

## **5.0 CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION**

### **5.1 INTRODUCTION**

During the planning and decision-making process for this Monticello Proposed Resource Management Plan (PRMP)/Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS), the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) made formal and informal efforts to consult and coordinate with other federal agencies and state and local governments, Native American tribes, and the interested public, in accordance with the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the Federal Land Policy Management Act (FLPMA), and all applicable Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) and Department of Interior regulations, policies, and procedures. NEPA, FLPMA, and applicable regulations and policy require that all federal agencies involve the interested general public in their decision-making, consider reasonable alternatives to the Preferred Alternative/Proposed Plan, and prepare environmental documents that disclose the potential impacts of the Preferred Alternative/Proposed Plan and the reasonable alternatives.

Public involvement, consultation, and coordination have been at the heart of the planning process leading to the Monticello PRMP/FEIS to ensure that (1) the most appropriate data have been gathered and employed for the analyses and (2) agency and public sentiment and values are considered and incorporated into decision making. This was accomplished through Federal Register notices, formal public and informal meetings, individual contacts, news releases, planning bulletins, the planning website, and public comments and responses there to on the Draft RMP/EIS.

The BLM initiated the planning process on June 4, 2003 by publishing in the Federal Register a Notice of Intent (NOI) to conduct land-use planning for the Monticello Field Office (Monticello FO). The NOI invited the participation of the affected and interested agencies, organizations, and members of the general public in determining the scope of and the significant issues to be addressed in the planning alternatives and analyzed in the EIS. Scoping remained open until January 31, 2004. As part of the resource inventory, members of the interdisciplinary (ID) team formally and informally contacted various relevant agencies to request data to supplement the BLM's existing resource database.

On November 2, 2007, the BLM published in the Federal Register a Notice of Availability (NOA) of the Draft RMP/EIS to announce and solicit public comments on the alternatives and impacts and effects of those alternatives on the human environment. The BLM distributed to relevant agencies and the interested public the Draft RMP/EIS for review and comment. The comment period ended February 8, 2008. The comments and the BLM's responses there to are addressed in this Proposed RMP/Final EIS (PRMP/FEIS or Proposed Plan). Likewise, the BLM will publish an NOA to announce the Proposed Plan and Final EIS.

The following sections of this chapter describe the public involvement, consultation, and coordination process, including key consultation and coordination activities undertaken to prepare a comprehensive PRMP/FEIS for the Monticello FO.

## **5.2 CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION WITH TRIBES, STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS, AND FEDERAL AGENCIES**

In the development of this PRMP/FEIS, the BLM is required to consult and coordinate with other federal agencies, state and local government agencies and officials, both elected and appointed, and federally recognized Native American tribes. More specifically, federal law, including FLPMA, NEPA, the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA) (16 United States Code [U.S.C.] 470 et seq.), the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (16 United States Code [U.S.C.] 661 et seq.), the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (ESA) (16 United States Code [U.S.C.] Sec 1531 et seq.), and other applicable laws, regulations, policies, and executive orders, direct BLM to coordinate and consult with Native Americans, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) during the planning/NEPA decision-making process. This section documents the specific consultation and coordination efforts undertaken by the BLM throughout the entire process of developing the PRMP/FEIS.

Coordination with other agencies and consistency, to the extent possible, with other plans were accomplished through frequent communications, meetings, and cooperative efforts among the BLM planning and ID team and involved federal, state, and local agencies and organizations. The cooperating agencies that were formally involved assisted the BLM throughout the planning process in the development of the PRMP/FEIS.

Cooperating agencies that have participated in the development of the Monticello land-use planning process consist of: State of Utah and San Juan County. In addition to the cooperating agencies, the Monticello FO held meetings with and sought the input of other agencies that have land management jurisdiction within or adjacent to the planning area. Agencies include the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the U.S. National Park Service (NPS), the U.S. Forest Service (USFS), and adjoining BLM field offices, including Durango, Montrose, and Moab, and the BLM Utah state office.

### **5.2.1 NATIVE AMERICAN CONSULTATION**

Protective measures for culturally sensitive Native American resources are established through consultation and coordination with the appropriate Native American tribes or entities. Pursuant to NEPA, NHPA, FLPMA, the American Indian Religious Freedom Act (AIRFA), Executive Order 13007, and BLM Manuals 8160, *Native American Coordination and Consultation*, and H-8160-1, *General Procedural Guidance for Native American Consultation*, the BLM has engaged in consultation with Native American representatives throughout the planning process. The applicable laws and guidance require that the consultation record demonstrates, "that the responsible manager has made a reasonable and good faith effort to obtain and consider appropriate Native American input in decision making" (H8160-1, 2003:4). Recommended procedures for initiating the consultation process include project notification, preferably by certified mail, follow-up contact (i.e., telephone calls), and meetings when appropriate (H8160-1, 2003:15). Native American consultation is an ongoing process that will continue after the PRMP/FEIS is completed.

Native American organizations were invited to participate at all levels of the planning process for the RMP. The BLM state director notified tribes of the BLM's intent to prepare the RMP and the Monticello and Moab Field Offices jointly invited tribes to consult regarding the entire range of cultural and natural resource issues.

As part of the RMP/EIS scoping process, by letter dated August 1, 2003, then Utah State Director Sally Wisely initiated consultation for land-use planning with 35 tribal organizations (Table 5.1). In the letter, the BLM requested information regarding any concerns the organizations might have within the planning areas, specifically requested input concerning the identification and protection of culturally significant areas and resources located on lands managed by the Moab and Monticello field offices, and offered the opportunity for meetings. Between November 2003 and May 2004, all 35 tribal organizations were contacted by SWCA ethnographer Molly Molenaar, under contract with and on behalf of the BLM, to 1) ensure that the appropriate tribal contact had received the consultation letter and 2) determine the need for additional or future consultation for the study areas identified in the consultation letter. Meetings were arranged when requested.

In consulting with tribes or tribal entities under the NHPA, the BLM emphasized the importance of identifying historic properties having cultural significance to tribes [commonly referred to as Traditional Cultural Properties (TCPs)]. The BLM held meetings with 12 tribal organizations between December 2003 and May 2004, but no TCPs were identified (Table 5.2). However, potential TCPs were identified during a records review and discussed in the AMS prepared in 2004. An ethnographic overview was prepared concurrently with the EIS that also discusses potential TCPs associated with local tribes. The BLM was represented at most of these meetings by the Field Office manager and archaeologist from both the Moab and Monticello field offices along with the representative from SWCA. During these meetings, tribal organizations were invited to be a cooperating agency in the development of the land-use plan; however, none of the tribal organizations the BLM came into contact with requested to be a cooperating agency.

Several tribal organizations requested that an additional meeting be held after the Draft RMP/EIS alternatives were prepared. The Monticello FO mailed a draft copy of the range of alternatives to 12 tribal organizations in December 2005. In 2006 and 2007, the Monticello FO manager and archaeologist, assisted by the SWCA ethnographer, participated in a second round of meetings with five tribes (Table 5.3). At these meetings, the Draft RMP/EIS alternatives were discussed with special emphasis on cultural resource issues. A copy of the Monticello Draft RMP/EIS was mailed to the tribal organizations listed in Table 5.2. Consultation with interested tribes is ongoing. In April 2003, the BLM extended an invitation to meet with tribal organizations regarding the PRMP/FEIS.

**Table 5.1. Tribal Organizations Contacted by the BLM, Utah State Director**

Navajo Nation	Hopi Tribe
Navajo Utah Commission	Navajo Nation, Aneth Chapter
Navajo Nation, Dennehotso Chapter	Navajo Nation, Mexican Water Chapter
Navajo Nation, Navajo Mountain Chapter	Navajo Nation, Oljato Chapter
Navajo Nation, Red Mesa Chapter	Navajo Nation, Teec Nos Pos Chapter

**Table 5.1. Tribal Organizations Contacted by the BLM, Utah State Director**

Ute Mountain Ute Tribe	White Mesa Ute Council
Southern Ute Tribe	Paiute Indian Tribe of Utah
Uintah and Ouray Ute Indian Tribe	Eastern Shoshone Tribe
San Juan Southern Paiute Council	Kaibab Paiute Tribe
Pueblo of Cochiti	Pueblo of Acoma
Pueblo of Jemez	Pueblo of Isleta
Pueblo of Nambe	Pueblo of Laguna
Pueblo of Pojoaque	Pueblo of Picuris
Pueblo of Santa Ana	Pueblo of Sandia
Pueblo of Santo Domingo	Pueblo of Santa Clara
Pueblo of Tesuque	Pueblo of Taos
Pueblo of Zuni	Pueblo of Zia

**Table 5.2. Meetings with Tribal Organizations as Part of Scoping for the RMP**

Navajo Nation	Hopi Tribe
Navajo Utah Commission	Paiute Indian Tribe of Utah
Navajo Nation, Dennehotso Chapter	Pueblo of Santa Clara
Pueblo of Zia	Pueblo of Zuni
Pueblo of Laguna	Southern Ute Tribe
Uintah and Ouray Ute Indian Tribe	Ute Mountain Ute Tribe

**Table 5.3. Meetings with Tribal Organizations to Discuss Draft Alternatives**

Navajo Nation	Hopi Tribe
Paiute Indian Tribe of Utah	Ute Mountain Ute Tribe
Southern Ute Tribe	

### **5.2.2 COOPERATING AGENCY INVOLVEMENT**

The Monticello FO extended cooperating agency status to state and local agencies with regard to the Monticello land-use planning effort. The State of Utah and San Juan County signed MOUs to establish cooperating agency status in January 2003 and April 2003, respectively.

NEPA requires that the BLM work closely with cooperating and other responsible trustee state agencies in preparing an EIS. The cooperating agencies participated in meetings to assist the Monticello FO with socioeconomics, WSR suitability, ACEC relevance and determination, travel plans, and the development of alternatives (Chapter 2) for the RMP. These meetings occurred between March 2003 and March 2006. A draft of the alternatives was sent to the cooperating agencies in November 2007 for review and comment before the release of the Draft RMP/EIS.

The BLM has continued to involve the cooperating agencies in addressing comments raised during the public comment period for the Draft RMP/EIS and in developing the Proposed Plan from the Draft EIS alternatives.

### **5.2.3 STATE AGENCY COORDINATION**

According to NEPA requirements, the lead agency (the BLM) must formally consult with responsible and trustee agencies in determining whether to prepare an EIS. The primary tool for this coordination is the preparation of the draft alternatives (Chapter 2) for review by state agencies, and subsequently the preparation of the Draft RMP/EIS. A draft was sent to the State of Utah Department of Natural Resources in November 2007 and distributed to the following agencies: The Utah Division of Oil, Gas and Mining; Utah Division of Wildlife Resources (UDWR); Utah State Parks and Recreation; Utah Geological Survey; the SHPO, and the School and Institutional Trust Lands Administration (SITLA). The State of Utah, SHPO Officer has also been involved in developing the Proposed Plan for Alkali Ridge and Hovenweep ACECs.

The Mineral Potential Report and the Reasonably Foreseeable Development scenario for oil and gas regarding the Monticello planning area were prepared in cooperation with the Utah Geological Survey.

### **5.2.4 COUNTY COORDINATION**

Grand County declined to participate as a Cooperating Agency because of the small amount of county acreage within the Monticello Planning Area. However, some Grand County Council members attended various planning meetings during the development of the RMP. Numerous discussions and meetings were held with representatives from San Juan County. Overall, San Juan County actively participated in the development of the Proposed Plan. Table 5.4 specifically brings forward the county plans and corresponding county positions or goals related to the management of the public lands.

### **5.2.5 CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION WITH OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES**

In developing the Proposed RMP/FEIS, the BLM coordinated with numerous other federal agencies. There are legal requirements for consultation with some federal agencies. The consultation and coordination efforts are described below.

#### **5.2.5.1 U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE**

The actions proposed in this document require consultation with the USFWS. These actions have met any consultation/coordination requirements that may exist pursuant to the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act.

The BLM and the USFWS are continuing close coordination for Endangered Species Act (ESA) compliance of all aspects of the Monticello RMP/EIS.

The USFWS and the UDWR have been consulted regarding the effects of the Draft RMP/EIS on species listed pursuant to the ESA. Endangered species protections include compliance with existing ESA requirements.

In July 2004, the BLM requested assistance from the USFWS in identifying threatened, endangered, proposed, and candidate plant and animal species that may be located in the Monticello planning area. A letter was sent by the BLM state office to the Service initiating informal consultation for the Monticello planning efforts. The Service responded in lists of species that may be present in or may be affected by projects in the subject project area. Tables 3.53 to 3.55 present a comprehensive list of sensitive species that may be present in the project area and indicates whether they could be affected by the proposed and alternative actions. The results of this consultation have been incorporated into this RMP/EIS.

This PRMP constitutes a Biological Assessment (BA), which has been provided to the USFWS for review and comment. The BLM determined that the implementation of the PRMP/FEIS is "not likely to adversely affect" /or/ "may affect" the 10 species on which this consultation occurred. The USFWS may concur with the BLM's determination via memorandum, or prepare a biological opinion, which advises the BLM on the actions that must be taken to protect federally listed special status species.

#### **5.2.5.2 ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**

The BLM provided the EPA with a copy of the Draft RMP/EIS and the EPA has submitted comments on this document. The EPA rated the document as Environmental Concerns-Insufficient Information, "EC-2." The EPA expressed concern that the actual and potential environmental impacts associated with visual and travel/recreation management issues the BLM faces will not be adequately mitigated under the Preferred Alternative, and that a number of actions need to be included in the FEIS. The EPA also had concern for a lack of information associated with the BLM's analysis of air quality impacts. Additional analysis and information addressing these concerns have been included in Chapter's 2 and 4 of the PRMP/FEIS based on EPA comments.

#### **5.2.5.3 OTHER AGENCY INVOLVEMENT/COORDINATION**

In addition to the cooperating agencies, the Monticello FO has held meetings with and sought the input of other agencies that have land management jurisdiction within or adjacent to the planning area. Agencies include the NPS, the USFS, and adjoining BLM field offices, including Durango, Montrose, and Moab, and the BLM Utah state office also provided input.

### **5.3 CONSISTENCY WITH OTHER PLANS**

The BLM's planning regulations require that resource management plans be consistent with officially approved or adopted resource-related plans of other federal agencies, state and local governments, and Indian tribes, so long as the guidance and resource management plans are also consistent with the purposes, policies, and programs of federal law and regulations applicable to public lands.

The 43 United States Code (U.S.C.) 1712(c) (9) states that the Secretary of the Interior (through the land-use plans of the federal agencies under it) shall "coordinate the land-use inventory, planning, and management activities of or for such lands with the land-use planning and management programs of other federal departments and agencies and of the States and local governments within which the lands are located." It further states that "the Secretary shall assure that consideration is given to those State, local, and tribal plans that are germane in the development of land-use plans for public lands [and] assist in resolving, to the extent practical, inconsistencies between Federal and non-Federal Government plans..." This language does not require the BLM to adhere to or adopt the plans of other agencies or jurisdictional entities, rather to give consideration to these plans and make an effort to resolve inconsistencies to the extent practical.

The BLM is aware that there are specific county and state plan decisions relevant to aspects of public land management which are discrete from, and independent of, federal law. However, the BLM is bound by federal law. The FLPMA requires that the development of an RMP for public lands must be coordinated and consistent with county plans, to the maximum extent possible by law, and inconsistencies between federal and non-federal government plans be resolved to the extent practical (FLPMA, Title II, Section 202 [c][9]). As a consequence, an inconsistency that cannot be resolved or reconciled will exist where state and local plans conflict with federal law.

Thus, while county and federal planning processes, under FLPMA, are required to be as integrated and consistent as practical, the federal agency planning process is not bound by or subject to county plans, planning processes, or planning stipulations. The BLM will identify these conflicts in the FEIS/PRMP, so state and local governments have a complete understanding of the impacts of the PRMP on state and local management options. A consistency review of the PRMP with the state and county master plans is included in Table 5.4. In addition, the relevant goals, objectives or policies of a county are often equivalent to an activity or implementation level decision and not a land-use plan decision. The very specific county goals would be addressed in any subsequent BLM activity or implementation level decision.

Table 5.4 outlines the planning consistency of the Proposed Plan with the approved management plans, land-use plans, and controls of other agencies with jurisdiction in or adjacent to the planning area. The authorized officer will continue to collaborate with federal agencies, state and local governments, and Native American tribes on implementation of the RMP and on pursuing consistency with other plans and will move toward integration of such plans to the extent that they are consistent with federal laws, regulations, and policy directives. Additional discussion is contained in Chapter 1.

**Table 5.4 Plan Consistency Review**

Master Plan	Consistent	Partially Consistent	Not Consistent	Discussion
<b>San Juan County Master Plan (2008)</b>				
Public Access	✓			San Juan County has strong opinions regarding public access and its impact on economic stability in the county. The county claims all roads and trails over public land constructed prior to Oct. 21, 1976.  Supports working with the BLM to develop off-road trails for ATV use and bikes.
Recreation and Tourism	✓			Support for increased recreational activity on public lands, however, agency needs to acknowledge and aggressively address the impact that recreation has on the county's essential services (i.e., law enforcement, emergency services, water and waste management, and search and rescue).
Wilderness	✓			County does not support designation of large wilderness areas but will accept areas that meet the criteria of wilderness in the 1964 Wilderness Act. The county plan (Appendix E) includes the county's preferred alternative for wilderness designation.
Wild and Scenic Rivers	✓			Statement that any special land-use classifications or designations should include analysis of adverse economic impact on local economy and stability of communities and commitment to adequate mitigation.
Threatened and Endangered Species	✓			Statement that any special land-use classifications or designations should include analysis of adverse economic impact on local economy and stability of communities and commitment to adequate mitigation.
Areas of Critical Environmental Concern	✓			Statement that any special land-use classifications or designations should include analysis of adverse economic impact on local economy and stability of communities and commitment to adequate mitigation.

**Table 5.4 Plan Consistency Review**

<b>Master Plan</b>	<b>Consistent</b>	<b>Partially Consistent</b>	<b>Not Consistent</b>	<b>Discussion</b>
Socioeconomics	✓			States that social and economic environment (of the communities most impacted by public land-use decisions) needs to be included in environmental review.
Wildlife	✓			States that forage allocations between livestock and wildlife should be balanced and based upon fair and equitable assumptions.  San Juan County is not in favor of and will generally oppose introduction of exotics or species not native to the area.
Land Tenure Adjustments		✓ Acquisition of State inholdings within the McLoyd Moonhouse SRMA and Valley of the Gods ACEC		States that public land acreage currently owned and managed by federal and State agencies is sufficient for the public interest. Supports a "no net loss of private" and no expansion of National parks position relative to federal-state property exchanges and transfers. (No net loss refers to both acreage and value.) Also, no net increase of public lands within San Juan County.
Water Resources	✓			Supports protection of limited water resources by promoting efficient use and management.
<b>Grand County General Plan Update 2003</b>				
Strong Economy	✓			Supports multiple use of public lands including continued recreation uses and oil and gas exploration and development.
Watersheds	✓			County will work to protect watersheds from activities and uses that are injurious to them and adopt policies that enhance and restore them.

**Table 5.4 Plan Consistency Review**

Master Plan	Consistent	Partially Consistent	Not Consistent	Discussion
Land Tenure Adjustments	✓			<p>Supports BLM/SITLA exchanges that result in protection of watersheds, protection of lands important for recreational or other economic values, protection from development with a net increase in county cost for infrastructure and public services, or consolidation of land ownership patterns to reduce fragmentation. These provisions are consistent with the exchange criteria in the plan.</p> <p>Supports general retention of federal lands in Grand County. Increases in federal lands should not be at the expense of county revenues and should offer clear benefit to county residents. This is consistent with BLM policy to gain county support in land tenure adjustments.</p>
Travel Management	✓			Recognizes that allowing open, cross-country travel by mechanized vehicles is no longer an appropriate management practice. Supports more restrictive travel designations limiting mechanized travel to designated roads and trails and a "no new tracks" policy.
ACECs	✓			Encourages identification and conservation of areas with unaltered plant communities and soils through ACEC designations.
Wilderness	✓			Supports recommendation for wilderness adopted by the Grand County Council in 1995. Will follow State of Utah's recommendation concerning wilderness designation where consistent with the interests of the people of Grand County
Wild and Scenic Rivers	✓			Will participate and promote cooperation in planning and administration of WSR designations.
Reintroduction of Animal Species	✓			Grand County would participate in evaluation of feasibility and advisability of reintroductions.

**Table 5.4 Plan Consistency Review**

Master Plan	Consistent	Partially Consistent	Not Consistent	Discussion
<b>San Juan County Amendment to Master Plan (8/2002)</b>				
All-Terrain Vehicle Plan	✓			Establishes an all-terrain transportation plan, on developed trails within the county, as an opportunity for increased recreational use and economic benefit to the county.

Table 5.5 summarizes the planning consistency of the Proposed Plan with the State of Utah's Code 63j-4-401.

**Table 5.5 Consistency with State of Utah Code 63j-4-401**

Resource	State of Utah Code 63j-4-401	Proposed Plan
ACECs	It is the policy of the State of Utah to withhold support for ACEC designation unless or until relevant and important values or significant natural hazards are clearly identified and the area requires special management protections not afforded by normal multiple-use management. ACECs should be no larger than necessary and management should be no more restrictive than necessary to prevent irreparable damage to relevant and important values or protect human safety. To the extent allowed by federal law, management prescriptions should comport with the plans and policies of the state and of the county where the proposed designation is located. These prescriptions should not result in management equivalent to that afforded congressionally designated wilderness areas.	<p>The potential ACECs brought forward for designation into the Proposed Plan have gone through a rigorous and stringent process in accordance with FLPMA, the planning regulations at 43 CFR 1600, Land Use Planning Handbook (H- 1601-1), and in accordance with BLM Manual 1613 and ACEC Policy and Procedures Guidelines (45 FR 57318). Appendix S outlines the process the ID team underwent to determine whether a nominated ACEC had relevance and/or importance values. The size of the proposed ACECs is limited only to the area(s) of geography where the relevance and importance values are manageable to protect and prevent irreparable damage. In the Proposed Plan, the potential ACECs generally do not have redundant special designations and/or other existing protections applied.</p> <p>The potential ACECs carried forward into the Proposed Plan necessitate an ACEC designation because special management protection is necessary (outside of normal multiple-use management) to specifically protect the relevance and importance values within the areas identified. The special management prescriptions that have been proposed are narrowly tailored to protect the identified relevant and important values; none of which are recognized as wilderness resources. For these reasons, the potential ACEC</p>

**Table 5.5 Consistency with State of Utah Code 63j-4-401**

Resource	State of Utah Code 63j-4-401	Proposed Plan
		decisions carried forward into the Proposed Plan are considered by the BLM to be consistent with Utah Code 63j-4-401.
Wild and Scenic Rivers	<p>It is the policy of the State of Utah that federal land managers should refrain from applying a non-impairment management standard to river segments inventoried as "eligible" for inclusions in the national WSRs and all eligible segments should promptly be evaluated for suitability. The State of Utah will work with federal land managers to identify suitable segments and work towards a recommendation to congress for designation where careful analysis: (1) identifies and evaluates regionally significant segments, (2) addresses the impact designation will have on physical, biological, and economic resources, (3) demonstrates that suitable segments have water present and flowing at all times, and (4) not interfere with water resources development.</p> <p>Interim management of suitable segments should not interfere with development of valid existing water rights, including development of waters apportioned to the State under all interstate compacts or agreements, including the Bear River Compact and the Upper Colorado River Compact. To the extent allowable by federal law and where not in conflict with state law or policy, interim management of suitable segments and congressional recommendations for designation should be consistent with plans and policies of the county or counties where the river segment is located.</p>	<p>The State of Utah has worked as a Cooperating Agency throughout this planning process and has been intimately involved with the BLM's WSR planning process. The state has assisted Field Office specialists to help determine eligibility findings for each of the river segments, and has provided social and economic expertise and advice as the BLM determined which eligible segments to carry forward as suitable into the Proposed Plan. The BLM has committed to working cooperatively among federal, State, and local governments and communities during the post-planning WSR study phase when statewide recommendations for inclusion of river segments into the National WSRs System would go forward to Congress. Prior to this post-planning phase, the BLM would work with affected partners to help identify in-stream flows necessary to protect the outstandingly remarkable values for which the subject river segments were found suitable via this planning process. Thus, because there are no effects of this planning decision on valid existing rights, and because suitability findings in this planning process do not create new water rights for the BLM, the land-use planning WSR suitability determinations are found by the BLM to be consistent with the Utah Code 63j-4-401.</p>
Grazing	<p>It is the policy of the State of Utah that the citizens of the state are best served by applying multiple-use and sustained-yield principles in public land-use planning and management. Public lands should continue to produce food and fiber, and the rural character and landscape should be preserved through a healthy and active agricultural and grazing industry. Land management plans should maximize forage availability</p>	<p>Grazing decisions carried forward into the Proposed Plan are considered by the BLM to be consistent with Utah Code 63j-4-401. Proposed Plan decisions on public lands would continue to promote a healthy active grazing industry. Forage allocations for livestock and wildlife are fully allocated on public lands. Numerous RMP decisions under other identified resources allow for the restoration and maintenance of</p>

**Table 5.5 Consistency with State of Utah Code 63j-4-401**

Resource	State of Utah Code 63j-4-401	Proposed Plan
	<p>for domestic livestock and wildlife use. The state favors active management to restore and maintain rangeland health, increase forage, and improve watershed for the mutual benefit of local communities, domestic livestock, and wildlife.</p> <p>Adjustments in AUM levels may occur as required by range and watershed conditions, based on scientific, on-the-ground analysis. Grazing AUMs should be placed in suspension where range conditions will not sustain the current level of AUMs or where necessary to protect range and watershed health. Any suspended AUMs should be returned to active use when range conditions improve. The state generally opposes forced relinquishment or forced retirement of grazing AUMs but will continue to recognize voluntary relinquishments and retirements agreed to prior to RMP revisions.</p>	<p>rangeland and watershed health. For example, the Proposed Plan provides the umbrella to allow implementation-level actions for hazardous fuel reductions, fire rehabilitation, vegetation treatments, riparian improvements, range and wildlife habitat improvements, UPCD projects—including Healthy Lands Initiative projects, seed collection, etc. Minor, if any, adjustments to current permitted livestock AUMs are made in the Proposed Plan. Prior voluntary relinquishments and/or retirements have been recognized.</p>
<p>Wilderness Characteristics</p>	<p>It is the policy of the State of Utah to oppose management of public lands as wilderness except where congress designates lands as wilderness. Under State policy and FLPMA's multiple-use mandate, BLM ascribed management prescriptions for non-WSA lands inventoried as possessing wilderness characteristics should take into account the long-term needs of future generations for renewable and non-renewable resources, including, but not limited to, recreation, range, timber, minerals, watershed, wildlife, and fish. Designation as VRM Class I, closure to oil and gas leasing, withdrawal from mineral entry, and closure to motorized and mechanized use affords protections comparable to those associated with formal wilderness designation and should be avoided for non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics. Non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics should be managed in a manner consistent with the multiple-use, sustained yield standard that applies to BLM lands other than congressionally designated wilderness or WSAs.</p>	<p>The Proposed Plan identifies certain "non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics" in order to protect, preserve, and maintain their wilderness characteristics. The BLM recognizes that it cannot, through the planning process, designate these lands as WSAs nor is it possible to manage them in accordance with IMP. For example, there is no provision to meet the "non-impairment criteria" mandated in IMP for WSA management. However, in following Section 201 of FLPMA, the BLM has maintained its wilderness inventory and has determined that lands previously found not to possess wilderness characteristics during the FLPMA Section 603 inventory process in the late 1970s and early 1980s, now have been determined to possess them. The focus of management in the areas carried forward in the Proposed Plan is to primarily provide for an experience of solitude and primitive recreation. This is enhanced by maintaining the naturalness of the geographic areas. However, management prescriptions do not mirror those for WSAs or designated</p>

**Table 5.5 Consistency with State of Utah Code 63j-4-401**

Resource	State of Utah Code 63j-4-401	Proposed Plan
		<p>wilderness since these two management objectives are sufficiently dissimilar that imposing similar prescriptions would not allow the BLM to meet the planning objectives outlined in the Draft RMP/Draft EIS. WSAs and designated wilderness are rights-of-way exclusion areas, closed to fluid mineral leasing by law, and do not allow for surface-disturbing activities. In comparison, lands with wilderness characteristics have no set management by either law, rule, regulation, or policy. The Proposed Plan would allow for surface-disturbing activities where and when they are compatible with enhancing management objectives identified in the Proposed Plan.</p> <p>In order to ensure that the BLM's planning decisions regarding the management of wilderness characteristics are consistent with Utah law, potential adjustments may be made in the Record of Decision to nomenclature. This editorial change would not affect management or goals and objectives.</p>
<p>RS-2477 Assertions</p>	<p>The State of Utah will defend its interest, and that of its political subdivisions, in rights-of-way accepted under the self-effectuating grant process set forth in Revised Statute 2477 (repealed by the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976) and <i>SUWA v. BLM</i>, 425 F.3d 735 (10th Cir. 2005). The State of Utah expects and requests the BLM to fully consider all information concerning individual rights-of-way submitted to BLM. Further, the State of Utah expects and requests BLM's consideration of this information as part of the preparation and implementation of Resource Management or Management Framework Plans, and preparation or implementation of Transportation Plans as part of the ongoing inventory of resources on the public lands.</p>	<p>The Proposed Plan makes no commitments with respect to any valid existing rights, particularly those concerning RS-2477. Chapter 1 of this land-use plan states that resolution of this issue is outside the purview and scope of public lands planning efforts and must be adjudicated by a court of law or other legal means. Therefore, nothing in this plan extinguishes any valid rights-of-way or alters, in any way, the legal rights of the State of Utah to assert RS-2477 rights or to challenge any use restrictions imposed by the RMP that they believe are inconsistent with their rights.</p>

The Monticello FO RMP is consistent with the following agency plans: Manti-LaSal National Forest Management Plan, Monument Valley Navajo Indian Reservation, Glen Canyon National

Recreation Area Management Plan, Canyonlands National Park General Management Plan, Hovenweep National Monument Plan (draft), Natural Bridges National Monument Management Plan, Edge of the Cedars State Park Plan, and Gooseneck State Park Plan. Comments were not received to indicate inconsistency of these plans with the Draft RMP.

## 5.4 PUBLIC OUTREACH AND PARTICIPATION

Public outreach and participation in the land-use planning process began with the publication of the Notice of Intent (NOI) to plan in the Federal Register and will be ongoing up until the Record of Decision for the Monticello RMP. Public outreach and participation has included public meetings, development of a mailing list, planning bulletins, newspaper articles, a RMP website, and workshops. It has also included informal meetings with individuals, groups, and organizations.

### 5.4.1 NOTICE OF INTENT TO PLAN AND SCOPING

This planning process began on June 4, 2003 with the publication in the Federal Register of a Notice of Intent (NOI) to plan. The NOI announced the BLM's intent to conduct land-use planning for the public lands administered by the Monticello FO by preparing an RMP and associated EIS. The NOI began what is known as the scoping process and invited the general public as well as other federal agencies, state and local governments, and Indian tribes to identify potential issues and submit concerns regarding the intended planning effort. In addition to the NOI, the BLM provided the public with planning bulletins, and newspaper articles. Through all this outreach, the public was notified of public meetings and the BLM requested information regarding planning criteria, resources, nominations for Areas of Critical Environmental Concern, nominations for WSRs, and proposals for route designations. Public service announcements on the radio were also used to inform the public about open house public meetings. The BLM distributed planning bulletins to all interested agencies, organizations, and individuals along with any other entity that requested to be included on the mailing list.

The scoping period began June 4, 2003, and ended January 31, 2004. The BLM relied on various public outreach methods for the scoping process, including six open houses in different communities (see Table 5.5), a mobile "comment cruiser" which visited 12 locations, a website with provision for emailing comments, and an invitation for the public to provide written comments via letters. In its Scoping Report, completed in July 2004, the Monticello FO provided an analysis of the information received. The Scoping Report is available at the Monticello FO, or online at the Monticello RMP website. The BLM received 6,138 comment letters with 19,437 comments identified in these letters and emails. Comments from the six open houses totaled 1,250, and the "comment cruiser" gathered 200 comments, resulting in a grand total of 20,887 comments. It should be noted that the Scoping Report covers both the Moab and Monticello field offices. The information received during the scoping period was utilized to establish the scope of the RMP/EIS.

**Table 5.6. Open House Locations and Attendance**

Location	Date	Attendance
Green River, UT	October 14, 2003	15

**Table 5.6. Open House Locations and Attendance**

<b>Location</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Attendance</b>
Grand Junction, CO	October 15, 2003	14
Moab, UT	October 16, 2003	53
Monticello, UT	October 21, 2003	54
Blanding, UT	October 22, 2003	87
Salt Lake City, UT	November 13, 2003	96
<b>Total</b>		<b>319</b>

#### **5.4.2. MAILING LIST**

As directed by 43 CFR 1610.2(d), the BLM has established and maintained a list of "individuals and groups known to be interested in or affected by a resource management plan." This list was initially developed from the Monticello FO mailing list and supplemented/updated throughout the planning process. Scoping meeting participants were given the option to be added to the mailing list. In addition, individuals were able to add themselves to the project mailing list by registering on the project website, as well as through requests to be placed on the mailing list by contacting the BLM.

The mailing list was used during the distribution of planning bulletins and postcards throughout the planning process. Postcards were mailed to the entire list, announcing the availability of the Draft RMP/EIS and the Proposed RMP/Final EIS. There are currently over 850 individuals, organizations, and agencies included on the mailing list.

#### **5.4.3 PLANNING BULLETINS**

Planning bulletins were developed to keep the public informed about the Monticello land-use planning process. They were provided to the public included on the mailing list for the Monticello RMP. The planning bulletins were also posted on the website for the Monticello RMP.

- The **first planning bulletin** (6/30/03) announced the intention of the BLM Monticello FO to prepare a Resource Management Plan. It also included preliminary planning issues, a request for nominations of Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) and WSRs, an announcement of public scoping meeting, and information on how to participate in the land-use plan process.
- The **second planning bulletin** (11/1/03) provided information regarding the preliminary review of river segments found eligible for consideration as WSRs. The public was invited to provide comments on the findings.
- The **third planning bulletin** (11/17/03) requested route data from the public to be considered in the alternatives for route designation in the Travel Plan.
- The **fourth planning bulletin** (5/7/04) provided the preliminary planning criteria for public comment and review.

- The **fifth planning bulletin** (7/9/04) provided the results of the public scoping process and included the issues to be addressed in the plan.
- The **sixth planning bulletin** (2/21/06) provided the results of the ACEC review process.

#### **5.4.4 WEBSITE**

Information regarding the Monticello land-use plan was made available to the public on the Monticello RMP website. This website is currently found at <http://www.blm.gov/ut/st/en/fo/monticello/planning.html>. The website serves as a virtual repository for documents related to development of the Monticello RMP including news releases and bulletins, background documents, schedule, the land-use planning process, preliminary issues, maps, photos, and the draft and final RMP/EIS. The documents are available in Adobe Portable Document Format (PDF) to ensure that they are available to the widest range of users. During the scoping period, the website allowed members of the public to add themselves to the project mailing list or to submit comments/concerns to be considered in the scoping process. In addition, during the public comment period on the Draft RMP/EIS, the website served as one of the ways in which the public could submit comments.

#### **5.4.5 SOCIOECONOMIC WORKSHOPS**

With the purpose of engaging in a collaborative decision-making process, the BLM held a workshop with the local government leaders, industry experts, and stakeholders from San Juan County that focused on the socioeconomic conditions of the region. This specialized group was assembled with the help of county officials for the purpose of promoting an open discussion about regional social and economic patterns. This meeting held on May 6, 2003, in Monticello, provided an opportunity for the BLM to understand existing conditions and to lay the framework for the analysis of socioeconomic impacts.

#### **5.4.6 NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY OF THE DRAFT RMP/EIS**

On November 2, 2007, the BLM and EPA published a Notice of Availability in (NOA) the Federal Register that marked the beginning of the formal 90-day public comment period. The Draft RMP/EIS states that the BLM is revising its current land-use plan and proposes several alternative ways of managing public lands within the Monticello planning area. The Draft RMP/EIS was designed to provide a comprehensive look at the impacts to natural and cultural resources from various planning alternatives. The formal 90-day public comment period ended on February 8, 2008. The BLM provided hard copies of the Draft RMP/EIS directly to cooperating agencies, other federal, state, and local agencies, tribal representatives, the Utah BLM Resource Advisory Committee members, public libraries, and elected officials. Also, hard copies and CDs were made available to the public upon request, and the Draft RMP/EIS was placed on the Monticello RMP website and in its public room at the BLM Utah state office. Additionally, the BLM widely distributed newspaper and radio press releases regarding the availability of the Draft RMP/EIS.

### 5.4.7 NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY OF THE FINAL RMP/EIS

The BLM and EPA will publish a Notice of Availability in the Federal Register which will mark the beginning of the protest period and concurrent Governor's Consistency Review period.

### 5.4.8 PUBLIC MEETINGS

Five open houses were held during the 90-day comment period for the Draft RMP/EIS. The open house locations, dates, and attendance are provided in Table 5.6. The locations, dates, and times of the open houses were announced to approximately 858 people included on the mailing list via a postcard. Press releases in local and regional newspapers and radio spots supplemented the mailing. In addition, the locations, dates, and times of the open houses were posted on the Monticello RMP website.

**Table 5.7 Open House Locations, Dates, and Attendance**

<b>Location</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Attendance</b>
Monticello, Utah	January 8, 2008	20
Moab, Utah	January 9, 2008	30
Salt Lake City, Utah	January 10, 2008	19
Blanding, Utah	January 16, 2008	36
Montezuma Creek, Utah	January 17, 2008	16
<b>Total</b>		<b>121</b>

The open houses were geared to provide information to the public on the content of the Draft RMP/EIS as well as to provide guidance on commenting on the document and answer questions. Each open house included a PowerPoint presentation that provided an overview of the planning process and a comparison of major elements contained in the alternatives. Attendees were then encouraged to visit with BLM representatives and managers regarding questions or concerns about the Draft RMP/EIS. The public was provided with the opportunity to submit written comments at the open houses.

## 5.5 PUBLIC COMMENTS ON THE MONTICELLO DRAFT RMP/EIS

### 5.5.1 PROCESS AND METHODOLOGY

According to National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the BLM is required to identify and formally respond to all substantive public comments received during the comment period for the Draft RMP/EIS. The BLM developed a systematic process for responding to comments to ensure all substantive comments were tracked and the content seriously considered. A description of this process follows.

First, the BLM developed a **coding structure** to help sort comments into logical groups by topics and issues. Codes were derived from resources covered in the Draft EIS or by common issues. Submissions (letters, emails, faxes, etc) were given a unique identifier for tracking

purposes and then each submission was carefully reviewed to capture all comments, more description of this process is set forth below. All comments received can be tracked to the original submission.

Second, the BLM created a **Comment Database**. For each comment in a unique submission, the BLM captured the name and address of the Commenter, assigned a code to the comment, and captured the text of all comments.

The coding and comment database processes aimed at assisting the ID team in determining if the substantive issues raised by the public warranted modification of one or more of the alternatives or further analysis of issues and impacts. With the information provided through the public review process, the BLM reconsidered the draft alternatives, made changes as appropriate, and developed the PRMP/FEIS. Factual or grammatical errors, which led to a change in text are not summarized but were incorporated into the PRMP/FEIS.

Finally, the BLM used the comment database to prepare a narrative summary of the substantive comments. Opinions, feelings, and preferences for one element or one alternative over another, and comments of a personal and/or philosophical nature were all read, analyzed, and considered, but not included in the summary because such comments are not substantive in nature.

### **5.5.2 COMMENT ANALYSIS**

During the 90-day public comment period for the Monticello Draft RMP/EIS, the Monticello FO received written comments by mail (205), fax, email (18,869), website, and submitted directly at the public meetings or to the Monticello FO. All faxed comments were duplicated via email. This amounted to over 19,000 comment submissions. Many of the submissions were non-substantive form letters (letters containing identical or nearly identical text submitted by a number of individuals) in which there were six different types. Outside the form letters, there were 1,624 unique submissions, of which 131 submissions contained substantive comments. These submissions amounted to about 980 comments. Additional submissions were received after the close of the comment period on February 8, 2008. However, none of the late submissions raised substantially new issues or concerns not already addressed by comments received before the deadline.

Where warranted, the BLM responded to substantive comments by making revisions to the PRMP/FEIS (text changes). If no change was warranted, the BLM responded to the substantive comment in writing. The BLM responded to all substantive comments and, in many cases, also responded to non-substantive comments in order to clarify a point or position.

The comments received from cooperating agencies and the BLM responses are provided in Tables 5.9a and 5.9b. Tables 5.10a through 5.10aa provide the comments and responses by resource category that resulted in a change to the PRMP/FEIS. All comments and the BLM responses are provided in the compact disc (CD) attached to the PRMP/FEIS.

The BLM considered every comment in the analysis process, whether it came repeatedly from many people with the same message(s) or from a single person raising a technical or personal

point. In analyzing comments, the BLM emphasized the content of the comment rather than the number of times a comment was received.

Respondents invested considerable time and effort to submit comments on the Draft RMP/EIS. Comments covered a wide spectrum of thoughts, opinions, ideas, and concerns. The commonly addressed themes include: travel, recreation, special designations (ACECs, WSRs), wilderness values, Special Status Species, and minerals/energy development.

While each comment was diligently considered, the comment analysis involved determining whether a comment was substantive or non-substantive in nature.

According to NEPA, the BLM is required to identify and formally respond to all substantive public comments. On the basis of the Council on Environmental Quality's (CEQ) regulations, a substantive comment does one or more of the following:

- Questions, with a reasonable basis, the accuracy of the information and/or analysis in the EIS.
- Questions, with a reasonable basis, the adequacy of the information and/or analysis in the EIS.
- Presents reasonable alternatives other than those presented in the Draft EIS that meet the purpose and need of the proposed action and addresses significant issues.
- Questions, with a reasonable basis, the merits of an alternative or alternatives.
- Causes changes in or revisions to the proposed action.
- Questions, with a reasonable basis, the adequacy of the planning process itself.

The NEPA handbook identifies the following types of comments:

- **Comments on the Adequacy of the Analysis:** Comments that express a professional disagreement with the conclusions of the analysis or assert that the analysis is inadequate are substantive in nature but may or may not lead to changes in the PRMP/FEIS. Interpretations of analyses should be based on professional expertise. Where there is disagreement within a professional discipline, a careful review of the various interpretations is warranted. In some cases, public comments may necessitate a reevaluation of analytical conclusions. If, after reevaluation, the BLM does not think that a change is warranted, the response should provide the rationale for that conclusion.
- **Comments Which Identify New Impacts, Alternatives, or Mitigation Measures:** Public comments on a Draft EIS that identify impacts, alternatives, or mitigation measures that were not addressed in the draft are substantive. This type of comment requires the BLM to determine if it warrants further consideration. If it does, the BLM must determine whether the new impacts, new alternatives, or new mitigation measures should be analyzed in either the FEIS; a supplement to the Draft EIS; or a completely revised and recirculated Draft EIS.
- **Significance Determinations:** Comments that directly or indirectly question, with a reasonable basis, determinations regarding the significance or severity of impacts are substantive. A reevaluation of these determinations may be warranted and may lead to

changes in the FEIS. If, after reevaluation, the BLM does not think that a change is warranted, the response should provide the rationale for that conclusion.

- **Non-Substantive Comments** simply state a position in favor of, or against, an alternative or a management action proposed in an alternative; merely agree or disagree with BLM policy; provide information not directly related to issues or impact analyses, or otherwise express an unsupported personal preference or opinion. For additional clarification, types of non-substantive comments are as follows:
- **Expressions of Personal Preferences or Opinion:** Comments that express personal preferences or opinions on the proposals are non-substantive and thus do not require further agency action. This includes comments in favor of or against the proposed action or alternatives, comments that only agree or disagree with BLM policy, or comments that raise, debate, or question a point of fact or policy. However, such comments are summarized whenever possible and brought to the attention of the BLM.

The BLM has reviewed and considered all comments. Non-substantive comments, including personal preferences and opinions, may be considered by the decision maker as he or she chooses the final agency's proposed action, but they generally will not affect the analysis.

The results of the comment analysis were important to the development of the PRMP/FEIS. From the nearly 19,000 comment submissions that BLM received on the Draft RMP/EIS, it extracted approximately 980 individual substantive comments. The BLM has presented these comments and the BLM responses in the CD attached to the PRMP/FEIS. A list of the businesses, government agencies, and organizations that submitted substantive comments are provided below in Table 5.8.

**Table 5.8. List of Organizations and Individuals that Submitted Substantive Comments**

Commenter Type	Organization	Individual(s)
B	CrownQuest	Clark, Craig
B	EOG Resources	Dille, Eric
B	PacifiCorp	Richards, Jeff
G	Blanding City-Webb	Webb, Chris
G	Environmental Protection Agency Region 8	
G	HOPI	Kuwanwisiwma, Leigh
G	National Park Service Intermountain Region	Runkel, Roxanne
G	San Juan County	Adams, Bruce
G	State of Utah	Harja, John
G	The Navajo Nation	Joe, Tony
G	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	Romin, Laura
G	Ute Mountain Ute Tribe	House, Ernest
I	Prescott College	Fleischner, Tom
O	BCS Project Rock Art	Sucec, David
O	Blue Ribbon Coalition	Hawthorne, Brian
O	Bluff Landowners Coalition	Schalk, Lynell

**Table 5.8. List of Organizations and Individuals that Submitted Substantive Comments**

Commenter Type	Organization	Individual(s)
O	Broads Healthy Lands	Peterson, Tim
O	Canyon Country Heritage Association	Bender, Krisanne
O	Canyon Land Defenders	Nelson, Judy Ellen
O	Capital Trail Vehicle Association	Salo, Ken
O	Coalition to Preserve Rock Art	Gum, Jon
O	Colorado Plateau Archaeological Alliance	Spangler, Jerry
O	ECOS Consulting	
O	Glen Canyon Group, Utah Chapter, Sierra Club	Binyon, Jean
O	Glen Canyon Institute	Ingebretsen, Richard
O	Grand Canyon Trust	Kamala, Laura
O	Howard County Bird Club	Schwarz, Kurt
O	IPAMS (Independent Petroleum Association of Mountain States)	Sgamma, Kathleen

**Table 5.8. List of Organizations and Individuals that Submitted Substantive Comments**

Commenter Type	Organization	Individual(s)
O	Maryland Ornithological Society, Inc	Harvey, Maureen
O	National Outdoor Leadership School	Cukjati, Gary
O	National Parks Conservation Association	Nimkin, David
O	National Trust for Historic Preservation	Hays, Ti
O	Nature Conservancy Moab Project Office	Bellagamba, Sue
O	Public Lands Advocacy	Moseley, Claire
O	Public Lands Equal Access Alliance	Bartholomew, Dale
O	Red Rock 4-Wheelers	Bandle, Bob
O	Ride with Respect	Parriott, Dale
O	Rising Sun 4x4 Club	Morgan, William
O	San Juan Public Entry and Access Rights	Johansen, Dr. Brent
O	Sierra Club Uncaompahgre Group	Rechel, Eric
O	Sierra Club Utah Chapter	Hoskisson, Wayne

**Table 5.8. List of Organizations and Individuals that Submitted Substantive Comments**

Commenter Type	Organization	Individual(s)
O	Spear	Turri, Bob
O	SUWA	Braden, Scott
O	The Nature Conservancy	Bellagamba, Susan
O	Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Partnership (TRCP)	Webster, Joel
O	Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Partnership	Webster, Joel
O	Trails Preservation Alliance	Riggles, Don
O	U4WDA	Williams, Kurt
O	Utah 4 Wheel Drive Association	Armbruster, David
O	Utah Archaeological Research Institute	Manning, Steven
O	Utah Professional Archaeology Association	Skinner, Betsy
O	Utah Rivers Council	Danenhauer, Mark
O	Utah Rock Art Association	Scotter, Troy
O	Utah State Office of Education	Donaldson, Tim
O	Western Watershed Project, Inc	Carter, John Kleiner-Roberts, Amy

Notes: B=Business, G=Government, I=Individual, and O=Organization

**THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK**

### **5.5.3 SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS**

During the public comment period for the Draft RMP/EIS, comments were received from government agencies, organizations, businesses, and individuals. The greatest number of comments concerned travel management, wildlife, Special Status Species, air quality, cultural resources, and recreation, in this order. Commenters focused on their own definitions of "multiple use" and "balance among resource uses and natural resource values." Comments ranged from those urging the BLM to impose maximum restrictions on resource uses to those expressing dissatisfaction with the restrictions imposed in the Preferred Alternative of the Draft RMP/EIS.

