance or reasonable compromise between national and local-regional interests

best fulfills BLM's statutory mission and responsibilities, giving consideration to environmental, scientific, educational and economic factors

maintains multiple use management while providing protection or enhancement to unique and sensitive resources.

## MINIMIZATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL HARM

All practical means to avoid or minimize environmental harm have been adopted in the decisions. These decisions are found in Chapter 2.

## IMPLEMENTATION AND PLAN MONITORING

The implementation and monitoring program outlined in the RMP is adopted. Details are outlined in Chapter 1. The software program SYZYG will be used to track plan implementation, monitoring and budget.

The estimated cost of implementing the plan is 2 million dollars annually (as of December 1990). This cost includes labor and non-labor costs in San Juan Resource Area as well as support from Moab District.

## PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL/INTERAGENCY COORDINATION

Public participation and consultation was encouraged and sought throughout the development of this plan. Details are listed in the Purpose and Need section of Chapter 1. The RMP/EIS documents notices; coordination with other federal, state, and local agencies; public meetings; public review and comment; and other public participation efforts involved in the preparation of this RMP.

The San Juan RMP has been determined to be consistent with the plans, programs, and policies of the U.S. Forest Service and National Park Service. It is mostly consistent with the San Juan County Master Plan. It is inconsistent in that the county plan recognizes the potential of parts of Cedar Mesa for agricultural and commercial development as private lands, while the RMP would retain these lands in federal ownership.

A summary and listing of public participation and interagency coordination is found in Appendix 1 of the Resource Management Plan.

## PROTEST RESOLUTION

The public was notified of their right to protest the proposed plan through the Federal Register, news release and letters. The protest period began July 14, 1989 and ended August 30, 1989.

Sixteen protests were filed with the Director, Bureau of Land Management. The protests focused on designation and management of ACECs, firewood gathering, eligibility of rivers for wild and scenic river designation, livestock grazing at the 5 year licensed average, consistency with NPS management, and management of ORV use, cultural resources, riparian areas and seasonal wildlife habitat.

Additional review of river segments under established wild and scenic river procedures will be accomplished within a year of approval of the RMP. This will ensure that all rivers or streams on public lands in the resource area are evaluated for eligibility for wild and scenic river designation.

## CONSISTENCY REVIEW

The RMP was reviewed by the State of Utah and determined to be consistent with the officially approved resource related plans and policies of the state as noted in the Governor's letter to the Utah State Director, BLM dated September 13, 1989.

## PLAN AVAILABILITY

Copies of the RMP may be obtained from the following locations:

Utah State Office  
324 S. State Street  
Suite 301  
Coordinated Financial Services Building  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111

Moab District Office  
82 East Dogwood  
P.O. Box 970  
Moab, Utah 84532

San Juan Resource Area Office  
435 North Main  
P.O. Box 7  
Monticello, Utah 84535