Travel management comments included a desire for either restricting travel in the Monticello PA or increasing the acreage available for travel within the Monticello PA. There were also many requests for clarification of what types of motorized travel would be permitted or restricted in areas, such as OHVs, mountain bikes, etc.

Wildlife comments ranged from stating that the habitat protection for animals was not enough and more needed to be designated to the proposed acreage was too large and would be too restricting on other resource development. Special status species comments had similar themed comments on sage-grouse buffers. Commenters also requested more information and explanation of analysis of the reasoning behind BLM's decisions for special status species habitat designations.

Air quality comments primarily focused on two main issues. First, commenters questioned the adequacy and analysis of the data used in the Draft RMP/EIS. Second, commenters desired clarification on what agency has the authority to manage air quality for the Monticello PA.

Many commenters addressed the impact analyses on various resources. Those commenters who alleged deficiencies in the impact analysis often were comparing the preferred alternative not to the No Action alternative (as required by the Council on Environmental Quality), but rather to the Commenter's version of an ideal environment.

The interest of the public in the management of BLM lands in the Monticello planning area was manifested in the number and complexity of the submissions received.

### **5.5.4 PUBLIC COMMENTS AND RESPONSES**

The following tables present a subset of the comments received by the Monticello BLM during the comment period. The first set of tables (Tables 5.9a and 5.9b) provides all the comments submitted by the three Cooperating Agencies –the State of Utah and San Juan County. These tables are organized by the commenter name, commenter ID number, comment number, the resource category being addressed, the comment text, the BLM's response, and whether the comment resulted in a change in the document. The second set of tables (Tables 5.10a through 5.10aa) provide the comments that resulted in a change to the document. These tables include similar information to that provided in the first set of tables except they are grouped by resource category.

All comments received during the public comment period are available on a CD accompanying this document. This CD contains two tables in Adobe Portable Document Format (PDF). Both tables have the following columns: Commenter Name, Commenter ID Number, Comment Number, Resource Category, Comment Text, Response to Comment, and if it required a change in the document. The first table is sorted and grouped by Commenter Type and the second table is sorted and grouped by resource.

**Table 5.9.a. Public Comments and Responses: State of Utah**

Record ID & Comment Number		Resource Category	Comment Text	Response to Comment	Doc Mod
004	1	TRR	The State requests that the listing on page 1–15 of the DEIS be amended to include the plans and policies indicated by Utah Code Section 63-38d-401, et seq., and that BLM carefully consider consistency with this state's law.	<p>Page 1-15 lists pertinent state and county plans. The State identified no specific plans or policies which have been omitted.</p> <p>The BLM is aware that there are specific County and State plan decisions relevant to aspects of public land management that are discrete from, and independent of, Federal law. However, the BLM is bound by Federal law. The FLPMA requires that the development of an RMP for public lands must be coordinated and consistent with County plans, to the maximum extent possible by law, and inconsistencies between Federal and non-Federal government plans be resolved to the extent practical (FLPMA, Title II Sec. 202 (c)(9)). As a consequence, where State and local plans conflict with Federal law there will be an inconsistency that cannot be resolved or reconciled.</p> <p>Thus, while County and Federal planning processes, under FLPMA, are required to be as integrated and consistent as practical, the Federal agency planning process is not bound by or subject to County plans, planning processes, or planning stipulations. The BLM will identify these conflicts in the FEIS/PRMP, so that the State and local governments have a complete understanding of the impacts of the PRMP on State and local management options. The BLM will document the required Governor's consistency review in Chapter 5.</p>	Yes
004	2	SOC	The BLM, Monticello Field Office should consider the information presented in the Economic and Business Research Study (Phase I) for oil and gas exploration and production in the Uintah Basin in terms of economic benefits of the oil and gas industry.	The BLM acknowledges the oil and gas study referenced for the Uintah Basin. However, the applicability to Monticello is limited. The Monticello Field Office prepared a Reasonably Foreseeable Development (RFD) scenario for oil and gas development over the next 15 years. The development predicted in the RFD was utilized to generate the economic impacts in the Draft RMP/EIS.	No

**Table 5.9.a. Public Comments and Responses: State of Utah**

Record ID & Comment Number		Resource Category	Comment Text	Response to Comment	Doc Mod
004	3	PRP	The BLM should commit to utilizing the State's expedited energy permitting process.	Federal laws, rules, regulations, and policies govern the procedures for processing all Federal projects.	No
004	4	SCO	The state requests that BLM commit to either work toward the energy efficiency goals as outlined in the Governor's May 30, 2006 Executive Order or coordinate alternative energy efficiency increases with the Governor's Energy Advisor.	Any policy changes or coordination between the state and the BLM to improve energy efficiency would be administrative and are outside the scope of the land use planning process.	No
004	5	OTH	The Draft RMP/EIS does not include a discussion on the nature or type of threat of "irreparable damage" or the regional significance of relevant and important values in its review. BLM misinterprets irreparable damage when reviewing and analyzing ACECs in the Draft RMP/EIS. The ACEC tool was intended by Congress to be limited to only those instances where irreparable damage would be caused without designation. Most surface disturbing actions can eventually be repaired.	<p>The potential ACECs brought forward for designation into the Proposed Plan have gone through a rigorous and stringent process in accordance with FLPMA, the planning regulations at 43 CFR 1600, Land-use Planning Handbook (H- 1601-1), and in accordance with BLM Manual 1613 and ACEC Policy and Procedures Guidelines (45 FR 57318). Appendix H outlines the process the interdisciplinary team underwent to determine whether a nominated ACEC had relevance and/or importance values. The size of the proposed ACECs is limited only to the area(s) of geography where the relevance and importance values are manageable to protect and prevent irreparable damage to these resources.</p> <p>The potential ACECs carried forward into the Proposed Plan necessitate an ACEC designation because special management protection is necessary (outside of normal multiple-use management) to specifically protect the relevance and importance values within the areas identified. The special management prescriptions that have been proposed are narrowly tailored to protect the identified relevant and important values. For these reasons, the potential ACEC decisions carried forward into the Proposed Plan are considered by BLM to be consistent with Utah Code 63j-4-401.</p> <p>A rationale for designating or not designating ACECs in the Preferred Alternative of the DRMP/EIS is found in Appendix H of the PRMP. Relevant text has been added to Appendix H of the PRMP/FEIS, which lists the threats to each proposed ACEC. These threats could result in irreparable damage to the</p>	Yes

**Table 5.9.a. Public Comments and Responses: State of Utah**

Record ID & Comment Number	Resource Category	Comment Text	Response to Comment	Doc Mod
			<p>area proposed for ACEC designation.</p> <p>The ACEC evaluation appendix was modified, and a section added to Chapter 2 discussing threats to the relevant and important ACEC values; however, whether the threats currently exist does not preclude a potential ACEC from being considered in the action alternatives. All nominated areas, where the BLM has determined to have relevant and important values, are identified as potential ACECs and are addressed in the action alternatives. Threats to relevant and important values are likely to vary by alternative. The PRMP/FEIS was revised from the draft document to better address potential threats and impacts associated with each alternative.</p> <p>On August 27, 1980, the BLM promulgated final ACEC guidelines (45 Federal Register 57318) clarifying the term "protects" – "To defend or guard against damage or loss to the important environmental resources of a potential or designated ACEC. This includes damage that can be restored over time and that which is irreparable. With regard to a natural hazard, protect means to prevent the loss of life or injury to people, or loss or damage to property." Thus, BLM is to consider the potential for both reparable and irreparable damage when protecting important historic, cultural, or scenic values; fish and wildlife resources; or other natural systems through ACEC designation. This interpretation is consistent with FLPMA's legislative history and implementing policy.</p> <p>Section 2 of the guidelines clarifies that ACECs are special places within the public lands. It states: "In addition to establishing in law such basic protective management policies that apply to all the public lands, Congress has said that 'management of national resource lands [public lands] is to include giving special attention to the protection of ACECs, for the purpose of ensuring that the most environmentally</p>	

**Table 5.9.a. Public Comments and Responses: State of Utah**

Record ID & Comment Number	Resource Category	Comment Text	Response to Comment	Doc Mod
			important and fragile lands will be given early attention and protection' (Senate Report 94-583, on FLPMA). Thus, the ACEC process is to be used to provide whatever special management is required to protect those environmental resources that are most important, i.e., those resources that make certain specific areas special places, endowed by nature or man with characteristics that set them apart. In addition, the ACEC process is to be used to protect human life and property from natural hazards."	
004	6	ACE The BLM must explain the need for "special" management for the ACEC and explain how this management is not duplicative of other normal BLM management or protections afforded by other state or federal laws.	The special management for an ACEC is in reality a package of management protections applied to an area specifically to protect its relevant and important values. The BLM can only apply those protections that are within its authority.	No
004	7	GRA The state discourages permanent closure of grazing allotments and encourages the reinstatement of suspended AUMs when rangeland conditions permit.	The BLM does not propose the permanent closure of allotments or portions thereof. However, certain allotments or areas may not be available for grazing over the next 15 years. These areas considered as not available are spread by alternative. Subsequent revisions of the land use plan may consider opening these areas to livestock grazing. Reinstatement of suspended AUMs and adjustment of available active AUMs will be considered during the site specific grazing permit renewal process, which will analyze forage productivity, grazing capacities, and vegetative trend in relation to sustainable grazing practices in accordance with the Standards for Rangeland Health (pg. 2-16).  The vast majority (93%) of the Monticello Planning Area is available for livestock grazing. For those limited number of allotments and areas shown on pages 2-16 through 2-18 of the DRMP/DEIS the BLM is proposing that other uses of the BLM land are the highest and best use of these areas. Both FLPMA and BLM's Land Use Planning Handbook authorize BLM to close specific areas to livestock grazing to place an emphasis on these areas for other purposes or values, such as wildlife use, watershed protection, and recreation. As	No

**Table 5.9.a. Public Comments and Responses: State of Utah**

Record ID & Comment Number		Resource Category	Comment Text	Response to Comment	Doc Mod
				indicated by the variable uses of the BLM lands, as shown in the proposed action, it is BLM's intention to emphasize "multiple use" of the public lands within the planning area.	
004	8	GRA	The state encourages flexible livestock grazing time (duration) and timing (season of use).	As stated in the Draft EIS / RMP, grazing would be managed on an allotment basis according to the Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management to meet the Standards for Rangeland Health (see Appendix D), including duration and adjustment in season of use. An allotment's associated 10-year term Grazing Permit outlines the season of use and livestock numbers. A yearly Grazing Application allows flexibility in relation to annual forage production that must meet these Standards for Rangeland Health and be pre-approved by the authorized officer.	No
004	9	GRA	The Final RMP should contain and rely on a robust monitoring program and BLM should work with the state, grazing permittees, and conservation organizations to actively monitor and record grazing use data, wildlife populations, and range conditions.	BLM will follow its policy which includes an active monitoring program with full coordination/consultation with grazing permittees, affected state agencies and conservation organizations.	No
004	10	SSS	The BLM should only employ the term "critical habitat" when referring to the legal habitat designations for endangered and threatened species under the ESA.	The term critical has been reserved to Threatened and Endangered (T &E) species. Corrections in the text have been made in the PRMP/FEIS. For non-T&E species the BLM relied on the UDWR crucial habitat designations.	Yes
004	11	WL	The state requests that the BLM use the "crucial habitat" designations mapped by the DWR solely as descriptive wildlife habitat designations, not as automatic exclusion zones for other multiple uses.	BLM has changed the document to use the crucial habitat designations of UDWR. Use of these habitat polygons does not automatically exclude other uses. Appendix A outlines exceptions, modifications and waivers that will be used when applicable for all surface disturbing activities in these areas.	Yes
004	12	WL	The state requests that habitat designations not be altered from alternative to alternative.	As required by NEPA, the BLM considered a range of alternatives. For non-special status species the alternatives varied by the size of the habitat and the timing restrictions. The management of habitat is consistent with the goals and objectives of each alternative.  In the Draft RMP/EIS, Alt B has a timing limitation for what is	No

**Table 5.9.a. Public Comments and Responses: State of Utah**

Record ID & Comment Number	Resource Category	Comment Text	Response to Comment	Doc Mod	
			referred to as "winter habitat." This habitat actually includes both crucial and high value winter habitats. These habitats, although not separated in the draft, have been properly described in the PRMP/FEIS.		
004	13	AQ	The state suggests initiating a coordinated approach to assessing and protecting air quality in Utah by working with federal, state, tribal and local agencies to identify and address air quality concerns.	No	
004	14	AQ	The state encourages BLM to request oil and gas operators apply best available control technology (BACT).	The application of BACT for oil and gas development has been added to the mitigation section in Chapter 4.	Yes
004	15	AQ	The state encourages BLM to adopt emission standards for compressor engines consistent with the Draft Four Corners Air Quality Task Force Report and impose those standards as lease conditions and conditions of approval for all new APDs.	The BLM does not have the responsibility to set air emission standards. That responsibility lies with EPA and the State of Utah. The BLM can only approve actions that meet the National Ambient Air Quality Standards as set by EPA or the State. Site specific mitigation or conditions of approval may be applied at the APD or implementation phase but not during land use planning and leasing.	No
004	16	AQ	Future air quality analysis should include modeling with the following factors: 1) oil and gas proponents should assume that leasing and exploration will result in full field development, 2) air quality analyses should be cumulative and include not only planned development but existing omission sources, 3) air quality analyses should be based on anticipated worst-case meteorological conditions for each dispersion scenario, 4) air quality analyses should address compliance/attainment with all applicable air quality-related requirements and standards, and 5) air quality analysis should specifically address impacts to sensitive visual resources and other air quality-related values.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The BLM would model the proposed action</li> <li>2. The potential impacts would include direct and indirect impacts from the project, as well as cumulative impacts from RFD, as required by NEPA</li> <li>3. The BLM would use reasonable-but-conservative assumptions rather than worst-case assumptions, as required by CEQ regulations</li> <li>4. The BLM would compare potential impacts to applicable NAAQS, and PSD increments, as appropriate</li> <li>5. The BLM would compare potential impacts to applicable visibility and atmospheric deposition levels-of-concern, as appropriate.</li> </ol>	No
004	17	WSR	The State believes that the BLM should disclose the reasons and rationale for determinations of eligibility and suitability for	The Preliminary Eligibility Determination of Wild and Scenic Rivers (BLM, 2003) details the steps undertaken in the	No

**Table 5.9.a. Public Comments and Responses: State of Utah**

Record ID & Comment Number	Resource Category	Comment Text	Response to Comment	Doc Mod
		<p>proposed additions to the National Wild and Scenic River System, and to fully meet the requirements of state and federal law in doing so.</p>	<p>eligibility review process including the identification of outstandingly remarkable values as well as the Suitability Considerations by eligible river segments. The BLM complied with all applicable Federal laws, regulations, and policies in the Wild and Scenic Rivers Study Process.</p> <p>Appendix H, beginning on page H-91 gives detailed information on tentative classification of eligible wild and scenic segments and suitability considerations.</p>	
004	18	WSR <p>The State is concerned that Wild and Scenic River designations may limit water development by communities for future growth, limit industrial and agricultural growth, and reduce funding for the Colorado River Salinity Control program.</p>	<p>The Wild and Scenic Rivers Act implies a Federal reserved water right; however, it must be the minimal amount necessary for purposed of the Act, it must be adjudicated through State processes, and it would be junior to existing water rights. The amount of Federal right will vary from river to river, depending on the river's flows, the un-appropriated quantities in the river, and the values for which the river is being protected. There is no effect whatsoever on water rights on in -stream flows related to suitability findings made in a land use plan decision, barring Congressional action. Even if Congress were to designate rivers in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, any such designation would have no affect on existing, valid water rights. Section 13 (b) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act states that jurisdiction over waters is determined by established principles of law. In Utah, the state has jurisdiction over water. Although the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act implies a federal reserved water right for designated rivers, it doesn't require or specify any amount, and instead establishes that only the minimum amount for purpose of the Act can be acquired. Because the State of Utah has jurisdiction over water, BLM would be required to adjudicate the right as would any other entity, by application through state processes. Thus, for Congressionally designated rivers, BLM may assert a federal reserved water right to appurtenant and inappropriate water with a priority date as of the date of designation (junior to all existing rights), but only in</p>	No

**Table 5.9.a. Public Comments and Responses: State of Utah**

Record ID & Comment Number	Resource Category	Comment Text	Response to Comment	Doc Mod
			<p>the minimum amount necessary to fulfill the primary purpose of the reservation. In practice, however, federal reserved water rights have not always been claimed if alternative means of ensuring sufficient flows are adequate to sustain the outstandingly remarkable values.</p> <p>During the suitability phase of the Wild and Scenic River process, San Juan County as well as the State of Utah and SITLA, were asked to supply information on uses, "including reasonably foreseeable potential uses of the area and related waters, which would be enhanced, foreclosed, or curtailed if the area were included in the national system of rivers, and the values which could be foreclosed or diminished if the area is not protected as part of the national system." (The Preliminary Eligibility Determination of Wild and Scenic Rivers, BLM, 2003). The preliminary eligibility determination summarizes suitability input by the public as well as local communities. Suitability decisions were made considering the results of this input.</p> <p>In 1994, Public Law 98-569 amended the Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Act and directed the Secretary to develop a comprehensive program for minimizing salt contributions from lands administered by BLM and to provide a report on this program to the Congress and the Advisory Council. BLM's Colorado River Basin Salinity Control program is designed to provide the best management practices (BMP) of the basic resource base. Successes with the resource base will translate to improved vegetation cover, better use of onsite precipitation, and stronger plant root systems. In turn, a more stable runoff regime and reduced soil loss should result, thus benefiting water quality of the streams in the Colorado River Basin including the San Juan River. In Section 1(b) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, Congress states that one of the objectives of the Act is to protect the water quality of designated rivers. Congress further specified that the river-</p>	

**Table 5.9.a. Public Comments and Responses: State of Utah**

Record ID & Comment Number	Resource Category	Comment Text	Response to Comment	Doc Mod
			<p>administering agencies cooperate with the EPA and state water pollution control agencies to eliminate or diminish water pollution (Section 2). Comparing the two, it is clear that the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act and the Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Act are not only complementary of one another, but share the same objective with regard to water quality. The Wild and Scenic Rivers Act directs the Secretary of the Interior or any government agency to prohibit any loan, grant, license, or otherwise construction of any water resources project that would have a direct effect on the values for which such river designation was established. The law also states that it cannot preclude licensing of, or assistance to, developments below or above a wild, scenic, or recreational river area or on any stream tributary thereto that will not invade the area or unreasonably diminish the scenic, recreational, and fish and wildlife values present in the area on the date of designation of a river as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. However, projects intended to comply with the Colorado River Salinity Control Act are those that would generally benefit stream segments instead of affecting or unreasonably diminishing its values including water quality.</p>	
004	19	WSR The state is concerned about suitability findings for those streams where there are significant water diversions upstream.	<p>According the "Wild and Scenic River Review in the State of Utah Process and Criteria for Interagency Use" (July 1996), Congress has allowed for the existence of some human modification of a riverway, the presence of impoundments or major dams above or below a segment under review (including those that may regulate the flow regime through the segment). The existence of minor dams, diversion structures, and rip-rap within the segment shall not by themselves render a reach ineligible.</p>	No
004	20	WSR The State is concerned that the Draft RMP/EIS does not state the authority for protection of river segments while studies conducted under the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act are underway.	<p>Section 5 (d) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act requires that Federal land management agencies make wild and scenic river considerations during land use planning. Two stages of</p>	No

**Table 5.9.a. Public Comments and Responses: State of Utah**

Record ID & Comment Number	Resource Category	Comment Text	Response to Comment	Doc Mod
			<p>review are involved. Eligibility is an inventory, solely involving river values. Suitability involves consideration of manageability and resource conflicts.</p> <p>As per BLM Manual 8351-Wild and Scenic Rivers-Policy and program .32 C, all eligible rivers are considered in the EIS for the planning effort as to their suitability for congressional designation into the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. With any suitability determination made in the RMP, the free-flowing, outstandingly remarkable values, and tentative classification of rivers would continue to be protected until Congress makes a decision on designation.</p> <p>The Preliminary Eligibility Determination of Wild and Scenic Rivers (BLM, 2003) describes the authorities for the Wild and Scenic Rivers Study Process.</p>	
004	21	WC	<p>The State asks BLM to provide a detailed explanation of the rationale and authority for management of lands solely because of wilderness characteristics, and why such management does not circumvent the provisions of the statutorily required wilderness review process.</p> <p>The BLM's authority for managing lands to protect or enhance wilderness characteristics comes directly from the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA) Section 202 (U.S.C. § 1712). This section of the BLM's organic statute gives the Secretary of the Interior authority to manage public lands for multiple use and sustained yield. Nothing in this section constrains the secretary's authority to manage lands as necessary to "achieve integrated consideration of physical, biological, economic, and other sciences." FLPMA, Section 202(c)(2) (43 U.S.C. § 1712(c)(2)). Further FLPMA makes it clear that the term "multiple use" means that not every use is appropriate for every acre of public land and that the Secretary can "make the most judicious use of land for some or all of these resources or related services over areas large enough to provide sufficient latitude for periodic adjustments in use...." FLPMA, Section 1039(c) (43 U.S.C. § 1702(c)). FLPMA intended the Secretary of the Interior to use land use planning as a mechanism for allocating resource use, including wilderness character management, amongst the various resources in a way that provides use for current and future</p>	No

**Table 5.9.a. Public Comments and Responses: State of Utah**

Record ID & Comment Number	Resource Category	Comment Text	Response to Comment	Doc Mod
			<p>generations.</p> <p>The Norton-Leavitt Agreement recognizes that nothing in the Agreement shall be construed to diminish the Secretary's authority under FLPMA to manage a tract of land that has been dedicated to a specific use.</p> <p>IM 2003-275-Change 1 which is a direct outcome of the Norton-Leavitt Agreement states, "the BLM may consider information on wilderness characteristics along with information on other uses and values when preparing land use plans." The IM goes on to say "considering wilderness characteristics in the land use planning process may result in several outcomes including, but not limited to, ...emphasizing the protection of some or all of the wilderness characteristics as a priority over other multiple uses" (although the area will not be designated as a WSA). The IM also states "typically, resource information contained in the BLM wilderness inventories was collected to support a land use planning process. Public wilderness proposals represent a land use proposal. In either case the BLM is authorized to consider such information in preparation of a land use plan amendment or revision."</p> <p>In September 2006, Judge Benson, whose court approved the Norton-Leavitt Agreement, stated that the Agreement did not strip the BLM of its powers to protect lands it determined to have wilderness characteristics in a manner substantially similar to the manner in which such lands are protected when protected as WSAs.</p>	
004	22	WC	<p>The BLM should give strong consideration to recommendations submitted by local government and not manage lands to protect wilderness character where such management would, in the opinion of local governments, be contrary to the interests of local residents.</p> <p>Secs. 103, 201, and 202 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA) direct the BLM to take into account the national interest as well as the local interest. In accordance with FLPMA and BLM rules, regulations, and policies, the BLM must provide management for all resources and resource uses on public lands.</p>	No

**Table 5.9.a. Public Comments and Responses: State of Utah**

Record ID & Comment Number		Resource Category	Comment Text	Response to Comment	Doc Mod
				Strong consideration was given to local governments. San Juan County is a cooperating agency in the entire land use planning process including in the development of alternatives where non-WSA areas with wilderness characteristics were considered.	
004	23	WC	BLM should consider the existence of inholdings and valid existing rights (VER) where development of inholdings or VER may compromise management and protection of areas with wilderness characteristics.	Valid existing rights are considered Administrative Actions by the BLM and do not require a specific planning decision to implement. As noted in Chapter 1 under Planning Criteria and as outlined in the BLM's Land Use Planning Manual (Section 1601.06G), all decisions made in land use plans and subsequent implementation decision are subject to valid existing rights. The BLM will work with and subject to the agreement of holders of valid existing rights to modify proposed actions or activities to reduce the effect of the actions or activities on resource values and uses. These modifications may be necessary to maintain the choice of alternatives being considered during land use plan development and implementation, and may include appropriate stipulations, relocations, redesigns, or delay of proposed actions.	No
004	24	WC	The state strongly suggests BLM give serious consideration to San Juan County's new field information concerning areas asserted by BLM to have wilderness characteristics.	As part of BLM's wilderness characteristics inventory maintenance, BLM performed a combination of data and on-site reviews. This included specific field inspections, Interdisciplinary team review of data such as range files, County and BLM GIS data, and high-resolution 2006 aerial photographs. The BLM's findings are described in the 1999-2003 wilderness reinventory documentation, as well as the 2007 wilderness characteristics review process. The BLM is confident of the high-standard approach used to inventory the public lands and stands by its findings, particularly the findings, which involved wilderness characteristics inventory maintenance.	No
004	25	SOC	BLM's decisions on how to manage its lands directly affect	Non-BLM lands could be indirectly impacted by RMP	Yes

**Table 5.9.a. Public Comments and Responses: State of Utah**

Record ID & Comment Number	Resource Category	Comment Text	Response to Comment	Doc Mod	
		Utah's ability to manage state trust lands to provide revenue for public schools and other beneficiary institutions. The state believes the Draft RMP fails to adequately address two issues, 1) the impact of BLM management decisions on state trust lands, and 2) the need for a substantially more robust program for land tenure adjustments between the BLM and the State of Utah.	<p>decisions both positively and negatively. The analysis in Chapter 4 of the PRMP/FEIS has been modified accordingly. For specifics regarding the impacts on mineral revenue, please refer to response to comment 120-101.</p> <p>The BLM does provide for reasonable access to all SITLA lands under all alternatives. A sentence has been added to Chapter 2, Lands and Realty, Management Common to All Action Alternatives, that states that reasonable access to State land would be provided including across BLM lands within avoidance and exclusion areas for rights-of-way as specified by the Cotter decision (Utah v. Andrus, 10/1/79). In addition, the travel management plan recognizes the requirement to provide access to SITLA lands per the Cotter decision.</p>		
004	26	TRV	<p>The RMP should specifically state that: 1) SITLA will be permitted continued access to trust lands where motorized access is currently available; 2) SITLA may undertake reasonable maintenance activities of existing access across BLM lands; and 3) existing access routes to state trust lands will not be closed without approval by SITLA and the state.</p>	<p>The travel plan provides restrictions to the public for recreational purposes, but does not restrict uses permitted or authorized by the BLM. State inholdings may or may not currently have access, depending upon whether or not existing vehicle routes lead to them. Under different alternative scenarios, existing routes may be proposed to closure. BLM policy, as required by the Cotter decision (State of Utah v. Andrus, 10/1/79), is that "the state must be allowed access to the state school trust lands so that those lands can be developed in a manner that will provide funds for the common school..." This decision confined the issue of access to situations directly involving economic revenues generated for the school trust. The recreation restrictions do not prohibit the State from reasonable access to its lands for economic purposes through separate permit authorization as specified by the Cotter decision. Routes to state sections may not have been identified for recreation purposes due to resource conflicts or actual route conditions.</p>	No
004	27	TRV	<p>The state urges the BLM to consider San Juan County's transportation map and to make BLM's transportation plan consistent with the county desires to keep roads and routes</p>	<p>The BLM under its multiple use mandate has considered the needs of a wide variety of recreationists in the DRMP/EIS alternative formulation. The BLM analyzed each travel route</p>	No

**Table 5.9.a. Public Comments and Responses: State of Utah**

Record ID & Comment Number	Resource Category	Comment Text	Response to Comment	Doc Mod
		open.	according to its purpose and need weighed against potential resource conflicts. This process is detailed in Appendix N of the DRMP/EIS. As described in Appendix N, the BLM's travel plan formulation involved numerous meetings of an interdisciplinary team (including vegetation, soils, wildlife and cultural resource specialists). Potential resource conflicts were identified, their extent evaluated, and then weighed against purpose and need for the particular route BLM feels that the range of alternatives reasonably covers options including roads to be closed and left open under discussion. The DEIS/RMP provides five alternatives that consist of no action, emphasis of protection and preservation of natural resources, balance between commodity production and protection of natural resources, and emphasis of commodity production and extraction. These alternatives provide a broad range of management actions to address the issues raised during scoping.	
004	28	AA The DEIS does not address consistency between neighboring jurisdictions' management objectives.	It was the intent in the development of the RMP/DEIS to be consistent with management objectives in the adjoining Moab BLM Planning Area where appropriate. This same intent was not necessarily applied to other neighboring jurisdictions. In some cases, the opportunity to develop consistency became apparent during scoping, comment periods and various interagency coordination meetings. Section 5.3 in the FEIS, (Consistency With Other Plans), addresses the consistency issue.	Yes
004	29	PRP The state encourages the BLM to contact all neighboring state, federal, and tribal agencies and collaboratively identify all other significant reasonably foreseeable activities to be considered as part of the analysis.	The Reasonably Foreseeable Development Scenario (RFD) for Oil and Gas is the best example of this process. Future foreseeable development for oil and gas was identified and analyzed for other land ownerships (non-BLM administered lands) within the Planning Area. Reasonably foreseeable activities for other resources on non-BLM administered lands were not identified unless they were brought up during scoping and comment periods.	No

**Table 5.9.a. Public Comments and Responses: State of Utah**

Record ID & Comment Number		Resource Category	Comment Text	Response to Comment	Doc Mod
004	30	MOG	The RFD for fluid minerals does not clearly state whether its projections are limited to exploration, or include possible subsequent development based on likely discoveries.	The RFD includes projections for development and production activity. Page 1, 3rd paragraph, states "It was assumed that 59% of the wells drilled would be productive...It is also reasonable to assume that the number of wells to be abandoned...will equal approximately one-half the number of wells going into production." Page 2, paragraph 1, states "RFD ...is a long-term projection of oil and gas exploration, development, production, and reclamation activity." The narrative on Pages 13 and 14 of the RFD describes the associated disturbances which were factored into the average acreage of surface disturbance per well (9.6 acres), including areas needed for associated production activities such as gas production facilities, oil storage tanks, gathering/injection pipelines and roads.	No
004	31	MOG	The state encourages BLM to prepare a detailed transportation system use analysis as part of the RFD, similar to the UDOT's "Analysis of Freight Traffic Associated with Oil and Gas Development in the Uinta Basin."	The BLM acknowledges that a transportation system use analysis can be a useful tool in assessing impacts from oil and gas development. However, the benefit of a transportation analysis is much greater for areas such as the Uintah Basin which have a high level of current and projected oil and gas activity. In comparison, the projected activity levels for the Monticello Field Office are relatively low. The Monticello Field Office prepared a Reasonably Foreseeable Development (RFD) scenario for oil and gas development over the next 15 years. The development predicted in the RFD was utilized to generate the economic impacts in the Draft RMP/EIS as detailed on pg. 4-340 through 4-344.	No
004	32	WR	The State Engineer recommends that the BLM consider the impact its actions may have on water rights in general and non-BLM water rights in particular.	On page 1-12 of the DRMP/DEIS under Planning Criteria, the BLM states 1) the planning process would recognize the existence of valid existing rights, and 2) the BLM would adhere to all applicable laws (including state and local laws). The text has been edited to ensure that water rights are recognized as valid existing rights.	Yes
004	33	WC	The BLM inconsistently applied road data between the 1999	The Wilderness Study Area Interim-Management Policy ("IMP"	No

**Table 5.9.a. Public Comments and Responses: State of Utah**

Record ID & Comment Number	Resource Category	Comment Text	Response to Comment	Doc Mod
		inventory and the 2007 WC review.	<p>or "WSA handbook") applied to inventories conducted prior to 2004. In 2004 BLM settled ongoing litigation with the State of Utah (known now as the Utah v. Norton Settlement Agreement). The IMP emphasized the difference between roads and "ways." A road was considered an impact on wilderness characteristics and needed to be excluded from the inventory unit. A "way" however, was not considered in and of itself a sufficient impact on naturalness to disqualify all or part of an inventory unit.</p> <p>Inventories conducted post-2004 applied current policy, which is based on IM 275-2003, Change 1 which emphasizes naturalness and does not distinguish roads from ways. The BLM has evaluated wilderness characteristics since 2004 on the basis of impacts to naturalness which could include both roads and ways.</p>	
004	34	WC The BLM should not consider undeveloped leases and potential for future development when it determines whether areas possess wilderness characteristics. The possibility of future development is irrelevant. It is only appropriate to consider this information when deciding whether to protect areas found to possess wilderness characteristics.	As part of its wilderness characteristics inventory maintenance, the BLM used a combination of field knowledge, ID Team review, og-wells GIS data, Reasonable Foreseeable Development (RFD) data, range allotment files, and a review of BLM and San Juan County (SJ CO) GIS data, including 2006 high resolution aerial photographs. RFDs were used to assist in determining what impacts were on the ground at the time of the 2007 Wilderness Character Review process to help determine naturalness. RFDs were not used to determine potential future scenarios for Oil and Gas Development. RFDs (potential Oil and Gas Development Scenarios) were used in determining what units would be managed for wilderness characteristics in the FEIS. This process allows the ID team to look at all resources during wilderness characteristics inventory maintenance. The BLM findings are described in the 2007 WCR process and are available as part of the administrative record in the Monticello BLM Field Office. The BLM stands by its findings of its wilderness characteristics inventories and WCR process.	No

**Table 5.9.a. Public Comments and Responses: State of Utah**

Record ID & Comment Number		Resource Category	Comment Text	Response to Comment	Doc Mod
004	35	WC	The BLM needs to consider the new information on roads (2007) to reevaluate the findings of the 1999/2003 wilderness inventory.	The 2003 Revision Document for the Monticello Field Office made adjustments to Wilderness Inventory Areas based on county road data, none of which differs from the current county inventory. BLM stands by its 1999/2003 data.	No
004	36	WC	The BLM should clarify whether Grand Gulch WC area, units A and B, possess outstanding opportunities for solitude or primitive and unconfined type of recreation as required. If BLM relies on the existence of outstanding opportunities within the contiguous WSA to satisfy this requirement then BLM should clarify how these requisite values can be satisfied at another location.	The wilderness character review process used specific guidelines in determining whether or not the areas possessed wilderness character. Appendix O briefly discusses the criteria used in this process. These areas are not the same as Wilderness or Wilderness Study Areas. The documents relevant to the wilderness character review process in 2007 are available at the Monticello Field Office, on the Monticello web site and in the administrative record.	No
004	37	WC	The BLM should clarify whether the National Forest system roadless area adjacent to the Hammond Canyon WC area has been administratively endorsed for wilderness. If no, then BLM should explain the apparent departure from the 5,000 acre minimum size standard.	The National Forest Service area in question has not been determined by that agency to possess wilderness characteristics (itself a BLM term), and its adjacency is irrelevant. Although the unit does not officially meet the 5,000 acre size requirement, and it is not contiguous to lands that possess Wilderness Characteristics, it is bordered on the east side by Ute Tribal Lands and on the west side by USFS Roadless Lands, which significantly limits motorized use. The 4, 702 acres identified in Hammond Canyon consist of only public lands administered by the BLM and does not include any USFS Roadless Lands and was found to possess wilderness characteristics.	No
004	38	WC	The review form for the Upper Red Canyon WC area notes "much of the mining activity in the area is still visible in the form of audits or waste dumps." Also, opportunities for solitude or primitive and unconfined type of recreation are not described as being outstanding in character. Please clarify 1) the standard applied to determine the existence of naturalness and, 2) whether Upper Red Canyon WC area possesses the requisite outstanding opportunities for solitude or primitive and unconfined type of recreation.	As part of BLM's wilderness characteristics inventory maintenance, BLM performed a combination of data and on-site reviews. This included specific field inspections, Interdisciplinary team review of data such as range files, County and BLM GIS data, and high-resolution 2006 aerial photographs. The BLM's findings are described in the 1999-2003 wilderness reinventory documentation, as well as the 2007 wilderness characteristics review process. The BLM is confident of the high-standard approach used to inventory the	No

**Table 5.9.a. Public Comments and Responses: State of Utah**

Record ID & Comment Number		Resource Category	Comment Text	Response to Comment	Doc Mod
				<p>public lands and stands by its findings, particularly the findings, which involved wilderness characteristics inventory maintenance.</p> <p>The ID team during the 2007 Wilderness review determined the surface disturbances noted in the 1979 inventory have naturally rehabilitated. Mining activity in the area while still visible is not considered to be a substantial impact to the naturalness of the area. With minimal evidence of continued human disturbances, opportunities for solitude can be found throughout the area.</p>	
004	39	WC	The opportunities for solitude or a primitive and unconfined type of recreation in the White Canyon WC area are not described as being outstanding in character. Please clarify whether opportunities must be outstanding in nature and whether the White Canyon WC area possesses these requisite values.	The 2007 wilderness character review examined 15 areas in the White Canyon area and found 3 of those areas to possess wilderness characteristics. The files relevant to the wilderness character review from 2007 are available in the administrative record and will provide specific information on the values of those areas reviewed.	No
004	40	WC	The review forms for the Bridger Jack Mesa, Indian Creek (A, B, C), White Canyon #8 and White Canyon #9 WC's indicate that outstanding opportunities for solitude are not present within the units themselves, but exist within contiguous WSAs, national parks, or wilderness inventory areas. Please clarify how the existence of requisite values can be satisfied by adjacent lands.	The ID team during the 2007 Wilderness review determined "Because of their size, opportunities for solitude or primitive recreation is limited, but exist when considered with the contiguous WIA and the AE lands within CNP."	No
004	41	AQ	The air quality analysis assumed all new compressors would operate at a NOx emission rate of 0.7 g/hp-hr (pg. 4-17). How will the BLM ensure this projection for newly permitted compressors?	This figure (0.7 g/hp-hr) was used as an analysis assumption and is based on the best available control technology. Air quality impacts would be analyzed for specific proposed oil and gas development on a case by case basis during the NEPA process. Air quality emission restrictions can be imposed at that time.	No
004	42	AQ	It appears that the air quality related analysis assumes all compressors used in natural gas development will be gas-fired. Please clarify how BLM will require utilization of compressor technology consistent with this assumption.	BLM assumed the use of gas-fired compressor for the purpose of the air resources analyses for the RMP. BLM would probably not prescribe a particular mitigation measure, such as gas-fired compressor. Rather, BLM would consider requiring the project proponent to demonstrate that potential	No

**Table 5.9.a. Public Comments and Responses: State of Utah**

Record ID & Comment Number		Resource Category	Comment Text	Response to Comment	Doc Mod
				direct impacts would be less than levels-of-concern, as set by BLM.	
004	43	AQ	The section entitled Impacts of Mineral Decisions on Air Quality under Alternative A discusses emissions from multiple sources and notes that emissions from each source are well below applicable NAAQS. BLM relies on this statement as basis for each alternative, noting that impacts would be the same or similar to Alternative A. It is unclear how BLM equates additional emissions to anticipated ambient conditions.	Please see revised air resources section in Chapter 4. BLM would consider using a quantitative approach to estimate potential concentrations for a project-specific EIS associated with a proposed project.	Yes
004	44	VRM	Chapter 3 discusses visibility in Class I areas. No comparable analysis is contained in chapter 4. The state recommends BLM include a careful analysis of impacts to visibility.	In Chapter 4, impacts to each resource are analyzed by the primary resource. For instance, Table 4.13. Impacts to Cultural Resources under Alternative A includes a reference to visual resource impacts to cultural resources and so on through all alternatives for all resources.	No
004	45	GRA	Please clarify at pp. 2-17 and 4-75 why allotments would be unavailable for livestock grazing for the next 15 years. Please clarify if using the term "unavailable" reflects a decision to temporarily suspend, or permanently retire grazing.	Areas are to be made unavailable for grazing due to potential conflicts with other resources or uses (wildlife habitat, primitive recreation, vegetation, cultural, etc), areas being unsuitable for feasible grazing practices (lack of water/forage, inaccessibility, etc.), and permittee requests. Unavailable refers to these areas not being authorized for livestock grazing during the next 15 years.	No
004	46	GRA	There is an apparent discrepancy in the number of acres unavailable for livestock grazing under all alternatives as indicated on pages 2-16 and 4-254 (note: page numbers have changed since the last draft). Please resolve.	Acreages for particular areas may vary slightly due to the differences in shapefiles for GIS calculations. The correct acreage figure is 128,098 acres to remain unavailable for grazing. Additional acres unavailable for grazing are added to this figure in each alternative. Acreage corrections have been made in the FEIS.	Yes
004	47	GRA	Under the No Action Alternative, the BLM would make an additional 20,361 acres unavailable for livestock grazing. Please clarify why the No Action Alternative involves a change in current management.	The No Action Alternative implements a previous court decision pending final determination in RMP revision that closed grazing in several Comb Wash side canyons (Mule Canyon south of U-95, Arch, Fish, Owl, and Road). This decision closed 16,599 acres (pg. 2-92) (20,361 is incorrect). These acres are included in acres closed under the No Action	Yes

**Table 5.9.a. Public Comments and Responses: State of Utah**

Record ID & Comment Number		Resource Category	Comment Text	Response to Comment	Doc Mod
				Alternative, thus no change in current management (see pg. 4-70). The statement of additional acres unavailable on page 4-254 is incorrect as these acres are already included in the No Action Alternative acres. These errors have been corrected in the FEIS.	
004	48	LAR	ES.4 (of the DEIS)– Planning Issues – Issue 8 (page ES-3 of DEIS), and; Section 1.3.1. – Scoping and Identifying Issues, Concern and Opportunities (Page 1-4). The discussions in these sections should contain detailed reference to the issue of inheld state lands within special areas such as WSAs, ACECs, and lands managed for wilderness characteristics. Priority should be given to resolving this issue.	It is not necessary to have this specific language stated in the description of the issue. Please refer to response to comment 004-52.	No
004	49	MOG	Section 1.3.2 – Development of Planning Criteria (page 1-11). The BLM states that the RMP will "apply only to public lands and, resources managed by the BLM." The BLM should reconsider whether it can impose its standard on split estate lands where it does not own the surface.	Information regarding leasing and development on split estate lands is found at the following Washington Office website: <a href="http://www.blm.gov/bmp/Split_Estate.htm">www.blm.gov/bmp/Split_Estate.htm</a> .  Instruction Memorandum No. 2003-202 outlines the policy, procedures and conditions for approving oil and gas operations on split-estate lands. In particular, the BLM will not consider an Application for Permit to Drill or a Sundry Notice administratively or technically complete until the Federal lessee or its operator certifies that an agreement with the surface owner exists, or until the lessee or its operator complies with Onshore Oil and Gas Order No. 1. Compliance with Onshore Oil and Gas Order No. 1 requires the Federal mineral lessee or its operator to enter into good-faith negotiations with the private surface owner to reach an agreement for the protection of surface resources and reclamation of the disturbed areas, or payment in lieu thereof, to compensate the surface owner for loss of crops and damages to tangible improvements, if any. In addition, the BLM will invite the surface owner to participate in the onsite inspection and will take into consideration the needs of the	No

**Table 5.9.a. Public Comments and Responses: State of Utah**

Record ID & Comment Number	Resource Category	Comment Text	Response to Comment	Doc Mod	
			<p>surface owner when reviewing the Application for Permit to Drill. The BLM will offer the surface owner the same level of surface protection BLM provides on Federal surface (Instruction Memorandum No. 89-201).</p> <p>Table 2.1, Page 2-18 (last paragraph) clarifies BLMs intent concerning management of split estate lands in the Monticello Field Office. On split estate lands, lease stipulations would consist only of those necessary to comply with non-discretionary federal laws, such as the Endangered Species Act. Discretionary measures to mitigate impacts to other resources, such as visual and wildlife, would not be applied as a lease stipulation but would be developed during site specific environmental analysis and would be attached as conditions of approval (COA) in consultation with the surface owner and consistent with lease rights.</p>		
004	50	SOC	<p>Section 1.4.4 – Energy Policy and Conservation Act. None of the alternatives adequately analyze the impacts from formally or effectively eliminating mineral development in lands subject to Special Designations, in terms of loss of revenue to the United States, State of Utah, local governments and Utah's school trust under EPCA.</p>	<p>Please refer to response to comments 004-2, 25, 53, 54, and 56.</p>	No
004	51	TRV	<p>Table 2-1 – Summary Table of Alternatives – Lands and Realty. It should be noted under all alternatives that, pursuant to Utah v. Andrus, BLM is obligated to grant reasonable access to the State of Utah and its grantees to school trust lands. In furtherance of this obligation, no existing roads providing access to trust lands should be closed without the consent of SITLA.</p>	<p>The BLM does provide for reasonable access to all SITLA lands under all alternatives. A sentence has been added to Chapter 2, Lands and Realty, Management Common to All Action Alternatives, that states that reasonable access to State land would be provided including across BLM lands within avoidance and exclusion areas for rights-of-way as specified by the Cotter decision (Utah v. Andrus, 10/1/79). In addition, the travel management plan recognizes the requirement to provide access to SITLA lands per the Cotter decision.</p>	Yes
004	52	LAR	<p>Section 3.6.2.1 – Land Tenure Adjustments and Section 3.6.2.1.2 – Exchanges. These paragraphs should specifically</p>	<p>Current BLM Utah State Policy is to give priority to State of Utah exchanges and such exchanges do not require a land</p>	No

**Table 5.9.a. Public Comments and Responses: State of Utah**

Record ID & Comment Number	Resource Category	Comment Text	Response to Comment	Doc Mod
		reference the need for Federal acquisition of State school trust lands that are captured by Federal reservations and withdrawals such as wilderness study areas will be a priority, in accordance with applicable BLM policy guidance. In addition State selection should be mentioned as an equally preferred method of land disposition as land exchanges.	<p>use planning decision.</p> <p>The federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA) Section 203 requires the BLM to use the land use planning process to identify lands for disposal through sales. Identifying lands for Section 203 sale requires the BLM to meet certain criteria set out specifically in the statute.</p> <p>FLPMA allows the BLM to identify lands that would be available for exchange (both disposal and acquisition) more generally. The DRMP/EIS has identified lands generally available for exchange, including identifying State lands that are currently available for acquisition. The DRMP/EIS does not contain a schedule or prioritize these lands, but the BLM understands that State in-lieu and other exchanges are a high priority for the State and for the BLM.</p>	
004	53	SOC Section 4.3 – Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Plan and All Alternatives. The state comments that BLM decisions to withdraw mineral lands from leasing in WSAs, areas with wilderness characteristics, ACECs, and other areas directly affects the economic viability of state trust lands inholdings in those areas, particularly for oil and gas.	Please refer to response to comment 004-25.	No
004	54	SOC Section 4.1.2 – Assumptions and Methodology for Mineral Development. The RFD must address the fact that BLM withdrawals and special designations directly affect development of oil and gas on SITLA lands. The BLM should assume that, in addition to the loss of oil and gas wells on BLM lands, there will be an additional loss of wells on SITLA lands in proportion to the amount of SITLA land within the proposed special designation under each alternative.	<p>The RFD is a technical report that makes long term projections of oil and gas exploration, development, production and reclamation activity. It is neither a planning decision nor the "No Action Alternative" in the NEPA document. It provides the baseline projection of future activity assuming all potentially productive areas (including SITLA lands) are open for leasing under standard lease terms and conditions. The only exceptions are those areas designated as closed to leasing by law, regulation or executive order.</p> <p>The BLM acknowledges that closure of adjoining public lands to oil and gas leasing may have a potentially negative impact on SITLA's mineral revenue. The closure of WSAs is nondiscretionary, and is beyond the scope of this plan.</p>	Yes

**Table 5.9.a. Public Comments and Responses: State of Utah**

Record ID & Comment Number	Resource Category	Comment Text	Response to Comment	Doc Mod
			<p>Non-BLM lands could be indirectly impacted by RMP decisions both positively and negatively. The analysis in Chapter 4 of the PRMP/FEIS has been modified accordingly to reflect the impacts in Alternative E on SITLA inholdings of the discretionary closures of public lands. The number of oil and gas wells foregone on SITLA lands, and the loss of revenue from SITLA wells foregone have been calculated and added to the analysis in Chapter 4.</p>	
004	55	<p>LAR Section 4.3.5 – Lands and Realty. The first paragraph of Section 4.3.5.1 (Impacts Common to the Proposed Plan and All Alternatives) incorrectly states that acres within WSAs, the Grand Gulch Special Emphasis area, NSO areas, and areas closed to oil and gas leasing will be excluded to new ROWs. In addition, BLM should note that since such ROWs and accompanying development could degrade wilderness characteristics in WSAs, acquisition of inheld state trust lands by land exchange will be a priority of BLM.</p>	<p>Narrative has been added to the text on these pages to clarify that the BLM has an obligation to grant reasonable access to inheld State lands in WSAs subject to Utah v. Andrus and the Interim Management Policy.</p> <p>Current BLM Utah State Policy is to give priority to State of Utah exchanges and such exchanges do not require a land use planning decision. Please refer to response to comment 004-52.</p>	Yes
004	56	<p>SOC Section 3.13-Socioeconomics (pgs 3-96). BLM decisions to withdraw mineral lands from leasing (WSAs, etc.) directly affect the economic viability of state trust lands inholdings. This should be acknowledged appropriately in the discussion of socioeconomic impacts.</p>	<p>The decision to manage lands as WSAs was made initially in the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (1976). Lands to be managed as WSAs in the State of Utah were identified in the 1980's. Any state trust land inholdings created by WSA management is beyond the scope of this plan.</p> <p>Those state land inholdings that are excluded from leasing as a result of the current planning effort have been specifically analyzed in the Socioeconomic section of Chapter 4. Please also refer to response to comment 004-54.</p>	Yes
004	57	<p>TRV Section 3.17.3 – Issues. Certain existing routes that provide the only physical access to trust lands sections would not be "Designated Routes," and motorized access on such routes would be terminated. The Draft RMP fails to address the impact of these closures on the economic value of the affected trust lands.</p>	<p>The BLM does provide for reasonable access to all SITLA lands under all alternatives. A sentence has been added to Chapter 2, Lands and Realty, Management Common to All Action Alternatives, that states that reasonable access to State land would be provided including across BLM lands within avoidance and exclusion areas for rights-of-way as specified by the Cotter decision (Utah v. Andrus, 10/1/79). In addition,</p>	Yes

**Table 5.9.a. Public Comments and Responses: State of Utah**

Record ID & Comment Number		Resource Category	Comment Text	Response to Comment	Doc Mod
				the travel management plan recognizes the requirement to provide access to SITLA lands per the Cotter decision.	
004	58	LAR	Appendix C Lands and Realty: C.1 Tracts Identified for Disposal. The disposal land list is inadequate to meet the need for BLM to acquire all state trust lands in existing WSAs as well as proposed special designations. The state identified specific lands in these areas to be added to the disposal list.	Current BLM Utah State Policy is to give priority to State of Utah exchanges and such exchanges do not require a land use planning decision. Please refer to response to comments 004-52, 004-55,	No
004	59	CUL	The state suggests that the BLM develop a specific ongoing program to identify and target identification efforts under Section 110 of the National Historic Preservation Act.	These type of actions are administrative and do not require land use planning decisions to accomplish.	No
004	60	CUL	The state recommends the BLM undertake a final check to ensure that other potential areas of high cultural resource densities or values are examined for potential conflicts. The MFO should use techniques such as GIS, existing site databases.	On pg. 4-28, a model of cultural resource site density is described that was used to predict potential impacts to cultural resources. This model identified high, medium, and low site densities and this information was used to quantify the impacts.  For site specific actions the BLM conducts a Class III cultural survey as appropriate.	No
004	61	CUL	The state suggests enhancing and strengthening the density analyses utilized in the Draft RMP/EIS. These techniques could be significantly enhanced and strengthened in implementation of the Final Plan for high cultural resource value areas which include Arch Canyon, Recapture Wash, and Montezuma Canyon.	The BLM will continue to enhance the inventory and density techniques for high cultural value areas identified in the final plan.  As prescribed in Table 2.1, Management Common to All Action Alternatives, the BLM will continue to identify areas for special protection of cultural resources and develop specific cultural resource management plans for those areas.  These type of actions are administrative and do not require land use planning decisions to accomplish.	No
004	62	CUL	Please clarify why Arch Canyon, Recapture Wash, and Montezuma Canyon have not been proposed for specific management consideration. The state recommends that these areas be considered for CSMA designation.	BLM considers these areas to possess important cultural values and will address issues in these areas with cultural special management plans as described under Management Common to All Action Alternatives. Please refer to response to comments 004-59 and 004-61.	No

**Table 5.9.a. Public Comments and Responses: State of Utah**

Record ID & Comment Number		Resource Category	Comment Text	Response to Comment	Doc Mod
004	63	CUL	The RMP proposes avoidance areas around National Register-eligible cultural resources and specific 100-foot buffers (page 4-284 and 4-385). The state recommends that rather than stipulations of a standard avoidance distance that the RMP stipulate that avoidance areas will be established that will be sufficient to protect the resources from direct and indirect impacts.	The intent of BLM is not to require a specific 100-foot buffer around National Register-eligible sites but to require an avoidance distance sufficient to protect cultural resources.  The final RMP/EIS will refer to the 100-foot buffer only under Alternative A since that is the current management prescription. BLM will add narrative to the proposed RMP to clarify that a specific avoidance distance will not be required.	Yes
004	64	CUL	It is unclear from the RMP what protective measures are proposed under the various alternatives for Hovenweep National Monument, Square Tower (and potentially Cajon) Unit(s). Please clarify how potential visual impacts to the setting, feeling, and association of these units, particularly from solid and/or fluid minerals leasing and/or development, will be managed.	Under Alternatives B and C, the Hovenweep ACEC would be expanded 620+ acres from Alternative A, to a total of 2,418 acres. The management prescriptions under Alternatives B and C would be the same as Alternative A (the 620+ acre addition would be managed as the "General Area Exclusive of Special Emphasis Zones"). Table 2.1 has been revised to clarify the specific prescriptions that apply to the 620+ acre expansion. The 880 acre visual protection zone around the Monument has been carried forward in the FEIS under an NSO lease category.  The total acreage shown on pg. 239 under Alternatives B and C for the Hovenweep ACEC should be 2,418 acres. BLM will correct the error.	Yes
004	65	CUL	With exception of the Alkali Ridge NHL, the Alkali Ridge area is listed under all alternatives as open for oil and gas development with either standard conditions or timing/controlled surface use conditions. The area appears to go from VRM Class III to VRM Class IV under all alternatives. The change in VRM Class appears to have the potential to result in adverse effects which will need to be analyzed during consultation on the RMP under Section 106 of the NHPA.	BLM understands its requirement to consult with the SHPO on the RMP and will comply. VRM class will remain as Class III for Alkali Ridge ACEC in the PRMP.	Yes
004	66	CUL	The Stipulation in Appendix A (Page A-5) for the Alkali Ridge area reiterates that an avoidance area will be established, but does not note whether this area will include consideration of indirect and cumulative as well as direct impacts to cultural resources.	BLM has reconsidered the stipulations for the Alkali Ridge ACEC and has rewritten them to include consideration of direct and indirect impacts to cultural resources.	Yes

**Table 5.9.a. Public Comments and Responses: State of Utah**

Record ID & Comment Number		Resource Category	Comment Text	Response to Comment	Doc Mod
004	67	CUL	The RMP rightly notes that the decisions have potential to cause adverse effects to cultural resources. These potential adverse effects may need to be addressed via mitigation during consultation of the RMP under Section 106 of the NHPA.	Please refer to response to comment 004-65	No
004	68	CUL	Table 2.1 (Page 2-8). The state encourages BLM to clarify the purposes and types of land treatments that could be authorized in the Comb Ridge CSMA, specifically whether land treatments modify the NSO stipulation as well as what VRM class would apply to this area.	<p>The Comb Ridge CSMA will be carried forward into the Proposed RMP as a recreation management zone within the Cedar Mesa Special Recreation Management Area (SRMA).</p> <p>Most of the management prescriptions proposed for the Comb Ridge CSMA will apply to the Comb Ridge recreation management zone. Future activities within the recreation management zone would be required to comply with those management prescriptions, including NSO and VRM II management objectives.</p> <p>Appendix A in the proposed RMP lists stipulations, including NSO and VRM II, that apply to surface disturbing activities within specific areas of the Monticello Field Office. The stipulations do not apply to non-surface disturbing activities as defined in the appendix. It is conceivable that non-surface disturbing activities could be allowed in the Comb Ridge recreation management zone. That determination would be made through site specific analysis of the proposal.</p>	Yes
004	69	CUL	Table 2.1 (Page 2-9). The area identified as "Butler Wash East of Comb Ridge" is not mapped like the other CSMA's. Please clarify whether this CSMA is mapped as part of the Comb Ridge CSMA and how large the Butler Wash East of Comb Ridge CSMA would be.	<p>The area identified as the "Butler Wash East of Comb Ridge" is part of the Comb Ridge SRMA. That part of the SRMA east of Comb Ridge was distinguished from the remaining area because it required separate prescriptions to address special management needs.</p> <p>The Comb Ridge SRMA will be carried forward into the proposed RMP as a recreation management zone within the Cedar Mesa Special Recreation Management Area (SRMA). Please refer to response to comment 004-68.</p>	No
004	70	CUL	The BLM notes in the RMP/DEIS on pages 4-284 and 4-385, that preservation-related management decisions would avoid	Buffers around cultural sites are not specifically defined but stated as "sufficient to allow for complete avoidance of the	No

**Table 5.9.a. Public Comments and Responses: State of Utah**

Record ID & Comment Number		Resource Category	Comment Text	Response to Comment	Doc Mod
			cultural resource impacts by incorporating a buffer around sensitive areas. Please clarify what resources BLM intends to protect with buffers.	cultural resource" to prevent direct and most indirect impacts. The avoidance distance would be specific to the disturbing action. Please refer to response to comment 004-63.	
004	71	SOC	The royalty payments for oil reported on page 3-113 exceed the sale value by more than one million dollars. Please verify and explain this anomaly.	BLM agrees that the production and royalty information on page 3-113 is confusing as presented. The information has been clarified and any erroneous figures have been corrected in the proposed RMP.	Yes
004	72	REC	It is unclear in Chapter 3 whether ROS classifications are carried forward as part of the action alternatives and whether ROS classifications will change by alternative.	The Recreational Opportunity Spectrum (ROS) will not be carried forward in any of the action alternatives. A statement has been added to Section 3.11.2.1 clarifying this. Management decisions will be based on special designations such as SRMAs, ACECs, National Historic designations, WSAs, ISAs, ERMAs, Wild and Scenic River recommendations, Non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics, etc.	Yes
004	73	REC	Please clarify whether the BLM intends to require permits and payment of fees in order to travel across SRMAs where the intended destination is on state land. Also, BLM should clarify how it intends to manage non-recreational use of SRMAs and non-BLM inholdings within SRMAs.	Travel through SRMAs to state land and non-recreational use of SRMAs would be managed as administrative use and fees would not be charged.	No
004	74	MOG	The Draft RMP/DEIS for both the Kanab and Richfield field offices assess cumulative timing limitations and their impact on oil and gas exploration and development for each alternative by classifying BLM administered lands into one of seven categories (i.e., Standard lease terms, controlled surface use, cumulative timing limits less than three months in duration, cumulative timing limits between three and six months in duration, cumulative timing limits between six and nine months in duration, areas subject to NSO stipulations, and areas unavailable for leasing). The state strongly encourages BLM to complete a similar analysis as part of the Monticello RMP/EIS and for all other RMPs within the State of Utah.	In accordance with IM 2003-233, lease stipulation categories used by the Monticello Field Office are consistent with the Uniform Format for Oil and Gas Lease Stipulations prepared by the Rocky Mountain Regional Coordinating Committee in March 1989.	No
004	75	OTH	Given the scale of available mapping, it is often difficult to	BLM has considered the interaction between management	No

**Table 5.9.a. Public Comments and Responses: State of Utah**

Record ID & Comment Number	Resource Category	Comment Text	Response to Comment	Doc Mod	
		reconcile interactions between management prescriptions. The state encourages BLM to carefully review and consider interactions between management stipulations as it formulates the Final RMP and eliminate incompatible requirements and improve mapping detail.	prescriptions and has attempted to make prescriptions compatible.		
004	76	VRM	To protect the viewshed in the area surrounding Goosenecks State Park, the state recommends changing the VRM Class from VRM Class III to VRM Class II, changing the oil and gas leasing to NSO and closing the area to mineral material disposal.	The BLM, in developing the PRMP/FEIS, can chose management actions from within the range of the alternatives presented in the DRMP/DEIS and create a management plan that is effective in addressing the current conditions in the planning area based on FLPMA's multiple-use mandate. BLM feels that the range of alternatives reasonably covers the options. For any proposals for leasing, all surrounding uses would be considered and analyzed in a site specific NEPA document. BLM feels this would adequately protect sensitive or scenic areas as those resources would be taken into consideration.	No
004	77	TRR	The state suggests the designation of training trails to control off-trail riding and indiscriminate OHV use around some dispersed camp areas and trailheads.	As stated in the Draft RMP/EIS (pg. 2-54) routes may be modified through subsequent implementation planning on a case by case basis. No specific trails or suggestions for "training trails" were submitted during the scoping period. After the RMP is completed and on a site specific basis, the BLM could consider training trails near dispersed camp sites in areas designated in the limited or open to OHV category. The BLM will consider the commenter's recommendation.	No
004	78	LAR	The RMP should recognize the opportunity to purchase rights-of-way across properties owned by SITLA to avoid having designated OHV routes closed in the future by the sale of these lands.	As noted in MCA Alternatives (Easements, pg. 2-15), easements would be acquired from willing landowners and the State of Utah to gain access to public lands or placement of facilities on non-public lands, and acquire easements to accomplish resource objectives.	No
004	79	TRV	It is unclear in Map 51(of the DEIS) whether or not routes shown in brown within the closed areas are open or closed. The state recommends that all of these routes remain open and the	The routes within the "Closed" areas are those that would remain open to vehicle use. These routes are either major county roads or access routes to trail heads or State lands.	Yes

**Table 5.9.a. Public Comments and Responses: State of Utah**

Record ID & Comment Number		Resource Category	Comment Text	Response to Comment	Doc Mod
			map and its legend be modified.	The map has been modified to clarify this point.	
004	80	TRR	The section of the Piute Pass OHV trail that passes by the "Chocolate Drop" is closed in the plan. This section should be left open to maintain the integrity of the signed and mapped trail. Also a right-of-way across the SITLA property should be acquired to ensure continued public access.	This portion of the route is not designated in the plan due to a resource conflict within the route. BLM would make future route adjustments based on access needs, recreational opportunities, and resource constraints. These activities would be analyzed at the site-specific activity planning level.	No
004	81	TRR	The OHV users in the Monticello/Blanding area have worked to identify and preserve many loop trails on Public lands such as Bridger Jack, Jacob's Chair, Piute Pass and a large loop trail called Canyon Rim Riders Trail. The Utah State Parks would like to see these trails left open and opportunities preserved to complete missing sections.	Based upon the requirements of NEPA, the BLM used a systematic interdisciplinary approach fully considering physical, biological, economic, and social aspects of management actions for the range of alternatives.  Plan accompanying the DRMP/EIS. The BLM would make future route adjustments based on access needs, recreational opportunities, and resource constraints. These activities would be analyzed at the site-specific activity planning level.	No
004	82	TRR	Under Management Common to All Action Alternatives (page 2-54), closures and restrictions are the options listed for dealing with adverse impacts caused by OHVs. The state believes mitigation should be the first option considered and applied where appropriate.	The Federal regulations at 8341.2(a) state "the authorized officer shall immediately close the areas affected to the types of vehicle causing the adverse affect." This does not preclude further analysis to determine a final course of action.	No
004	83	TRV	Table ES 1 – OHV Categories by Alternative. The BLM should ensure that access to remote irrigation facilities like diversions, gates, and canals are preserved.	These type of actions are administrative and do not require land use planning decisions to accomplish. The OHV category designations do not apply to administrative uses.	No
004	84	WSR	Table 3.50 – Individual Eligible Wild and Scenic River(s) Segments. In determining suitability, the rights of irrigators to divert flow from these rivers and streams need to be fully protected and considered.	Barring congressional action, there is no effect on water rights or instream flows related to suitability findings made in a land use plan decision. Even if Congress were to designate rivers into the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, any such designation would have no effect on existing water rights. Section 13(b) of the Wild and Scenic River Act states that jurisdiction over waters is determined by established principles of law. In Utah, the State has jurisdiction over water. Although the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act implies a federal reserved water right for designated rivers, it does not require or specify any amount, and as noted above, confirms that Utah has	No

**Table 5.9.a. Public Comments and Responses: State of Utah**

Record ID & Comment Number	Resource Category	Comment Text	Response to Comment	Doc Mod	
			<p>jurisdiction over water rights. The BLM would be required to adjudicate the water right, in the same manner as any other entity, by application through state processes. Thus, for congressionally designated rivers, BLM may assert a federal reserved water right for appurtenant and unappropriated water with a priority date as of the date of designation (junior to all existing rights), but only in the minimum amount necessary to fulfill the primary purpose of the reservation.</p> <p>The Draft RMP/EIS states that the BLM would not seek water rights as part of a suitability determination made in the Record of Decision for the RMP.</p> <p>Please refer to response to comments 004-17, 004-18, 004-19, and 004-20.</p>		
004	85	WR	<p>Potential dam locations are shown on Map 46 (of the DEIS). The state assumes that the potential to construct dams in these areas has been preserved in the RMP but it is hard to tell from the maps and text whether or not this is the case. BLM should clarify by adding language to appropriate sections.</p>	<p>Potential dam locations were included on Map 46 as a factor related to potential eligibility for wild and scenic river designation. It was later determined that these potential dam sites did not affect the eligibility classification so this information has been removed from the map. Any future proposal for dam construction would be assessed on a case-by-case basis regardless of whether such information is listed in the RMP.</p>	Yes
004	86	VRM	<p>The state objects if the Draft RMP does not make information supporting the VRM inventory class determinations available for review. The state also objects if the rationale for each VRM management class is not presented, nor is the impact on resources fully disclosed in the analysis of impacts.</p>	<p>The BLM will consider the commenter's recommendation to include information supporting the VRM inventory class determinations and the rationale for each VRM management class.</p> <p>BLM feels that the impacts of visual management on resources was fully disclosed for each resource in Chapter 4.</p>	No
004	87	VRM	<p>The state has concerns that the BLM's identification of VRM inventory classes has led to a self-effectuating class protection scheme, rather than a source of information to be considered within the proposed resource use allocation schemes within each of the Draft's alternatives.</p>	<p>VRM inventory was completed in the late 1970s and early 1980s. These inventory classes were not changed. Management classes were subject to intensive discussions by an interdisciplinary team of BLM resource specialist using their best expertise and seeking the best compromises among resources to carry out BLM's mandate for multiple use and</p>	No

**Table 5.9.a. Public Comments and Responses: State of Utah**

Record ID & Comment Number		Resource Category	Comment Text	Response to Comment	Doc Mod
				sustained yield while protecting resource values including visual resources. BLM disagrees with the commenter's statement regarding a self-effectuating class protection scheme and stands by its decisions and analysis.	
004	88	WL	The state requests that the BLM not alter habitat designations from alternative to alternative. The proper description of crucial winter habitats should occur regardless of alternative. The alternatives should then describe different levels of impact to these habitats.	Please refer to response to comments 004-11 and 004-12.	No
004	89	WL	The Monticello RMP should be consistent with the newly developed Utah Wildlife Action Plan (UWAP). As a cooperator in developing this plan, the BLM should acknowledge it as the guideline for sensitive species management in the State of Utah.	On page 2-51 (of the DEIS), it states the "BLM would work with the UDWR to implement the Utah Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy to coordinate management decisions that would conserve native species and prevent the need for additional listings."  This reference has been changed from the Utah Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy to the Utah Wildlife Action Plan.	Yes
004	90	SSS	UDWR intends to investigate the status of the Spotted ground squirrel, Stephens' woodrat and the Silky pocket mouse and would welcome mention of cooperation from the BLM in the RMP.	These species are included in the Utah Wildlife Action Plan. Please refer to response to comment 004-89.	No
004	91	SSS	Devils Canyon appears to be a unique habitat for the Acorn woodpecker and deserves special consideration.	Although there is not specific mention of Devils Canyon and the Acorn woodpecker, this area and species would be considered on a site-specific basis. Please refer to response to comment 004-89.	No
004	92	WL	Alternative C. The state encourages the BLM not to permit the use of toxicants to control prairie dogs except within 100 m of irrigated fields and pastures.	The use of toxicants to control prairie dogs would be considered on a site-specific basis and the state would be consulted at such a time.	No
004	93	WL	Alternative C. To protect western Yellow-billed Cuckoos and Southwestern Willow Flycatcher's habitat, the BLM should make a commitment in the RMP to locate designated campsites between Montezuma Creek and Bluff so that riparian wildfires	Fire pans are currently required along the river and BLM does follow all fire ordinances. The BLM is planning on developing a San Juan River Plan in the future and designated campsites would be considered during this site specific document.	No

**Table 5.9.a. Public Comments and Responses: State of Utah**

Record ID & Comment Number		Resource Category	Comment Text	Response to Comment	Doc Mod
			are less likely to be started by campfires.		
004	94	VEG	The UDWR believes that desirable non-native plants should never be categorically excluded from use on western rangelands and encourages BLM not to exclude use of non-native plants in the Monticello RMP.	On pg. 3-159 it states "for revegetation purposes, the use and perpetuation of native species is a priority, except for instances when non-intrusive, non-native species are more ecologically or economically feasible." This policy under the Draft EIS / RMP allows use of non-native plant species where deemed appropriate on a site specific basis.	No
004	95	WL	The BLM needs to address how to avoid, reduce, and mitigate impacts from uranium mining on wildlife and their habitat in the RMP because voluntary mitigation efforts will be inadequate.	The BLM does not rely exclusively on voluntary mitigation to address impacts from uranium mining.  Section 302 of FLPMA requires the BLM to prevent unnecessary or undue degradation of the public lands. Regulations at 43 CFR Subpart 3809 establish procedures and standards to ensure that operators and mining claimants meet this responsibility for operations authorized by the mining laws. All operations must meet the performance standards at 43 CFR 3809.420 including, measures to rehabilitate fisheries and wildlife habitat and measures to prevent adverse impacts to threatened or endangered species, and their habitat.  Site specific environmental analysis is done for proposed mining operations and appropriate mitigation measures are attached as conditions of approval. Consistent with the mining laws, operations and post-mining land use must comply with the RMP management prescriptions (table 2.1., Page 2-19).	No
004	96	WL	The BLM should refer to the USFWS document Interim Guidelines to Avoid and Minimize Wildlife Impacts from Wind Turbines and consult with UDWR and USFWS about future wind energy development.	Future wind energy projects would be analyzed on a site specific basis and consultation with UDWR and USFWS would be done at that time. As stated in table 2.1 page 2-16, "Authorization of wind energy development would incorporate best management practices and provision contained in the Wind Energy Programmatic EIS, once this document becomes final."	No
004	97	WL	The state recommends that the BLM develop a long-term plan for mineral extraction and wildlife mitigation within the area	According to Washington Office Instruction Memorandum 2005-069, the BLM may identify off-site mitigation opportunities to address impacts of the project proposal, but is	No

**Table 5.9.a. Public Comments and Responses: State of Utah**

Record ID & Comment Number		Resource Category	Comment Text	Response to Comment	Doc Mod
			covered by this RMP.	not to carry them forward for detailed analysis unless volunteered by the applicant.	
004	98	WL	The state recommends that the RMP require adequate mitigation (including off-site mitigation where appropriate) in all mineral leases that result in long-term impacts to crucial wildlife habitats.	The state cites no specific failures in the DRMP/EIS concerning onsite mitigation of impacts to crucial wildlife habitats.  BLM's policy for the use of compensatory offsite mitigation for authorizations issued in the oil and gas program is contained in IM No. 2005-069. That policy states that the BLM will approach compensatory mitigation "on a voluntary basis where it is performed offsite." In its NEPA analysis, the BLM may identify other offsite mitigation opportunities to address impacts of the project proposal but should not carry them forward for detailed analysis unless volunteered by the applicant.  Omission of discussion in the land use plan does not prohibit consideration of offsite mitigation at the project development phase.	No
004	99	WL	The state requests that this RMP consider impacts to hunting and fishing from energy development.	Hunting and fishing is considered a recreational activity and although it is not specifically mentioned; the impacts to hunting and fishing from energy development is discussed under 4.3.10.3.8 Impacts of Mineral Decisions on Recreation.	No

**Table 5.9.b. Public Comments and Responses: San Juan County**

Record ID & Comment Number		Resource Category	Comment Text	Response to Comment	Doc Mod
007	1	PRP	The County asks BLM to consider its statutory responsibility under FLPMA toward consistency of its land use plans with State and local plans.	The BLM is aware that there are specific County and State plan decisions relevant to aspects of public land management that are discrete from, and independent of, Federal law. However, the BLM is bound by Federal law. The FLPMA	No

**Table 5.9.b. Public Comments and Responses: San Juan County**

Record ID & Comment Number	Resource Category	Comment Text	Response to Comment	Doc Mod
			<p>requires that the development of an RMP for public lands must be coordinated and consistent with County plans, to the maximum extent possible by law, and inconsistencies between Federal and non-Federal government plans be resolve to the extent practical (FLPMA, Title II Sec. 202 ©(9)). As a consequence, where State and local plans conflict with Federal law there will be an inconsistency that cannot be resolved or reconciled.</p> <p>Thus, while County and Federal planning processes, under FLPMA, are required to be as integrated and consistent as practical, the Federal agency planning process is not bound by or subject to County plans, planning processes, or planning stipulations. The BLM will identify these conflicts in the FEIS/PRMP, so that the State and local governments have a complete understanding of the impacts of the PRMP on State and local management options. The BLM will document the required Governor's consistency review in Chapter 5.</p>	
007	2	AA The BLM's interpretation of the Multiple Use mandate where all uses occur someplace but not together is flawed. Landscapes can be managed so that a broad spectrum of resource uses can create social, economic and ecological wealth simultaneously. Multiple use management results in benefits to various resources. For example, grazing can be a tool to benefit wildlife and their habitats.	In developing land use plans, the BLM is mandated by FLPMA to observe the principles of multiple use and sustained yield. FLPMA defines multiple use as "the management of the public lands and their various resource values so that they are utilized in the combination that will best meet the present and future needs of the American people.....the use of some land for less than all of the resources, a combination of balanced and diverse resource uses that takes into account the long term needs of future generations for renewable and nonrenewable resources....with consideration given to the relative values of the resources and not necessarily to the combination of uses that will give the greatest economic return or the greatest unit output."	No
007	3	PRP More emphasis should be placed on monitoring the plan decisions both to measure the results of the plan and to insure	The Federal regulations at 43 CFR 1610.4-9 require that land use plans establish intervals and standards and evaluations	No

**Table 5.9.b. Public Comments and Responses: San Juan County**

Record ID & Comment Number	Resource Category	Comment Text	Response to Comment	Doc Mod	
		that actions are taken to incorporate any changes needed. Watershed function, livestock use, recreation, OHV use and wildlife populations are uses that should be monitored more closely. The plan should have greater flexibility to adapt to changing conditions.	based on the sensitivity of the resource decisions involved. The Record of Decision (ROD) for the RMP will commit to a monitoring plan the specifics of which will be developed subsequent to the signing of the ROD.		
007	4	PRP	San Juan County asks for more cooperation and collaboration with local, state, and federal agencies (as well as interest groups) in actions and decisions within the Field Office. Misunderstandings could then be worked out in advance -- in the field rather than the courtroom. Within the framework of this RMP, the BLM should provide more opportunities to facilitate cooperative relationships and foster better collaboration efforts.	The State of Utah and San Juan County are cooperating agencies involved in the preparation of the RMP. The BLM has involved the cooperating agencies in all aspects of the land use planning process including participation in the interdisciplinary team meetings. Cooperation and collaboration will continue on site specific projects after the RMP is completed and this does not require a plan decision to accomplish.	No
007	5	WR	San Juan County feels more emphasis should be placed on sustaining and developing healthy watersheds. The functionality of watersheds underlies all resources values. The best way to improve the functionality of watersheds is by increasing the ground cover. Well managed grazing is one of the best, most economical, large scale tools for increasing ground cover.	The BLM actively supports efforts to improve watersheds. The BLM is a partner in the Healthy Lands Initiative for Utah. The RMP, under all action alternatives, specifies the treatment of 30,000 to 50,000 acres over a 15 year period to restore ecosystem health and functioning condition (p. 2-58 of the DEIS). The RMP, under all alternatives, also specifies that grazing would be managed according to the Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management to meet the Standards for Rangeland Health. Implementation of these standards would improve watershed health and functioning condition.	No
007	6	GRA	San Juan County supports livestock grazing in a prescriptive manner to accelerate progress toward improved rangeland health and reduction of catastrophic fire. The BLM should reassess timing and season of use for grazing.	The BLM Land Use Planning Handbook (H-1601-1) requires the BLM to identify lands available or nonavailable for livestock grazing. This is the only planning decision within the RMP. Decisions concerning timing and season of use are made on an allotment basis using the Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Grazing Management.	No
007	7	GRA	San Juan County feels that social/economic analysis for livestock grazing is inadequate, as many allotments have been reduced or closed. The county urges BLM to look at grazing on a watershed basis vs. an allotment basis so that livestock	Only one entire allotment is to be closed to grazing and that is the Dodge Canyon allotment (1598 BLM acres). This allotment has been in voluntary non-use for many years so there would be no change in the grazing situation from formal closing of	No

**Table 5.9.b. Public Comments and Responses: San Juan County**

Record ID & Comment Number	Resource Category	Comment Text	Response to Comment	Doc Mod
		operations would have opportunities to be more profitable but also to benefit wildlife and other resources.	<p>the allotment to grazing in the PRMP. Other areas to be excluded from grazing are parts of allotments, not entire allotments. In all cases, these areas have not been used by livestock for many years so there would be no real change to the permittee or the on-ground situation from exclusion of livestock.</p> <p>BLM agrees that using a watershed perspective is important and may allow more flexibility in managing livestock operations for a wider range of benefits. This type of management can be used at the activity planning level regardless of whether it is so stated in the RMP. However individual allotments would still have to be considered as the building blocks to such an approach because of the tie of grazing preference to individual allotments.</p>	
007	8	TRV Table 2.1 at page 2-56 indicates the amount of "Open B-Class Roads" and Open D-Class Road" varies across alternatives. Please clarify the authority under which BLM would designate county roads, and what happens to a class B, C, or D road if BLM chooses not to designate it.	<p>It is beyond the scope of this document to make determinations on R.S.2477 claims. In the Tenth Circuit Court decision – SUWA v. BLM – September 8, 2005, the court noted that ultimately deciding who holds legal title to an interest in real property, including R.S.2477 right of way, "is judicial, not an executive, function." 425 F.3d at 752. Chapter one of the DEIS states at 1.3.3 ISSUES BEYOND THE SCOPE OF THE PLAN Settlement of R.S. 2477 (i.e., right-of-way) claims. The State of Utah and San Juan County may hold valid existing rights-of-way in the PA according to Revised Statute (R.S.) 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 by passing the 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 may have to assert and protect R.S. 2477 rights or challenge in federal court or other appropriate venues.</p> <p>Routes are coincident merely meaning that in a comparison</p>	No

**Table 5.9.b. Public Comments and Responses: San Juan County**

Record ID & Comment Number	Resource Category	Comment Text	Response to Comment	Doc Mod
			that they appeared on both the County's list of routes as well as those identified by BLM.	
007	9	TRV Any closure of a state or county road within BLM administered lands will require assent of all parties with an interest in the road. BLM should carefully coordinate travel management with local governments and take care to avoid impinging upon the state's legal interests in public roads.	San Juan County was a cooperator in the development of the Travel plan. Each route was discussed with the County planner along with BLM resource specialists. As in the past, no route closures would be done without consultation and agreement with San Juan County officials, as has been done in the past.	No
007	10	TRV Access is of major concern to San Juan County. The County has been working with the BLM to get a road maintenance agreement which conforms to the 10th Circuit ruling.	BLM is as eager as the County to develop a Road Maintenance Agreement (RMA) between the two which satisfies the 10th Circuit Court 2005 ruling as well as both the County and BLM.  However, a RMA would be developed and implemented after the signing of the RMP and not addressed nor will they be decided in the RMP DEIS.	No
007	11	SCO The State of Utah has a reversionary interest in any roads that may have been granted to the state and local government pursuant to R.S. 2477. Abandonment of the right-of-way by both entities is necessary for a complete resolution for any particular road.	It is beyond the scope of this document to make determinations on R.S.2477 claims. In the Tenth Circuit Court decision – SUWA v. BLM – September 8, 2005, the court noted that ultimately deciding who holds legal title to an interest in real property, including R.S.2477 right of way, "is judicial, not an executive, function." 425 F.3d at 752. Chapter one of the DEIS states at 1.3.3 ISSUES BEYOND THE SCOPE OF THE PLAN Settlement of R.S. 2477 (i.e., right-of-way) claims. The State of Utah and San Juan County may hold valid existing rights-of-way in the PA according to Revised Statute (R.S.) 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 by passing the 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 may have to assert and protect R.S. 2477 rights or challenge in	No

**Table 5.9.b. Public Comments and Responses: San Juan County**

Record ID & Comment Number		Resource Category	Comment Text	Response to Comment	Doc Mod
				federal court or other appropriate venues.	
007	12	TRR	San Juan County supports Alt C for travel management. The county wants the BLM to highlight specific prescriptions to promote responsible use, such as areas that would be highlighted for OHV use, maps, signing, kiosks etc. In addition, BLM assumes that all impacts are the result of OHVs and does not mention impacts to other resources, such as wildlife, from hikers, mountain bikers, and other recreationists.	In the FEIS, the travel plan selected is similar to Alternative C with some corrections to the map. Zero acres would be open to cross country travel by OHVs as opposed to 2,311 acres in Alternative C. Approximately 8 miles in Arch Canyon is designated for motorized travel up to the USFS boundary as opposed to 3.8 miles in Alternative C.  The creation of OHV use designation maps, placement of signs and kiosks, etc. would be accomplished during the implementation phase of the travel plan and is discussed in detail on page N-32, section N.15.  Environmental consequences of alternatives such as "other recreationalist" and wildlife can be found in Chapter 4.	No
007	13	WL	The BLM erroneously uses the term critical habitat for wildlife habitat that does not apply to endangered species act. The term crucial habitat is used too loosely; UDWR uses crucial habitat as descriptive designations. They are not intended to mislabel resource concerns and result in a limitation of compatible uses. San Juan County disputes the acreage identified for crucial elk and deer winter range in San Juan County and submits information from Dr. Charles Kay in that regard.	The critical habitat term has been changed to crucial in the final RMP/EIS.  The UDWR is the jurisdictional agency for wildlife management within the State. The BLM relied on the expertise of this agency for delineating wildlife habitats, estimating population numbers, and recommending wildlife restrictions.	Yes
007	14	WL	The BLM cites Sawyer et al. (2006) as the basis for its discussion of deer and elk habitat fragmentation, including maps 61 thru 65 and 69 thru 72. The county contacted the lead author of the study for his response to the study's applicability in San Juan County. Based on the author's written comments the county questions BLMs use of the referenced study. The county suggests that fragmentation maps for deer and elk along with the references thereto be removed and not included in the final RMP/EIS.  The misuse of this scientific study raises questions about other	The fragmentation analysis is not an attempt to quantify specific impacts from site specific project but is presented to analyze the degree of habitat fragmentation under each alternative. GIS models were based on the BLM's best available information. These models address fragmentation differences between alternatives on a landscape level.  The BLM acknowledges that the study may not fit the situation entirely as stated in Section 4.3.19.3.21, "The impacts of habitat fragmentation on various animal species are difficult to quantify. Even with site-specific, peer-reviewed ecological	No

**Table 5.9.b. Public Comments and Responses: San Juan County**

Record ID & Comment Number	Resource Category	Comment Text	Response to Comment	Doc Mod
		<p>studies, particularly the Desert Sheep Habitat Fragmentation Analysis based on Singer et al. (2001) as presented in Table 4.216 on page 4-600. The county cautions BLM about using scientific studies inappropriately.</p>	<p>research on the impacts to particular wildlife species from habitat fragmentation, many variables that contribute to the severity of the impacts to nearby wildlife remain difficult to predict."</p>	
007	15	<p>WC</p> <p>Managing Non-WSA Lands for so-called wilderness characteristics violates FLPMA, Utah Code 63-38d-401(6)(b), the San Juan County master plan, the Norton-Leavitt Agreement and other agreements.</p> <p>The county asks the BLM to provide a detailed explanation of the rationale and authority for management of lands solely because of WC, and why such management does not circumvent the provisions of the statutorily required wilderness review process.</p>	<p>The BLM's authority for managing lands to protect or enhance wilderness characteristics comes directly from the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA) Section 202 (U.S.C. § 1712). This section of the BLM's organic statute gives the Secretary of the Interior authority to manage public lands for multiple use and sustained yield. Nothing in this section constrains the Secretary's authority to manage lands as necessary to "achieve integrated consideration of physical, biological, economic, and other sciences." FLPMA, Section 202(c)(2) (43 U.S.C. § 1712(c)(2)). Further FLPMA makes it clear that the term "multiple use" means that not every use is appropriate for every acre of public land and that the Secretary can "make the most judicious use of land for some or all of these resources or related services over areas large enough to provide sufficient latitude for periodic adjustments in use...." FLPMA, Section 1039(c) (43 U.S.C. § 1702(c)). FLPMA intended the Secretary of the Interior to use land use planning as a mechanism for allocating resource use, including wilderness character management, amongst the various resources in a way that provides use for current and future generations.</p> <p>The Norton-Leavitt Agreement recognizes that nothing in the Agreement shall be construed to diminish the Secretary's authority under FLPMA to manage a tract of land that has been dedicated to a specific use.</p> <p>IM 2003-275-Change 1 which is a direct outcome of the Norton-Leavitt Agreement states, "the BLM may consider information on wilderness characteristics along with information on other uses and values when preparing land use plans." The IM goes on to say "considering wilderness</p>	No

**Table 5.9.b. Public Comments and Responses: San Juan County**

Record ID & Comment Number	Resource Category	Comment Text	Response to Comment	Doc Mod
			<p>characteristics in the land use planning process may result in several outcomes including, but not limited to, ...emphasizing the protection of some or all of the wilderness characteristics as a priority over other multiple uses" (although the area will not be designated as a WSA). The IM also states "typically, resource information contained in the BLM wilderness inventories was collected to support a land use planning process. Public wilderness proposals represent a land use proposal. In either case the BLM is authorized to consider such information in preparation of a land use plan amendment or revision."</p> <p>In September 2006, Judge Benson, whose court approved the Norton-Leavitt Agreement, stated that the Agreement did not strip the BLM of its powers to protect lands it determined to have wilderness characteristics in a manner substantially similar to the manner in which such lands are protected when protected as WSAs.</p>	
007	16	WC The BLM inconsistently applied road data between the 1999 inventory and the 2007 WC review.	<p>The Wilderness Study Area Interim-Management Policy ("IMP" or "WSA handbook") applied to inventories conducted prior to 2004. In 2004 BLM settled ongoing litigation with the State of Utah (known now as the Utah v. Norton Settlement Agreement). The IMP emphasized the difference between roads and "ways." A road was considered an impact on wilderness characteristics and needed to be excluded from the inventory unit. A "way" however, was not considered in and of itself a sufficient impact on naturalness to disqualify all or part of an inventory unit.</p> <p>Inventories conducted post-2004 applied current policy, which is based on IM 275-2003, Change 1 which emphasizes naturalness and does not distinguish roads from ways. The BLM has evaluated wilderness characteristics since 2004 on the basis of impacts to naturalness which could include both roads and ways.</p>	No

**Table 5.9.b. Public Comments and Responses: San Juan County**

Record ID & Comment Number		Resource Category	Comment Text	Response to Comment	Doc Mod
007	17	WC	The BLM should not consider undeveloped leases and potential for future development when it determines whether areas possess wilderness characteristics. The possibility of future development is irrelevant. It is only appropriate to consider this information when deciding whether to protect areas which have been found to possess wilderness characteristics.	As part of its wilderness characteristics inventory maintenance, the BLM used a combination of field knowledge, ID Team review, og-wells GIS data, Reasonable Foreseeable Development (RFD) data, range allotment files, and a review of BLM and San Juan County (SJ CO) GIS data, including 2006 high resolution aerial photographs. RFDs were used to assist in determining what impacts were on the ground at the time of the 2007 Wilderness Character Review process to help determine naturalness. RFDs were not used to determine potential future scenarios for Oil and Gas Development. RFDs (potential Oil and Gas Development Scenarios) were used in determining what units would be managed for wilderness characteristics in the FEIS. This process allows the ID team to look at all resources during wilderness characteristics inventory maintenance. The BLM findings are described in the 2007 WCR process and are available as part of the administrative record in the Monticello BLM Field Office. The BLM stands by its findings of its wilderness characteristics inventories and WCR process.	No
007	18	WC	The BLM needs to consider the new information on roads (2007) to reevaluate the findings of the 1999/2003 wilderness inventory and discuss any changes to BLM's 1999/2003 determination of WC that result from more recent route information and intrusion information.	The 2003 Revision Document for the Monticello Field Office made adjustments to Wilderness Inventory Areas based on county road data, none of which differs from the current county inventory. BLM stands by its 1999/2003 data.  As part of BLM's wilderness characteristics inventory maintenance, BLM performed a combination of data and on-site reviews. This included specific field inspections, Interdisciplinary team review of data such as range files, County and BLM GIS data, and high-resolution 2006 aerial photographs. The BLM's findings are described in the 1999-2003 wilderness reinventory documentation, as well as the 2007 wilderness characteristics review process. The BLM is confident of the high-standard approach used to inventory the public lands and stands by its findings, particularly the findings, which involved wilderness characteristics inventory	No

**Table 5.9.b. Public Comments and Responses: San Juan County**

Record ID & Comment Number	Resource Category	Comment Text	Response to Comment	Doc Mod
			maintenance.	
007	19	PRP San Juan County is opposed to "layering" of restrictive land use designations such as ACECs or SRMAs over WSAs or Wild and Scenic Rivers.	<p>"Layering" is planning. Under FLPMA's multiple use mandate, BLM manages many different resource values and uses on public lands. Through land use planning BLM sets goals and objectives for each of those values and uses, and prescribes actions to accomplish those objectives. Under the multiple use concept, BLM doesn't necessarily manage every value and use on every acre, but routinely manages many different values and uses on the same areas of public lands. The process of applying many individual program goals, objectives, and actions to the same area of public lands may be perceived as "layering." BLM strives to ensure that the goals and objectives of each program (representing resource values and uses) are consistent and compatible for a particular land area. Inconsistent goals and objectives can lead to resource conflicts, failure to achieve the desired outcomes of a land use plan, and litigation. Whether or not a particular form of management is restrictive depends upon a personal interest or desire to see that public lands are managed in a particular manner. All uses and values cannot be provided for on every acre. That is why land use plans are developed through a public and interdisciplinary process. The interdisciplinary process helps ensure that all resource values and uses can be considered together to determine what mix of values and uses is responsive to the issues identified for resolution in the land use plan. Layering of program decisions is not optional for BLM, but is required by the FLPMA and National BLM planning and program specific regulations.</p> <p>FLPMA directs BLM to manage public lands for multiple use and sustained yield (Section 102(a)(7)). As a multiple-use agency, the BLM is required to implement laws, regulations and policies for many different and often competing land uses and to resolve conflicts and prescribe land uses through its land use plans. BLM's Land Use Planning Handbook requires</p>	No

**Table 5.9.b. Public Comments and Responses: San Juan County**

Record ID & Comment Number	Resource Category	Comment Text	Response to Comment	Doc Mod
			<p>that specific decisions be made for each resource and use (See, Appendix C, Planning Handbook "H-1601-1"). Specific decisions must be included in each of the alternatives analyzed during development of the land use plan. As each alternative is formulated, each program decision is overlaid with other program decisions and inconsistent decisions are identified and modified so that ultimately a compatible mix of uses and management prescriptions result.</p> <p>SRMAs are not restrictive of resource uses but rather are utilized to control recreation use. Several SRMAs overlay other designations such as WSAs, ACECs and wild and scenic river segments, but the management proposed in each is for differing purposes and is not incompatible.</p>	
007	20	<p>ACE</p> <p>The Draft RMP/EIS does not include a discussion on the nature or type of threat of "irreparable damage" or the regional significance of relevant and important values in its review. BLM misinterprets irreparable damage when reviewing and analyzing ACECs in the Draft RMP/EIS. The ACEC tool was intended by Congress to be limited to only those instances where irreparable damage would be caused without designation. Most surface disturbing actions can eventually be repaired.</p> <p>The BLM must explain the need for "special" management for the ACEC and explain how this management is not duplicative of other normal BLM management or protections afforded by other state or federal laws.</p>	<p>The ACEC evaluation appendix (Appendix H) was modified, and a section added discussing threats to the relevant and important ACEC values; however, whether the threats currently exist does not preclude a potential ACEC from being considered in the action alternatives. All nominated areas, where the BLM has determined to have relevant and important values, are identified as potential ACECs and are addressed in the action alternatives. Threats to relevant and important values are likely to vary by alternative.</p> <p>On August 27, 1980, the BLM promulgated final ACEC guidelines (45 Federal Register 57318) clarifying the term "protects" – "To defend or guard against damage or loss to the important environmental resources of a potential or designated ACEC. This includes damage that can be restored over time and that which is irreparable. With regard to a natural hazard, protect means to prevent the loss of life or injury to people, or loss or damage to property." Thus, BLM is to consider the potential for both reparable and irreparable damage when protecting important historic, cultural, or scenic values; fish</p>	Yes

**Table 5.9.b. Public Comments and Responses: San Juan County**

Record ID & Comment Number	Resource Category	Comment Text	Response to Comment	Doc Mod
			<p>and wildlife resources; or other natural systems through ACEC designation. This interpretation is consistent with FLPMA's legislative history and implementing policy.</p> <p>Section 2 of the guidelines clarifies that ACECs are special places within the public lands. It states: "In addition to establishing in law such basic protective management policies that apply to all the public lands, Congress has said that 'management of national resource lands [public lands] is to include giving special attention to the protection of ACECs, for the purpose of ensuring that the most environmentally important and fragile lands will be given early attention and protection' (Senate Report 94-583, on FLPMA). Thus, the ACEC process is to be used to provide whatever special management is required to protect those environmental resources that are most important, i.e., those resources that make certain specific areas special places, endowed by nature or man with characteristics that set them apart. In addition, the ACEC process is to be used to protect human life and property from natural hazards."</p>	
007	21	VRM The County objects if the Draft RMP does not make information supporting the VRM inventory class determinations available for review. The County also objects if the rationale for each VRM management class is not presented, nor is the impact on resources fully disclosed in the analysis of impacts.	The VRM inventory was completed in the late 1970s and early 1980s. These inventory classes were not changed. Management classes were subject to intensive discussions by an interdisciplinary team of BLM resource specialist using their best expertise and seeking the best compromises among resources to carry out BLM's mandate for multiple use and sustained yield while protecting resource values including visual resources. BLM disagrees with the commenter's statement regarding a self-effectuating class protection scheme and stands by its decisions and analysis.	No
007	22	VRM The County has concerns that the BLM's identification of VRM inventory classes has led to a self-effectuating class protection scheme, rather than a source of information to be considered	Please refer to response to comment 7-21.	No

**Table 5.9.b. Public Comments and Responses: San Juan County**

Record ID & Comment Number	Resource Category	Comment Text	Response to Comment	Doc Mod
		within the proposed resource use allocation schemes within each of the Draft's alternatives.		
007	23	AA In the analysis of the impacts for the Draft RMP/EIS, almost all the impacts are attributable to OHV use, oil and gas use, and, to some extent, grazing. The underlying theme is that these 3 things are the cause of all negative impacts and if they are eliminated or controlled then everything else is taken care of. The BLM should consider cheat grass and juniper encroachment, invasive weed problems, and catastrophic fires. The BLM should utilize livestock to control invasive plants.	In the Draft RMP/EIS, surface disturbing activities are considered potential negative impacts to natural and cultural resources. On page A-1, surface disturbing activities are defined. Surface disturbing activities include, among many other things, oil and gas development and cross country OHV use. Neither grazing nor vehicle travel on vehicular routes are defined as surface disturbing activities.  The BLM has addressed cheat grass, juniper encroachment, invasive weeds and catastrophic fires.  On pg. 2-50 in decisions common to all action alternatives, the BLM specifies controlling and reducing invasive and noxious weed species. Vegetation treatments areas for pinyon-juniper area are identified on pg. 2-14. The PRMP/FEIS adopts the Utah Fire Plan, which seeks to prevent catastrophic fires.  On an allotment basis, Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Grazing Management could be utilized to control invasive species on any given allotment.	No
007	24	SOC San Juan County commends the BLM for the effort that has been expended to better understand and portray socioeconomic impacts in this DRMP. This has been a weakness in previous plans. San Juan County encourages BLM to use studies done by Utah's universities to enhance this information such as the social survey undertaken by USU and the economic studies done by the U of U. Every NEPA action in the RMP should include a discussion on socioeconomic conditions and fully disclose all impacts.	The BLM has reviewed the Utah State University survey of rural counties conducted by the State of Utah. The BLM received preliminary data for San Juan County after completion of the Draft RMPM/EIS. The BLM has incorporated findings in chapter 3 of the PRMP/FEIS as appropriate. In addition, an appendix has been added to the PRMP/FEIS which summarizes the results of this study.  The recent research undertaken by the University of Utah's Bureau of Economic and Business Research on oil and gas activities in San Juan County is not yet complete. The unexpected death of the primary researcher has slowed this effort. The BLM has extensively utilized data provided by the	Yes

**Table 5.9.b. Public Comments and Responses: San Juan County**

Record ID & Comment Number		Resource Category	Comment Text	Response to Comment	Doc Mod
				Utah Division of Oil, Gas and Mining in its economic analyses of the contributions of various industries.  On a broad land use planning level, the BLM has disclosed the socioeconomic impacts from various resource actions as discussed in Chapter 4 of the DRMP/EIS. It is not practical to separate out the socioeconomic impacts of the many of the specific resource decisions specified in the plan.	
007	25	LAR	There is no mention of Ute Indian lands in Table 1.1 on pg. 1-2.	That error has been corrected in the PRMP/FEIS.	Yes
007	26	WC	San Juan County is opposed to any non- WSA wilderness designations described in 1.3.1.3, Non-Wilderness Study Areas (WSA) Lands with Wilderness Characteristics on pg. 1-6.	The commenter's preference is noted.	No
007	27	CUL	Pg. 2-8 and 2-9 - The management prescriptions for the Comb Ridge CSMA are more restrictive for Alternative C than Alternative B with regard to group size. The County questions how limits on group size and restrictions on collection of firewood for campfires can be enforced.	The restrictions on group size have been eliminated in the PRMP and collection of firewood for campfires is not restricted in the PRMP. Therefore, enforcement is not an issue.	No
007	28	CUL	Pg. 2-11 - The County requests BLM's rationale for the limits of people per day, numbers in rooms and numbers in corridors proposed for McLoyd Canyon-Moon House CSMA. How will compliance be accomplished?	The limits for people per day, numbers in rooms and numbers in corridors in the McLoyd Canyon-Moon House area are based on the results of a condition assessment that was conducted for the Moon House Complex. This condition assessment was conducted by the National Park Service, Archaeological Site Conservation Program, Mesa Verde National Park. The limits are designed to protect the site from threats caused by uncontrolled visitation. Such threats include damage to existing intact plaster walls and damage to structural elements such as walls and floors that are already weakened by visitation and other natural factors.  Compliance will be accomplished through establishment of a site stewardship program for the site, information about visiting the site that will be provided at the Kane Gulch Ranger Station, and through patrols by BLM rangers and law enforcement.	No

**Table 5.9.b. Public Comments and Responses: San Juan County**

Record ID & Comment Number		Resource Category	Comment Text	Response to Comment	Doc Mod
007	29	CUL	Pg. 2-12 - The Hole-in-the-Rock trail is one of regional and national importance and yet is basically ignored in the DRMP. The BLM should consider assistance from other individuals, organizations, and government entities that have an interest in interpreting and protecting the trail.	The BLM does consider assistance from other individuals, organizations, and government entities who may have an interest in the Hole in the Rock Trail. In Table 2.1, page 2-12, Historic Trails, under Management Common to All Alternatives, it states that the Hole in the Rock Trail would be managed for Heritage Tourism in consultation with the Utah State Historic Preservation Office and Native American Tribes, as well as interested stakeholder groups.	No
007	30	FIR	Pg. 2-13 (note: page numbers have changed since the last draft) The Prescott National Forest has used goats in critical WUI areas to successfully reduce fuels. Is the BLM planning to use goats/sheep as a fuel treatment? If so, where and how?	The Finding of No Significant Impact and Decision Record for the Utah Land Use Plan Amendment for Fire and Fuels Management (UT-USO-04-01) signed in September of 2005 identifies maximum treatment acres and authorizes fuels treatment activities for the Monticello Field Office. The Land Use Plan Amendment, the associated USFW Biological Opinion, and the Resource Protection Measures developed to minimize or avoid resource impacts from fire management actions are incorporated into this RMP. The LUP Amendment incorporated new fire management policy, guidance and directives for BLM-administered lands in Utah, although detailed information regarding fire management goals and objectives was provided in a programmatic Fire Management Plan (FMP). The FMP covers field offices administered by an individual fire district such as the Moab Fire District which oversees fire management for the Monticello Field Office. The LUP Amendment for Fire and Fuels states (Chapter 1, page 1-11) that the [EA] is limited to planning-level analyses and that site-specific analysis of resources such as air, water, soil, and cultural is conducted for individual fire management planning and implementation actions. Public comment was solicited for the LUP Amendment as well as for the Moab Fire District FMP. The EA process also involved collaboration between the public, the BLM and other governmental and local agencies. The LUP Amendment states (Chapter 2, page 2-10) that acreages identified for fire management [in the LUP	No

**Table 5.9.b. Public Comments and Responses: San Juan County**

Record ID & Comment Number	Resource Category	Comment Text	Response to Comment	Doc Mod
			<p>Amendment and as carried through in the RMP] are broad guidelines useful for the development of field office Fire Management Plans (FMP), and are not "assumed to be quotas, targets or exact limitations." The FMP covering the Monticello Field Office does include descriptions of individual Fire Management Units (FMUs) for the vegetative communities within the field office, and outlines general fire management goals for each of those FMUs. The programmatic EA for the FMP (UT-063-04-02, UT-060-2005-042) analyzed the overall direct, indirect and cumulative impacts of fire management goals and objectives. Individual vegetation treatment methods, potential impacts from treatments, and the number of acres proposed for a treatment in a vegetative community or communities would be detailed and analyzed at a project-level basis in a site-specific NEPA document.</p>	
007	31	AA The Health and Safety section seems rather weak. Is abandoned mine lands the only health and safety concern in the Monticello Field Office?	<p>The goal for the Health and Safety section states that the BLM would manage hazardous risks on public lands to protect the health and safety of public land users and stewards, protect natural and environmental resources, minimize future hazardous and related risks, costs and liabilities, and mitigate physical hazards in compliance with all applicable laws, regulations and policies. Statements were added under this section to include all physical hazards, hazardous materials and hazardous wastes for mitigation and management common to all alternatives.</p>	Yes
007	32	GRA Under Livestock Grazing, Management Common to All Alternatives, the statement "Modify and implement existing Allotment Management Plans...that require such action" is unclear. Please clarify intent and need.	<p>The intent is to use an AMP where appropriate as the vehicle to implement grazing management actions which would facilitate maintaining or achieving Standards for Rangeland Health. Not all allotments would need an AMP to accomplish this goal. Those listed are existing AMPs and those allotments where new AMPs would be most effective.</p>	No
007	33	GRA Please furnish rationale and authority to allocate 17,300 acres	<p>This is an allocation recommended by the Grazing Advisory Board in the 1960s or early 1970s which was approved in a</p>	No

**Table 5.9.b. Public Comments and Responses: San Juan County**

Record ID & Comment Number		Resource Category	Comment Text	Response to Comment	Doc Mod
			to wildlife (parts of Peter's Canyon and East Canyon).	previous Management Framework Plan (Land Use Plan) and has been in effect since that time. The rationale was that these steep slopes and benchlands along the edges of these canyons were better suited to wildlife use than domestic livestock. The authority is in the Taylor Grazing Act, Grazing Regulations and Land Use Planning Regulations.	
007	34	GRA	San Juan County policy is against the relinquishment or retirement of grazing rights in favor of conservation, wildlife and other uses. Please clarify BLM's goals in encouraging relinquishment and what mechanism would be used to retire grazing rights.	BLM does not encourage relinquishment of grazing preference. BLM policy recognizes the prerogative of a grazing permittee to voluntarily relinquish his grazing preference. As stated on Pg. 2-17 of the DEIS, once relinquished, the preference is still available for application for preference for grazing by livestock unless BLM determines that the lands are better used for other purposes. If the latter is the case, discontinuation of grazing would be made by amendment to the RMP. Even so, discontinuance would not be permanent but would be subject to reconsideration during subsequent revision or amendment of the RMP.	No
007	35	REC	Pg. 2-21(note: page numbers have changed since last draft). The county is concerned that the BLM establishes SRMAs to charge fees without providing facilities.	BLM policy directly ties the charging of fees to the level of facilities provided. Recreational site fee establishment is out of the scope of this document.	No
007	36	REC	Pg. 2-22 (note: page numbers have changed since last draft). The BLM should insure that providing facilities and services for other agencies doesn't take away from management needs that occur on BLM lands. In particular, the NPS Needles District should provide camping facilities for its visitors within the NP since there is ample room for facilities and because the NPS has a larger budget.	The BLM priority is to provide facilities and services for BLM public land users.	No
007	37	CUL	Pg. 2-25 (note: page numbers have changed since last draft). The one goal listed for the Cedar Mesa Cultural SRMA is "Integrate management between the BLM and NPS to provide outstanding recreational opportunities and visitor experiences while protecting natural and cultural resource values." The County feels there is little shared recreational opportunities	Although opportunities may be limited, the BLM will strive to integrate management between the BLM and NPS to provide outstanding recreational opportunities and visitor experiences while protecting natural and cultural resource values when possible.	No

**Table 5.9.b. Public Comments and Responses: San Juan County**

Record ID & Comment Number		Resource Category	Comment Text	Response to Comment	Doc Mod
			across the BLM/NPS common boundary because of topography and other factors. Also, there is nothing to address this goal in Appendix E Recreation, or Chapter 4.		
007	38	PRP	Pg. 2-25 (note: page numbers have changed since last draft). The maps for Cedar Mesa Cultural SRMA and ACEC for Valley of the Gods overlap. Please clarify the management of this area to avoid the layering of protection.	In the FEIS, this overlap does not exist.	No
007	39	AA	The BLM should resolve inconsistencies in the Draft RMP/EIS. For instance, on page 4-266, reference is made to "Section 3.10.4.2." However the County could find no Section 3.10.4.2. Likewise on page 4-267, reference is made to recreational trends in Section 3.10.4 but that section discusses paleontological resources.	These inconsistencies have been corrected in the PRMP.	Yes
007	40	REC	Pg. 2-29 (note: page numbers have changed since last draft). The first bullet concerning camping under management common to all alternatives seems to be in conflict with Alternatives A, C, and D. Please clarify.	The second part of the first bullet under Management Common to All Action Alternatives stating "Camping outside of the riparian corridor within this area would be limited to designated campsites only" is incorrect. Camping management prescriptions vary with each alternative. A change has been made in the document.  The camping management prescription for the proposed plan is:  Dispersed camping would be allowed in the Indian Creek Corridor, except within the established designated camping zones: Bridger Jack Mesa, Indian Creek Falls, and Creek Pasture. Camping within these zones is limited to designated sites.	Yes
007	41	REC	Pg. 2-29 (note: page numbers have changed since last draft). The county encourages BLM to address the safety issue in Indian Creek caused by rock climbers who park and obstruct traffic within the narrow highway corridor.	Chapter 2, page 2-29 states management of the Indian Creek Corridor would be in conformance with the guidance outlined in the Indian Creek Corridor Plan. Bullet number 10 listed under the guidelines states "parking areas would be developed."	No
007	42	WL	Pg. 2-29 (note: page numbers have changed since last draft). In	In areas, such as Indian Creek and Bridger Jack Mesa where	No

**Table 5.9.b. Public Comments and Responses: San Juan County**

Record ID & Comment Number	Resource Category	Comment Text	Response to Comment	Doc Mod	
		some instances such as Bridger Jack Mesa, timing and other restrictions apply to OHVs to protect wildlife/raptors but the same restrictions do not apply to rock climbers. The county requests BLM to clarify this apparent inconsistency.	there are rock climbers; BLM conducts annual raptor surveys and have closed portions of the climbing areas to protect raptors.  On Page 2-60 in Table 2.1 it states to "Temporarily close areas (amount of time depends on species) near raptor nests to rock climber or other activities if activity may result in nest abandonment."		
007	43	WL	Pg. 2-31 (note: page numbers have changed since last draft). San Juan County feels that restrictions imposed in wildlife areas are excessive and not supported by best science. In particular, road use should be allowed unless impacts can be shown.	All surface restrictions imposed in wildlife areas have exceptions, modifications, and waiver languages that allows for flexibility and use of current situations and science when making a site-specific decision (see Appendix A).	No
007	44	WR	Pg. 2-33 (note: page numbers have changed since last draft). San Juan County feels that more emphasis on watersheds is needed in the RMP.	Please refer to response to comment 007-5.	No
007	45	PRP	Pg. 2-34 (note: page numbers have changed since last draft). San Juan County is opposed to any layering of ACEC's over WSAs.	Please refer to response to comment 007-19.	No
007	46	ACE	Pg. 2-34 (note: page numbers have changed since last draft). San Juan County feels that, with exception of the National Historic Landmark (2,146 acres), the Alkali Ridge ACEC does not meet the requirements necessary to qualify as an ACEC and that the area can be protected within the framework of current laws and regulations. The County urges BLM to not manage this area as an ACEC but choose Alternative D in the final RMP.	Please refer to response to comment 007-20.	No
007	47	PRP	Pg. 2-37 (note: page numbers have changed since last draft). San Juan County cannot support the designation of the Butler Wash North ACEC due to its layering over a WSA. However, the County would support Alternative C if the WSA was not included as part of the ACEC.	In the FEIS, the Butler Wash North area would not be designated as an ACEC but would be managed under the IMP.	No
007	48	ACE	Pg. 2-37 (note: page numbers have changed since last draft). The statement "Portions of the Cedar Mesa ACEC lie within 8	A correction has been made in the document showing that 3 WSAs and 1 ISA lie within the Cedar Mesa ACEC.	Yes

**Table 5.9.b. Public Comments and Responses: San Juan County**

Record ID & Comment Number	Resource Category	Comment Text	Response to Comment	Doc Mod
		<p>WSAs" under Management Common to All Alternatives should be clarified because according to all of the maps there are only 4 WSAs. San Juan County recommends that BLM avoid layering of protective designations.</p>	<p>"Layering" is planning. Under FLPMA's multiple use mandate, BLM manages many different resource values and uses on public lands. Through land use planning BLM sets goals and objectives for each of those values and uses, and prescribes actions to accomplish those objectives. Under the multiple use concept, BLM doesn't necessarily manage every value and use on every acre, but routinely manages many different values and uses on the same areas of public lands. The process of applying many individual program goals, objectives, and actions to the same area of public lands may be perceived as "layering." BLM strives to ensure that the goals and objectives of each program (representing resource values and uses) are consistent and compatible for a particular land area. Inconsistent goals and objectives can lead to resource conflicts, failure to achieve the desired outcomes of a land use plan, and litigation. Whether or not a particular form of management is restrictive depends upon a personal interest or desire to see that public lands are managed in a particular manner. All uses and values cannot be provided for on every acre. That is why land use plans are developed through a public and interdisciplinary process. The interdisciplinary process helps ensure that all resource values and uses can be considered together to determine what mix of values and uses is responsive to the issues identified for resolution in the land use plan. Layering of program decisions is not optional for BLM, but is required by the FLPMA and National BLM planning and program specific regulations.</p> <p>FLPMA directs BLM to manage public lands for multiple use and sustained yield (Section 102(a)(7)). As a multiple-use agency, the BLM is required to implement laws, regulations and policies for many different and often competing land uses and to resolve conflicts and prescribe land uses through its land use plans. BLM's Land Use Planning Handbook requires</p>	

**Table 5.9.b. Public Comments and Responses: San Juan County**

Record ID & Comment Number		Resource Category	Comment Text	Response to Comment	Doc Mod
				that specific decisions be made for each resource and use (Planning Handbook "H-1601-1"). Specific decisions must be included in each of the alternatives analyzed during development of the land use plan. As each alternative is formulated, each program decision is overlaid with other program decisions and inconsistent decisions are identified and modified so that ultimately a compatible mix of uses and management prescriptions result.	
007	49	PRP	Pg. 2-37 (note: page numbers have changed since last draft). San Juan County cannot support any of the alternatives for the Cedar Mesa area because of the layering of ACEC and C-SRMA over WSA. The County would support Alternative C if the ACEC and C-SRMA are removed from the WSA and management is in accordance with the IMP in those areas.	In the FEIS, the ACEC and the C-SRMA are not being carried forward. The area will be managed as a SRMA and it will contain WSAs. See also refer to response to comment 007-48.	No
007	50	ACE	Pg. 2-37 (note: page numbers have changed since last draft). Management prescriptions for the Cedar Mesa ACEC under Alternative C are unclear. For instance the County cannot determine rather activities such as geophysical work, disposal of mineral materials, or mineral entry are available.	The text of the PRMP has been changed to clarify the management prescriptions.	Yes
007	51	TRV	Pg. 2-40 (note: page numbers have changed since last draft). The OHV open area is not included under Alternative C for the Indian Creek ACEC. This seems to be an oversight since it is addressed in other portions of the plan. The County supports Alternative C for this area provided the OHV open area is included.	The Indian Creek open to OHV area is not to be confused with the Indian Creek ACEC. The ACEC was established to maintain visual resources and it has been closed to OHV use since its establishment and is to remain that way in Alternative C. The ACEC was never included in the 2214 acres in the Indian Creek area that is open to OHV use in certain alternatives.	No
007	52	WSR	Pg. 2-45 (note: page numbers have changed since last draft). San Juan County feels that a W&SR designation in Dark Canyon is unnecessary because current management for the WSA already protects the ORVs. W&SR status for this segment would be confusing and would present unnecessary management problems and associated costs.	The Wild and Scenic River suitability process and the WSA process differ. The outstandingly remarkable values found along Dark Canyon differ from the wilderness values found within the WSA. It is very common for rivers within Wilderness Areas to be designated as Wild and Scenic Rivers by Congress.	No
007	53	WL	Pg. 2-54 and 2-56 (note: page numbers have changed since	Comment noted. The proposed travel plan has been adjusted.	Yes

**Table 5.9.b. Public Comments and Responses: San Juan County**

Record ID & Comment Number	Resource Category	Comment Text	Response to Comment	Doc Mod
		<p>last draft). San Juan County is opposed to any alternative in the Monticello RMP/EIS which closes any portion of the Arch Canyon road. Reasons for the County's opposition include: 1) the Flannelmouth Sucker is not found above the State Section (T. 37 S., R. 10 E., Section 16). Therefore there is no justification to close the Arch Canyon road to protect this species above the State Section; 2) The stream is in proper functioning condition and BLM surveys have found no evidence that the Flannelmouth Sucker is being impacted by the road or its use; 3) The two primary reasons for listing the MSO, as described by the USFWS in its final rule dated August 31, 2004, are not major threats in the portion of Arch Canyon located on BLM lands; 4) In its final rule, the USFWS also described important habitat conditions for the MSO, all of which are much more prevalent on the Forest Service lands than on the BLM lands; 5) The portion of Arch Canyon on BLM land is near the fringe of the habitat for the MSO as mapped by the USFWS and would appear not to be as important for the survival of the owl; 6) The BLM is proposing to allow hikers unrestricted access in Arch Canyon.</p> <p>The county requests an explanation of BLM's rationale for allowing hikers to hike and camp both on the road and throughout the canyon and cliffs while proposing to close the road to OHV use.</p>	<p>Even if the flannelmouth sucker is not found above the state section, it does not preclude management of the stream and watershed above the fish since activities that happen upstream will directly impact fish that live downstream.</p> <p>The endangered species act does not preclude the protection of species simply because the proposed action is not included as one of the primary reason for the need of a species to be listed.</p> <p>Arch Canyon is included in the Designated Critical Habitat for Mexican Spotted Owls and habitat evaluations have determined that Arch Canyon is suitable habitat for Spotted Owls.</p> <p>As stated in table 2.1 on Page 2-54, the BLM also analyzed a permit system to restrict the number of hikers in Alternative B and C.</p>	
007	54	VEG	<p>Pg. 2-57 (note: page numbers have changed since last draft). The first goal under vegetation should include livestock as well.</p>	<p>The document has been revised to include vegetative goals in relation to livestock management.</p> <p>Yes</p>
007	55	WL	<p>Pg. 2-60 (note: page numbers have changed since last draft). San Juan County cannot support any of the management alternatives for wildlife because of it's concerns on crucial habitat acreage. The County would welcome an opportunity to discuss this with BLM and see if adjustments can be made.</p>	<p>Please refer to response to comment 007-13.</p> <p>No</p>
007	56	WD	<p>Pg. 2-62 (note: page numbers have changed since last draft). Opportunities for woodland harvest under Alternatives A, B, C</p>	<p>The RMP has been revised that allows woodland harvesting in areas not identified as a harvesting zone, thus increasing</p> <p>Yes</p>

**Table 5.9.b. Public Comments and Responses: San Juan County**

Record ID & Comment Number		Resource Category	Comment Text	Response to Comment	Doc Mod
			and D are 73%, 41%, 47% and 31%, respectively. San Juan County is concerned about the drastic reductions in lands available for woodland harvest and the impact on citizens who depend on these woodland products, especially on Cedar Mesa and other areas where Native Americans have traditionally gathered wood. The county suggests that the BLM give this use more consideration in the final RMP.	available localities. Areas of historic woodland harvest will essentially continue to be available. Areas closed to woodland harvest are typically limited to areas devoid of woodlands, sites with no access to woodland products, Wilderness Study Areas, and riparian communities. The RMP language for Cedar Mesa and the Montezuma Watershed on page 2-63, Alternatives C and D, has been revised to allow the continuation of existing woodland harvest until a woodland management plan is implemented that includes a cultural Class III surveys in woodland harvesting boundaries.	
007	57	REC	Section 3.11.2.1 – It is unclear whether the BLM is carrying ROS into the new RMP. ROS is described in the current plan and on Map 35 but there is no other analysis across alternatives. However, it appears that the primitive designation is used in effect to create "defacto wilderness" and VRM I areas smaller than 5,000 acres. BLM needs to clarify use of ROS in the Draft RMP.	The Recreational Opportunity Spectrum (ROS) has not be carried forward in any of the action alternatives. A statement has been added to Section 3.11.2.1 clarifying this. Management decisions will be based on special designations such as SRMAs, ACECs, National Historic designations, WSAs, ISAs, ERMAs, Wild and Scenic River recommendations, Non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics, etc.	Yes
007	58	WL	Section 3.20.2.1 – It is generally agreed that in southeast Utah the limiting factor for mule deer is summer range, not winter range as stated by BLM. The county suggests that BLM correct this in the Final RMP.	The sentence, "Winter range is often considered a limiting factor for mule deer" has been removed and replaced with the following clarification: "In the summer months, mule deer populations could be limited during years where there is little rainfall, water availability, and summer forage which reduces fawning success. In the winter months, insufficient quantity or quality of habitat or deep snow results in heavy concentration of deer on winter ranges, increasing the spread of disease, reduction in population, and fawning success."	Yes
007	59	WL	Section 3.20.2.1. The county points out that BLM's statement that "Within the Monticello PA, there has been a loss/die-off of sagebrush habitat due to drought and insect infestations" is only partially correct. The county references Charles E. Kay's studies in Beef Basin which show that sagebrush loss/die off is due primarily to deer overgrazing. Overgrazing by deer can also stress sagebrush and make it more susceptible to drought and	The sentence has been modified to: "Within the Monticello PA, there has been a loss/die-off of sagebrush habitat due to drought, insect infestations, and overgrazing."	Yes

**Table 5.9.b. Public Comments and Responses: San Juan County**

Record ID & Comment Number		Resource Category	Comment Text	Response to Comment	Doc Mod
			insects.		
007	60	WL	Table 3.61 – The county requests BLM's justification for tripling the deer population given the condition of the crucial habitat in Beef Basin and Harts Draw.	Please refer to response to comment 007-13.	No
007	61	WL	Section 3.20.2.4 – The county agrees with BLM's description of Desert bighorn sheep habitat. However, based on that description, the county questions how BLM can reconcile the large acres of thick pinyon-juniper areas included as crucial Bighorn Sheep habitat (Map 54 and 78 thru 82 of the DEIS).	Please refer to response to comment 007-13.	No
007	62	WL	Tables 4.235, 4.236, 4.237 and 4.238 show huge acreage of pinyon-juniper that will be protected for special wildlife conditions for deer, elk, pronghorn, and bighorn sheep. The BLM should reconcile why special conditions exist in this area given that the encroachment of pinyon-juniper has resulted in the loss of crucial habitat for these species.	Please refer to response to comment 007-13.	No
007	63	AA	Pg. 4-561 (note: page numbers have changed since last draft). The BLM refers to Section 4.3.19.2.6 but that section does not exist in the document.	The PRMP has been changed to correct this error. The sections referenced should be Sections 4.3.19.3.6, Impacts of Cultural Resource Decisions on Wildlife and Fisheries and 4.3.19.3.12, Impacts of Recreation Decisions on Wildlife and Fisheries.	Yes
007	64	AA	Pg. 4-593 (note: page numbers have changed since last draft). The BLM refers to Section 4.3.19.2.15, Impacts of Habitat Fragmentation. That section is found at 4.3.19.3.21.	The text of the PRMP has been corrected.	Yes
007	65	WC	Managing non-WSA Lands for wilderness characteristics under Alternative E would: 1) Violate Federal Law, BLM Policy, and the State of Utah/Department of Interior Settlement Agreement of 2003; 2) Clash with State and Local Policies and Plans for managing those lands and thus violate the consistency requirement of FLPMA Section 202 ( c )(9); and 3) Arbitrarily and capriciously ignore the documentation and information submitted by San Juan County which show that the subject lands lack true wilderness character.	The BLM's authority for managing lands to protect or enhance wilderness characteristics comes directly from the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA) Section 202 (U.S.C. § 1712). This section of the BLM's organic statute gives the Secretary of the Interior authority to manage public lands for multiple use and sustained yield. Nothing in this section constrains the Secretary's authority to manage lands as necessary to "achieve integrated consideration of physical, biological, economic, and other sciences." FLPMA, Section	No

**Table 5.9.b. Public Comments and Responses: San Juan County**

Record ID & Comment Number	Resource Category	Comment Text	Response to Comment	Doc Mod
			<p>202(c)(2) (43 U.S.C. § 1712(c)(2)). Further FLPMA makes it clear that the term "multiple use" means that not every use is appropriate for every acre of public land and that the Secretary can "make the most judicious use of land for some or all of these resources or related services over areas large enough to provide sufficient latitude for periodic adjustments in use...." FLPMA, Section 1039(c) (43 U.S.C. § 1702(c)). FLPMA intended the Secretary of the Interior to use land use planning as a mechanism for allocating resource use, including wilderness character management, amongst the various resources in a way that provides use for current and future generations.</p> <p>The Norton-Leavitt Agreement recognizes that nothing in the Agreement shall be construed to diminish the Secretary's authority under FLPMA to manage a tract of land that has been dedicated to a specific use.</p> <p>IM 2003-275-Change 1 which is a direct outcome of the Norton-Leavitt Agreement states, "the BLM may consider information on wilderness characteristics along with information on other uses and values when preparing land use plans." The IM goes on to say "considering wilderness characteristics in the land use planning process may result in several outcomes including, but not limited to, ...emphasizing the protection of some or all of the wilderness characteristics as a priority over other multiple uses" (although the area will not be designated as a WSA). The IM also states "typically, resource information contained in the BLM wilderness inventories was collected to support a land use planning process. Public wilderness proposals represent a land use proposal. In either case the BLM is authorized to consider such information in preparation of a land use plan amendment or revision."</p> <p>In September 2006, Judge Benson, whose court approved the Norton-Leavitt Agreement, stated that the Agreement did not</p>	

**Table 5.9.b. Public Comments and Responses: San Juan County**

Record ID & Comment Number	Resource Category	Comment Text	Response to Comment	Doc Mod
			<p>strip the BLM of its powers to protect lands it determined to have wilderness characteristics in a manner substantially similar to the manner in which such lands are protected when protected as WSAs.</p> <p>The proposed FEIS will state that the MFO will manage 88,871 acres for wilderness characteristics. This acreage includes Dark Canyon (11,540 acres), Mancos Mesa (30,068 acres), Nokai Dome West (14,988 acres), Nokai Dome East (18,618 acres) and Grand Gulch (13,657 acres). Management prescriptions include:</p> <p>All existing improvements could be maintained at their current level.</p> <p>VRM II for surface disturbing activities.</p> <p>No Surface Occupancy for Dark Canyon and Closed to leasing for Mancos Mesa, Nokai Dome West, Nokai Dome East and Grand Gulch.</p> <p>OHV travel limited to designated roads and trails.</p> <p>Avoidance areas for rights-of-way.</p> <p>Fire suppression on non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be through light on the land techniques.</p> <p>The BLM feels this represents a balance approach to managing wilderness characteristics and providing for mandated multiple use.</p>	
007	66	AQ	<p>Air quality baseline should be established based on average case scenarios as opposed to worse case scenarios. Air quality monitoring stations should be installed using best available control technology. San Juan County should be involved in any air quality analysis for quality assurance purposes.</p>	No
007	67	WSR	<p>San Juan County opposes any statement in the DRMP/EIS which purports to continue to manage eligible river segments, or presumptively suitable segments, as if those segments may</p>	No

**Table 5.9.b. Public Comments and Responses: San Juan County**

Record ID & Comment Number	Resource Category	Comment Text	Response to Comment	Doc Mod
		<p>some day be included in the National Wild and Scenic River System. Congress conferred no such interim management authority on the BLM. The County recommends that any such statements be substituted with appropriate language indicating that management will be in accordance with the principles of multiple use and sustained yield until such time as Congress may designate for inclusion in the National WSR system.</p>	<p>review are involved. Eligibility is an inventory, solely involving river values. Suitability involves consideration of manageability and resource conflicts.</p> <p>As per BLM Manual 8351-Wild and Scenic Rivers-Policy and Program, Section .32C, all eligible rivers are considered in the EIS for the planning effort as to their suitability for congressional designation into the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. With any suitability determination made in the ROD for the FEIS/PRMP, the free-flowing, outstandingly remarkable values, and tentative classification of rivers would continue to be protected until Congress makes a decision on designation.</p>	
007	68	WSR Any statements in the DRMP/EIS which purports to prohibit impoundments, diversions, channelizations and rip-rapping on any river segment in San Juan County are particularly offensive to Utah State water law and water rights.	<p>The Wild and Scenic Rivers Act implies a Federal reserved water right; however, it must be the minimal amount necessary for purposes of the Act, it must be adjudicated through State processes, and it would be junior to existing water rights. The amount of Federal right will vary from river to river, depending on the river's flows, the un-appropriated quantities in the river, and the values for which the river is being protected. There is no effect whatsoever on water rights on in -stream flows related to suitability findings made in a land use plan decision, barring Congressional action. Even if Congress were to designate rivers in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, any such designation would have no affect on existing, valid water rights. Section 13 (b) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act states that jurisdiction over waters is determined by established principles of law. In Utah, the state has jurisdiction over water. Although the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act implies a federal reserved water right for designated rivers, it doesn't require or specify any amount, and instead establishes that only the minimum amount for purpose of the Act can be acquired. Because the State of Utah has jurisdiction over water, BLM would be required to adjudicate the right as would any other entity, by application</p>	No

**Table 5.9.b. Public Comments and Responses: San Juan County**

Record ID & Comment Number		Resource Category	Comment Text	Response to Comment	Doc Mod
				<p>through state processes. Thus, for Congressionally designated rivers, BLM may assert a federal reserved water right to appurtenant and unappropriated water with a priority date as of the date of designation (junior to all existing rights), but only in the minimum amount necessary to fulfill the primary purpose of the reservation. In practice, however, federal reserved water rights have not always been claimed if alternative means of ensuring sufficient flows are adequate to sustain the outstandingly remarkable values.</p> <p>During the suitability phase of the Wild and Scenic River process, San Juan County as well as the State of Utah and SITLA, were asked to supply information on uses, "including reasonably foreseeable potential uses of the area and related waters, which would be enhanced, foreclosed, or curtailed if the area were included in the national system of rivers, and the values which could be foreclosed or diminished if the area is not protected as part of the national system." Appendix H summarizes suitability input by the public as well as local communities. Suitability decisions were made considering the results of this input.</p>	
007	69	WSR	San Juan County's position is that no river segments on BLM lands in the Monticello Field Office planning area should be recommended as suitable for Congressional classification and designation in the W&SR system.	The Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (WSRA) of 1968, Congress established legislation to protect and preserve designated rivers throughout the United States in their free-flowing condition. Section 5(d)(1) of the WSRA directs federal agencies to consider the potential for national wild, scenic, and recreational river areas in all planning for the use and development of water and related land resources. A full range of alternatives for Wild and Scenic River designation are proposed in the DRMP. The Wild and Scenic River Study Process and a list of authorities and guidelines can be found in Appendix H, beginning on page H-67.	No
007	70	GRA	San Juan County is concerned with any language in the DRMP/EIS that would accept whatever wildlife herd number objective the UDWR may give to BLM, if accepting that herd	BLM works cooperatively with UDWR to provide habitat for wildlife herd objective levels which are set by UDWR and the wildlife boards (on which BLM has a representative) in an	No

**Table 5.9.b. Public Comments and Responses: San Juan County**

Record ID & Comment Number	Resource Category	Comment Text	Response to Comment	Doc Mod
		<p>number means BLM has to place more active use livestock AUMs in suspension. The County feels that BLM has an obligation to tell the UDWR to reduce it's herd size objectives in order to allow the restoration of all suspended use AUMs back to active use AUMs for livestock, as guaranteed by the Taylor Grazing Act.</p>	<p>open public process.</p> <p>As provided for in FLPMA, the Secretary has the discretion, in the land use planning process, to modify levels of use including livestock grazing. While it is the goal of the BLM to enhance rangeland health while providing for domestic sources of minerals, food, timber and fiber, there is no requirement in the Taylor Grazing Act (TGA) or other applicable law for the BLM "to allow the restoration of all suspended use AUMs back to active use AUMs for livestock" to the detriment of other uses of the public lands. According to FLPMA, BLM is to manage for "multiple uses" which best meet the present and future needs of the American people without permanently impairing the productivity of the land.</p>	
007	71	<p>GRA</p> <p>Utah Code Section 63-38d-401 prohibits permanent closure of grazing allotments and conversion of livestock AUMs to wildlife or other uses. The County is concerned that any decision to diminish grazing AUMs for any reason other than rangeland conditions is contrary to state law and is inconsistent with San Juan County public land policy and plans.</p> <p>When considering non-use, transfers of AUMs, suspensions of use or reductions of livestock AUMs, relinquishments or retirements, BLM decisions should be scientifically based on range conditions or rangeland health standards. Suspensions or reductions in AUMs should be temporary and should be restored to livestock use when rangeland conditions improve and not converted to wildlife or other use.</p>	<p>BLM is not permanently closing grazing allotments. BLM is determining that certain areas will be unavailable for livestock grazing for the next 15 years. These determinations may be reconsidered at any time and changed by amending the RMP or during revision of the RMP.</p> <p>The BLM is aware that there are specific County and State plan decisions relevant to aspects of public land management that are discrete from, and independent of, Federal law. However, the BLM is bound by Federal law. FLPMA requires that the development of an RMP for public lands must be coordinated and consistent with County plans, to the maximum extent possible by law, and that inconsistencies between Federal and non-Federal government plans be resolved to the extent practical (FLPMA, Title II Sec. 202 (c)(9)). Thus while County and Federal planning processes, under FLPMA, are required to be as integrated and consistent as practical, the Federal agency planning process is not bound by or subject to County plans, planning processes, or planning stipulations. The BLM will identify these conflicts in the PRMP/FEIS, so that the State and local governments have a complete understanding of the impacts of the PRMP on State and local</p>	No

**Table 5.9.b. Public Comments and Responses: San Juan County**

Record ID & Comment Number		Resource Category	Comment Text	Response to Comment	Doc Mod
				management options. A consistency review of the PRMP with the State and County Master Plans is included in Chapter 5.	
007	72	GRA	Transfer of AUMs to wildlife violates the Taylor Grazing Act and FLPMA and would require amending Presidential Executive Orders 6910 and 6964 which withdrew public lands as chiefly valuable for grazing.	The Monticello RMP determines the allowable uses of the public lands as provided for in FLPMA. FLPMA states in Section 202(a) that land use planning provides for the use of the public lands "regardless of whether such lands previously have been classified, withdrawn, set aside, or otherwise designated for one or more uses." FLPMA further provides in Section 202(e) the authority to issue management decisions which implement newly developed or revised land use plans. BLM is not proposing to change the Grazing Districts set up under the Taylor Grazing Act and no change to Presidential Executive Orders 6910 and 6964 is needed. The Secretary has the discretion under FLPMA to use the land use planning process to close areas to grazing, change levels of use, or to devote the land to another public purpose in accordance with the relevant land use plan. Under FLPMA, BLM is to manage for "multiple uses" which best meets the present and future needs of the American people without permanently impairing the productivity of the land. The combinations of uses proposed in the Draft RMP/EIS are varied and diverse across the planning area taking into consideration the current and future needs of the public. This is consistent with both FLPMA and the TGA. The RMP does not propose to transfer AUMs from livestock to wildlife but reflects BLMS desire to manage for multiple uses of the public lands and, where appropriate, limit livestock grazing to emphasize other uses of BLM lands.	No

**Table 5.10.a. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: AA – Adequacy and Analysis**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number		Comment Text	Response to Comment
State of Utah	4	28	The DEIS does not address consistency between neighboring jurisdictions' management objectives.	It was the intent in the development of the RMP/DEIS to be consistent with management objectives in the adjoining Moab BLM Planning Area where appropriate. This same intent was not necessarily applied to other neighboring jurisdictions. In some cases, the opportunity to develop consistency became apparent during scoping, comment periods and various interagency coordination meetings. Section 5.3 in the FEIS, (Consistency With Other Plans), addresses the consistency issue.
San Juan County	7	31	Pg. 2-14 (note: page numbers have changed since the last draft). The Health and Safety section seems rather weak. Is abandoned mine lands the only health and safety concern in the Monticello Field Office?	The goal for the Health and Safety section states that the BLM would manage hazardous risks on public lands to protect the health and safety of public land users and stewards, protect natural and environmental resources, minimize future hazardous and related risks, costs and liabilities, and mitigate physical hazards in compliance with all applicable laws, regulations and policies. Statements were added under this section to include all physical hazards, hazardous materials and hazardous wastes for mitigation and management common to all alternatives.
San Juan County	7	39	The BLM should resolve inconsistencies in the Draft RMP/EIS. For instance on page 4-266, reference is made to "Section 3.10.4.2." However the county could find no Section 3.10.4.2. Likewise on page 4-267, reference is made to recreational trends in Section 3.10.4 but that section discusses paleontological resources.	These inconsistencies have been corrected in the PRMP.
San Juan County	7	63	The BLM refers to Section 4.3.19.2.6 but that section does not exist in the document.	The PRMP has been changed to correct this error. The sections referenced should be Sections 4.3.19.3.5, Impacts of Cultural Resource Decisions on Wildlife and Fisheries and 4.3.19.3.10, Impacts of Recreation Decisions on Wildlife and Fisheries.
San Juan County	7	64	The BLM refers to Section 4.3.19.2.15, Impacts of Habitat Fragmentation on Wildlife. That section is found at 4.3.19.3.19	The text of the PRMP has been corrected.

**Table 5.10.a. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: AA – Adequacy and Analysis**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number	Comment Text	Response to Comment
		on page 4-742.	
Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance	26 89	The DRMP failed to analyze the impacts of climate change to the resources of the MFO, especially on the Colorado Plateau.	<p>A growing body of scientific evidence supports the concern that global climate change will result from the continued build-up of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere. While uncertainties remain, particularly in the area of exact timing, magnitude and regional impacts of such changes, the vast majority of scientific evidence supports the view that continued increases in greenhouse gas emissions will lead to climate change. This information was added to the PRMP/FEIS.</p> <p>The EPA has not developed regulatory protocol or emission standards regarding global climate change. When these protocols and standards are available, the BLM will analyze potential effects to global warming in the NEPA documentation prepared for site-specific projects. All information to this effect was added to the PRMP/FEIS.</p>
	29 2	On page 4.624, Volume 2, there is a reference to the cumulative impacts on livestock and grazing from the "adjacent Ashley National Forest." I am not aware of any such national forest adjacent to the Monticello PA.	This error has been corrected in the FEIS.
	29 5	"The trade and service sector employees (sic) a large amount of people..." This should read "employs," not "employees." (Reference: pg. 3-107, Vol. 1, under "Shift in Regional Economic Activity," second paragraph).	This misspelling has been corrected in the FEIS.
	29 13	The list of ID team members (Reference pg. H-70, Vol. 3) did not include a law enforcement representative, yet the DRMP addresses "protection" and "enforcement" including drawing conclusions about what levels of protection given areas and/or resources need. There are no charts showing levels of law enforcement incidents, either by area or resource. This data would have been particularly valuable in determining the need for extra protection for cultural areas, route designation, ACEC nominations, and various other resource impacts, etc.	Monticello's law enforcement officers did participate in ID Team meetings and provided expertise in travel planning, cultural resources, recreation uses, woodland harvest and other matters. The list of preparers has been changed in the FEIS to correct this omission. A report of law enforcement incidents is out of scope for this document but incidents were part of the knowledge base of the law enforcement officers.

**Table 5.10.a. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: AA – Adequacy and Analysis**

<b>Commenter Name</b>	<b>Record ID &amp; Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Text</b>	<b>Response to Comment</b>
IPAMS(Independent Petroleum Assc of Mountain State	55 4	Maps 23 -27, which identify areas to be leased with NSO stipulations, do not clearly delineate the NSO areas. For example, there are approximately 40,000 acres in Alkali Ridge, and 2,146 acres are designated as NSO. However, it is impossible to tell if the acreage is scattered throughout the Alkali Ridge area, or within a contained portion of it. Operators are unable to analyze the impacts of the DRMP without that information, and therefore, unable to comment on how that NSO stipulation affects their operations.	Maps have been corrected in the FEIS and Chapter 2 describes which special designation areas are subject to NSO.
CrownQuest	62 94	Appendix A sets forth stipulations applicable to oil and gas leases in Table A.1. Many of the stipulations set forth in Appendix A, however, are not identified as restrictions on leases in Chapter 2, Table 2.1. The BLM must resolve discrepancies between the stipulations identified in Appendix 2.1 and those identified in Table 2.1. To the extent the BLM attempts to impose stipulations that are not identified in Appendix 2.1, it must analyze the impacts of these stipulations on other resource values in Chapter 4.	Any discrepancies between Appendix A and Chapter 2 have been resolved in the PRMP/FEIS.
Pamela Baker	102 1	On page 2-30 at the top under Alternative C is there a "not" missing? Otherwise the message is contradictory. Same on page 2-40 under Alternative C at the bottom of the page.	The sentence on page 2-30 at the top under Alternative C has been changed for clarification. It now reads "Dispersed camping would be allowed in the Indian Creek Corridor, except within the following designated camping zones that have been established: Bridger Jack Mesa, Indian Creek Falls, and Creek Pasture. Camping within these zones is limited to designated sites." Page 2-40 of the DEIS was incorrect as this prescription did not apply to the ACEC but to the SRMA.
Pamela Baker	102 2	On page 2-23 and 2-24 there are blank boxes under Alternative E. Should these all be "Same as Alternative B"?	These errors have been corrected in the FEIS. Alternative E should read "Same as Alternative B."
Adonia Ripple	148 1	Global climate change is one of the most serious challenges facing the world, yet the DRMP completely ignores climate change. The FRMP needs to thoroughly analyze the impacts of climate change on the planning area and the potential impacts	A growing body of scientific evidence supports the concern that global climate change will result from the continued build-up of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere. While uncertainties remain, particularly in the area of exact timing,

**Table 5.10.a. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: AA – Adequacy and Analysis**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number	Comment Text	Response to Comment
		of proposed activities on climate change.	<p>magnitude and regional impacts of such changes, the vast majority of scientific evidence supports the view that continued increases in greenhouse gas emissions will lead to climate change. This information was added to Chapter 3 of the PRMP/FEIS.</p> <p>The EPA has not developed regulatory protocol or emission standards regarding global climate change. When these protocols and standards are available, the BLM will analyze potential effects to global warming in the NEPA documentation prepared for site-specific projects. All information to this effect was added to Chapter 4 of the PRMP/FEIS.</p>
Patrick Flynn	151	1 Global climate change is one of the most serious challenges facing the world yet the DRMP completely ignores climate change. The FRMP needs to thoroughly analyze the impacts of climate change on the planning area and the potential impacts of proposed activities on climate change.	Please refer to response to comment 148-1.
Warren Kesselring	155	1 Global climate change is one of the most serious challenges facing the world, yet the DRMP completely ignores climate change. The FRMP needs to thoroughly analyze the impact of climate change on the planning area and the potential impact of proposed activities on climate change.	Please refer to response to comment 148-1.
Mike Mellick	156	1 Global climate change is one of the most serious challenges facing the world, yet the DRMP completely ignores climate change. The FRMP needs to thoroughly analyze the impacts of climate change on the planning area and the potential impacts of proposed activities on climate change.	Please refer to response to comment 148-1.
Casey Yorkunas	158	1 Global climate change is one of the most serious challenges facing the world, yet the DRMP completely ignores climate change. The FRMP needs to thoroughly analyze the impacts of climate change on the planning area and the potential impacts of proposed activities on climate change.	Please refer to response to comment 148-1.

**Table 5.10.a. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: AA – Adequacy and Analysis**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number	Comment Text	Response to Comment
Glen Canyon Institute	222 1	<p>The Secretary of the Interior, who oversees the BLM, considers global climate change so important that he has created a special Interior Department Climate Change Task Force to consider this pervasive issue. This action shows that even the Bush administration - which has actively weakened many environmental laws - cannot ignore the potential impacts of climate change. There is growing scientific evidence that climate change will have major impacts on the hydrology and ecosystems of the Monticello planning area and the entire West. For example, a February 2007 National Research Council report concludes that climate change is altering the hydrology of the Colorado River Basin. This has been reiterated most recently in an article in Science magazine that identifies that considerable change will occur to the climate and hydrologic processes that impact the Colorado Plateau. Moreover, many activities proposed by the BLM, such as oil, gas, and mineral extraction, ORV use, and livestock grazing, emit greenhouse gases that promote climate change. Despite this, other than one oblique reference to fire (p. 4-11), the Monticello DRMP completely ignores climate change. This calls into question the entire basis of this plan, which is meant to provide management guidance for the next 20 years.</p> <p>Changes Needed in the Final Resource Management Plan</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Significantly revise the DRMP to address climate change across all resource and management categories and on all levels.</li> <li>2. Include a full analysis of the potential impacts of climate change on the natural resources of the planning area, including soils, precipitation and water flows, vegetation, wildlife and wildlife habitat, and aquatic communities.</li> <li>3. Include a full analysis of the potential impacts on climate change of emissions of greenhouse gases resulting from current and potential consumptive activities such as oil and gas,</li> </ol>	<p>A growing body of scientific evidence supports the concern that global climate change will result from the continued build-up of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere. While uncertainties remain, particularly in the area of exact timing, magnitude and regional impacts of such changes, the vast majority of scientific evidence supports the view that continued increases in greenhouse gas emissions will lead to climate change. This information was added to Chapter 3 of the PRMP/FEIS.</p> <p>The EPA has not developed regulatory protocol or emission standards regarding global climate change. When these protocols and standards are available, the BLM will analyze potential effects to global warming in the NEPA documentation prepared for site-specific projects. All information to this effect was added to Chapter 4 of the PRMP/FEIS.</p>

**Table 5.10.a. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: AA – Adequacy and Analysis**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number	Comment Text	Response to Comment
		coal, oil shale and tar sands, and mineral extraction; ORV use; and livestock grazing. 4. Evaluate changes in the hydrology of the Colorado River Basin resulting from global climate change, as identified in the National Research Council report.	

**Table 5.10.b. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: ACE – Areas of Critical Environmental Concern**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number	Comment Text	Response to Comment
Environmental Protection Agency Region 8	1 7	EPA supports increasing the size of Hovenweep ACEC but is concerned that this would result in changing the existing oil and gas leasing stipulation from NSO and TL/CSU to open with standard stipulations. This change in stipulations would likely negate the intended protection provided under the ACEC designation.	The 880 acre visual protective zone is NSO in the proposed plan. Cajon Pond would remain as TL. The remainder of the ACEC would be classified as Controlled Surface Use stipulations for oil and gas leasing. Under Alternatives B and C, the Hovenweep ACEC would be expanded 620+ acres from Alternative A, to a total of 2,418 acres. The management prescriptions under Alternatives B and C would be the same as Alternative A (the 620+ acre addition would be managed as the "General Area Exclusive of Special Emphasis Zones"). Table 2.1., pg. 2-39 will be revised to clarify the specific prescriptions that apply to the 620+ acre expansion. The total acreage shown on pg. 239 under Alternatives B and C for the Hovenweep ACEC should be 2,418 acres. BLM will correct the error. The existing BLM/NPS (1987) Cooperative Management Strategies will be added to the DRMP/DEIS references. This agreement defines VRM and NSO for visual zones.
San Juan County	7 20	The Draft RMP/EIS does not include a discussion on the nature or type of threat of "irreparable damage" or the regional	The ACEC evaluation appendix (Appendix H) was modified, and a section added discussing threats to the relevant and

**Table 5.10.b. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: ACE – Areas of Critical Environmental Concern**

Committer Name	Record ID & Comment Number	Comment Text	Response to Comment
		<p>significance of relevant and important values in its review. BLM misinterprets irreparable damage when reviewing and analyzing ACECs in the Draft RMP/EIS. The ACEC tool was intended by Congress to be limited to only those instances where irreparable damage would be caused without designation. Most surface-disturbing actions can eventually be repaired.</p> <p>The BLM must explain the need for "special" management for the ACEC and explain how this management is not duplicative of other normal BLM management or protections afforded by other state or federal laws.</p>	<p>important ACEC values; however, whether the threats currently exist does not preclude a potential ACEC from being considered in the action alternatives. All nominated areas, where the BLM has determined to have relevant and important values, are identified as potential ACECs and are addressed in the action alternatives. Threats to relevant and important values are likely to vary by alternative.</p> <p>On August 27, 1980, the BLM promulgated final ACEC guidelines (45 Federal Register 57318) clarifying the term "protects" – "To defend or guard against damage or loss to the important environmental resources of a potential or designated ACEC. This includes damage that can be restored over time and that which is irreparable. With regard to a natural hazard, protect means to prevent the loss of life or injury to people, or loss or damage to property." Thus, BLM is to consider the potential for both reparable and irreparable damage when protecting important historic, cultural, or scenic values; fish and wildlife resources; or other natural systems through ACEC designation. This interpretation is consistent with FLPMA's legislative history and implementing policy.</p> <p>Section 2 of the guidelines clarifies that ACECs are special places within the public lands. It states: "In addition to establishing in law such basic protective management policies that apply to all the public lands, Congress has said that 'management of national resource lands [public lands] is to include giving special attention to the protection of ACECs, for the purpose of ensuring that the most environmentally important and fragile lands will be given early attention and protection' (Senate Report 94-583, on FLPMA). Thus, the ACEC process is to be used to provide whatever special management is required to protect those environmental resources that are most important, i.e., those resources that make certain specific areas special places, endowed by nature or man with characteristics that set them apart. In addition, the</p>

**Table 5.10.b. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: ACE – Areas of Critical Environmental Concern**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number	Comment Text	Response to Comment
			ACEC process is to be used to protect human life and property from natural hazards."
San Juan County	7 48	Pg. 2-37 - The statement "Portions of the Cedar Mesa ACEC lie within 8 WSAs" under Management Common to All Alternatives should be clarified because according to all of the maps there are only 4 WSAs. San Juan County recommends that BLM avoid layering of protective designations.	<p>A correction has been made in the document showing that 3 WSAs and 1 ISA lie within the Cedar Mesa ACEC.</p> <p>"Layering" is planning. Under FLPMA's multiple use mandate, BLM manages many different resource values and uses on public lands. Through land use planning BLM sets goals and objectives for each of those values and uses, and prescribes actions to accomplish those objectives. Under the multiple use concept, BLM doesn't necessarily manage every value and use on every acre, but routinely manages many different values and uses on the same areas of public lands. The process of applying many individual program goals, objectives, and actions to the same area of public lands may be perceived as "layering." BLM strives to ensure that the goals and objectives of each program (representing resource values and uses) are consistent and compatible for a particular land area. Inconsistent goals and objectives can lead to resource conflicts, failure to achieve the desired outcomes of a land use plan, and litigation. Whether or not a particular form of management is restrictive depends upon a personal interest or desire to see that public lands are managed in a particular manner. All uses and values cannot be provided for on every acre. That is why land use plans are developed through a public and interdisciplinary process. The interdisciplinary process helps ensure that all resource values and uses can be considered together to determine what mix of values and uses is responsive to the issues identified for resolution in the land use plan. Layering of program decisions is not optional for BLM, but is required by the FLPMA and National BLM planning and program specific regulations.</p> <p>FLPMA directs BLM to manage public lands for multiple use</p>

**Table 5.10.b. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: ACE – Areas of Critical Environmental Concern**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number		Comment Text	Response to Comment
				and sustained yield (Section 102(a)(7)). As a multiple-use agency, the BLM is required to implement laws, regulations and policies for many different and often competing land uses and to resolve conflicts and prescribe land uses through its land use plans. BLM's Land Use Planning Handbook requires that specific decisions be made for each resource and use (Planning Handbook "H-1601-1"). Specific decisions must be included in each of the alternatives analyzed during development of the land use plan. As each alternative is formulated, each program decision is overlaid with other program decisions and inconsistent decisions are identified and modified so that ultimately a compatible mix of uses and management prescriptions result.
San Juan County	7	50	Pg. 2-37 - Management prescriptions for the Cedar Mesa ACEC under Alternative C are unclear. For instance the County cannot determine rather activities such as geophysical work, disposal of mineral materials, or mineral entry are available.	The text of the PRMP has been changed to clarify the management prescriptions.
	29	10	On pg. 3-127, Vol. 1, the total number of existing ACEC acres under the 1991 RMP is listed at 513,452. On pg. ES-6, Vol. 1, and again on pg. 2-4, Vol. 1, the total number of existing ACEC acreage is 488,616, a difference of 24,836 acres. Is there overlap in ACECs or is the agency unaware of exactly how much is already designated as ACECs?	This inconsistency has been corrected in the FEIS with the correct acreage figure.
Lynell Schalk	29	32	Valley of the Gods ACEC: There is no mention of OHV and non-motorized/mechanical use prescriptions under Alternatives B, C, D, and E.	Under the proposed plan the Valley of the Gods would be designated as a Scenic ACEC. The Travel Plan will designate this area as limited to designated roads and trails. Motorized use and mechanized use would be restricted to designated roads and trails. Foot travel is allowed throughout the ACEC.
Bluff Landowners Coalition	48	6	Valley of the Gods ACEC: Why is this existing ACEC being reduced by nearly 10,000 acres (Alternative B and C)? It is a world class scenic area and should be provided additional protection, not less so (Reference: pg. 2-45, Vol. 1). There is also no mention of OHV	Valley of the Gods was a special emphasis area with the Cedar Mesa ACEC and was never an ACEC in its own right under Alternative A. The Valley of the Gods ACEC boundary was made to be coincident with the Road Canyon WSA to avoid unnecessary overlap. Additionally, the area estimates for

**Table 5.10.b. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: ACE – Areas of Critical Environmental Concern**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number	Comment Text	Response to Comment
		and non-motorized/mechanized use prescriptions under Alternatives B, C, D, and E. Are mountain bikers and other nonmotorized wheeled vehicles allowed indiscriminate cross-country travel here?	<p>the 1991 RMP were made without the use of GIS, and may be inaccurate.</p> <p>OHV use is to be on designated roads and trails in Alternatives B, C, D and E. This has been clarified in the PRMP.</p> <p>Under the proposed plan the Valley of the Gods would be designated as a Scenic ACEC. The Travel Plan will designate this area as limited to designated roads and trails. Motorized use and mechanized use would be restricted to designated roads and trails. Foot travel is allowed throughout the ACEC. See Map 63 for the travel plan for this area.</p> <p>The WSA area not part of the ACEC under the proposed plan will be managed within the management prescription of the IMP. This area would not be open to motorized or mechanized use.</p>

**Table 5.10.c. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: AQ – Air Quality**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number	Comment Text	Response to Comment
Environmental Protection Agency Region 8	1 1	Several references in Section 4.4.1 refer to projected air pollutant concentrations as being well below National Ambient Air Quality Standards. The commenter found projected concentrations in Table 3-8 of the Draft Analysis of Management Situation (AMS) but not in the Draft RMP/EIS. The DRMP/EIS does not describe in detail the methods used to calculate the projected concentrations. EPA recommends that BLM disclose this information in the Final RMP/EIS.	The methods used to calculate the projected concentrations of pollutants are included in the PRMP/FEIS. The BLM analyzed potential impacts by a qualitative emissions-based approach. BLM estimated potential emissions from BLM activities within the planning area. The State of Utah provided emissions from permitted sources.
Environmental Protection Agency Region 8	1 2	The air quality analysis omits potential impacts to ozone, visibility and deposition. The planning area encompasses and is near class I National Park Service airsheds. Ozone is of	Analyses of impacts on ozone, visibility, and deposition are included in Chapter 4 of the PRMP/FEIS. Please see updated descriptions of current ozone concentrations, visibility and

**Table 5.10.c. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: AQ – Air Quality**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number	Comment Text	Response to Comment
		particular concern because of the potential emissions of volatile organic compounds and oxides of nitrogen from sources in the area including oil and gas development.	atmospheric deposition in Chapter 3, Section 3.2.2, 3.2.4, and 3.2.5.
Environmental Protection Agency Region 8	1 3	The RMP makes general estimates of air quality impacts due to various activities but does not describe nor calculate the projected concentrations for any of the alternatives. EPA recommends that BLM disclose projected NAAQS and visibility pollutant concentrations in the FEIS. EPA recommends that the FEIS contain wording from the Rawlins BLM DRMP/EIS, which used a comparative, emissions-based approach: "As project-specific developments are proposed, quantitative air quality analysis would be conducted for project-specific assessments performed pursuant to NEPA."	The BLM's draft air resources guidance states that quantitative dispersion modeling is inappropriate in the absence of detailed emission data, especially source location information. BLM would consider dispersion modeling for a project-specific EIS associated with a proposed project. Please see chapter 4 Air Quality for the added text.
Environmental Protection Agency Region 8	1 12	Figure 3.3 of the DRMP/EIS presents visibility trend data through 1997. Data through 2005 are now available and should be used in the FEIS.	Data has been added to Chapter 3 giving visibility in Canyonlands National Park from 1990 through 2004.
Environmental Protection Agency Region 8	1 16	Section 4.3.1.2.1.1 includes sources of emissions from various oil and gas activities but it is unclear how drill rig emission sources were included or treated in the emission inventory. The FEIS should reference the more current emission estimates from the UT DAQ's most recent Annual Report (2005). It is also not clear how these existing emission sources are interpreted. BLM should disclose this information in the FEIS.	This section (methodology and emission estimates) was rewritten using AP-42 methodology.
Environmental Protection Agency Region 8	1 17	The AMS Table 3-4 and Figure 3-3 should be updated with more current data.	Section has been updated with more recent data.
National Park Service Intermountain Region	3 3	The EIS refers to projected future emissions from oil and gas sources; these estimates are omitted from the EIS but should be included.	Estimated emissions from BLM activities within the Monticello Planning Area have been added to Chapter 4.
State of Utah	4 14	The state encourages BLM to request oil and gas operators apply best available control technology (BACT).	The application of BACT for oil and gas development has been added to the mitigation section in Chapter 4.

**Table 5.10.c. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: AQ – Air Quality**

<b>Commenter Name</b>	<b>Record ID &amp; Comment Number</b>		<b>Comment Text</b>	<b>Response to Comment</b>
State of Utah	4	43	The section entitled Impacts of Mineral Decisions on Air Quality under Alternative A discusses emissions from multiple sources and notes that emissions from each source are well below applicable NAAQS. BLM relies on this statement as basis for each alternative, noting that impacts would be the same or similar to Alternative A. It is unclear how BLM equates additional emissions to anticipated ambient conditions.	Please see revised air resources section in Chapter 4. BLM would consider using a quantitative approach to estimate potential concentrations for a project-specific EIS associated with a proposed project.
Ute Mountain Ute Tribe	6	9	Tribal members' health could be compromised by air pollution related to uranium and oil and gas development. The White Mesa community is surrounded by BLM lands identified as having moderate potential for uranium development as well as oil and gas development potential. The FEIS needs to more carefully consider the potential impacts to air quality and human health from mineral development.	The analysis related to air quality has been updated in the PRMP/FEIS.
National Parks Conservation Association	44	1	The RMP ignores data from the Canyonlands National Park IMPROVE particle monitor. Table 3.2 sites only the ozone data from this monitor but ignores PM2.5, PM 10, sulfate, nitrate, organics, and elemental carbon. The BLM needs to re-evaluate its findings utilizing existing air quality data and make meaningful analysis of current and future conditions.	These data have been added to Table 3.2 in Chapter 3 of the RMP/FEIS.
National Parks Conservation Association	44	5	The cumulative impacts analysis on air quality fails to adequately address the threats from increased energy development in the area. The Four Corners region is seeing an explosion in oil and gas developments along with proposed coal fired power plants. There are also three new proposed coal fired power plants across the border in Nevada. Additionally, the surrounding BLM regions of Kanab, Moab and Richfield are releasing new resource management plans. Implementation of the Monticello RMP would have impacts that would add to these other past, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects that have not been analyzed. BLM needs to adequately address these impacts and consider reissuing the draft for public review.	BLM has added oil and gas development to the list of activities that contribute to cumulative impacts. Please see section 4.3.24.1.
EOG Resources	60	42	On page 4-10, the BLM assumes that "regulatory [Prevention of	This sentence has been revised to make clear that UDEQ

**Table 5.10.c. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: AQ – Air Quality**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number	Comment Text	Response to Comment
		Significant Deterioration] increment consumption analyses are the responsibility of the state air quality agency (under Environmental Protection Agency [EPA] supervision) and would be conducted where appropriate during the permit process" (emphasis added). Monticello DRMP/EIS, pg. 4-10. The BLM should revise this sentence to clarify that Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) analyses would occur during the process for air emission permits to be obtained from the UDEQ, and not during the process for APDs that are obtained from the BLM/ As the BLM correctly observes on page 4-10, the UDEQ, and not the BLM, has the sole authority to conduct PSD analyses.	permits for air emissions would be obtained.
EOG Resources	60 43	See Monticello DRMP/EIS, pgs. 4-14, 4-17,4-16. As the BLM is aware, the EPA revised the 24 hour NAAQS standard for PM to lower it from 65 ug/m. 71 Fed. Reg. 61144 (Oct. 17, 2006). The new 24 hour PM became effective on December 18, 2006 but states will not actually be required to meet the new 24 hour NAAQS for PM until April 2015, with possible extensions until April 2020. The BLM correctly references the revised standard elsewhere in the Monticello DRMP/EIS. See Monticello DRMP/EIS, pg 3-6, Table 3.2. The BLM should correct the references in Chapter 4 to reflect the new standard to demonstrate that the management prescriptions proposed in the Monticello MP/EIS will not jeopardize compliance with the more conservative standard.	The PRMP/FEIS has been corrected in Chapter 4 on air quality to reflect the new NAAQS standard.
CrownQuest	62 78	When analyzing potential impacts to air quality, the BLM states that the 24-hour National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) for PM emissions is 65 ug/m. See Monticello DRMP/EIS, pgs. 4-14, 4-17, 4-16. As the BLM is aware, the EPA revised the 24-hour NAAQS standard for PM to lower it from 65 ug/m to 35 ug/m. 71 Fed. Reg. 61144 (Oct. 17, 2006). The new 24-hour PM became effective on December 18, 2006 but states will not actually be required to meet the new 24-hour NAAQS for PM until April 2015, with possible extensions until	Please refer to response to comment 60-43.

**Table 5.10.c. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: AQ – Air Quality**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number	Comment Text	Response to Comment
		April 2020. The BLM correctly references the revised standard elsewhere in the Monticello DRPM/EIS. See Monticello DRMP/EIS, pg. 3-6, Table 3.2. The BLM should correct the references in Chapter 4 to reflect the new standard to demonstrate that the management prescriptions proposed in the Monticello RMP/EIS will not jeopardize compliance with the more conservative standard. Additionally, the BLM should maintain consistency throughout the document.	
Megan Williams	76 5	The MPA encompasses an area of frequent drought. These conditions can be expected to contribute to particulate matter exposure and visibility impacts in the area. In addition, the area is seeing ozone concentrations that threaten to exceed the 8-hour ozone NAAQS. For the BLM to present alternatives for the MPA that allow significant growth in the emissions that contribute to these existing air quality concerns is extremely shortsighted when one considers the impacts of these air pollutants to human health and the environment. These issues must be dealt with in this resource management plan by ensuring overall air quality compliance throughout the affected areas.	BLM does not have control over drought related particulate emissions. PM emissions related to oil and gas development will be recalculated using AP-42 methodology and compared to existing emissions in Grand and San Juan Counties. The BLM will follow the air quality regulations required by the Department Air Quality, State of Utah.
Megan Williams	76 9	The BLM has not analyzed whether the plan will prevent significant deterioration (PSD) of air quality, as required by the Clean Air Act. The BLM must complete an analysis to determine how much of the incremental amount of air pollution allowed in clean air areas (i.e., PSD increment) has already been consumed in the affected area and how much additional increment consumption will occur due to the proposed development. Without this analysis, the BLM is not ensuring that the air quality in the MPA will not deteriorate more than allowed under the CAA.	The new air quality analysis will calculate total emissions related to the plan using AP-42 methodology. These emissions will be compared to existing emissions. However, concentrations will not be calculated since dispersion modeling will not be used.
Megan Williams	76 11	The NO emissions from compression are based on the assumption that all gas compressors are equipped with the Best Available Control Technology (BACT) with an emission rate of 0.7 grams of NO per horsepower-hour (g/hp-hr). DEIS/RMP at	A discussion of Utah's BACT requirements has been added to the appropriate section.

**Table 5.10.c. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: AQ – Air Quality**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number	Comment Text	Response to Comment
		4-9. There should be a discussion of Utah's BACT requirements and whether BACT would apply to all compressor engines under current state rules. Because BACT determinations are made on a case-by-case basis, there is no guarantee that similar BACT emission limits will necessarily be required for every compressor engine. Therefore, the BLM needs to provide justification that the emission limits assumed for compressor engines will be similar to, and not less stringent, than those assumed for the BLM's Monticello DEIS/RMP inventory.	
Megan Williams	76 13	It is unclear from the SEIS/RMP to what extent the BLM quantified VOC emissions from oil and gas development. On page 4-14 and 4-15 of the DEIS/RMP the BLM discusses NO and CO emissions from flaring but there are few details of these estimates. The BLM must analyze VOC emissions from flaring and from other potential sources (e.g., from dehydration, well completion, leaking well heads and pipes, etc.). The BLM must analyze all sources of VOC emissions from oil and gas development.	AP-42 methodology has been used to quantify VOC emissions associated with oil and gas development in the revised air quality analysis.
Megan Williams	76 14	<p>The Monticello DEIS/RMP Does Not Include a Comprehensive Regional Inventory for Use in Determining Cumulative Air Quality Impacts</p> <p>In addition to a comprehensive inventory of oil and gas activities and other BLM-administered activities in the MPA, the BLM must inventory all pollutants from all other air pollution sources in the planning area as well as all sources expected to impact the same areas impacted by emissions from the planning area. The inventory presented in Table 3.4 of the DEIS/RMP for three sources in San Juan County does not constitute an adequate inventory of sources. The inventory of sources should include state-permitted sources in Utah and surrounding states, Utah Division of Oil, Gas, and Mining and Colorado State Oil and Gas Commission permitted oil and gas wells, the oil shale research, development and demonstration sites in Utah and Colorado as well as all reasonably foreseeable development</p>	<p>A summary of existing emissions in Grand and San Juan County has been updated using 2005 data. This will replace the estimates for 2002 currently in Table 3.4. The units of emissions are in tons/year as reported by the State of Utah. These data can be found at:  <a href="http://www.airquality.utah.gov/Planning/Emission-Inventory/2005_State/05_State_List.htm">http://www.airquality.utah.gov/Planning/Emission-Inventory/2005_State/05_State_List.htm</a></p>

**Table 5.10.c. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: AQ – Air Quality**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number	Comment Text	Response to Comment
		(RFD) sources (e.g., other NEPA projects, proposed power plants, proposed mining operations, future commercial tar sands development, etc.).	
Megan Williams	76 15	<p>Coal-fired power plants can often have significant impacts on a Class I area even when located 200-300 km or more away from that area. Specifically, the following power plants were recently permitted or are proposed in the region:</p> <p>The 1,500 MW Desert Rock power plant in northwest New Mexico (no permit issued yet)</p> <p>The 270 MW Sevier Power Company coal-fired plant in Sigurd, Utah in the Richfield PA (recently permitted)</p> <p>The 950 MW Unit 2 Intermountain Power Project in the central part of Utah near Delta (permit issued)</p> <p>The 600 MW Unit 4 at the Hunter Power Plant (PacifiCorp) in central Utah (no permit issued yet)</p> <p>The 110 MW Unit 2 at the Bonanza Power Plant in Uintah County in northeast Utah (permit issued August 30, 2007)</p> <p>All of these power plants have the potential to impact the same Class I areas that are impacted by the Monticello planning area and, therefore, must be included in the BLM's regional inventory. In addition, the BLM must include in the regional inventory any other new or modified sources, other than power plants, proposed in the region.</p>	Discussion of coal-fired power plants in the region has been added to the discussion of cumulative impacts for air quality.
Megan Williams	76 20	The BLM must also disclose the cumulative hazardous air pollutant (HAP) impacts to the exposed population. The BLM's assessment must be a cumulative one, not just an analysis of the incremental risk associated with the oil and gas projects, which would be imposed on top of existing health risks in the area. It should, at a minimum, include an analysis of the health impacts of the following HAPs associated with oil and gas development; benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, xylene, n-hexane, 1, 3-butadiene, formaldehyde and secondary	AP-42 has been used to estimate total HAPs emissions and compare to current HAPs emissions in San Juan County. HAPs have been added to the discussion on cumulative impacts.

**Table 5.10.c. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: AQ – Air Quality**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number		Comment Text	Response to Comment
			formaldehyde as well as diesel exhaust.	
Susan Dexter	77	2	To properly assess various alternatives and their impacts, it would be necessary to analyze green house gas emissions associated with each activity (mineral extraction, burning, ORV use, grazing, etc) Furthermore, the analysis would need to include, not just the levels of green house gas increases resulting from the immediate activity, but those of all the activities or processes supporting the activity, including the use of motorized vehicles to transport ORVs to the sites of recreational use; the use of motorized vehicles in grazing activities; the generation of electric power for mining and oil and gas extraction, and so on. These long term cumulative effects are not addressed, whatsoever.	Information on global climate change has been added to the PRMP/FEIS. The degree of specificity requested by the commenter would be purely speculative.

**Table 5.10.d. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: CUL – Cultural Resources**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number		Comment Text	Response to Comment
Environmental Protection Agency Region 8	1	18	AMS Section 3.3.1 should be corrected to state that while the Uintah and Ouray Indian Reservation is under authority of EPA Region 8, the Navajo Reservation is under the authority of EPA Region 9.	EPA Region 9 has been listed as the authority for the Navajo Reservation.
State of Utah	4	63	The RMP proposes avoidance areas around National Register-eligible cultural resources and specific 100-foot buffers (page 4-284 and 4-385). The state recommends that rather than stipulations of a standard avoidance distance that the RMP stipulate that avoidance areas will be established that will be sufficient to protect the resources from direct and indirect impacts.	The intent of BLM is not to require a specific 100-foot buffer around National Register-eligible sites but to require an avoidance distance sufficient to protect cultural resources. The final RMP/EIS will refer to the 100-foot buffer only under Alternative A since that is the current management prescription. BLM will add narrative to the proposed RMP to clarify that a specific avoidance distance will not be required.
State of Utah	4	64	It is unclear from the RMP (Pages 2-39, 40 and Table 4.18) what protective measures are proposed under the various	Under Alternatives B and C, the Hovenweep ACEC would be expanded 620+ acres from Alternative A , to a total of 2,418

**Table 5.10.d. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: CUL – Cultural Resources**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number	Comment Text	Response to Comment
		alternatives for Hovenweep National Monument, Square Tower (and potentially Cajon) Unit(s). Please clarify how potential visual impacts to the setting, feeling, and association of these units, particularly from solid and/or fluid minerals leasing and/or development, will be managed.	acres. The management prescriptions under Alternatives B and C would be the same as Alternative A (the 620+ acre addition would be managed as the "General Area Exclusive of Special Emphasis Zones"). Table 2.1., pg. 2-39 has been revised to clarify the specific prescriptions that apply to the 620+ acre expansion. The 880 acre visual protection zone around the Monument has been carried forward in the FEIS under an NSO lease category.  The total acreage shown on pg. 239 under Alternatives B and C for the Hovenweep ACEC should be 2,418 acres. BLM will correct the error.
State of Utah	4 65	With exception of the Alkali Ridge NHL, the Alkali Ridge area is listed under all alternatives as open for oil and gas development with either standard conditions or timing/controlled surface use conditions. The area appears to go from VRM Class III to VRM Class IV under all alternatives. The change in VRM Class appears to have the potential to result in adverse effects which will need to be analyzed during consultation on the RMP under Section 106 of the NHPA.	BLM understands its requirement to consult with the SHPO on the RMP and will comply. VRM class will remain as Class III for Alkali Ridge ACEC in the PRMP.
State of Utah	4 66	The Stipulation in Appendix A (Page A-5) for the Alkali Ridge area reiterates that an avoidance area will be established, but does not note whether this area will include consideration of indirect and cumulative as well as direct impacts to cultural resources.	BLM has reconsidered the stipulations for the Alkali Ridge ACEC and has rewritten them to include consideration of direct and indirect impacts to cultural resources.
State of Utah	4 68	Table 2.1 (Page 2-8). The state encourages BLM to clarify the purposes and types of land treatments that could be authorized in the Comb Ridge CSMA, specifically whether land treatments modify the NSO stipulation as well as what VRM class would apply to this area.	The Comb Ridge CSMA will be carried forward into the Proposed RMP as a recreation management zone within the Cedar Mesa Special Recreation Management Area (SRMA).  Most of the management prescriptions proposed for the Comb Ridge CSMA will apply to the Comb Ridge recreation management zone. Future activities within the recreation management zone would be required to comply with those management prescriptions, including NSO and VRM II management objectives.

**Table 5.10.d. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: CUL – Cultural Resources**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number	Comment Text	Response to Comment
			<p>Appendix A in the proposed RMP lists stipulations, including NSO and VRM II, that apply to surface disturbing activities within specific areas of the Monticello Field Office. The stipulations do not apply to non-surface disturbing activities as defined in the appendix. It is conceivable that non-surface disturbing activities could be allowed in the Comb Ridge recreation management zone. That determination would be made through site specific analysis of the proposal.</p>
National Trust for Historic Preservation	13 1	<p>The draft RMP shows little commitment to scientific investigation in the field office over 90% of which has never been surveyed. The draft RMP also contains inconsistent management standards for comparable cultural resources and lacks an alternative focused on their protection. The draft RMP proposes to designate and implement nearly 2000 miles of OHV routes without complying with Section 106 of the NHPA, 16 USC 470f, and with little recognition of its obligation to preserve and protect cultural resources pursuant to Section 110 of the NHPA, 16 USC 470h-2.</p>	<p>The BLM does show commitment to scientific investigation and proactive Section 110 inventory. The first goal outlined for Cultural Resources in Table 2.1, Page 2.8 states that the BLM would identify, preserve, and protect important cultural resources. Under the Cultural Resources Section, Table 2.1, Page 2-8, it states that BLM would provide for legitimate field research by qualified scientists and institutions.</p> <p>Line 2 under Cultural Resources Management Actions Common to All Alternatives will be modified to make specific reference to proactive inventory under Section 110 of NHPA and Section 14 of ARPA.</p> <p>Alternative B focused on management prescriptions providing additional protection to various resources including cultural resources. This alternative proposed establishment of special designations on certain areas of high cultural site density with management prescriptions designed to minimize impacts to cultural resources.</p> <p>The BLM will comply with its Section 106 responsibilities as direct by the NHPA regulations and BLM IM-2007-030 (Clarification of Cultural Resource Considerations for Off Highway Vehicle Designation and Travel Management). As described in BLM IM-2007-030, cultural resource inventory requirements, priorities and strategies will vary depending on the effect and nature of the proposed OHV activity and the</p>

**Table 5.10.d. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: CUL – Cultural Resources**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number	Comment Text	Response to Comment
			<p>expected density and nature of historic properties based on existing inventory information.</p> <p>A. Class III inventory is not required prior to designations that (1) all continued use of an existing route; (2) impose new limitations on an existing route; (3) close and open area or travel route; (4) keep a closed area closed; or (5) keep an open area open.</p> <p>B. Where there is a reasonable expectation that a proposed designation will shift, concentrate or expand travel into areas where historic properties are likely to be adversely affected, Class III inventory and compliance with Section 106, focused on areas where adverse effects are likely to occur, is required prior to designation.</p> <p>C. Proposed designations of new routes or new areas open to OHV use will require Class III inventory of the Area of Potential Effect and compliance with Section 106 prior to designation. Class III inventory of the APE and compliance with Section 106 will also be required prior to identifying new locations proposed as staging areas or similar areas of concentrated OHV use.</p> <p>D. Class II inventory, or development of field testing of a cultural resources probability model, followed by Class III inventory in high potential areas and for specific projects, may be appropriate for larger planning areas for which limited information is currently unavailable.</p> <p>The Monticello field office is developing a strategy for compliance with Section 106 for implementation of the travel plan consistent with BLM policy and budget allocations. The Utah SHPO was consulted on the Travel Plan in the DRMP, and further consultations will take place in relation to the strategy that is currently being developed for compliance with Section 106.</p>

**Table 5.10.d. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: CUL – Cultural Resources**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number		Comment Text	Response to Comment
National Trust for Historic Preservation	13	14	Under each alternative, BLM would, "in coordination with San Juan County" identify and evaluate historic trail segments for National Register eligibility. BLM must acknowledge that additional parties, Indian Tribes and USHPO have designated roles.	The statement that the commenter is referring to in Cultural Resources, Management Actions Common to All (Table 2.1, Page 2-8) has been modified to include and acknowledge the USHPO, tribes, and other interested stakeholders.
Lynell Shalk	29	9	<p>Cultural Resources - Issues:</p> <p>In the scoping section (Reference: 1.3.1.1 Cultural Resources, pg. 1-4 and 1-5, Vol. 1), the DRMP states that two of the "issues of concern" are:</p> <p>(1) "protection of sensitive cultural resources from vandalism;" and (2) "management of National Historic trails (Old Spanish National Historic Trail and Hole in the Rock Trail) in compliance with the intent of the enabling legislation so that the historic resource is protected."</p> <p>If these are issues to be addressed in the DRMP, then I could find no evidence that they were addressed. In fact, the exact opposite intention shows up a few pages later (Reference: 1.3.2 Issues Addressed Through Administrative or Policy Action, pg. 1-10, Vol. 1), which states that vandalism will be addressed by administrative actions and does not require a "planning decision to be implemented." So why is this listed previously as an issue to be addressed in the DRMP, if in fact, it isn't going to be?</p>	<p>The reviewer is correct in stating that vandalism is mentioned as an issue in Chapter 1, 1.3.1.1, page 1-5 and again in Chapter 1, 1.3.2, page 1-10. Vandalism is an issue addressed through administrative or policy action. The issue of vandalism in Chapter 1, 1.3.1.1, page 1-5 has been removed.</p> <p>Management of The Old Spanish Trail and Hole in the Rock Trail is addressed in Table 2.1, Page 2-12, under Historic Trails, Management Common to All Alternatives.</p>
Lynell Schalk	29	31	San Juan River ACEC: Under Alternatives B, C, and D (Reference: pg. 2-43, Vol. 1), one of the prescriptions is that there will be "no camping in cultural sites." I did not find this prescription anywhere else in the DRMP. Shouldn't all cultural sites be closed to camping? Shouldn't a camping restriction have been listed under the Cultural spread sheet in Vol. 1 under "Management Common to all Alternative?"	A prescription regarding camping within archaeological sites has been added to the Cultural Resources Section, Management Common to All Alternatives (Table 2.1, Page 2.8). No camping will be allowed within cultural sites.
EOG Resources	60	13	EOG objects to the proposal on page 2-8 and 2-9 to designate the Comb Ridge Cultural Special Management Area (CSMA) as available for leasing subject only to NSO stipulations under all	The BLM acknowledges EOG Resources objection to the Comb Ridge area as available for leasing subject to NSO. Map 29 has been changed to reflect the NSO stipulation for

**Table 5.10.d. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: CUL – Cultural Resources**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number		Comment Text	Response to Comment
			the action alternatives. See Monticello DRMP/EIS, pgs. 2-8 - 2-9, Table 2.1. First, EOG notes that although Alternative C proposes the same management as proposed under Alternative B, Map 29 (Oil and Gas Leasing – Alternative C) does not depict the Comb Ridge CSMA area as subject to NSO stipulations. The BLM must revise the management prescriptions on pages 2-8 and 2-9 to be consistent with Map 29.	the Comb Ridge.
CrownQuest	62	16	Additionally, the BLM should define "culturally sensitive areas" in the final Monticello RMP/EIS.	This definition has been added to the PRMP/FEIS.

**Table 5.10.e. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: GRA – Grazing**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number		Comment Text	Response to Comment
State of Utah	4	46	There is an apparent discrepancy in the number of acres unavailable for livestock grazing under all alternatives as indicated on pages 2-16 and 4-254. Please resolve.	Acreages for particular areas may vary slightly due to the differences in shapefiles for GIS calculations. The correct acreage figure is 128,098 acres to remain unavailable for grazing. Additional acres unavailable for grazing are added to this figure in each alternative. Acreage corrections have been made in the FEIS.
State of Utah	4	47	Under the No Action Alternative, BLM would make an additional 20,361 acres unavailable for livestock grazing. Please clarify why the No Action Alternative involves a change in current management.	The No Action Alternative implements a previous court decision pending final determination in RMP revision that closed grazing in several Comb Wash side canyons (Mule Canyon south of U-95, Arch, Fish, Owl, and Road). This decision closed 16,599 acres (pg. 2-92) (20,361 is incorrect). These acres are included in acres closed under the No Action Alternative, thus no change in current management (see pg. 4-70). The statement of additional acres unavailable on page 4-254 is incorrect as these acres are already included in the No Action Alternative acres. These errors have been corrected in the FEIS.

**Table 5.10.e. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: GRA – Grazing**

<b>Commenter Name</b>	<b>Record ID &amp; Comment Number</b>		<b>Comment Text</b>	<b>Response to Comment</b>
Lynell Schalk	29	7	<p>Grazing Acreage Inconsistency:</p> <p>There are two identical statements made regarding the number of acres "unavailable for livestock grazing for resource protection" within boundary allotments. One indicates 125,356 acres (Reference: pg. 3-41, Vol. 1). The other indicates 137,440 acres. Which is it?</p>	<p>Acreages for particular areas may vary slightly due to the differences in shapefiles for GIS calculations. The correct acreage figure is 128,098 acres to remain unavailable for grazing. Additional acres unavailable for grazing are added to this figure in each alternative. Acreage corrections and inconsistencies have been made in the FEIS.</p>
Lynell Schalk	29	8	<p>Grazing Allotments:</p> <p>Because there is no accompanying map depicting where each of the 75 grazing allotments is located, it is impossible to locate them based on the names used to describe them.</p>	<p>An allotment map with associated names for the Monticello Field Office has been included in the final Resource Management Plan.</p>
Tom Ratcliff	56	2	<p>In the final analysis, your "Livestock Grazing" section is incomplete and inadequate. Real issues of serious range management problems are not disclosed; a significant portion of the workload is dismissed by placement in to "custodial" management. Alternative A makes several grazing management changes, which is good, but which is not "No Action." Specific range management measures needed for range improvement are not disclosed, and in the end, AUM reductions between Alternatives are not significant, ranging from 750 to 940 out of a total program of 78,796 AUMs. (1% decrease at most extreme) The "Livestock Grazing" discussion is simply a justification for continuing business as usual. There is no significant change proposed, nor are there significant differences between Alternatives.</p>	<p>Alternative A is referred to as the "No Action" alternative which means continuation of current management (including action items) under the 1991 RMP.</p> <p>The purpose of the current RMP revision was to update the RMP to provide management consistent with changes that have occurred since completion of the 1991 RMP. Alternatives were designed to provide a range of actions to resolve issues brought out by public scoping and internal review.</p> <p>Please refer to response to comment 058-4.</p>
ECOS Consulting	58	4	<p>The DRMP's range of alternatives for livestock grazing is not adequate and must be expanded to include alternatives that prohibit grazing (0%), allow a small amount of grazing (15-25%), or more grazing (50%), or a lot of grazing (&gt;90%). As proposed -- with most of the area within the Monticello Planning Area open to the widespread soil and vegetation adverse</p>	<p>Alternatives for no livestock grazing and an increased allocation of forage to wildlife and other non-consumptive uses were considered for inclusion in the DRMP/DEIS. However, they were eliminated from further analysis; a discussion concerning these alternatives has been included in Chapter 2 of the PRMP/FEIS, Section 2.3, Alternatives Considered but</p>

**Table 5.10.e. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: GRA – Grazing**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number	Comment Text	Response to Comment
		impacts of livestock grazing, probably over 88% or approximately 1,800,000 acres -- it appears that the FLPMA mandates of "multiple use" and "sustained yield" are in jeopardy.	<p>Eliminated from Analysis.</p> <p>It is BLM policy to monitor existing livestock use levels, forage utilization, and the trend of resource condition and make necessary adjustments on an allotment or watershed basis. These actions are activity-based actions and are part of the implementation of an RMP to assure that Rangeland Health Standards are met, as well the other objectives of the RMP. Regulations at 43 CFR 4130.3 require that the terms and conditions under which livestock are authorized "ensure conformance with the provisions of subpart 4180," the Standards for Rangeland Health and further 43 CFR 4130.3-1 require that "livestock grazing use shall not exceed the livestock carrying capacity of the allotment."</p> <p>It would be inappropriate and unfeasible to estimate variable levels of livestock and wildlife use and determine what specific changes to livestock and wildlife numbers and management are appropriate at the RMP planning level. Such changes would not be supportable and need to be made by considering the monitoring data on a site-specific basis. The BLM policy directs that monitoring and inventory data be evaluated on a periodic basis and that change to livestock numbers and management be made through a proposed decision under 43 CFR 4160. These implementation level decisions will be in conformance with the Goals and Objectives of the applicable RMP, and must protect and enhance the conditions and uses of the BLM lands.</p>
Thomas Ratcliff	79 1	You provide no MFO allotments map, so the non-local reader/reviewer has no way to know where these "good allotments" are located!	An allotment map with associated names for the Monticello Field Office has been included in the final Resource Management Plan.
Thomas Ratcliff	79 2	Twenty-nine allotments are in your "improve" category; "may have serious resource conflicts (again undefined)...or resource production below its potential...can be improved, conflicts resolved through changed grazing strategies or range	An allotment map with associated names for the Monticello Field Office has been included in the final Resource Management Plan.

**Table 5.10.e. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: GRA – Grazing**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number	Comment Text	Response to Comment
		improvement projects" (which I assume would be "public investments"). NO MFO allotments map---we can't know where they are since we don't live there and know local place names.	
Thomas Ratcliff	79 3	At 3.7.2.5 you discuss Ecological Status of the allotments rated on a PCN scale. You'll need to correct some errors that occur in Table 3.13. You show 3.6% of your allotments at PCN. 4 allotments of 73 would be 5.5%; 3 allotments would be 4.1%. 3.6% obviously comes from a different data set!	The percentage figures are based upon an acreage total, not allotment. The title to Table 3.13 has been updated to "Percent of Acres within the Monticello FO Boundaries by Ecological Class."
Thomas Ratcliff	79 4	Without a MFO allotments map, we cannot properly evaluate the appropriateness of the prescribed grazing season. Similarly, we cannot determine if dormant season grazing (mid-October thru early March, based on our experience in your country) is occurring in big game winter range, or in other crucial habitat where livestock/big game conflicts most likely occur.	An allotment map with associated names for the Monticello Field Office has been included in the final Resource Management Plan. All grazing that occurs in big game winter range is under a deferred rotation system.
Thomas Ratcliff	79 5	AUM reductions between Alternatives are not significant, ranging from 750 to 940 out of a total program of 78,796 AUMs. (1% decrease at most extreme) The "Livestock Grazing" discussion is simply business as usual. There is no significant change proposed, nor are there significant differences between Alternatives.	<p>An alternative considering the increased allocation of forage to wildlife and other non-consumptive uses was considered for inclusion in the DRMP/DEIS. However, it was eliminated from further analysis; a discussion concerning this alternative has been included in the PRMP/FEIS under Alternatives Considered but Eliminated from Analysis.</p> <p>It is BLM policy to monitor existing livestock use levels, forage utilization, and the trend of resource condition and make necessary adjustments on an allotment or watershed basis. These actions are activity-based actions and are part of the implementation of an RMP to assure that Rangeland Health Standards are met, as well the other objectives of the RMP. Regulations at 43 CFR 4130.3 require that the terms and conditions under which livestock are authorized "ensure conformance with the provisions of subpart 4180," the Standards for Rangeland Health and further 43 CFR 4130.3-1 require that "livestock grazing use shall not exceed the livestock carrying capacity of the allotment."</p> <p>It would be inappropriate and unfeasible to estimate variable</p>

**Table 5.10.e. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: GRA – Grazing**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number		Comment Text	Response to Comment
				levels of livestock and wildlife use and determine what specific changes to livestock and wildlife numbers and management are appropriate at the RMP planning level. Such changes would not be supportable and need to be made by considering the monitoring data on a site-specific basis. The BLM policy directs that monitoring and inventory data be evaluated on a periodic basis and that change to livestock numbers and management be made through a proposed decision under 43 CFR 4160. These implementation level decisions will be in conformance with the Goals and Objectives of the applicable RMP, and must protect and enhance the conditions and uses of the BLM lands.
Owen Severance	105	2	The DEIS on page 2-17 opens Dark Canyon to grazing by not carrying this restriction forward in other alternatives. Why?	This was an oversight in the DEIS. Clarification has been added to the PRMP/FEIS specifying that Dark Canyon continues to be unavailable for grazing.
Nick Stevens	115	1	The information in the Draft EIS regarding range management is inadequate. Range allotments are listed however their physical location is not mapped.	An allotment map with associated names for the Monticello Field Office has been included in the final Resource Management Plan.
Linda Peterson	126	1	Under Alternative C you have eliminated grazing and limited livestock use to trailing in at least four or more canyons. (Moki, Harts, Lake and Indian Creek). Grazing is a traditional, historic use of these canyons. The Proposed RMP does not say why you are closing grazing in these canyons. Although the Proposed RMP does address the socio-economic impact of these closures on the livestock industry in San Juan County as a whole. It did not address the adverse economic or management impact that the closures would have on the individual grazing operators. Studies have show that proper grazing techniques can improve resources even in riparian areas. Grazing in these canyons should not be eliminated.	The BLM does not propose the permanent closure of allotments or portions thereof. However, certain allotments may not be available for grazing over the next 15 years. The allotments considered, as not available are spread by alternative. Subsequent revisions of the land use plan may consider opening these areas to livestock grazing.  The vast majority (over 98%) of the Monticello Planning Area is available for livestock grazing. For those limited number of allotments shown on page 2-16 of the DRMP/DEIS the BLM is proposing that other uses of the BLM land are the highest and best use of these areas. Both FLPMA and BLM's Land Use Planning Handbook authorizes BLM to close specific areas to livestock grazing to place an emphasis on these areas for other purposes or values, such as wildlife use, watershed protection, and recreation. As indicated by the variable uses of

**Table 5.10.e. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: GRA – Grazing**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number		Comment Text	Response to Comment
				<p>the BLM lands, as shown in the proposed action, it is BLM's intention to emphasize "multiple use" of the public lands within the planning area.</p> <p>As stated in the DRMP/DEIS (pg. 2-16), for those areas open to livestock grazing, grazing would be managed on an allotment basis according to the Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management to meet the Standards for Rangeland Health (see Appendix D), including duration and adjustment in season of use. This will provide the manager flexibility to adjust the permitted numbers of livestock, and the season and duration of use on specific allotments after the careful evaluation of monitoring and inventory data in full compliance with appropriate rules and regulations and BLM policy.</p>
Veronica Egan	131	5	Please provide maps with grazing allotment boundaries. It is impossible to determine who is the responsible permittee without this information, and rangeland conditions are generally in "functioning at risk" conditions, at best, on many allotments.	An allotment map with associated names for the Monticello Field Office has been included in the final Resource Management Plan.

**Table 5.10.f. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: LAR – Lands and Realty**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number		Comment Text	Response to Comment
State of Utah	4	55	Section 4.3.5. – Lands and Realty. The first paragraph of Impacts Common to the Proposed Plan and All Alternatives incorrectly states that acres within WSAs, the Grand Gulch Special Emphasis area, NSO areas, and areas closed to oil and gas leasing will be excluded to new ROWs. In addition, BLM should note that since such ROWs and accompanying development could degrade wilderness characteristics in WSAs, acquisition of inheld state trust lands by land exchange will be a priority of BLM.	<p>Narrative has been added to the text on these pages to clarify that the BLM has an obligation to grant reasonable access to inheld State lands in WSAs subject to Utah v. Andrus and the Interim Management Policy.</p> <p>Current BLM Utah State Policy is to give priority to State of Utah exchanges and such exchanges do not require a land use planning decision. Please refer to response to comment 004-52.</p>
San Juan County	7	25	There is no mention of Ute Indian lands in Table 1.1.	That error has been corrected in the PRMP/FEIS.

**Table 5.10.f. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: LAR – Lands and Realty**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number	Comment Text	Response to Comment
Utah State Office of Education	31 4	The Planning Issues Identified section should include discussion and detailed reference to the issue of inheld school lands in special designation categories, particularly WSAs, ACECs, and areas to be managed for "wilderness characteristics," and the need to give priority to resolution of the issue.	<p>The BLM does provide for reasonable access to all SITLA lands under all alternatives. Information has been added to Chapter 2, Lands and Realty, that states that reasonable access to state land would be provided including across BLM lands within avoidance and exclusion areas for rights-of-way as specified by the Cotter decision (Utah v. Andrus, 10/1/79). In addition, the Monticello DRMP/DEIS travel management plan recognizes the requirement to provide access to SITLA lands per the Cotter decision. Also, please see the revised analysis under Socioeconomics in Chapter 4 of the PRMP/FEIS. Considering lands for WSA or wilderness designation is beyond the scope of BLM's land use planning effort, as identified on pg. 1-12 of the DRMP/DEIS. Those Non-WSA lands that are considered for management of wilderness characteristics were analyzed for the economic effects of that action. For example, on pg. 4-94 of the DRMP/DEIS, the number of oil and gas wells foregone in Alternative B is discussed.</p> <p>The need for the BLM to give priority to state-federal land exchanges has been recognized.</p>
Public Lands Advocacy	35 11	We are also concerned that the DEIS fails to contain maps depicting the location of all ROW exclusion and avoidance areas by alternative. Maps clearly identifying exclusion and avoidance areas by category need to be included in the FEIS. It is also necessary for BLM to fully disclose the impacts these exclusion and avoidance areas will have on existing and future leases by alternative.	In the PRMP/FEIS, a map of exclusion and avoidance areas has been included. The analysis of the impacts these avoidance and exclusion areas would have on other resources is discussed in Chapter 4 of the PRMP/FEIS.
IPAMS(Independent Petroleum Assc of Mountain State	55 3	The BLM does not clearly identify which areas it intends to designate as ROW avoidance areas and which areas it intends to designate as ROW exclusion areas. It is not clear whether the BLM intends to designate lands closed for oil and gas leasing as ROW exclusion areas or ROW avoidance areas. IN Chapter 4, Table 4.25 page 4-65 indicates that areas closed to oil and gas leasing will be designated as ROW exclusion areas,	BLM has made changes in the document to identify these exclusion and avoidance areas and reconcile inconsistencies.

**Table 5.10.f. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: LAR – Lands and Realty**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number	Comment Text	Response to Comment
		<p>while in Chapter 2, page 2-16 it is indicated that areas closed to oil and gas leasing will be designated as ROW avoidance areas. The BLM must reconcile the management prescriptions in Table 2.1 with those set forth in Table 4.25 and clearly identify the ROW avoidance and ROW exclusion areas proposed in the Monticello RMP/EIS. In addition, the DRMP contains inconsistent statements regarding the number of acres that are proposed as ROW exclusion or avoidance areas between Table 4.25 and Table 4.41.</p>	
CrownQuest	62 18	<p>The Monticello DRMP/EIS, contains conflicting information about which areas the BLM intends to designate as avoidance areas and which areas it intends to designate as exclusion areas. On page 2-16, Table 2.1, the BLM identifies areas designated as NSO, unavailable for leasing, or VRM Class I as ROW avoidance areas. In Chapter 4 of the Monticello DRMP/EIS, however, the BLM identifies areas unavailable or closed for leasing as ROW exclusion areas. See Monticello DRPM/EIS, pg 4-65, Table 4.25. The BLM must clearly identify areas it intends to designate as ROW avoidance and exclusion areas, and resolve inconsistencies in the Monticello DRMP/EIS.</p>	<p>The Proposed Plan/Final EIS has a list of avoidance and exclusion areas. Right-of-way (ROW) avoidance and exclusion areas would generally be consistent with the stipulations identified in Appendix A for oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities. These stipulations have been developed to protect important resource values. Areas identified as NSO are open to oil and gas leasing but surface disturbing activities cannot be conducted on the surface of the land. Access to oil and gas deposits would require horizontal drilling from outside the boundaries of the NSO areas. NSO areas are avoidance areas for ROWs; no ROW would be granted in NSO areas unless there are no feasible alternatives.</p> <p>Areas closed to leasing are ROW exclusion areas.</p>
CrownQuest	62 20	<p>Although the BLM has mapped some ROW exclusion and avoidance areas under different headings, such as oil and gas leasing stipulations, the BLM did not provide maps that exclusively identified all ROW exclusion and avoidance areas.</p>	<p>The Proposed Plan Final EIS contains maps showing the avoidance and exclusion areas.</p>

**Table 5.10.g. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: MLO – Minerals and Energy – Locatable**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number		Comment Text	Response to Comment
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	2	37	Page 4-575 in Table 4.204. The table only depicts the number of acres of surface disturbance for oil and gas development (the following table includes geophysical exploration). Throughout the document, including this section, oil and gas has been included under the "Minerals" section that includes a number of other activities such as coal, tar sands, potash and salt, and uranium. Including acres in the tables for only oil and gas and for exploration within the "Minerals" section underestimates the total number of acres of surface disturbance. Acres of surface disturbance for other "Minerals" activities should be estimated and presented in this section.	Changes have been made to the document to analyze other mineral activities.

**Table 5.10.h. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: MOG – Minerals and Energy – Oil and Gas**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number		Comment Text	Response to Comment
Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance	26	34	The BLM must consider a no leasing alternative. The current draft of the RMP fails to consider such an alternative. Federal courts have made clear that a no leasing alternative should be a vital component in ensuring that agencies have all possible approaches before them (See, e.g., Bob Marshall Alliance v. Hodel, 852 F.2d 1223, 1228 [9th Cir. 1988]).	The BLM has inserted additional text in the proposed plan to address this issue. Refer to pg. 101, table 2.3, Alternative Elements Eliminated from Detailed Analysis.
Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance	26	82	The BLM must consider a no leasing alternative.	Please refer to response to comment 026-34.
EOG Resources	60	4	Page ES-7 contains Table ES6 which sets forth the numbers of acres that are open to oil and gas leasing with standard terms, open to leasing subject to stipulations, and closed to leasing under each of the alternatives in Monticello DRMP/EIS. Table ES6 represents that 213,288 acres will be open for leasing with	The BLM has revised its acreage calculations to reflect the changed management prescriptions in the proposed plan.

**Table 5.10.h. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: MOG – Minerals and Energy – Oil and Gas**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number	Comment Text	Response to Comment
		standard lease terms and figures elsewhere in the Monticello RMP. For example, on page 4-98, Table 4.41 represents that 213,290 acres will be open for leasing with standard lease terms and 974,463 acres will be closed to leasing under Alternative E. The BLM must reconcile its acreage figures in the final Monticello RMP.	
EOG Resources	60 18	Alternative E, in particular, is inconsistent with the National Energy Policy and Executive Order 13211, 13212, and 13302. The removal of vast areas of land from future oil and gas development and potential restrictions on both leasing and development under Alternative E would significantly restrict regional earnings, jobs, and tax revenue. According to the information presented in the Monticello DRMP/EIS, the adoption of Alternative E would reduce the number of wells that could be drilled in the Monticello RA by over 26% compared to the Alternative A, the No Action Alternative. See Monticello DRMP/EIS, pg. 4-136. Annual revenue from potential oil and gas production would also be reduced under Alternative E. See Monticello DRMP/EIS, pg. 4-344. The BLM cannot adopt an alternative that would reduce economic development, decrease domestic energy supplies, and harm the local tax base.	<p>The DRMP/DEIS in Chapter 4, page 100, states: " In accordance with BLM policy and its recognition of the National Energy Policy and Conservation Act of 2000 (EPCA), as discussed in Chapters 2 and 3, mineral resource development would be allowed throughout the planning area subject to standard terms and conditions, unless precluded by other program prescriptions, as specified in the RMP."</p> <p>The BLM expects that energy resource contributions in the Monticello Field Office will be very small relative to national production or even State production. Moreover, The BLM does not expect to see significant energy development (such as that experienced in Uintah Basin or parts of Wyoming) in the planning area over the life of the plan as described in chapter 4. Therefore, BLM does not expect large (similar to the other areas noted above) socioeconomic benefits or costs from these activities to national, state, or local communities.</p> <p>The BLM has expanded its discussion of fiscal impacts to state and local governments in Chapter 4 of the DRMP/DEIS.</p> <p>See also responses to comments 55-5, 60-52, and 62-64.</p>
CrownQuest	62 11	The BLM references a Memorandum of Understanding between the BLM and the United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service (Forest Service) establishing joint BLM and Forest Service procedures for managing oil and gas leasing and operational activities. See Monticello DRMP/EIS, pg. 1-16. The BLM should explain in greater detail the purpose and effect of this Memorandum of Understanding	Section 1.4.6 has been revised in the proposed plan to explain the purpose of the MOU in more detail.

**Table 5.10.h. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: MOG – Minerals and Energy – Oil and Gas**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number		Comment Text	Response to Comment
CrownQuest	62	70	In Section 3.8.1, the BLM identifies "shale" as a "low-energy mud" that occurs throughout the Monticello RA. See Monticello DRMP/EIS, pg 3-46. The BLM asserts that "[no information is available regarding past and present exploration, development, or production within the Monticello RA." The BLM should distinguish between oil shale, from which oil can be extracted, and shale formations, which yield natural gas. Shale formations exist within the Monticello RA. With advances in drilling completion technology, production of natural gas from shale formations is feasible. Additionally, because of the development of highly productive shale formations such as Barnett shale formation in Texas, shale recently has been the subject of increased interest among oil and gas producers.	In its preliminary review of mineral resources, the BLM considered "shale" as an industrial commodity similar to sand and gravel or other crushed stone. However, based on past development (or lack thereof) in the Monticello Field Office it was determined that the use of shale for industrial purposes has been minimal and therefore shale as an industrial commodity was not addressed in the Mineral Potential Report (MPR).  Because it was not addressed in the MPR, the BLM has deleted the reference to shale in Section 3.8.1.

**Table 5.10.i. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: MSA – Minerals and Energy – Salable**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number		Comment Text	Response to Comment
EOG Resources	60	40	In Section 3.8.1, the BLM identifies "shale" as a "low-energy mud" that occurs throughout the Monticello RA. See Monticello DRMP/EIS, pg 3-46. The BLM asserts that "[no information is available regarding past and present exploration, development, or production within the Monticello RA." The BLM should distinguish between oil shale, from which oil can be extracted, and shale formations, which yield natural gas. Shale information exist within the Monticello RA.	In its preliminary review of mineral resources, the BLM considered "shale" as an industrial commodity similar to sand and gravel or other crushed stone. However, based on past development (or lack thereof) in the Monticello Field Office it was determined that the use of shale for industrial purposes has been minimal and therefore shale as an industrial mineral material was not addressed in the Mineral Potential Report (MPR).  Because it was not addressed in the MPR, the BLM has deleted the reference to shale in section 3.8.1

**Table 5.10.j. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: OTH – Other**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number		Comment Text	Response to Comment
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	2	26	Page 4-423 (note: page and section numbers have changed since the last draft) in Section 4.3.15.1. In the second line, provide a reference in this section to Table 4.107 on page 4-435; check for similar places in the document for which a reference to another page will provide the reader easy access to further information.	The reference has been added in and BLM will check for other opportunities to reference other sections throughout the document.
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	2	34	Page 4-556 (note: page numbers have changed since the last draft) in Section 4.3.19.1. In the first paragraph, the document references Appendix O as providing a list of BMPs for reducing impacts on wildlife resources. Instead, Appendix O discusses wilderness characteristics.	Changes have been made to the document to reflect the appropriate appendix.
State of Utah	4	5	The Draft RMP/EIS does not include a discussion on the nature or type of threat of "irreparable damage" or the regional significance of relevant and important values in its review. BLM misinterprets irreparable damage when reviewing and analyzing ACECs in the Draft RMP/EIS. The ACEC tool was intended by Congress to be limited to only those instances where irreparable damage would be caused without designation. Most surface disturbing actions can eventually be repaired.	<p>The potential ACECs brought forward for designation into the Proposed Plan have gone through a rigorous and stringent process in accordance with FLPMA, the planning regulations at 43 CFR 1600, Land-use Planning Handbook (H- 1601-1), and in accordance with BLM Manual 1613 and ACEC Policy and Procedures Guidelines (45 FR 57318). Appendix H outlines the process the interdisciplinary team underwent to determine whether a nominated ACEC had relevance and/or importance values. The size of the proposed ACECs is limited only to the area(s) of geography where the relevance and importance values are manageable to protect and prevent irreparable damage to these resources.</p> <p>The potential ACECs carried forward into the Proposed Plan necessitate an ACEC designation because special management protection is necessary (outside of normal multiple-use management) to specifically protect the relevance and importance values within the areas identified. The special management prescriptions that have been proposed are narrowly tailored to protect the identified relevant and important values. For these reasons, the potential ACEC decisions carried forward into the Proposed Plan are</p>

**Table 5.10.j. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: OTH – Other**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number	Comment Text	Response to Comment
			<p>considered by BLM to be consistent with Utah Code 63j-4-401.</p> <p>A rationale for designating or not designating ACECs in the Preferred Alternative of the DRMP/EIS is found in Appendix H of the PRMP. Relevant text has been added to Appendix H of the PRMP/FEIS, which lists the threats to each proposed ACEC. These threats could result in irreparable damage to the area proposed for ACEC designation.</p> <p>The ACEC evaluation appendix was modified, and a section added to Chapter 2 discussing threats to the relevant and important ACEC values; however, whether the threats currently exist does not preclude a potential ACEC from being considered in the action alternatives. All nominated areas, where the BLM has determined to have relevant and important values, are identified as potential ACECs and are addressed in the action alternatives. Threats to relevant and important values are likely to vary by alternative. The PRMP/FEIS was revised from the draft document to better address potential threats and impacts associated with each alternative.</p> <p>On August 27, 1980, the BLM promulgated final ACEC guidelines (45 Federal Register 57318) clarifying the term "protects" – "To defend or guard against damage or loss to the important environmental resources of a potential or designated ACEC. This includes damage that can be restored over time and that which is irreparable. With regard to a natural hazard, protect means to prevent the loss of life or injury to people, or loss or damage to property." Thus, BLM is to consider the potential for both reparable and irreparable damage when protecting important historic, cultural, or scenic values; fish and wildlife resources; or other natural systems through ACEC designation. This interpretation is consistent with FLPMA's legislative history and implementing policy.</p> <p>Section 2 of the guidelines clarifies that ACECs are special places within the public lands. It states: "In addition to</p>

**Table 5.10.j. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: OTH – Other**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number		Comment Text	Response to Comment
				<p>establishing in law such basic protective management policies that apply to all the public lands, Congress has said that 'management of national resource lands [public lands] is to include giving special attention to the protection of ACECs, for the purpose of ensuring that the most environmentally important and fragile lands will be given early attention and protection' (Senate Report 94-583, on FLPMA). Thus, the ACEC process is to be used to provide whatever special management is required to protect those environmental resources that are most important, i.e., those resources that make certain specific areas special places, endowed by nature or man with characteristics that set them apart. In addition, the ACEC process is to be used to protect human life and property from natural hazards."</p>
Glen Canyon Group, Utah Chapter, Sierra Club	221	7	<p>GLOSSARY in Volume 3 should include many definitions from Attachment B to Appendix N, namely definitions for: Designation, Emergency limitations or closures, Mechanized travel, Motorized travel, and Non-motorized travel. Additional definitions should be added for: Road, Trail, and Route.</p>	<p>The glossary has been updated in the FEIS to include these terms.</p>

**Table 5.10.k. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: PRP – Process and Procedure**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number		Comment Text	Response to Comment
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	2	13	<p>The characterization and description of BLM lands and all Planning Area lands are used interchangeably within the between sections, causing confusion. Consistent use of one or the other would be beneficial, or otherwise provide both throughout. See page 3-42</p>	<p>Consistent use of BLM lands and Planning Area lands has been incorporated into the document to avoid confusion.</p>
National Park Service	3	9	<p>The Glen Canyon NRA Minerals Management Plan (1980) and the Glen Canyon NRA Grazing Management Plan (1999)</p>	<p>The BLM has added the plans to Section 1.4. The BLM was aware of the Management Plans at the time the DRMP/EIS</p>

**Table 5.10.k. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: PRP – Process and Procedure**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number		Comment Text	Response to Comment
Intermountain Region			should be added to the list in Section 1.4. (Relationship to Other Policies, Plans, and Programs) and further incorporate their contents throughout the DRMP as necessary.	was prepared and the information contained was used as appropriate. The commenter did not provide other specific deficiencies.
National Park Service Intermountain Region	3	11	The NPS suggested the following narrative be inserted where appropriate: [Glen Canyon NRA was established on October 27, 1972, under Public Law (P. L.) 92-593. In establishing Glen Canyon NRA, Congress directed that, "The administration of ...grazing leases within the recreation area shall be by the BLM. The same policies followed by the BLM in issuing and administering...grazing leases on other lands under its jurisdiction shall be followed in regard to lands within the boundaries of the recreation area, subject to provisions of Section 3(a) and 4 of this Act." The Monticello FO administers livestock grazing on six grazing allotments that occur on public land and within Glen Canyon NRA. In total, the Monticello FO administers grazing on approximately 264,267 acres of the recreation area. Specific management direction for livestock grazing in Glen Canyon NRA is provided for under the Glen Canyon NRA 1999 Grazing Management Plan.]	The BLM has inserted the narrative as follows: Page 3-41, 3.7.1. [Glen Canyon NRA was established on October 27, 1972, under Public Law (P. L.) 92-593. In establishing Glen Canyon NRA, Congress directed that, "The administration of ...grazing leases within the recreation area shall be by the BLM. The same policies followed by the BLM in issuing and administering...grazing leases on other lands under its jurisdiction shall be followed in regard to lands within the boundaries of the recreation area, subject to provisions of Section 3(a) and 4 of this Act." The Monticello FO administers livestock grazing on six grazing allotments that occur on public land and within Glen Canyon NRA. In total, the Monticello FO administers grazing on approximately 264,267 acres of the recreation area.] Management Common to All, page 2-17, "Specific management direction for livestock grazing in Glen Canyon NRA is provided for under the Glen Canyon NRA 1999 Grazing Management Plan."
National Park Service Intermountain Region	3	12	The 1984 Interagency Memorandum of Understanding on the administration of livestock grazing in Glen Canyon NRA should be added to the list of programmatic MOUs.	The BLM has added the Memorandum of Understanding to the list of programmatic MOUs, Section 1.4.
Lynell Schalk	29	1	The final section of Volume 3 has a section entitled "References, Acronyms and Glossary, and Index." In the Reader's Guide at the beginning of Volume 1, there is no reference to an acronym index, nor is it referenced in the Table of Contents, which ends with Appendix Q. Some acronyms used in the document are not even listed in this acronym index, such as the double meaning of ORV, i.e. off-road vehicle and outstandingly remarkable values (Reference: pg. H-91, Vol. 3).	Acronyms and Glossary is listed in the Table of Contents in Volume 1. Additional acronyms have been added to this list as they are identified.

**Table 5.10.k. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: PRP – Process and Procedure**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number		Comment Text	Response to Comment
National Parks Conservation Association	44	3	Maps 23-27 need to identify all national park units and their boundaries. Otherwise meaningful analysis of oil and gas development upon park resources is difficult to access. All alternatives appear to have standard and special stipulation leasing near or adjacent to park borders including Canyonlands NP, Glen Canyon NRA, Natural Bridges NM and Hovenweep NM.	The map has been updated to show National Park Service units.
BlueRibbin Coalition	54	1	<p>Regarding planning criteria in Section 1.3:</p> <p>The BLM would make all possible attempts to ensure that its management prescriptions and actions are as complementary as possible with other planning jurisdictions (both federal and nonfederal), subject to applicable law and policy.</p> <p>Similar management prescriptions would be considered on adjoining lands to minimize inconsistency. To the extent possible, inventories, planning, and management programs would be coordinated with other federal, state, and local agencies and tribal governments.</p> <p>Chapter 1, page 1-12 (note: page numbers have changed since the last draft)</p> <p>The term "complementary" should be changed to "consistent." BIM's FLPMA mandate is for consistency, not to be "complementary." Changing the term from the well understood term of "consistent" to an undefined term of "complementary" is in poor form. The consistency requirement is extremely important to state and local governments and is considered to be on of the key "pillars" of FLMPA.</p>	The word has been changed to "consistent" in the FEIS.
EOG Resources	60	23	The BLM must clarify the term "site specific NEPA." As the BLM is aware, all agency actions or authorizations are generally subject to the mandates of NEPA. See 42 U.S.C. 4332 (2006). Merely instructing that an action is subject to "site-specific NEPA" does not impose any obligation beyond that already required by federal law. However, NEPA requires that the BLM	The commenter is correct in that an activity proposed on sensitive soils may not necessarily constitute a major federal action requiring an EIS, solely based on its association with a sensitive site. The appropriate level of NEPA analysis is generally determined by the size and type of proposed activity, potential impacts, and resource concerns, as identified in

**Table 5.10.k. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: PRP – Process and Procedure**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number		Comment Text	Response to Comment
			prepare an EIS for any major federal actions that will significantly affect the quality of the human environment. 42 U.S.C. 4332 (2006). The phrase "site specific NEPA" may improperly suggest that all activities in sensitive soils are major federal actions that require preparation of an EIS. The BLM clearly did not intend to impose such an onerous and absurd result that would require the agency to expend significant time and resources before authorizing any activities in sensitive soils. The BLM must revise the phrase to clearly explain the amount of environmental analysis the BLM intended to require, if any, prior to authorizing activities in sensitive soils.	internal and external scoping. This section has been clarified to indicate that additional or site specific mitigation measures necessary to protect sensitive soils would be determined in site specific planning through the "appropriate NEPA process." Also a definition of sensitive soils has been added to the glossary. It was not deemed necessary to define "site-specific planning" in that this term is generally understood to be related to a specific project or group of similar activities.

**Table 5.10.l. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: REC – Recreation**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number		Comment Text	Response to Comment
State of Utah	4	72	It is unclear in Chapter 3 whether ROS classifications are carried forward as part of the action alternatives and whether ROS classifications will change by alternative.	The Recreational Opportunity Spectrum (ROS) will not be carried forward in any of the action alternatives. A statement has been added to Section 3.11.2.1 clarifying this. Management decisions will be based on special designations such as SRMAs, ACECs, National Historic designations, WSAs, ISAs, ERMAs, Wild and Scenic River recommendations, Non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics, etc.
San Juan County	7	40	Pg. 2-29 (note: page numbers have changed since the last draft). The first bullet concerning camping under management common to all alternatives seems to be in conflict with Alternatives A, C, and D. Please clarify.	The second part of the first bullet under Management Common to All Action Alternatives stating "Camping outside of the riparian corridor within this area would be limited to designated campsites only" is incorrect. Camping management prescriptions vary with each alternative. A change has been made in the document.  The camping management prescription for the proposed plan

**Table 5.10.I. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: REC – Recreation**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number	Comment Text	Response to Comment
			<p>is: Dispersed camping would be allowed in the Indian Creek Corridor, except within the established designated camping zones: Bridger Jack Mesa, Indian Creek Falls, and Creek Pasture. Camping within these zones is limited to designated sites.</p>
San Juan County	7 57	Section 3.11.2.1 – It is unclear whether the BLM is carrying ROS into the new RMP. ROS is described in the current plan and on Map 35 but there is no other analysis across alternatives. However, it appears that the primitive designation is used in effect to create "defacto wilderness" and VRM I areas smaller than 5,000 acres. BLM needs to clarify use of ROS in the Draft RMP.	The ROS has not been carried forward in any of the action alternatives. A statement has been added to Section 3.11.2.1 clarifying this. Management decisions will be based on special designations such as SRMAs, ACECs, National Historic designations, WSAs, ISAs, ERMAs, Wild and Scenic River recommendations, Non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics, etc.
Blue Ribbon Coalition	24 12	Arch Canyon does not warrant group size limits, it does not warrant a permit system for groups under 25 under current use levels.	<p>Letters from the USFWS concerning on-going issues with Mexican Spotted Owl habitat in Arch Canyon, and discussions in coordination with BLM and UDWR, are the basis for choices made by the ID team in evaluating draft alternatives for Arch Canyon.</p> <p>For Arch Canyon, the FEIS will not be requiring permits or group size limits for private use for any user group except motorized groups of 50 vehicles or more. Special Recreation Permits will be required for any organized or commercial groups.</p>
Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance	26 85	There is a restriction in Alternative E for car camping of more than 10 vehicles or more than 50 people before an SRP is required. This conflicts directly with the first limitation on group size of 15 people for overnight use in ERMA.	A change has been made in the document.
Lynell Schalk	29 26	The DRMP is inconsistent in its application of the "no pets" rule. In an area as sensitive as the canyons of Cedar Mesa where there has been documented damage by dogs, there should be tighter controls, not the same old ones. It is my understanding that the current requirement that dogs be "under control" in Grand Gulch is not working. They either need to be excluded or	In the proposed plan, a management prescription has been added to exclude pets and stock animals from cultural sites field office wide. It states "Domestic pets and pack animals are not allowed in cultural sites or on archaeological resources as defined in ARPA." Under the Cedar Mesa SRMA, the proposed plan will state "If resources or the visitors'

**Table 5.10.I. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: REC – Recreation**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number	Comment Text	Response to Comment
		on a leash at all times. The leash requirement is generally unenforceable once the owner is out of sight of BLM personnel. There should be exclusion of dogs in Grand Gulch, an area that is already too heavily visited by humans. In other less sensitive areas, dogs should not be allowed in or on archaeological sites.	experiences are adversely impacted, pets and or stock animals may be limited or prohibited in canyons requiring permits."
Broads Healthy Lands	41 12	Section 3.11.2.3 of the DRMP references "a growing level of conflict between motorized and non-motorized users of the planning area (see Section 3.10.4.3 below)." However, no such section exists in the document. Please locate this missing section and include it in the Final RMP.	A correction has been made in the document. It states see Section 3.11.4.3 – User Conflicts.
Bluff Landowners Coalition	48 3	Domestic pets are excluded from Outlaws Canyon/Lower Cottonwood & Butler Wash areas adjacent to our residences/properties under Alt. B, C, and D. The DRMP makes no mention regarding non-motorized/mechanized uses in this area (Reference: pg. 2-9, Vol. 1). Cows and bikes are allowed—including within archaeological sites—based on your proposals. As mountain bikes and cows cause more impacts than domestic pets, where is the sense in this?	The proposed plan will allow domestic pets into Outlaws Canyon/Lower Cottonwood and Butler Wash with the new restriction that they will not be allowed into cultural sites.  Section 4.3.8.9.2. – Mechanized Recreational Travel (Mountain Bikes) states the MFO policy on mechanized use. Under the preferred alternative, mountain bikes would only be allowed on routes designated open for motorized use.  The proposed plan states, "Available for livestock use but it may be limited if cultural resources are impacted."
EOG Resources	60 20	Cedar Mesa/Grand Gulch Plateau Special Recreation Management Area.  On page 2-25, the BLM proposes that under the action alternatives, the "Grand Gulch SRMA would be changed to the Cedar Mesa Cultural Special Recreation Management Area." Map 36, which depicts SRMAs under Alternative A, the No Action Alternative, identifies the Grand Gulch SRMA and not a Cedar Mesa SRMA. Map 36 does not comport with the management action on page 2-25, which suggests that the Cedar Mesa SRMA would still exist under Alternative A. On Maps 37-40, which depict SRMAs under the action alternatives, the BLM identifies a Cedar Mesa SRMA, even though the management prescription on page 2-25 suggests that this area would become the Grand Gulch SRMA. The BLM must review	The proposed plan now eliminates all CSMA's or C-SRMA's and proposed to manage them as SRMA's. The Cedar Mesa C-SRMA is now the Cedar Mesa SRMA and incorporates the Comb Ridge and McLoyd Moonhouse CSRMA's as recreation management zones within the Cedar Mesa SRMA. The acreage for the Cedar Mesa SRMA totals 407,098. The PRMP and FEIS have been updated to reflect these changes. Maps of the proposed SRMA's have been created and will include the new Cedar Mesa SRMA.

**Table 5.10.l. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: REC – Recreation**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number		Comment Text	Response to Comment
			the management prescription on page 2-25 and ensure that Maps 36-40 reflect the proposed management prescription.	
CrownQuest	62	19	The BLM identifies "developed recreation sites" as avoidance areas for ROWs. The BLM should clearly define the term "developed recreation sites" in the Monticello RMP/EIS.	Developed recreation sites both existing and proposed are found on Page 2-22 under Management Common To All Action Alternatives.
Mike Meloy	220	2	Concerning the San Juan River SRMA 4. 3. 10. 3. 10. 1 of the planning document on page 4-261 last paragraph it states: "The land on the south bank of the San Juan River is owned by the Navajo Nation and camping is currently not permitted." This statement is incorrect. The Navajo Nation permits camping on the river.	A change has been made in the document.

**Table 5.10.m. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: RIP – Riparian**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number		Comment Text	Response to Comment
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	2	9	According to Table 2.2, the Wildlife and Fisheries Resources impacts to Riparian Resources include "some loss of riparian vegetation from elk grazing." This impact should also be applied to Cattle Grazing.	The PRMP/FEIS adds: "Compliance with Standard 2 would minimize adverse impacts to riparian areas by requiring changes in grazing management wherever monitoring shows degradation of riparian areas when PFC is not achieved."
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	2	10	Beneficial or adverse impacts from beavers on riparian resources are not discussed in Table 2.2.	The oversight has been corrected and added into Table 2.2.
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	2	11	Minerals and energy resources are not mentioned as a source of impacts to the Riparian Resources in Table 2.2. Land disturbing activities can affect riparian areas; therefore, adding a no surface occupancy buffer around riparian areas would benefit the riparian resources.	This oversight has been corrected by adding a minerals section to Table 2.2 in the PRMP/FEIS
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	2	14	In Section 3.12.1, the first sentence of this section should be revised for clarity as the 1.2% describes the percentage of riparian acres within the BLM administered lands (of ~1.8	The correct figure is 20,912 acres (1.6%) of lands that are riparian and wetland resources within the Monticello PA.

**Table 5.10.m. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: RIP – Riparian**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number		Comment Text	Response to Comment
			million) rather than 1.2% of riparian acres within the Monticello Planning Area. Instead, the BLM administers ~70% of riparian acres in the planning area.	
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	2	15	If possible, in Table 3.24, indicate the acres and miles (by drainage) that are administered by the BLM.	The data provided are from a study done in 1990. The mileage and the acreage were calculated by drainage.
Tom Ratcliff	56	3	I have found an interesting issue related to this and other resource areas of discussion in the Draft. Riparian resources are discussed in at least Fire Management 3.4, Riparian Resources 3.12, and Vegetation 3.18 sections of the document, and of course at 4.3.11. Each of those sections has different and conflicting information. For example, Fire says that riparian habitat is "less than 1% of the MPA." Vegetation is more specific at "20,699 acres"... "only 1% of the FO"; Riparian Resources, at 3.12 claims approximately 20,435 acres (1.2%). And now the kicker: At 4.3.11 riparian acres are listed at 28,994, based on a GIS database. By my calculation that is about a 42% error factor over the lower figure.	The acreages and percent have been fixed in the PRMP: 28,944 correct acres/1785127 total acres=1.6% riparian Fire Management 3.4.5.9 – covers approximately 1.6% Riparian Resources 3.12 – The BLM administers approximately 28,944 acres (1.6%) of BLM administered lands of riparian and wetland resources within the Monticello Field Office. Vegetation 3.18.1.4 – Riparian and Wetland Communities. Approximately 28,944 acres of wetland and riparian areas exist in the Monticello FO.
Thomas Ratcliff	79	6	Riparian resources are discussed in at least Fire Management 3.4, Riparian Resources 3.12 and Vegetation 3.18 sections of the document, and of course at 4.3.11. Each of those sections has different and conflicting information. For example, Fire says that riparian habitat is "less than 1% of MPA," Vegetation is more specific at "20,699 acres"... "only 1% of the FO"; Riparian Resources, at 3.12 claims approximately 20,435 acres (1.2%).	Please refer to response to comment 059-3.

**Table 5.10.n. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: SCO – Scope**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number		Comment Text	Response to Comment
Grand Canyon	33	1	There is an omission of relevant information from the planning	BLM - Global climate change comment -- suggests changes to

**Table 5.10.n. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: SCO – Scope**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number		Comment Text	Response to Comment
Trust			document in the absence of any reference to global climate destabilization. Climate models predict that current trends of higher temperatures and reduced precipitation will continue in the Upper Colorado River Basin leading to a decrease in quantity and quality of river water and severe consequences for human, agricultural uses, wildlife and ecosystems. The MFO has already been affected by the prolonged drought. Soil disturbing activities such as cattle grazing, energy exploration and development and recreation have increased dramatically and these uses destabilize soils. Massive dust storms from soil loss deposit dark-colored dust on mountain snowpacks that absorb heat and melt too soon. Snowmelt storage in watersheds is reduced. The implications of these and other climate effects on management decisions on public lands are not adequately addressed in the DRMP. Modeling and technical information can be accessed from USGS and NOAA.	text in Chapters 3 and 4. Will this be done. A growing body of scientific evidence supports the concern that global climate change will result from the continued build-up of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere. While uncertainties remain, particularly in the area of exact timing, magnitude and regional impacts of such changes, the vast majority of scientific evidence supports the view that continued increases in greenhouse gas emissions will lead to climate change. This information was added to Chapter 3 of the PRMP/FEIS.  The EPA has not developed regulatory protocol or emission standards regarding global climate change. When these protocols and standards are available, the BLM will analyze potential effects to global warming in the NEPA documentation prepared for site-specific projects. All information to this effect was added to Chapter 4 of the PRMP/FEIS.

**Table 5.10.o. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: SD – Special Designations**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number		Comment Text	Response to Comment
CrownQuest	62	83	Under all of the action alternatives, the BLM proposes to designate the Alkali Ridge National Historic Landmark as subject to NSO stipulations and as a ROW Avoidance area. See Monticello DRMP/EIS, pg 2-35, Table 2.1. The BLM entirely fails to address the impacts on this proposed management action on oil and gas development. See Monticello DRMP/EIS, pgs. 4-114, 4-123, 4-132, 4-140. A pipeline borders, and perhaps may cross, the Alkali Ridge National Historic Landmark. The BLM's proposed management of the historic landmark will prevent owners and operators of neighboring oil and gas leases from accessing the pipeline,	Management prescriptions for the ACEC and NHL have been clarified in the PRMP/FEIS to note that exceptions would be granted to allow access to existing utility corridors for maintenance of existing facilities and construction of new facilities. Standard exception language to honor valid existing rights would also apply.

**Table 5.10.o. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: SD – Special Designations**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number	Comment Text	Response to Comment
		thereby impairing development of the leases. The BLM must analyze the impacts of the proposed management.	

**Table 5.10.p. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: SOC – Socioeconomics**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number	Comment Text	Response to Comment
State of Utah	4 25	BLM's decisions on how to manage its lands directly affect Utah's ability to manage state trust lands to provide revenue for public schools and other beneficiary institutions. The state believes the Draft RMP fails to adequately address two issues, 1) the impact of BLM management decisions on state trust lands, and 2) the need for a substantially more robust program for land tenure adjustments between the BLM and the State of Utah.	<p>Non-BLM lands could be indirectly impacted by RMP decisions both positively and negatively. The analysis in Chapter 4 of the PRMP/FEIS has been modified accordingly. For specifics regarding the impacts on mineral revenue, please refer to response to comment 120-101.</p> <p>The BLM does provide for reasonable access to all SITLA lands under all alternatives. A sentence has been added to Chapter 2, Lands and Realty, Management Common to All Action Alternatives, that states that reasonable access to state land would be provided including across BLM lands within avoidance and exclusion areas for rights-of-way as specified by the Cotter decision (Utah v. Andrus, 10/1/79). In addition, the travel management plan recognizes the requirement to provide access to SITLA lands per the Cotter decision.</p>
State of Utah	4 54	Section 4.1.2 – Assumptions and Methodology for Mineral Development. The RFD must address the fact that BLM withdrawals and special designations directly affect development of oil and gas on SITLA lands. The BLM should assume that, in addition to the loss of oil and gas wells on BLM lands, there will be an additional loss of wells on SITLA lands in proportion to the amount of SITLA land within the proposed special designation under each alternative.	<p>The RFD is a technical report that makes long term projections of oil and gas exploration, development, production and reclamation activity. It is neither a planning decision nor the "No Action Alternative" in the NEPA document. It provides the baseline projection of future activity assuming all potentially productive areas (including SITLA lands) are open for leasing under standard lease terms and conditions. The only exceptions are those areas designated as closed to leasing by law, regulation or executive order.</p> <p>The BLM acknowledges that closure of adjoining public lands</p>

**Table 5.10.p. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: SOC – Socioeconomics**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number		Comment Text	Response to Comment
				<p>to oil and gas leasing may have a potentially negative impact on SITLA's mineral revenue. The closure of WSAs is nondiscretionary, and is beyond the scope of this plan.</p> <p>Non-BLM lands could be indirectly impacted by RMP decisions both positively and negatively. The analysis in Chapter 4 of the PRMP/FEIS has been modified accordingly to reflect the impacts in Alternative E on SITLA inholdings of the discretionary closures of public lands. The number of oil and gas wells foregone on SITLA lands, and the loss of revenue from SITLA wells foregone have been calculated and added to the analysis in Chapter 4.</p>
State of Utah	4	56	Section 3.13 – Socioeconomics. BLM decisions to withdraw mineral lands from leasing (WSAs, etc.) directly affect the economic viability of state trust lands inholdings. This should be acknowledged appropriately in the discussion of socioeconomic impacts.	<p>The decision to manage lands as WSAs was made initially in the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (1976). Lands to be managed as WSAs in the State of Utah were identified in the 1980's. Any state trust land inholdings created by WSA management is beyond the scope of this plan.</p> <p>Those state land inholdings that are excluded from leasing as a result of the current planning effort have been specifically analyzed in the Socioeconomic section of Chapter 4. Please also refer to response to comment 004-54.</p>
State of Utah	4	71	The royalty payments for oil reported on page 3-132 (note: page numbers have changed since the last draft) exceed the sale value by more than one million dollars. Please verify and explain this anomaly.	BLM agrees that the production and royalty information on page 3-132 is confusing as presented. The information has been clarified and any erroneous figures have been corrected in the proposed RMP.
San Juan County	7	24	San Juan County commends the BLM for the effort that has been expended to better understand and portray socioeconomic impacts in this DRMP. This has been a weakness in previous plans. San Juan County encourages BLM to use studies done by Utah's universities to enhance this information such as the social survey undertaken by USU and the economic studies done by the U of U. Every NEPA action in the RMP should include a discussion on socioeconomic conditions and fully disclose all impacts.	<p>The BLM has reviewed the Utah State University survey of rural counties conducted by the State of Utah. The BLM received preliminary data for San Juan County after completion of the Draft RMP/FEIS. The BLM has incorporated findings in chapter 3 of the PRMP/FEIS as appropriate. In addition, an appendix has been added to the PRMP/FEIS which summarizes the results of this study.</p> <p>The recent research undertaken by the University of Utah's Bureau of Economic and Business Research on oil and gas</p>

**Table 5.10.p. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: SOC – Socioeconomics**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number	Comment Text	Response to Comment	
			<p>activities in San Juan County is not yet complete. The unexpected death of the primary researcher has slowed this effort. The BLM has extensively utilized data provided by the Utah Division of Oil, Gas and Mining in its economic analyses of the contributions of various industries.</p> <p>On a broad land use planning level, the BLM has disclosed the socioeconomic impacts from various resource actions as discussed in Chapter 4 of the DRMP/EIS. It is not practical to separate out the socioeconomic impacts of the many of the specific resource decisions specified in the plan.</p>	
Utah State Office of Education	31	6	<p>The BLM should assume that in addition to a decline in the number of wells drilled on BLM lands, there will be a proportionate decrease in the number of wells drilled on school trust lands. It can be assumed that a significant number of wells may not be drilled on SITLA lands if Alternatives B or E is adopted. All bonus, rental, and royalty revenues from these wells, at SITLA's royalty rate of 12% would be captured by the RMP decision to adopt Alternative B or E. This could amount to millions of dollars lost to the schools of the state of Utah. The State Board of Education cannot be supportive of any taking of school trust assets.</p>	<p>The potential SITLA revenues lost to Alternative E has been added to the FEIS. See Section 4.3.12.2.5.9. As stated in the EIS, impacts resulting from Alternative B would be similar to A given that the acres open for oil and gas development is greater under B than A by 0.3% and the total well potential differs by only 7 wells over the next 15 years.</p>
EOG Resources	60	5	<p>On page ES-8, the BLM asserts that Alternative B has the "potential for short-term adverse impacts to local economics and business that depend on public land for resource extraction." Elsewhere in the Monticello DRMP/EIS, the BLM defines "short-term impacts" as impacts that "result in changes to the environment that are stabilized or mitigated rapidly." Monticello DRMP/EIS, pg 4-6. In the analysis of the impacts of the alternatives in Chapter 4 of the Monticello DRMP/EIS, the BLM provides no justification to support its assertion that the economic impacts of Alternative B will be "short term."</p>	<p>The sentence on page ES-8 has been rephrased to state: "Alternative B would have potential for adverse impacts to businesses that depend on public lands for resource extraction."</p>
EOG Resources	60	38	<p>Monticello DRMP/EIS, pg 2-113, Table 2.2, This statement is completely unsubstantiated and misleading. The statement</p>	<p>The statement on page 2-113 has been revised to reflect the statement of 4-345.</p>

**Table 5.10.p. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: SOC – Socioeconomics**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number	Comment Text	Response to Comment
		<p>suggests that managing lands for wilderness characteristics under Alternative E may yield positive economic impacts that outweigh the negative economic impacts that will result from closing these lands to other resource uses such as oil and gas development. The analysis set forth in Chapter 4 of the Monticello DRMP/EIS does not support the conclusion that Alternative will yield positive economic benefits. The BLM provides absolutely no evidence to support its speculation that closing non-WSA lands to development will generate revenue for the local economy or, moreover, that any positive effects would offset the revenue lost by closing the area to oil and gas development. In Chapter 4, the BLM admits that it cannot quantify any potential economic impacts from managing additional lands for wilderness characteristics. See Monticello DRMP/EIS, pg. 4-345 ("It is difficult to predict whether the potential socioeconomic gains described above will outweigh the socioeconomic losses which could result from" managing non-WSA lands for wilderness characteristics.). Without such quantification, it is impossible for the BLM to suggest that closing lands for wilderness character may create positive economic impacts that will outweigh lost revenue from other resource uses such as oil and gas development. The BLM must revise its statement on page 2-113 to clearly state that the management prescriptions in Alternative E will result in lost revenue from oil and gas development and other resource uses, and that the BLM cannot determine whether managing lands as wilderness will ultimately yield economic benefits that will outweigh this lost revenue.</p>	
EOG Resources	60 51	<p>The BLM understates the impacts of the ROW exclusion designation under Alternative E. The BLM asserts that designating 582.357 acres of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics as ROW exclusion areas as proposed under Alternative E "could potentially have a minor adverse impact on socioeconomics." See Monticello DRMP/EIS, pg. 4-336. The BLM provides no justification for its proposition that impacts</p>	<p>Impacts to ROW exclusions are not expected to be major for the proposed plan based on the fact that the RFD for the overall planning area for oil and gas development is quite low (74 wells over the next 15 years). Alternative E could have increased adverse effects compared to the proposed plan, although not expected to be major given the low potential of mineral occurrence in the area. The proposed plan, as</p>

**Table 5.10.p. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: SOC – Socioeconomics**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number		Comment Text	Response to Comment
			would be "minor." By designating large areas of the resource area as ROW exclusion areas, the BLM makes oil and gas development more difficult and more expensive. The BLM must provide some justification for its assertion that designating these areas as ROW exclusion areas would result in "minor" impacts.	opposed to Alternative E manages far fewer acres as ROW exclusion than Alternative E. Further, existing leases will be granted ROW regardless of alternative selected. The PRMP/FEIS has been revised to further explain existing leases and RFD potential.
CrownQuest	62	72	In Section 3.13.4.2.2, the BLM acknowledges that San Juan has the highest unemployment in the state at 11% and that unemployment in consistently double or triple the state average. See Monticello DRMP/EIS, pg. 3-102. Similarly, in Section 3.13.4.2.3, the BLM acknowledges that per capita personal income in San Juan County has been consistently lower than the state average and was the lowest in the State of Utah in 2003. See Monticello DRMP/EIS, pg. 3-104. Despite these recognitions, many of the prescriptions in the Monticello DRMP/EIS would limit economic activity by restricting access to oil and gas development. The Monticello DRMP/EIS does not properly assess the effects restrictive land management decisions will have on the local economy, and the opportunities denied by severely restricting access to energy resources through a whole range of overlapping restrictions including wilderness-like designation of land, NSO, CSU, VRM, timing limitations, and others.	It is not the BLM's role to create (or decrease) employment opportunities in any one sector of the economy. The role of the DEIS is to assess the impacts of planning decisions have on various affected sectors, if any.  The BLM summarizes the minor costs and benefits associated with oil and gas development on local communities in Chapter 4, p. 429-436. The commenter's reference to the impacts such activities have had in other parts of the West is unlikely to apply to the Monticello planning area. The Reasonably Foreseeable Development (RFD) scenario for oil and gas projects that relatively few wells would be drilled, would employ relatively few people, and would produce negligible adverse social impacts. The commenter seems to be confusing the MPA with the large-scale development that has occurred in certain areas. The BLM's analysis is based on the RFD; the commenter has provided no evidence that the RFD is incorrect. Data show that less than 3% of the San Juan County's economy is dependent on oil and gas activities. This corresponds closely to BLM's analysis in Chapter 4.

**Table 5.10.q. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: SOL – Soils**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number		Comment Text	Response to Comment
CrownQuest	62	35	On pg. 2-49, the BLM proposes the following Management Common to All Alternatives: "Any proposed activities that would	Please refer to response to comment 60-23. In addition: Sensitive soils are determined based on maps and field

**Table 5.10.q. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: SOL – Soils**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number	Comment Text	Response to Comment
		<p>be located in sensitive soils (e.g., hydric, saline, gypsiferous, or highly erodible soils, Maps 41–47) would be subject to site-specific NEPA and would incorporate BMPs and other mitigation measures to minimizing soil erosion and maintain soil stability." See Monticello DRMP/EIS, pg 2-34 Table 2.1. This Management Common to All Alternatives must clarify what is meant by "sensitive soils." The parenthetical phrase following "sensitive soils" does not adequately describe what constitutes a sensitive soil. Similarly, Maps 44–47 do not refer to the types of soils listed in the parenthetical clause in this Management Common to All Alternatives. Although Map 44 depicts areas with "highly saline," "moderately saline," and "low saline" soils. Neither Map 44 nor the Management Common to All Alternatives in Table 2.1 clearly identifies which soils are subject to special management. In the final Monticello RMP/EIS, the BLM must clearly define and map any soils that are managed under specific prescriptions.</p>	<p>verification, as well as field data from research studies, rangeland health assessments, or other monitoring efforts. At this time the BLM does not have an accurate map of all the soils that would meet the criteria for sensitive soils within the planning area. NRCS maps provide broad scale planning soil information that generally must be field verified prior to implementing activities on the ground. This would be done during activity and site specific planning. The maps provided display published soil survey information depicting some of the characteristics that could lead to the determination that a project site may contain sensitive soils, in order to help plan and prioritize field verification efforts within a project planning area. A definition of sensitive soils was added to the glossary.</p>
CrownQuest	62	36 <p>Additionally, the BLM must clarify the term "site-specific NEPA." Merely instructing that an action is subject to "site-specific NEPA" does not impose any obligation beyond that already required by federal law. However, NEPA requires that the BLM prepare an EIS for any major federal actions that will significantly affect the quality of the human environment. 42 U.S.C. 4332 (2006). The phrase "site-specific NEPA" may improperly suggest that all activities in sensitive soils are major federal actions that require preparation of an EIS. The BLM must revise the phrase to clearly explain the amount of environmental analysis the BLM intended to require, if any prior to authorizing activities in sensitive soils.</p>	Please refer to response to comment 60-23.
CrownQuest	62	37 <p>Finally, aside from the management action that proposed activities located in sensitive soils would be subject to "site-specific NEPA and would incorporate BMPs and other mitigation measures to minimize soil erosion and maintain soil stability," the BLM does not appear to identify any other special</p>	The leasing categories were determined based on criteria such as ACEC designations, Floodplains, or Special Status Species habitat or special timing needs for wildlife. Soil characteristics or limiting factors were not used in determining lease categories. Tables 4.67, 4.72, 4.76, 4.80, and 4.84

**Table 5.10.q. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: SOL – Soils**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number	Comment Text	Response to Comment
		management to protect or preserve sensitive soils. In Chapter 4 of the Monticello DRMP/EIS, however, the BLM appears to analyze the imposition of special and NSO leasing stipulations to protect sensitive soils. See Monticello DRMP/EIS, pgs. 4-113 (Table 4.48), 4-122 (Table 4.52), 4-131 (Table 4.56), 4-140 (Table 4.60). The BLM must identify any specific management actions to protect sensitive soils in Table 2.1. Accordingly, the BLM must revise either Table 2.1 or the discussion of impacts in Chapter 4 to clarify which management actions it proposes to protect sensitive soils.	simply list potential acreages of soils with limiting soil characteristics within each of the leasing categories; soil characteristics or criteria were not used to determine leasing categories. However, based on the categories, the amount of "sensitive soils" that are potentially affected in each alternative differs. Language has been added to Chapter 4 to clarify this in Section 4.3.7.4.6. Impacts of Soils and Watershed Decisions on Mineral Resource Development.

**Table 5.10.r. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: SSS – Special Status Species**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number	Comment Text	Response to Comment
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	2 1	Remove Bald Eagle from Section 2.1.1.5 and check entire document to remove threatened status for Bald Eagle throughout. Recommend including Bald Eagle in wildlife section and retaining Conservation Measures of Appendix Q since the species is still protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and the Eagle Protection Act.	Entire document has been adjusted to correct the status from "threatened" to "special status species." The Bald Eagle is now listed on the BLM and Utah Sensitive Species List and is listed in that section vs. the wildlife section. Conservation Measures will be kept in Appendix Q to continue protection for Bald Eagles.
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	2 3	The conservation measures listed in Table 2.1 appear to be paraphrased items from Appendix Q. To avoid confusion, either replicates Appendix Q measures into this table, or at a minimum reference Appendix Q here.	The Conservation Measures listed in Table 2.1 – Special Status Species for Bald Eagle, Mexican Spotted Owl, Southwestern Willow Flycatcher, and Yellow-billed Cuckoo, Colorado River fishes, and California Condor has been removed from this table and will make reference to Appendix Q to avoid confusion.
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	2 4	Alternative C reduces the buffer around Gunnison Sage-grouse leks to 0.6 miles. FWS recommends CSU for oil and gas leasing activities within 2.0 miles of leks and that construction of permanent facilities be avoided within a 2.0 miles buffer around	Changes have been made to reflect BLM's suggested guidelines and those found in the Gunnison Sage-grouse Rangewide Plan. The year-round habitat is CSU which would avoid permanent

**Table 5.10.r. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: SSS – Special Status Species**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number	Comment Text	Response to Comment
		leks, unless it can be shown to not affect sage-grouse.	structures. Other suggested management practices will be implemented and came directly from the Gunnison Sage-grouse Rangewide Conservation Plan, which BLM has committed to implement.
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	2 16	Section 3.16. The third line limits additional sensitive species to plants; however, the second paragraph more accurately includes the numerous species of animals also identified as sensitive.	The sentence has been changed to read, "Under the Endangered Species Act, as well as those plant AND ANIMAL species listed or proposed as sensitive by the BLM."
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	2 17	Section 3.16.2. In Utah, Mexican Spotted Owl habitat does not include high canopy closure, high stand density and multi-layered canopies of uneven-aged stands.	These habitat descriptions have been removed from this section.
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	2 21	Table 4.137. The entire state of Utah is not within the nonessential, experimental boundary of the condor. A small portion of San Juan County is outside of the nonessential, experimental boundary. Update the RMP for accuracy.	The Table 4.106 has been changed to show that the entire state of Utah is not within the nonessential, experimental boundary of the California Condor.
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	2 27	Section 4.3.15.1(of the DEIS). In the first paragraph, recovery plans for all species should be referenced here, not just the Southwestern Willow Flycatcher plan.	Other recovery plans have been added and referenced.
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	2 30	Section 4.3.15.3.6.1. Rocky Slopes and Canyons: The statement, "Direct, adverse impacts include short-term disturbance of... special status species resulting from construction and operation noise, and a long-term reduction in habitat from the installation of mineral development infrastructure" should be applied to all habitats and alternatives, not just the rocky slopes and canyons habitat.	The statement has been added into the riparian habitat. The same impacts are discussed in the Desert Shrub, Sagebrush, Perennial Grassland, Pinyon-Juniper Woodland, and Conifer/Mountain Shrub habitats on Page 4-437 although it is not worded exactly the same.
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	2 31	Section 4.3.15.2.6.3. The decision that "No Gunnison Sage-grouse habitat would be closed or NSO to mineral entry" does not adequately protect this species. Need to provide additional protection of leks by limiting surface occupancy for minerals and other ground disturbing activities would help preserve sage-grouse.	Changes have been made to the document and the lek habitat will be protected from all surface-disturbing activities by being closed and classified as NSO.
U.S. Fish and	2 32	Section 4.3.15.2.12.2. (of the DEIS) Alternatives B and E would	Adjustments have been made to the alternatives for Gunnison

**Table 5.10.r. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: SSS – Special Status Species**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number	Comment Text	Response to Comment
Wildlife Service		result in fewer adverse impacts on Gunnison Sage-grouse and other sagebrush special status species than the preferred alternative. We recommend these be applied to sage-grouse.	Sage-grouse to ensure they are protected according to the Gunnison Sage-grouse Rangewide Conservation Plan.
State of Utah	4	10	The term critical has been reserved to Threatened and Endangered (T &E) species. Corrections in the text have been made in the PRMP/FEIS. For non-T&E species the BLM relied on the UDWR crucial habitat designations.
Grand Canyon Trust	33	3	Under Table 2.1 – Summary Table of Alternative Gunnison Sage Grouse we recommend protection of lek habitat within 2 miles of active strutting grounds and year-round habitat protection within 6 miles of active strutting grounds (Alternatives "B" and "E"). This recommendation is based on USFWS assertion that a 5-mile buffer around lek sites is necessary. The USFWS based their recommendation for sage-grouse on Connelly et al. (2000) "Specifically, for non-migratory populations occupying habitats that are uniformly distributed, protect sagebrush and herbaceous understory within 2 miles of all occupied leks. For non-migratory populations, leks should be considered the center of year round activity and treated as focal points for management activities. For non-migratory populations where sagebrush is not uniformly distributed, suitable habitats should all be protected out to 3.1 miles from all occupied leks. For migratory populations of sage-grouse, breeding habitats within 11.2 miles of active leks should be protected recognizing that birds may move more than 11.2 miles from leks to nest sites."
Public Lands Advocacy	35	8	Table 2.1, the DEIS identifies several restrictions designed to protect the Bald Eagle as listed under the Endangered Species Act (ESA). The Bald Eagle was removed by the USFWS from the T&E list last July. Further, it is not listed as a sensitive species by the Utah BLM State Office. In fact, the USFWS has already proposed new regulations that authorize a "take" of the Bald Entire document has been adjusted to correct the status from "threatened" to "special status species." The Bald Eagle is now listed on the BLM and Utah Sensitive Species List and has been listed in that section vs. the wildlife section. Conservation Measures have been kept in Appendix Q to continue protection for Bald Eagles.

**Table 5.10.r. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: SSS – Special Status Species**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number	Comment Text	Response to Comment
		Eagle in accordance with the criteria listed in the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act. Therefore, the FEIS must recognize that protection of the Bald Eagle is subject only to that described in the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act of 1940 and remove the restrictions identified in the DEIS.	
Public Lands Advocacy	35 9	<p>Table 2-1 indicates that sage-grouse lek habitat will be protected within 0.6 miles of an active strutting ground and that new oil and gas leases will be subject to a controlled surface use (CSU) stipulation under Alternative C. Under Alternative B the protection zone would be 2 miles, while under Alternative D it would be .25 of a mile. Additionally, BLM has identified a 6-mile year-round habitat buffer in which oil and gas operators would be required to utilize Suggested Management Practices listed in the Gunnison Sage-grouse Range-wide Conservation Plan. BLM indicates that these restrictions are based upon best available scientific information, i.e., National Sage-grouse Habitat Conservation Strategy: Strategic Management Plan for Sage-grouse (BLM 2004d), WAFWA Conservation Assessment of Greater Sage-grouse and Sagebrush Habitats (Connelly et al. 2004), and the Gunnison Sage-grouse Range-wide Conservation Plan (2005, as revised).</p> <p>In reviewing the DEIS, we can find no description of the documents referenced nor any analysis or justification regarding the need for any buffer zones around strutting grounds in the MFO. Nor can we find any maps that illustrate where restrictions would be imposed, making it impossible to discern the impacts to future oil and gas development. Maps 74 through 77 fail to identify the specific of sage-grouse species depicted and they fail to outline what BLM considers "crucial year-round habitat," as discussed on page 2-53 (note: page numbers have changed since the last draft).</p>	Changes have been made to the proposed plan that make the protection measure more consistent with the Gunnison Sage-grouse Rangewide Conservation Plan as listed in Table 2.1. Changes have also been made to the maps to clearly show where the proposed stipulations would be. Lek sites are not specifically mapped since they do change from year to year and those will be analyzed on a site-specific basis.
Public Lands Advocacy	35 10	In our experience in reviewing RMP DEIS, most BLM office's that manage sage grouse habitat have limited the buffer to .25 mile around active leks. The proposals in Preferred Alternative	Changes have been made to the proposed plan to protect the Gunnison Sage-grouse as suggested in the Gunnison Sage-grouse Rangewide Conservation Plan. This plan was

**Table 5.10.r. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: SSS – Special Status Species**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number	Comment Text	Response to Comment
		<p>C and Alternative B are excessive and have no supporting scientific foundation. We do not support the unsubstantiated 6-mile year-round radius around Sage grouse leks because it has no scientific basis.</p> <p>The suggested 0.6-mile and 2-mile buffers lack empirical support.</p>	<p>developed with the best available science.</p>
<p>The Nature Conservancy</p>	<p>49 2</p>	<p>We urge that the language in the Final RMP pertaining to the necessary commitment to the protection and sustaining of SSS be stronger.</p> <p>—Under 2.1.1.5 – Special Status Species. The DRMP states that "Land use plan decisions should be consistent with..." various mandates, plans and agreements for T and E species. A stronger and more accurate statement to put into the Final RMP is that "Land use plan decision must be consistent with..." those mandates and agreements etc.</p> <p>—We suggest adding a statement pertaining to allowing and participating in research of threatened and endangered and Sensitive species and their habitats.</p> <p>—"The protection of species and potential and/or occupied habitat for special status species would be considered and implemented prior to any authorization or action by the BLM that could alter or disturb such habitat." While it is fine to consider such SSS habitat protection, the BLM needs to give primacy to the conservation of SSS in such cases -- not necessarily a wholesale halting or precluding of other valid uses of public lands, but fine-scale design of such uses so as to be compatible with the priority of maintaining SSS habitats/occurrences.</p> <p>—A second point states that "No management action would be permitted on BLM lands that would jeopardize the continued existence of species that are listed, proposed for listing, or</p>	<p>Chapter 2 shows the summary of proposed actions. Terms such as "should and would" are appropriate in this chapter since the decision has not been made yet. It is simply proposed.</p> <p>Please refer to Table 2.1 under Management Common to All Alternatives: "Inventories and monitoring studies would be conducted in order to determine special status plant and animal species locations, potential habitat, population dynamics, and existing and potential threats. BLM has added another sentence to this that states, 'Monitoring protocols established by U.S. Fish and Wildlife and Utah Division of Wildlife Resources would be used.'</p> <p>Wording is changed on Page 2-51 to state, "No management action would be permitted on BLM lands that would jeopardize the continued existence of species that are listed, proposed for listing, or candidates for listing under the Endangered Species Act and BLM State Director's sensitive plant and animal species as required by the BLM Manual 6840."</p>

**Table 5.10.r. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: SSS – Special Status Species**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number	Comment Text	Response to Comment
		<p>candidates for listing under the Endangered Species Act." Give that BLM Manual 6840.06E and the DRMP provide sensitive species with (at least) the same level of protections candidate species, then we would clarify this statement in the Final RMP to be applicable to BLM Sensitive species as well.</p> <p>—A following point states that "Inventories and monitoring studies would be conducted in order to determine special status species locations, potential habitat, population dynamics, and existing and potential threats." However, the DRMP does not specify the use of the appropriate protocols for such inventories and monitoring. A statement should be added indicating that the BLM will use protocols established for individual species.</p> <p>—A following point states that "BLM would support and implement the guidelines and management recommendations presented in species recovery or conservation plans (as updated), or alternative management strategies developed in consultation with USFWS." A stronger and more accurate statement in the Final RMP would be "the BLM will support, follow and implement current and future special status plant and animal species Recovery Plans, Conservation Plans, Strategies, and Agreements..."</p>	
EOG Resources	60	26 Because the Bald Eagle is no longer protected by the Endangered Species Act, the Act does not require the BLM to consult with the USFWS prior to authorizing activities that may affect the Bald Eagle or its habitat. The BLM accordingly must revise these management actions. In light of the Bald Eagle's changed status, the BLM must not impose the restrictive management measures identified on page 2-51 (note: page numbers have changed since the last draft).	Entire document has been adjusted to correct the status from "threatened" to "special status species." The Bald Eagle is now listed on the BLM and Utah Sensitive Species List and has been listed in that section vs. the wildlife section. Conservation Measures have been kept in Appendix Q to continue protection for Bald Eagles.
EOG Resources	60	27 Although Maps 74–77 purport to identify "sage-grouse habitat," these maps are unclear and unhelpful. First, the maps do not specify which species of sage-grouse they identify—Gunnison sage-grouse or greater sage-grouse. Second, the maps do not	As discussed in Chapter 3, there are only Gunnison Sage-grouse within the Monticello Field Office planning area. BLM has revised the sage-grouse maps to define the entire sage-grouse habitat, not just the BLM parcels within the

**Table 5.10.r. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: SSS – Special Status Species**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number	Comment Text	Response to Comment	
		define what the BLM considers "sage-grouse habitat," which could include active strutting ground, "crucial year-round habitat" as defined on page 2-53 (note: page numbers have changed since the last draft). The BLM must revise Maps 74-77 to clearly describe the sage-grouse habitat that is mapped.	habitat.	
EOG Resources	60	28	Under all of the action alternatives, the BLM proposed to prohibit or avoid the construction of "power lines and other tall structures" within various distances of sage-grouse habitat or strutting grounds. See Monticello DRMP/EIS, pg 2-53. EOG objects to this proposed management action, for several reasons. First, the BLM must clarify what "tall structures" it intends to prohibit by providing, for example, a height limit defining what it perceives as "tall." Without such clarification, this management action does not clearly identify for both land managers and users of the public lands what structures are prohibited.	Definition of what tall structures are has been added to the document that says, "Prohibit construction of power lines or other tall structures (structures above 10 feet, such as windmills or buildings) year-round.
EOG Resources	60	30	Under all of the action alternatives, the BLM would prohibit or avoid the construction of new fences within specified distances of active strutting grounds. See Monticello DRMP/EIS, pg. 2-53. The BLM must not prohibit all fences near active strutting grounds. Rather, the BLM should exempt fences around disposal pits associated with oil and gas operations. The Utah Division of Oil, Gas, and Mining requires operators to fence disposal pits to protect wildlife and livestock. See Utah Admin. Code Rule 649-9-3 (2008). The BLM must revise this management action to allow fences around disposal pits or, at a minimum, to provide the BLM with discretion to waive a prohibition against fences where required to protect wildlife and livestock.	Wording has been changed to clarify to uses allowed within the specified distances of active strutting grounds, including NSO for oil and gas leasing activities.  Disposal pits associated with oil and gas operation would not be developed within these distances of active strutting grounds, therefore these fences would not need to be exempt.
EOG Resources	60	41	The BLM incorrectly identifies the Bald Eagle, <i>Haliaeetus leucocephalus</i> , as a threatened species in the Monticello DRMP/EIS. See Monticello DRMP/EIS, pg 3-141. The Bald Eagle was removed from the Federal List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife by the USFWS on July 9, 2007. See 72 Fed. Reg. 37346 (July 9, 2007). Furthermore, the Bald Eagle	Entire document has been adjusted to correct the status from "threatened" to "special status species." Bald Eagle is now listed on the BLM and Utah Sensitive Species List and has been listed in that section vs. the wildlife section. Conservation Measures have been kept in Appendix Q to continue

**Table 5.10.r. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: SSS – Special Status Species**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number	Comment Text	Response to Comment
		<p>was not listed or identified as a candidate for listing on the USFWS's most recent list of candidate species. See 72 Fed. Reg. 69034 (Dec. 6, 2007). Notably, the Bald Eagle does not appear on the Utah BLM's list of special status species. See State-listed and BLM-listed Sensitive Species, <a href="http://www.ut.blm.gov/vernalrmpguide/state_blm_species.htm">http://www.ut.blm.gov/vernalrmpguide/state_blm_species.htm</a> (last visited January 17, 2008). The BLM should correct the information in the Final EIS and remove the Bald Eagle from its discussion of threatened and endangered species.</p>	<p>protection for Bald Eagles.</p>
EOG Resources	60 48	<p>The area over which the CSU stipulations apply varies by alternative, with Alternatives B and E applying to CSU stipulation within 2 miles of active strutting ground, Alternative C applying to CSU stipulations within 0.6 miles of active strutting ground, and Alternative D applying in CSU stipulation within 0.25 miles of active strutting ground. The BLM does not identify the number of acres that will be subject to the CSU stipulations under the various alternatives.</p>	<p>The acres are identified on Page 2-53 directly under each Alternative. The map in the appendix has been adjusted to make this clearer.</p>
EOG Resources	60 49	<p>In Section 4.3.7.4.8.6, the BLM fails to disclose the significant impacts of its management action to protect migratory bird habitat during nesting season on oil and gas development. See Monticello DRMP/EIS, pg. 4-95 (note: page numbers have changed since the last draft). The BLM has not explained why such restrictions are necessary. These restrictions are not required by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918, which permits disruptive activities in certain circumstances. 16 U.S.C. 703--712 (2006). The BLM must revise its proposed management action to ensure it is the least restrict necessary to protect the resource.</p>	<p>Although the Executive Order 13186 or the Migratory Bird Treaty Act does not state specifically what type of measures should be taken on surface disturbing activities, it is BLM's responsibility to decide how we are going to protect nesting habitat for migratory bird and by avoiding or minimizing surface disturbing activities during nesting season, the BLM is protecting migratory birds as mandated.</p> <p>By using the term "avoid," the BLM would consider on a case by case basis to allow a surface disturbing project if there is no reasonable alternative. At that time the activity would be done to minimize the impacts to migratory birds. BLM has added the words "or minimize" behind "avoid" to clarify this.</p> <p>As stated in Section 4.3.7.4.8.3, "This in turn would result in impacts on mineral resource development similar to those described for Bald Eagle." Please refer to page 4-92 for a more detailed description of the impacts to oil and gas.</p>

**Table 5.10.r. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: SSS – Special Status Species**

<b>Commenter Name</b>	<b>Record ID &amp; Comment Number</b>		<b>Comment Text</b>	<b>Response to Comment</b>
CrownQuest	62	42	Despite statements elsewhere in the Monticello DRMP/EIS, the Bald Eagle is not a threatened or endangered species. The Bald Eagle was removed from the Federal List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) on July 9, 2007. Furthermore, the Bald Eagle was not listed or identified as a candidate for listing on the USFWS's most recent list of candidate species. Finally, the Bald Eagle does not appear on the Utah BLM's list of special status species.	Entire document has been adjusted to correct the status from "threatened" to "special status species." The Bald Eagle is now listed on the BLM and Utah Sensitive Species List and has been listed in that section vs. the wildlife section. Conservation Measures have been kept in Appendix Q to continue protection for Bald Eagles.
CrownQuest	62	43	As part of several of the Bald Eagle management actions listed, the BLM proposes consultation with the USFWS pursuant to Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act. Section 7 consultation is only required when an action may affect a threatened or endangered species. 16 U.S.C. 1536(a) (2006); 50 C.F.R. 402.14(2007). Because the Bald Eagle is no longer protected by the Endangered Species Act, the Act does not require the BLM to consult with the USFWS prior to authorizing activities that may affect the Bald Eagle or its habitat. The BLM accordingly must revise these management actions.	The entire document has been adjusted to correct the status from "threatened" to "special status species." The Bald Eagle is now listed on the BLM and Utah Sensitive Species List and is listed in that section as opposed to the wildlife section. Conservation Measures will be kept in Appendix Q to continue protection for Bald Eagles; consultation is no longer required for Bald Eagles.
CrownQuest	62	46	The Monticello DRMP/EIS does not include any maps indicating the areas subject to restrictions identified on pages 2-53 and 2-54 (note: page numbers have changed since the last draft). Without maps identifying areas subject to Gunnison sage-grouse management, CrownQuest cannot determine the extent to which the BLM's proposed management actions affect CrownQuest's operations. The final Monticello RMP/EIS should include maps depicting the areas subject to Gunnison sage-grouse management restrictions.	Maps have been added to show the Gunnison Sage-grouse management areas.
CrownQuest	62	47	Although Maps 74–76 purport to identify "sage-grouse habitat," these maps are unclear and unhelpful. First, the maps do not specify which species of sage-grouse they identify—Gunnison Sage-grouse or Greater Sage-grouse. Second, the maps do not define what the BLM considers "sage-grouse habitat," which	Maps have been added to show the Gunnison Sage-grouse habitat. The Lek sites are not specifically mapped since the number and location of the sites change from year to year.

**Table 5.10.r. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: SSS – Special Status Species**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number	Comment Text	Response to Comment	
		could include active strutting ground, "crucial year-round habitat" as defined on pg. 2-53 of the Monticello DRMP/EIS, or "year-round habitat" as defined on pg. 2-53. The BLM must revise Maps 74–76 to clearly describe the sage-grouse habitat that is mapped.		
CrownQuest	62	73	The BLM incorrectly identifies the Bald Eagle, <i>Haliaeetus leucocephalus</i> , as a threatened species in the Monticello DRMP/EIS. See Monticello DRMP/EIS, pg. 3-141. The Bald Eagle was removed from the Federal List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife by the USFWS on July 9, 2007. See 72 Fed. Reg. 37346 (July 9, 2007). Furthermore, the Bald Eagle was not listed or identified as a candidate for listing on the USFWS's most recent list of candidate species. See 72 Fed. Reg. 69034 (Dec. 6, 2007). Notably, the Bald Eagle does not appear on the Utah BLM's list of special status species. See state-listed and BLM listed Sensitive Species, <a href="http://www.ut.blm.gov/vernalrmpguide/state_blm_species.htm">http://www.ut.blm.gov/vernalrmpguide/state_blm_species.htm</a> (last visited January 17, 2008).	Entire document has been adjusted to correct the status from "threatened" to "special status species." The Bald Eagle is now listed on the BLM and Utah Sensitive Species List and has been listed in that section vs. the wildlife section. Conservation Measures have been kept in Appendix Q to continue protection for Bald Eagles.
CrownQuest	62	84	In Section 4.3.7.4.8.6, the BLM fails to disclose the significant impacts of its management action to protect migratory bird habitat during nesting season on oil and gas development. See Monticello DRMP/EIS, pg. 4-95. The BLM has not explained why such restrictions are necessary. These restrictions are not required by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918, which permits disruptive activities in certain circumstances. 16 U.S.C. 703-712 (2006). The BLM must revise its proposed management action to ensure it is the least restrict necessary to protect the resource. Furthermore, although the management action proposes to require no surface occupancy in migratory bird habitat during nesting season, the BLM fails to identify where such habitat exists.	Although the Executive Order 13186 or the Migratory Bird Treaty Act does not state specifically what type of measures should be taken on surface disturbing activities, it is the BLM's responsibility to decide how we are going to protect nesting habitat for migratory bird and by avoiding or minimizing surface disturbing activities during nesting season, the BLM is protecting migratory birds as mandated.  By using the term "avoid" the BLM would consider on a case by case basis to allow a surface disturbing project if there is no reasonable alternative. At that time the activity would be done to minimize the impacts to migratory birds. The BLM has added the words "or minimize" behind "avoid" to clarify this.  A sentence has been added to this section to discuss how these areas will be determined: "Occupied priority migratory bird habitat will be determined with the use of Utah Partners in

**Table 5.10.r. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: SSS – Special Status Species**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number	Comment Text	Response to Comment	
			Flight Avian Conservation Strategy, Intermountain West Joint Venture Bird Habitat Conservation Areas, and other migratory bird conservation plans."	
CrownQuest	62	101	On page A-19, the BLM identifies a CSU/TL that provides, "Where technically and economically feasible, use directional drilling or multiple wells from the same pad to reduce surface disturbance and eliminate drilling in canyon or habitat suitable for [Mexican Spotted Owl] nesting." Table 2.1 does not identify such a restriction for the Mexican Spotted Owl. See Monticello DRMP/EIS, pg 2-52, Table 2.1.	The stipulations listed in Table 2.1 were removed and reference was made to Appendix A.
CrownQuest	62	102	On page A-19, the BLM identifies a CSU/TL that provides, "Any activity that includes water production should be managed to ensure maintenance of enhancement of riparian habitat." Additionally, on page A-19, the BLM identifies a CSU/TL that provides, "Where technically and economically feasible, use directional drilling or multiple wells from the same pad to reduce surface disturbance and eliminate drilling in canyon or habitat suitable for [Mexican Spotted Owl] nesting." Table 2.1 does not identify these restrictions for the Mexican Spotted Owl. See Monticello DRMP/EIS, pg. 2-52, Table 2.1.	The stipulations listed in Table 2.1 were removed and reference was made to Appendix A.
CrownQuest	62	103	Table 2.1 does not identify avoidance and minimization measures Nos. 6, 7, 8, and 10 to protect the Bald Eagle. Compare Monticello DRMP/EIS, Appx. A, pg 2-22, Table A.1 with Monticello DRMP/EIS, pg. 2-51, Table 2.1.	The stipulations listed in Table 2.1 were removed and reference was made to Appendix A.
CrownQuest	62	104	Avoidance and minimization measure No. 2 provides, "Lease activities would require monitoring throughout the duration of the project." See Monticello DRMP/EIS, Appx. A pg. A-22, Table A.1 (emphasis added). Activities may require monitoring through the duration of the project." See Monticello DRMP/EIS. Pg 2-51, Table 2.1 (emphasis added).	The stipulations listed in Table 2.1 were removed and reference was made to Appendix A.
CrownQuest	62	105	Avoidance and minimization measure No. 2 references Section 7 consultation for the Bald Eagle. Because the Bald Eagle was removed from the endangered species list and is no longer	Entire document has been adjusted to correct the status from "threatened" to "special status species." The Bald Eagle is now listed on the BLM and Utah Sensitive Species List and

**Table 5.10.r. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: SSS – Special Status Species**

<b>Commenter Name</b>	<b>Record ID &amp; Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Text</b>	<b>Response to Comment</b>
		listed as threatened or endangered, see 72 Fed. Reg. 37346 (July 9, 2007); 72 Fed. Reg. 69034 (December 6, 2007). Section 7 consultation is no longer required.	has been listed in that section vs. the wildlife section. Conservation Measures have been kept in Appendix Q to continue protection for Bald Eagles.
CrownQuest	62 106	Table 2.1 does not identify avoidance and minimization measures Nos. 3 and 4 to protect the Southwestern Willow Flycatcher. Compare Monticello DRMP/EIS, Appx. A, pg. 2-24, Table A.1 with Monticello DRMP/EIS, pg 2-51, Table 2.1.	The stipulations listed in Table 2.1 were removed and reference was made to Appendix A.
CrownQuest	62 107	Avoidance and minimization measure No. 2 provides, "Activities would require monitoring throughout the duration of the project." See Monticello DRMP/EIS, Appx. A, pg. A-24, Table A.1. Table 2.1 provides, "Activities may require monitoring through the duration of the project." See Monticello DRMP/EIS, pg 2-52, Table 2.1.	The stipulations listed in Table 2.1 were removed and reference was made to Appendix A.
CrownQuest	62 108	Avoidance and minimization measure No. 6 provides, "Activities within .025 mile of occupied breeding habitat would not occur during the breeding season of May 1 to August 15." See Monticello DRMP/EIS, Appx A, pg. A-24, Table A.1. Table 2.1 provides that such activities would be restricted between May 1 and "September." See Monticello DRMP/EIS, pg 2-52, Table 2.1.	The stipulations listed in Table 2.1 were removed and reference was made to Appendix A.
CrownQuest	62 109	Table 2.1 does not identify the avoidance and minimization measure "Water production will be managed to ensure maintenance or enhancement of riparian habitat" to protect endangered Colorado River fishes. Compare Monticello DRMP/EIS, Appx. A, pg. 2-26, Table A.1 with Monticello DRMP/EIS, pg. 2-52, Table 2.1.	The stipulations listed in Table 2.1 were removed and reference was made to Appendix A.
CrownQuest	62 110	Table A.1 identifies the avoidance and minimization measure "Activities would require monitoring throughout the duration of the project." See Monticello DRMP/EIS, Appx. A, pg. A-26, Table A.1 (emphasis added). Table 2.1 provides, "Activities may require monitoring through the duration of the project." See Monticello DRMP/EIS, pg. 2-52, Table 2.1 (emphasis added).	The stipulations listed in Table 2.1 were removed and reference was made to Appendix A.

**Table 5.10.s. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: TRR – OHV; Open/Closed Routes**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number		Comment Text	Response to Comment
State of Utah	4	1	The state requests that the listing on page 1-15 of the DEIS be amended to include the plans and policies indicated by Utah Code section 63-38d-401, et seq., and that the BLM carefully consider consistency with this state law.	<p>Page 1-15 lists pertinent state and county plans. The state identified no specific plans or policies which have been omitted.</p> <p>The BLM is aware that there are specific County and State plan decisions relevant to aspects of public land management that are discrete from, and independent of, Federal law. However, the BLM is bound by federal law. The FLPMA requires that the development of an RMP for public lands must be coordinated and consistent with county plans, to the maximum extent possible by law, and inconsistencies between Federal and non-Federal government plans be resolved to the extent practical (FLPMA, Title II Sec. 202 (c)(9)). As a consequence, where state and local plans conflict with Federal law there will be an inconsistency that cannot be resolved or reconciled.</p> <p>Thus, while county and federal planning processes, under FLPMA, are required to be as integrated and consistent as practical, the Federal agency planning process is not bound by or subject to County plans, planning processes, or planning stipulations. The BLM will identify these conflicts in the FEIS/PRMP, so that the State and local governments have a complete understanding of the impacts of the PRMP on State and local management options. The BLM will document the required Governor's consistency review in Chapter 5.</p>
Lynell Schalk	29	19	Each of the 5 alternative travel plan maps most two "Historic Trails," The Hole-in-the-Rock Trail and the Spanish Trail, under the title of "OHV and Travel Plan" (Reference Maps 58–62). These trails are actually drawn onto the Travel Plan map. The reader has to assume that these two historic trails are proposed in all 5 alternatives to be open as OHV roads or trails. Is this what the agency is proposing? None of the four BLM	It is confusing that the two historic trails are shown in their entirety on the OHV and travel plan maps. But, the intent is not to imply that they are open to vehicular use in their entirety. Portions of the trails are open to vehicle use. Some long established, major roads lie atop portions of the old trail systems. The entire historic trails are not open to vehicular use. They have been deleted from the OHV/Travel Plan maps

**Table 5.10.s. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: TRR – OHV; Open/Closed Routes**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number		Comment Text	Response to Comment
			employees I talked to at the Montezuma Creek meeting could explain why this route was depicted on the Travel Plan alternative maps, including the MFO planning coordinator and one of the outdoor recreation planners.	in the FEIS. The references quoted from Chapter 3 – Affected Environment state the current situation not the proposed. The term "Hole in the Rock Trail" has two different meanings. It can refer to the entire pioneer trail—some of which is unknown on the ground. It also refers to the known segment that accesses the actual "Hole in the Rock." The two references can be confusing. The access trail does get intense legitimate use.
Lynell Schalk	29	20	The route of the Hole-in-the-Rock Trail is largely inaccurate as to its plotted location, often miles from where the trail can actually be found on the ground, as well as being plotted where it can no longer be traced. What is most unsettling about the DRMP map is that it shows the Hole-in-the-Rock Trail leading directly into the town of Bluff. There is no evidence on the ground of the trail between Butler Wash and Bluff, yet the BLM has plotted in on its DRMP map.	Please refer to response to comment 29-19.
National Parks Conservation Association	44	2	It is particularly troubling that the BLM has included designated ORV routes that are within the boundaries of Canyonlands National Park. This error needs to be removed. The BLM also needs to address how it will monitor routes it intends to designate that run up to the park boundaries.	The roads in lands administered by the Park Service have been removed from the OHV and travel plan maps. The placement of signs, kiosks, informing and educating the public recreation users as well as monitoring route usage will be implemented after the signing of the RMP and are not addressed nor will they be decided in the RMP process.

**Table 5.10.t. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: TRV – Travel**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number		Comment Text	Response to Comment
National Park Service	3	6	Since the RMP does not apply to travel management within NPS units, the NPS would prefer that all roads within the NPS	Changes have been made to the Travel Plan (maps 49-53) as suggested by the commenter.

**Table 5.10.t. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: TRV – Travel**

<b>Commenter Name</b>	<b>Record ID &amp; Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Text</b>	<b>Response to Comment</b>
Intermountain Region		units be removed from the map.	
State of Utah	4 51	Table 2-1 – Summary Table of Alternatives – Lands and Realty. It should be noted under all alternatives that, pursuant to Utah v. Andrus, the BLM is obligated to grant reasonable access to the State of Utah and its grantees to school trust lands. In furtherance of this obligation, no existing roads providing access to trust lands should be closed without the consent of SITLA.	The BLM does provide for reasonable access to all SITLA lands under all alternatives. A sentence has been added to Chapter 2, Lands and Realty, Management Common to All Action Alternatives, that states that reasonable access to State land would be provided including across BLM lands within avoidance and exclusion areas for rights-of-way as specified by the Cotter decision (Utah v. Andrus, 10/1/79). In addition, the travel management plan recognizes the requirement to provide access to SITLA lands per the Cotter decision.
State of Utah	4 57	Section 3.17.3 –Issues. Certain existing routes that provide the only physical access to trust lands sections would not be "Designated Routes," and motorized access on such routes would be terminated. The Draft RMP fails to address the impact of these closures on the economic value of the affected trust lands.	The BLM does provide for reasonable access to all SITLA lands under all alternatives. A sentence has been added to Chapter 2, Lands and Realty, Management Common to All Action Alternatives, that states that reasonable access to State land would be provided including across BLM lands within avoidance and exclusion areas for rights-of-way as specified by the Cotter decision (Utah v. Andrus, 10/1/79). In addition, the travel management plan recognizes the requirement to provide access to SITLA lands per the Cotter decision.
State of Utah	4 79	It is unclear in Map 51 (of the DEIS) whether or not routes shown in brown within the closed areas are open or closed. The state recommends that all of these routes remain open and the map and its legend be modified.	The routes within the "Closed" areas are those that would remain open to vehicle use. These routes are either major county roads or access routes to trail heads or state lands. The map has been modified to clarify this point.
Sierra Club Utah Chapter	17 4	Commenter states: "The relationship of roads and other mechanized routes to weeds, wildlife, cultural sites, wilderness, landscapes resilient to global and local climate change, and a host of other issues must be analyzed."	Chapter 4 is an extensive analysis for weeds, wildlife, cultural sites, wilderness (as well as a "host of other issues") included impacts from all resources uses such as the relationship of roads and other mechanized routes.  A growing body of scientific evidence supports the concern that global climate change will result from the continued build-up of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere. While uncertainties remain, particularly in the area of exact timing, magnitude and regional impacts of such changes, the vast

**Table 5.10.t. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: TRV – Travel**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number	Comment Text	Response to Comment
			<p>majority of scientific evidence supports the view that continued increases in greenhouse gas emissions will lead to climate change. This statement has been added to Chapter 3 of the PRMP/FEIS.</p> <p>The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has not developed regulatory protocol or emission standards regarding global climate change. When these protocols and standards are available, the BLM will analyze potential effects to global warming in the NEPA documentation prepared for site-specific projects. A statement to this effect has been added to Chapter 4 of the PRMP/FEIS.</p>
Canyon Country Heritage Association	18 6	Historic trails – Hole in the Rock and Old Spanish Trail are highlighted on all OHV and travel plan maps – assume they are open for OHV use.	<p>It is confusing that the two historic trails are shown in their entirety on the OHV and travel plan maps. But, the intent is not to imply that they are open to vehicular use in their entirety. Portions of the trails are open to vehicle use. Some long established, major roads lie atop portions of the old trail systems. The entire historic trails are not open to vehicular use. These trails have been removed from the travel plan maps to eliminate this confusion.</p> <p>The references quoted from Chapter 3 – Affected Environment state the current situation not the proposed.</p> <p>The term "Hole in the Rock Trail" has two different meanings. It can refer to the entire pioneer trail—some of which is unknown on the ground. It also refers to the known segment that accesses the actual "Hole in the Rock." The two references can be confusing. The access trail does get intense legitimate use.</p>
Utah State Office of Education	31 7	Under the law, as laid out in Utah v. Andrus, the State of Utah and SITLA are entitled to reasonable access across the BLM's lands to all school trust lands, including those within WSAs. That right of access must be recognized in this document or the document will be in violations of the case law. In the Travel Management section, Under the Preferred Alternative	The BLM does provide for reasonable access to all SITLA lands under all alternatives. A sentence has been added to Chapter 2, Lands and Realty, Management Common to All Action Alternatives, that states that reasonable access to State land would be provided including across BLM lands within avoidance and exclusion areas for rights-of-way as specified

**Table 5.10.t. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: TRV – Travel**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number	Comment Text	Response to Comment
		(Alternative C), certain existing routes that provide the only physical access to school trust land sections would be deemed not to be "Designated Routes," and motorized access on such lands would be terminated. Under Alternatives B and E, this problem would be magnified exponentially. The conservation alternatives show approximately 728 miles of roads marked for closure. School trust lands will be greatly affected by these road closures.	by the Cotter decision (Utah v. Andrus, 10/1/79). In addition, the travel management plan recognizes the requirement to provide access to SITLA lands per the Cotter decision.
Utah State Office of Education	31 8	The draft RMP fails to address the impact of these closures on the economic value of the affected school trust lands in either this section or its section on socioeconomic impacts of the preferred alternative. Under the Takings Clause of the United States Constitution, no road that accesses a school trust land section, within the RMP, should be closed without trustee consent. It is anticipated that SITLA would take the necessary legal action, on behalf of the beneficiary, to prevent such a closure.	The BLM does provide for reasonable access to all SITLA lands under all alternatives. A sentence has been added to Chapter 2, Lands and Realty, Management Common to All Action Alternatives, that states that reasonable access to State land would be provided including across BLM lands within avoidance and exclusion areas for rights-of-way as specified by the Cotter decision (Utah v. Andrus, 10/1/79). In addition, the travel management plan recognizes the requirement to provide access to SITLA lands per the Cotter decision.
Utah State Office of Education	31 9	The Draft RMP should be amended to specifically state that: (1) Continued motorized administrative access on "non-designated" routes providing access to school trust lands will be permitted to the State of Utah, SITLA, and its permittees and grantees, notwithstanding any closure to the general public; (2) The State of Utah, SITLA, and its permittees and grantees may undertake reasonable maintenance activities to preserve and improve existing access across the BLM lands, after consultation and appropriate environmental review by the BLM; and (3) Existing routes that are the sole access to school trust lands will not be reclaimed without full BLM consultation with, written approval by SITLA, and fair market compensation to the trust after consultation with the State Board of Education and its designated representatives.	The BLM does provide for reasonable access to all SITLA lands under all alternatives. A sentence has been added to Chapter 2, Lands and Realty, Management Common to All Action Alternatives, that states that reasonable access to State land would be provided including across BLM lands within avoidance and exclusion areas for rights-of-way as specified by the Cotter decision (Utah v. Andrus, 10/1/79). In addition, the travel management plan recognizes the requirement to provide access to SITLA lands per the Cotter decision.
ECOS Consulting	58 27	Section 4.3.17.2.13 – Impacts of Travel Decisions on Vegetation	This is a mistake in the document and has been changed. Under Alternative A there are 611,310 acres open to cross country travel by OHVs. The remaining 1,171,813 acres is

**Table 5.10.t. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: TRV – Travel**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number	Comment Text	Response to Comment
		Here it is stated: "There are a total of 1,940,740 acres open to OHV use under this alternative, which is more than under any of the other alternatives." How can this many acres be open to OHV use if there is only about 1,800,000 acres within the Monticello Planning Area?	either closed to OHV use or open with restrictions.
Veronica Egan	131	3 Remove the Hole in the Rock Trail from all maps depicting routes open to motorized use. The entire trail is listed on the National Historic Register, and as such must be protected from the damage inflicted by motorized use. The presence of this trail on these maps gives the false impression that it is open to motorized use.	It is confusing that the historic trail is shown in its entirety on the OHV and travel plan maps. But, the intent is not to imply that it is open to vehicular use in its entirety. Portions of the trails are open to vehicle use. Some long established, major roads lie atop portions of the old trail system. The entire historic trail is not open to vehicular use. It has been deleted from the OHV/Travel Plan maps in the FEIS.
Veronica Egan	131	4 Clarify (NPS, USFS) agency boundaries on all maps and determine if the routes that the BLM has specified as open are open on these agencies lands, or not, before placing them on BLM maps.	The roads in lands administered by the Park Service and Forest Service have been removed from the OHV and travel plan maps. The BLM is dealing with routes on their lands only. Both NPS and FS have had opportunity to review the BLM's travel plan designations.
Glen Canyon Group, Utah Chapter, Sierra Club	221	5 Regarding Table ES1 (page ES-5), OHV Categories (acres) by Alternative: How can the total of acres under the No Action Alternative A be over 2.2 million acres when less than 1.8 million acres is managed by the BLM? Adding footnote 3 under Summary Table A on page 2-3 would clarify the matter.	Changes have been made to the document as noted.
Glen Canyon Group, Utah Chapter, Sierra Club	221	6 Summary Table A on page 2-3 should note that the "Miles of Routes Designated" are D roads only. The totals for Alternatives C and D are incorrect.	Changes have been made to the document as noted.

**Table 5.10.u. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: VEG – Vegetation**

<b>Commenter Name</b>	<b>Record ID &amp; Comment Number</b>		<b>Comment Text</b>	<b>Response to Comment</b>
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	2	18	Table 3.58. The title suggests cover types in all of the Monticello Planning Area, but they are actually only of the lands administered by the BLM.	The title of Table 3.58 has been changed from the Monticello PA to BLM lands.
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	2	24	Page 4-421 in Section 4.3.15.1 (note: page and section numbers have changed since the last draft). In the third paragraph it states "A diverse native community would have the potential to establish...." This statement assumes that natives will successfully reestablish. The document should thoroughly describe the difficulties with nonnative, invasive plant species following surface disturbances that include fire.	This section has been revised to incorporate impacts of non-native, invasive plant species following surface disturbances that include fire.
San Juan County	7	54	Pg. 2-57 (note: page numbers have changed since the last draft). The first goal under vegetation should include livestock as well.	The document has been revised to include vegetative goals in relation to livestock management.
The Nature Conservancy	49	20	The statement that Upland areas would be managed for "desired future condition" is vague because no specific DFC is defined. The glossary defines desired condition as "Description of those factors, which should exist within ecosystems both to maintain their survival and to meet social and economic needs." However, desired condition depends upon personal use or requirements. For example, desired future condition for a rancher may differ vastly from desired condition for mineral exploration or wildlife. Therefore a better management prescription would be to manage according to Interpreting Indicators or Rangeland Health (technical reference 1734-6 2005) and, when appropriate, the complimentary manuals Monitoring Manual for Grassland, Shrubland and Savanna; Volume I and II to determine if goals and objectives are being met.	The definition in the Vegetation section for desired future condition (DFC) has been clarified to "Manage vegetation resources for desired future conditions, as determined by site-specific BLM objectives and rangeland functionality and health, thereby ensuring ecological diversity, stability, and sustainability, including the desired mix of vegetation types, structural stages, and landscape/riparian/watershed function, and provide for native plant, fish, and wildlife habitats." Therefore, DFC is determined by the BLM utilizing Ecological Site Descriptions and managed to meet ecological process and sustain and/or improve rangeland health.  The resources of concern identified by the commenter related to livestock grazing do not require a land use planning decision. These resource values are addressed on a site specific allotment basis utilizing Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Grazing Management.
ECOS Consulting	58	13	In this Monticello DRMP/EIS, the BLM has not provided clear, objective, and measurable "Desired Future Conditions" for each vegetation community in the Monticello Planning Area. There are numerous management activities proposed in this	The definition in the Vegetation section for desired future condition (DFC) has been clarified to "Manage vegetation resources for desired future conditions, as determined by site specific BLM objectives and rangeland functionality and

**Table 5.10.u. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: VEG – Vegetation**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number	Comment Text	Response to Comment
		<p>Monticello DRMP/EIS that will drastically change conditions on the ground throughout the Planning Area, and do not appear to have measurable and objective habitat goals. Livestock grazing is planned to be allowed on over 90% of the Planning Area. Vegetation treatments are proposed on over 20% of the Planning Area. Forestry and woodland products activities are planned over most of the Planning Area. Mining and energy development has the potential to be widespread. OHV use and routes are proposed in over 90% of the Planning Area. All of these activities, and others, can have extensive long-term adverse direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts on the ecosystem. In considering, these impacts, the BLM must precisely define Desired Future Conditions for each vegetation community in order to effectively manage the resources.</p>	<p>health, thereby ensuring ecological diversity, stability, and sustainability, including the desired mix of vegetation types, structural stages, and landscape/riparian/watershed function, and provide for native plant, fish, and wildlife habitats." Therefore, DFC is determined by the BLM utilizing Ecological Site Descriptions and managed to meet ecological process and sustain and/or improve rangeland health.</p> <p>The resources of concern identified by the commenter related to livestock grazing do not require a land use planning decision. These resource values are addressed on a site specific allotment basis utilizing Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Grazing Management.</p>
ECOS Consulting	58	20 <p>Pages 3-154 through 3-160 (note: page numbers have changed since the last draft): Throughout this section there is no mention of "Desired Future Condition" of these plant communities, yet the BLM will be allowing activities and actively managing as if they knew what future condition they wanted. This is obviously not the case. The BLM must develop detailed "Desired Future Conditions" for each of its major vegetation communities and use these definitions as guides for future management. These definitions must include descriptions of the condition of biological soil crusts, vegetation cover, vegetation diversity, and vegetation structure. This must be done now, before 10–20 years of future planning is committed, before this DRMP/EIS is finalized.</p>	<p>A definition for desired future condition (DFC) has been added to the glossary: "The desired mix of vegetation types, structural stages, and landscape/riparian/watershed function, as determined by management objectives and rangeland functionality and health, that ensures ecological diversity, stability and sustainability to provide for plant, fish and wildlife habitats."</p> <p>Therefore, DFC is determined by the BLM utilizing Ecological Site Descriptions and managed to meet ecological process and sustain and/or improve rangeland health.</p> <p>The resources of concern identified by the commenter related to livestock grazing do not require a land use planning decision. These resource values are addressed on a site specific allotment basis utilizing Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Grazing Management.</p>
Nature Conservancy Moab Project Office	214	4 <p>The statement that Upland areas would be managed for "desired future condition" is vague because no specific DFC is defined. The glossary defines desired condition as "Description of those factors, which should exist within ecosystems both to maintain their survival and to meet social and economic needs."</p>	Please refer to response to comment 49-20.

**Table 5.10.u. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: VEG – Vegetation**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number	Comment Text	Response to Comment
		However, desired condition depends upon personal use or requirements. For example, desired future condition for a rancher may differ vastly from desired condition for mineral exploration or wildlife.	

**Table 5.10.v. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: VRM – Visual Resource Management**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number	Comment Text	Response to Comment
Lynell Schalk	29 3	Indian Creek ACEC Alternative B states that it is the "same as Alternative A except..." (Reference: pg. 2-40, Vol. 1). Alternative B then repeats several of the same "prescriptions" as are in Alternative A, i.e. "closed to OHV use," "managed as a VRM Class I," "available for livestock use," "unavailable for disposal of mineral materials," etc. Many of the listed "exceptions" are not exceptions at all, making it doubly difficult for the reader to determine the difference in the alternatives.	The document has been changed to correct duplications between Alternatives A and B.
CrownQuest	62 68	On page 2-114 (note: page numbers have changed since the last draft), the BLM understates the significant economic impacts of the proposed VRM management restrictions under Alternatives B and E. See Monticello DRMP/EIS, pg 2-114, Table 2.2.	Table 2.2 has been changed to more adequately describe the impacts. Analysis of these impacts can be found in Sections 4.3.7.4.9 and 4.3.12.2.10 of the FEIS. Please also refer to response to comment 62-64.

**Table 5.10.w. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: WC – Wilderness Characteristics**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number		Comment Text	Response to Comment
Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance	26	55	Cheesebox Canyon Unit – The commenter states that the BLM did not properly create accurate boundary lines for this unit, and that it is actually adjacent to a 1999 WIA unit with WC.	The BLM incorrectly stated that this unit is not contiguous to the 1999 WIA unit with WC. It is, in fact, contiguous; however, the unit contains multiple vehicle routes and evidence of mining activity, and thus does not meet the naturalness criteria for wilderness characteristic management. Therefore, the unit is determined to not possess wilderness characteristics.
Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance	26	62	Lockhart Basin Unit, Comment A – The commenter states, "What happened to the BLM's assessment of the Lockhart Basin wilderness character area? It was recently found by the BLM to have reasonable probability of having wilderness character (RPD), but within the DRMP and the background files, this area seems to have slipped through its proper wilderness character identification."	The Lockhart Basin area was found to have reasonable probability of having wilderness character in 2001. That area was not reviewed during the 2007 WCR because of this prior finding. WSAs and the 1999 WIA areas also were not reviewed under the 2007 WCR process. The WC finding has not changed, however it was not one of the areas carried forward for management of wilderness character in the proposed plan. The Lockhart Basin RPD area was inadvertently left off the maps showing non-WSA areas with Wilderness Character in the draft, this oversight has been corrected in the PRMP.
Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance	26	73	Tin Cup Mesa Unit – The commenter states that the "BLM's WCR fails to account the adjoining Squaw and Papoose Canyon WSA is part of the larger Tin Cup Mesa wilderness character unit within the recent WCR."	As part of its wilderness characteristics inventory maintenance, the BLM used a combination of field knowledge, ID Team review, og-wells GIS data, range allotment files, and a review of BLM and San Juan County (SJ CO) GIS data, including 2006 high resolution aerial photographs. This unit was reviewed as a standalone unit due to its overall size (16,000 acres approximately), and thus the fact that it is contiguous to a WSA is not relevant. The BLM findings are described in the 2007 WCR process and are available as part of the administrative record in the Monticello BLM Field Office. The BLM stands by its findings of its wilderness characteristics inventories and WCR process.
Utah State Office of Education	31	5	In the Affected Environment section, it should be stated that to the extent the BLM creates new areas managed for preservation, based on impacts to physical, biological, and cultural resources, such as ACECs or areas managed for	The BLM acknowledges that the closure of adjoining public lands to oil and gas leasing may have a potentially negative impact on SITLA's mineral revenue. The assumption has been changed to reflect this fact. In Alternative C, the closure of

**Table 5.10.w. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: WC – Wilderness Characteristics**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number		Comment Text	Response to Comment
			"wilderness characteristics," such designation has a direct economic impact on the Utah school trust. For all school trust lands inheld in such areas, it will therefore become necessary to identify and make available lands, and acknowledge that each special designation will require an accompanying land exchange. Failure to provide a necessarily large pool of available economically productive lands for exchange will constitute an unconstitutional taking of the captured lands.	acreage managed as WSA or Wilderness Areas is nondiscretionary and beyond the scope of this plan. Chapter 4 of the PRMP/FEIS has been revised to reflect the impacts in Alternative E on SITLA inholdings of the discretionary closures of public land. It should be noted that under any Alternative, the proposed ACECs are not managed as closed to mineral leasing.
EOG Resources	60	50	On pages 4-153 through 4-155 (note: page numbers have changed since the last draft) the BLM must expressly provide that any special management of non-WSA lands cannot affect existing lease rights. See, e.g., National Wildlife Fed'n. et. Al., 150 IBLA 385, 403 (1999). The BLM may not modify valid existing lease rights through the revision of RMPs.	The land use plan makes decisions for new leasing actions. Valid existing rights (previous leases) are recognized regardless of plan decisions.
CrownQuest	62	65	On page 2-113 (note: page numbers have changed since the last draft), under the resource Non-WSA Lands with Wilderness Characteristics, the BLM explains that managing over a half million acres of public lands for wilderness characteristics under Alternative E is "likely to have positive impacts on local economy with the potential for some socioeconomic losses due to restricted activities in these areas.	The analysis in Chapter 4 has been expanded to address the potential negative impacts of Alternative E on oil and gas development. The BLM believes that the impact would be minor in the context of the RFD, but nonetheless real. Whether the economic benefits from Alternative E will exceed the economic costs is impossible to determine with available data.

**Table 5.10.x. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: WD - Woodlands**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number		Comment Text	Response to Comment
San Juan County	7	56	Pg. 2-62 (note: page numbers have changed since the last draft) – Opportunities for woodland harvest under Alternatives A, B, C, and D are 73%, 41%, 47%, and 31%, respectively. San Juan County is concerned about the drastic reductions in lands available for woodland harvest and the impact on citizens who depend on these woodland products, especially on Cedar Mesa	The RMP has been revised that allows woodland harvesting in areas not identified as a harvesting zone, thus increasing available localities. Areas of historic woodland harvest will essentially continue to be available. Areas closed to woodland harvest are typically limited to areas devoid of woodlands, sites with no access to woodland products, Wilderness Study

**Table 5.10.x. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: WD - Woodlands**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number		Comment Text	Response to Comment
			and other areas where Native Americans have traditionally gathered wood. The county suggests that the BLM give this use more consideration in the final RMP.	Areas, and riparian communities. The RMP language for Cedar Mesa and the Montezuma Watershed zones has been revised to allow the continuation of existing woodland harvest in the interim of designating woodland harvest areas and completing associated cultural surveys, so long as vehicles remain on designated routes.

**Table 5.10.y. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: WL – Wildlife**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number		Comment Text	Response to Comment
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	2	25	Page 4-422 in Section 4.3.15.1. In the third paragraph: "The installation of power poles would increase raptor predation...." The "would" should be changed to "may."	The change has been made to the document.
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	2	28	Page 4-426 in Section 4.3.15.1 (of the DEIS). In the third paragraph it states: "In occupied priority migratory bird habitat..." The document should describe how this habitat will be delineated.	A sentence has been added to this section to discuss how these areas will be determined. "Occupied priority migratory bird habitat will be determined with the use of Utah Partners in Flight Avian Conservation Strategy, Intermountain West Joint Venture Bird Habitat Conservation Areas, and other migratory bird conservation plans."
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	2	36	Page 4-575 in Table 4.204 (of the DEIS) FWS recommends the method be described which was used to calculate the number of acres derived in this table.	An explanation has been added to the bottom of the tables to explain the methods used to calculate the number of acres derived in this table.
State of Utah	4	11	The state requests that the BLM use the "crucial habitat" designations mapped by the DWR solely as descriptive wildlife habitat designations, not as automatic exclusion zones for other multiple uses.	The BLM has changed the document to use the crucial habitat designations of UDWR. Use of these habitat polygons does not automatically exclude other uses. Appendix A outlines exceptions, modifications and waivers that will be used when applicable for all surface disturbing activities in these areas.
State of Utah	4	89	The Monticello RMP should be consistent with the newly developed Utah Wildlife Action Plan (UWAP). As a cooperator in developing this plan, the BLM should acknowledge it as the	This reference has been changed from the Utah Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy to the Utah Wildlife Action Plan.

**Table 5.10.y. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: WL – Wildlife**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number	Comment Text	Response to Comment
		<p>guideline for sensitive species management in the State of Utah. On page 2-51, it states the "BLM would work with the UDWR to implement the Utah Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy to coordinate management decisions that would conserve native species and prevent the need for additional listings."</p>	
San Juan County	7 13	<p>The BLM erroneously uses the term critical habitat for wildlife habitat that does not apply to endangered species act. The term crucial habitat is used too loosely; UDWR uses crucial habitat as descriptive designations. They are not intended to mislabel resource concerns and result in a limitation of compatible uses. San Juan County disputes the acreage identified for crucial elk and deer winter range in San Juan County and submits information from Dr. Charles Kay in that regard.</p>	<p>The critical habitat term has been changed to crucial in the final RMP/EIS.</p> <p>The UDWR is the jurisdictional agency for wildlife management within the state. The BLM relied on the expertise of this agency for delineating wildlife habitats, estimating population numbers, and recommending wildlife restrictions.</p>
San Juan County	7 53	<p>Pg. 2-54 and 2-56 (note: page numbers have changed since the last draft).- San Juan County is opposed to any alternative in the Monticello RMP/EIS which closes any portion of the Arch Canyon road. Reasons for the County's opposition include: 1) the Flannelmouth Sucker is not found above the State Section (T. 37 S., R. 10 E., Section 16). Therefore there is no justification to close the Arch Canyon road to protect this species above the State Section; 2) The stream is in proper functioning condition and BLM surveys have found no evidence that the Flannelmouth Sucker is being impacted by the road or its use; 3) The two primary reasons for listing the MSO, as described by the USFWS in its final rule dated August 31, 2004, are not major threats in the portion of Arch Canyon located on BLM lands; 4) In its final rule, the USFWS also described important habitat conditions for the MSO, all of which are much more prevalent on the Forest Service lands than on the BLM lands; 5) The portion of Arch Canyon on BLM land is near the fringe of the habitat for the MSO as mapped by the USFWS and would appear not to be as important for the survival of the owl; 6) The BLM is proposing to allow hikers unrestricted access in</p>	<p>Comment noted. The proposed travel plan has been adjusted.</p> <p>Even if the flannelmouth sucker is not found above the state section, it does not preclude management of the stream and watershed above the fish since activities that happen upstream will directly impact fish that live downstream.</p> <p>The endangered species act does not preclude the protection of species simply because the proposed action is not included as one of the primary reason for the need of a species to be listed.</p> <p>Arch Canyon is included in the Designated Critical Habitat for Mexican Spotted Owls and habitat evaluations have determined that Arch Canyon is suitable habitat for Spotted Owls.</p> <p>As stated in Table 2.1, the BLM also analyzed a permit system to restrict the number of hikers in Alternative B and C.</p>

**Table 5.10.y. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: WL – Wildlife**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number	Comment Text	Response to Comment
		<p>Arch Canyon.</p> <p>The county requests an explanation of the BLM's rationale for allowing hikers to hike and camp both on the road and throughout the canyon and cliffs while proposing to close the road to OHV use.</p>	
San Juan County	7 58	Section 3.20.2.1 – It is generally agreed that in southeast Utah the limiting factor for mule deer is summer range, not winter range as stated by the BLM. The county suggests that the BLM correct this in the Final RMP.	The sentence, "Winter range is often considered a limiting factor for mule deer" will be removed and replaced with the following clarification. "In the summer months, mule deer populations could be limited during years where there is little rainfall, water availability, and summer forage which reduces fawning success. In the winter months, insufficient quantity or quality of habitat or deep snow results in heavy concentration of deer on winter ranges, increasing the spread of disease, reduction in population, and fawning success."
San Juan County	7 59	Pg. 3-164 (note: page numbers have changed since the last draft) – The county points out that the BLM's statement that "Within the Monticello PA, there has been a loss/die-off of sagebrush habitat due to drought and insect infestations" is only partially correct. The county references Charles E. Kay's studies in Beef Basin which show that sagebrush loss/die off is due primarily to deer overgrazing. Overgrazing by deer can also stress sagebrush and make it more susceptible to drought and insects.	The sentence has been modified to: "Within the Monticello PA, there has been a loss/die-off of sagebrush habitat due to drought, insect infestations, and overgrazing."
Lynell Schalk	29 16	What is the date of the statistics used for the desert bighorn sheep population, reference: pg. 3-166, Vol.1 (note: page numbers have changed since the last draft)?	The numbers were given by the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources at the time the plan was being developed in 2005 or 2006. Numbers need to be updated.
ECOS Consulting	58 23	<p>Section 4.3.13.2.5 – Impacts of Wildlife and Fisheries Decisions Common to the Proposed Plan and All Alternatives</p> <p>The BLM must be more specific as to what it means by "maintenance and improvement" of migratory bird habitat. What specific techniques does the BLM plan to use? Have they been</p>	<p>In Section 4.3.13.2.5, the first sentence has been changed to state, "...low and high desert scrub communities, which are four important habitat types used by fish, amphibians, big game, and migratory birds in the Monticello PA."</p> <p>Maintenance and improvement could mean several things and</p>

**Table 5.10.y. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: WL – Wildlife**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number	Comment Text	Response to Comment
		<p>used in the past? If so, what are the specific locations where this has occurred? The BLM must also show an analysis of the needs and effectiveness of "maintenance and improvement" projects. What about the rest of the wildlife; the predators, the large mammals, small mammals, reptiles, amphibians, and other wildlife groups? How about the fish? What are the plans for fish and wildlife habitat improvement? These activities will all have direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts on soils and water resources, but there is no analysis here, no attempt to divulge extent, location, and duration of the impacts of these projects. This is a violation of NEPA.</p>	<p>also corresponds to improvement of vegetative conditions that was evaluated in Sections 4.3.17 (Vegetation Resources) and 4.3.11 (Riparian Resources). The acres of each habitat type that could be completed are analyzed in these sections. Site-specific NEPA would be done and impacts analyzed that would discuss exact location and techniques.</p>
EOG Resources	60 55	<p>On page 4-560 (note: page numbers have changed since the last draft), the BLM states, "Under all alternatives adherence to the Migratory Treat Bird Act [sic] and Executive Order 13186 'Responsibilities of Federal Agencies to Protect Migratory Birds' would have beneficial impacts on migratory birds...." The BLM then discusses its management action that would avoid surface disturbing activities in migratory bird habitat during nesting season. Contrary to the BLM's suggestion, neither the Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918 nor Executive Order 13186 requires the BLM to impose this management action. See 16 U.S.C. 703-712 (2006); Exec. Order No. 13,186, 66 Fed. Reg. 3853 (Jan. 17, 2001). The BLM must, at a minimum, revise its statements on page 4-560 to make clear that this management action is inconsistent with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and Executive Order 13186. EOG urges the BLM to remove this management action from the Monticello RMP/EIS.</p>	<p>Although the Executive Order 13186 or the Migratory Bird Treaty Act does not state specifically what type of measures should be taken on surface disturbing activities, it is the BLM's responsibility to decide how we are going to protect nesting habitat for migratory bird and by avoiding or minimizing surface disturbing activities during nesting season, the BLM is protecting migratory birds as mandated.</p> <p>By using the term "avoid" the BLM would consider on a case by case basis to allow a surface disturbing project if there is no reasonable alternative. At that time the activity would be done to minimize the impacts to migratory birds. The BLM has added the words "or minimize" behind "avoid" to clarify this.</p>
CrownQuest	62 54	<p>On page 2-59 (note: page numbers have changed since the last draft), as Management Common to All Alternatives, the BLM proposes to avoid surface-disturbing activities and vegetative-altering projects in identified occupied migratory bird habitat during migratory bird nesting season. See Monticello DRMP/EIS, Table 2.1. The BLM has not defined or mapped "identified occupied migratory bird habitat." Furthermore, the</p>	<p>The BLM is required to protect habitat for all migratory birds. A sentence has been added to this section to discuss how these areas will be determined. "Occupied priority migratory bird habitat will be determined with the use of Utah Partners in Flight Avian Conservation Strategy, Intermountain West Joint Venture Bird Habitat Conservation Areas, and other migratory bird conservation plans."</p>

**Table 5.10.y. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: WL – Wildlife**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number	Comment Text	Response to Comment
		BLM has not identified any specific species of migratory bird that it aims to protect.	
CrownQuest	62 55	On page 2-60 (note: page numbers have changed since the last draft), as Management Common to All Alternatives, the BLM proposes to apply compensatory measures when ground-disturbing activities occur in crucial habitats. See Monticello DRMP/EIS, Table 2.1. As BLM Washington Office Instruction Memorandum 2005-069 provides, the BLM may only consider off-site mitigation after it has applied best management practices. Furthermore, off-site mitigation must be voluntary on the part of the applicant. Finally, a blanket requirement for off-site mitigation in crucial habitat is entirely inconsistent with the BLM's off-site mitigation policy, which considers off-site mitigation "appropriate when the specific conditions of a proposed project make such mitigation appropriate." See BLM Washington Office Instruction Memorandum 2005-069 (Feb. 1, 2005).	On pg. 2-86, under management common to all with Bighorn Sheep, The sentence was removed the states, "On-site mitigation would be required for projects that disturb or remove forage and browse....forage lost."  It is stated on pg. 2-86, under Habitat Improvements and Protection that, the "BLM would follow BLM Washington Office Guidance (IM 2005-069) on application of compensatory measures.
CrownQuest	62 91	On page 4-556 (note: page numbers have changed since the last draft), the BLM states, "Adverse impacts of minerals decisions on wildlife resources would be reduced by the implementation of [Best Management Practices] outlined in Section 2.1 and Appendix O." This statement is problematic for two reasons. First, Appendix O relates to Identification of Wilderness Characteristics on Non-WSA Lands Managed by Monticello BLM and not Best Management Practices (BMPs). Assumedly, the BLM intended to reference Appendix M, which identifies BMPs for Raptors and Their Associated Habitats in Utah.	A change has been made to the document to clarify this issue.
CrownQuest	62 95	On page A-12 (note: page numbers have changed since the last draft), the BLM identifies that a timing limitation (TL) will be applied under Alternative D that prohibits surface disturbing activities or occupancy between April 15 to May 15 for lambing and from November 1 to December 15 for rutting. Table 2.1 identifies the limitation periods as between April 1 to June 15 for	The timing limitation dates have been corrected.

**Table 5.10.y. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: WL – Wildlife**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number	Comment Text	Response to Comment
		lambing and October 15 to December 15 for rutting. See Monticello DRMP/EIS, pg 2-61, Table 2.1; see also Monticello DRMP/EIS, pg 4-134, Table 4.58.	
CrownQuest	62 96	Appendix A identifies the number of acres affected by TL stipulations to protect desert bighorn sheep. The numbers of acres presented in Appendix A are different than those presented in Table 2.1 for Alternatives B, D, and E. Compare Monticello DRMP/EIS, Appx. A pgs. A-11, A-12 (note: page numbers have changed since the last draft), Table A.1 with Monticello DRMP/EIS, pg 2-61, Table 2.1.	The acreage has been corrected.
CrownQuest	62 97	On page A-16 (note: page numbers have changed since the last draft), the BLM identifies a TL that will be applied under Alternative D that prohibits surface disturbing activities between December 15 and March 31. Table 2.1 identifies the limitation period as between December 1 and April 15. See Monticello DRMP/EIS, pg. 2-61, Table 2.1; see also Monticello DRMP/EIS Table 4.58 (note: page numbers have changed since the last draft).	Dates have been corrected.
CrownQuest	62 98	Appendix A identifies the number of acres affected by TL stipulations to protect deer winter range. The numbers of acres presented in Appendix A are different than those presented in Table 2.1 for Alternatives B, D, and E. Compare Monticello DRMP/EIS, Appx. A, pgs. A-15 - A-16, Table A.1 with Monticello DRMP/EIS, pg 2-61, Table 2.1.	Acres have been corrected.
CrownQuest	62 99	On page A-18, the BLM identifies a TL that will be applied under Alternative D that prohibits surface disturbing activities between December 15 and March 31. Table 2.1 identifies the limitation periods as between December 1 and April 15. See Monticello DRMP/EIS, pg. 2-61, Table 2.1; see also Monticello DRMP/EIS, pg 4-134, Table 4.58 (note: page numbers have changed since the last draft).	Dates have been corrected.
CrownQuest	62 100	Appendix A identifies the number of acres affected by TL stipulations to protect elk winter range. The numbers of acres	Acres have been corrected.

**Table 5.10.y. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: WL – Wildlife**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number		Comment Text	Response to Comment
			presented in Appendix A are different tat those presented in Table 2.1 for Alternatives B, D, and E. Compare Monticello DRMP/EIS, Appx. A, pgs. A-17 - A-18, Table A.1 with Monticello DRMP/EIS, pg. 2-61, Table 2.1 (note: page numbers have changed since the last draft).	
Mary Moran	145	2	P. 3-171 (note: page numbers have changed since the last draft). Where reptiles of the Monticello Project Area are briefly discussed: "Most turtles are aquatic, although a few live entirely on land." Perhaps a joke, a cut-and-paste error, or something stuck in to see how closely we are reading? I know there a couple naturalized non-native turtle species in southwest Utah (as well as native desert tortoises), but I sure didn't think San Juan County or Grand County had any turtles.	The sentence on turtles was put in by mistake and has been removed.

**Table 5.10.z. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: WR – Water Resources**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number		Comment Text	Response to Comment
State of Utah	4	32	The state engineer recommends that the BLM consider the impact its actions may have on water rights in general and non-BLM water rights in particular.	In Section 1.3.2, the BLM states 1) the planning process would recognize the existence of valid existing rights, and 2) the BLM would adhere to all applicable laws (including state and local laws). The text has been edited to ensure that water rights are recognized as valid existing rights.
State of Utah	4	85	Potential dam locations are shown on Map 46 (of the DEIS) . The state assumes that the potential to construct dams in these areas has been preserved in the RMP but it is hard to tell from the maps and text whether or not this is the case. The BLM should clarify by adding language to appropriate sections.	Potential dam locations were included on Map 46 as a factor related to potential eligibility for wild and scenic river designation. It was later determined that these potential dam sites did not affect the eligibility classification so this information has been removed from the map. Any future proposal for dam construction would be assessed on a case-by-case basis regardless of whether such information is listed in the RMP.

**Table 5.10.aa. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: WSA – Wilderness Study Areas**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number		Comment Text	Response to Comment
Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance	26	87	The DRMP/EIS directs readers to see below for miles of route per WSA but this mileage never appears anywhere in the DRMP/EIS.	A change has been made in the document.
Utah State Office of Education	31	3	At the current time, approximately 46,541 surface acres are inheld in Wilderness Study Areas (WSAs) in the MPA. When these lands are added to the 66,515 acres included in the proposed non-WSA lands in the Alternative E, Utah's school trust will be left with approximately 113,056 surface acres within the MPA that cannot produce revenue or that will have reduced revenue potential. In this respect, the Resource Management Plan includes an unconstitutional taking of approximately 57% of the school children's lands within the MPA, and the BLM must include specific provisions in the RMP to adequately compensate the school trust, through exchanges or purchase if the Board of Trustees determines it desires to sell the property so captured.	<p>Non-BLM lands could be indirectly impacted by RMP decisions both positively and negatively. The analysis in Chapter 4 of the PRMP/FEIS has been modified accordingly.</p> <p>The BLM does provide for reasonable access to all SITLA lands under all alternatives. Information has been added to Chapter 2, Lands and Realty, Management Common to all action alternatives, that states that reasonable access to State land would be provided including across BLM lands within avoidance and exclusion areas for rights-of-way as specified by the Cotter decision (Utah v. Andrus, 10/1/79). In addition, the Monticello DRMP/DEIS travel management plan recognizes the requirement to provide access to SITLA lands per the Cotter decision. Also, please see the revised analysis under Socioeconomics in Chapter 4 of the PRMP/FEIS.</p> <p>The need for the BLM to give priority to State-Federal land exchanges has been recognized.</p>
Broads Healthy Lands	41	17	The Collins Spring access road seems to end at the Grand Gulch ISA per the 1999 BLM Inventory, but the TMP shows this road entering the ISA. There is an additional several mile section of road shown on the Alt C map that appears to be on the boundary that does not exist on maps published in the 1999 Inventory. These routes must be removed from the preferred alternative of the final TMP.	The Collins Springs access road the commenter is referring to is proposed to be closed to the public at the ISA boundary. The road outside of the ISA is proposed to remain open in the plan.
Broads Healthy Lands	41	22	Squaw Canyon WSA – Thankfully, the BLM is not proposing any new routes or ways in this WSA. However, you are proposing an extension of a route along the north boundary that does not exist on maps published in the 1999 Inventory. Please	Two existing short sections of routes within the WSA are proposed for closure in Alternative C and not shown on the map. There are no proposed routes or ways within this WSA. The route the commenter recommends for closure is proposed

**Table 5.10.aa. Comments Requiring a Change in the Document: WSA – Wilderness Study Areas**

Commenter Name	Record ID & Comment Number		Comment Text	Response to Comment
			consider eliminating all but the original well-pad access route.	to remain open in the plan.
Broads Healthy Lands	41	24	Indian Creek WSA – Thankfully, the BLM does not attempt to designate new routes in this WSA. However, the BLM's maps show a new route coming to the north edge of the WSA (within Canyonlands National Park) that should not be reflected in your route designations.	Changes have been made to the Travel Plan (maps 58–62) as suggested by the commenter and the route within the National Park has been removed.

## 5.6 RECORD OF DECISION

Following publication by the EPA and BLM of a Notice of Availability of the PRMP/FEIS in the Federal Register, there is a 30-day protest period. In addition, a 60-day Governor's Consistency Review period runs concurrently with the the protest period.

The state director will approve the PRMP/FEIS by issuing a public Record of Decision (ROD), which is a concise document summarizing the findings and decisions brought forth from the PRMP/FEIS. However, approval shall be withheld on any portion of a plan being protested until final action has been completed on such protest. Before such approval is given, there shall be public notice and opportunity for public comment on any significant change made to the Proposed Plan.

Management actions specified for the Proposed Alternative in Chapter 2 of the PRMP/FEIS are labeled as follows:

- **Land Use Plan Decisions (P):** These broad-scale decisions guide future land management actions and subsequent site-specific implementation decisions. Land use plan decisions fall into two categories: desired outcomes (goals; standards, including land health standards; and objectives) and allowable uses and actions to achieve outcomes. Proposed land-use plan decisions are protestable to the BLM director.
- **Implementation Decisions (I):** These decisions take action to implement land-use plan decisions on a site-specific basis. They may be incorporated into implementation plans or may exist as stand-alone decisions. When issued, implementation decisions are generally appealable to the Interior Board of Land Appeals as outlined in 43 CFR Part 4.
- **Administrative and Policy Decisions (A):** These decisions are based on law, regulation, and/or policy and do not require a land-use plan decision or implementation decision. They are not protestable or appealable.

## 5.7 DISTRIBUTION LIST FOR THE PROPOSED RMP/FINAL EIS

A copy of the PRMP/FEIS has been sent to all the entities identified in the distribution list below (Table 5.11). The individuals, groups, organizations, and agencies included in the mailing list for the Monticello RMP will be notified that the PRMP/FEIS is available and a hard copy or compact disc of the document can be provided upon request. In an effort to reduce printing costs, the PRMP/FEIS is also available on the Monticello RMP website at <http://www.blm.gov/ut/st/en/fo/monticello/planning.html/>, the Monticello FO, the public room in the BLM Utah State Office, and the public libraries listed on the distribution list.

**Table 5.11. Distribution List Proposed RMP/Final EIS**

<b>Federal Agencies (Required)</b>	<b>Local Federal Agencies</b>
Bureau of Reclamation Denver Federal Center Denver, CO	Canyonlands National Park Moab, UT
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Division of Environmental Quality Arlington, VA	U.S. Geological Survey Moab, UT
Office of Environmental Compliance Department of Energy Washington, DC	Manti-LaSal National Forest Forest Supervisor Price, UT
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Office of Federal Activities Washington, DC	Manti-LaSal National Forest District Ranger Moab, UT
U.S. Geological Survey Environmental Affairs Program Reston, VA	BLM Moab Field Office Moab, UT
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 8 Denver, CO	BLM Grand Junction Field Office Grand Junction, CO
Minerals Management Service Environmental Division Herndon, VA	BLM Price Field Office Price, UT
U.S. Geological Survey Reston, VA	BLM Montrose Field Office Montrose, CO
National Park Service Washington, DC	BLM Durango Field Office Durango, CO
Bureau of Indian Affairs Reston, VA	BLM Vernal Field Office Vernal, UT
Office of Surface Mining Washington, DC	
U.S. Department of the Interior Office of Environmental Policy and Compliance Washington, DC	
U.S. Department of the Interior Natural Resources Library Washington, DC	

**Table 5.11. Distribution List Proposed RMP/Final EIS**

Other Federal Agencies	Utah BLM Resource Advisory Council
Mineral Management Service Denver, CO	Mr. Carl Albrecht Richfield, UT
Federal Highway Administration Utah Division Salt Lake City, UT	Mr. Norman Carroll Orderville, UT
U.S. Department of Energy Grand Junction Office Grand Junction, CO	Mr. Michael Jenkins Salt Lake City, UT
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service West Valley City, UT	Mr. Lowell Braxton Salt Lake City, UT
Bureau of Reclamation Provo, UT	Mr. Ray Bloxham Salt Lake City, UT
Natural Resources Conservation Service Provo Service Center Provo, UT	Ms. Ashley Korenblat Moab, UT
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Chief, Planning Division Sacramento, CA	Mr. Clair "Riley" Cutler Salt Lake City, UT
Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Air Force Environment, Safety, and Occupational Health Washington, DC	Mr. Jerry Spangler Ogden, UT
Federal Depository Library System Government Printing Office Washington, DC	Mr. Gordon Topham Monroe, UT
US Department of the Interior Natural Resources Library Washington, DC	Mr. Drew Sitterud Castle Dale, UT
	Mr. F.E. "Fee" Busby Logan, UT
	Mr. Tom Clawson Salt Lake City, UT
	Mr. Lynn Stevens Blanding, UT
	Mr. Manuel Morgan Aneth, UT

**Table 5.11. Distribution List Proposed RMP/Final EIS**

<b>State Agencies</b>	<b>Elected Officials</b>
Public Lands Policy Coordination Office Salt Lake City, UT	Senator Orrin Hatch Washington, DC
Utah State Historic Preservation Office Salt Lake City, UT	Senator Bob Bennett Washington, DC
Utah School and Institutional Trust Lands Administration Moab, UT	Representative Jim Matheson Washington, DC
Utah School and Institutional Trust Lands Administration Salt Lake City, UT	Mike Dimitrich State Senator Price, UT
Utah Governor's Office of Planning and Budget Salt Lake City, UT	Brad King State Representative Price, UT 84501
Utah Department of Transportation Price, UT	John Mathis State Representative Vernal, UT
Utah State Parks Moab, UT	
<b>County Governments</b>	<b>City Governments</b>
Grand County Council Moab, UT	City of Blanding Blanding, UT
San Juan County Commission Monticello, UT	City of Monticello Monticello, UT
San Juan County Planner Monticello, UT	
<b>Tribal Governments</b>	
Program Manager Navajo Nation Historic Preservation Department Window Rock, AZ	Chapter President Dennehotso Navajo Chapter Dennehotso, AZ
Hopi Cultural Preservation Office Hopi Tribal Council Kykotsmovi, AZ	NAGPRA Coordinator Pueblo of Laguna Laguna, NM
Chapter Vice-President Navajo Mountain Navajo Chapter Tonalea, AZ	Chapter President Mexican Water Navajo Chapter Teecnospos, AZ
Chapter President Oljato Navajo Chapter Monument Valley, UT	Chapter President Red Mesa Navajo Chapter Montezuma Creek, UT

**Table 5.11. Distribution List Proposed RMP/Final EIS**

Chapter President Aneth Navajo Chapter Montezuma Creek, UT	Chapter President Teecnospos Navajo Chapter Teecnospos, AZ
White Mesa Ute Council White Mesa, UT	The Pueblo of Zia Historic Preservation Office Zia Pueblo, NM
Pueblo of Santa Clara Office of Cultural Preservation Española, NM	Zuni Heritage and Preservation Office Zuni, NM
Tribal Cultural Representative Ute Mountain Ute Tribe Towaoc, CO	
<b>Public Libraries</b>	<b>Adjoining State Agencies</b>
Public Reading Room Salt Lake City Public Library 210 East 400 South Salt Lake City, UT 84111	Colorado Division of Wildlife Grand Junction, CO
Grand County Public Library 257 East Center Moab, UT 84532	
San Juan County Public Library P.O. Box 66 Monticello, UT 84535	
Public Reading Room Marriott Library University of Utah 295 S. 1500 East Salt Lake City, UT 84112-0860	
Library of Congress 101 Independence Avenue SE Washington DC 20540	
<b>Groups</b>	
The Nature Conservancy Moab, UT	

## 5.8 LIST OF PREPARERS

The BLM Monticello FO PRMP/FEIS was written and produced by a team composed of Monticello FO interdisciplinary resource specialists and SWCA Inc., an independent, third-party consulting firm. In accordance with 40 CFR 1506.5(c), SWCA certified that it does not have any financial or other interest in the outcome of the decisions made pursuant to this RMP/EIS. Under the guidance and direction of the BLM, and in collaboration with the cooperating agencies, the team developed alternatives, collected baseline data to be used in the analysis, assessed potential effects of the alternatives, and prepared all the necessary elements of an RMP/EIS with additional participation, comments, and critique from the cooperating agencies and resource specialists with the BLM Utah state office. Table 5.12 lists the name, position, and planning role of the team members associated with preparation of the PRMP/FEIS.

**Table 5.12. List of Preparers**

Name	Position	Planning Role
<b>BLM</b>		
Ann Marie Aubry, B.S.	Hydrologist	Water Resources
Scott Berkenfield	Recreation Lead	Recreation, Wilderness
Todd Berkenfield	Assistant Planner	Wild and Scenic Rivers, ACECs, Travel Plan, Planning
Andy Boone	GIS Specialist	GIS, Travel Plan
Jeff Brown	Petroleum Engineering Technician	Hazardous Materials
Jed Carling, B.S.	Rangeland Management Specialist	Livestock Grazing
Jim Carter, M.A.	Archeologist	Cultural
Brad Colin, B.S.	Recreation Specialist	Recreation
Paul Curtis, B.S.	Range Management Specialist	Soils and Water, Riparian
Maxine Deeter, B.A.	Lands and Realty Specialist	Lands and Realty, Visual Resources
Katie Juenger	Fuels Specialist	Fire
Laura Kochanski, B.A.	Archeologist	Cultural, Paleontology, Native American Consulting
Paul Leatherbury, B.S.	GIS	Mapping
Ted McDougall, B.S.	Geologist	Minerals
Brian Quigley, B.S.	Recreation Specialist	Recreation, Wilderness, Wild and Scenic Rivers
Nick Sandberg, B.S.	Assistant Field Office Manager	Livestock, Soils, Riparian
Pam Schuller, B.S.	Planning NEPA Lead	NEPA
Summer Schulz, M.S.	Range Management Specialist	Range, Weeds, Vegetation, Woodlands
Nancy Shearin, Ph. D.	Archeologist	Cultural, Paleontology, Native American Consulting
Bill Stevens, M.B.A., Ph. D.	Planning Specialist	Socioeconomics
Rob Sweeten, B.S.	Landscape Architect	Visual Resources
Gary Torres, B.S.	Planning NEPA Lead	Field Office Planner, NEPA, Minerals

**Table 5.12. List of Preparers**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Planning Role</b>
Tammy Wallace, M.A.	Wildlife Biologist	Wildlife and Special Status Species
Marie Tuxhorn	Law Enforcement Officer	Recreation, Cultural, Travel Planning
<b>SWCA Environmental Consultants</b>		
Barb Bannon, B.A.	Technical Editor	General
Jean Ballagh, B.A.	Technical Editor	General
Barb Bittner, B.A.	Technical Editor	General
Laura Burch Vernon M.P.A.	Environmental Planner	Socioeconomics, Hazardous Materials
Linda Burfitt, B.A.	Technical Editor	General, Formatting
Kari Chalker, M.A.	Technical Editor	General
Catherine Chatfield, B.A.	GIS Specialist	GIS
Amanda Christensen, B.S.	Wildlife Biologist	Wildlife, Special Status Species
Tonya Dombrowski, Ph.D.	Environmental Chemist	Air Quality
Sheri Ellis, M.S.	Cultural Resources Lead	Fire Management, Cultural Resources, Lands and Realty
Russ Gatlin, B.A.	Technical Editor	General
Jason Green, B.S.	Environmental Planner	Recreation, Transportation
Janet Guinn, B.S.	Project Coordinator	Project Coordination, Formatting
David Harris, M.S.	NEPA Specialist	Recreation, Travel, Visual Resource Management, Woodlands
Kristen Knippenberg, M.F.A.	Resource Specialist, Technical Editor	Minerals, editing
Greg Larson, M.S.	Resource Specialist	Fire, Lands, Soils
Cynthia Manseau, B.A.	Technical Editor	General
Susan Martin, M.S.	Ecologist	Special Status Plant Species, Vegetation
Eric McCulley, B.S.	Geologist	Riparian, Soils/Watershed
Molly Mollenaar, M.A.	Cultural Anthropologist	Native American Consultation
Paul C. Murphey, Ph.D.	Principal Investigator, Paleontology	Paleontology
Megan Nelson, B.A.	Environmental Technician	Public Comments Analysis, Formatting
Brian Nicholson, M.S.	Ecologist	Riparian and Soils and Watershed
John Pecorelli, B.S.	Technical Editor	General
Matt Petersen, M.S.	Principal Ecologist	NEPA Specialist/QA/QC
Deb Reber, B.S.	Natural Resource Planner	Project Manager/ QA/QC
Jan Reed, B.A.	Ecologist	Livestock Grazing
Dave Reinhart, B.A.	GIS Specialist	GIS Mapping
Mathew Seddon, Ph. D	Anthropologist	Cultural Resources
Thomas Sharp, M.S.	Ecologist	Wildlife, Special Status Species
Elisha Wardle, B.S.	Resource Specialist	Vegetation, Special Status Species